

MARKETING SCALES HANDBOOK

*Multi-Item Measures
for Consumer Insight Research*

— VOLUME —

X

GORDON C. BRUNER II

Marketing Scales Handbook

.....

**Multi-Item Measures
for Consumer Insight Research**

Volume 10
(library version)

Gordon C. Bruner II



GCBII Productions, LLC
Fort Worth, Texas USA

Marketing Scales Handbook, Volume 10, e-book library version.
Copyright © 2019, Gordon C. Bruner II. All rights reserved.

ISBN-13: 978-0-578-47002-3

Reviews of the measurement scales in this book are the intellectual property of Gordon C. Bruner II. Unless otherwise noted, ownership and copyright of the measures themselves is not clear. The scales can be used freely but citations of the original sources or some previous users is expected when reports or papers are written that refer to the scales.

Published by:

GCBII Productions, LLC

6109 Timberwolfe Lane

Fort Worth, Texas 76135

USA

gcbii@marketingscales.com

817-677-8876

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-------|
| Preface | xvii |
| Acknowledgements | xviii |
| Introduction | xix |
| Scale Reviews | 1 |
| Ad Message Construal Level (Abstract) | 3 |
| Ad Message Construal Level (Concrete) | 4 |
| Aesthetic Appeal | 5 |
| Affective Response (Negative) | 6 |
| Affective Response to the Ad (Positive) | 7 |
| Anticipation (Affective) | 8 |
| Appreciation for Producers' Efforts | 10 |
| Approval of Unfriendliness Towards the Employee | 11 |
| Attachment Anxiety | 13 |
| Attachment to the Product | 15 |
| Attention to the Product Information | 16 |
| Attitude Certainty | 17 |
| Attitude Toward Corporate Philanthropy | 18 |
| Attitude Toward Following Others in Social Media | 19 |
| Attitude Toward Literacy Skills | 21 |
| Attitude Toward Pesticide Use | 22 |
| Attitude Toward Recycling | 23 |
| Attitude Toward the Activity (Work-Likeness) | 24 |
| Attitude Toward the Ad (Credibility) | 26 |
| Attitude Toward the Ad (Divergence) | 27 |
| Attitude Toward the Ad (Gain/Loss Message) | 29 |
| Attitude Toward the Ad (Joyful Nostalgia) | 30 |
| Attitude Toward the Ad (Language Comprehension) | 31 |
| Attitude Toward the Ad (Narrativeness) | 32 |
| Attitude Toward the Ad (Relevance) | 34 |
| Attitude Toward the Ad (Supporting a Cause) | 35 |
| Attitude Toward the Bank | 37 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Attitude Toward the Brand (Luxury) | 38 |
| Attitude Toward the Brand Name | 39 |
| Attitude Toward the Brand's Price | 40 |
| Attitude Toward the Color | 41 |
| Attitude Toward the Company's Charitable Contribution | 42 |
| Attitude Toward the Discussion Thread (Friendliness) | 44 |
| Attitude Toward the Experience (Affective) | 45 |
| Attitude Toward the Experience (Affective) | 46 |
| Attitude Toward the Food Product (GMO Content) | 47 |
| Attitude Toward the Food Product (Nutritiousness) | 49 |
| Attitude Toward the Food Product (Nutritiousness) | 50 |
| Attitude Toward the Food Product (Nutritiousness) | 51 |
| Attitude Toward the Logo (Agentic Animacy) | 52 |
| Attitude Toward the Logo (General) | 53 |
| Attitude Toward the Logo (Helplessness) | 54 |
| Attitude Toward the Object (General) | 55 |
| Attitude Toward the Object (Outrageous) | 56 |
| Attitude Toward the Offer | 58 |
| Attitude Toward The Organization's Repositioning | 59 |
| Attitude Toward the Product (Goal Achievement) | 60 |
| Attitude Toward the Product (Post-Purchase) | 62 |
| Attitude Toward the Product Choice set | 63 |
| Attitude Toward the Product Design | 64 |
| Attitude Toward the Retailer's Website (Customer Service) | 65 |
| Attitude Toward the Retailer's Website (Design) | 66 |
| Attitude Toward the Retailer's Website (Fulfillment) | 67 |
| Attitude Toward the Retailer's Website (Security/Privacy) | 68 |
| Attitude Toward the Slogan (General) | 69 |
| Being Watched | 70 |
| Belief in a Just World | 71 |
| Brand Affordability | 72 |
| Brand Expectations | 73 |
| Brand Imitation | 75 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Brand Preference | 76 |
| Brand Relationship (Partner Quality) | 77 |
| Brand Sponsorship Motive (Normative)..... | 78 |
| Busyness at Work | 80 |
| Cause-Related Marketing Motive Attributions (Egoistic) | 82 |
| Cause-Related Marketing Motive Attributions (Values Driven)..... | 83 |
| Choice Difficulty | 84 |
| Choice Uncertainty..... | 86 |
| Closeness of the Friend | 87 |
| Comfortableness of the Object | 88 |
| Commitment to the Company (General) | 89 |
| Company Reputation..... | 91 |
| Company Success Expectations | 92 |
| Company's Value to the Customer | 93 |
| Competence..... | 94 |
| Competitive/Collaborative Orientation | 95 |
| Confidence in Finding Product Information | 97 |
| Conformity Orientation | 98 |
| Congruence (General) | 99 |
| Congruence (Self with Object)..... | 100 |
| Connectedness with Nature..... | 101 |
| Consciousness of Face (Desire to Gain Face) | 102 |
| Consciousness of Face (Fear of Losing Face) | 103 |
| Conservation Intention at the Hotel | 104 |
| Consumption Closure | 105 |
| Control Value (Customer's Interaction with The Salesperson) | 107 |
| Conversational Value..... | 109 |
| Co-Production of the Product..... | 110 |
| Corporate Social Responsibility (Effect on Product Quality)..... | 111 |
| Corporate Social Responsibility (Engagement)..... | 112 |
| Corporate Social Responsibility (High Costs) | 114 |
| Corporate Social Responsibility (Personal Benefit)..... | 115 |
| Corporate Social Responsibility (Price Markup) | 116 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Corporate Social Responsibility (Sales-Contingent Engagement) | 117 |
| Corporate Social Responsibility (Self-Serving Expenditures) | 118 |
| Creative Authenticity..... | 120 |
| Creativity of the Sponsorship Promotion | 121 |
| Credibility of the News Story | 122 |
| Crowding (General)..... | 124 |
| Crowding in the Store | 126 |
| Cultural Distinctiveness | 127 |
| Customer Engagement (Influence)..... | 128 |
| Customer Engagement (Knowledge) | 129 |
| Customer Engagement (Purchases) | 131 |
| Customer Engagement (Reference)..... | 132 |
| Customer Inspiration (Activation) | 134 |
| Customer Inspiration (Intention) | 135 |
| Customer's Status with a Company..... | 137 |
| Customer's Unfair Treatment by a Company | 138 |
| Dangerous World..... | 140 |
| Decision Comfort | 141 |
| Decision Confidence (Comparative)..... | 143 |
| Decision Conflict..... | 144 |
| Decision Goal (Gratification-Seeking)..... | 145 |
| Delight | 146 |
| Desirability of Scoring Points | 148 |
| Desire to Connect with Home | 149 |
| Discount Size | 150 |
| Disposal Guilt..... | 151 |
| Dispute Likelihood | 152 |
| Distraction During the Task..... | 153 |
| Donation Likelihood | 154 |
| Durability of the Object | 155 |
| Ease of Being Persuaded..... | 156 |
| Ease of Using the Shopping Technology..... | 157 |
| Eating Behavior (External Stimuli Motivation)..... | 158 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Effectiveness of the Smoking Warning | 160 |
| Efficacy of Joining the Fitness Club..... | 161 |
| Embarrassment (Product Purchase) | 162 |
| Emergency Expenditure (Ease of Paying) | 163 |
| Employee Unfriendliness..... | 164 |
| Environmental Concern of the Company | 165 |
| Environmental Concern of the Company | 167 |
| Environmentalism (Activism)..... | 168 |
| Environmentalism (Crisis Concern) | 169 |
| Environmentalism (Purchasing Behavior) | 170 |
| E-Service Quality (Contact Availability)..... | 172 |
| E-Service Quality (Delivery Condition)..... | 173 |
| E-Service Quality (Delivery Timeliness) | 174 |
| E-Service Quality (Order Accuracy) | 175 |
| E-Service Quality (Privacy) | 176 |
| E-Service Quality (Return Policies)..... | 178 |
| E-Service Quality (Security) | 179 |
| Exchange Equity (Customer with Company) | 181 |
| Face Enhancement in Idea Sharing | 182 |
| Face Threat in Idea Sharing | 183 |
| Fairness | 185 |
| Femininity | 186 |
| Financial Comfort..... | 187 |
| Financial Sufficiency (Childhood) | 188 |
| Financial Sufficiency (Current)..... | 189 |
| Financial Wellness..... | 190 |
| Fit (Brand With Charity) | 192 |
| Fluency of the Ad..... | 193 |
| Fluency of the Package's Health-related Information | 194 |
| Fluency of the Products' Health-related Information | 195 |
| Fluency of the Written Information..... | 196 |
| Food Healthiness Effects | 197 |
| Food Healthiness Expense..... | 198 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Friendliness | 199 |
| Friendliness Towards Employees (Social Norms) | 200 |
| Gamification Effectiveness | 201 |
| Gender Identity | 202 |
| Global Self-Identity | 204 |
| Goal Reengagement in the Store | 206 |
| Grandiosity of Another Person | 208 |
| Greed of the Organization | 210 |
| Guilt from Eating the Meal (Expected) | 212 |
| Health Condition Severity | 214 |
| Health Treatment Effectiveness | 215 |
| Hostility Toward the Brand | 217 |
| House Fire Risk | 218 |
| Human Capital | 219 |
| Hunger Satiation Expectation | 221 |
| Identification with the Organization (Affective) | 222 |
| Identification with the Organization (Cognitive) | 224 |
| Implicit Body Theory | 226 |
| Information Sharing Benefits | 228 |
| Information Sharing Motivation (Protect Others) | 229 |
| Information Sharing Motivation (Self-Enhancement) | 230 |
| Innovativeness (Packaging) | 231 |
| Inspiration Felt (State) | 232 |
| Interaction Orientation of the Brand | 234 |
| Interdependent Ideation Style | 235 |
| Interestingness of the Ad | 236 |
| Internet Usage (Escape Motivation) | 237 |
| Involvement (Cognitive) | 238 |
| Involvement in the Task | 239 |
| Involvement with Shopping | 240 |
| Involvement with the Celebrity | 241 |
| Involvement with the Reading Task | 243 |
| Knowledge of the Product Class | 244 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Knowledge of the Product Class (Expert) | 246 |
| Lightness of the Object..... | 247 |
| Local Self-Identity | 248 |
| Locus of Control | 250 |
| Loneliness (State)..... | 251 |
| Looking for Possessions to Donate | 252 |
| Loyalty (Cognitive) | 253 |
| Loyalty to the Brand (Conative)..... | 254 |
| Loyalty to the Service Provider | 255 |
| Loyalty to the Store | 256 |
| Loyalty to the Team (Behavioral)..... | 257 |
| Masculinity..... | 258 |
| Meaningfulness of Self..... | 259 |
| Mindfulness (Acting With Awareness) | 260 |
| Mindfulness (Acting Without Judgment)..... | 262 |
| Mindfulness (Attention to One's Body)..... | 264 |
| Mindfulness (Attention to One's Environment) | 266 |
| Mindfulness (Attention to One's Feelings) | 267 |
| Mindfulness (Describing) | 268 |
| Mindfulness (Observing) | 270 |
| Moral Violation of the Employee(s)..... | 272 |
| Morality of the Employee | 273 |
| Morality of the Object..... | 274 |
| Multi-Media Usage in a Task..... | 275 |
| Narcissism (State) | 276 |
| Need for Status | 278 |
| Normalcy of Unfriendly Behavior..... | 279 |
| Optimism (General) | 281 |
| Optimism (Personal Economic Situation)..... | 282 |
| Outdoors Lifestyle..... | 283 |
| Parental Media Mediation (Autonomy-Supportive Active) | 284 |
| Parental Media Mediation (Autonomy-Supportive Restrictive) | 286 |
| Parental Media Mediation (Controlling Restrictive)..... | 288 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Parental Media Mediation (Inconsistent Restrictive)..... | 290 |
| Parental Style (Authoritarian)..... | 292 |
| Parental Style (Authoritative) | 294 |
| Parental Style (Permissive) | 296 |
| Participation (Active)..... | 298 |
| Patronage Likelihood (Restaurant) | 299 |
| Performance Improvement Expectancy..... | 300 |
| Personal Savings Orientation..... | 302 |
| Persuasiveness of the Ad | 304 |
| Playfulness of The Object..... | 305 |
| Polychronicity..... | 307 |
| Power Felt (State) | 309 |
| Power Felt (State) | 310 |
| Powerlessness with the Brand | 311 |
| Preference For the Familiar Food Brand | 312 |
| Prestige of Consuming the Product..... | 314 |
| Price Fairness..... | 315 |
| Price familiarity With a Product Category | 316 |
| Price Format Comprehension..... | 317 |
| Pride in Task Accomplishment | 318 |
| Privacy Concerns (Control of Information) | 319 |
| Privacy Concerns (Data Use Transparency) | 320 |
| Privacy Concerns (Fairness) | 321 |
| Privacy Concerns (Falsifying Personal Information) | 322 |
| Privacy Concerns (Trust in the Company) | 323 |
| Privacy Concerns (Violated) | 324 |
| Privacy Concerns (Vulnerability) | 326 |
| Privacy Control | 327 |
| Privacy Importance | 328 |
| Procrastination (Online)..... | 329 |
| Procrastination (Trait Decisional) | 331 |
| Product Choice Overload in the Store | 333 |
| Product Contamination | 334 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Product Contamination | 335 |
| Product Design (Aesthetic)..... | 336 |
| Product Development Process (Innovative) | 337 |
| Product Evaluation (Food)..... | 339 |
| Product Evaluation (General) | 340 |
| Product Preference Heterogeneity | 341 |
| Product Scarcity | 342 |
| Product Usage Automaticity | 343 |
| Program Engagement..... | 345 |
| Program Information Value | 346 |
| Psychological Distance (Consumer-Retailer) | 347 |
| Purchase Abandonment (Store) | 349 |
| Purchase Abandonment (Store) | 350 |
| Purchase Likelihood (Current Price)..... | 352 |
| Purchase Likelihood (Product From The Retailer) | 354 |
| Quality of the Brand..... | 355 |
| Quality of the Company's Products..... | 357 |
| Quality of the Product Application | 358 |
| Quality of the Retailer's Products | 359 |
| Realism of the Ad Scenario | 360 |
| Reciprocity Motivation (Mutual Interest) | 361 |
| Reciprocity Motivation (Self-Interest) | 363 |
| Reflection on the Story | 365 |
| Regret (Decision)..... | 366 |
| Relational Benefits with the Salesperson (Functional) | 367 |
| Relationship Equity (Customer With Company) | 369 |
| Relationship Feedback..... | 371 |
| Relationship Orientation of the Brand | 372 |
| Relationship Strength (Due to Gift) | 373 |
| Relationship Termination Responsibility (Company) | 374 |
| Relationship Type (Economic Exchange) | 375 |
| Relationship Type (Social Exchange) | 377 |
| Religiosity..... | 379 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Reminiscing Enjoyment | 380 |
| Repatronage Intention | 381 |
| Reviewer's Effort | 382 |
| Reviewing Motive (Altruistic) | 384 |
| Riskiness of Reviewing the Product (Social)..... | 385 |
| Riskiness of the Purchase (Product/Website) | 386 |
| Rumination of Brand-Related Mistreatment | 387 |
| Sacrifice for a Cause | 388 |
| Salesperson's Customer Orientation | 390 |
| Salesperson's Pressure (Aggressive) | 391 |
| Salesperson's Pressure (Directive) | 393 |
| Satisfaction (Cognitive) | 395 |
| Satisfaction with the Brand | 396 |
| Satisfaction with The Co-Produced Product | 398 |
| Satisfaction with the Resort | 399 |
| Satisfaction with the Service Agent | 400 |
| Scarcity in the Job Market..... | 401 |
| Self-Congruence (Uniqueness) | 403 |
| Self-Efficacy | 404 |
| Self-Efficacy (Financial) | 405 |
| Self-Efficacy (Financial) | 406 |
| Self-Efficacy (Health) | 407 |
| Self-Enhancement When Talking to Someone..... | 408 |
| Self-Regulatory Orientation (Assessment)..... | 409 |
| Self-Regulatory Orientation (Locomotion) | 411 |
| Self-Worth (Competence) | 413 |
| Self-Worth (Overall)..... | 414 |
| Sense of Completion with Negotiated Price | 415 |
| Sense of Control | 416 |
| Sensory Pleasure Expectation (Food Portion)..... | 418 |
| Severity of the Event | 419 |
| Shopping for New Ideas | 420 |
| Shopping Stress | 421 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Side Effects Severity (Drug)..... | 422 |
| Similarity to Another Person (Expressiveness)..... | 423 |
| Similarity to Another Person (Overall) | 424 |
| Similarity to Other Customers | 425 |
| Skepticism of Negative Information About the Company | 426 |
| Social Acceptance Concern (Posting) | 427 |
| Social Attraction | 428 |
| Social Avoidance (Place Specific) | 429 |
| Social Exclusion..... | 431 |
| Social Group Identity | 432 |
| Social Media Usage | 433 |
| Social Media Usage | 434 |
| Social Mobility | 435 |
| Socioeconomic Status | 436 |
| Softness of the Seat..... | 438 |
| Sophisticated Consumption | 439 |
| Spatial Presence (Product) | 440 |
| Spending Freedom..... | 442 |
| Sponsor/Sponsee Congruence | 443 |
| Store Design (Confusing Interior Layout) | 444 |
| Store Design (Cramped)..... | 445 |
| Stress Mindset | 446 |
| Submitting Ideas to the Company..... | 447 |
| Sunscreen Use Intention..... | 448 |
| Susceptibility to Persuasion..... | 449 |
| Suspicious of Other People..... | 451 |
| Taking Money From Savings (Future-Mindedness) | 452 |
| Taking Money From Savings (Irresponsibility) | 453 |
| Targetedness of the Ad | 455 |
| Task Difficulty | 457 |
| Task Enjoyment | 458 |
| Task Enjoyment | 459 |
| Team Preference | 460 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Team Rivalry (Game Induced) | 462 |
| Temporal Proximity to the Health Problem | 463 |
| Threat to Social Order | 465 |
| Tie Strength..... | 466 |
| Transferred Essence..... | 467 |
| Trust in the Retailer | 468 |
| Trust in the Salesperson | 469 |
| Trustworthiness (General) | 471 |
| Unfriendliness Towards Employees (Other Customers) | 473 |
| Uniqueness of the Object..... | 474 |
| Uniqueness of the Object..... | 475 |
| Usefulness of the Online Shopping App..... | 476 |
| Usefulness of the Shopping Technology | 478 |
| Value Equity of the Product..... | 479 |
| Value of the Company's Products..... | 481 |
| Value of the Object | 482 |
| Value of the Objects (Comparison)..... | 483 |
| Value of the Product..... | 484 |
| Value of the Reward..... | 486 |
| Value-in-Use (Product) | 488 |
| Variety Among the Activities | 490 |
| Variety-Seeking Tendency | 491 |
| Versatility of the Product | 493 |
| Visual Appeal of the Product..... | 494 |
| Visual Processing Fluency (General) | 495 |
| Vulnerability..... | 496 |
| Wait Time in the Store | 497 |
| Warm Glow | 498 |
| Warmth of the Person | 499 |
| Warmth of the Person | 500 |
| Website Design (Aesthetics)..... | 501 |
| Website Design (Information Quality)..... | 502 |
| Website Design (Interactivity) | 503 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Website Design (Low Prices) | 504 |
| Website Design (Product Selection)..... | 505 |
| Website Design (Purchasing Process) | 507 |
| Website Design (Readability) | 509 |
| Willingness of The Business to Accommodate a Special Request | 511 |
| Willingness to Pay More | 513 |
| Willingness to Purchase | 515 |
| Willingness to Purchase | 517 |
| Willingness to Purchase a Product as a Gift | 518 |
| Willingness to Switch Companies | 519 |
| Word-of-Mouth (Negative) | 521 |
| Word-of-Mouth Intention Toward the Resort | 522 |
| Subject Index..... | 523 |
| About the Author | 529 |

Preface

.

How exciting it is to publish the tenth volume of the *Marketing Scales Handbook* series! I did not imagine when I began working on the first volume that I would still be immersed in the activity 30 years later, even after retiring from academia. The problem when I began was how to write the book and get it published. After all of this time, the work has become more routine and yet, there are still challenges (as mentioned below).

Indeed, I found myself more discouraged while working on this volume. Instead of it becoming more common over time for authors of journal articles to use higher quality scales and provide information about them, that was not the case. I am especially concerned with the number of scholars who throw together scales and not borrow measures used previously by others in the field. In other words, there is still far too much recreating the wheel! Also, I am alarmed with the authors who mash up some items they think measure a construct even though the face validity is suspicious since the items appear to measure what others have treated as distinct constructs. Although I could have confronted more authors and requested justification for their scales, I have chosen instead to ignore them. I do not want to give credence to measures for which I have strong reservations.

As for the future, I can not state with strong certainty that more books will be published. It has been several years now since I retired from academia and the pull to change my priorities is growing. Having said that, I have already begun gathering source articles for scales to be included in the next volume and I will soon begin reviewing the measures. If I decide not to produce another volume, I assume the reviews I write will be added to the database at *MarketingScales.com*. The point is that if you do not find something in this book that you are looking for, please search for it at the website.

Good luck in your research!

Acknowledgements

.

When describing scales, I primarily depend upon information in the journal articles in which the scales were reported. There are many cases, however, when I need more information or clarification. When that happens, I attempt to contact the authors. Listed below are those authors who responded to my requests while working on this volume. My gratitude is extended to:

Rajesh Bagchi
Steve Bellman
S. Adam Brasel
Chingching Chang
Meredith David
Cassandra Davis
Ping Dong
Paul W. Fombelle
Bart de Langhe
Johannes Habel
Henrik Hagtvedt
Patrick Hartmann
Tim Hilken
Yuwei Jiang
Andrea Kähr
Hean Tat Keh

Eunjin Kim
Amna Kirmani
Arie Kruglanski
Ashish Kumar
Jennifer Labreque
Elison Ai Ching Lim
Robert Madrigal
Kelly Martin
Ravi Mehta
Ravi Prakash
Kumar Rakesh Ranjan
Brandon Reich
Marisabel Romero
Yuhosua Ryoo
Aner Sela
Ilona Szőcs

Lena Steinhoff
Lei Su
Gabriela Tonietto
Noah VanBergen
Wenbo Wang
Morgan Ward
Liad Weiss
Karen Page Winterich
David M. Woisetschläger
Jeremy Wolter
Freeman Wu
Yi Xie
Dezhi Yin
James J. Zboja

As with previous volumes, I thank my wife for understanding the time and effort I put into this work. That is doubly true now that I have been retired for several years and could be traveling more or hanging out with my growing brood of grandchildren.

May your measures always be valid!

Fort Worth, Texas
February 2019

Introduction

.

Volumes 1 to 9 of this series contained multi-item scales that had been included in articles published in six of the top marketing journals between 1980 and 2015. (See the table below for the six journals.) This tenth volume of the series covers the scales that were reported in articles published in 2016 and 2017. As with the earlier books, this one should not be viewed simply as a revision of the previously published material, in fact, the contents of this volume are new. While that does not necessarily mean a scale was first reported during that time period, it does mean that none of the scales in this volume were in a previous volume of this series. If users are looking for something and not finding it in this book, check out the full database at *MarketingScales.com* where several thousand scales are available.

Similar to Volumes 4 to 9, this volume is composed entirely of scales that were used in scholarly research of “consumers” or similar groups of respondents, e.g., viewers, patients, donors, citizens, etc. Fortunately, hundreds of the scales in this volume are amenable for use in a wide variety of studies and with all sorts of people, including those in an organizational context when studying administrators or employees.

To be included in this volume, scales had to be composed of three or more items, have an acceptable level of psychometric quality, and be reflective measures rather than formative. There were three other criteria used as well. As described below, one was a constraint imposed at the scale level, one was a constraint at the construct level, and the final one had to do with time.

At the scale level, many measures reported in recent articles were not included in this volume because they were the same or very similar to ones that had been reviewed in previous volumes. Those reviews from previous volumes scales can be found in the database at *MarketingScales.com*. In many cases, recent uses of older scales are cited in those online reviews.

Another criterion used to focus the work was at the construct level. The question asked was, how many unique, alternative measures of a construct have already been reviewed and are housed in the repository at *MarketingScales.com*? Having alternative measures of the same construct is useful to researchers so that they can compare the various characteristics and choose the scale that best suits their needs. But, at some point, the endless review of alternative measures of the same construct is not the best use of time. While there was no hard and fast rule to guide this constraint, suffice it to say that the greater the number of different measures of a construct that have already been reviewed, the less likely that yet another measure was reviewed for this volume.

The final major criterion used to manage the workload was to focus on articles from a

two-year period. This was begun with Volume 7 because there are limits to the number of pages printers allow for paperback books. (While page length is not necessarily a problem for an e-book, the contents of printed and electronic versions should be the same.) With that in mind, an initial examination was conducted of over 600 articles published in six top marketing journals during 2016 and 2017. (The journals are specified in the table on the next page.) From that group, 213 articles received more scrutiny because they appeared to have measures of the type focused on in the series. After closer examination, some of those articles were dismissed because the measures they included did not meet enough of the stated criteria or the authors did not respond to requests for more information. Ultimately, there were 174 articles from the marketing literature that received the greatest attention and provided the 402 scales that are reviewed in this volume.

Assigning names to scales is more challenging than might be imagined. It is not as simple as calling measures the same thing as the users did. In some cases, the authors of an article did not give their measure a name as such but merely referred to it generally, e.g., *the attitude scale used in the field survey*. Other times, a scale was given a name by authors that made sense in the context of their particular study but was more widely known with a more general construct name or one that would make more sense to readers, e.g., *promotion depth* vs. *Discount Size*. In general, scales were assigned names here based on the constructs they appear to measure. More specifically, several things were taken into account when deciding what to call each scale: what did the creators of the measure call it; what a common name among marketing scholars for the construct being measured; how have similar measures of the construct been referred to in previous volumes of this series; and, does a name need to be reduced due to length?

As for finding scales of interest, the Table of Contents is useful place to start. A Subject Index is provided at the back of the book. Also, an option may be provided by the vendor of the version being used that enables readers to type a word or phrase and have the complete contents of the book searched.

Finally, the layout of reviews is the same as in the most recent volumes. Description of the information found in the various sections of each review are provided in the table on the next page.

TABLE

Scale Review Format

A name for each scale is given at the top of the page on which a review begins. Several issues are taken into account when assigning a name. (See the discussion in the Introduction for more details.) In a few cases, multiple scales have been given the same name because they appear to measure the same construct, e.g., Social Media Usage, Task Enjoyment, Willingness to Purchase.

Just below the scale name are a few sentences that succinctly describe the construct being assessed and the number of items composing the measure. If known, the number of points on the rating scale and the response format (e.g., Likert, semantic differential) are described as well.

ORIGIN:

Some information about the creation of the scale is provided in this section, if known. In a substantial portion of cases, the source of the scale was not stated by the authors of the article. While in many of those cases the authors were the likely creators of the scale, it is not always true. Sometimes when authors of an article do not cite a scale's source, it leaves the impression that the measure is original even though some digging reveals that they borrowed it from someone else. The opposite also occurs far too often. Specifically, authors describe their scale as having been "adapted" from a certain source. Yet, when a comparison is made between the "adapted" scale and the cited one, little resemblance is found. This information is noted when relevant.

RELIABILITY:

For the most part, reliability is described in terms of internal consistency, most typically with Cronbach's alpha or construct reliability. In the few cases where it is known, a scale's temporal stability (test-retest correlation) is reported as well. For those unfamiliar with these statistics, higher numbers are generally better. With particular regard to internal consistency, a statistic below .70 indicates that a scale is not reliable enough for testing theory. Very few scales of low reliability are included in the book.

VALIDITY:

There are several types of validity and no single study is expected to fully validate a scale. While it is hoped that authors of each study would provide at least some evidence of a scale's validity, the reality is the opposite. Most articles reviewed for this volume have not included evidence of a scale's validity. (The reason for this systemic omission is unknown.) At the other extreme, a few authors have provided so much information in their articles about a scale's validation process that the work is merely summarized and readers are urged to consult the cited article for more details.

COMMENTS:

This section of a review is used only occasionally. For example, if something about a scale is judged to be deficient then readers may be urged in this section to exercise caution in using the scale. Another example is that in many cases a scale was phrased by its creators for use in a particular

context, but it is noted that with a little modification the scale could be usable in other contexts.

REFERENCES:

Every source cited in a review is referenced in this section. The six journals that were closely examined for articles with scales are the ***Journal of Advertising***, the ***Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science***, the ***Journal of Consumer Research***, the ***Journal of Marketing***, the ***Journal of Marketing Research***, and the ***Journal of Retailing***. Citation of additional journals, books, proceedings, and other sources are provided when relevant to a review. As stated in the Acknowledgements, the scale users themselves were contacted in many cases but many did not respond. If they did respond and provide useful information, they are cited.

ITEMS:

The statements, adjectives, or questions composing a scale are listed in this field and are generally referred to as the *scale items*. Also, an indication of the response format is provided in this section unless it has been adequately specified in the description at the beginning of the review. For example, many of the measures were merely described by authors of the source articles as “Likert-type” and the verbal anchors of the response scales were not stated. Unless stated otherwise in this section, the extreme anchors of “Likert-type” scales were *strongly agree* / *strongly disagree* or some close variant. The graphic version of the scales and how to lay them out in a questionnaire are not provided in the reviews here because they are rarely provided in the source material. Concerned readers are urged to consult books that deal with survey development or the various types of measurement scales.

Where an item is followed by an (r) it means that the numerical response should be reverse-coded when calculating scale scores. Errors involving notation of reverse-coding can occur at various stages of an article’s composition, review, editing, and publication. Users of scales are urged to examine items closely to determine which ones should be reverse-coded before using scores in analyses.

Finally, the instructions that were given to participants when they responded to scales, are rarely provided in the reviews here because authors of the source articles very rarely provide them. Despite that, some suggestions have been provided in many cases, especially when the scales do not make sense without directions or scale stems of some sort. Potential users of a measure should feel free to contact the creators and/or other users who have been cited in the review and ask them about the instructions along with any other questions related to the measure.

Scale Reviews

AD MESSAGE CONSTRUAL LEVEL (ABSTRACT)

How much a person believes that an advertising message explains why customers should participate in an activity is measured with three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Ryoo, Hyun, and Sung (2017) used the scale in a study with a well-known South Korean coffee brand. Participants ($n = 148$) were recruited in Seoul, South Korea and asked to imagine that they visited a coffee bar and saw an ad there about the chain's Mug Usage Campaign. As for the scale's source, the authors adapted a measure by Yang and Kim (2012, p. 159). The scale was phrased in Korean when provided to participants and was translated into English for the article (Ryoo 2018).

Reliability:

The alpha reported for the scale was .96 (Ryoo, Hyun, and Sung 2017, p. 541).

Validity:

Ryoo, Hyun, and Sung (2017) did not explicitly discuss the scale's validity. However, the authors did say a factor analysis indicated that the three items composing this scale and three items measuring a companion construct (concrete construal level) loaded on separate factors. Further, since both of the scales were used as manipulation checks and the manipulations were successful, it provides some limited evidence of their predictive validities.

References:

Ryoo, Yuhosua (2018), personal correspondence.

Ryoo, Yuhosua, Na Kyong Hyun, and Yongjun Sung (2017), "The Effect of Descriptive Norms and Construal Level on Consumers' Sustainable Behaviors" *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (4), 536-549.

Yang, Yoon, and Minhye Kim (2012), "The Influence of Construal Level, Message Type, and Temporal Distance on Message Attitude and Purchase Intention," *Korean Journal of Advertising*, 23 (2), 151-72.

Scale Items:¹

1. This message explains the reasons for participating in the _____.
2. This message introduces the purpose of the _____.
3. This message is about the ultimate goal of the _____.

1. The end-points of the scale used with these items were *Strongly disagree* (1) and *Strongly agree* (7). The blanks at the end of each item should be filled with a name or brief description of the focal activity. For example, Ryoo, Hyun, and Sung (2017) used the word "campaign" because the experimental setting had to do with in-store ads run by the business to convince customers to request store-owned mugs in which to drink their coffee rather than disposable cups.

AD MESSAGE CONSTRUAL LEVEL (CONCRETE)

Three, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a person believes an advertising message stresses how customers can participate in an activity.

Origin:

Ryoo, Hyun, and Sung (2017) used the scale in a study with a well-known South Korean coffee brand. Participants ($n = 148$) were recruited in Seoul, South Korea. They were asked to imagine that they visited a coffee bar and saw an ad there about the chain's Mug Usage Campaign. As for the scale's source, the authors adapted a measure by Yang and Kim (2012, p. 159). The scale was phrased in Korean when provided to participants and was translated into English for the article (Ryoo 2018).

Reliability:

The alpha reported for the scale was .95 (Ryoo, Hyun, and Sung 2017, p. 541).

Validity:

Ryoo, Hyun, and Sung (2017) did not explicitly discuss the scale's validity. However, the authors did say a factor analysis indicated that the three items composing this scale and three items measuring a companion construct (abstract construal level) loaded on separate factors. Further, since both of the scales were used as manipulation checks and the manipulations were successful, it provides some limited evidence of their predictive validities.

References:

Ryoo, Yuhosua (2018), personal correspondence.

Ryoo, Yuhosua, Na Kyong Hyun, and Yongjun Sung (2017), "The Effect of Descriptive Norms and Construal Level on Consumers' Sustainable Behaviors" *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (4), 536-549.

Yang, Yoon and Minhye Kim (2012), "The Influence of Construal Level, Message Type, and Temporal Distance on Message Attitude and Purchase Intention," *Korean Journal of Advertising*, 23 (2), 151-72.

Scale Items:¹

1. This message suggests how to participate in the _____.
2. This message explains the actions one should take in detail.
3. This message informs about the methods one can participate in the _____.

1. The end-points of the scale used with these items were *Strongly disagree* (1) and *Strongly agree* (7). The blanks in items #1 and #3 should be filled with a name or brief description of the focal activity. For example, Ryoo, Hyun, and Sung (2017) used the word "campaign" because the experimental setting had to do with in-store ads run by the business to convince customers to request store-owned mugs in which to drink their coffee rather than disposable cups.

AESTHETIC APPEAL

How beautiful and pleasing an object appears to be is measured with four, seven-point uni-polar items.

Origin:

The scale was used by Wu et al. (2017, p. 670) in a pretest with 130 participants recruited from Amazon MTurk (Wu 2018) to help select two brands in each of several product categories that varied significantly in their aesthetic appeal. The authors created the scale (Wu 2018).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale as used with several product categories were very high, ranging from .92 to .97 (Wu et al. 2017, p. 670).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Wu et al. (2017).

Comments:

Wu et al. (2017) created the scale for use with products, however, the items seem to be amenable for use with a wide variety of objects.

References:

Wu, Freeman (2018), personal correspondence.

Wu, Freeman, Adriana Samper, Andrea C. Morales, and Gavan J. Fitzsimons (2017), "It's Too Pretty to Use! When and How Enhanced Product Aesthetics Discourage Usage and Lower Consumption Enjoyment," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (3), 651–672.

Scale Items:¹

1. beautiful
2. pretty
3. artistic
4. aesthetically pleasing

1. The response scale that Wu et al. (2017, p. 670) used with these items had end-points labeled as *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7). The following sentence preceded the list of items: "Please rate the pictured above on the following dimensions" (Wu 2018). (The generic name for the product was placed in the blank.)

AFFECTIVE RESPONSE (NEGATIVE)

The scale is composed of six, nine-point uni-polar items that measure one's expressed level of unfavorable feelings. While the scale appears to be amenable for use in a wide variety of situations, it seems to be best suited for occasions in which respondents have experienced something that did not go as well as expected.

Origin:

Huang et al. (2016) used the scale in Study 2 with data gathered from 124 participants recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The authors borrowed the scale from Aaker, Drolet, and Griffin (2008) who apparently created the measure and indicated its internal consistency to be high ($\alpha \geq .89$) based on multiple uses.

Reliability:

As used by Huang et al. (2016, p. 376), the alpha for the scale was .97.

Validity:

The scale's validity was not addressed by Huang et al. (2016).

Reference:

Aaker, Jennifer, Aimee Drolet, and Dale Griffin (2008), "Recalling Mixed Emotions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35 (2), 268-278.

Huang, Xun (Irene), Zhongqiang (Tak) Huang, and Robert S. Wyer (2016), "Slowing Down in the Good Old Days: The Effect of Nostalgia on Consumer Patience," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (3), 372-387.

Scale Items:¹

1. unhappy
2. disappointed
3. depressed
4. bad
5. unfavorable
6. dissatisfied

1. The response scale employed by Huang et al. (2016, p. 376) with these items was anchored by *not at all* (1) and *very much* (9).

AFFECTIVE RESPONSE TO THE AD (POSITIVE)

Using five, nine-point Likert-type items, the scale measures a person's emotional involvement in an advertisement.

Origin:

The scale was used by Kim, Ratneshwar, and Thorson (2017) in a study with a final data set of responses from 484 U.S. residents recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk. The authors created the scale and referred to it as *emotive response*. Two of the items (#1 and #3) were adapted from items in the measure of psychological transportation by Green and Brock (2000).

Reliability:

The scale's internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was .75 (Kim, Ratneshwar, and Thorson 2017, p. 289).

Validity:

Kim, Ratneshwar, and Thorson (2017) conducted CFA on the items measuring affective response to the ad and several other constructs. In addition to the results indicating there was good model fit, there was also evidence of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

References:

Green, Melanie C. and Timothy C. Brock (2000), "The Role of Transportation in the Persuasiveness of Public Narratives," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79 (5), 701–721.

Kim, Eunjin (Anna) (2018), personal correspondence.

Kim, Eunjin (Anna), S. Ratneshwar, and Esther Thorson (2017), "Why Narrative Ads Work: An Integrated Process Explanation," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (2), 283-296.

Scale Items:¹

1. I felt emotionally involved in the ad.
2. I found the ad moving.
3. The ad affected me emotionally.
4. I was able to connect with the ad emotionally.
5. This ad hooked me in terms of my feelings.

1. The full set of items was provided by Kim (2018). She also indicated that the verbal anchors of the response scale were *Strongly Disagree* (1) and *Strongly Agree* (9).

ANTICIPATION (AFFECTIVE)

The six item, seven-point scale measures the degree to which a person experiences feelings of anticipation such as excitement (at one extreme) or apprehension (at the other extreme) with regard to an upcoming event or activity.

Origin:

The scale appears to have been created by Tonietto in her dissertation research which was then reported in an article with her dissertation supervisor (Tonietto and Malkoc 2016). The authors referred to the construct as *anticipation utility* and used the scale in Studies 3 (n = 163 undergraduates), 4 (n = 141 undergraduates), and 5 (n = 228 recruits from MTurk).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .78, .90, and .88 in Studies 3, 4, and 5, respectively ((Tonietto and Malkoc 2016, pp. 927-929).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Tonietto and Malkoc (2016).

Comments:

Although the directions shown below used by Tonietto and Malkoc (2016) in their studies are stated hypothetically, it is easy to rephrase them so that the scale measures what a person actually experienced before the focal event or activity.

Reference:

Tonietto, Gabriela N. and Selin A. Malkoc (2016), "The Calendar Mindset: Scheduling Takes the Fun Out and Puts the Work In," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (6), 922-936.

Scale Items:¹

Directions: Please indicate the degree to which you would feel each of the following emotions
_____.²

1. Excited
2. Thrilled
3. Looking forward to it
4. Resentful (r)
5. Unenthusiastic (r)
6. Reluctant (r)

1. A seven-point response format was used and the extreme anchors were *not at all (1)* and *to a great extent (7)*.
2. A phrase indicating when the person experienced the emotions should be stated in the blank. For example, the phrase used in Studies 3 and 4 was "as you head there" while it was "right before hand" in Study 5.

APPRECIATION FOR PRODUCERS' EFFORTS

Five, seven-point Likert-type items were used to measure how much a person notices and values the effort expended by a person or company to produce an object. To be clear, the scale measures a general attitude about things that are made rather than being specific to a particular producer or product.

Origin:

The scale was created by Wu et al. (2017; Wu 2018) and used in a Study 5 pretest (n = 134).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .91 (Wu et al. 2017, p. 662).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Wu et al. (2017).

References:

Wu, Freeman (2018), personal correspondence.

Wu, Freeman, Adriana Samper, Andrea C. Morales, and Gavan J. Fitzsimons (2017), "It's Too Pretty to Use! When and How Enhanced Product Aesthetics Discourage Usage and Lower Consumption Enjoyment," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (3), 651–672.

Scale Items:¹

1. I notice when people work really hard to create something.
2. I really appreciate it when somebody takes the time and effort to make something.
3. I treasure something more when I know a lot of effort has gone into creating it.
4. I have an appreciation for products that reflect a great deal of effort on the maker's part.
5. I value something more when I know it took a lot of time and energy to produce.

1. The response scale that Wu et al. (2017, p. 662) used with these items had end-points labeled as *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

APPROVAL OF UNFRIENDLINESS TOWARDS THE EMPLOYEE

How much a customer believes that other people would approve if he/her acted unfriendly to a particular employee is measured by the scale. The scale is useful when it is assumed that the actions of an employee could motivate customers to be unfriendly. Items for both an eight-item and a five-item version are described.

Origin:

The scale was created by Albrecht et al. (2017, p. 832) in a multi-stage process which included item generation based on depth interviews and prior research, experts rating each item, refining items, and then pretesting items. The final eight-item version of the scale was used in the pilot study with 111 students.

Reliability:

The alpha reported by Albrecht et al. (2017, p. 842) for the scale was .89.

Validity:

Beyond evidence of content validity from the process used when experts rated the items, CFA was used to show that the measurement model had a good fit with the data (Albrecht et al. 2017, p. 832). Further, the analysis provided support for the scale's discriminant validity with respect to some other measures of employee-related attitudes. The scale's AVE was .51.

Comments:

In the interest of parsimony, Albrecht et al. (2017, p. 832) also created a short version of the scale. (The items for the abbreviated version are noted below with an asterisk at the end.) The authors said that the psychometric quality of the abbreviated version as well as the results of the analyses were similar to the full scale.)

Reference:

Albrecht, Arne K., Gianfranco Walsh, Simon Brach, Dwayne D. Gremler, and Erica van Herpen (2017), "The Influence of Service Employees and Other Customers on Customer Unfriendliness: A Social Norms Perspective," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (6), 827-847.

Scale Items:¹

1. I think that people would frown upon me if I were a bit impolite to the employee in the video. (r)*
2. Most people would think it is OK if I behave somewhat unfriendly toward the employee in the video.*
3. Most people would approve if I am unfriendly toward the employee in the video.
4. People would approve if I don't smile to the employee in the video.

5. People would approve if I had an unfriendly facial expression.*
6. People would approve if I talked to the employee in an unfriendly way.*
7. People would approve if I did not to say "thank you" to the employee.*
8. People would approve if I did not say goodbye to the employee when leaving.

1. The response format used in the pilot study was not described by Albrecht et al. (2017). It seems likely that it was similar if not exactly the same as what was used by the authors in Study 2 with all their scales in which the extreme anchors of the response scale were *completely disagree* (1) and a *completely agree* (7). Further, depending upon the way participants observe the employee, the phrases in the five items referring to the video will need to be changed.

ATTACHMENT ANXIETY

The scale uses five, seven-point Likert-type items to measure a trait-like attachment style characterized by the fear of rejection and abandonment.

Origin:

David (2016) appears to have used the scale in all five studies reported in her article as well as an additional one described in a web appendix. The scale itself was borrowed most directly from Johnson, Whelan, and Thomson (2012) although key phrasings can be found in earlier work by others, e.g., Collins and Read 1990; Hazan and Shaver 1987.

The work by Johnson, Whelan, and Thomson (2012) provided strong evidence of the scale's discriminant validity with respect to several constructs, most particularly the avoidance dimension of attachment.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .89 in both Study 1 and 2 and it was .88 in the study reported in the online appendix. (Reliabilities were not stated for the other studies.)

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by David (2016).

Reference:

Collins, Nancy L. and Stephen J. Read (1990), "Adult Attachment, Working Models, and Relationship Quality in Dating Couples," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58 (4), 644–663.

David, Meredith E. (2016), "The Role of Attachment Style in Shaping Consumer Preferences for Products Shown in Advertisements that Depict Consensus Claims," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 227-243.

Hazan, Cindy and Phillip R. Shaver (1987), "Romantic Love Conceptualized as an Attachment Process," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52 (3), 511-524.

Johnson, Allison, Jodie Whelan, and Matthew Thomson (2012), "Why Brands Should Fear Fearful Consumers: How Attachment Style Predicts Retaliation," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 22 (April), 289–298.

Scale Items:¹

1. I worry about being alone.
2. When I'm not involved in a relationship, I feel somewhat anxious and insecure.
3. I worry that people I have relationships with won't care about me as much as I care about them.
4. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.

5. I worry a lot about my relationships.

1. The response format of the seven-point scale was merely described by David (2016, p. 230) as indicating agreement. Given that, the end points were likely to have been *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7) or some close variant.

ATTACHMENT TO THE PRODUCT

Four, seven-point Likert-type items measure the degree to which a consumer has a special bond with a certain product, especially of an affective and sentimental nature.

Origin:

Winterich, Reczek, and Irwin (2017) used the scale in a supplementary study (described in the article's web appendix) with 64 participants who dropped off a donation to a particular nonprofit thrift store. The scale was borrowed from Sivadas and Venkatesh (1995) who had created the measure by combining three attachment items from Sivadas and Machleit (1994) with one item from Schultz (1989).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .95 (Winterich, Reczek, and Irwin 2017, web appendix).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Winterich, Reczek, and Irwin (2017).

References:

Schultz, Susan E. (1989), *An Empirical Investigation of Person-Material Possession Attachment*, unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Cincinnati.

Sivadas, Eugene and Karen A. Machleit (1994), "A Scale to Determine the Extent of Object Incorporation in the Extended Self," in *Marketing Theory and Applications*, Vol. 5, C. Whan Park and Daniel C. Smith, eds. Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association.

Sivadas, Eugene and Ravi Venkatesh (1995), "An Examination of Individual and Object Specific Influences on the Extended Self and its Relation to Attachment and Satisfaction," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 22, Chris T. Allen and Deborah Roedder John, eds. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 406-412.

Winterich, Karen Page, Rebecca Walker Reczek, and Julie R. Irwin (2017), "Keeping the Memory but Not the Possession: Memory Preservation Mitigates Identity Loss from Product Disposition," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (5), 104-120.

Scale Items:¹

1. I have no feelings for this product. (r)
2. I am emotionally attached to this product.
3. I am sentimental about this product.
4. This product reminds me of memories and experiences.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Winterich, Reczek, and Irwin (2017, p. 112) with these items appear to have been *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

ATTENTION TO THE PRODUCT INFORMATION

Four items are used to measure the degree to which a person reports focusing only on product-related information in a task and ignoring other information.

Origin:

The scale was used by Coleman et al. (2017) in Studies 5 (n = 259) and 6 (n = 242). In both cases, participants were students at Arizona State University. The source of the scale was not stated and may have been created by the authors.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .74 and .75 in Studies 5 and 6, respectively (Coleman et al. 2017, pp. 299, 302).

Validity:

Coleman et al. (2017) did not discuss the scale's validity.

Comments:

Information about a set of products was apparently presented to participants on computers in the studies by Coleman et al. (2017). The scale appears to be amenable for use when products are presented in other ways such as in ads, on television, or in-person within a store. In those cases, the final phrase of item #2 (below) should be modified and the scale re-tested.

Reference:

Coleman, Nicole Verrochi, Patti Williams, Andrea C. Morales, and Andrew Edward White (2017), "Attention, Attitudes, and Action: When and Why Incidental Fear Increases Consumer Choice," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (2), 283-312.

Scale Items:¹

1. I paid close attention to the product information.
2. I was very focused on the product information.
3. I ignored everything unrelated to the products _____.²
4. I only looked at the product information.

1. The response format was not described by Coleman et al. (2017). It was likely to have been a Likert-type scale with 5- or 7-points.

2. The phrase used by Coleman et al. (2017, p. 299) was "in the table" which referred to information presented to participants that they could use to evaluate some alternative product. In other contexts, the phrase could be different or none used at all.

ATTITUDE CERTAINTY

The degree to which a person is confident that his/her attitude toward an object is correct is measured in this scale with six, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Mathmann et al. (2017) used this scale in Study 3 with 81 students at a Dutch university. The measure was used with respect to a product choice and the items were adapted for that purpose from a scale by Krosnick et al. (1993). The language in which the scale was presented to participants was not identified by the authors.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .91 (Mathmann et al. 2017, p. 218).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Mathmann et al. (2017).

References:

Krosnick, Jon A., David S. Boninger, Yao C. Chuang, Matthew K. Berent, and Catherine G. Carnot (1993), "Attitude Strength: One Construct or Many Related Constructs?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65 (December), 1132–1151.

Mathmann, Frank, Mathew Chylinski, Ko de Ruyter, and E. Tory Higgins (2017), "When Plentiful Platforms Pay Off: Assessment Orientation Moderates the Effect of Assortment Size on Choice Engagement and Product Valuation," *Journal of Retailing*, 93 (2), 212-227.

Scale Items:¹

Instructions: Read each of the following statements and decide how much you agree with each.

1. I am certain about the feelings about the _____ I selected.
2. I am sure that my opinion about this _____ is right.
3. My opinion about this _____ is firm.
4. My opinion about this _____ can be changed easily. (r)
5. My view on this _____ is definite.
6. I am convinced about my _____.

1. The end-points of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). The blanks should be filled with the name of the object.

ATTITUDE TOWARD CORPORATE PHILANTHROPY

How much a person believes that, in general, companies should be engaged in philanthropic activities and that such behavior is beneficial to them is measured with four, seven-point semantic differentials.

Origin:

Xie and Keh (2016) used the scale in Study 2 (340 U.S. consumers) and Study 3 (133 Chinese consumers). The source of the scale was not stated, and it is assumed to have been created by the authors. The language in which the scale was phrased for the participants in Study 3 was not stated but would appear to have been Chinese.

Reliability:

The alphas reported for the scale were .92 and .94 for Studies 2 and 3, respectively (Xie and Keh 2016, pp. 216, 219).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Xie and Keh (2016).

References:

Xie, Yi (2017), personal correspondence.

Xie, Yi and Hean Tat Keh (2016), "Taming the Blame Game: Using Promotion Programs to Counter Product-Harm Crises," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 211-226.

Scale Items:

Many companies are involved in philanthropic causes. Please indicate your overall attitude towards this type of corporate behavior.¹

1. Not supportive / Supportive
2. Negative / Positive
3. Companies should not make such effort / Companies should make such effort
4. Not beneficial for the involved companies / Beneficial for the involved companies

1. This statement was provided by Xie (2017).

ATTITUDE TOWARD FOLLOWING OTHERS IN SOCIAL MEDIA

Within a particular social network, the degree of concern a person has about following others and the riskiness of doing so is measured with six, seven-point items.

Origin:

The scale was created by Roy et al. (2017) and referred to as *network trusting-decision involvement*. Besides indicating that they drew ideas for the measure from the involvement literature, no details about the scale's development were provided. The authors used the scale in a study with data gathered from 123 undergraduates attending a large university in the United States.

Reliability:

The scale was used by Roy et al. (2017, p. 277) with three different social networks and the alphas for them were .761 (Twitter), .787 (Epinions), and .838 (EQ2).

Validity:

Roy et al. (2017) did not provide evidence of the scale's validity.

Comments:

Despite the acceptable levels of internal consistency reported for the scale, there is concern about the scale's dimensionality. A close reading of the items raises doubt that all of the items are measuring exactly the same construct. Caution is urged in using the scale to test theory until clear evidence of the scale's unidimensionality is reported.

Related to that, the listing of the items provided by Roy et al. (2017, supplemental table) did not indicate any of the items should be reverse-coded. Yet, a close reading of item #6 suggests it should be reverse-coded since the logical response of someone responding with high scores on the other items, particularly #5, would indicate he/she had "a lot to lose" by following the wrong person. Again, factor analysis will be helpful in deciding which, if any, of the items should be reverse-coded.

Reference:

Roy, Atanu, Jisu Huh, Alexander Pfeuffer, and Jaideep Srivastava (2017), "Development of Trust Scores in Social Media (TSM) Algorithm and Application to Advertising Practice and Research," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (2), 269-282.

Scale Items:¹

1. In deciding to follow in _____, would you say that:
I would not care at all whom I follow / I would care a great deal whom I follow
2. Do you think that the users of _____ would be all very alike or all very different in terms of their trustworthiness for your following?
They are all very alike / They are all very different
3. How important would it be for you to make a right choice of following a person in _____?
Not at all important / Extremely important
4. In making your decision to follow someone in _____, how concerned would you be about the outcome of your choice?
Not at all concerned / Very much concerned
5. How do you feel about the potential risk of following a wrong person in _____?
Insignificant risk to me / Very significant risk to me
6. How do you feel about potential personal loss caused by following a wrong person in _____?
A lot to lose / Little to lose

1. The name of the social network of interest should be placed in the blanks.

ATTITUDE TOWARD LITERACY SKILLS

How much a person believes that literacy skills are important and that low-income families need help developing those skills is measured with six, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Hamby and Brinberg (2016) created the scale and used it in Study 1B with 72 U.S.-based Mechanical Turk participants. The measure was completed after participants read a story about a low-income mother's experience with a program offered by a nonprofit literacy organization.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .85 (Hamby and Brinberg 2016, p. 502).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Hamby and Brinberg (2016).

Comments:

Despite the scale's acceptable level of internal consistency based on the alpha coefficient, there is some concern about the scale's unidimensionality. Note how there appear to be at least two factors represented by the items. For example, a person could legitimately believe that literacy skills are important (#3 below) yet not believe the lack of skills is a growing problem (#1 below). Examination of the scale's unidimensionality is recommended before the measure is used further in theory testing.

Reference:

Hamby, Anne and David Brinberg (2016), "Happily Ever After: How Ending Valence Influences Narrative Persuasion in Cautionary Stories," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (4), 498-508.

Scale Items:¹

1. To what extent do you think lack of literacy skills is an increasing problem?
2. To what extent do you think reading problems are a serious issue for low income families?
3. To what extent do you think literacy skills are important?
4. To what extent do you think that reading skills are a key to future success?
5. How much do you think low income families need programs to help with literacy development?
6. To what extent do you think that literacy programs should be enacted at an early age to be effective?

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Hamby and Brinberg (2016, p. 501) were *Not at all* (1) and *A great deal* (7).

ATTITUDE TOWARD PESTICIDE USE

A person's beliefs regarding the need for careful usage of pesticides in the home are measured with three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Hamby and Brinberg (2016) created the scale and used it in Study 1A with 116 U.S.-based Mechanical Turk participants. The measure was used after participants read a story about a person having health problems following improper usage of home pesticides.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .89 (Hamby and Brinberg, p. 501).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Hamby and Brinberg (2016).

Reference:

Hamby, Anne and David Brinberg (2016), "Happily Ever After: How Ending Valence Influences Narrative Persuasion in Cautionary Stories," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (4), 498-508.

Scale Items:¹

1. Consumers should exercise caution when using pesticides.
2. Pesticide companies should be required to tell consumers about the risks involved in using their products.
3. Consumers should be careful when using chemicals such as pesticides in their homes.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Hamby and Brinberg (2016, p. 501) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

ATTITUDE TOWARD RECYCLING

This scale uses four, seven-point bi-polar adjectives to measure whether a person believes recycling is desirable and necessary or is unfavorable and not needed.

Origin:

Baek and Yoon (2017) used the scale in Study 3 (n = 150) in which participants were described as undergraduate students attending a northeastern U.S. university. The source of the scale was not stated. The bi-polar adjectives are very common in attitude scales.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .95 (Baek and Yoon 2017, p. 448) which indicates that the measure has high internal consistency.

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Baek and Yoon (2017).

Reference:

Baek, Tae Hyun and Sukki Yoon (2017), "Guilt and Shame: Environmental Message Framing Effects," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (3), 440-453.

Scale Items:¹

1. Negative / Positive
2. Unfavorable / Favorable
3. Undesirable / Desirable
4. Unnecessary / Necessary

1. The instructions and/or scale stem used with these items were not provided in the article. Based on what was stated, participants were asked to indicate "their attitude toward recycling" after watching an ad (Baek and Yoon 2017, p. 448).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE ACTIVITY (WORK-LIKENESS)

The scale measures the degree to which a person views a particular activity as being like a chore and requiring effort to do. Two- and three-item versions have been tested as have versions with slightly different items.

Origin:

The scale was created by Tonietto in her dissertation research and then reported in a published version with her dissertation supervisor (Tonietto and Malkoc 2016). They sometimes called the construct *work construal* and other times referred to it as *work qualities*. The article and its web appendix describe 13 studies of which the scale is used in most of them. Based on a pretest as well as examination of relevant literature, several one-word descriptors of work-likeness were selected. In the studies described in the article, varying subsets of the items were used to measure how much an activity seemed like work. The reason for using different versions is that reviewers asked the authors to create a scale without the *commitment* and *obligation* items, apparently doubting that the items tapped into *work construal* (Tonietto 2017; Tonietto and Malkoc 2016, p. 925). Thus, *commitment* and *obligation* were used in some studies, particularly the earliest ones, but not the others.

Reliability:

Across the ten studies in which work-likeness was measured, the alphas ranged from .61 in Study 1a (n = 68 undergraduate students) to .92 in Study 2 (n = 201 participants from MTurk).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Tonietto and Malkoc (2016).

Comments:

Based on the information available, it is difficult to choose which version of the scale is "best." The large range of alphas reported for the versions of the scale could have been due to several factors such as the number of items, the items used, the sample sizes, and sample composition. Among other tests, factor analyzing the full set with data from a large, representative sample would be extremely helpful. Apart from that, the only observation that can be made now is that the three-item versions performed better than those with just two items.

Reference:

Tonietto, Gabriela N. (2017), personal correspondence.

Tonietto, Gabriela N. and Selin A. Malkoc (2016), "The Calendar Mindset: Scheduling Takes the Fun Out and Puts the Work In," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (6), 922-936.

Scale Items:¹

Directions: On the scales below, please indicate how you would feel about _____.²

1. like a chore [Studies 1a, c, d, e, f, g, 2, 4, 5]
2. obligation [Studies 1b, c, e, f, g, 5]
3. effortful to do [Studies 1c, d, 2, 4, 5]
4. commitment [Studies 1a, b, e, f, g]
5. like work [Studies 1d, 2, 4]

1. As clarified by Tonietto (2017), a nine-point response format was used in Study 1a while a seven-point scale was used for all the others and the end points in all cases were *not at all* and *to a great extent*. As noted above, the set of items used to measure the construct of work-likeness varied somewhat across the studies. The numbers to the right of each item indicate in which studies they appear to have been used.

2. The name or brief description of the focal activity should be stated in the blank. For example, the phrase used in Study 4 was "playing frisbee as you head there."

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE AD (CREDIBILITY)

Using three, nine-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the extent to which a person believes a certain advertisement provides accurate information.

Origin:

The scale was used by Kim, Ratneshwar, and Thorson (2017) in a study with a final data set of responses from 484 U.S. residents recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk. The authors created the scale by drawing phrases and concepts from a measure of advertising skepticism developed by Obermiller and Spangenberg (1998).

Reliability:

The scale's internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was .87 (Kim, Ratneshwar, and Thorson 2017, p. 289).

Validity:

Kim, Ratneshwar, and Thorson (2017) conducted CFA on the items measuring ad credibility and several other constructs. In addition to the results indicating there was good model fit, there was also evidence of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

References:

Kim, Eunjin (Anna) (2018), personal correspondence.

Kim, Eunjin (Anna), S. Ratneshwar, and Esther Thorson (2017), "Why Narrative Ads Work: An Integrated Process Explanation," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (2), 283-296.

Obermiller, Carl and Eric R. Spangenberg (1998), "Development of a Scale to Measure Consumer Skepticism Toward Advertising," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 7 (2), 159-186.

Scale Items:¹

1. This ad is generally truthful.
2. This ad leaves one feeling accurately informed.
3. This ad is believable.

1. The full set of items was provided by Kim (2018). She also indicated that the verbal anchors of the response scale were *Strongly Disagree* (1) and *Strongly Agree* (9).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE AD (DIVERGENCE)

The scale has five, seven-point Likert-type items that measure the degree to which a person believes a particular advertisement contains elements that are novel or unusual and yet artistically arranged.

Origin:

Chen, Yang, and Smith (2016) used the scale in their main study as well as in a pretest. Data were gathered for the main study from 283 students attending a major midwestern U.S. university. The authors appear to have created the scale by drawing heavily upon work by Smith et al. (2007). Chen, Yang, and Smith (2016) selected one item a piece from the measures of the five first-order factors that were viewed by Smith et al. (2008) as forming ad divergence (a second-order composite latent factor).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .87 (Chen, Yang, and Smith 2016, p. 341).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not explicitly discussed by Chen, Yang, and Smith (2016). However, it is worth noting that the scale was used in a pretest as a manipulation check and, given that the manipulation was successful, it provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

Comments:

Although Smith et al. (2007) conducted a great deal of work developing their measures of the five factors of ad divergence and testing a model, the scale shown below was not reported to have been used in their studies. To be clear, the items shown below were used but they were in separate scales. Thus, it is reasonable to ask how well these items form a unidimensional and global measure of ad divergence. Ironically, there was a global measure created and used by Smith et al. (2007, p. 831) in the course of their work but those items are not the same as the ones shown below.

Reference:

Chen, Jiemiao, Xiaojing Yang, and Robert E. Smith (2016), "The Effects of Creativity on Advertising Wear-in and Wear-out," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (3), 334-349.

Smith, Robert E., Jiemiao Chen, and Xiaojing Yang (2008), "The Impact of Advertising Creativity on the Hierarchy of Effects," *Journal of Advertising*, 37 (4), 47-61.

Smith, Robert E., Scott B. MacKenzie, Xiaojing Yang, Laura M. Buchholz, and William K. Darley (2007), "Modeling the Determinants and Effects of Creativity in Advertising," *Marketing Science*, 26 (6), 819-833.

Scale Items:¹

1. The ad broke away from habit-bound and stereotypical thinking.
2. The ad contained ideas that moved from one subject to another.
3. The ad connected objects that are usually unrelated.
4. The ad finished basic ideas so that they become more intricate.
5. The ad was artistically produced.

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale used by Chen, Yang, and Smith (2016, p. 341) were *Disagree* (1) and *Agree* (7).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE AD (GAIN/LOSS MESSAGE)

Three, seven-point semantic differentials are used in this scale to measure a person's judgment of whether an advertisement emphasized benefits gained by the person taking an action or the losses and costs if the action was not taken.

Origin:

Baek and Yoon (2017) used the scale in Studies 1 (n = 275) and 3 (n = 150). In both cases, participants were described as undergraduate students attending a northeastern U.S. university. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

Alphas for the scale were .92 and .95 in Studies 1 and 3, respectively (Baek and Yoon 2017, pp. 444, 448).

Validity:

Although the authors did not refer to the measure as a manipulation check, it appears to have been used that way to "ensure that the gain-framed message emphasized positive benefits and the loss-framed message highlighted negative consequences" (Baek and Yoon 2017, p. 448). Since the results indicated that the framing of the ads was successful, it provides some support for the scale's predictive validity.

Reference:

Baek, Tae Hyun and Sukki Yoon (2017), "Guilt and Shame: Environmental Message Framing Effects," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (3), 440-453.

Scale Items:¹

1. Costs / Benefits
2. Losses / Gains
3. Negative outcomes / Positive outcomes

1. The instructions used with these items were not provided in the article. Based on what was said, after watching an ad with either a gain-framed or a loss-framed advertisement, participants "were asked to identify the message conveyed in the ad" (Baek and Yoon 2017, p. 444).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE AD (JOYFUL NOSTALGIA)

Five, seven-point items measure the degree to which an advertisement caused a person to think of happy events in his/her own life.

Origin:

Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend (2016) used the scale in Study 3 with data collected from a representative sample of the U.S. population provided by an online panel company. The authors called the scale *positive autobiographical memory* and created it by drawing items from several extant measures.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .98 (Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend 2016, p. 434).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend (2016). However, they did indicate that a factor analysis showed the items composing the scale had very high loadings on the same factor and explained most of the variance.

Reference:

Hartmann, Patrick, Vanessa Apaolaza, and Martin Eisend (2016), "Nature Imagery in Non-Green Advertising: The Effects of Emotion, Autobiographical Memory, and Consumer's Green Traits," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (4), 427-440.

Scale Items:¹

1. While seeing the ad I was transported back to joyful moments in my life.
2. The ad reminded me of some positive events that have happened to me in the past.
3. The ad made me think of pleasant experiences I have had.
4. The images in the ad take me back to positive moments in my life.
5. The ad makes me think back in joyful events in my life.

1. The response format used with these items by Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend (2016, p. 434) had seven-points and was anchored by *Not at all* and *Extremely so*.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE AD (LANGUAGE COMPREHENSION)

Using three, six-point Likert-type items, the scale measures a person's familiarity and proficiency with the language used in a particular advertisement.

Origin:

The scale was used by Lin and Wang (2016) in both studies reported in their article. The language appears to have been Chinese. As for the source of the scale, the authors said they adapted a measure from Chang (2009, 2013). However, a comparison of the scales shows their similarity is at the construct level at best. Thus, it may be more precise to say the scale shown below was created by Lin and Wang (2016) with some inspiration coming from the work of Chang (2009, 2013).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .85 and .83 in Studies 1 and 2, respectively (Lin and Wang 2016, pp. 487, 489).

Validity:

Lin and Wang (2016) did not address the validity of the scale.

Reference:

Chang, Chingching (2009), "Repetition Variation Strategies for Narrative Advertising," *Journal of Advertising*, 38 (3), 51–66.

Chang, Chingching (2013), "Imagery Fluency and Narrative Advertising Effect," *Journal of Advertising*, 42 (1), 54–68.

Lin, Ying-Ching and Kai-Yu Wang (2016), "Local or Global Image? The Role of Consumers' Local – Global Identity in Code-Switched Ad Effectiveness Among Monolinguals," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (4), 482–497.

Scale Items:¹

1. I understand the meaning of the words in the advertisement.
2. I am familiar with the language used in the advertisement.
3. I am proficient in the language used in the advertisement.

1. Besides stating that the response format was "a six-point Likert scale," Lin and Wang (2016) did not indicate the verbal anchors they employed. They may have been the Chinese equivalent of *strongly disagree/strongly agree*.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE AD (NARRATIVENESS)

The five item, nine-point Likert scale measures a person's belief that an advertisement uses a story-like format that communicates information about critical structural components such as who, what, where, and why.

Origin:

The scale was used as a manipulation check by Kim, Ratneshwar, and Thorson (2017) in a study with a final data set of responses from 484 U.S. residents recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk. The authors created the scale by drawing phrases and concepts from several cited sources: Escalas (1998); Deighton, Romer, and McQueen (1989); and, Padgett and Allen (1997).

Reliability:

The scale's internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was .90 (Kim, Ratneshwar, and Thorson 2017, p. 289).

Validity:

Kim, Ratneshwar, and Thorson (2017) did not discuss the scale's validity. However, since the scale was used as a manipulation check and the manipulation was successful, it provides some evidence of the measure's predictive validity.

Comments:

Although Kim, Ratneshwar, and Thorson (2017) used the scale with reference to a commercial, the items seem to be flexible enough for use in other contexts such as movies, books, plays, etc. Of course, the psychometric quality of the adapted scale should be confirmed before use in theory testing.

References:

- Deighton, John, Daniel Romer, and Josh McQueen (1989), "Using Drama to Persuade," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16 (3), 335-343.
- Escalas, Jennifer Edson (1998), "Advertising Narratives: What Are They and How Do They Work?" in *Representing Consumers: Voices, Views, and Visions*, B. Stern, ed., New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 267-289.
- Kim, Eunjin (Anna) (2018), personal correspondence.
- Kim, Eunjin (Anna), S. Ratneshwar, and Esther Thorson (2017), "Why Narrative Ads Work: An Integrated Process Explanation," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (2), 283-296.
- Padgett, Dan, and Douglas Allen (1997), "Communicating Experiences: A Narrative Approach to Creating Service Brand Image," *Journal of Advertising*, 26 (4), 49-62.

Scale Items:¹

Now, think back to the commercial that you just watched. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements in regard to this commercial.

1. The commercial tells a story.
2. The commercial shows the main actors or characters in a story.
3. The commercial shows a series of events unfolded in a story form.
4. The commercial shows when and where things happened in a story.
5. The commercial shows why things happened in a story.

1. The instructions and full set of items were provided by Kim (2018). She also indicated that the verbal anchors of the response scale were *Strongly Disagree* (1) and *Strongly Agree* (9).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE AD (RELEVANCE)

Four, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a person believes a particular advertisement addressed concerns about a product that was important to him/her.

Origin:

Chen, Yang, and Smith (2016) used the scale in their main study as well as in a pretest. Data were gathered for the main study from 283 students attending a major midwestern U.S. university. The authors were not clear about the scale's source. They cited Smith et al. (2007), however, the scale they used to measure ad relevance had no items in common with the one shown below.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .93 (Chen, Yang, and Smith 2016, p. 341).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not explicitly discussed by Chen, Yang, and Smith (2016). However, it is worth noting that the scale was used in a pretest as a manipulation check and, given that the manipulation was successful, it provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

Reference:

Chen, Jiemiao, Xiaojing Yang, and Robert E. Smith (2016), "The Effects of Creativity on Advertising Wear-in and Wear-out," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (3), 334-349.

Smith, Robert E., Scott B. MacKenzie, Xiaojing Yang, Laura M. Buchholz, and William K. Darley (2007), "Modeling the Determinants and Effects of Creativity in Advertising," *Marketing Science*, 26 (6), 819-833.

Scale Items:1

1. The ad was very relevant to me.
2. The ad spoke to my concerns.
3. The advertised good/service fits my needs well.
4. The advertised good/service is important to me.

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale used by Chen, Yang, and Smith (2016, p. 341) were *Disagree* (1) and *Agree* (7).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE AD (SUPPORTING A CAUSE)

The degree to which a person has been persuaded by an advertisement to engage in behaviors that support of a particular cause is measured with six, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Grinstein and Kronrod (2016) used the scale in Study 3 with 422 participants from an online panel apparently in the United States. They referred to the scale as *intentions to behave environmentally*. Participants read about a real nonprofit organization and were randomly assigned to one of four message conditions encouraging them to sign a petition related to the cause. The authors stated that the scale was adapted from other measures of environmental attitudes and behaviors by Mittal (1995) as well as Cleveland, Kalamas, and Laroche (2005). However, no scale was similar to what is shown below, thus, it seems to be more likely that the scale was created by Grinstein and Kronrod (2016) with some inspiration for the items coming from work by the cited sources.

Reliability:

The alpha reported for the scale was .926 (Grinstein and Kronrod 2016, p. 437).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Grinstein and Kronrod (2016).

References:

Cleveland, Mark, Maria Kalamas, and Michel Laroche (2005), "Shades of Green: Linking Environmental Locus of Control and Pro-Environmental Behaviors," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 22 (4), 198–212.

Grinstein, Amir and Ann Kronrod (2016), "Does Sparing the Rod Spoil the Child? How Praising, Scolding, and an Assertive Tone Can Encourage Desired Behaviors," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (3), 433–441.

Mittal, Banwari (1995), "A Comparative Analysis of Four Scales of Consumer Involvement," *Psychology and Marketing*, 12 (7), 663–682.

Scale Items:¹

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about this ad:

1. Seeing this ad would make me talk with friends and family about the ____.
2. Seeing this ad makes me think that the cause ____ promotes is important.
3. Seeing this ad makes me more willing to contribute my time to ____.
4. Seeing this ad makes me want to volunteer for ____.
5. Seeing this ad makes me more willing to donate money to ____.
6. Seeing this ad makes me more likely to Like ____ on Facebook.

1. The response format used by Grinstein and Kronrod (2016) with these items had end points of *Definitely not* (1) and *Definitely yes* (7). The name of the cause referred to in the ad should be stated in the blanks.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE BANK

This three item, 100-point Likert-type scale measures a person's belief that a particular bank would be a excellent institution in which to put money. The sentences are phrased hypothetically such that the scale makes most sense when the person is aware of the bank but is not a customer.

Origin:

Isaac, Brough, and Grayson (2016) used the scale in two studies. Analyses were based on data gathered from 223 participants in Study 1 and 225 respondents in Study 6. In both cases, participants were recruited from MTurk. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

The alphas reported for the scale were .956 and .933 for Studies 1 and 6, respectively (Isaac, Brough, and Grayson 2016, pp. 341, 349).

Validity:

No information about the scale's validity was provided in the article by Isaac, Brough, and Grayson (2016).

Reference:

Isaac, Mathew S., Aaron R. Brough, and Kent Grayson (2016), "Is Top 10 Better than Top 9? The Role of Expectations in Consumer Response to Imprecise Rank Claims," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (3), 338-353.

Scale Items:¹

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about _____:

1. If I needed to open a bank account, _____ would be an excellent choice.
2. I would feel confident banking at _____.
3. I believe that _____ is probably one of the best places to put my money.

1. The name of the focal bank should be placed in the blanks. The response scale used by Isaac, Brough, and Grayson (2016, p. 341) with these items was described as a "slider" ranging from 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 100 (*strongly agree*).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE BRAND (LUXURY)

With three, seven-point semantic-differentials, this scale measures the extent to which a consumer believes a product to be either a luxury brand (at one end) or a "value" brand (at the other end).

Origin:

Hagtvedt and Patrick (2016) used the scale in Study 2. Analyses were based on data collected from 157 undergraduate students. The scale was used as a manipulation check to make sure there was a difference in attitude between the participants who read either about a Rolex watch or a Timex. In terms of the scale's source, it was not identified.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was reported to be .97 (Hagtvedt and Patrick 2016, p. 59).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not examined *per se* by Hagtvedt and Patrick (2016). However, to the extent that the scale was used as a manipulation check and the manipulation was successful, it provides some evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

Reference:

Hagtvedt, Henrik and Vanessa M. Patrick (2016), "Gilt and Guilt: Should Luxury and Charity Partner at the Point of Sale?" *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (1), 56-64.

Scale Items:¹

1. Inexpensive / Expensive
2. Low-end / High-end
3. Value-for-money / Luxury

1. The question/instructions that proceeded these items in the questionnaire was not described by Hagtvedt and Patrick (2016). It may have merely asked participants to use the attribute descriptions to indicate their opinion of the watch they read about.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE BRAND NAME

In this scale, four, seven-point semantic differentials evaluate how positive or negative a person's attitude is toward a brand name. A three-item version is also described.

Origin:

Van Horen and Pieters (2017) used a four-item version of the scale in Experiment 1 ($n = 171$ undergraduate students) and a three-item subset in Experiment 2 ($n = 578$ members of a nationally representative panel). In both cases, the data were gathered in The Netherlands but the language in which the scales were presented to participants was not stated. Although the source of the scale was not identified, the items are commonly used when measuring attitudes towards products and advertisements.

Reliability:

The four-item version of the scale was used with two brand names in Experiment 1 and their alphas were merely described as being above .87 (Van Horen and Pieters 2017, p. 819). For Experiment 2, the alpha for the three-item version of the scale was .94 (p. 821).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Van Horen and Pieters (2017).

Reference:

Van Horen, Femke and Rik Pieters (2017), "Out-of-Category Brand Imitation: Product Categorization Determines Copycat Evaluation," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (4), 816–832.

Scale Items:¹

1. negative / positive
2. bad / good
3. uninteresting / interesting
4. unattractive / attractive

1. The instructions used with these items were not provided in the article by Van Horen and Pieters (2017). However, it appears that participants were told a new brand was about to be introduced and then they were asked to evaluate the brand name. The items in the short version were #1, #2, and #4.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE BRAND'S PRICE

A consumer's belief that the price of a brand is reasonable and a good value is measured using three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Heinberg, Ozkaya, and Taube (2016) identified the source of the scale as being Maddox (1982). Although the latter created one of the earliest multi-item measures of this construct, only one of the items in his scale has similar phrasing as the ones shown below. Given that, the scale was likely created by Heinberg, Ozkaya, and Taube (2016) based on inspiration from the work of Maddox (1982). Their study was conducted in China with analysis based on data gathered from a sample of 1188 respondents. The back-translation method was employed to ensure that the Chinese version was as close as possible to what is stated in the English version shown below. The Chinese version was then tested for comprehension in a pretest.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .889 (Heinberg, Ozkaya, and Taube 2016, p. 596).

Validity:

A variety of tests were performed on this scale along with the other measures used by Heinberg, Ozkaya, and Taube (2016). With regard to the measure of price attitude, evidence was found for its convergent and discriminant validities. The scale's AVE was .729.

References:

Heinberg, Martin, H. Erkan Ozkaya, and Markus Taube (2016), "A Brand Built on Sand: Is Acquiring a Local Brand in an Emerging Market an Ill-Advised Strategy for Foreign Companies?" *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (5), 586-607.

Maddox, R. Neil (1982), "The Structure of Consumers' Satisfaction: Cross-Product Comparisons," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 10 (Winter), 37-53.

Scale Items:¹

1. _____ has attractive prices.
2. _____ is a good buy.
3. _____ is available for reasonable prices.

1. The brand name should be placed in the blanks. The extreme anchors of the response scale appear to have been the typical *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE COLOR

The scale has three, seven-point Likert-type items that measure a person's overall attitude toward a particular color (unspecified in the sentences themselves).

Origin:

The scale was used in Study 1 by Batra and Ghoshal (2017) with data collected from 92 students at the Indian School of Business, Hyderabad. Participants were shown a particularly intense shade of a color (orange) and told a manufacturer was considering it as a paint for a new decoration line. The source of the scale was not stated but appears to have been created by the authors using phrasing typical of global attitude scales.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .95 (Batra and Ghoshal 2017, p. 923).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Batra and Ghoshal (2017).

Reference:

Batra, Rishitee K. and Tanuka Ghoshal (2017), "Fill Up Your Senses: A Theory of Self-Worth Restoration through High-Intensity Sensory Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (4), 916-938.

Scale Items:¹

1. I like this color.
2. This is a nice color.
3. This is a good color.

1. The end-points of the response scale used with these items by Batra and Ghoshal (2017, p. 922) were *completely disagree* (1) and *completely agree* (7).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE COMPANY'S CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION

Five, seven-point uni-polar items are used to measure the kindness and effort a person believes were sincerely exhibited by a company with its contribution to a charitable event.

Origin:

Hildebrand et al. (2017) used the scale in Study 2B with a final sample of 55 undergraduate students attending a university in the United States. The authors called the scale "contribution beliefs" because the context of the study was what participants thought about a particular company and the contribution it made to a particular disaster relief effort. The source of the scale was not identified.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .85 (Hildebrand et al. 2017, p. 746).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Hildebrand et al. (2017).

Comments:

Although Hildebrand et al. (2017) used the scale to measure attitudes about the action of a company to aid with a disaster, the scale appears to be amenable for use with other charitable actions, other causes, and other organizations (government, religious, non-profit). Of course, the more different the application of the scale, the more prudent to re-examine its psychometric quality.

Reference:

Hildebrand, Diogo, Yoshiko DeMotta, and Sankar Sen, and Ana Valenzuela (2017), "Consumer Responses to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Contribution Type," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (4), 738–758.

Scale Items:¹

1. effortful
2. kind
3. humane
4. sincere
5. helpful

1. The end-points of the response scale used with these items by Hildebrand et al. (2017, p. 746) were *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7). The particular cause, the particular company, and the action taken by the company should be stated in the survey instrument or other materials provided

to participants. That information will affect the phrasing of the instructions and/or scale stem used with the scale. The latter could be as simple as, "The contribution made by the company was"

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE DISCUSSION THREAD (FRIENDLINESS)

With three, seven-point items, the scale measures the importance a person places on having friendly interactions with other participants of an online discussion thread.

Origin:

Hamilton, Schlosser, and Chen (2017) used the scale in Study 4 with 195 participants from Amazon's Mechanical Turk. (A five-item version of the scale may have been used in Study 3.) The source of the scale was not stated. It was likely to have been created by the authors for the study.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha in Study 4 was .72 (Hamilton, Schlosser, and Chen 2017, p. 551).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Hamilton, Schlosser, and Chen (2017).

Reference:

Hamilton, Rebecca W., Ann Schlosser, and Yu-Jen Chen (2017), "Who's Driving This Conversation? Systematic Biases in the Content of Online Consumer Discussions," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (4), 540-555.

Scale Items:¹

1. To what extent do you perceive the discussion thread as a friendly interaction between people?
2. How important to you was maintaining friendly relations with others when you replied to this thread?
3. How important to you was creating a relationship with the other participants in the discussion forum?

1. The end-points that Hamilton, Schlosser, and Chen (2017, p. 551) used with these items were *not at all* (1) and *very* (7).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE EXPERIENCE (AFFECTIVE)

The scale measures the degree to which a person liked a particular experience he/she had. Versions with two and four items are described.

Origin:

Chun, Diehl, and MacInnis (2017) referred to the construct as "remembered enjoyment" and measured it in four studies, each of the scales being slightly different. Because of the differences, the versions are described in two reviews. The versions of the scale used in Studies 1 and 4 are described here and the versions used in Studies 2 and 3 are described in another review.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale used in Studies 1 and 4 were .93 and .96, respectively (Chun, Diehl, and MacInnis 2017, pp. 100, 105).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Chun, Diehl, and MacInnis (2017). However, the version of the scale used in Study 1 was examined with principal component analysis and indicated that the four items loaded well on the same factor, explaining the overwhelming majority of the variance.

Reference:

Chun, HaeEun Helen, Kristin Diehl, and Deborah J. MacInnis (2017), "Savoring an Upcoming Experience Affects Ongoing and Remembered Consumption Enjoyment," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (3), 96-110.

Scale Items:¹

1. To what extent was your _____ enjoyable? *Not at all enjoyable / Very enjoyable*
2. To what extent was your _____ fun? *Not at all fun / Very fun*
3. To what extent was your _____ good? *Not at all good / Very good*
4. To what extent did you like your _____? *Disliked it very much / Liked it very much*

1. These are the items as phrased in Study 1. The version of the scale used in Study 4 had just two items and they were similar to #1 and #4. The name of the focal experience should be stated in the blanks.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE EXPERIENCE (AFFECTIVE)

How much a person liked a particular experience and thought it was fun is measured in this scale with four, nine-point items.

Origin:

Chun, Diehl, and MacInnis (2017) referred to the construct as "remembered enjoyment" and measured it in four studies, each of the scales being slightly different. Because of the differences, the versions are described in two reviews. The versions of the scale used in Studies 2 and 3 are described here and the versions used in Studies 1 and 4 are described in another review.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale versions used in Studies 1 and 4 were .98 and .95, respectively (Chun, Diehl, and MacInnis 2017, pp. 100, 102).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Chun, Diehl, and MacInnis (2017).

Reference:

Chun, HaeEun Helen, Kristin Diehl, and Deborah J. MacInnis (2017), "Savoring an Upcoming Experience Affects Ongoing and Remembered Consumption Enjoyment," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (3), 96-110.

Scale Items:¹

1. How much did you like _____? *Disliked it very much / Liked it very much*
2. How enjoyable was the experience of _____? *Not at all enjoyable / Very enjoyable*
3. How fun was the experience of _____? *Not at all fun / Very fun*
4. How good was the experience of _____? *Not at all good / Very Good*

1. The name of the focal experience should be stated in the blanks. In Studies 2 and 3 the experience was "watching a movie." The phrasing in both studies was the same except that in Study 3, the positive verbal anchor of the response scale used with items #2-#4 was changed to "A great deal."

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE FOOD PRODUCT (GMO CONTENT)

The scale uses three, seven-point items to measure a consumer's belief that a particular food product featured in an advertisement is likely to have genetically modified ingredients. (GMO stands for Genetically Modified Organisms.)

Origin:

Berry, Burton, and Howlett (2017) used the scale in Studies 2 ($n = 161$) and 3 ($n = 309$). Participants were recruited from Amazon MTurk in both cases. The source of the scale was not identified but appears to have been created by the authors for these studies.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .94 and .91 for Studies 2 and 3, respectively (Berry, Burton, and Howlett 2017, pp. 708, 711).

Validity:

For Studies 2 and 3, Berry, Burton, and Howlett (2017, pp. 708, 711) assessed the scale's discriminant validity with respect to some other measures having to do with food healthiness and purchase intention. Although the statistical details were not provided, the authors stated that the results provided evidence of the scale's discriminant validity in both studies.

Comments:

Participants watched one of two ads: one that made a claim of "all natural" for a food product or one that did not. Because of that, the items (below) refer to the ad. If an ad is not used in a research design, the words referring to it can be easily changed or dropped. If changes are made, however, the psychometric quality of the modified scale should be re-examined before use in theory testing.

Reference:

Berry, Christopher, Scot Burton, and Elizabeth Howlett (2017), "It's Only Natural: The Mediating Impact of Consumers' Attribute Inferences on the Relationships Between Product Claims, Perceived Product Healthfulness, and Purchase Intentions," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (5), 698-719.

Scale Items:¹

1. Based on the _____ advertisement that you just viewed, how likely is it that the _____ in the advertisement contains genetically modified organisms (GMOs)?
very unlikely / very likely

2. Based on the information presented in the advertisement, how likely is the _____ to contain ingredients that have been genetically engineered?
very unlikely / very likely
3. How probable is it that the _____ presented in the advertisement contains ingredients that have been artificially manipulated?
not probable / very probable

1. The generic name for the focal food product should be stated in the blanks.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE FOOD PRODUCT (NUTRITIOUSNESS)

Using four, nine-point semantic differentials, the scale measures a consumer's belief that a particular food product is not only safe to consume but is nutritious as well.

Origin:

White et al. (2016) used the scale in Studies 3 and 4. The source of the scale was not stated but it seems likely that it was created by the authors.

Reliability:

The scale's alphas were .83 and .84 in Studies 3 and 4, respectively (White et al. 2016, p. 116, 117).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by White et al. (2016).

Reference:

White, Katherine, Lily Lin, Darren W. Dahl, and Robin J. B. Ritchie (2016), "When Do Consumers Avoid Imperfections? Superficial Packaging Damage as a Contamination Cue," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (1), 110-123.

Scale Items:¹

1. unhealthy / healthy
2. less nutritious than average / more nutritious than average
3. not at all safe / safe
4. harmful / not harmful

1. The instructions used with the items were not stated by White et al. (2016). They could merely have asked participants to rate of the healthiness and safety of the food they saw.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE FOOD PRODUCT (NUTRITIOUSNESS)

Four, seven-point items measure how much a person believes that a particular food is good to eat and is not fattening.

Origin:

The scale was created by Olson et al. (2016) by borrowing some items and concepts from a scale by Stein and Nemeroff (1995). Olson et al. (2016) used the scale in Experiments 1 (135 students from a midwestern U.S. university) and 2 (608 adults recruited from Amazon MTurk).

Reliability:

Olson et al. (2016) reported alphas of .89 and .83 for the scale as used in Experiment 1 (p. 883) and Experiment 2 (p. 885), respectively.

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Olson et al. (2016).

References:

Olson, Jenny G., Brent McFerran, Andrea C. Morales, and Darren W. Dahl (2016), "Wealth and Welfare: Divergent Moral Reactions to Ethical Consumer Choices," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (6), 879-896.

Stein, Richard I. and Carol J. Nemeroff (1995), "Moral Overtones of Food: Judgments of Others Based on What They Eat," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21 (May), 480-490.

Scale Items:¹

1. nutritious
2. wholesome
3. fattening (r)
4. good for you

1. The extreme anchors used to evaluate the food were *not at all* (1) and *very* (7).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE FOOD PRODUCT (NUTRITIOUSNESS)

The degree to which a person believes a particular food is wholesome and healthy is measured with three questions, each with its own semantic differential and a 101-point sliding response scale.

Origin:

Hagen, Krishna, and McFerran (2017) used the scale in Study 3 with 160 people in the U.S. recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The source of the scale was not stated but the key words in the items (healthy, nutritious, and wholesome) are common to several measures of the construct that have been used in other consumer studies, e.g., Olson et al. (2016); White et al. (2016).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .95 (Hagen, Krishna, and McFerran 2017, p. 595).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Hagen, Krishna, and McFerran (2017).

References:

Hagen, Linda, Aradhna Krishna, and Brent McFerran (2017), "Rejecting Responsibility: Low Physical Involvement in Obtaining Food Promotes Unhealthy Eating," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (4), 589-604.

Olson, Jenny G., Brent McFerran, Andrea C. Morales, and Darren W. Dahl (2016), "Wealth and Welfare: Divergent Moral Reactions to Ethical Consumer Choices," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (6), 879-896.

White, Katherine, Lily Lin, Darren W. Dahl, and Robin J. B. Ritchie (2016), "When Do Consumers Avoid Imperfections? Superficial Packaging Damage as a Contamination Cue," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (1), 110-123.

Scale Items:¹

1. How healthy is this food?
unhealthy / healthy
2. How nutritious is this food?
not at all nutritious / very nutritious
3. How wholesome is this food?
not at all wholesome / completely wholesome

1. The response format used by Hagen, Krishna, and McFerran (2017, web appendix pp. 2, 3) with these items was a sliding scale ranging from 0 to 100.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE LOGO (AGENTIC ANIMACY)

Three, seven-point Likert-type items measure the degree to which a logo appears to move as if it is alive.

Origin:

The scale was created by Brasel and Hagtvedt (2016) and used in Studies 1 and 2 as a manipulation check of what the authors called *agency* as well as *agent animation*. The basic idea is that the logo appears to take self-directed action (agency), one of which is movement (animation). The three items in the final version of the scale (shown below) were part of a larger group that was used in pretests (Brasel 2017).

Reliability:

In Studies 1 and 2, the alphas for the scale were .91 and .94, respectively (Brasel and Hagtvedt 2016, pp. 644, 645).

Validity:

Although the scale's validity was not discussed *per se*, some evidence of its predictive validity was evident given that the scale was used as a manipulation check and the manipulation was successful in both studies.

Comments:

The scale seems to be amenable for use with other inanimate objects by simply replacing *logo* with the name or brief description of the focal object. Of course, pretesting is encouraged to confirm the modified scale's psychometric quality.

References:

Brasel, S. Adam (2017), personal correspondence.

Brasel, S. Adam and Henrik Hagtvedt (2016), "Living Brands: Consumer Responses to Animated Brand Logos," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (5), 639–653.

Scale Items:¹

1. The logo moved on its own.
2. The logo seemed alive.
3. The logo was lifelike.

1. The items were provided by Brasel (2017). He also clarified that the end points of the response scale used with these statements were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE LOGO (GENERAL)

A person's general attitude about a logo is measured with three, five-point semantic differentials.

Origin:

Vermeulen and Beukeboom (2016) used the scale in Study 3 which was an experiment with 127 participants. The source of the scale was not stated. Despite that, the items composing the scale have been commonly used in measuring attitudes towards a variety of objects, most notably brands and advertisements.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .88 (Vermeulen and Beukeboom 2016, p. 58).

Validity:

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Vermeulen and Beukeboom (2016).

Reference:

Vermeulen, Ivar and Camiel J. Beukeboom (2016), "Effects of Music in Advertising: Three Experiments Replicating Single-Exposure Musical Conditioning of Consumer Choice (Gorn 1982) in an Individual Setting," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (1), 53-61.

Scale Items:

1. Bad / Good
2. Negative / Positive
3. Worthless / Valuable

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE LOGO (HELPLESSNESS)

Using three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a person attributes thought and emotion to a logo regarding its helplessness and not being in control.

Origin:

Brasel and Hagtvedt (2016) used the scale in Study 2 with 84 MBA students. The purpose of the experiment was to determine if object-animated logos are interpreted as being moved by outside forces rather than appearing to be self-directed. The authors did not give a specific name to this construct but referred to it merely as "pushed around." The origin of the scale was not identified but is assumed to have been created by the authors for the study.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .92 (Brasel and Hagtvedt 2016, p. 645).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Brasel and Hagtvedt (2016).

Comments:

The scale seems to be amenable for use with other inanimate objects by simply replacing *logo* with the name or a brief description of the focal object. Of course, pretesting is encouraged to confirm the modified scale's psychometric quality.

References:

Brasel, S. Adam (2017), personal correspondence.

Brasel, S. Adam and Henrik Hagtvedt (2016), "Living Brands: Consumer Responses to Animated Brand Logos," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (5), 639–653.

Scale Items:¹

1. The logo felt pushed around.
2. The logo felt not in control of itself.
3. The logo felt helpless.

1. The items were provided by Brasel (2017). He also clarified that the end points of the response scale used with these statements were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE OBJECT (GENERAL)

The desirability of an object is measured with four brief statements and a seven-point Likert-type response scale. The scale is “general” in the sense that the statements are amenable for use with a wide variety of objects.

Origin:

Chang (2017) used the scale in Studies 1 ($n = 167$) and 3A ($n = 319$), with data gathered in both studies from people recruited at a university in East Asia. The author appears to have created the four sentences by drawing key words for the items (like, positive, desirable, good) from the positive verbal anchors found in a semantic differential measure of general evaluation by Crites, Fabrigar, and Petty (1994, p. 624). Those key words are commonly found in semantic differential measures of product attitudes.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scales were .93 and .91 in Studies 1 and 3A, respectively (Chang 2017, pp. 493, 497).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Chang (2017).

References:

Chang, Chingching (2017), "A Metacognitive Model of the Effects of Susceptibility to Persuasion Self-Beliefs on Advertising Effects," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (4), 487-502.

Chang, Chingching (2018), personal correspondence.

Crites, Stephen L., Jr., Leandre R. Fabrigar, and Richard E. Petty (1994), "Measuring the Affective and Cognitive Properties of Attitudes: Conceptual and Methodological Issues," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20 (6), 619-634.

Scale Items:¹

1. I like _____.
2. I feel positive toward _____.
3. _____ is desirable.
4. _____ is good.

1. The name of the focal object should be placed in the blanks. The object in Study 1 was organic food while in Study 3A it was either bottled water or “a balanced diet.” The response scale used with the items had seven points with *strongly disagree* / *strongly agree* as the extreme verbal anchors (Chang 2018).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE OBJECT (OUTRAGEOUS)

The degree to which a person believes that something is inappropriate and scandalous is measured with five, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Kähr et al. (2016) used in the scale in what they called Preliminary Study 2 with 289 participants recruited from Germany, Austria, and Switzerland using the Clickworker platform. The scale was a slight adaptation of a measure created by Lindenmeier, Schleer, & Pricl (2012, p. 1367). Those researchers treated the scale as a measure of emotions felt by the respondents whereas Kähr et al. (2016) phrased the scale stem and the items more as an attitude about a brand that had either experienced a major performance-based or a PR-based failure.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .93 (Kähr et al. 2016, p. 30).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Kähr et al. (2016).

Comments:

The scale was part of a questionnaire phrased in German (Kähr (2018)). The English version of the scale (below) was translated into English for purposes of the publication. Given that, the English version should be tested thoroughly before use in theory testing, especially since the meaning of some of the words is unlikely to be familiar to many English speakers.

References:

Kähr, Andrea (2018), personal correspondence.

Kähr, Andrea, Bettina Nyffenegger, Harley Krohmer, and Wayne D. Hoyer (2016), "When Hostile Consumers Wreak Havoc on Your Brand: The Phenomenon of Consumer Brand Sabotage," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (3), 25-41.

Lindenmeier, Jörg, Christoph Schleer, and Denise Pricl (2012), "Consumer Outrage: Emotional Reactions to Unethical Corporate Behavior," *Journal of Business Research*, 65 (9), 1364-1373.

Scale Items:¹

1. . . . outrageous.
2. . . . scandalous.
3. . . . imprudent.
4. . . . egregious.
5. . . . impertinent.

1. The scale items were provided by Kähr (2018). The labels for the end-points of the seven-point response scale were *I completely disagree* (1) and *I completely agree* (7). A scale stem (sentence) is needed that will end with each of the items. The statement used by Kähr et al. (2016; Kähr 2018) was "The behavior and the statements of the brand (and its employees) are"

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE OFFER

Using three, nine-point items, the scale measures how much a consumer believes that a particular sales-related deal is so good that he/she is likely to purchase the product.

Origin:

Mao (2016) used the scale in Studies 1 and 3, referring to the measure as *deal evaluation*. Data appear to have been gathered for both studies from undergraduate students at a university in China. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

Alphas for the scale were .90 and .84 in Studies 1 and 3, respectively (Mao 2016, pp. 176, 179).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Mao (2016).

Reference:

Mao, Wen (2016), "Sometimes 'Fee' Is Better Than 'Free': Token Promotional Pricing and Consumer Reactions to Price Promotion Offering Product Upgrades," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (2), 173-184.

Scale Items:¹

1. How attractive does the deal appear to you?
very unattractive / very attractive
2. In your opinion, does the promotion suggest a good or a bad deal overall?
definitely a bad deal / definitely a good deal
3. How likely are you to buy the _____?²
definitely will not / definitely will

1. A nine-point response format was used with these items by Mao (2016, p. 176).
2. An appropriate name or descriptor of the focal product should be placed in the blank.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE ORGANIZATION'S REPOSITIONING

Four, seven-point Likert-type items measure a person's attitude about the radical change a particular organization is about to make regarding what it stands for. As currently phrased and scored, the items indicate the respondent is against the repositioning. Also, the scale instructions frame the situation as hypothetical but minor changes could make the scale amenable for use with a real event.

Origin:

Wolter and Cronin (2016) used the scale in a study with data collected from 628 participants recruited from Amazon.com's MTurk who represented a broad range of demographics. The scale was created by the authors and called *resistance to organizational repositioning*.

Reliability:

The scale's composite reliability was reported to be .89 (Wolter and Cronin 2016, p. 408).

Validity:

Using CFA, Wolter and Cronin (2016) showed that their measurement model adequately fit the data. Further, a test of discriminant validity provided evidence that the scale measuring attitude toward the organization's repositioning was distinct from the other measures in the model. The scale's AVE was .68.

References:

Wolter, Jeremy S. (2017), personal correspondence.

Wolter, Jeremy S. and J. Joseph Cronin Jr. (2016), "Re-Conceptualizing Cognitive and Affective Customer-Company Identification: The Role of Self-Motives and Different Customer-Based Outcomes," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (3), 397-413.

Scale Items:¹

Imagine that _____ announced it was going to go under a radical repositioning. While this change would involve redefining the meaning of what _____ stands for, it would probably result in an overall positive change for the organization. How do you think about such a change?²

1. I would fully accept this change. (r)
2. If there was some way to do it, I would resist this change.
3. This type of change would upset me.
4. This type of change would probably be for the better. (r)

1. The response scale had seven points (Wolter and Cronin 2016, p. 405) and Wolter (2017) clarified that the end-points were *strongly disagree* / *strongly agree*.

2. The name of the organization should be placed in the blanks.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE PRODUCT (GOAL ACHIEVEMENT)

Using six, nine-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a person believes that consuming a particular product or brand would help attain some of his/her life goals.

Origin:

The scale was used by Kim, Ratneshwar, and Thorson (2017) in a study with a final data set of responses from 484 U.S. residents recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk. The authors created the scale and referred to it as *goal facilitation*. In creating the scale, the authors drew ideas from work by Park, Eisingerich, and Park (2013) as well as Richins (2013).

Reliability:

The scale's internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was .90 (Kim, Ratneshwar, and Thorson 2017, p. 289).

Validity:

Kim, Ratneshwar, and Thorson (2017) conducted CFA on the items measuring goal achievement and several other constructs. In addition to the results indicating there was good model fit, there was also evidence of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

References:

- Kim, Eunjin (Anna) (2018), personal correspondence.
- Kim, Eunjin (Anna), S. Ratneshwar, and Esther Thorson (2017), "Why Narrative Ads Work: An Integrated Process Explanation," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (2), 283-296.
- Park, Choong W., Andreas B. Eisingerich, and Jason Whan Park (2013), "Attachment-Aversion (AA) Model of Customer-Brand Relationships," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23 (2), 229-248.
- Richins, Marsha L. (2013), "When Wanting Is Better Than Having: Materialism, Transformation Expectation, and Product-Evoked Emotions in the Purchase Process," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40 (1), 1-18.

Scale Items:¹

Based on the ad you just saw, how likely is it that each of these things would happen if you were able to buy and consume the advertised product/brand?

1. I would be able to communicate who I am to other people.
2. I would be able to express who I wish to be.
3. I would be able to express my values in life.
4. I would be able to accomplish some of my personal projects.
5. I would be able to get things done.
6. I would be more efficient.

1. The question and full set of items were provided by Kim (2018). She also indicated that the verbal anchors of the response scale were *Strongly Disagree* (1) and *Strongly Agree* (9).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE PRODUCT (POST-PURCHASE)

How much a consumer likes and uses a product is measured with three, seven-point items. Unlike most other measures of product attitude, this one makes most sense to use with people after they have bought a product and used it.

Origin:

Etkin and Sela (2016) used the scale in four of the five studies reported in the article. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

The alphas reported for the scale by Etkin and Sela (2016) ranged from .89 (Study 5) to .94 (Study 3).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Etkin and Sela (2016).

Comments:

In Study 5, Etkin and Sela (2016) modified the scale questions slightly so that they were hypothetical or, as the authors referred to it, for a pre-purchase context. The modified items are listed in the footnotes below.

Reference:

Etkin, Jordan and Aner Sela (2016), "How Experience Variety Shapes Post-Purchase Product Evaluation," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (1), 77-90.

Scale Items:¹

1. How much do you like _____?²
don't like that much / like a lot
2. How happy do _____ make you?³
not very happy / very happy
3. How much do you enjoy using _____?⁴
enjoy very little / enjoy a lot

1. The blanks in each item should be filled with a brand name, description of the product, or something very general such as Etkin and Sela (2016, web appendix) used in several of the studies with the phrase "your recent purchase."

2. The pre-purchase version of this question was phrased "How much will you enjoy using this purchase?"

3. The pre-purchase version of this question was phrased "How happy do you think this purchase will make you?"

4. The pre-purchase version of this question was phrased "How much will you enjoy using this purchase?"

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE PRODUCT CHOICE SET

Three items are used to measure how much a person has a positive attitude toward a set of products and believes, as a whole, they are better than expected. As implied by one of the items, the person will choose one product from the set.

Origin:

The scale was used by Coleman et al. (2017) in Studies 3, 5, and 6. The source of the scale was not stated and may have been created by them.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .87, .79, .79 in Studies 3, 5, and 6, respectively (Coleman et al. 2017, pp. 293, 299, 302).

Validity:

Coleman et al. (2017) did not discuss the scale's validity.

Reference:

Coleman, Nicole Verrochi, Patti Williams, Andrea C. Morales, and Andrew Edward White (2017), "Attention, Attitudes, and Action: When and Why Incidental Fear Increases Consumer Choice," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (2), 283-312.

Scale Items:¹

1. The products I saw were better than I expected.
2. The product selection was better than expected.
3. I was happy with the products presented.

1. The response format was not described by Coleman et al. (2017). It may have been a Likert-type scale with five or seven points.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE PRODUCT DESIGN

With three, seven-point Likert items, the scale measures how much a consumer likes the design of a product because it fits with his/her preferences.

Origin:

Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017, Web Appendix B) used the scale in Ancillary Study 1A with a final sample of 234 business students. The source of the scale was not stated. It seems likely the measure was created by the authors.

Reliability:

The alpha calculated for the scale was .88 (Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski 2017, Web Appendix B).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017).

Reference:

Kaiser, Ulrike, Martin Schreier, and Chris Janiszewski (2017), "The Self-Expressive Customization of a Product Can Improve Performance," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (5), 816-831.

Scale Items:¹

1. I like the _____ I have _____.²
2. The _____ fits my taste and preferences.
3. The design comes close to my idea of a "perfect" design.

1. The response scale used with these items had the following extreme anchors: *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). The blank in item #2 and the first blank of item #1 should be filled with the generic name of the product.

2. The second blank should be filled with the action taken by the participants. In the experiment by Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017, Web Appendix B), the participants either chose a pen from a set of options or they designed one. Given that, the last word of the sentence was either "chosen" or "designed." Depending upon the context of the study, other terms could be used, e.g., "purchased."

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE RETAILER'S WEBSITE (CUSTOMER SERVICE)

The scale has three, five-point Likert-type items that measure a person's overall attitude toward the customer service dimension of a particular retailer's website.

Origin:

The scale was created by Blut (2016) as a measure of what he viewed as a second order construct. As such, the items were rather general because specific first-order attributes forming the website customer service construct were measured separately. Data for the impressive study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and, if selected, they were told to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .93 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Although Blut (2016) did not provide much discussion of the scale's validity, he did indicate there was evidence of its discriminant validity. Further, the AVE of the scale was .82.

Reference:

Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.

Scale Items:¹

1. Overall, the online retailer's customer service is excellent.
2. Overall, the quality of the online retailer's return handling is excellent.
3. I am generally very satisfied with the customer service.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE RETAILER'S WEBSITE (DESIGN)

Three, five-point Likert-type items are used in this scale to measure a customer's overall attitude toward the design of a particular retailer's website.

Origin:

The scale was created by Blut (2016) as a measure of what he viewed as a second order construct. As such, the items were rather general because specific first-order attributes forming the website design construct were measured separately. Data for the impressive study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and, if selected, they were told to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .93 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Although Blut (2016) did not provide much discussion of the scale's validity, he did indicate there was evidence of its discriminant validity. The AVE of the scale was .82.

Reference:

Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.

Scale Items:¹

1. Overall, my experience at the online retailer's website is excellent.
2. Overall, the quality of the online retailer's website is excellent.
3. I am generally very satisfied with the website.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE RETAILER’S WEBSITE (FULFILLMENT)

A customer’s overall attitude toward the order fulfillment dimension of a particular retailer’s website is measured with three, five-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale was created by Blut (2016) as a measure of what he viewed as a second order construct. As such, the items were rather general because specific first-order attributes forming the website fulfillment construct were measured separately. Data for the impressive study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and, if selected, they were told to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer.

Reliability:

The scale’s alpha was .94 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Although Blut (2016) did not provide much discussion of the scale’s validity, he did indicate there was evidence of its discriminant validity. Further, the AVE of the scale was .85.

Reference:

Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.

Scale Items:¹

1. Overall, the online retailer’s order fulfillment is excellent.
2. Overall, the quality of the online retailer’s order fulfillment is excellent.
3. I am generally very satisfied with the order reliability.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE RETAILER'S WEBSITE (SECURITY/PRIVACY)

Using three, five-point Likert-type items, the scale measures a customer's overall attitude toward the security and privacy facets of a particular retailer's website.

Origin:

The scale was created by Blut (2016) as a measure of what he viewed as a second order construct. As such, the items were rather general because specific first-order attributes forming the website security/privacy construct were measured separately. Data for the impressive study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and, if selected, they were told to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .94 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Although Blut (2016) did not provide much discussion of the scale's validity, he did indicate there was evidence of its discriminant validity. Further, the AVE of the scale was .84.

Reference:

Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.

Scale Items:¹

1. Overall, the online retailer's handling of data security is excellent.
2. Overall, the quality of the online retailer's security is excellent.
3. I am generally very satisfied with handling of private information.

1. The response format used by Blut (2016, p. 506) with these items had the following anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SLOGAN (GENERAL)

The scale is composed of three, five-point semantic differentials that measure the degree to which a person considers a particular slogan to be positive and valuable.

Origin:

The scale was used in Study 3 by Vermeulen and Beukeboom (2016). The experiment appears to have collected data from 127 participants. The source of the scale was not identified. It is known that the items composing the scale have been commonly used in measuring attitudes towards a variety of objects, most notably brands and advertisements.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was reported to be .92 by Vermeulen and Beukeboom (2016, p. 58).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Vermeulen and Beukeboom (2016).

Reference:

Vermeulen, Ivar and Camiel J. Beukeboom (2016), "Effects of Music in Advertising: Three Experiments Replicating Single-Exposure Musical Conditioning of Consumer Choice (Gorn 1982) in an Individual Setting," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (1), 53-61.

Scale Items:

1. Bad / Good
2. Negative / Positive
3. Worthless / Valuable

BEING WATCHED

Four, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure one's belief that he/she was being observed in a particular situation.

Origin:

The scale was used by Esmark, Noble, and Breazeale (2017) in Studies 2, 3, and 4 as a manipulation check. The authors cited Gilovich, Medvec, and Savitsky (2000) who studied some similar constructs, though no multi-item scale was employed to measure one's sense of being watched. Given that, it appears that the scale was created by Esmark, Noble, and Breazeale (2017).

Reliability:

The alphas reported by Esmark, Noble, and Breazeale (2017, p. 341) for the scale were .99 (Studies 2 and 3) and .98 (Study 4).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by the authors. However, since the scale was used as a manipulation check in the three studies and the manipulations were successful, it provides some evidence of the scale's productive validity.

References:

Esmark, Carol L., Stephanie M. Noble, and Michael J. Breazeale (2017), "I'll Be Watching You: Shoppers' Reactions to Perceptions of Being Watched by Employees," *Journal of Retailing*, 93 (3), 336-349.

Gilovich, Thomas, Victoria H. Medvec, and Kenneth Savitsky (2000), "The Spot-light Effect in Social Judgement: An Egocentric Bias in Estimates of the Salience of One's Own Actions and Appearance," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78 (2), 211-222.

Scale Items:¹

1. not watched / very much watched
2. not observed / very much observed
3. not paid attention to / very much paid attention to
4. not looked at / very much looked at

1. The question that preceded these items was not provided in the article by Esmark, Noble, and Breazeale (2017) and may have varied across the three studies. In general, the question(s) probably asked participants to indicate the extent to which they thought they had been watched during the exercise just completed. Further, the word "much" in each item was not shown in the article but has been added here to make the phrases clearer.

BELIEF IN A JUST WORLD

Seven Likert-type items measure the degree to which a person believes that he/she is treated fairly, in general, and receives what is deserved.

Origin:

Kulow and Kramer (2016) used the scale in Study 3 of five reported in their article about prosocial behavior among consumers. Data were gathered via Amazon's MTurk from 150 participants living in the United States. The scale was created by Dalbert (1999) who reported alphas for the scale ranging from .82 to .87. To be clear, the scale used by Kulow and Kramer (2016) is the one Dalbert (1999) referred to as the *Personal Belief in a Just World Scale* which is distinct from the one she called the *General Belief in a Just World Scale*.

Reliability:

As calculated by Kulow and Kramer (2016, p. 343), the scale's alpha was .90.

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Kulow and Kramer (2016).

References:

Dalbert, Claudia (1999), "The World Is More Just for Me Than Generally: About the Personal Belief in a Just World Scale's Validity," *Social Justice Research*, 12 (June), 79-98.

Kulow, Katina and Thomas Kramer (2016), "In Pursuit of Good Karma: When Charitable Appeals to Do Right Go Wrong," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (2), 334-353.

Scale Items:¹

1. I believe that, by and large, I deserve what happens to me.
2. I am usually treated fairly.
3. I believe that I usually get what I deserve.
4. Overall, events in my life are just.
5. In my life injustice is the exception rather than the rule.
6. I believe that most of the things that happen in my life are fair.
7. I think that important decisions that are made concerning me are usually just.

1. The response format used by Kulow and Kramer (2016) was not described. Dalbert (1999, p. 95) used a six-point Likert-type format with end points labeled as *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (6).

BRAND AFFORDABILITY

The scale uses three, five-point Likert-type items to measure the extent to which a consumer believes a brand is on sale a lot and not expensive.

Origin:

De Langhe, Fernbach, and Lichtenstein (2016) created the scale from questions asked by a top market research firm in the U.S. that annually surveys consumers regarding their shopping attitudes. Of all the brand image questions, 15 were asked across most product categories and were used to create two scales, one of which measured affordability. Data were gathered from nearly 38,000 people for 132 brands covering 88 product categories.

Although the items in this scale appear to have been created by the market research firm referred to above, two of the items are almost identical to ones in a scale used by Yoo (2014) that appears to have a different origin.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .75 (De Langhe, Fernbach, and Lichtenstein 2016, p. 825).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not addressed *per se* by De Langhe, Fernbach, and Lichtenstein (2016). However, the authors did discuss a factor analysis that showed the three items in this scale loaded highest on the same factor and not on a factor the authors referred to as *perceived benefits*. This provides evidence of the scale's unidimensionality.

References:

De Langhe, Bart (2017), personal correspondence.

De Langhe, Bart, Philip M. Fernbach, and Donald R. Lichtenstein (2016), "Navigating by the Stars: Investigating the Actual and Perceived Validity of Online User Ratings," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (6), 817-833.

Yoo, Chan Yun (2014), "Branding Potentials of Keyword Search Ads: The Effects of Ad Rankings on Brand Recognition and Evaluations," *Journal of Advertising*, 43 (1), 85-99.

Scale Items:¹

1. _____ is affordable.
2. _____ is high-priced. (r)
3. _____ has a lot of sales or special deals.

1. The brand name should be placed in the blanks. As clarified by De Langhe (2017), the extreme anchors of the response scale used with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (5).

BRAND EXPECTATIONS

A customer's beliefs regarding the anticipated quality of a company's branded goods or services (before he/she has experienced the product) is measured with three, ten-point items.

Origin:

This measure is part of the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI), the only national cross-industry measure of customer satisfaction in the United States. The index is based on a theoretical model by Claes Fornell (Fornell et al. 1996) which views customer expectations of a brand as one of the three primary drivers of satisfaction.

In the study by Hult et al. (2017), the expectations scale was used along with the rest of the ACSI to determine how well company managers understand customers' critically important attitudes about the firm's brand(s). Data for their analyses were collected by the ACSI company during 2009 from about 60,000 customers who had recently purchased the products of one of the "significant" companies that were part of the survey (primarily Fortune 500 companies).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale as used in the study by Hult et al. (2017, p. 44) was .953.

Validity:

Using results of a structural equation model (PLS-SEM), Hult et al. (2017, pp. 44, 45) claimed support for their scales' convergent and discriminant validities. The AVE for the expectations scale was .915. Of concern is that, while all the items for the scales used in the study loaded most strongly on their own factors, there were high cross-loadings as well. For example, the loadings of the expectations items on satisfaction were between .798 and .824.

References:

Fornell, Claes, Michael D. Johnson, Eugene W. Anderson, Jaesung Cha, and Barbara Everitt Bryant (1996), "The American Customer Satisfaction Index: Nature, Purpose, and Findings," *Journal of Marketing*, 60 (October), 7-18.

Hult, Tomas M., Forrest V. Morgeson, Neil A. Morgan, Sunil Mithas, and Claes Fornell (2017), "Do Managers Know What Their Customers Think and Why?" *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (1), 37-43.

Scale Items:¹

1. Thinking about your overall expectations of the quality you would receive from _____, how would you rate your expectations? *not very high / very high*
2. At the same time, you probably thought about things you personally require from _____. How would you rate the degree to which you expected that these personal requirements would be

met? *not very well / very well*

3. Thinking about your expectations before your recent experiences with _____, how often did you expect that things could go wrong? *very often / not very often*

1. As conducted in an ACSI survey, participants are asked questions with regard to a specific brand rather than the company marketing the brand if there is a difference (Hult et al. 2017, p. 41). Higher scores indicated more positive expectations.

BRAND IMITATION

The scale uses three, seven-point Likert-type items to measure how much a consumer believes that a set of brands they were exposed to seem to have been intentionally made to resemble each other. While the sentences do not explicitly refer to the similarity of brands' packaging or some other visual attribute, that is the implication.

Origin:

Kelting, Duhachek, and Whitler (2017) created the scale and used it in Studies 1 ($n = 136$) and 2 ($n = 135$). In both cases, participants were undergraduate students at a large public university in the United States. Also, in both studies, participants were presented with a set of competing brands and were asked to pick one.

Reliability:

The alphas calculated for the scale in Studies 1 and 2 were .92 and .89, respectively (Kelting, Duhachek, and Whitler 2017, pp. 574, 576).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Kelting, Duhachek, and Whitler (2017). However, since the scale was used as a manipulation check in both studies and the manipulations were successful, it provides some evidence of the scale's predicative validity.

Reference:

Kelting, Katie, Adam Duhachek, and Kimberly Whitler (2017), "Can Copycat Private Labels Improve the Consumer's Shopping Experience? A Fluency Explanation," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (4), 569-585.

Scale Items:¹

1. The products in this selection appear to be copying each other.
2. The products in this selection appear to be imitating each other.
3. The products in this selection appear to be mimicking each other.

1. A seven-point Likert-type response scale was used with these items. The end points were labeled *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

BRAND PREFERENCE

The favorability of one brand compared to another is measured with three, nine-point questions.

Origin:

Cheng, Mukhopadhyay, and Schrift (2017) used the scale in Study 5 with data gathered from 234 undergraduate students at a major public university. (The location of the university was not stated.) The source of the scale was not stated and may have been created by the authors for this study.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .89 (Cheng, Mukhopadhyay, and Schrift 2017, p. 643).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Cheng, Mukhopadhyay, and Schrift (2017).

Reference:

Cheng, Yimin, Anirban Mukhopadhyay, and Rom Y. Schrift (2017), "Do Costly Options Lead to Better Outcomes? How the Protestant Work Ethic Influences the Cost-Benefit Heuristic in Goal Pursuit," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (4), 636-649.

Scale Items:¹

1. Which _____ do you like more?
2. Which _____ are you more favorable toward?
3. Which _____ are you more likely to buy?

1. The nine-point response scale was not fully described by Cheng, Mukhopadhyay, and Schrift (2017, p. 643) but, based on the information provided, it appears that the verbal anchors referred to two different brands. For example, Brand A could be shown on the far left of the scale (1) while Brand B is the anchor on the far right (9). Once a score is determined for a person or group, a higher (lower) scale score would indicate a preference for Brand B (Brand A).

BRAND RELATIONSHIP (PARTNER QUALITY)

Using eight sentences and a seven-point response format, this scale measures the degree to which a consumer expresses strong trust of, affection toward, and commitment to a particular brand. Several of the sentences are phrased as if one were describing a relationship with a person.

Origin:

He, Chen, and Alden (2016) used the scale in Studies 1a, 1b, and 2, each with very small samples ($n \leq 53$). The scale itself was created by Smit, Bronner, and Tolboom (2007). They took 16 items from the 39-item Brand Relationship Quality scale by Fournier (1994), factor analyzed them, and concluded that there were two factors: *connection* and *partner quality*.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale in Study 2 was .83 (He, Chen, and Alden 2016, p. 797). (The alphas for the scale as used in the other two studies were not reported).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed or examined by He, Chen, and Alden (2016).

References:

Fournier, Susan (1994), *A Consumer-Brand Relationship Framework for Strategic Brand Management*, unpublished dissertation, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.

He, Yi, Qimei Chen, and Dana L. Alden (2016), "Time Will Tell: Managing Post-Purchase Changes in Brand Attitude," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (6), 791-805.

Smit, Edith, Fred Bronner, and Maarten Tolboom (2007), "Brand Relationship Quality and its Value for Personal Contact," *Journal of Business Research*, 60 (6), 627-633.

Scale Items:¹

1. I have feelings for _____ that I do not have for a lot of other brands.
2. _____ is my most favorite brand.
3. _____ has always been good to me.
4. _____ treats me as an important and valuable customer.
5. _____ can always count on me.
6. I will continue using _____ in the near future.
7. I trust _____.
8. _____ is an honest brand.

1. The name of the brand should be placed in the blanks. The verbal anchors of the seven-point response scale used by He, Chen, and Alden (2016) with these items were not described. It appears to have been a Likert-type scale and the authors may have used the same anchors as Smit, Bronner, and Tolboom (2007, p. 631) or something similar: *totally disagree* / *totally agree*.

BRAND SPONSORSHIP MOTIVE (NORMATIVE)

Three Likert-type items are used to measure the degree which a person believes the reason a brand sponsors something, such as a team, event, or charity, is because it is something that is expected by constituents, e.g., employees, customers, the community at large.

Origin:

Woisetschläger, Backhaus, and Cornwell (2017) used the scale in Studies 1 and 2, with participants coming from an online panel in Germany. The scale was presented to participants in German and phrased in English for the journal publication (Woisetschläger 2018). The context of the studies involved issues related to brand sponsorship of professional soccer clubs. The items for the scale were adaptations of items from two measures of consumer attributions of company motives by Ellen, Webb, and Mohr (2006): values-driven attributions and stakeholder-driven attributions.

Reliability:

The measures of internal consistency reported by Woisetschläger, Backhaus, and Cornwell (2017, pp. 130, 134) for the scale were .861 (composite reliability calculated in Study 1) and .87 (Cronbach's alpha calculated in Study 2).

Validity:

Based on the results of a CFA using Study 1 data, evidence of this scale's discriminant validity was provided with respect to several other sponsorship scales. The AVE of this scale was .857.

Comments:

Although the information provided by Woisetschläger, Backhaus, and Cornwell (2017) about the scale's psychometric quality was good, there is still concern about its validity given that one of the items (#1 below) was taken from a measure of values-driven attributions while the other two items were from a measure of stakeholder-driven attributions. While those are related constructs, the question is whether or not they should be measured together or separately.

References:

Ellen, Pam Scholder, Deborah J. Webb, and Lois A. Mohr (2006), "Building Corporate Associations: Consumer Attributions for Corporate Socially Responsible Programs," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34 (2), 147-157.

Woisetschläger, David M. (2018), personal correspondence.

Woisetschläger, David M., Christof Backhaus, and T. Bettina Cornwell (2017), "Inferring Corporate Motives: How Deal Characteristics Shape Sponsorship Perceptions," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (5), 121-141.

Scale Items:¹

Please evaluate the following statements about the relationship between _____ and _____:

1. A reason for _____ to get involved as a sponsor is that they feel a moral obligation of their environment.
2. _____ is principally engaged in the sponsorship, because they feel that it is expected from a company this size.
3. _____ is a loyal sponsor, primarily because customers, employees or other important target groups expect it.

1. The name of the sponsor (brand or company) should be placed in the first blank of the scale stem and each blank of the three items. The name of the organization being sponsored should be placed in the second, longer, blank of the scale stem. The response format used with these items in Study 1 was a five-point, Likert-type scale while a seven-point Likert-type format was used in Study 2 (Woisetschläger 2018; Woisetschläger, Backhaus, and Cornwell 2017, p. 133).

BUSYNESS AT WORK

This scale is composed of three, seven-point items that measure how much a person believes another person is busy at work rather than spending time in leisure activities.

Origin:

The scale was used in several studies reported by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017) in the main body of their article as well as in the web appendix. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

In the many uses of the scale by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017), the alphas ranged from .82 (Study 2A) to .93 (Study 1B).

Validity:

Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017) conducted tests of discriminant validity in several of the studies and each time they found support for this scale with respect to measures of the other main constructs being examined. For the studies in which AVE was reported, the values ranged from .733 (Study 2A) to .875 (Study 1B). Support for the scale's predictive validity comes from the fact that the measure was used as a manipulation check in several of the studies and the manipulations were successful.

Comments:

The scale was used by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017) to measure one person's attitude about another person rather than assessing one's own busyness at work. While it seems like the scale is amenable for self-assessment, further testing is suggested to confirm the adapted scale's psychometric quality.

It is worthy of note that Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017) distinguished between busyness at work and busyness with hobbies and other leisure activities. This means that, according to this scale, a retired person who spends many hours each day involved with hobbies as well as taking care of the house and yard would not be considered busy. If researchers desire a scale that views busyness more broadly, then modification of this scale or use of another measure may be necessary. Related to that, item #3 (below) does not specify whether "busy" refers to work or not. While that ambiguity did not seem to be a problem for the authors given the scenarios that participants read, it would improve the scale for item #3 to be more specific in referring to work.

Reference:

Bellezza, Silvia, Neeru Paharia, and Anat Keinan (2017), "Conspicuous Consumption of Time: When Busyness and Lack of Leisure Time Become a Status Symbol," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (1), 118-138.

Scale Items:¹

1. _____ spends many hours at work.
Strongly disagree (1) / *Strongly agree* (7)
2. _____ spends many hours doing hobbies and/or leisure activities.
Strongly disagree (1) / *Strongly agree* (7) (r)
3. How busy is _____?
Not busy at all (1) / *Extremely busy* (7)

1. The name of the person being assessed should be placed in the blanks. The end-points of the response scale used by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017, p. 124) with these items are shown below the questions.

CAUSE-RELATED MARKETING MOTIVE ATTRIBUTIONS (EGOISTIC)

The degree to which a person believes a particular company engages in social activity and supports causes because of how it (the company) could benefit from the activity is measured with three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale was used by Habel et al. (2016, web appendix) in Study 6 as a manipulation check and referred to it as *extrinsic CSR attribution*. Data for the experiment came from 273 members of a consumer panel. The source of the scale was not stated. It appears the authors created the scale and possibly drew some inspiration from a measure of the construct by Ellen, Webb, and Mohr (2006).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .943 (Habel 2017).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Habel et al. (2016). However, since the scale was used as a manipulation check in the experiment, and the manipulation worked as intended, it provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

References:

Ellen, Pam Scholder, Deborah J. Webb, and Lois A. Mohr (2006), "Building Corporate Associations: Consumer Attributions for Corporate Socially Responsible Programs," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34 (2), 147-157.

Habel, Johannes (2017), personal correspondence.

Habel, Johannes, Laura Marie Schons, Sascha Alavi, and Jan Wieseke (2016), "Warm Glow or Extra Charge? The Ambivalent Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility Activities on Customers' Perceived Price Fairness," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 84-105.

Scale Items:¹

1. The company supports good causes to take advantage of the cause.
2. The company engages in social activities to gain a competitive advantage.
3. The company does good deeds out of egoistic motives.

¹ The seven-point response scale had the extreme anchors labeled as *I do not agree at all* and *I fully agree* (Habel et al. 2016, web appendix, p. 17).

CAUSE-RELATED MARKETING MOTIVE ATTRIBUTIONS (VALUES DRIVEN)

Three, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a person believes a particular company is socially active due to its genuine concern and unselfish motivation.

Origin:

The scale was used by Habel et al. (2016) in Studies 3, 4, and 6 and was referred to as *intrinsic CSR attribution*. The source of the scale was not stated and was likely created by the authors.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .928 (Study 3) and .933 (Studies 4 and 6; Habel 2017).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Habel et al. (2016). However, since the scale was used in the three studies as a manipulation check and the manipulations worked as intended, it provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

References:

Habel, Johannes (2017), personal correspondence.

Habel, Johannes, Laura Marie Schons, Sascha Alavi, and Jan Wieseke (2016), "Warm Glow or Extra Charge? The Ambivalent Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility Activities on Customers' Perceived Price Fairness," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 84-105.

Scale Items:¹

1. The company engages in good deeds because it is genuinely concerned about being socially responsible.
2. The company supports good causes out of unselfish motives.
3. The good deeds of the company are based on the honest wish to do good.

1. The response scale had seven points with the extreme anchors being labeled as *I do not agree at all* and *I fully agree* (Habel et al. 2016, web appendix, p. 17).

CHOICE DIFFICULTY

The degree of difficulty a person expresses in choosing one brand from among several in a product category is measured with three, seven-point semantic differentials.

Origin:

Kelting, Duhachek, and Whitler (2017) used the scale in Studies 1 ($n = 136$) and 2 ($n = 135$). In both cases, participants were undergraduate students at a large public university in the United States. Also, in both studies, participants were presented with a set of competing brands and were asked to pick one. The authors referred to the scale as *choice ease* because they reverse-scored each item. (They are not reversed here.)

As for the source of the scale, the authors indicated that they “adapted” a measure by Iyengar and Lepper (2000). However, only one item from the latter was adapted. Interestingly, there is much more similarity between the items shown below and those composing a scale by Diehl and Poynor (2010).

Reliability:

The alphas calculated for the scale in Studies 1 and 2 were .81 and .85, respectively (Kelting, Duhachek, and Whitler 2017, pp. 574, 576).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Kelting, Duhachek, and Whitler (2017).

References:

Diehl, Kristin and Cait Poynor (2010), "Great Expectations?! Assortment Size, Expectations, and Satisfaction," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47 (2), 312-322.

Iyengar, Sheena S. and Mark R. Lepper (2000), "When Choice Is Demotivating: Can One Desire Too Much of a Good Thing?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79 (6), 995–1006.

Kelting, Katie, Adam Duhachek, and Kimberly Whitler (2017), "Can Copycat Private Labels Improve the Consumer's Shopping Experience? A Fluency Explanation," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (4), 569-585.

Scale Items:¹

Choosing the one product from the selection was:

1. not at all difficult / extremely difficult
2. not at all confusing / extremely confusing
3. not at all overwhelming / extremely overwhelming

1. A seven-point response scale was used with these items.

CHOICE UNCERTAINTY

Using three, seven-point items, this scale measures how much a person feels uncertain about a choice he/she has made.

Origin:

May (2017) used the scale in Study 4 with a sample of 228 participants recruited from Amazon's MTurk. Although use of the scale is stated in the body of the article (p. 323), details about it are only provided in the web appendix. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .81 (May 2017, web appendix, p. 7).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not addressed by May (2017).

Reference:

May, Frank May (2017), "The Effect of Future Event Markers on Intertemporal Choice Is Moderated by the Reliance on Emotions versus Reason to Make Decisions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (2), 313-331.

Scale Items:

1. I felt a lot of uncertainty as I made my decision.
Not at all (1) / *Very much so* (7)
2. I didn't feel any uncertainty as I made my choice.
Not at all (1) / *Very much so* (7) (r)
3. When making your choice, did you feel very certain or very uncertain about the outcome? *Very uncertain* (1) / *Very certain* (7) (r)

CLOSENESS OF THE FRIEND

Using three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures how well one person knows a particular person and believes their relationship is important.

Origin:

The scale was used by Ward and Broniarczyk (2016) in three studies (2, 3b, and 4) as a manipulation check. The source of the scale was not identified.

Reliability:

The alphas reported for the scale were .80, .84, and .84 in studies 2, 3b, and 4, respectively (Ward and Broniarczyk 2016, pp. 1006, 1009, 1012).

Validity:

Ward and Broniarczyk (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity. However, given that the scale was used in three experiments and that the manipulations were successful in each case, it provides some evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

Reference:

Ward, Morgan K. and Susan M. Broniarczyk (2016), "Ask and You Shall (Not) Receive: Close Friends Prioritize Relational Signaling over Recipient Preferences in Their Gift Choices," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (6), 1001-1018.

Scale Items:¹

Please rate how descriptive each of the following statements are of the relationship you have with _____.²

1. We are very close friends.
2. Our relationship is not important to me. (r)
3. We know each other very well.

1. The end points of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

2. The name or description of the other person should be placed in the blank. For example, Ward and Broniarczyk (2016) used the phrase "the person whose initials you entered above" which referred to a person they were instructed to think of earlier in the experiment.

COMFORTABLENESS OF THE OBJECT

How cozy and cushiony a person judges a particular object to be is measured with three, nine-point semantic differentials. Although “comfortable” can be thought of in emotional or social terms, this scale is most suited for use when rating physical objects, particularly ones that can be sat or laid on, e.g., chairs, sofas, beds.

Origin:

The scale was used by Jiang et al. (2016) in Experiment 2 of the five studies reported in the article. Respondents were shown ads for a sofa that varied between two treatment groups only in the shape of the logo associated with the product. The source of the scale was not stated but appears to have been the authors.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .91 (Jiang et al. 2016, p. 714).

Validity:

The scale’s validity was not addressed by Jiang et al. (2016).

Reference:

Jiang, Yuwei, Gerald J. Gorn, Maria Galli, and Amitava Chattopadhyay (2016), "Does Your Company Have the Right Logo? How and Why Circular- and Angular-Logo Shapes Influence Brand Attribute Judgments," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 709-726.

Scale Items:¹

1. Not at all comfortable / Very comfortable
2. Not at all cozy / Very cozy
3. Not at all cushiony / Very cushiony

1. The instructions used with this scale were not stated but it is clear that participants were asked to fill out the items after being exposed to an ad that featured a sofa.

COMMITMENT TO THE COMPANY (GENERAL)

Four, five-point Likert-type items measure a customer's degree of commitment and loyalty. The scale is general in the sense that it can be easily adapted for use with a variety of business entities such as a company, brand, store, or website.

Origin:

Wilson, Giebelhausen, and Brady (2017) referred to the measure as *self-brand connection* and used it in two studies. Data for one of the two studies came from data collected in the 2013 J.D. Power North American Hotel Guest Satisfaction study. The dataset created by Wilson, Giebelhausen, and Brady (2017) had responses from 6,577 people. The second sample had 292 full responses from people recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk. That study was used to examine some psychometric aspects of their measures. As for the original of the scale, it was composed of items taken from the J.D. Power study. Beyond that, several of the key words and phrases in the scale are commonly found in measures of loyalty and commitment, e.g., Garbarino and Johnson (1999); Price and Arnould (1999).

Reliability:

The scale was found to have high internal consistency. Specifically, an alpha of .94 was reported for the scale using data from the J.D. Power data. A CR of .894 was found for the scale in the psychometric study.

Validity:

As noted above, a separate study was conducted by Wilson, Giebelhausen, and Brady (2017) to determine if the scales they created and used in Studies 1 and 2 were equivalent to scales created from items in the J.D. Power study. The CFA provided evidence that the scales were "substitutable" (p. 543). The AVE for the commitment scale was .682.

References:

Garbarino, Ellen and Mark S. Johnson (1999), "The Different Roles of Satisfaction, Trust, and Commitment in Customer Relationships," *Journal of Marketing*, 63 (April), 70-87.

Price, Linda L. and Eric J. Arnould (1999), "Commercial Friendships: Service Provider-Client Relationships in Context," *Journal of Marketing*, 63 (October), 38-56.

Wilson, Andrew E., Michael D. Giebelhausen, and Michael K. Brady (2017), "Negative Word of Mouth Can be a Positive for Consumers Connected to the Brand," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (4), 534-547.

Scale Items:¹

1. I feel loyal to _____.
2. If I were unable to be a customer of _____ I would be disappointed.
3. I am committed to _____.

4. I am proud to be a customer of _____.

1. The response format used with the scale items in the J.D. Power study was described by Wilson, Giebelhausen, and Brady (2017, p. 539) as a five-point Likert type. The response format used in the psychometric study was not explicitly stated. The name of the entity (brand, company, website, etc.) should be stated in the blanks.

COMPANY REPUTATION

Four semantic differentials are used in this scale to measure how successful and respected a company is believed to be.

Origin:

Xie and Keh (2016) used the scale in the Study 2 pretest ($n = 64$) as well as the Study 3 pretest ($n = 35$). The source of the scale was not stated and it is assumed to have been created by the authors. The scale was used in both cases as a manipulation check with the goal of finding a brand with a good reputation and one with a moderate reputation.

Reliability:

The alphas were calculated for 10 toasters in the Study 2 pretest. The alpha of the brand selected for use in the main study as having a high reputation was .94 while the alpha for the brand selected for use with a moderate reputation was .91 (Xie and Keh 2016, p. 216). In the Study 3 pretest, six fast food chain brands were considered. The alphas were .89 and .95 for the high reputation and moderate reputation brands, respectively (p. 218). (Although the scale was used in the main studies, the alphas were not reported.)

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Xie and Keh (2016). It is worth noting, however, that since the scale was used as a manipulation check in Study 2 and 3 and that the manipulations were found to be successful, some limited evidence was provided of the scale's predictive validity.

Reference:

Xie, Yi and Hean Tat Keh (2016), "Taming the Blame Game: Using Promotion Programs to Counter Product-Harm Crises," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 211-226.

Scale Items:¹

1. Not successful / Successful
2. Not prestigious / Prestigious
3. Not respected / Respected
4. Not admired / Admired

1. The scale stem used with these items was not stated but could have been as simple as a question such as *What do you believe about this company?* The number of points on the scale was not stated but it appears to have been seven.

COMPANY SUCCESS EXPECTATIONS

Four, seven-point items compose the scale and are used to measure how successful a company is expected to be in the future.

Origin:

Bagchi and Ince (2016) created the scale for use in Study 3a with 94 undergraduate students. The participants were asked to imagine they were thinking about buying stock in a particular company and read a report about the company supposedly from an investment analyst.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .81 (Bagchi and Ince 2016, p. 37).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Bagchi and Ince (2016).

References:

Bagchi, Rajesh (2017), personal correspondence.

Bagchi, Rajesh and Elise Chandon Ince (2016), "Is a 70% Forecast More Accurate Than a 30% Forecast? How Level of a Forecast Affects Inferences About Forecasts and Forecasters," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (1), 31-45.

Scale Items:¹

1. How successful is _____ going to be?
Not successful at all / Very successful
2. How quickly will _____ become successful?
Not quickly at all / Very quickly
3. How profitable will _____ be in the coming years?
Not profitable at all / Very profitable
4. How likely are you to invest in _____ stock?
Not likely at all / Very likely

1. Phrasing of the items was clarified by Bagchi (2017). The name of the company being assessed should be placed in the blanks.

COMPANY'S VALUE TO THE CUSTOMER

With three, seven-point Likert-type items, this scale measures the degree to which a customer values a particular business and believes it saves him/her money.

Origin:

The scale was called *customer value* by Steinhoff and Palmatier (2016). It was used in the authors' three studies of loyalty programs with respect to a hypothetical retail store in Study 1, a hypothetical hotel in Study 2, and real airlines in Study 3. Because Studies 1 and 2 were very similar lab experiments, their data were combined for some of the analyses. Study 3 data were gathered in a survey and were analyzed separately. The scale was created by the authors who drew concepts and phrases from a measure of value by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .83 and .93 for Studies 1 and 2 (combined) and Study 3, respectively (Steinhoff 2017).

Validity:

In analyses of data for both the combined samples of Studies 1 and 2 as well as Study 3, CFAs were used by Steinhoff and Palmatier (2016, p. 98) to assess the psychometric qualities of the scales. Evidence was found of the scales' convergent and discriminant validities. (It is assumed that the value scale was included in the analyses though it was not stated explicitly.)

References:

Sirdeshmukh, Deepak, Jagdip Singh, and Barry Sabol (2002), "Consumer Trust, Value, and Loyalty in Relational Exchanges," *Journal of Marketing*, 66 (January), 15-37.

Steinhoff, Lena (2017), personal correspondence.

Steinhoff, Lena and Robert W. Palmatier (2016), "Understanding Loyalty Program Effectiveness: Managing Target and Bystander Effects," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (1), 88-107.

Scale Items:¹

1. _____ helps me save money.
2. _____ is a "good deal" for me.
3. _____ provides me value.

1. The name of the business should be placed in the blanks. The extreme verbal anchors of the response scale used by Steinhoff and Palmatier (2016, p. 98) with the three statements were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

COMPETENCE

Using four, seven-point uni-polar items, the scale measures how much a person is considered to be skillful and intelligent.

Origin:

Wang et al. (2017) used the scale in Studies 1a, 2a, and 2b. The authors appear to have created the scale by drawing items from measures by Aaker, Vohs, and Mogilner (2010) as well as Cuddy, Fiske, and Glick (2007).

Reliability:

The alphas reported for the scale were .93, .95, and .96 in Studies 1a, 2a, and 2b, respectively (Wang et al. 2017, pp. 789, 793, 796).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Wang et al. (2017).

References:

Aaker, Jennifer, Kathleen D. Vohs, and Cassie Mogilner (2010), "Nonprofits Are Seen as Warm and For-Profits as Competent: Firm Stereotypes Matter," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37 (2), 224–237.

Cuddy, Amy, Susan T. Fiske, and Peter Glick (2007), "The BIAS Map: Behaviors from Intergroup Affect and Stereotypes," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92 (4), 631–648.

Wang, Ze, Huifang Mao, Yexin Jessica Li, and Fan Liu (2017), "Smile Big or Not? Effects of Smile Intensity on Perceptions of Warmth and Competence," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (5), 787–805.

Scale Items:¹

1. competent
2. intelligent
3. capable
4. skillful

1. The end points of the response scale used with these items by Wang et al. (2017, p. 789) were *not at all* (1) and *very much so* (7). The instructions were not provided but apparently asked participants to indicate how well each of the items described the focal person.

COMPETITIVE/COLLABORATIVE ORIENTATION

With four, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures whether a person has a habitual mental attitude in which self-distinctiveness is emphasized or, at the other extreme, an integration mindset in which assimilation and cooperation are emphasized.

Origin:

The scale was used by Ju et al. (2017) in Studies 1A, 1B, and 2. The authors cited Stapel and Koomen (2005) as the source of the scale. While those items are, indeed, part of a 13-item personality measure created by those authors, the four items below were originally part of scales by others. Items #1 and #3 are from Martin and Larsen (1976); items #2 and #4 are from Wagner (1995).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .71 in Study 1A. In Studies 1B and 2, the alphas were .77 and .74, respectively, for participants in the experiment who read a competitive ad. For those who read the collaborative ad, the alphas were .81 (Study 1B) and .79 (Study 2).

Validity:

Ju et al. (2017) did not discuss the scale's validity *per se*. However, the scale was used in each study as a manipulation check, and since the manipulations were successful in each case, it provides some preliminary evidence of the measure's predictive validity.

References:

- Ju, Ilyoung, Yi He, Qimei Chen, Wei He, Bin Shen, and Sela Sar (2017), "The Mind-Set to Share: An Exploration of Antecedents of Narrowcasting Versus Broadcasting in Digital Advertising," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (4), 473-486.
- Martin, Harry J. and Knud S. Larsen (1976), "Measurement of Competitive-Cooperative Attitudes," *Psychological Reports*, 39 (1), 303-306.
- Stapel, Diederik A. and Willem Koomen (2005), "Competition, Cooperation, and the Effects of Others on Me," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88 (6), 1029-1038.
- Wagner, John A., III. (1995), "Studies of Individualism-Collectivism: Effects on Cooperation in Groups," *Academy of Management Journal*, 38 (1), 152-172.

Scale Items:¹

1. I do not care if I hurt people on my way to success. (r)
2. It annoys me when other people perform better than I do. (r)
3. It is important to treat everyone nicely.
4. I prefer to work with others in a group rather than working alone.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Ju et al. (2017, p. 478) were *Strongly disagree* (1) and *Strongly agree* (7). Indications of reverse-scoring were not provided in the article and are shown here based on judgment.

CONFIDENCE IN FINDING PRODUCT INFORMATION

The degree to which a person expresses confidence in his/her ability to find information about a product in order to make a decision is measured with three, seven-point Likert-type items. While this scale might be used with sources other than online, it seems to be most suited for that context.

Origin:

Bhargave, Mantonakis, and White (2016) used the scale in Study 2 with 164 undergraduates attending a large public university in the United States. They referred to the scale as *confidence in information access*. The authors created the scale by adapting two of the items from a general measure of cognitive self-esteem by Ward (2013).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .88 (Bhargave, Mantonakis, and White 2016, p. 703).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Bhargave, Mantonakis, and White (2016).

References:

Bhargave, Rajesh, Antonia Mantonakis, and Katherine White (2016), "The Cue-of-the-Cloud Effect: When Reminders of Online Information Availability Increase Purchase Intentions and Choice," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (5), 699-711.

Ward, Adrian F. (2013), *One with the Cloud: Why People Mistake the Internet's Knowledge for Their Own*, doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Scale Items:¹

Right now I feel . . .

1. confident that I can access information about this product at any time to make an informed choice.
2. that I know where to look to find information about this product that I don't know myself.
3. that even if I don't know some information about this product right away, I know that I can access it.

1. The end points of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

CONFORMITY ORIENTATION

With six, nine-point Likert-type items, the scale measures a person's general attitude that society should have well-defined rules (social norms and laws) and that punishment is appropriate when rules are not adhered to.

Origin:

Dong and Zhong (2017) used the scale in Studies 2, 3, 4, as well as in some of the pretests. The authors cited Murray and Schaller (2012) as the source. Those authors indicated that a factor analysis of the six items yielded only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1. Its alpha was .77.

Reliability:

The alphas reported by Dong and Zhong (2017) for the scale as used in the main studies ranged from .77 (Study 3, p. 784) to .86 (Study 2, p. 783).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Dong and Zhong (2017).

References:

Dong, Ping and Chen-Bo Zhong (2017), "Witnessing Moral Violations Increases Conformity in Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (4), 778–793.

Murray, Damian R. and Mark Schaller (2012), "Threat(s) and Conformity Deconstructed: Perceived Threat of Infectious Disease and Its Implications for Conformist Attitudes and Behavior," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42 (2), 180–188.

Scale Items:¹

1. Imposing tough laws and punishments, even to minor crimes, is an effective way to preserve the fiber of a society.
2. Constantly breaking social norms often has harmful, unintended consequences.
3. The most important part of any game is a well-defined set of rules.
4. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
5. People are constantly prying into matters that should remain unquestioned.
6. Too many new ideas in one country can cause its values to erode.

1. The end-points of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (9). The items were provided in the web appendix (p. 16) of Dong and Zhong (2017).

CONGRUENCE (GENERAL)

The scale uses three, seven-point semantic differentials to measure how well two objects are considered to fit each other and be compatible.

Origin:

David (2016) used the scale in Studies 2-5 and referred to it as measuring *perceived fit*. The three items were borrowed from a four-item measure by Choi and Rifon (2012) that those authors called *perceived congruence*.

Reliability:

The scale appears to have high internal consistency with alphas ranging from .86 (Study 2, n = 102) to .89 (Study 5, n = 406).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by David (2016).

Comments:

In the studies by David (2016), the scale was used with respect to the fit of a product to the consumer. With the proper instructions, the items appear to be amenable for use in a wide variety of contexts such as the congruence of a product to an ad, a product to a company, or an ad to a consumer.

References:

Choi, Sejung Marina and Nora J. Rifon (2012), "It Is a Match: The Impact of Congruence between Celebrity Image and Consumer Ideal Self on Endorsement Effectiveness," *Psychology and Marketing*, 29 (9), 639–650.

David, Meredith E. (2017), personal correspondence.

David, Meredith E. (2016), "The Role of Attachment Style in Shaping Consumer Preferences for Products Shown in Advertisements that Depict Consensus Claims," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 227-243.

Scale Items:¹

1. Not compatible / Compatible
2. Bad fit / Good fit
3. Bad match / Good match

1. The items were provided by David (2017). She asked participants in the studies to indicate the extent to which they felt the product shown in the ad was a good fit for them.

CONGRUENCE (SELF WITH OBJECT)

With three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a person believes an object or experience is closely associated with his/her identity.

Origin:

Bastos and Brucks (2017) used the scale in Experiment 2 ($n = 153$) with data gathered from Amazon MTurk participants. The source of the scale was not stated and is assumed to have been created by the authors using words and phrases found in past measures of the construct. The authors referred to the scale as *closeness to the self*.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .922 (Bastos and Brucks 2017, p. 602).

Validity:

Although Bastos and Brucks (2017) did not explicitly discuss the scale's validity they did report that an EFA of the items from five scales used in Experiment 2 indicated that the scores expected to measure congruence loaded highest on the same factor. That provides some evidence of the scale's unidimensionality.

Reference:

Bastos, Wilson and Merrie Brucks (2017), "How and Why Conversational Value Leads to Happiness for Experiential and Material Purchases," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (3), 598–612.

Scale Items:¹

1. That _____ reflects who I am as a person.
2. That _____ is close to my sense of self.
3. That _____ is closely associated with my identity.

1. The blanks should be filled with a name or description of the focal object or experience. The endpoints of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

CONNECTEDNESS WITH NATURE

Using four, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a person likes natural environments and enjoys spending time in them.

Origin:

Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend (2016) used the scale in Studies 2 and 3. The authors drew items for the scale from several sources.

Reliability:

The scale's alphas were .79 and .88 in Studies 2 and 3, respectively (Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend 2016, pp. 433, 434).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not addressed *per se* by Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend (2016). However, they did indicate that in both studies the factor analyses showed the items composing the scale had high loadings on the same factor and explained a majority of the variance.

Reference:

Hartmann, Patrick, Vanessa Apaolaza, and Martin Eisend (2016), "Nature Imagery in Non-Green Advertising: The Effects of Emotion, Autobiographical Memory, and Consumer's Green Traits," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (4), 427-440.

Scale Items:¹

1. When I am in natural environments, I feel connected with nature.
2. It makes me sad to see natural environments destroyed.
3. Spending time in nature makes me feel happy.
4. I usually spend some of my time being in nature.

1. The response format used with these items by Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend (2016, p. 433) had seven-points and was anchored by *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree*.

CONSCIOUSNESS OF FACE (DESIRE TO GAIN FACE)

A person's hope that he/she can perform better than others in socially-relevant ways and earn admiration for it is measured with five, seven-point items.

Origin:

Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016) used the scale in Studies 1a (n = 195) and 3a (n = 330), with the participants being recruited from Amazon's MTurk in both cases. This scale is one of two that were developed and tested with Chinese participants by Zhang, Cao, and Grigoriou (2011). Work by the latter showed there was a two-factor correlated structure of the *consciousness of social face* construct. In multiple studies, they provided evidence of both subscales' convergent validity, discriminant validity, and criterion-related validity. Alphas for the *desire to gain face* subscale were .76 (Study 1) and .79 (Study 3). Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016) did not state why they did not use all six items of that subscale.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .70 (Fombelle 2017). (It is not clear for which study that was calculated.)

Validity:

Any evidence bearing on the scale's validity that may have been gathered by Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016) was not mentioned.

References:

Fombelle, Paul W. (2017), personal correspondence.
Fombelle, Paul W., Sterling A. Bone, and Katherine N. Lemon (2016), "Responding to the 98%: Face-Enhancing Strategies for Dealing with Rejected Customer Ideas," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (6), 685-706.
Zhang, Xin-An, Qing Cao, and Nicholas Grigoriou (2011), "Consciousness of Social Face: The Development and Validation of a Scale Measuring Desire to Gain Face versus Fear of Losing Face," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 151 (2), 129-149.

Scale Items:¹

1. I hope people think I can do better than most others.
2. I hope that I can talk about things that most others do not know.
3. It is important for me to get praise and admiration.
4. I hope to let people know that I have association with some big names.
5. I hope that I have a better life than most others in others view.

1. The response format used with these items by Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016, p. 690) was merely described as "seven-point Likert scales." The end points used were probably *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree* as was used by Zhang, Cao, and Grigoriou (2011, p. 133).

CONSCIOUSNESS OF FACE (FEAR OF LOSING FACE)

With five, seven-point items, the scale measures a person's motivation to hide his/her socially-relevant mistakes and weaknesses.

Origin:

Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016) used the scale in Studies 1a (n = 195) and 3a (n = 330), with the participants being recruited from Amazon's MTurk in both cases. The scale is one of two that were developed and tested with Chinese participants by Zhang, Cao, and Grigoriou (2011). Work by the latter showed there was a two-factor correlated structure of the *consciousness of social face* construct. In multiple studies, they provided evidence of both subscales' convergent validity, discriminant validity, and criterion-related validity. Alphas for the *fear of losing face* subscale were .74 (Study 1) and .72 (Study 3).

Reliability:

As used by Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016), the scale's alpha was .69 (Fombelle 2017). (It is not clear for which study that was calculated.)

Validity:

Evidence bearing on the scale's validity may have been gathered by Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016) but was not mentioned in the article.

References:

Fombelle, Paul W. (2017), personal correspondence.
Fombelle, Paul W., Sterling A. Bone, and Katherine N. Lemon (2016), "Responding to the 98%: Face-Enhancing Strategies for Dealing with Rejected Customer Ideas," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (6), 685-706.
Zhang, Xin-An, Qing Cao, and Nicholas Grigoriou (2011), "Consciousness of Social Face: The Development and Validation of a Scale Measuring Desire to Gain Face versus Fear of Losing Face," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 151 (2), 129-149.

Scale Items:¹

1. I always avoid talking about my weakness.
2. I try to avoid letting others think that I am ignorant even if I really am.
3. I do my best to hide my weakness before others.
4. If I work in an organization of bad reputation, I will try not to tell others about that.
5. It is hard for me to acknowledge a mistake even if I am really wrong.

1. The response format used with these items by Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016, p. 690) was merely described as "seven-point Likert scales." The end points used were probably *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree* as was used by Zhang, Cao, and Grigoriou (2011, p. 133).

CONSERVATION INTENTION AT THE HOTEL

The extent to which a guest at a particular hotel plans to engage in behaviors that conserve resources, especially electricity, is measured with five, nine-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale was used by Wang, Krishna, and McFerran (2017) in Study 2. Participants were 548 undergraduate students from a major university in Hong Kong who were taken individually to one of two real hotel rooms where they could observe the accommodations and fill out the questionnaire. The authors developed the scale in several studies that were not reported in the final version of the article due to space constraints (Wang 2018).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .93 (Wang, Krishna, and McFerran 2017, p. 488).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Wang, Krishna, and McFerran (2017).

References:

Wang, Wenbo (2018), personal correspondence.

Wang, Wenbo, Aradhna Krishna, and Brent McFerran (2017), "Turning Off the Lights: Consumers' Environmental Efforts Depend on Visible Efforts of Firms," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (3), 478-494.

Scale Items:¹

1. I intend to forgo housekeeping services during my stay.
2. I will definitely tell housekeeping not to bother cleaning my room each day.
3. I will re-use my hotel towels.
4. I will save electricity during my stay at this hotel.
5. I will set the A/C at a warmer temperature to conserve power.²

1. The end points of the response scale used with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (9).

2. The authors indicated that exclusion of this item did not affect their results (Wang, Krishna, and McFerran 2017, p. 488).

CONSUMPTION CLOSURE

The extent to which a person feels he/she has used or consumed an adequate amount of a product in a particular instance is measured with ten, seven-point items.

Origin:

Ilyuk and Block (2016) used the scale in Studies 6A (n = 60) and 6B (n = 62). Sentence phrasings were slightly different in the two studies due to the nature of the products. (The focal product in Study 6A was a pain reliever while in Study 6B it was an energy drink.) The authors created the scale by drawing heavily on phrases in measures used by Gu, Botti, and Faro (2013) as well as Beike and Wirth-Beaumont (2005).

Reliability:

The scale's alphas were .76 and .70 in Studies 6A and 6B, respectively (Ilyuk and Block 2016, p. 872, 873).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Ilyuk and Block (2016).

References:

Beike, Denise R. and Erin Wirth-Beaumont (2005), "Psychological Closure as a Memory Phenomenon," *Memory*, 13 (6), 574–593.

Gu, Yangjie, Simona Botti, and David Faro (2013), "Turning the Page: The Impact of Choice Closure on Satisfaction," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40 (August), 268–283.

Ilyuk, Veronika and Lauren Block (2016), "The Effects of Single-Serve Packaging on Consumption Closure and Judgments of Product Efficacy," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (6), 858-878.

Scale Items:¹

1. To what extent did you feel a sense of closure?
2. To what extent were you still thinking about any remaining _____? (r)
3. To what extent did you feel a sense of completion?
4. To what extent did you perceive the amount you consumed as "settled?"
5. To what extent were you still thinking about the amount of _____ you took? (r)
6. To what extent did you perceive taking the _____ as "unfinished business?" (r)
7. To what extent did you perceive taking the _____ as a "closed book?"
8. To what extent did you think that taking the _____ was 'behind you'?
9. To what extent did you experience complete closure?
10. To what extent did you feel like you were 'finished'?

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale used with these items were *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7). The name of the product should be placed in the blanks. Also, several of the items use terms such as "took" or "taking" which fit the consumption of health-related products such as pills, dosages, and tablets but do not fit food or beverages. Adaptation of some of the items will need to be made before the scale is used with some product categories.

CONTROL VALUE

(CUSTOMER'S INTERACTION WITH THE SALESPERSON)

Six, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure how much a customer feels some control over the interaction with a salesperson by actively participating in a discussion of goods and/or services appropriate for his/her needs.

Origin:

The scale was used by Wan, Chan, and Chen (2016) in Study 3 with data gathered from 220 matched pairs of customers and service agents from a global insurance institution near Hong Kong. The survey instrument was created in English but was prepared for administration in Chinese using the back-translation method. Based on their citations, the authors seem to have drawn concepts and phrases for creating the scale from work by Chan, Yim, and Lam (2010) as well as Dabholkar (1990).

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .89 (Wan, Chan, and Chen 2016, p. 767).

Validity:

CFA was used by Wan, Chan, and Chen (2016) to examine their model and the psychometric quality of their measures. The results indicated a satisfactory model fit as well as evidence of convergent and discriminant validities for their scales. The AVE for the control value scale was .57.

References:

Chan, Kimmy Wa, Chi Kin (Bennett) Yim, and Simon S.K. Lam (2010), "Is Customer Participation in Value Creation a Double-Edged Sword? Evidence from Professional Financial Services Across Cultures," *Journal of Marketing*, 74 (3), 48-64.

Dabholkar, Pratibha A. (1990), "How to Improve Perceived Service Quality by Improving Customer Participation," *Developments in Marketing Science*, 13, 483-487.

Wan, Echo Wen, Kimmy Wa Chan, and Rocky Peng Chen (2016), "Hurting or Helping? The Effect of Service Agents' Workplace Ostracism on Customer Service Perceptions," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (6), 746-769.

Scale Items:¹

To what extent do you agree that the agent performs in the following ways so as to gain more control over his/her interaction with you?

1. I mostly don't have a say or chance to discuss much with the agent, he or she always works out everything for me. (r)
2. The agent always invites my suggestions and feedbacks on their products and services.
3. I have the opportunities to voice my personal view on their products and services.

4. The agent talks most of the time during our discussion on the _____, which make me feel less control over the interaction.² (r)
5. The agent always selects a product or service that he or she feels suit my needs without consulting much of my view. (r)
6. I have the opportunities to ask for different services or products to choose from the agent.

1. The extreme verbal anchors of the response scale used with these items were *strongly disagree* (7) and *strongly agree* (7).
2. The blank should be filled with a word or phrase relevant to the product category. For example, the phrase used by Wan, Chan, and Chen (2016, p. 767) was "insurance plan."

CONVERSATIONAL VALUE

The degree to which a consumer not only believes that an object or experience is a good topic of conversation but also desires to talk to others about it is measured with five, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Bastos and Brucks (2017) used the scale in Experiment 1 ($n = 103$) and 2 ($n = 153$) reported in the article. Data were gathered for both experiments from Amazon MTurk participants. The same or similar scale was used in several supplementary studies reported in the web appendix. The source of the scale was not stated and is assumed to have been created by the authors.

Reliability:

The alphas of the scale were .956 and .946 for Experiment 1 and 2, respectively (Bastos and Brucks 2017, pp. 601 and 602).

Validity:

Bastos and Brucks (2017) did not explicitly discuss the scale's validity. They did report, however, that the CFA of scores from the conversational value scale and another scale in Experiment 1 showed a two-factor model had an acceptable fit whereas the one-factor model did not. Similarly, an EFA of the items from five scales used in Experiment 2 indicated that the items expected to measure conversational value loaded highest on the same factor. In total, this provides evidence of the scale's unidimensionality and some indication of its convergent and discriminant validities as well.

Reference:

Bastos, Wilson and Merrie Brucks (2017), "How and Why Conversational Value Leads to Happiness for Experiential and Material Purchases," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (3), 598–612.

Scale Items:¹

1. That _____ makes for a good conversation.
2. I want to talk to others about that _____.
3. That _____ is a good topic to talk about.
4. I desire to talk to people about that _____.
5. I feel excited about telling others about that _____.

1. The blanks should be filled with a name or description of the focal object or experience. The endpoints of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

CO-PRODUCTION OF THE PRODUCT

The scale has three statements that measure the degree to which a person believes that a particular product is the result of cooperation between the customer and the producer.

Origin:

Ranjan and Read (2016) viewed co-production as a dimension of value co-creation. They created a measure of the former along with measures of other constructs, tested them with a sample in India, and then used them in an online survey of people drawn from the U.S. and India. Usable data were received from 230 respondents.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .79 (Ranjan and Read 2016, p. 304).

Validity:

Some aspects of the scale's validity were addressed by the authors (Ranjan 2017; Ranjan and Read 2016, p. 304). Results of a CFA conducted on this measure along with two others provided some evidence in support of their convergent and discriminant validities. This scale's AVE was 0.57.

References:

Ranjan, Kumar Rakesh (2017), personal correspondence.

Ranjan, Kumar Rakesh and Stuart Read (2016), "Value Co-Creation: Concept and Measurement," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (3), 290-315.

Scale Items:¹

1. The consumer and the company share ideas with each other.
2. This product is jointly made by the consumer and the company.
3. The consumer is a co-producer of this product along with the company.

1. The focal product should be identified for respondents in a scenario, instructions, or some other way. As described by Ranjan (2017), the end points of the response scale used with the items were *extremely disagree* and *extremely agree*.

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (EFFECT ON PRODUCT QUALITY)

The degree to which a person believes that resources devoted to social issues by a company come at the expense of performance and product quality is measured using five, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Bodur, Tofighi, and Grohmann (2016) used the scale in Study 3 with data collected from 147 undergraduate students. The authors referred to the construct measured by the scale as *resource-synergy beliefs*. The scale was created by Gupta and Sen (2013) and its alpha was .95 in a pre-test (n = 46).

Reliability:

As used by Bodur, Tofighi, and Grohmann (2016, p. 212), the alpha calculated for the scale was .94.

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Bodur, Tofighi, and Grohmann (2016).

References:

Bodur, H. Onur, Maryam Tofighi, and Bianca Grohmann (2016), "When Should Private Label Brands Endorse Ethical Attributes?" *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (2), 204-217.
Gupta, Reetika and Sankar Sen (2013), "The Effect of Evolving Resource Synergy Beliefs on the Intentions-Behavior Discrepancy in Ethical Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23 (1), 114-121.

Scale Items:¹

1. Socially responsible behavior by firms is often accompanied by inferior product offerings.
2. When companies focus on CSR, the quality and performance of their products suffer.
3. Companies that engage in socially responsible behavior often produce products that are inferior on performance.
4. Products that are made in a socially responsible manner are often worse on important functional features such as performance than those that are not socially responsible.
5. Resources devoted to social causes come at the expense of improved product performance.

¹. The end points used on the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (ENGAGEMENT)

Eight, seven-point Likert-type items measure a consumer's belief that a particular company engages in behaviors that are thought to advance social good such as caring for people and the environment.

Origin:

Habel et al. (2016) used the scale in Studies 1 and 2 of the four described in their article. The authors created the scale by drawing ideas and phrases from past studies, e.g., Sen and Bhattacharya (2001); Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

Reliability:

The scale's internal consistencies (alpha) for the scale in Studies 1 and 2 were .936 and .98 (Habel 2017; Habel et al. 2016, p. 92).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not explicitly discussed by Habel et al. (2016) for Study 1, however, some evidence of its predictive validity comes from the fact that the scale was used as a manipulation check and, indeed, the manipulation was successful. For Study 2, evidence of discriminant validity was found based on the Fornell–Larcker (1981) criterion. The scale's AVE was .80.

Comments:

Habel et al. (2016, p. 102) also created a normative version of the scale for use in Study 2 which measured the person's attitude about the social responsibilities of all companies. The only change was the phrasing of the scale stem: "Companies should" The scale's alpha was .926.

References:

- Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (February), 39-50.
- Habel, Johannes (2017), personal correspondence.
- Habel, Johannes, Laura Marie Schons, Sascha Alavi, and Jan Wieseke (2016), "Warm Glow or Extra Charge? The Ambivalent Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility Activities on Customers' Perceived Price Fairness," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 84-105.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R., Minette E. Drumwright, and Bridgette M. Braig (2004), "The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Customer Donations to Corporate-Supported Nonprofits," *Journal of Marketing*, 68 (October), 16-32.

Sen, Sankar and C.B. Bhattacharya (2001), "Does Doing Good Always Lead to Doing Better? Consumer Reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38 (May), 225-243.

Scale Items:¹

_____ . . .

1. values ecological sustainability.
2. acts in a responsible way regarding the environment.
3. donates parts of its earnings to charity on a regular basis.
4. donates money for people in need.
5. treats employees in a socially responsible way.
6. cares for their employees beyond the regulatory framework.
7. engages in local community support projects.
8. cares for the people in the communities in which it operates.

1. The name of the company should be stated in the blanks. The response scale had seven points and the extreme anchors were labeled as *fully disagree* and *fully agree*.

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

(HIGH COSTS)

With three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a person believes a particular company spends a lot of money on "socially responsible" activities.

Origin:

The scale was created by Habel et al. (2016) who drew some inspiration from the single-item measures used by Kirmani (1990, 1997) with respect to perceived spending by a company on its ads. Habel et al. (2016) used their scale in Study 3 with 885 people recruited from a consumer panel.

Reliability:

The scale's internal consistency (alpha) in Study 3 was reported to be .98 (Habel et al. 2016, p. 92).

Validity:

Evidence of the scale's discriminant validity was found in Study 3 with respect to several other scales based on the Fornell-Larcker (1981) criterion. Further, the scale's AVE was .91.

References:

Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (February), 39-50.

Habel, Johannes, Laura Marie Schons, Sascha Alavi, and Jan Wieseke (2016), "Warm Glow or Extra Charge? The Ambivalent Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility Activities on Customers' Perceived Price Fairness," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 84-105.

Kirmani, Amna (1990), "The Effect of Perceived Advertising Costs on Brand Perceptions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17 (2), 160-171.

Kirmani, Amna (1997), "Advertising Repetition as a Signal of Quality: If It's Advertised So Much, Something Must Be Wrong," *Journal of Advertising*, 26 (3), 77-86.

Scale Items:¹

1. _____ bears considerable costs for its social activities.
2. The amount of money that _____ invests in its social projects is very large.
3. _____ incurs very high costs for its social engagement.

1. The name of the company should be stated in the blanks. The response scale had seven points and the extreme anchors were labeled as *fully disagree* and *fully agree*.

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

(PERSONAL BENEFIT)

The degree to which a consumer experiences satisfaction in buying products from a company because of its support of "good" causes is measured using three, seven-point Likert-type items. Due to the phrasing of one of the items, the scale may make most sense when the company being evaluated is a retailer.

Origin:

Habel et al. (2016) used the scale in Studies 2 and 3 of the four described in their article. Although not explicitly stated by the authors, they appear to have created the scale and drew inspiration from work by Andrews et al. (2014).

Reliability:

The scale's internal consistencies (alpha) in Studies 2 and 3 were .88 and .93, respectively (Habel et al. 2016, p. 92).

Validity:

For both Study 2 and Study 3, evidence of the scale's discriminant validity was found based on the Fornell-Larcker (1981) criterion. Further, the scale's AVEs in Studies 2 and 3 were .75 and .81, respectively.

References:

Andrews, Michelle, Xueming Luo, Zheng Fang, and Jaakko Aspara (2014), "Cause Marketing Effectiveness and the Moderating Role of Price Discounts," *Journal of Marketing*, 78 (6), 120-142.

Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (February), 39-50.

Habel, Johannes, Laura Marie Schons, Sascha Alavi, and Jan Wieseke (2016), "Warm Glow or Extra Charge? The Ambivalent Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility Activities on Customers' Perceived Price Fairness," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 84-105.

Scale Items:¹

1. I derive benefit from supporting good causes by purchasing _____'s products.
2. After purchasing at _____, I am satisfied as my money helps support a good cause.
3. I like that _____ uses my money to support a good cause.

1. The name of the company should be stated in the blanks. The response scale had seven points with the end points labeled as *fully disagree* and *fully agree*.

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (PRICE MARKUP)

The degree to which a person believes that a particular company raises its prices to compensate for the expense of supporting "good" causes is measured using three, seven-point Likert-type items. The scale does not measure whether or not the person agrees with the markup but just that it is occurring because of the company's benevolent activity.

Origin:

Habel et al. (2016) created the scale and used it in Studies 2 and 3 of the four described in their article.

Reliability:

The scale's internal consistencies (alpha) in Studies 2 and 3 were .80 and .81, respectively (Habel et al. 2016, p. 92).

Validity:

For both Study 2 and Study 3, evidence of the scale's discriminant validity was found based on the Fornell-Larcker (1981) criterion. Further, the scale's AVEs in Studies 2 and 3 were .55 and .62, respectively.

References:

Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (February), 39-50.

Habel, Johannes, Laura Marie Schons, Sascha Alavi, and Jan Wieseke (2016), "Warm Glow or Extra Charge? The Ambivalent Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility Activities on Customers' Perceived Price Fairness," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 84-105.

Scale Items:¹

1. I believe _____'s prices include a markup for the company's support of good causes.
2. I think _____ has priced its corporate social responsibility activities into its products.
3. I think _____ could reduce its prices if it didn't engage as much in corporate social responsibility.

1. The name of the company should be stated in the blanks. The response scale had seven points with the ends labeled as *fully disagree* and *fully agree*.

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (SALES-CONTINGENT ENGAGEMENT)

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type items that measure a person's belief that a particular company's level of "social responsibility" depends upon the positive effect the activities have on product sales.

Origin:

The scale was used by Habel et al. (2016) in Study 5 discussed in the web appendix. Data were gathered for the experiment from 87 undergraduate students. The source of the scale was not stated but, if it was the authors themselves, they appear to have been inspired by the conceptual work of Kirmani and Rao (2000).

Reliability:

The scale's internal consistency (alpha) in Study 3 was reported to be .96 (Habel et al. 2016, web appendix p. 11).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Habel et al. (2016). Some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity comes from the fact that it was used as a manipulation check and, indeed, the manipulation was found to be successful.

References:

Habel, Johannes, Laura Marie Schons, Sascha Alavi, and Jan Wieseke (2016), "Warm Glow or Extra Charge? The Ambivalent Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility Activities on Customers' Perceived Price Fairness," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 84-105.

Kirmani, Amna and Akshay R. Rao (2000), "No Pain, No Gain: A Critical Review of the Literature on Signaling Unobservable Product Quality," *Journal of Marketing*, 64 (2), 66-79.

Scale Items:¹

1. The extent of _____'s social activities depends on how many products they sell.
2. _____ engages to a greater extent in social activities if it sells more products.
3. The extent to which _____ engages in social projects depends on their product sales.

1. The name of the company should be stated in the blanks. Besides indicating that a seven-point Likert-type response scale was used with these items, the verbal anchors were not described by Habel et al. (2016, web appendix p. 11). Possibly, the end points were *fully disagree* and *fully agree* as used in many of their other measures.

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (SELF-SERVING EXPENDITURES)

Using three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a person believes a particular company spends money on "social responsibility" activities in order to improve its own reputation.

Origin:

The scale was created by Habel et al. (2016) who drew some inspiration from the single-item measures used by Kirmani (1990, 1997) with respect to perceived spending by a company on its ads. Habel et al. (2016) used their scale in Study 3 with 885 people recruited from a consumer panel.

Reliability:

The scale's internal consistency (alpha) in Study 3 was reported to be .96 (Habel et al. 2016, p. 92).

Validity:

Evidence of the scale's discriminant validity was found in Study 3 with respect to several other scales based on the Fornell-Larcker (1981) criterion. Further, the scale's AVE was .88.

References:

- Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (February), 39-50.
- Habel, Johannes, Laura Marie Schons, Sascha Alavi, and Jan Wieseke (2016), "Warm Glow or Extra Charge? The Ambivalent Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility Activities on Customers' Perceived Price Fairness," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 84-105.
- Kirmani, Amna (1990), "The Effect of Perceived Advertising Costs on Brand Perceptions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17 (2), 160-171.
- Kirmani, Amna (1997), "Advertising Repetition as a Signal of Quality: If It's Advertised So Much, Something Must Be Wrong," *Journal of Advertising*, 26 (3), 77-86.

Scale Items:¹

1. I regard _____'s costs for its social activities as costs to improve its image.
2. I regard _____'s costs for its social activities as costs to improve its public reputation.
3. I regard _____'s costs for its social activities as costs to improve its standing.

1. The name of the company should be stated in the blanks. The response scale had seven points with the ends labeled as *fully disagree* and *fully agree*.

CREATIVE AUTHENTICITY

Six, nine-point semantic differentials measure the degree to which a consumer believes a product is an accurate fulfillment of the creator's vision.

Origin:

Valsesia, Nunes, and Ordanini (2016) used the scale in two studies. There were 345 beer-drinking U.S. residents in Study 4 recruited from MTurk who read about a microbrewery's brewmaster and then evaluated him. For Study 5, U.S. residents were recruited from MTurk, with 152 completing the survey. The task was for them to evaluate a new Cajun restaurant they were told about.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .87 in both studies (Valsesia, Nunes, and Ordanini 2016, pp. 908, 910).

Validity:

Using CFA, the discriminant validity of the measure of creative authenticity was assessed by Valsesia, Nunes, and Ordanini (2016, p. 908) with respect to another scale that measured recognition (accolades). Indeed, the analysis indicated that the two scales measured distinct constructs, thus, providing some evidence of the scales' discriminant validities.

Reference:

Valsesia, Francesca, Joseph C. Nunes, and Andrea Ordanini (2016), "What Wins Awards Is Not Always What I Buy: How Creative Control Affects Authenticity and Thus Recognition (But Not Liking)," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (6), 897-914.

Scale Items:

1. being personal (about self) / being impersonal (about others)
2. being a form of self-expression / being a form of interpretation
3. being a form of art / being a form of entertainment
4. reflecting true inspiration / reflecting commercial purposes
5. being truthful / being untruthful
6. being composed with integrity / being composed without integrity

CREATIVITY OF THE SPONSORSHIP PROMOTION

With three, seven-point semantic differentials, the scale measures the novelty and interestingness of a sponsorship being promoted in an advertisement by a sponsoring entity for something such as an event, an organization, or a cause.

Origin:

The scale was used by Madrigal and King (2017) in Studies 1, 2A, and 2B. They referred to the scale in several ways including *creativity of the sponsorship alignment* and *sponsorship creativity*. The source of the scale was not stated. It was probably created by the authors using items found in measures of novelty and creativity reported in the literature.

Reliability:

The alphas were .92, .93, and .91 for Studies 1, 2A, and 2B, respectively (Madrigal and King 2017, pp. 524, 525, 527).

Validity:

No information about the scale's validity was provided by Madrigal and King (2017).

Comments:

The scale items appear to be quite flexible for use in a variety of contexts if appropriate instructions are provided. If changes are made, it is prudent to retest the scale's quality prior to use in theory testing.

References:

Madrigal, Robert (2018), personal correspondence.

Madrigal, Robert and Jesse King (2017), "Creative Analogy as a Means of Articulating Incongruent Sponsorships," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (4), 521-535.

Scale Items:¹

Directions: To what extent do you consider the sponsorship promotion used by _____ in this advertisement to be:

1. not at all creative / very creative
2. not at all interesting / very interesting
3. not at all novel / very novel

1. The scale stem was provided by Madrigal (2018). The name of the sponsor should be placed in the blank. Depending upon the context in which the scale is used in a study, other changes will need to be made to the stem.

CREDIBILITY OF THE NEWS STORY

Five, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure a person's attitude regarding the bias and believability of a particular news story to which he/she has been exposed.

Origin:

The scale was used by Wojdyski and Evans (2016) in both studies reported in their article. Data were gathered in Study 1 from 242 adult residents of the U.S. via Amazon Mechanical Turk. In Study 2, data were collected for the experiment from 60 undergraduates at a large university in the southeastern United States.

The source of the scale was not stated by the authors. However, the items themselves have been commonly used to measure credibility, e.g., Bruner (2009, p. 375).

Reliability:

Alphas for the scale were .79 and .63 in Studies 1 and 2, respectively (Wojdyski and Evans 2016, pp. 160, 163).

Validity:

Wojdyski and Evans (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity.

Comments:

Although the scale was used by Wojdyski and Evans (2016) to measure the credibility of a particular news story, the items themselves appear to be amenable for use in many other contexts by merely rephrasing the scale stem.

References:

Bruner II, Gordon C. (2009), *Marketing Scales Handbook: A Compilation of Multi-Item Measures for Consumer Behavior & Advertising* (Volume 5), Carbondale, IL: GCBII Productions.

Wojdyski, Bartosz W. and Nathaniel J. Evans (2016), "Going Native: Effects of Disclosure Position and Language on the Recognition and Evaluation of Online Native Advertising," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 157-168.

Scale Items:¹

I think the news story was . . .

1. honest
2. trustworthy
3. convincing

4. biased (r)
5. not credible (r)

1. The extreme verbal anchors used by Wojdowski and Evans (2016, p. 160) with these items were *Strongly disagree* and *Strongly agree*.

CROWDING (GENERAL)

The belief that one's personal space would be restricted if one were in a particular physical environment is measured in this scale with three Likert-type items.

Origin:

Puzakova and Kwak (2017) used the scale in Study 3 with data gathered from 392 undergraduate students. One of the ways the authors referred to the construct was *personal space violation*. As for the source of the scale, the authors implied that they created it by drawing inspiration from work by Harrell, Hutt, and Anderson (1980).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .94 (Puzakova and Kwak 2017, p. 107).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Puzakova and Kwak (2017). However, since the measure was used as a manipulation check and showed the manipulation of crowdedness was successful, it provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

Comments:

The scale items are phrased hypothetically because participants were exposed to a picture of a place rather than actually being in it. With very minor changes, the sentences could be used with respect to an environment in which the person has actually been or is in currently, e.g., *I feel restricted*.

References:

Harrell, Gilbert D., Michael D. Hutt, and James C. Anderson (1980), "Path Analysis of Buyer Behavior Under Conditions of Crowding," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17 (February), 45–51.
Puzakova, Marina and Hyokjin Kwak (2017), "Should Anthropomorphized Brands Engage Customers? The Impact of Social Crowding on Brand Preferences," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (6), 99–115.

Scale Items:¹

1. I would feel my personal space is violated.
2. I would feel restricted.
3. I would feel constricted.

1. Except for saying the scale was "Likert-type," the response format used by Puzakova and Kwak (2017, p. 107) was not described. Based on what the authors did with several other scales, it seems likely that this scale had seven points with *strongly disagree* / *strongly agree* as the extreme

anchors. Further, the directions used with the scale were not stated explicitly but seem to have asked participants to describe how they would feel if they were in the place shown in the photograph.

CROWDING IN THE STORE

Composed of three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures how much a person believes that there were too many customers in a store.

Origin:

Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017) used the scale in Studies 1a (n = 883) and 1b (n = 501). The authors created the scale by drawing words and phrases from two measures of crowding used by Machleit, Kellaris, and Eroglu (1994).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .92 and .94 in Studies 1a and 1b, respectively (Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann 2017, p. 738).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017).

References:

Albrecht, Carmen-Maria, Stefan Hattula, and Donald R. Lehmann (2017), "The Relationship Between Consumer Shopping Stress and Purchase Abandonment in Task-Oriented and Recreation-Oriented Consumers," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (5), 720-740.

Machleit, Karen A., James J. Kellaris, and Sevin A. Eroglu (1994), "Human versus Spatial Dimensions of Crowding Perceptions in Retail Environments: A Note on Their Measurement and Effect on Shopper Satisfaction," *Marketing Letters*, 5 (2), 183-194.

Scale Items:¹

1. There were too many people in the store.
2. The store was jammed with people.
3. The store was crowded with customers.

1. It appears the end-points of the response scale used by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017, p. 724) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

CULTURAL DISTINCTIVENESS

The extent to which people experience a feeling that they belong to a different culture than those around them is measured with three, seven-point items.

Origin:

Torelli et al. (2017) used the scale in Pilot Studies 1 and 3 with data gathered from college students in the U.S. ($n = 60$) and Hong Kong ($n = 80$), respectively. The source of the scale was not identified.

Reliability:

The alphas reported for the scale in Pilot Studies 1 and 3 were .93 and .85, respectively (Torelli et al. 2017, pp. 49-50).

Validity:

The only aspect of the scale's validity referred to by Torelli et al. (2017) was its role as a manipulation check in the pilot studies. To the extent the manipulations were successful, some evidence of the scale's predictive validity was provided.

Reference:

Torelli, Carlos J., Rohini Ahluwalia, Shirley Y. Y. Cheng, Nicholas J. Olson, and Jennifer L. Stoner (2017), "Redefining Home: How Cultural Distinctiveness Affects the Malleability of In-Group Boundaries and Brand Preferences," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (1), 44-61.

Scale Items:¹

1. Feeling culturally distinct from those around you.
2. Feeling that you belong to a different culture.
3. Feeling that your culture would stand out.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Torelli et al. (2017, p. 59) with these items were *Not at all* (1) and *Very much* (7). Participants were asked to indicate to what extent they had experienced what was stated in the items; the explicit instructions used with the scale were not provided.

CUSTOMER ENGAGEMENT (INFLUENCE)

A customer's enjoyment of talking in various media about a particular brand is measured using four, five-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale was developed by Kumar and Pansari (2016) as part of a larger instrument intended to measure four dimensions of customer engagement: purchases, reference, influence, and knowledge. Twenty-four items were generated and then tested with 135 customers of a mobile service provider in a large U.S. city. Analysis led to the elimination of 8 items, leaving four for each dimension. The items were reviewed by scholars as well as industry managers for appropriateness. Following that, a second survey was conducted with data collected from 300 customers of a mobile service company. Finally, a third survey was conducted to test the measurement and structural models. Data were gathered from a variety of sources (475 from Amazon Mechanical Turk, personal interviews with 118 employees at a public function, and 169 executive MBA students attending a major urban university). Among the findings of CFA was that Customer Engagement is a second-order construct and the four dimensions are first-order factors reflected in their respective scale items.

Reliability:

As reported for the second survey, the scale's alpha was .810 (Kumar and Pansari 2016, p. 504). (Alphas for the other surveys were not stated.)

Validity:

Several forms of validity were provided by Kumar and Pansari (2016) though they were not always discussed. Two rounds of EFA and at least one round of CFA provided evidence of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities. Based on data from the second survey, AVEs of the scales measuring the four dimensions were described as being between .66 and .77.

Reference:

Kumar, V. and Anita Pansari (2016), "Competitive Advantage Through Engagement," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (4), 497-514.

Scale Items:¹

1. I do not actively discuss this brand on any media. (r)
2. I love talking about my brand experience.
3. I discuss the benefits that I get from this brand with others.
4. I am a part of this brand and mention it in my conversations.

1. Kumar and Pansari (2016) used a five-point response format with *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (5) as the extreme anchors.

CUSTOMER ENGAGEMENT (KNOWLEDGE)

With four, five-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a customer provides feedback to a company about his/her experiences with a brand's products in order to help improve them or have new ones created. The implication in the sentences is that this behavior is ongoing rather than a one-time event.

Origin:

The scale was developed by Kumar and Pansari (2016) as part of a larger instrument intended to measure four dimensions of customer engagement: purchases, reference, influence, and knowledge. Twenty-four items were generated and then tested with 135 customers of a mobile service provider in a large U.S. city. Analysis led to the elimination of 8 items, leaving four for each dimension. The items were reviewed by scholars as well as industry managers for appropriateness. Following that, a second survey was conducted with data collected from 300 customers of a mobile service company. Finally, a third survey was conducted to test the measurement and structural models. Data were gathered from a variety of sources (475 from Amazon Mechanical Turk, personal interviews with 118 employees at a public function, and 169 executive MBA students attending a major urban university). Among the findings of CFA was that Customer Engagement is a second-order construct and the four dimensions are first-order factors reflected in their respective scale items.

Reliability:

As reported for the second survey, the scale's alpha was .83 (Kumar and Pansari 2016, p. 504). (Alphas for the other surveys were not stated.)

Validity:

Several forms of validity were provided by Kumar and Pansari (2016) though they were not always discussed. Two rounds of EFA and at least one round of CFA provided evidence of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities. Based on data from the second survey, AVEs of the scales measuring the four dimensions were described as being between .66 and .77.

Reference:

Kumar, V. and Anita Pansari (2016), "Competitive Advantage Through Engagement," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (4), 497-514.

Scale Items:¹

1. I provide feedback about my experiences with the brand to the firm.
2. I provide suggestions for improving the performance of the brand.
3. I provide suggestions/feedback about the new products of the brand.
4. I provide feedback/suggestions for developing new goods and services for this brand.

-
1. Kumar and Pansari (2016) used a five-point response format with *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (5) as the extreme anchors.

CUSTOMER ENGAGEMENT (PURCHASES)

Four, five-point Likert-type items measure a customer's attitude toward his/her current and future purchases of the brand.

Origin:

The scale was developed by Kumar and Pansari (2016) as part of a larger instrument intended to measure four dimensions of customer engagement: purchases, reference, influence, and knowledge. Twenty-four items were generated and then tested with 135 customers of a mobile service provider in a large U.S. city. Analysis led to the elimination of 8 items, leaving four for each dimension. The items were reviewed by scholars as well as industry managers for appropriateness. Following that, a second survey was conducted with data collected from 300 customers of a mobile service company. Finally, a third survey was conducted to test the measurement and structural models. Data were gathered from a variety of sources (475 from Amazon Mechanical Turk, personal interviews with 118 employees at a public function, and 169 executive MBA students attending a major urban university). Among the findings of CFA was that Customer Engagement is a second-order construct and the four dimensions are first-order factors reflected in their respective scale items.

Reliability:

As reported for the second survey, the scale's alpha was .879 (Kumar and Pansari 2016, p. 504). (Alphas for the other surveys were not stated.)

Validity:

Several forms of validity were provided by Kumar and Pansari (2016) though they were not always discussed. Two rounds of EFA and at least one round of CFA provided evidence of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities. Based on data from the second survey, AVEs of the scales measuring the four dimensions were described as being between .66 and .77.

Reference:

Kumar, V. and Anita Pansari (2016), "Competitive Advantage Through Engagement," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (4), 497-514.

Scale Items:¹

1. I will continue buying the goods and services of this brand in the near future.
2. My purchases with this brand make me content.
3. I do not get my money's worth when I purchase this brand. (r)
4. Owning the products of this brand makes me happy.

1. Kumar and Pansari (2016) used a five-point response format with *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (5) as the extreme anchors.

CUSTOMER ENGAGEMENT (REFERENCE)

The degree to which a customer promotes and refers a brand to friends and relatives because of monetary incentives from the company is measured with four, five-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale was developed by Kumar and Pansari (2016) as part of a larger instrument intended to measure four dimensions of customer engagement: purchases, reference, influence, and knowledge. Twenty-four items were generated and then tested with 135 customers of a mobile service provider in a large U.S. city. Analysis led to the elimination of 8 items, leaving four for each dimension. The items were reviewed by scholars as well as industry managers for appropriateness. Following that, a second survey was conducted with data collected from 300 customers of a mobile service company. Finally, a third survey was conducted to test the measurement and structural models. Data were gathered from a variety of sources (475 from Amazon Mechanical Turk, personal interviews with 118 employees at a public function, and 169 executive MBA students attending a major urban university). Among the findings of CFA was that Customer Engagement is a second-order construct and the four dimensions are first-order factors reflected in their respective scale items.

Reliability:

As reported for the second survey, the scale's alpha was .874 (Kumar and Pansari 2016, p. 504). (Alphas for the other surveys were not stated.)

Validity:

Several forms of validity were provided by Kumar and Pansari (2016) though they were not always discussed. Two rounds of EFA and at least one round of CFA provided evidence of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities. Based on data from the second survey, AVEs of the scales measuring the four dimensions were described as being between .66 and .77.

Reference:

Kumar, V. and Anita Pansari (2016), "Competitive Advantage Through Engagement," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (4), 497-514.

Scale Items:¹

1. I promote the brand because of the monetary referral benefits provided by the brand.
2. In addition to the value derived from the product, the monetary referral incentives also encourage me to refer this brand to my friends and relatives.
3. I enjoy referring this brand to my friends and relatives because of the monetary referral incentives.
4. Given that I use this brand, I refer my friends and relatives to this brand because of the monetary referral incentives.

-
1. Kumar and Pansari (2016) used a five-point response format with *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (5) as the extreme anchors.

CUSTOMER INSPIRATION (ACTIVATION)

The five-item Likert-scale measures a motivational state in which a customer's imagination is stimulated by an evocative external stimulus. In a consumer context, the inspiration is assumed to come from marketing activity although it is not stated in the items themselves.

Origin:

In a thoughtful and admirable process, the scale was developed along with a companion measure by Böttger et al. (2017). The authors viewed customer inspiration as a second-order construct that is composed of what they called an "inspired by" factor (activation) and an "inspired to" factor (intention to do something). Work began by generating 93 potential items for both components. Several rounds of analyses led to the elimination of items and better fit of the measurement model. Ultimately, 18 items remained. Despite that version's psychometric quality, its length was viewed as a limitation to its usage. That led to the development of short measures of each component. Two, five-item subscales were created, tested, and found to have very good psychometric properties as specified below.

Reliability:

In the five studies reported by Böttger et al. (2017), the alphas were high, ranging from .87 to .92.

Validity:

Across the studies conducted by Böttger et al. (2017), a wealth of evidence was provided in support of several forms of validity for the two customer inspiration subscales: content, discriminant, convergent, predictive, and known-groups validity. As for the AVEs of the activation subscale, they were good and ranged from .58 to .68.

Reference:

Böttger, Tim, Thomas Rudolph, Heiner Evanschitzky, and Thilo Pfrang (2017), "Customer Inspiration: Conceptualization, Scale Development, and Validation," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (6), 116-131.

Scale Items:¹

1. My imagination was stimulated.
2. I was intrigued by a new idea.
3. I unexpectedly and spontaneously got new ideas.
4. My horizon was broadened.
5. I discovered something new.

1. In Study 1, the extreme anchors of the response scale used by Böttger et al. (2017, p. 121) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). The response scales used in the other studies were not described.

CUSTOMER INSPIRATION (INTENTION)

The degree to which a customer is motivated by a stimulus (unspecified) toward the pursuit of a consumption-related goal is measured with a five-item Likert scale. In a consumer context, the inspiration comes from some type of marketing activity and, as stated in the items, stimulates a purchase motivation.

Origin:

In a thoughtful and admirable process, the scale was developed along with a companion measure by Böttger et al. (2017). The authors viewed customer inspiration as a second-order construct that is composed of what they called an "inspired by" factor (activation) and an "inspired to" factor (intention to do something). Work began by generating 93 potential items for both components. Several rounds of analyses led to the elimination of items and better fit of the measurement model. Ultimately, 18 items remained. Despite that version's psychometric quality, its length was viewed as a limitation to its usage. That led to the development of short measures of each component. Two, five-item subscales were created, tested, and found to have very good psychometric properties as specified below.

Reliability:

In the five studies reported by Böttger et al. (2017), the alphas were very high, ranging from .92 to .98.

Validity:

Across the studies conducted by Böttger et al. (2017), a wealth of evidence was provided in support of several forms of validity for the two customer inspiration subscales: content, discriminant, convergent, predictive, and known-groups validity. The AVEs for the intention subscale were very strong, ranging from .70 to .91.

Reference:

Böttger, Tim, Thomas Rudolph, Heiner Evanschitzky, and Thilo Pfrang (2017), "Customer Inspiration: Conceptualization, Scale Development, and Validation," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (6), 116-131.

Scale Items:¹

1. I was inspired to buy something.
2. I felt a desire to buy something.
3. My interest to buy something was increased.
4. I was motivated to buy something.
5. I felt an urge to buy something.

1. In Study 1, the extreme anchors of the response scale used by Böttger et al. (2017, p. 121) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). The response scales used in the other studies were not described.

CUSTOMER'S STATUS WITH A COMPANY

The degree to which a customer believes that a company makes him/her feel special and has treated him/her better compared to other customers is measured with three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale used by Steinhoff and Palmatier (2016) in their three studies of loyalty programs was an adaptation of a scale called *superiority* by Drèze & Nunes (2009). The scale was used by Steinhoff and Palmatier (2016) with respect to a hypothetical retail store in Study 1, a hypothetical hotel in Study 2, and real airlines in Study 3. Because Studies 1 and 2 were very similar lab experiments, their data were combined for some of the analyses. Study 3 data were gathered in a survey and were analyzed separately.

Reliability:

Alphas of .90 and .87 were reported for the scale in Studies 1 and 2 (combined) and Study 3, respectively (Steinhoff and Palmatier 2016, p. 99).

Validity:

In analyses of data for both the combined samples of Studies 1 and 2 as well as Study 3, CFAs were used by Steinhoff and Palmatier (2016, pp. 97, 101) to assess the psychometric qualities of the scales. In all cases, including the measure of customer status, evidence was found of convergent and discriminant validity. The AVEs for the customer status scale were .76 (combined Studies 1 and 2) and .73 (Study 3).

References:

Drèze, Xavier, and Joseph C. Nunes (2009), "Feeling Superior: The Impact of Loyalty Program Structure on Consumers' Perceptions of Status," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35 (April), 890–905.

Steinhoff, Lena and Robert W. Palmatier (2016), "Understanding Loyalty Program Effectiveness: Managing Target and Bystander Effects," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (1), 88–107.

Scale Items:¹

1. _____ makes me feel privileged.
2. _____ gives me a feeling of high status.
3. Relative to the other customers, I experience better treatment at _____.

1. The name of the company or store should be placed in the blanks. The extreme verbal anchors of the response scale used by Steinhoff and Palmatier (2016, p. 98) with the three statements were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

CUSTOMER'S UNFAIR TREATMENT BY A COMPANY

The scale uses four, seven-point Likert-type items to measure the degree to which a customer believes a particular company treats him/her unfairly.

Origin:

The scale was apparently created by Steinhoff and Palmatier (2016) for use in their three studies of loyalty programs. Although it was implied that the scale was an adaptation of a measure used by Samaha, Palmatier, and Dant (2011) in a business-to-business context, the only similarity was that the two scales measured unfairness and there were a few words in common for one of the items.

The scale was used by Steinhoff and Palmatier (2016) with respect to a hypothetical retail store in Study 1, a hypothetical hotel in Study 2, and real airlines in Study 3. Because Studies 1 and 2 were very similar lab experiments, their data were combined for some of the analyses. Study 3 data were gathered in a survey and were analyzed separately.

Reliability:

Alphas of .96 and .95 were reported for the scale in Studies 1 and 2 (combined) and Study 3, respectively (Steinhoff and Palmatier 2016, p. 99).

Validity:

In analyses of data for both the combined samples of Studies 1 and 2 as well as Study 3, CFAs were used by Steinhoff and Palmatier (2016, p. 98) to assess the psychometric qualities of the scales. In all cases, including the measure of unfairness, evidence was found of convergent and discriminant validity. The AVEs for the unfairness scale were .84 (Studies 1 and 2 data combined) and .82 (Study 3).

References:

Samaha, Stephen A., Robert W. Palmatier, and Rajiv P. Dant (2011), "Poisoning Relationships: Perceived Unfairness in Channels of Distribution," *Journal of Marketing*, 75 (3), 99–117.

Steinhoff, Lena and Robert W. Palmatier (2016), "Understanding Loyalty Program Effectiveness: Managing Target and Bystander Effects," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (1), 88–107.

Scale Items:¹

1. The way _____ treats me is unfair.
2. The way _____ treats me is unjustified.
3. Given my behavior as a customer, _____ treats me unfairly.
4. Given what _____ earns from their sales to me, it treats me unfairly.

1. The name of the company or store should be placed in the blanks. The extreme verbal anchors of the response scale used by Steinhoff and Palmatier (2016, p. 98) with the four statements were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

DANGEROUS WORLD

The scale uses four, seven-point Likert-type items to measure the degree to which a person believes that the world is dangerous in general and, more specifically, that he/she does not feel safe.

Origin:

Rahinel and Nelson (2016) used the scale in Studies 2B (n = 70) and 4 (n = 145). Participants were undergraduate students attending the University of Cincinnati and the University of Kansas, respectively. The source of the scale was not identified.

Reliability:

Alphas reported for the scale by Rahinel and Nelson (2016, pp. 486, 489) were .84 (Study 2B) and .79 (Study 4).

Validity:

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Rahinel and Nelson (2016).

Reference:

Rahinel, Ryan and Noelle M. Nelson (2016), "When Brand Logos Describe the Environment: Design Instability and the Utility of Safety-Oriented Products," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (3), 478-496.

Scale Items:¹

1. There are a lot of unsafe things in the world around me.
2. Society's surroundings are particularly hazardous.
3. It's a dangerous world to live in right now.
4. I feel like my safety is at risk on a daily basis.

1. The endpoints of the response scale used by Rahinel and Nelson (2016, p. 486) with these sentences were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

DECISION COMFORT

Five Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a person experiences a feeling of well-being with respect to a particular choice he/she has made. Two slightly different versions of the scale are provided: one that allows for comparison of two decision options and another version that focuses on just one option.

Origin:

The scale was created and tested in a series of studies by Parker, Lehmann, and Xie (2016). More specifically, the authors developed two versions of the scale. One version had comparative wording while the other one did not. In the 11 studies they conducted, the authors discussed the development process and provided evidence of the scales' validities. For each of the studies, data were collected online using participants from Amazon Mechanical Turk.

The non-comparative version of the scale was borrowed by Hilken et al. (2017) and used in their Study 4.

Reliability:

Parker, Lehmann, and Xie (2016) reported the alphas for the comparative version of the scale to be .91 (Study 8) and .89 (Study A2). More uses were reported for the non-comparative version and the alphas ranged from .92 (Study 6) to .94 (Studies 3, 4, and 5). (Both versions of the scale were not used in every study nor were alphas reported for every study.)

The alpha of the non-comparative version of the scale was .89 in the study by Hilken et al. (2017, p. 897).

Validity:

Aspects of the scale's validity were examined in several of the studies by Parker, Lehmann, and Xie (2016). EFA was used in Studies 1A and 1B to show that the items for each version of the scale loaded together and highest on the same factor. Evidence was provided in several of the studies of the discriminant validities of the scale (both versions). For example, the non-comparative version was found to be distinct from decision confidence (Study 3), general affect (Study 4), and anticipated satisfaction (Study 5). As for the comparative form of the scale, it was demonstrated to have discriminant validity with respect to decision confidence and anticipated regret in Study 8 as well as being distinct from decision satisfaction and anticipated regret in Study A2. Reported AVEs for the non-comparative version ranged from .69 (Study 6) to .77 (Studies 3, 5, A1). As for the comparative version, the reported AVEs were .67 (Study 8) and .62 (Study A2).

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Hilken et al. (2017).

Comments:

With regard to which version is better, Parker, Lehmann, and Xie (2016, p. 121) recommended the non-comparative version because testing showed it to be the more "sensitive" of the two.

However, they quickly pointed out that researchers should use the version that best serves their needs.

References:

- Hilken, Tim, Ko de Ruyter, Mathew Chylinski, Dominik Mahr, and Debbie I. Keeling (2017), "Augmenting the Eye of the Beholder: Exploring the Strategic Potential of Augmented Reality to Enhance Online Service Experiences," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (6), 884–905.
- Parker, Jeffrey R., Donald R. Lehmann, and Yi Xie (2016), "Decision Comfort," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (1), 113-133.

Scale Items:¹

1. I am comfortable with choosing X [over Y].
2. I feel good about choosing X [over Y].
3. I am experiencing negative emotions about choosing X [over Y]. (r)
4. Whether or not it is "the best choice," I am okay with choosing X [over Y].
5. Although I don't know if X is the best [is superior to Y], I feel perfectly comfortable with choice I made.

1. The comparative version of the scale included the bracketed phrases while the non-comparative version did not (Parker, Lehmann, and Xie 2016, p. 119; Hilken et al. 2017, p. 901). The focal option should replace the X in both versions; in the comparative version, another option should replace the Y. The end points of the response scale used by Parker, Lehmann, and Xie (2016, p. 119) were *strongly disagree* (-5) and *strongly agree* (+5). The extreme anchors used by Hilken et al. (2017, p. 898) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (5).

DECISION CONFIDENCE (COMPARATIVE)

The degree of certainty a person has in the appropriateness of a particular choice in which one option was selected over another one (explicitly stated) is measured in this five-item Likert scale.

Origin:

This measure of decision confidence was created and tested by Parker, Lehmann, and Xie (2016) in a series of studies in which a related construct, *decision comfort*, was the primary focus of the research. In fact, one of the goals of the research was to show that those two constructs were distinct. For each of the studies, data were collected online using participants from Amazon Mechanical Turk.

Reliability:

Alphas for the scale were not reported for each study but, for those that were reported, they were good to very good, ranging from .82 (Study 3) to .96 (Study A2).

Validity:

Aspects of the scale's validity were examined in several of the studies, with the emphasis on discriminant validity. EFA was used in Studies 1A and 1B to show that the items (shown below) loaded together and highest on the same factor. As mentioned above, one of the goals of the research was to show that *decision comfort* was distinct from *decision confidence*. Indeed, in the several studies in which tests of discriminant validity were conducted of the two constructs, support was consistently found that they were distinct. Additionally, there was evidence of the distinction between *decision confidence* and *anticipated regret* (Study 8). Of the AVEs reported for the decision confidence scale, most were well above .50 though in one study it was .46 (Study 3).

Reference:

Parker, Jeffrey R., Donald R. Lehmann, and Yi Xie (2016), "Decision Comfort," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (1), 113-133.

Scale Items:¹

1. I am 100% confident that my choice (X) is objectively better than Y.
2. I am unsure whether X is objectively better than Y, or vice versa. (r)
3. I am certain that X was the best choice I could make.
4. Regardless of my personal feelings about my choice, it is clear that X is objectively superior to Y.
5. Even if my friends might not agree, X is the best option.

1. The focal option should replace the X and another option should replace the Y. The end points of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (-5) and *strongly agree* (+5).

DECISION CONFLICT

With three, seven-point items, the scale measures how difficult a person believes it would be for him/her to make a particular choice.

Origin:

The scale was created by Ward and Broniarczyk (2016; Ward 2017) and used in a post-test of Study 3A (n = 75) as a manipulation check.

Reliability:

The alpha reported for the scale was .90 (Ward and Broniarczyk 2016, p. 1009).

Validity:

Ward and Broniarczyk (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity. However, given that the scale was used as a manipulation check and the manipulation was successful, it provides some evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

References:

Ward, Morgan K. (2017), personal correspondence.

Ward, Morgan K. and Susan M. Broniarczyk (2016), "Ask and You Shall (Not) Receive: Close Friends Prioritize Relational Signaling over Recipient Preferences in Their Gift Choices," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (6), 1001-1018.

Scale Items:¹

1. How conflicted would you feel while making this choice?
2. How difficult would it be to make this choice?
3. How easy would it be to make this choice? (r)

1. The end points of the response scale were *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7). The particular choice that participants are supposed to be thinking about should be specified in the instructions or obvious to them based on the context. As used by Ward and Broniarczyk (2016), the question was hypothetical which affected the phrasing of the scale items. In situations where the decision has already been made then some minor rephrasing of the items is necessary.

DECISION GOAL (GRATIFICATION-SEEKING)

The scale is composed of four, seven-point semantic differentials that measure how much a person viewed the goal of a particular choice he/she made being gratification seeking rather than avoiding indulgence.

Origin:

Huyghe et al. (2017) called the scale *instant gratification-seeking goal* and used it in Study 4 with 125 college students. The authors slightly adapted a measure that had been used by Shiv and Fedorikhin (2002) and referred to as *decision-goal*.

Reliability:

As used by Huyghe et al. (2017, p. 69), the scale's alpha was .84.

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Huyghe et al. (2017).

References:

Huyghe, Elke, Julie Verstraeten, Maggie Geuens, and Anneleen Van Kerckhove (2017), "Clicks as a Healthy Alternative to Bricks: How Online Grocery Shopping Reduces Vice Purchases," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (1), 61-74.

Shiv, Baba, and Alexander Fedorikhin (2002), "Spontaneous Versus Controlled Influences of Stimulus-Based Affect on Choice Behavior," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 87 (March), 342-370.

Scale Items:¹

When I made my choice, my goal (unconsciously or not) was one of:

1. keeping my impulses in check / satisfying my impulses
2. avoiding pleasure / seeking pleasure
3. avoiding gratification / seeking gratification
4. avoiding indulging / indulging

1. Both Huyghe et al. (2017, p. 69) as well as Shiv and Fedorikhin (2002, p. 357) used a seven-point response format such that a higher score implied more gratification seeking.

DELIGHT

The degree to which a person has an emotional response to a stimulus which results from feelings of surprise and joy is measured with five, seven-point items.

Origin:

Böttger et al. (2017) used the scale in four studies, with a three-item version in two studies (2 and 3b) and a five-item version in the other two studies (3a and 4). The items were borrowed from Finn (2005) who used three of the items to measure what he called "delight" and two of them to measure "surprising consumption."

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .75, .95, .78, and .95 for Studies 2, 3a, 3b, and 4, respectively (Böttger et al. 2017, web appendix, p. 10-13).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not explicitly examined and discussed by Böttger et al. (2017). However, the scale was used when testing the psychometric quality of two scales created by the authors to measure components of inspiration. The results help support claims of the two scales' nomological validity. Further, the items in the delight scale loaded high on the same factor in each of the four studies, which supports a claim of scale unidimensionality. Finally, the AVEs for the scale were .50, .79, .55, and .78 which provide some evidence of convergent validity.

Comments:

Although the three-item and five-item versions of the scale were found to be unidimensional in the studies by Böttger et al. (2017), it is concerning that the items came from scales measuring two different constructs and loaded on different factors in the work of Finn (2005). Resolving this apparent inconsistency is urged for those who want to be precise about defining and measuring the construct.

References:

Böttger, Tim, Thomas Rudolph, Heiner Evanschitzky, and Thilo Pfrang (2017), "Customer Inspiration: Conceptualization, Scale Development, and Validation," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (6), 116-131.

Finn, Adam (2005), "Reassessing the Foundations of Customer Delight," *Journal of Service Research*, 8 (2), 103-116.

Scale Items:¹

_____, I felt:²

1. Delighted
2. Positively surprised
3. Astonished
4. Gleeful
5. Elated

1. Böttger et al. (2017, web appendix, p. 11) stated that all the response scales used in the study had seven-points. The extreme verbal anchors used with this scale were not described. They might have been the typical Likert-type, e.g., *strongly disagree* / *strongly agree*.
2. The blank in the scale stem should be filled with a phrase that identifies the stimulus that apparently produced the delight-related feelings. Depending upon the study context, the phrase used by Böttger et al. (2017, web appendix, p. 11) was either "During my shopping trip" or "While reading the ad."

DESIRABILITY OF SCORING POINTS

The scale has three, seven-point Likert items that measure how much a person expected to feel good if he/she scored many points in a game.

Origin:

Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017, p. 819) used the scale in Study 3 with a sample of 185 female business students. After playing a game, participants filled out the scale as a manipulation check. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

The alpha calculated for the scale was .83 (Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski 2017, p. 820).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017). However, to the extent that the scale was used as a manipulation check and confirmed the experimental manipulation was successful, it provides some limited support for the scale's predictive validity.

Comments:

If the researcher's desire is to measure expectations before the game starts, the items could be easily modified, e.g., *I think that I will feel good if I score many points*. Further, as the items are currently phrased, the scale is for use with games in which the individual is personally competing. To measure expectations regarding a team's performance, the items could be easily changed, e.g., *I thought that I would feel good if the team scored many points*. Of course, the more changes that are made to the items, the more it is important to pretest the scale's psychometric quality before using it in theory testing.

Reference:

Kaiser, Ulrike, Martin Schreier, and Chris Janiszewski (2017), "The Self-Expressive Customization of a Product Can Improve Performance," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (5), 816-831.

Scale Items:¹

1. I thought that I would feel good if I scored many points.
2. Scoring many points was very desirable.
3. I thought that the more points I scored the better I would feel.

1. The response scale used with these items had the following extreme anchors: *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). Before filling out the scale, participants were instructed to recall the expectations they had prior to playing the game about scoring points.

DESIRE TO CONNECT WITH HOME

The scale uses four, seven-point items to measure how much a person has the desire to be around and in touch with things from "home," however he/she defines it.

Origin:

Torelli et al. (2017) used the scale in Study 1a with 115 undergraduate students at an American university. The same scale was also used in an extra study reported in the web appendix of the article. In that case, data were gathered from 161 undergraduate students at an American university. The source of the scale was not identified.

Reliability:

The alphas reported for the scale in Study 1a and the additional study were .94 in both cases (Torelli et al. 2017, pp. 50 and online appendix 2).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Torelli et al. (2017).

Reference:

Torelli, Carlos J., Rohini Ahluwalia, Shirley Y. Y. Cheng, Nicholas J. Olson, and Jennifer L. Stoner (2017), "Redefining Home: How Cultural Distinctiveness Affects the Malleability of In-Group Boundaries and Brand Preferences," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (1), 44-61.

Scale Items:¹

1. Feel like connecting with home.
2. Want to be in touch with something from home.
3. Want to be around familiar faces from home.
4. Want to connect to things from home.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Torelli et al. (2017, p. 59) with these items were *Not at all* (1) and *Very much* (7). Participants were asked to indicate to what extent they had the desire to connect with home; the explicit instructions used with the scale were not provided.

DISCOUNT SIZE

The scale has three, seven-point semantic differentials that measure how large a consumer considers a particular discount on a product's normal price to be.

Origin:

Xie and Keh (2016) used the scale with data collected from 163 U.S. consumers who were members of Amazon's Mechanical Turk. The source of the scale was not stated and it is assumed to have been created by the authors. They referred to the measure as *promotion depth*. The scale was used as a manipulation check with the goal of confirming that a high-discount manipulation was believed by participants to be significantly larger than a discount intended to be viewed as low.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .93 (Xie and Keh 2016, p. 215).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Xie and Keh (2016). It is worth noting, however, that since the scale was used as a manipulation check and that the manipulation was successful, it provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

References:

Xie, Yi (2017), personal correspondence.

Xie, Yi and Hean Tat Keh (2016), "Taming the Blame Game: Using Promotion Programs to Counter Product-Harm Crises," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 211-226.

Scale Items:¹

Please indicate how you assess the promotion program provided by _____.²

1. Trivial / Significant
2. Small / Large
3. Negligible / Substantial

1. The number of points on the scale was seven (Xie 2017).

2. The name of the brand/manufacturer/store should be placed in the blank. This statement was provided by Xie (2017).

DISPOSAL GUILT

The degree to which a person experiences negative emotions and thoughts for throwing away something in particular is measured with three, seven-point Likert-type items. The scale may make most sense to use in contexts where the person is aware of alternatives for disposing of the item, particularly recycling.

Origin:

Trudel, Argo, and Meng (2016) used the scale in Study 5 (n = 200) with participants recruited from Amazon's MTurk. They referred to the measure as a *negative emotions index*. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .98 (Trudel, Argo, and Meng 2016, p. 255).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Trudel, Argo, and Meng (2016).

Reference:

Trudel, Remi, Jennifer J. Argo, and Matthew D. Meng (2016), "The Recycled Self: Consumers' Disposal Decisions of Identity-Linked Products, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (2), 246-264.

Scale Items:¹

1. I feel ashamed for throwing the _____ in the garbage.
2. I feel guilty for throwing this _____ in the garbage.
3. I regret throwing this _____ in the garbage.

1. The end points of the response scale were *Strongly disagree* (1) and *Strongly agree* (7). The blanks should be filled with a name for the item being discarded, e.g., plastic cup.

DISPUTE LIKELIHOOD

With four, seven-point items, the scale measures a person's stated likelihood of challenging an action taken by an organization that he/she disputes and even escalating the issue if necessary.

Origin:

Jung et al. (2017) used the scale in a survey with data gathered from 182 people in the U.S. recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk. The source of the scale was not stated but appears to have been created by the authors for the study. Specifically, participants read a scenario in which they were to imagine that their bank had unexpectedly charged them a fee. Further, they asked a representative for an explanation and received a response indicating the charges were consistent with the policies of the bank.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .97 (Jung et al. 2017, p. 491).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Jung et al. (2017).

Comments:

As noted below, the phrasing of the scale items was tailored for a bank context. If used in other contexts, the sentences will need to be modified somewhat. The more changes that are made, the more important it will be to re-examine the scale's psychometric quality.

Reference:

Jung, Kiju, Ellen Garbarino, Donnel A. Briley, and Jesse Wynhausen (2017), "Blue and Red Voices: Effects of Political Ideology on Consumers' Complaining and Disputing Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (3), 477–499.

Scale Items:¹

1. How likely is it that you would continue to challenge these charges?
2. How likely is it that you would dispute the bank representative's outcome?
3. How likely is it that you would fight the bank on this issue?
4. How likely is it that you would escalate this issue?

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale used by Jung et al. (2017, p. 491) with these items were *not at all likely* (1) and *very likely* (7). The underlined words in the items should be considered for replacement if the scale is used in a context other than a bank.

DISTRACTION DURING THE TASK

With three, seven-point items, the scale measures the degree to which a person was daydreaming or thinking about other things during a particular task.

Origin:

Woolley and Fishbach (2016) used the scale in Study 4 with data from 156 students in a Florida high school. The scale was administered to students after they completed an in-class assignment. The source of the scale was not identified and was probably created by the authors.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .76 (Woolley and Fishbach 2016, p. 962).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Woolley and Fishbach (2016).

Reference:

Woolley, Kaitlin and Ayelet Fishbach (2016), "For the Fun of It: Harnessing Immediate Rewards to Increase Persistence in Long-Term Goals," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (6), 952-966.

Scale Items:¹

1. How focused were you on this task?
Not focused / Very focused (r)
2. How much time did you spend daydreaming or thinking about other things during this task?
No time / A lot of time
3. How distracted were you during this task?
Not distracted / Very distracted

1. The response scale had seven points, running from 0 to 6. To make the scale more useful in a wide variety of situations, the word "assignment," used by Woolley and Fishbach (2016, p. 962), has been replaced here with "task." Other words might also be appropriate, depending upon the context.

DONATION LIKELIHOOD

The scale is composed of four, seven-point items that measure the likelihood that a person will donate a product of his/hers that is not used anymore but could still be useful to someone else.

Origin:

Winterich, Reczek, and Irwin (2017) used the scale in Studies 3 ($n = 151$) and 4 ($n = 237$). The context was that participants were asked to think about a product of theirs that they do not use anymore and that could be useful to someone else. The source of the scale was not stated but seems to have been created by the authors for the study.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .88 and .91 for Studies 3 and 4, respectively (Winterich, Reczek, and Irwin 2017, pp. 111, 113).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Winterich, Reczek, and Irwin (2017).

References:

Winterich, Karen Page (2018), personal correspondence.

Winterich, Karen Page, Rebecca Walker Reczek, and Julie R. Irwin (2017), "Keeping the Memory but Not the Possession: Memory Preservation Mitigates Identity Loss from Product Disposition," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (5), 104-120.

Scale Items:¹

Directions: Please indicate how likely you would be to get rid of the special item that you listed in each of the following ways.

1. Donate it to the local Goodwill.²
2. Donate it to a local charity for children and families in need.
3. Donate it to a national nonprofit organization.
4. Donate it to an international charity collecting items for those in poverty in other countries.

1. The directions were provided by Winterich (2018). The end-points of the response scale were *very unlikely* (1) and *very likely* (7).

2. Goodwill Industries International is a large non-profit organization that operates stores in the U.S., Canada, as well as 12 other countries. If desired, the name could be replaced with that of another charity which accepts donated items and is well-known to participants.

DURABILITY OF THE OBJECT

The scale has three, nine-point semantic differentials that measure how enduring and long-lasting a particular object is judged to be. The scale appears to be most appropriate when used to describe physical objects (furniture, cars, electronics) rather than non-physical entities (emotions, faith, relationships).

Origin:

The scale was used by Jiang et al. (2016) in Experiment 2 of the five studies reported in the article. Respondents were shown ads for a sofa that varied between two treatment groups only in the shape of the logo associated with the product. The source of the scale was not stated but is likely to have been the authors.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .95 (Jiang et al. 2016, p. 714).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not addressed by Jiang et al. (2016).

Reference:

Jiang, Yuwei, Gerald J. Gorn, Maria Galli, and Amitava Chattopadhyay (2016), "Does Your Company Have the Right Logo? How and Why Circular- and Angular-Logo Shapes Influence Brand Attribute Judgments," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 709-726.

Scale Items:¹

1. Not at all durable / Very durable
2. Not at all enduring / Very enduring
3. Not at all long-lasting / Very long-lasting

1. The instructions used with this scale were not stated but it is clear that participants were asked to fill out the items after being exposed to an ad that featured a sofa.

EASE OF BEING PERSUADED

This Likert scale measures a person's admission that he/she was easily influenced by the message in a particular ad and had difficulty resisting it. A seven- and a four-item version are discussed. Although the scale was made for use with ads, it can be easily modified for use with other types of presentations such as political speeches, religious sermons, educational lectures, movies, etc.

Origin:

Chang (2017) used the scale in all five studies reported in the article. Although not explicitly stated, the scale appears to have been created by the author. A seven-item version seems to have been used in Studies 1, 2B, and 3B while a four-item version was used in Studies 2A and 3A. No reasons were given for the use of the abbreviated version, how particular items were selected for the shorter version, and why the number of points on the response scales varied across studies.

Reliability:

The alphas for both versions of the scale were quite good, ranging from .88 to .95 for the full version and were .87 and .88 for the short version (Chang 2017, pp. 493-495, 497, 498).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Chang (2017).

References:

Chang, Chingching (2017), "A Metacognitive Model of the Effects of Susceptibility to Persuasion Self-Beliefs on Advertising Effects," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (4), 487-502.
Chang, Chingching (2018), personal correspondence.

Scale Items:¹

Directions: Please focus on how you felt when you read the ad and to what degree you think that the following experiences describe how you felt.

1. While reading the ad, I experienced difficulty in resisting the message.
2. While reading the ad, I experienced difficulty in counterarguing the message.
3. I found myself being easily influenced by the message.
4. I found the ad persuaded me easily.
5. I am feeling vulnerable in resistance to its influence.
6. I am feeling susceptible in resistance to its influence.
7. I am feeling weak in resistance to its influence.

1. The abbreviated version of the scale was composed of items #1 to #4. A seven-point response scale was used in Studies 1, 2A, and 3A while a five-point scale was used in Studies 2B and 3B. The response scale used with the items had *strongly disagree* / *strongly agree* as the extreme verbal anchors (Chang 2018).

EASE OF USING THE SHOPPING TECHNOLOGY

Three, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure how easy and understandable a person believes a particular in-store shopping technology would be to use. As currently phrased, the items are stated hypothetically because the respondent has only read about the technology. The sentences could be easily changed to measure a shopper’s actual experience with the technology.

Origin:

Inman and Nikolova (2017, p. 25) used the scale in a supplementary study with 302 participants recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. Participants were asked to imagine that a local supermarket with which they were familiar began using a new in-store shopping technology. Six technologies (apps or devices) with varying capabilities and benefits were examined. As for the source of the scale, the authors created it by drawing some phrasing and concepts from a measure of ease of use by Venkatesh et al. (2003).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .92 (Inman and Nikolova 2017, p. 25).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Inman and Nikolova (2017).

References:

Inman, J. Jeffrey and Hristina Nikolova (2017), "Shopper-Facing Retail Technology: A Retailer Adoption Decision Framework Incorporating Shopper Attitudes and Privacy Concerns," *Journal of Retailing*, 93 (1), 7–28.

Venkatesh, Viswanath, Michael G. Morris, Gordon B. Davis and Fred D. Davis (2003), "User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward A Unified View," *MIS Quarterly*, 27 (30), 425–478.

Scale Items:¹

1. I believe that my interaction with this technology will be clear and understandable.
2. It will be easy for me to become skillful in using this technology.
3. I would find this technology easy to use in the store.

1. The end points of the response scale used by Inman and Nikolova (2017) with these items were *Strongly Disagree* (1) and *Strongly Agree* (7).

EATING BEHAVIOR (EXTERNAL STIMULI MOTIVATION)

The scale has ten items that measure a person's desire to eat in response to "external" stimuli (non-hunger related), with an emphasis on exposure to the sights and smells of food.

Origin:

The measure is one part of the Dutch Eating Behavior Questionnaire developed by van Strien et al. (1986). A factor analysis conducted on data from 1169 Dutch residents showed that the ten items in this scale loaded highest on the same factor and had low loadings on the other factors. Alphas were calculated for the overall sample as well as for several subgroups (obese/non-obese, male/female). In all cases the alphas were .80 or above.

Van De Veer et al. (2016) used the scale in Study 5 with a final sample of 467 people from a panel administered at Tilburg University. It is assumed that the Dutch version of the scale was used in the study. The English language version is shown below.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .83 as used by van De Veer et al. (2016, p. 796).

Validity:

van De Veer et al. (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity.

References:

van De Veer, Evelien, Erica van Herpen, and Hans C. M. van Trijp (2016), "Body and Mind: Mindfulness Helps Consumers to Compensate for Prior Food Intake by Enhancing the Responsiveness to Physiological Cues," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 783-803.

van Strien, Tatjana, Jan E.R. Frijters, Gerard P.A. Bergers, and Peter B. Defares (1986), "The Dutch Eating Behaviour Questionnaire (DEBQ) for Assessment of Restrained, Emotional and External Eating Behavior," *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 5 (2), 747-55.

Scale Items:¹

1. If food tastes good to you, do you eat more than usual?
2. If food smells and looks good, do you eat more than usual?
3. If you see or smell something delicious, do you have a desire to eat it?
4. If you have something delicious to eat, do you eat it straight away?
5. If you pass by a bakery, does that make you feel like buying something yummy?
6. If you walk past a snack bar or a cafe, do you have the desire to buy something delicious?
7. If you see others eating, do you also have the desire to eat?
8. Can you resist eating delicious foods? (r)
9. Do you eat more than usual, when you see others eating?
10. When preparing a meal are you inclined to eat something?

1. This English translation of the items is from van Strien et al. (1986) except for #5 which was provided by van De Veer et al. (2016, p. 796) and is phrased a little differently from the one given by van Strien et al. (1986, p. 305). Although not explicitly stated by van De Veer et al. (2016), it appears they used a response format with the Dutch equivalent of *Never* and *Very often* as extreme verbal anchors which is the same as used by van Strien et al. (1986, p. 305). As for scale points, it is not clear if van De Veer et al. (2016) used five or seven; van Strien et al. (1986, p. 305) used five.

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SMOKING WARNING

How effective a person believes a particular anti-smoking message to be in terms of changing attitudes and behaviors is measured with three items.

Origin:

Davis and Burton (2016) created the scale and used it in several studies. For example, 157 smokers were recruited from an online panel for Study 1a in which they saw a brief anti-smoking message in a mock, one-page magazine advertisement for a fictitious brand of cigarettes.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .87, .90, and .88 in Studies 1a, 1b, and 2 (Davis 2017; Davis and Burton 2016, p. 35).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not addressed by Davis and Burton (2016).

References:

Davis, Cassandra (2017), personal correspondence.

Davis, Cassandra and Scot Burton (2016), "Understanding Graphic Pictorial Warnings in Advertising: A Replication and Extension," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (1), 33-42.

Scale Items:¹

1. How effective is this warning in communicating the risks associated with smoking cigarettes?
2. How effective is this warning in encouraging current smokers to quit smoking?
3. How effective is this warning in encouraging non-smokers to not start smoking?

1. The response scale used with these statements was not described by Davis and Burton (2016). The extreme anchors were likely to have been something like *very ineffective* (1) and *very effective* (7). The items were provided by Davis (2017).

EFFICACY OF JOINING THE FITNESS CLUB

With four, nine-point items, the scale measures a person's belief that joining a particular fitness club will help reduce health risks.

Origin:

Han, Duhachek, and Agrawal (2016) used the scale in Study 3 with 608 participants recruited from Amazon MTurk. The measure was completed by participants after they saw an ad from a fitness club. The authors viewed the scale as a measure of response efficacy in that the action (joining a fitness club) could be expected by participants to be effective in producing a desired outcome (good health). Although the authors said they "adopted" the scale from Keller (2006, p. 111), comparison of the two measures shows they have different phrasing and application though, at a general level, they could both be viewed as measuring response efficacy.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .89 (Han, Duhachek, and Agrawal 2016, p. 438).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Han, Duhachek, and Agrawal (2016).

References:

Han, Dahee, Adam Duhachek, and Nidhi Agrawal (2016), "Coping and Construal Level Matching Drives Health Message Effectiveness via Response Efficacy or Self-Efficacy Enhancement," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (3), 429-447.
Keller, Punam (2006), "Regulatory Focus and Efficacy of Health Messages," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33 (June), 109-14.

Scale Items:¹

1. To what extent do you think this fitness club can prevent you from being unhealthy?
2. To what extent do you think following programs or actions suggested by this fitness club can reduce the threat of health risks (e.g., being unhealthy)?
3. To what extent do you think joining this fitness club can prevent you from feeling stressed due to the health goal pursuit?
4. To what extent do you think this fitness club can prevent health risks?

1. The extreme anchors used by Han, Duhachek, and Agrawal (2016, p. 438) with these items were *not at all* (1) and *very much* (9).

EMBARRASSMENT (PRODUCT PURCHASE)

The degree to which a person believes that he/she would feel uncomfortable if seen purchasing a particular product is measured using three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale was used by Esmark, Noble, and Breazeale (2017) in Studies 2 (n = 69) and 3 (n = 88) with data collected from participants who were recruited using Amazon MTurk. As for the source of the scale, the authors cited Dahl, Manchanda, and Argo (2001). That article has a semantic differential measure of embarrassment from which the key words of the scale items (listed below) could have been developed. Uncited is a much more similar scale by Allard and White (2015, p. 412 and web appendix) who used a scale to measure the embarrassment of giving a particular product as a gift to a friend. (The source of that scale was not stated.)

Reliability:

The alphas reported by Esmark, Noble, and Breazeale (2017, p. 341) for the scale were .92 (Study 2) and .96 (Study 3).

Validity:

Evidence for the scale's validity was not provided by Esmark, Noble, and Breazeale (2017).

References:

- Allard, Thomas and Katherine White (2015), "Cross-Domain Effects of Guilt on Desire for Self-Improvement Products," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (3), 401-419.
- Dahl, Darren W., Rajesh V. Manchanda, and Jennifer J. Argo (2001), "Embarrassment in Consumer Purchase: The Roles of Social Presence and Purchase Familiarity," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (December), 473-481.
- Esmark, Carol L., Stephanie M. Noble, and Michael J. Breazeale (2017), "I'll Be Watching You: Shoppers' Reactions to Perceptions of Being Watched by Employees," *Journal of Retailing*, 93 (3), 336-349.

Scale Items:¹

1. I think that buying this product is awkward.
2. It would be embarrassing to be seen buying this product.
3. I always feel really uncomfortable when I buy this product.

1. Besides indicating that the response format was seven-point Likert-type, the authors did not specify the verbal anchors. They were likely to have been *strongly disagree/strongly agree* or something very similar.

EMERGENCY EXPENDITURE (EASE OF PAYING)

The scale has five, six-point items that measure how quickly and easily a person believes he/she could repay money taken from personal savings or charged to a credit card if it was used to pay for an emergency.

Origin:

Sussman and O'Brien (2016, p. 797) seem to have only used the scale in Study 3. Analysis appears to have been based on data from 329 participants in the U.S. recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The source of the scale was not identified but is likely to have been created by the authors for the experiment.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .80 (Sussman and O'Brien 2016, web appendix).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed. However, it is worth noting that an EFA showed that the items in the ease of paying scale loaded high and together on one factor and not on the other factors found in the analysis (Sussman and O'Brien 2016, web appendix).

Reference:

Sussman, Abigail B. and Rourke L. O'Brien (2016), "Knowing When to Spend: Unintended Financial Consequences of Earmarking to Encourage Savings," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (5), 790-803.

Scale Items:

1. If you took money out of savings to pay for this emergency, when do you think you would replace the money?¹
2. If you took money out of savings to pay for this emergency, when do you think you would replace the money?²
3. If you took money out of savings to pay for this emergency, how hard do you think it would be to replace the money?³
4. If you borrowed from the credit card to pay for this emergency, when do you think you would pay off the balance?⁴
5. If you borrowed from the credit card to pay for this emergency, how hard do you think it would be to repay the money?⁵

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale were *Immediately* (1) and *Over a long period* (6).

2. The anchors of the response scale were *less than one week* (1), *one week to one month* (2), *one month to six months* (3), *six months to one year* (4), *one year to two years* (5), and *more than two years* (6).

3. The extreme anchors of the response scale were *Very easy* (1) and *Very Hard* (6).

4. The extreme anchors of the response scale were *Immediately* (1) and *Over a long period* (6).

5. The extreme anchors of the response scale were *Very easy* (1) and *Very Hard* (6).

EMPLOYEE UNFRIENDLINESS

This Likert scale measures the degree to which a customer of a store believes an employee was unfriendly based upon several verbal and non-verbal behaviors observed during a visit. Items for both a nine-item and a three-item version are described.

Origin:

The scale was created by Albrecht et al. (2017, p. 832) in a multi-stage process which included item generation based on depth interviews and prior research, experts rating each item, refining items, and then pretesting items. The final nine-item version of the scale was used in a pilot study as well as in Study 1. A three-item subset was used in Study 2.

Reliability:

The alphas reported by Albrecht et al. (2017) for the scale were .98 (pilot study, p. 842), .98 (Study 1, p. 843), and .94 (Study 2, p. 844).

Validity:

Beyond evidence of content validity from the process used when experts rated the items, each of the studies provided support for discriminant validity with respect to some other measures of employee-related attitudes. The AVEs reported by Albrecht et al. (2017) for the scale were .86 (pilot study, p. 842), .87 (Study 1, p. 843), and .86 (Study 2, p. 844).

Reference:

Albrecht, Arne K., Gianfranco Walsh, Simon Brach, Dwayne D. Gremler, and Erica van Herpen (2017), "The Influence of Service Employees and Other Customers on Customer Unfriendliness: A Social Norms Perspective," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (6), 827-847.

Scale Items:¹

1. The employee in the shop was friendly toward me. (r)
2. The employee in the shop was unfriendly toward me.
3. The employee in the shop behaved in a friendly way toward me. (r)
4. The employee in the shop had a friendly smile. (r)
5. The employee in the shop showed an unfriendly facial expression.
6. The employee in the shop talked to me in a friendly way. (r)
7. The employee in the shop greeted me friendly. (r)
8. The employee in the shop thanked me when it was appropriate. (r)
9. The employee in the shop had friendly eye contact with me. (r)

1. The first three items composed the scale in Study 2 and the end-points of the response scale were *completely disagree* (1) and a *completely agree* (7) (Albrecht et al. 2017, p. 836, 844). All nine items were used in the pilot as well as Study 1 (p. 842). Their response formats were not described but are likely to have also been seven-point Likert-type.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN OF THE COMPANY

The scale measures the degree to which a person believes that a company is genuinely trying to be environmentally responsible and not just acting that way to make more money. A six-item version of the scale is provided as well as an eight-item version, both with seven-point response formats.

Origin:

Reich and Armstrong Soule (2016) used the scale in Studies 1, 2, and 3, with participants being recruited from Amazon's MTurk in each case. The authors created the scale by drawing some phrases and concepts from scales by Vlachos et al. (2009) that were used to measure the egoistic- and values-driven attributions people make about a company when it engages in socially responsible activities.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .936, .944, and .932 in Studies 1, 2, and 3, respectively (Reich and Armstrong Soule 2016, pp. 444, 448, 450).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not addressed *per se* by Reich and Armstrong Soule (2016). However, it is worth noting that the authors ran a principal components factor analysis and a CFA for each study. (The six-item version was used in Study 1 and the eight-item version was used in Studies 2 and 3). The results strongly supported the conclusion that both versions of the scale were unidimensional.

References:

Reich, Brandon J. (2017), personal correspondence.

Reich, Brandon J. and Catherine A. Armstrong Soule (2016), "Green Demarketing in Advertisements: Comparing 'Buy Green' and 'Buy Less' Appeals in Product and Institutional Advertising Contexts," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (4), 441-458.

Vlachos, Pavlos A., Argiris Tsamakos, Adam P. Vrechopoulos, and Panagiotis K. Avramidis (2009), "Corporate Social Responsibility: Attributions, Loyalty, and the Mediating Role of Trust," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 37 (2), 170-180.

Scale Items:¹

1. _____ feels morally obligated to help the environment.
2. _____ is trying to give something back to society.
3. _____ genuinely cares about the well-being of the environment.
4. _____ is just taking advantage of the "Green trend" to make more money. (r)
5. _____ is just trying to make their product seem more attractive so they can charge a higher price. (r)
6. _____ does not genuinely care about the environment. (r)
7. How environmentally friendly do you think _____ is, as a company?

8. How committed to the environment do you think _____is, as a company?

1. The items were provided by Reich (2017). The first six-items (above) composed the scale used in Study 1 while all eight items were used in Studies 2 and 3. The end-points used with the first six items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). For items #7 and #8, the end-points were labeled *not at all* (1) and *extremely* (7).

ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN OF THE COMPANY

How much a person believes that a particular business is committed to environmentally friendly practices is measured in this scale with four, seven-point items.

Origin:

The scale was used by Wang, Krishna, and McFerran (2017; Wang 2018) in Studies 1 and 2 phrased in Chinese and English, respectively. Participants in Study 1 were 281 employees of a large Chinese company who were participating in a training workshop and assigned to one of two hotels. In Study 2, 548 undergraduate students from a major university in Hong Kong were taken individually to one of two real hotel rooms where they could observe the accommodations and fill out the questionnaire. The authors developed the scale in several studies that were not reported in the final version of the article due to space constraints (Wang 2018).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .89 and .83 for Studies 1 and 2, respectively (Wang, Krishna, and McFerran 2017, pp. 483, 488).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Wang, Krishna, and McFerran (2017).

References:

Wang, Wenbo (2018), personal correspondence.

Wang, Wenbo, Aradhna Krishna, and Brent McFerran (2017), "Turning Off the Lights: Consumers' Environmental Efforts Depend on Visible Efforts of Firms," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (3), 478-494.

Scale Items:¹

In my opinion, the _____ is...²

1. committed to helping the environment.
2. making a difference.
3. doing environmentally friendly practices.
4. committed to sustainability.

1. The end points of the response scale used with these items were *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7).

2. The name of a particular company or a generic term should be placed in the blank, e.g., hotel, manufacturer, grocery store.

ENVIRONMENTALISM (ACTIVISM)

A person's tendency to not only express his/her concern for the environment via product-related decisions but also by engaging in other pro-environmental activities is measured with ten, seven-point items.

Origin:

Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend (2016) used the scale in Study 2 with data collected from 160 undergraduate and graduate students. The authors called the scale *green behavior* and created it by drawing on items from several scales.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .86 (Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend 2016, p. 433).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend (2016). However, they did indicate that for both studies, the factor analyses showed the items composing the scale had high loadings on the same factor and explained a majority of the variance.

Reference:

Hartmann, Patrick, Vanessa Apaolaza, and Martin Eisend (2016), "Nature Imagery in Non-Green Advertising: The Effects of Emotion, Autobiographical Memory, and Consumer's Green Traits," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (4), 427-440.

Scale Items:¹

1. I buy paper products (toilet paper, paper towels, etc.) made from recycled paper.
2. I buy environmentally friendly household products (dishwashing liquid, detergent, etc.).
3. I purchase organic food.
4. I try to buy energy-efficient household appliances.
5. I participate in demonstrations against companies that are harming the environment.
6. I contribute to environmental organizations (volunteering, donations or membership).
7. I would sign a petition in support of tougher environmental laws.
8. I have switched products for ecological reasons.
9. I have changed my behavior for environmental reasons.
10. I vote for or against a political party because of its environmental stance.

1. The response format used with these items by Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend (2016, p. 433) had seven-points and was anchored by *Very untrue of me* and *Very true of me*.

ENVIRONMENTALISM (CRISIS CONCERN)

A Likert-type scale with five statements measure the degree to which a person believes that ecological crises are likely to occur because of harmful human activity.

Origin:

Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend (2016) used the scale in Studies 1, 2, and 3. Four of the items in the scale were taken from the 15-item New Environmental Paradigm by Dunlap et al. (2000). A fifth item was created by Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend (2016).

Reliability:

The scale's alphas were .68, .70, and .80 in Studies 1, 2, and 3, respectively (Hartmann 2017; Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend 2016, pp. 433, 434).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not addressed *per se* by Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend (2016). However, they did indicate that a factor analysis with data from Study 3 showed the items composing the scale had moderate to high loadings on the same factor and explained the majority of the variance (p. 434).

References:

Dunlap, Riley E, Kent D. Van Liere, Angela G. Mertig, and Robert Emmet Jones (2000), "Measuring Endorsement of the New Ecological Paradigm: A Revised NEP Scale," *Journal of Social Issues*, 56 (3), 425-442.
Hartmann, Patrick (2017), personal correspondence.
Hartmann, Patrick, Vanessa Apaolaza, and Martin Eisend (2016), "Nature Imagery in Non-Green Advertising: The Effects of Emotion, Autobiographical Memory, and Consumer's Green Traits," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (4), 427-440.

Scale Items:¹

1. Humans are severely abusing the environment.
2. The so-called "ecological crisis" facing humankind has been greatly exaggerated. (r)
3. If things continue on their present course, we will soon experience a major ecological catastrophe.
4. The balance of nature is strong enough to cope with the impacts of modern industrial nations. (r)
5. Claims that current levels of pollution are changing the earth's climate are exaggerated. (r)

1. The response format used with these items by Hartmann, Apaolaza, and Eisend (2016, p. 431) had *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree* as extreme verbal anchors. A five-point scale was used in Study 1 and it appears to have been a seven-item scale in Studies 2 and 3.

ENVIRONMENTALISM (PURCHASING BEHAVIOR)

Six, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a person expresses support for environmental protection through his/her purchases and consumption.

Origin:

Summers, Smith, and Reczek (2016) used the scale in Study 3. Data were collected from 178 undergraduate students attending The Ohio State University. The scale was developed by Haws, Winterich, and Naylor (2014) and called GREEN. They were not satisfied with previous attempts to measure green consumption values and conducted six studies, four of which focused on scale development and validation. Across the studies, the items were found to load strongly on the same factor and have high AVEs as well as strong reliability (internal consistency and temporal stability). The scale exhibited the expected correlations with respect to other measures of the construct as well as several measures of consumers' use their personal financial and physical resources. It is also noteworthy that the scale was not related to socially desirable responding.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .92 (Summers, Smith, and Reczek 2016, p. 165).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Summers, Smith, and Reczek (2016).

References:

Haws, Kelly L., Karen Page Winterich, and Rebecca Walker Naylor (2014), "Seeing the World Through GREEN-tinted Glasses: Green Consumption Values and Responses to Environmentally Friendly Products," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 24 (July), 336–354.

Summers, Christopher A., Robert W. Smith, and Rebecca Walker Reczek (2016), "An Audience of One: Behaviorally Targeted Ads as Implied Social Labels," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (1), 156–178.

Scale Items:¹

1. It is important to me that the products I use do not harm the environment.
2. I consider the potential environmental impact of my actions when making many of my decisions.
3. My purchase habits are affected by my concern for our environment.
4. I am concerned about wasting the resources of our planet.
5. I would describe myself as environmentally responsible.
6. I am willing to be inconvenienced in order to take actions that are more environmentally friendly.

1. The extreme anchors of the response scales used by Summers, Smith, and Reczek (2016) as well as Haws, Winterich, and Naylor (2014) were not described. It appears the typical *strongly disagree/strongly agree* endpoints are appropriate.

E-SERVICE QUALITY (CONTACT AVAILABILITY)

Composed of three, five-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a consumer believes that a particular website, most likely an online retailer, provides ways for customers to reach them and even speak with a live representative if desired.

Origin:

The scale was called "service level" by Blut (2016) and was used in an impressive study of e-service quality. Data for the study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and that they were to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer.

Blut (2016) borrowed the scale from Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Malhotra (2005) who had created and used it as part of their E-S-Qual instrument.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .75 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Blut (2016, p. 509) provided some evidence in support of the scale's face and discriminant validities. The AVE of the scale was .51.

References:

Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.

Parasuraman, A., Valarie A. Zeithaml and Arvind Malhotra (2005), "E-S-QUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Assessing Electronic Service Quality," *Journal of Service Research*, 7 (3), 213–233.

Scale Items:¹

1. This site provides a telephone number to reach the company.
2. This site has customer service representatives available online.
3. It offers the ability to speak to a live person if there is a problem.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

E-SERVICE QUALITY (DELIVERY CONDITION)

The scale has three, five-point Likert-type items that measure the degree to which a customer believes that products he/she purchased from a particular online retailer arrived in acceptable condition, with no major damage.

Origin:

The scale was used by Blut (2016) in an impressive study of e-service quality. Data for the study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and that they were to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer. Blut (2016) created the scale items based on inspiration received from work by Holloway and Beatty (2008) that indicated product fulfillment issues are critical drivers of satisfaction.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .89 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Blut (2016, p. 509) provided some evidence in support of the scale's face and discriminant validities. The AVE of the scale was .80.

References:

Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.

Holloway, Betsy Bugg and Sharon E. Beatty (2008), "Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers in the Online Environment: A Critical Incident Assessment," *Journal of Service Research*, 10 (4), 347–364.

Scale Items:¹

1. The product was damaged during delivery. (r)
2. The ordered products arrived in a good condition.
3. The products arrived with a major damage. (r)

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

E-SERVICE QUALITY (DELIVERY TIMELINESS)

A customer's attitude regarding a particular online retailer's tendency to deliver products in an acceptable period of time is measured using three, five-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale was used by Blut (2016) in an impressive study of e-service quality. Data for the study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and that they were to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer.

The scale was created by Blut (2016) by borrowing one item from the eTailQ instrument by Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) and combining it with two statements that are loosely based on items from the E-S-Qual instrument by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Malhotra (2005).

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .89 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Blut (2016, p. 509) provided some evidence in support of the scale's face and discriminant validities. The AVE of the scale was .72.

References:

Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.

Parasuraman, A., Valarie A. Zeithaml and Arvind Malhotra (2005), "E-S-QUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Assessing Electronic Service Quality," *Journal of Service Research*, 7 (3), 213–233.

Wolfinbarger, Mary and Mary C. Gilly (2003), "eTailQ: Dimensionalizing, Measuring and Predicting eTail Quality," *Journal of Retailing*, 79 (3), 183–198.

Scale Items:¹

1. The product is delivered by the time promised by the company.
2. This website makes items available for delivery within a suitable time frame.
3. It quickly delivers what I order.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

E-SERVICE QUALITY (ORDER ACCURACY)

With three, five-point Likert-type items, the scale measures a customer's belief that a particular online retailer delivers exactly what customers have ordered.

Origin:

The scale was used by Blut (2016) in an impressive study of e-service quality. Data for the study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and that they were to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer.

The scale was created by Blut (2016) by borrowing one item (#1 below) that is in the eTailQ instrument by Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003). Another item (#2 below) was drawn from the E-S-Qual instrument by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Malhotra (2005). The source of the third item is less clear though it has conceptual similarity to some items in the E-S-Qual instrument.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .88 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Blut (2016, p. 509) provided some evidence in support of the scale's face and discriminant validities. The AVE of the scale was .71.

References:

Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.

Parasuraman, A., Valarie A. Zeithaml and Arvind Malhotra (2005), "E-S-QUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Assessing Electronic Service Quality," *Journal of Service Research*, 7 (3), 213–233.

Wolfinbarger, Mary and Mary C. Gilly (2003), "eTailQ: Dimensionalizing, Measuring and Predicting eTail Quality," *Journal of Retailing*, 79 (3), 183–198.

Scale Items:¹

1. You get what you ordered from this website.
2. The website sends out the items ordered.
3. The website is truthful about its offerings.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

E-SERVICE QUALITY (PRIVACY)

How much a customer trusts that an online retailer is protecting his/her personal information is measured using three, five-point items.

Origin:

The scale was used by Blut (2016) in an impressive study of e-service quality. Data for the study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and that they were to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer.

Blut (2016) borrowed one item (#3 below) from the measure of privacy used by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Malhotra (2005) which was part of their E-S-Qual instrument. The source of the other two items (#1 and #2 below) is unknown though they have some conceptual similarity to phrases in items considered by Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) for use in their eTailQ instrument.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .87 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Blut (2016, p. 509) provided some evidence in support of the scale's face validity. He also appeared to say that evidence of the scale's discriminant validity was lacking with respect to the measure of security he used in his study based on the Fornell and Larcker (1981) test but that the scale passed the more lenient test suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). The AVE of the scale was .69.

References:

- Anderson, James C. and David W. Gerbing (1988), "Structural Equation Modeling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-Step Approach," *Psychological Bulletin*, 103 (3), 411–423.
- Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.
- Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39–50.
- Parasuraman, A., Valarie A. Zeithaml and Arvind Malhotra (2005), "E-S-QUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Assessing Electronic Service Quality," *Journal of Service Research*, 7 (3), 213–233.
- Wolfinbarger, Mary and Mary C. Gilly (2003), "eTailQ: Dimensionalizing, Measuring and Predicting eTail Quality," *Journal of Retailing*, 79 (3), 183–198.

Scale Items:¹

1. I trust the website to keep my personal information safe.

2. I trust the website administrators will not misuse my personal information.
3. It protects information about my web-shopping behavior.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

E-SERVICE QUALITY (RETURN POLICIES)

How much a customer believes that a particular online retailer manages product returns and guarantees in an acceptable manner is measured with three, five-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale was called "return handling/policies" by Blut (2016) and was used in an impressive study of e-service quality. Data for the study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and that they were to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer.

Blut (2016) borrowed three statements from a five-item measure of service responsiveness created by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Malhotra (2005) who used it as part of their E-S-Qual instrument.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .87 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Blut (2016, p. 509) provided some evidence in support of the scale's face and discriminant validities. The AVE of the scale was .70.

References:

Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.

Parasuraman, A., Valarie A. Zeithaml and Arvind Malhotra (2005), "E-S-QUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Assessing Electronic Service Quality," *Journal of Service Research*, 7 (3), 213–233.

Scale Items:¹

1. It provides me with convenient options for returning items.
2. This site handles product returns well.
3. This site offers a meaningful guarantee.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

E-SERVICE QUALITY (SECURITY)

The scale has three, five-point items that measure the extent to which a customer feels safe in his/her transactions with a particular online retailer because of the belief that it has implemented adequate safety measures.

Origin:

The scale was used by Blut (2016) in an impressive study of e-service quality. Data for the study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and that they were to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer.

Blut (2016) borrowed two items (#1 and #2) from a three-item measure of website security/privacy created by Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003). The latter used their scale as part of their eTailQ instrument. The third item below was borrowed from the measure of privacy used by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Malhotra (2005) which was part of their E-S-Qual instrument.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .89 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Blut (2016, p. 509) provided some evidence in support of the scale's face validity. He also appeared to say that evidence of the scale's discriminant validity was lacking with respect to the privacy scale he used in his study based on the Fornell and Larcker (1981) test but that the scale passed the more lenient test suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). The AVE of the scale was .74.

References:

- Anderson, James C. and David W. Gerbing (1988), "Structural Equation Modeling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-Step Approach," *Psychological Bulletin*, 1003 (3), 411–423.
- Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.
- Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39–50.
- Parasuraman, A., Valarie A. Zeithaml and Arvind Malhotra (2005), "E-S-QUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Assessing Electronic Service Quality," *Journal of Service Research*, 7 (3), 213–233.
- Wolfinbarger, Mary and Mary C. Gilly (2003), "eTailQ: Dimensionalizing, Measuring and Predicting eTail Quality," *Journal of Retailing*, 79 (3), 183–198.

Scale Items:¹

1. I feel safe in my transactions with the website.
2. The website has adequate security features.
3. This site protects information about my credit card.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

EXCHANGE EQUITY (CUSTOMER WITH COMPANY)

With three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures a customer's belief that a particular deal he/she has negotiated with a business provides equal benefits for both parties.

Origin:

Blanchard, Carlson, and Hyodo (2016) used the scale in two experiments (Studies 3 and 4) having to do with a hypothetical negotiation between a customer (the respondent) and the owner of an art store for a painting. The scale is a slightly adapted version of the *exchanging good* dimension of the reciprocity scale developed by Pervan, Bove, and Johnson (2009). Using multiple studies and admirable procedures, Pervan, Bove, and Johnson (2009) provided evidence supporting the two-factor reciprocity scale's reliability and validity in a business-to business context.

Reliability:

As used by Blanchard, Carlson, and Hyodo (2016), the alphas for the scale were .90 in both Study 3 and 4.

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Blanchard, Carlson, and Hyodo (2016).

References:

Blanchard, Simon J., Kurt A. Carlson, and Jamie D. Hyodo (2016), "The Favor Request Effect: Requesting a Favor from Consumers to Seal the Deal," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (6), 985-1001.

Pervan, Simon J., Liliana L. Bove, and Lester W. Johnson (2009), "Reciprocity as a Key Stabilizing Norm of Interpersonal Marketing Relationships: Scale Development and Validation," *Industrial Marketing Management*, 38 (1), 60-70.

Scale Items:¹

Overall with the owner, . . .²

1. there is a balance in our dealing.
2. we provided each other with equal benefits.
3. the benefits we provide and receive even out over time.

1. The response format used with these items was described by Blanchard, Carlson, and Hyodo (2016, p. 991) as a seven-point Likert-type scale. That implies the end points were *strongly disagree* / *strongly agree* or something very similar.

2. This is the beginning phrase Blanchard, Carlson, and Hyodo (2016) used with each item in the art dealer scenario. The phrase should be changed depending upon the context in which the scale is used.

FACE ENHANCEMENT IN IDEA SHARING

Four, seven-point items are used to measure a person's belief that an entity (such as a company or person) has responded to his/her idea sharing in such a way that it enriched one's social value.

Origin:

Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016) used the scale in Studies 1a, 1b, 2, and 3a. The authors appear to have created the scale by drawing some phrasing from items in a scale used by Cupach and Carson (2002).

Reliability:

Across the several uses of the scales, the alphas were extremely strong, ranging from .95 to .97 (Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon 2016, p. 693).

Validity:

The scale's validity was examined several different ways in the studies via EFAs, CFAs, and other methods. Evidence was provided of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities. The scale's AVEs across the studies ranged from .82 to .90 (Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon 2016, p. 693).

References:

Cupach, William R. and Christine L. Carson (2002), "Characteristics and Consequences of Interpersonal Complaints Associated with Perceived Face Threat," *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 19 (4), 443–462.
Fombelle, Paul W., Sterling A. Bone, and Katherine N. Lemon (2016), "Responding to the 98%: Face-Enhancing Strategies for Dealing with Rejected Customer Ideas," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (6), 685–706.

Scale Items:¹

1. The _____'s response to my idea made me look good in the eyes of others.
2. The _____'s response to my idea made me feel useful.
3. The _____'s response to my idea made me feel liked.
4. The _____'s response to my idea showed that my abilities were evaluated highly.

1. The response format used with these items by Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016, p. 690) was merely described as "seven-point Likert scales." The end points used were probably *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree*. A generic name for the focal entity should be placed in the blanks. For example, Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016, p. 690) used "bank."

FACE THREAT IN IDEA SHARING

The scale uses three, seven-point items to measure a person's belief that an entity (such as a company or person) has responded to his/her idea sharing such that it negatively affected one's social value.

Origin:

Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016) used the scale in Studies 1a, 1b, 2, and 3a. Although the authors stated that their scale was based on work by Cupach and Carson (2002) as well as Zhang, Cao, and Grigoriou (2011), very little phrasing was borrowed from those sources. It may be more accurate to say that Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016) created the scale by drawing some inspiration and concepts from the cited articles.

Reliability:

Across the several uses of the scales, the alphas ranged from .83 to .88 (Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon 2016, p. 693).

Validity:

The scale's validity was examined several different ways in the studies via EFAs, CFAs, and other methods. Evidence was provided of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities. The scale's AVEs across the studies ranged from .66 to .73 (Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon 2016, p. 693).

References:

Cupach, William R. and Christine L. Carson (2002), "Characteristics and Consequences of Interpersonal Complaints Associated with Perceived Face Threat," *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 19 (4), 443–462.

Fombelle, Paul W., Sterling A. Bone, and Katherine N. Lemon (2016), "Responding to the 98%: Face-Enhancing Strategies for Dealing with Rejected Customer Ideas," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (6), 685–706.

Zhang, Xin-An, Qing Cao, and Nicholas Grigoriou (2011), "Consciousness of Social Face: The Development and Validation of a Scale Measuring Desire to Gain Face versus Fear of Losing Face," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 151 (2), 129–149.

Scale Items:¹

1. The _____'s response to my idea showed disrespect towards me.
2. The _____'s response to my idea embarrassed me.
3. The _____'s response to my idea gave me less confidence.

1. The response format used with these items by Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016, p. 690) was merely described as “seven-point Likert scales.” The end points used were probably *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree*. A generic name for the focal entity should be placed in the blanks. For example, Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016, p. 690) used “bank.”

FAIRNESS

Four, seven-point, semantic differentials measure how honest and legitimate something is believed to be.

Origin:

Jung et al. (2017) used the scale in a survey with data gathered from 182 people in the U.S. recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk. The source of the scale was not stated but appears to have been created by the authors for the study. Participants in the study read a scenario in which they were to imagine that their bank had unexpectedly charged them a fee. Upon asking a representative for an explanation for the fee, they were told that the charges were consistent with the policies of the bank.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .93 (Jung et al. 2017, p. 491).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Jung et al. (2017).

Reference:

Jung, Kiju, Ellen Garbarino, Donnel A. Briley, and Jesse Wynhausen (2017), "Blue and Red Voices: Effects of Political Ideology on Consumers' Complaining and Disputing Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (3), 477–499.

Scale Items:¹

1. not at all fair / very fair
2. not at all trustworthy / very trustworthy
3. not at all honest / very honest
4. not at all legitimate / very legitimate

1. The instructions used with this scale were not described by Jung et al. (2017) except to indicate that, after reading the scenario, participants were asked to rate the fairness of the bank's policy regarding the fee that was charged.

FEMININITY

The degree to which a person describes a person as having traits stereotypically associated with females is measured in this scale with three, five-point unipolar items.

Origin:

Brough et al. (2016) used the scale in Study 2 with a sample of 194 students recruited from two universities in the United States. The authors created the scale as well as a companion measure (masculinity). Items for the scales were drawn from prior research and the authors' pretests.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .80 (Brough et al. 2016, p. 571).

Validity:

Using both EFA and CFA, the six traits used to measure femininity and masculinity (three items apiece) loaded as expected on two factors. Evidence of the discriminant validity came from the low interfactor correlation.

Comments:

This scale was not created to measure with which gender a person identifies. Instead, it was used to measure how one sees another person. How appropriate it would be to use this scale with regard to one's self or with respect to objects rather than people, is unknown. Further, since ideas about femininity change over time and around the world, caution is urged in assuming the external validity of the scale for a particular usage.

Reference:

Brough, Aaron R., James E. B. Wilkie, Jingjing Ma, Mathew S. Isaac, and David Gal (2016), "Is Eco-Friendly Unmanly? The Green-Feminine Stereotype and Its Effect on Sustainable Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (4), 567-582.

Scale Items:¹

Please indicate the extent to which you feel each word below describes ____.

1. sensitive
2. gentle
3. feminine

1. A name for or description of the person being described should be placed in the blank. The extreme anchors of the response scale used with these items were *not at all* (1) and *perfectly* (5).

FINANCIAL COMFORT

How a person feels (affectively) about his/her financial status is measured with four, nine-point semantic differentials.

Origin:

This measure of financial comfort was used in Study 8 by Parker, Lehmann, and Xie (2016). (They referred to the construct as *financial status*.) Analyses were based on data collected from 355 participants from Amazon Mechanical Turk. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

The alpha calculated for the scale was .98 (Parker, Lehmann, and Xie 2016, p. 126).

Validity:

Parker, Lehmann, and Xie (2016) did not address the validity of the scale. However, because the scale was successfully used in Study 8 to confirm the experimental manipulation was successful, it provides some evidence of the measure's predictive validity.

Reference:

Parker, Jeffrey R., Donald R. Lehmann, and Yi Xie (2016), "Decision Comfort," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (1), 113-133.

Scale Items:¹

1. uncomfortable / comfortable
2. stressed / at ease
3. upset / happy
4. bad / good

¹ The response scale had nine points (Parker, Lehmann, and Xie 2016, p. 126). Although the question and/or scale stem used with these items was not explicitly stated in the article, it is clear that participants were asked to "rate their feelings about their financial status" (p. 126).

FINANCIAL SUFFICIENCY (CHILDHOOD)

Three, seven-point items measure a person's belief regarding the degree to which the family had enough money to pay for food and housing when he/she was growing up.

Origin:

The scale was used by Mittal and Griskevicius (2016) in all the studies reported in their article (1A, 1B, 2, 3, and 4). The measure they called *childhood resources index* is the money subscale of the Family Unpredictability Scale by Ross and Hill (2000). Those authors provided evidence of the overall scale's reliability and validity. In particular, it was shown that the money subscale, shown below, was uncorrelated with social desirability bias.

Reliability:

In Study 1A by Mittal and Griskevicius (2016, p. 640), the scale's alpha was .76. (The alphas for the scale in the other studies were not reported.)

Validity:

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Mittal and Griskevicius (2016) beyond their belief it had already been "validated" in studies by Ross and Hill (2000) as well as Ross and McDuff (2008).

References:

Mittal, Chiraag and Vidas Griskevicius (2016), "Silver Spoons and Platinum Plans: How Childhood Environment Affects Adult Health Care Decisions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (4), 636-656.
Ross, Lisa T. and Elizabeth M. Hill (2000), "The Family Unpredictability Scale: Reliability and Validity," *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62 (2), 549-562.
Ross, Lisa Thomson and Jennifer A. McDuff (2008), "The Retrospective Family Unpredictability Scale: Reliability and Validity," *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 17 (1), 13-27.

Scale Items:¹

1. We were never sure how we would pay my bills from month to month. (r)
2. My family always had enough money for food and the rent or mortgage payment.
3. Some months we had plenty of money to spend; other months we were quite poor. (r)

1. The endpoints of the response scale used with these items by Mittal and Griskevicius (2016, p. 640) were *not at all* (1) and *extremely* (7).

FINANCIAL SUFFICIENCY (CURRENT)

A person's belief that he/she has the necessary financial resources to not only pay bills but also feel relatively wealthy is measured using three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale was called *current resources index* by Mittal and Griskevicius (2016) and was used in all the studies reported in their article (1A, 1B, 2, 3, and 4). The source of the scale was not stated by the authors but appears to have been used by one of them in several previous studies, e.g., Griskevicius et al. (2011).

Reliability:

In Study 1A by Mittal and Griskevicius (2016, p. 640), the scale's alpha was .90. (The alphas for the scale in the other studies were not reported.)

Validity:

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Mittal and Griskevicius (2016).

References:

Griskevicius, Vlasdas, Andrew W. Delton, Theresa E. Robertson, and Joshua M. Tybur (2011), "Environmental Contingency in Life History Strategies: The Influence of Mortality and Socioeconomic Status on Reproductive Timing," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100 (February), 241–254.

Mittal, Chiraag and Vlasdas Griskevicius (2016), "Silver Spoons and Platinum Plans: How Childhood Environment Affects Adult Health Care Decisions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (4), 636-656.

Scale Items:¹

1. I have enough money to buy things I want.
2. I don't need to worry too much about paying my bills.
3. I feel relatively wealthy these days.

1. The endpoints of the response scale used with these items by Mittal and Griskevicius (2016, p. 640) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

FINANCIAL WELLNESS

The scale employs eight, ten-point items to measure how stress-free and comfortable a person feels with respect to his/her financial condition.

Origin:

In an impressive set of studies, Dholakia et al. (2016) developed and tested a scale they called personal saving orientation (POS). In the process of doing that, the researchers compared the predictive value of the financial wellness scale in five studies to that of the POS.

The wellness scale was developed by Prawitz et al. (2006). Its full, formal name is InCharge Financial Distress/Financial Well-Being Scale. In a commendable series of steps, the authors began with a modified Delphi data collection process which produced 10 concepts that became the basis for the items used in the beta version of the scale. After gathering data from a sample of financially distressed consumers and members of the general population, the authors examined each item to determine if it met at least 11 of 12 criteria of psychometric quality in order to be included in the final version of the instrument. A unidimensional scale with eight items and an alpha of .956 was the result.

Reliability:

Despite the financial wellness measure being used in five studies, its reliability was only reported for Study 3 (n = 200 adults from a U.S. based marketing research firm). Alpha was .95.

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Dholakia et al. (2016).

References:

Dholakia, Utpal, Leona Tam, Sunyee Yoon, and Nancy Wong (2016), "The Ant and the Grasshopper: Understanding Personal Saving Orientation of Consumers," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (1), 134-155.

Prawitz, Aimee D., E. Thomas Garman, Benoit Sorhaindo, Barbara O'Neill, Jinhee Kim, and Patricia Drentea (2006), "Incharge Financial Distress/Financial Well-Being Scale: Development, Administration, and Score Interpretation," *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning*, 17 (1), 34-50.

Scale Items:¹

1. What do you feel is the level of your financial stress today?
overwhelming stress / no stress at all
2. Please indicate how satisfied you are with your present financial situation.
dissatisfied / satisfied

3. How do you feel about your current financial situation?
feel overwhelmed / feel comfortable
4. How often do you worry about being able to meet normal monthly living expenses?
worry all the time / never worry
5. How confident are you that you could find the money to pay for a financial emergency that costs about \$1000?
no confidence / high confidence
6. How often does this happen to you? You want to go out to eat, go to a movie or do something else but don't go because you can't afford to?
all the time / never
7. How frequently do you find yourself just getting by financially and living paycheck to paycheck?
all the time / never
8. How stressed do you feel about your personal finances in general?
overwhelming stress / no stress at all

1. A ten-point response scale with the extreme verbal anchors shown with each item above were used by Dholakia et al. (2016, web appendix). Higher scores indicated greater wellness and less stress.

FIT (BRAND WITH CHARITY)

Using three, seven-point uni-polar items, the scale measures how much a person believes one brand is closely related in some way to another brand. In particular, the scale and its corresponding stem (question) were developed for use when comparing the fit between a brand associated with a product and a brand name associated with a charity.

Origin:

Hagtvedt and Patrick (2016) used the scale in Study 2 ($n = 157$) and its pretest ($n = 31$). As for the scale's source, it was not identified.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .83 and .92 in the Study 2 pre-test and main study, respectively (Hagtvedt and Patrick 2016, p. 59).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Hagtvedt and Patrick (2016).

References:

Hagtvedt, Henrik (2017), personal correspondence.

Hagtvedt, Henrik and Vanessa M. Patrick (2016), "Gilt and Guilt: Should Luxury and Charity Partner at the Point of Sale?" *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (1), 56-64.

Scale Items:¹

In general, please consider the fit between _____ and _____. How would you describe these two brands?²

1. Similar
2. Related
3. Close fit

1. The verbal anchors used in the seven-point response scale for these items were *not at all* and *very* (Hagtvedt 2017; Hagtvedt and Patrick 2016, p. 59).

2. This is the form of the question that preceded the scale items (Hagtvedt 2017). The brand name of the product or company should be placed in the short (first) blank and the name of the charity should be placed in the long (second) blank.

FLUENCY OF THE AD

Six, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure how well organized and easy to understand an ad is which a person has seen.

Origin:

In Study 7, Yan (2016) used the scale with 323 participants from Amazon's MTurk. The scale was created by the author who borrowed many of the key words from previous measures of constructs referred to as *fluency* or *cognitive resource demands*, e.g., Lee and Aaker (2004).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .88 (Yan 2016, p. 313).

Validity:

Yan (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity.

Comments:

Although Yan (2016) used this scale with respect to an ad, the measure appears to be amenable for use with other stimuli such as a movie, a presentation, or a website. Of course, pretesting the scale for a different context is recommended in order to confirm the measure's psychometric quality.

References:

Lee, Angela Y. and Jennifer L. Aaker (2004), "Bringing the Frame into Focus: The Influence of Regulatory Fit on Processing Fluency and Persuasion," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86 (2), 205-218.

Yan, Dengfeng (2016), "Numbers Are Gendered: The Role of Numerical Precision," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (2), 303-316.

Scale Items:¹

1. This advertisement is very easy to understand.
2. This advertisement is very difficult to process. (r)
3. Viewing this advertisement gives me a sense of feeling right.
4. Information contained in this advertisement is congruent and coherent.
5. This advertisement is very organized.
6. Information contained in this advertisement is believable.

1. The response scale used by Yan (2016, web appendix) was anchored by *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

FLUENCY OF THE PACKAGE'S HEALTH-RELATED INFORMATION

The ease with which a consumer can determine the healthiness of a food product from information provided on its package is measured with four, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Newman, Howlett, and Burton (2016) used the scale in Study 1A with 207 participants recruited from MTurk. In creating the scale, the researchers borrowed phrases from measures by Fang, Singh, and Ahluwalia (2007) as well as Lee and Aaker (2004).

Reliability:

The alpha reported for the scale by Newman, Howlett, and Burton (2016, p. 755) was .94.

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Newman, Howlett, and Burton (2016).

References:

Fang, Xiang, Surendra Singh, and Rohini Ahluwalia (2007), "An Examination of Different Explanations for the Mere Exposure Effect," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34 (1), 97–103.

Lee, Angela Y. and Jennifer L. Aaker (2004), "Bringing the Frame into Focus: The Influence of Regulatory Fit on Processing Fluency and Persuasion," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86 (2), 205–218.

Newman, Christopher L., Elizabeth Howlett, and Scot Burton (2016), "Effects of Objective and Evaluative Front-of-Package Cues on Food Evaluation and Choice: The Moderating Influence of Comparative and Noncomparative Processing Contexts," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 749-766.

Scale Items:¹

1. Given the information on the package, it is easy to determine how healthy the product is.
2. Given the information on the package, it is clear whether the product is high or low in its level of nutritiousness.
3. I feel confident about whether this product is a healthy or unhealthy choice based on the information on the package.
4. It is easy to understand whether this product is a healthy or unhealthy choice given the information shown on the package.

1. The end points of the response scale used by Newman, Howlett, and Burton (2016, p. 755) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

FLUENCY OF THE PRODUCTS' HEALTH-RELATED INFORMATION

With four Likert-type statements, the scale measures how easy a consumer believes it was to compare the healthiness of some similar products by using the information available on their packages.

Origin:

Newman, Howlett, and Burton (2016) used the scale in Study 1B, Study 2, and Study 3, slightly modifying the measure in each case for the particular set of products used with participants. The source of the scale was not stated and appears to be original.

Reliability:

The alphas reported for the scale by Newman, Howlett, and Burton (2016, p. 756, 758, 761) were .98., .96, and .94, for Studies 1B, 2, and 3, respectively.

Validity:

As part of the analysis of Study 2 data, CFA was used to examine the discriminant and convergent validities of this scale and another measure. The findings supported claims for both types of validity.

Reference:

Newman, Christopher L., Elizabeth Howlett, and Scot Burton (2016), "Effects of Objective and Evaluative Front-of-Package Cues on Food Evaluation and Choice: The Moderating Influence of Comparative and Noncomparative Processing Contexts," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 749-766.

Scale Items:¹

1. Overall, given the information provided on the packages in the set of _____ products, it is easy to determine which ones are the more healthy options.
2. Based on the information on the packages in the set of _____ products, I know which brands are the healthy ones.
3. The information presented on the packages in the set of _____ products makes it easy for me to choose a healthy option.
4. For the set of _____ products available, I can easily tell which ones are more healthy and which ones are less healthy.

1. The end points of the response scale used by Newman, Howlett, and Burton (2016, p. 755) with these items were *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree*. Although the authors did not explicitly state that they used a seven-point scale, that was what they used with other scales described in the article. The name of the focal product category should be placed in the blanks, e.g., pizza, soup, cereal.

FLUENCY OF THE WRITTEN INFORMATION

Six, seven-point semantic differentials measure the ease with which some particular written information was read and processed.

Origin:

Hildebrand et al. (2017) used the scale in a post-test of Study 4 with 94 online participants. The source of the scale was not identified but phrases in the items have strong resemblance to those used to measure fluency and cognitive resource demands, e.g., White and Peloza (2009).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .91 (Hildebrand et al. 2017, p. 746).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Hildebrand et al. (2017).

References:

Hildebrand, Diogo, Yoshiko DeMotta, and Sankar Sen, and Ana Valenzuela (2017), "Consumer Responses to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Contribution Type," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (4), 738–758.

White, Katherine and John Peloza (2009), "Self-Benefit Versus Other-Benefit Marketing Appeals: Their Effectiveness in Generating Charitable Support," *Journal of Marketing*, 73 (4), 109-124.

Scale Items:¹

1. difficult to read / easy to read
2. unpleasant to read / pleasant to read
3. difficult to process / easy to process
4. unpleasant to process / pleasant to process
5. difficult to understand / easy to understand
6. unpleasant to understand / pleasant to understand

¹. The scale stem and/or instructions were not stated but apparently directed participants to indicate what they thought about the material they read.

FOOD HEALTHINESS EFFECTS

Three, seven-point semantic-differentials are used to measure a food's healthiness in terms of its effectiveness. To be clear, the emphasis in this particular measure is not on the nutritiousness of the food but rather how well it helps one to stay physically fit.

Origin:

Mai, Symmank, and Seeberg-Elverfeldt (2016) used the scale in Study 2 with 179 participants recruited from the eastern part of Germany. The scale was administered twice to participants, once when they were only able to see the product package and then later when they were able to look at the product itself (herb cream cheese) and taste it.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .77 and .84 for the first and second administrations, respectively (Mai, Symmank, and Seeberg-Elverfeldt 2016, p. 433).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Mai, Symmank, and Seeberg-Elverfeldt (2016).

Reference:

Mai, Robert, Claudia Symmank, and Berenike Seeberg-Elverfeldt (2016), "Light and Pale Colors in Food Packaging: When Does This Package Cue Signal Superior Healthiness or Inferior Tastiness?" *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 426-444.

Scale Items:¹

1. healthy / unhealthy
2. helps me to stay fit / does not help me to stay fit
3. helps me to stay slim / does not help me to stay slim

1. The instructions used with these items were not explicitly stated by Mai, Symmank, and Seeberg-Elverfeldt (2016). Apparently, participants were asked to evaluate properties of the product using these and other items.

FOOD HEALTHINESS EXPENSE

The degree to which a person believes there is a relationship between the healthiness of food and its cost such that healthier foods tend to be more expensive than unhealthy foods is measured with three, seven-point items.

Origin:

The scale was reported being used in a pilot study by Haws, Reczek, and Sample (2017, web appendix). Data were gathered from 267 people living in the U.S. and recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The source of the scale was not identified.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .93 (Haws, Reczek, and Sample 2017, web appendix, p. 2).

Validity:

Haws, Reczek, and Sample (2017) did not discuss the scale's validity.

Reference:

Haws, Kelly L., Rebecca Walker Reczek, and Kevin L. Sample (2017), "Healthy Diets Make Empty Wallets: The Healthy = Expensive Intuition," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (6), 992-1007.

Scale Items:¹

1. Eating a healthy diet costs more than eating an unhealthy diet.
2. Healthier foods are generally more expensive than unhealthier foods.
3. Unhealthy foods are often quite inexpensive compared to healthy foods.

1. The verbal anchors of the seven-point response scale were not stated by Haws, Reczek, and Sample (2017). However, it appears the scale was Likert-type which frequently has *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree* as end points.

FRIENDLINESS

The scale uses four, seven-point unipolar items to measure how caring and kind a person is considered to be.

Origin:

Bagchi and Ince (2016) created the scale for use in Study 3b with data gathered from 241 panelists. The participants were asked to imagine that they were thinking about investing in the stock market and read a report about a company ostensibly written by an investment analyst.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .94 (Bagchi and Ince 2016, p. 39).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Bagchi and Ince (2016).

References:

Bagchi, Rajesh (2017), personal correspondence.

Bagchi, Rajesh and Elise Chandon Ince (2016), "Is a 70% Forecast More Accurate Than a 30% Forecast? How Level of a Forecast Affects Inferences About Forecasts and Forecasters," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (1), 31-45.

Scale Items:¹

To what extent do you think the _____ is:²

1. caring
2. friendly
3. kind
4. warm

1. The scale stem and response anchors were provided by Bagchi (2017). The response scale was anchored by *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7).
2. The name or brief description of the person to be assessed should be placed in the blank.

FRIENDLINESS TOWARDS EMPLOYEES (SOCIAL NORMS)

Using a Likert-type response format, the scale measures the degree to which a person thinks that relevant others believe customers ought to be friendly to employees, especially to those at stores who provide service. Items for both a four-item and a two-item version are described.

Origin:

The scale was created by Albrecht et al. (2017, p. 832) in a multi-stage process which included item generation based on depth interviews and prior research, experts rating each item, refining items, and then pretesting items. The final four-item version of the scale was used in a pilot study as well as in Study 1. A two-item version was used in Study 2. The scale was referred to by the authors as a measure of "injunctive norms" (p. 829).

Reliability:

The alphas reported by Albrecht et al. (2017) for the scale were .87 (pilot study, p. 842), .80 (Study 1, p. 843), and .78 (Study 2, p. 844).

Validity:

Beyond evidence of content validity from the process used when experts rated the items, each of the studies provided support for discriminant validity with respect to some other measures of employee-related attitudes. The AVEs reported by Albrecht et al. (2017) for the scale were .65 (pilot study, p. 842), .52 (Study 1, p. 843), and .64 (Study 2, p. 844).

Reference:

Albrecht, Arne K., Gianfranco Walsh, Simon Brach, Dwayne D. Gremler, and Erica van Herpen (2017), "The Influence of Service Employees and Other Customers on Customer Unfriendliness: A Social Norms Perspective," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (6), 827-847.

Scale Items:¹

1. Most of my friends think that it is important to be friendly towards shop employees.
2. Many people who are important to me take the view that people should be friendly toward service employees.
3. Most people who are important to me think that people should always be friendly toward service employees even if it can be difficult at times.
4. Most of my friends think that it is important to always say "goodbye" to service employees in a friendly way.

1. The response scale used with the items in Study 2 had *completely disagree* (1) and a *completely agree* (7) as end-points (Albrecht et al. 2017, p. 836). The response scales used in the pilot as well as Study 1 were not described but are likely to have also been seven-point Likert-type scales. The short version of the scale used in Study 2 was composed of items #1 and #2.

GAMIFICATION EFFECTIVENESS

The degree to which a person believes that a game has effectively communicated information about a particular featured product is measured with three, seven-point semantic differentials.

Origin:

Müller-Stewens et al. (2017) used the scale as a manipulation check in Study 6 (n = 252) in which a demonstration about a product innovation was "gamified." Participants were recruited from an online panel. The source of the scale was not stated but appears to have been created by the authors for the study.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .92 (Müller-Stewens et al. 2017, p. 17).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Müller-Stewens et al. (2017). Despite that, some predictive validity was evident given that the scale was used as a manipulation check and showed the manipulation was successful.

Reference:

Müller-Stewens, Jessica, Tobias Schlager, Gerald Häubl, and Andreas Herrmann (2017), "Gamified Information Presentation and Consumer Adoption of Product Innovations," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (2), 8-24.

Scale Items:¹

1. The game was not integrated at all with the information / The game was very well integrated with the information
2. The game did not demonstrate the _____ / The game demonstrated the _____ very well
3. The game did not convey information about the _____ / The game conveyed information about the _____

1. The name of the product should be placed in the blanks.

GENDER IDENTITY

Using six items, this scale not only measures how strongly a person identifies with a particular gender but how important that identity is to his/her self-image.

Origin:

The scale was used in Study 4 ($n = 92$) by Batra and Ghoshal (2017) with data collected from 73 females at the Indian School of Business, Hyderabad. The authors adapted items from the Collective Self-Esteem instrument by Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) so that their measure was specific to one group (women).

Reliability:

The alpha of the scale was .84 (Batra and Ghoshal 2017, p. 931).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Batra and Ghoshal (2017).

Comments:

A close examination of the sentences listed below indicates that they are modifications of items drawn from three of the subscales of the Collective Self-Esteem instrument (Luhtanen and Crocker 1992). Specifically, four of the sentences are modifications of the items forming the Identity subscale. The fifth sentence is a modification of an item from the Private subscale. The sixth sentence is less clear due to heavy modification but seems to be from the Membership subscale. Since the items were taken from three different subscales and then adapted for reference to a gender, it is far from clear that the resulting scale is unidimensional. Examination of the measure's dimensionality should be conducted prior to its use in theory testing.

References:

- Batra, Rishtee K. and Tanuka Ghoshal (2017), "Fill Up Your Senses: A Theory of Self-Worth Restoration through High-Intensity Sensory Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (4), 916–938.
- Luhtanen, Riia and Jennifer Crocker (1992), "A Collective Self-Esteem Scale: Self-Evaluation of One's Social Identity," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18 (3), 302–318.

Scale Items:¹

1. Overall, being a _____ has a lot to do with how I feel about myself.
2. My gender is important to my sense of what kind of person I am.
3. In general, I am glad to be a _____.
4. In general, being a _____ is an important part of my self-image.
5. Being a _____ is an important reflection of who I am.

6. I participate in activities related to my gender.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Batra and Ghoshal (2017) with these items were not identified but were likely to have been Likert-type as were most of the other scales they used, e.g., *completely disagree* (1) and *completely agree* (7). The blanks should be filled with a term that specifies a particular gender, e.g., man, woman.

GLOBAL SELF-IDENTITY

With four Likert-type items, the scale measures a person's identification with people around the world as well as the desire to know what is happening to them.

Origin:

Lin and Wang (2016) used the scale in Study 2 with 228 students, apparently at a university in Taiwan. The language appears to have been Chinese.

Tu, Khare, and Zhang (2012) are the source of the scale. They abbreviated a scale that two of the authors had created previously (Zhang and Khare 2008, 2009) and slightly rephrased the items in the process. With multiple studies, the authors provided evidence of the scale's reliability (internal consistency, temporal stability) and validity (convergent, discriminant, predictive). A companion measure (local self-identity) was also refined in this series of studies and CFA showed that the two factors being measured were correlated yet separate.

Reliability:

When used by Lin and Wang (2016, p. 489), the scale's alpha was .82.

Validity:

Lin and Wang (2016) did not address the validity of the scale.

References:

Lin, Ying-Ching and Kai-Yu Wang (2016), "Local or Global Image? The Role of Consumers' Local – Global Identity in Code-Switched Ad Effectiveness Among Monolinguals," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (4), 482-497.

Tu, Lingjiang, Adwait Khare, Yinlong Zhang (2012), "A Short 8-Item Scale for Measuring Consumers' Local-Global Identity," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 29 (1), 35-42.

Zhang, Yinlong and Adwait Khare (2008), "Consumers' Local-Global Identity: Measurement," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, ed. Ann L. McGill and Sharon Shavitt, Duluth, MN: Association for Consumer Research, 43-44.

Zhang, Yinlong and Adwait Khare (2009), "The Impact of Accessible Identities on the Evaluation of Global versus Local Products," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (3), 524-537.

Scale Items:¹

1. My heart mostly belongs to the whole world.
2. I believe people should be made more aware of how connected we are to the rest of the world.
3. I identify that I am a global citizen.
4. I care about knowing global events.

1. Besides stating that the response format was a seven-point scale, Lin and Wang (2016) did not indicate the verbal anchors they employed. They may have been the Chinese equivalent of what Tu, Khare, and Zhang (2012, p. 36) used: *strongly disagree/strongly agree*.

GOAL REENGAGEMENT IN THE STORE

Using three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the extent to which a customer decides in a store to switch from accomplishing the intended goal to working on one or more other goals. The goals themselves are not defined in the items themselves. Further, the items do not specify whether the behavior is limited to a specific shopping trip or frequently occurs across stores and time.

Origin:

Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017) used the scale in Studies 2 with a usable sample of 285 consumers. The purpose of the scale in the shopping context appears to be to measure if a shopper has realized while in a store that a goal for the visit was not attainable at that time and a change was made to accomplish something else. As for the scale's source, the authors adapted three of the six items used by Wrosch et al. (2003, p. 1497) to measure goal reengagement.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .88 (Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann 2017, p. 738).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017).

Comments:

As can be noted below, the items themselves are rather general and ambiguous. It is up to the researcher to provide clarity to participants by providing instructions that help focus of attention on the relevant information.

References:

Albrecht, Carmen-Maria, Stefan Hattula, and Donald R. Lehmann (2017), "The Relationship Between Consumer Shopping Stress and Purchase Abandonment in Task-Oriented and Recreation-Oriented Consumers," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (5), 720-740.

Wrosch, Carsten, Michael F. Scheier, Gregory E. Miller, Richard Schulz, and Charles S. Carver (2003), "Adaptive Self-Regulation of Unattainable Goals: Goal Disengagement, Goal Reengagement, and Subjective Well-Being," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29 (12), 1494-1508.

Scale Items:¹

1. I think about other goals than the intended one to pursue in the store.
2. I seek other meaningful goals than the intended one in the store.
3. I start working on other goals in the store.

1. It appears the end-points of the response scale used by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017, p. 724) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

GRANDIOSITY OF ANOTHER PERSON

Seven, seven-point items are used in this scale to measure a person's enduring belief that he/she is superior to others and makes him/herself the center of attention.

Origin:

Packard, Gershoff, and Wooten (2016) used the scale in Studies 1 ($n = 127$), 2 ($n = 300$), and 3 ($n = 179$), with undergraduate students being the participants in each case. The IPIP-NEO 5 Modesty subscale by Costa and McCrae (1992) was cited as the source. However, that phrasing was modified by an uncited source to make the measure suitable for evaluating another person rather than self.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .93, .92, and .90 in Studies 1, 2, and 3, respectively (Packard, Gershoff, and Wooten 2016, pp. 30, 31, 34).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not addressed by Packard, Gershoff, and Wooten (2016). However, since the scale was used as a manipulation check in the studies and the manipulations were successful in each case, it provides some evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

Comments:

As presented in the article by Packard, Gershoff, and Wooten (2016), the scale items are not grammatically correct due to subject-verb disagreement. The items have been rephrased here to make them grammatically correct for native English speakers.

References:

Costa, Paul T. and McCrae Robert R. (1992), "Normal Personality Assessment in Clinical Practice: The NEO Personality Inventory," *Psychological Assessment*, 4 (1), 5–13.
Packard, Grant, Andrew D. Gershoff, and David B. Wooten (2016), "When Boastful Word of Mouth Helps versus Hurts Social Perceptions and Persuasion," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (1), 26–43.

Scale Items:¹

1. Believes he/she is better than others.
2. Thinks highly of him/herself.
3. Has a high opinion of him/herself.
4. Makes him/herself the center of attention.
5. Dislikes talking about him/herself. (r)
6. Considers him/herself an average person. (r)

7. Seldom toots his/her own horn. (r)

1. The response scale used by Packard, Gershoff, and Wooten (2016, p. 30) with these items had the following endpoints: *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7).

GREED OF THE ORGANIZATION

The scale measures how much an organization is believed to be selfish and motivated by its own self-interest. Two versions of the scale are presented and vary in terms of whether one organization is being described or if two organizations are being compared. Most of the studies used the same eight items.

Origin:

Lee, Bolton, and Winterich (2017) used the scale in each of the seven main studies reported in the article. For the majority of the studies, the measure was phrased such that participants were instructed to respond with respect to a particular organization. In two of the studies (3 and 6B), a slightly different version of the scale was used because participants were to indicate which of two organizations was considered the greediest. The authors referred to that as the relative version of the scale.

As for the scale's source, it appears to have been created by the authors for this set of studies, drawing upon some literature for concepts and terms (Crossley 2009; Grégoire, Laufer, and Tripp 2010; Seuntjens et al. 2015).

Reliability:

The primary version of the scale had alphas ranging from .77 to .91 in the five studies in which it was used. The alphas for the relative version of the scale were .89 (Study 3) and .83 (Study 6B).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Lee, Bolton, and Winterich (2017).

References:

- Crossley, Craig D. (2009), "Emotional and Behavioral Reactions to Social Undermining: A Closer Look at Perceived Offender Motives," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108 (1), 14–24.
- Gregoire, Yany, Daniel Laufer, and Thomas M. Tripp (2010), "A Comprehensive Model of Customer Direct and Indirect Revenge: Understanding the Effects of Perceived Greed and Customer Power," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 38 (6), 738–758.
- Lee, Saerom, Lisa E. Bolton, and Karen Page Winterich (2017), "To Profit or Not to Profit? The Role of Greed Perceptions in Consumer Support for Social Ventures," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (4), 853–876.
- Seuntjens, Terri G., Marcel Zeelenberg, Niels van de Ven, and Seger M. Breugelmans (2015), "Dispositional Greed," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 108 (6), 917–933.

Scale Items:¹

This organization is. . .

1. greedy
2. acquisitive²
3. selfish
4. selfless (r)
5. motivated by its own interest
6. motivated by good intentions (r)
7. motivated by a concern for others (r)
8. motivated to improve society (r)

1. This version of the scale stem was used in Studies 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6A. In those studies, the extreme anchors of the response scale were *Not at all* (1) and *Very much* (7). While the scale stem and directions were not reported for the relative version of the scale used in Studies 3 and 6B, the extreme verbal anchors were *Organization A is more . . .* (1) and *Organization B is more. . .* (7).

2. This item was not used in Studies 5 and 6A. The reason was not stated but may have been dropped because the term was not widely understood by participants.

GUILT FROM EATING THE MEAL (EXPECTED)

How much a person anticipates that if a particular meal is eaten then he/she would feel bad and sorry about it afterwards. A three- and a four-item version are discussed. Each item has its own unique semantic differential and a 101-point sliding scale.

Origin:

Hagen, Krishna, and McFerran (2017) used the scale in Study 3 (n = 160 people recruited from Amazon's MTurk) and Study 4 (n = 179 undergraduates at a U.S. university). The source of the scale was not stated. The four-item version was used in both studies but, as explained below, a three-item version was discussed as well in Study 4.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .95, .60, and .66 in Study 3 (four item), Study 4 (four item), and Study 4 (3 item), respectively (Hagen, Krishna, and McFerran 2017, pp. 596, 597).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Hagen, Krishna, and McFerran (2017).

Comments:

The difference between the alphas reported for the four-item version of the scale in Studies 3 and 4 is concerning. In a footnote, the authors were aware of the very weak alpha in Study 4 and said item #2 (below) "appears to fit less well with the other items" (Hagen, Krishna, and McFerran 2017, p. 597). Why that would be true in Study 4 and not Study 3 is not clear. Since the internal consistency of the three-item version of the scale was also poor in Study 4, it may indicate that something else was remiss about the scale, the sample, or something else. Care should be taken in using the scale until this matter is diagnosed and the scale re-tested.

Reference:

Hagen, Linda, Aradhna Krishna, and Brent McFerran (2017), "Rejecting Responsibility: Low Physical Involvement in Obtaining Food Promotes Unhealthy Eating," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (4), 589-604.

Scale Items:¹

1. How would you feel about yourself after eating this meal? (r)
bad / very good
2. Would you feel justified to eat this meal? (r)
not at all justified / completely justified

3. Would you feel guilty after eating this meal?
not at all guilty / extremely guilty
4. Would you feel shameful after eating this meal?
not at all shameful / extremely shameful

1. The response format used by Hagen, Krishna, and McFerran (2017, web appendix pp. 3, 4) with these items was a sliding scale ranging from 0 to 100. The three-item version of the scale used in Study 4 does not include #2.

HEALTH CONDITION SEVERITY

The degree to which a person believes that a particular health issue is serious and important is measured with three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Murdock and Rajagopal (2017) used the scale in each of the five studies reported in their article. The source of the scale was not identified. The authors examined the relationship between the temporal proximity of a specific health problem and the perceived severity of the problem. Across the studies, several different health problems were examined with the scale: gingivitis, obesity, mouth cancer, skin cancer, and skin damage.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale as used in the five studies by Murdock and Rajagopal (2017) were very high, ranging from .90 to .95.

Validity:

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Murdock and Rajagopal (2017).

Comments:

Not only does the scale appear to be amenable for use when studying a wide variety of health problems but it also seems like it could be used when studying non-health related events as well, e.g., having a kitchen fire, getting a divorce, air pollution. However, the greater the difference in context, the greater the need to carefully test the scale's psychometric quality before the measure is used in theory testing.

Reference:

Murdock, Mitchel R. and Priyali Rajagopal (2017), "The Sting of Social: How Emphasizing Social Consequences in Warning Messages Influences Perceptions of Risk," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (2), 83-98.

Scale Items:¹

1. I believe that _____ is severe.
2. I believe that _____ is serious.
3. I believe that _____ is significant.

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). The name of the problem should be placed in the blanks, e.g., skin cancer.

HEALTH TREATMENT EFFECTIVENESS

The efficacy and likelihood that a “treatment” will cure a “condition” are measured with five, nine-point questions. The particular treatment and condition are specified in the items.

Origin:

Cheng, Mukhopadhyay, and Schrift (2017) used the scale in Study 1 with data gathered from a final group of 152 people recruited from Amazon MTurk in the United States. The source of the scale was not stated but it appears to have been created by the authors for this study.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .92 (Cheng, Mukhopadhyay, and Schrift 2017, p. 639).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Cheng, Mukhopadhyay, and Schrift (2017).

Comments:

Although the scale was used by Cheng, Mukhopadhyay, and Schrift (2017) with respect to a cough syrup, the items may be amenable for use with a wide variety of “treatments” that have the potential to cure a health condition.

Reference:

Cheng, Yimin, Anirban Mukhopadhyay, and Rom Y. Schrift (2017), "Do Costly Options Lead to Better Outcomes? How the Protestant Work Ethic Influences the Cost–Benefit Heuristic in Goal Pursuit," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (4), 636-649.

Scale Items:¹

1. How effective do you think _____ is in treating _____?
2. How powerful do you think _____ is in treating _____?
3. How useful do you think _____ is in treating _____?

If you take _____ to treat your _____, how likely do you think it will cure you . . .

4. quickly?
5. thoroughly?

1. The anchors of the response scale used by Cheng, Mukhopadhyay, and Schrift (2017, p. 639) for items #1 to #3 were *not at all* (1) and *very* (9). The anchors were *very unlikely* (1) and *very likely* (9) for items #4 and #5. The first blank of each item should be filled with the name of the

treatment, for example, the name of a pharmaceutical product. The name or phrase of the illness or condition should be stated in the second blank, for example, a cough.

HOSTILITY TOWARD THE BRAND

Five, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a person expresses the desire to engage in behaviors that would damage a brand as well as stores and employees that sell the product.

Origin:

Kähr et al. (2016) created the scale for use in what they called Preliminary Study 2. Data were gathered from 289 participants recruited from several European countries using the Clickworker platform.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .86 (Kähr et al. 2016, p. 30).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Kähr et al. (2016).

References:

Kähr, Andrea (2018), personal correspondence.

Kähr, Andrea, Bettina Nyffenegger, Harley Krohmer, and Wayne D. Hoyer (2016), "When Hostile Consumers Wreak Havoc on Your Brand: The Phenomenon of Consumer Brand Sabotage," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (3), 25-41.

Scale Items:¹

1. I would like to punish the brand (and its employees).
2. I feel the urge to of damage a store or building of the brand.
3. I have the urge to attack the brand (and its employees).
4. I have the urge to insult the brand (and its employees).
5. I feel the urge to say something nasty to the brand (and its employees).

1. The scale items were provided by Kähr (2018). The labels for the end-points of the seven-point response scale were *I completely disagree* (1) and *I completely agree* (7).

HOUSE FIRE RISK

The scale uses three, seven-point Likert-type items to measure a person's belief that everyone could experience a house fire and, if it occurs, smoke detectors can reduce the damage.

Origin:

Hamby and Brinberg (2016) created the scale and used it in Study 2 with 149 U.S.-based Mechanical Turk participants. The measure was completed after participants read a story about an individual who experienced a house fire.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .81 (Hamby and Brinberg 2016, p. 503).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Hamby and Brinberg (2016).

Comments:

Despite the scale's acceptable level of internal consistency based on the alpha coefficient, there is some concern about the scale's unidimensionality. Note how there appear to be two factors represented by the items, consistent with the dual-component theory of risk perception (e.g., Bauer 1960; Cox 1967). Items #1 and #3 (below) appear to measure the uncertainly component of perceived risk while item #2 seems to measure the consequences component. Examination of the scale's unidimensionality is recommended before the measure is used further in theory testing.

References:

Bauer, Raymond A. (1960), "Consumer Behavior as Risk Taking," in *Proceedings of the 43rd Conference of the American Marketing Association*, R. S. Hancock, ed. Chicago: American Marketing Association, 389-398.

Cox, Donald F. ed. (1967), *Risk Taking and Information Handling in Consumer Behavior*, Boston, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

Hamby, Anne and David Brinberg (2016), "Happily Ever After: How Ending Valence Influences Narrative Persuasion in Cautionary Stories," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (4), 498-508.

Scale Items:¹

1. Fires can happen when one least expects them.
2. Owning a working smoke detector can significantly reduce the damage caused by a fire.
3. Everyone is at risk for experiencing a house fire.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Hamby and Brinberg (2016, p. 501) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

HUMAN CAPITAL

Three, seven-point Likert-type items measure the degree to which a person is viewed as competent and ambitious.

Origin:

The scale was used in several studies reported by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017) in the main body of their article as well as in the web appendix. The authors appear to have developed the scale by drawing ideas from the literature on the topic of human capital. While the phrase itself was popularized at least as early as the book by Becker (1964), concepts similar to it can be found in the writings of Adam Smith and Karl Marx. The basic idea as it relates to this scale is that some people have attributes that are valued by others.

Reliability:

In the many uses of the scale by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017), the alphas ranged from .80 (Study 4B replication) to .92 (Study 4A).

Validity:

Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017) conducted tests of discriminant validity in several of the studies and each time they found support for this scale with respect to other measures of constructs related to human capital. For the studies in which AVE was reported, the value ranged from .724 (Study 1B) to .840 (Study 4B).

Comments:

The scale was used by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017) to measure one person's attitude about another person rather than assessing one's own human capital. While it seems likely that the scale is amenable for self-assessment, further testing is suggested to confirm the adapted scale's psychometric quality.

References:

Becker, Gary S. (1964), *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*, New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bellezza, Silvia, Neeru Paharia, and Anat Keinan (2017), "Conspicuous Consumption of Time: When Busyness and Lack of Leisure Time Become a Status Symbol," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (1), 118-138.

Scale Items:¹

1. _____ is competent.
2. _____ is ambitious.
3. _____ wants to move up in the world.

1. The name of the person being assessed should be placed in the blanks. The end-points of the response scale used by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017, p. 124) with these items were *Strongly disagree* (1) and *Strongly agree* (7).

HUNGER SATIATION EXPECTATION

The belief that a particular portion of food is sufficient for satisfying one's appetite in a particular context or for part of a meal is measured with three, nine-point items.

Origin:

The scale appears to have been used by Cornil and Chandon (2016, p. 853) only in Study 3. Analyses were based on data collected from 100 people recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The portion size and type of food were communicated to participants via a photograph. The source of the scales was not stated. It seems to have been created by the authors.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .92 (Cornil and Chandon 2016, p. 853).

Validity:

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by the authors.

Comments:

Although the scale items referred to dessert in the study by Cornil and Chandon (2016, p. 853), it appears that other occasions or parts of a meal could be substituted, e.g., lunch, snack, watching a game.

Reference:

Cornil, Yann and Pierre Chandon (2016), "Pleasure as a Substitute for Size: How Multisensory Imagery Can Make People Happier with Smaller Food Portions," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (5), 847-864.

Scale Items:¹

1. This portion would be just right for me to feel comfortably full for _____.
2. This portion would be just right for me to be satiated for _____.
3. This portion would be just right to satisfy my appetite for _____.

1. The blanks should be filled with the name for the part of the meal or the occasion. The end points of the response scale were *not at all* (1) and *absolutely* (9). The instructions used with these items were not given explicitly but were described by Cornil and Chandon (2016, p. 853) as follows: "We asked them to rate how much they agreed that each portion was 'just right' in terms of hunger satiation (i.e., to choose a higher rating if the size was just right and a lower rating if it was too small or too large)."

IDENTIFICATION WITH THE ORGANIZATION (AFFECTIVE)

With four, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a person has an affective connection with a particular organization that is reflected in expressions of positive emotions.

Origin:

The scale was used by Wolter and Cronin (2016) in a study with data collected from 628 participants recruited from Amazon.com's MTurk who represented a broad range of demographics. The authors referred to the construct measured by the scale as Customer-Company Identification (Affective). This scale and a companion scale measuring cognitive identification were strongly based on measures developed by Johnson, Morgeson, and Hekman (2012). In turn, those authors drew items and concepts from several measures of identification in the literature. Unlike previous scales, however, the ones developed by Johnson, Morgeson, and Hekman (2012) were deliberately created to distinguish between the cognitive and affective dimensions of identification.

Reliability:

Wolter and Cronin (2016, p. 408) reported the scale's composite reliability to be .94.

Validity:

Using CFA, Wolter and Cronin (2016) found their measurement model adequately fit the data. Further, two different tests of discriminant validity were used to provide evidence that the scales measuring the cognitive and the affective components of company identification were distinct. The AVE of affective identification was .79.

References:

Johnson, Michael D., Frederick P. Morgeson, and David R. Hekman (2012), "Cognitive and Affective Identification: Exploring the Links Between Different Forms of Social Identification and Personality with Work Attitudes and Behavior," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33 (8), 1142–1167.

Wolter, Jeremy S. (2017), personal correspondence.

Wolter, Jeremy S. and J. Joseph Cronin Jr. (2016), "Re-Conceptualizing Cognitive and Affective Customer-Company Identification: The Role of Self-Motives and Different Customer-Based Outcomes," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (3), 397-413.

Scale Items:¹

1. The things that _____ stands for makes me feel good to be connected with it.
2. Generally, being associated with _____ gives me a sense of pride.
3. Overall, I feel good when people associate me with _____.
4. I feel happy to be a customer of _____.²

1. The name of the focal organization should be placed in the blanks. Wolter and Cronin (2016, p. 405) explicitly stated that the response scale had seven points and Wolter (2017) indicated that the end-points were *strongly disagree* / *strongly agree*.
2. If the organization is not a business then the word "customer" should be replaced with something more appropriate, e.g., member, fan, supporter.

IDENTIFICATION WITH THE ORGANIZATION (COGNITIVE)

The scale contains four, seven-point Likert-type items that measure a person's use of self-categorization and conceptual overlap to consciously link his/her identity with the identity of a particular organization.

Origin:

The scale was used by Wolter and Cronin (2016) in a study with data collected from 628 participants recruited from Amazon.com's MTurk who represented a broad range of demographics. The authors referred to the construct measured by the scale as Customer-Company Identification (Cognitive). This scale and a companion scale measuring affective identification were strongly based on measures developed by Johnson, Morgeson, and Hekman (2012). In turn, those authors drew items and concepts from several measures of identification in the literature. Unlike previous scales, however, the ones developed by Johnson, Morgeson, and Hekman (2012) were deliberately created to distinguish between the cognitive and affective dimensions of identification.

Reliability:

Wolter and Cronin (2016, p. 408) reported the scale's composite reliability to be .94.

Validity:

Using CFA, Wolter and Cronin (2016) found their measurement model adequately fit the data. Further, two different tests of discriminant validity were used to provide evidence that the scales measuring the cognitive and the affective components of company identification were distinct. The AVE of cognitive identification was .79.

References:

Johnson, Michael D., Frederick P. Morgeson, and David R. Hekman (2012), "Cognitive and Affective Identification: Exploring the Links Between Different Forms of Social Identification and Personality with Work Attitudes and Behavior," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33 (8), 1142–1167.

Wolter, Jeremy S. (2017), personal correspondence.

Wolter, Jeremy S. and J. Joseph Cronin Jr. (2016), "Re-Conceptualizing Cognitive and Affective Customer-Company Identification: The Role of Self-Motives and Different Customer-Based Outcomes," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (3), 397-413.

Scale Items:¹

1. My identity is based in part on my relationship with ____.
2. Being associated with ____ helps me express my identity.
3. ____ is part of my sense of who I am.
4. My sense of self overlaps with the identity of ____.

1. The name of the focal organization should be placed in the blanks. Wolter and Cronin (2016, p. 405) explicitly stated that the response scale had seven points and Wolter (2017) indicated that the end-points were *strongly disagree* / *strongly agree*.

IMPLICIT BODY THEORY

The scale has eight, seven-point Likert-type items that are intended to measure a person's belief in either the stability of body type (entity theory) or their ability to change basic body characteristics (incremental theory). To be clear, beliefs about the nature of human bodies in general are measured by this scale rather than what people think about a particular person's body.

Origin:

The scale was developed by Levy, Stroessner, and Dweck (1998) with a focus on personality traits and adapted by Cinelli and Yang (2016) for measuring lay "theories" that people have about body types. The latter used the scale in Study 1 (n = 91), a post-test of Study 1 (n = 49), and Study 2 (n = 236). Participants in each case were women recruited from Amazon's MTurk who were determined to be overweight.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .88 and .89 in Studies 1 and 2, respectively, by Cinelli and Yang (2016). (The alpha for the scale in the small post-test was not reported.)

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Cinelli and Yang (2016).

Comments:

While the internal consistency of the scale is high, the unidimensionality is a concern given that four items are meant to measure entity theory (#1-#4) and four are supposed to measure incremental theory (#5-#8). These eight items may be highly correlated yet not measure exactly the same thing. Further research is needed to ensure that the scale is unidimensional and has acceptable validity.

References:

Cinelli, Melissa D. and Lifeng Yang (2016), "The Role of Implicit Theories in Evaluations of 'Plus-Size' Advertising," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (4), 472-481.
Levy, Sheri R., Steven J. Stroessner, and Carol S. Dweck (1998), "Stereotype Formation and Endorsement: The Role of Implicit Theories," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74 (6), 1421-1436.

Scale Items:¹

1. Everyone has a certain kind of body, and there is not much they can really do to change that.
2. The kind of body someone has is something basic about them, and it can't be changed very much.
3. People can do things differently, but their body type can't really be changed.

4. As much as I hate to admit it, you can't teach an old dog new tricks. People can't really change their bodies.
5. People can change even their most basic physical qualities. (r)
6. Everyone, no matter who they are, can significantly change their physical characteristics. (r)
7. People can substantially change the type of body they have. (r)
8. No matter what kind of person someone is, they can always change very much. (r)

1. Besides indicating that the format of the response scale used with these items was seven-point Likert-type, Cinelli and Yang (2016) did not describe the verbal anchors of the end points. The extreme verbal anchors were likely to have been the typical *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree*.

INFORMATION SHARING BENEFITS

The extent to which a person believes there are benefits to a particular company having and using his/her personal data is measured with four, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017) used the scale with 202 participants recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk for an experiment (Study 3) having to do with data privacy. The authors referred to the construct as "value." To create the scale, the authors borrowed some concepts and terms from a measure by Chellappa and Sin (2005).

Reliability:

In Study 3, the construct reliability was .94 (Martin, Borah, and Palmatier 2017, p. 54).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017). They did, however, indicate that analysis of Study 3 data indicated the AVE for the benefits scale was .80 (p. 54).

References:

Chellappa, Ramnath K., and Raymond G. Sin (2005), "Personalization Versus Privacy: An Empirical Examination of the Online Consumer's Dilemma," *Information Technology and Management*, 6 (2), 181-202.

Martin, Kelly D., Abhishek Borah, and Robert W. Palmatier (2017), "Data Privacy: Effects on Customer and Firm Performance," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (1), 36-58.

Scale Items:¹

1. I receive value from the ways this company uses my customer data.
2. I save money (or can use free services) by providing my information.
3. I value how my information is used to customize my experience.
4. This company saves me time by using my personal information.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017, p. 55) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) *strongly agree* (7).

INFORMATION SHARING MOTIVATION (PROTECT OTHERS)

The scale has three, seven-point items that measure the degree to which a person has shared information with another person in order to help and prepare him/her for a particular “experience.”

Origin:

Dubois, Bonezzi, and Angelis (2016) used the scale in Study 2 with data from 240 participants. The setting of the experiment was a communication task in which some participants were asked to share information in writing with other participants about their recent experiences with a restaurant.

The authors said the scale items were adapted from work by Hennig-Thurau et al. (2004). While there is a construct in that study that is the same or similar to the one being measured here, the items are not the same. Given that, it may be more precise to say that Dubois, Bonezzi, and Angelis (2016) created the scale based on inspiration from work by Hennig-Thurau et al. (2004).

Reliability:

The scale’s alpha was .89 (Dubois, Bonezzi, and Angelis 2016, p. 716).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Dubois, Bonezzi, and Angelis (2016).

References:

Dubois, David, Andrea Bonezzi, and Matteo De Angelis (2016), "Sharing with Friends Versus Strangers: How Interpersonal Closeness Influences Word-of-Mouth Valence," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (5), 712-727.

Hennig-Thurau, Thorsten, Kevin P. Gwinner, Gianfranco Walsh, and Dwayne D. Gremler (2004), "Electronic Word-of-Mouth via Consumer-Opinion Platform: What Motivates Consumers to Articulate Themselves on the Internet?" *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18 (1), 38-52.

Scale Items:¹

I shared information about the _____ . . .

1. because I wanted to help the message recipient.
2. primarily to protect the message recipient.
3. with the intent to fully inform the message recipient so s/he is best prepared for the experience.

1. The blank should be filled with a name for the object being talked about, e.g., product, company, idea. The response scale used with these items was not described. A Likert-type scale appears to be appropriate, with end-points such as the typical *strongly disagree/strongly agree*.

INFORMATION SHARING MOTIVATION (SELF-ENHANCEMENT)

With three, seven-point items, the scale measures the degree to which a person shared information with another person in order to improve that person's attitude about him/herself.

Origin:

Dubois, Bonezzi, and Angelis (2016) used the scale in Study 2 with data from 240 participants. The setting of the experiment was a communication task in which some participants were asked to share information in writing with other participants about their recent experiences with a restaurant.

The authors said the scale items were adapted from work by Hennig-Thurau et al. (2004). While there is a construct in that study that has some similarity to the one being reviewed here, the items are not the same. Given that, it may be more precise to say that Dubois, Bonezzi, and Angelis (2016) created the scale based on inspiration from the work of Hennig-Thurau et al. (2004).

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .91 (Dubois, Bonezzi, and Angelis 2016, p. 716).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Dubois, Bonezzi, and Angelis (2016).

References:

Dubois, David, Andrea Bonezzi, and Matteo De Angelis (2016), "Sharing with Friends Versus Strangers: How Interpersonal Closeness Influences Word-of-Mouth Valence," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (5), 712-727.

Hennig-Thurau, Thorsten, Kevin P. Gwinner, Gianfranco Walsh, and Dwayne D. Gremler (2004), "Electronic Word-of-Mouth via Consumer-Opinion Platform: What Motivates Consumers to Articulate Themselves on the Internet?" *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18 (1), 38-52.

Scale Items:¹

I shared information about the _____ . . .

1. so that the message recipient would like me.
2. to create a good impression about myself.
3. thinking it will have positive consequences on the message recipient's attitude towards me.

1. The blank should be filled with a name for the object being talked about, e.g., product, company, idea. The response scale used with these items was not described. A Likert-type scale appears to be appropriate, with end-points such as the typical *strongly disagree/strongly agree*.

INNOVATIVENESS (PACKAGING)

With four, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a person believes that the packaging for a particular product is new and unique.

Origin:

Sundar and Noseworthy (2016) used the scale in the Study 1 pretest, the Study 3 pretest, and two Study 4 pretests. The authors created the scale by drawing ideas from scales by Ali, Krapfel, and LaBahn (1995) as well as Calantone, Chan, and Cui (2006) that were used to measure the innovativeness of products.

Reliability:

Alphas for the scale ranged from .84 to .92 in the pretests conducted by Sundar and Noseworthy (2016, pp. 49, 53, 56).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Sundar and Noseworthy (2016).

References:

Ali, Abdul, Robert Krapfel, and Douglas LaBahn (1995), "Product Innovativeness and Entry Strategy: Impact on Cycle Time and Break-Even Time," *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 12 (1), 54–69.

Calantone, Roger J., Kwong Chan, and Anna S. Cui (2006), "Decomposing Product Innovativeness and Its Effects on New Product Success," *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 23 (5), 408–421.

Sundar, Aparna and Theodore J. Noseworthy (2016), "Too Exciting to Fail, Too Sincere to Succeed: The Effects of Brand Personality on Sensory Disconfirmation," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (1), 44–67.

Scale Items:¹

1. The _____ packaging is highly innovative.
2. Relative to other brands in this product category, this _____ packaging is very innovative.
3. The _____ packaging I reviewed is unique to its users.
4. The technology adopted in this _____ package is new and cutting edge.

1. The extreme anchors used with these items by Sundar and Noseworthy (2016) were *Strongly disagree* (1) and *Strongly agree* (7). The name of the focal product category should be placed in the blanks, e.g., coffee.

INSPIRATION FELT (STATE)

How much a person experienced something that inspired him/her to do something is measured with four, seven-point items. As phrased, this scale is general and could be applied in a wide variety of contexts where the focus is on a temporary state a person has experienced rather than an enduring trait.

Origin:

Böttger et al. (2017) used the scale in Studies 3a and 4. The measure was developed and validated in a thoughtful series of studies by Thrash & Elliot (2003, 2004). They referred to it as the Intensity subscale of the Inspiration Scale while Böttger et al. called it General Inspiration State (2017, web appendix, p. 9).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .98 in Study 3a as well as Study 4 by Böttger et al. (2017, web appendix, pp. 11, 13).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not explicitly examined and discussed by Böttger et al. (2017) but was used to help validate two scales of their own intended to measure two theorized components of inspiration. Indeed, the two component measures had high correlations with the general inspiration scale (items shown below) and that provided some evidence of convergent validity. Further, since the items in the scale loaded high on the same factor in Studies 3a and 4, it supports a claim of unidimensionality. Finally, the AVEs for the scale were .93 and .91 in Studies 3a and 4 which also provide some evidence of convergent validity.

References:

- Böttger, Tim, Thomas Rudolph, Heiner Evanschitzky, and Thilo Pfrang (2017), "Customer Inspiration: Conceptualization, Scale Development, and Validation," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (6), 116-131.
- Thrash, Todd M. and Andrew J. Elliot (2003), "Inspiration as a Psychological Construct," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84 (4), 871-889.
- Thrash, Todd M., and Andrew J. Elliot (2004), "Inspiration: Core Characteristics, Component Processes, Antecedents, and Function," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87 (6), 957-973.

Scale Items:¹

1. I experienced inspiration.
2. Something I encountered or experienced inspired me.
3. I was inspired to do something.
4. I felt inspired.

1. Böttger et al. (2017, web appendix, p. 11) stated that all of the response scales used in the study had seven-points. The extreme verbal anchors of this scale were not described. They might have been the typical Likert-type, e.g., *strongly disagree* / *strongly agree*.

INTERACTION ORIENTATION OF THE BRAND

With three items, this scale measures a consumer's belief that a brand expresses interest in being part of one's life.

Origin:

Puzakova and Kwak (2017) used the scale as a manipulation check in their Study 1 pretest as well as in Studies 2, 3, and 4. The source of the scale was not stated but appears to have been created by the authors for use in these studies.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale ranged from .85 to .96 (Puzakova and Kwak 2017, pp. 104, 105, 107, 110).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Puzakova and Kwak (2017). However, since the scale was used in the studies as a manipulation check and confirmed the manipulations, it provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

Reference:

Puzakova, Marina and Hyokjin Kwak (2017), "Should Anthropomorphized Brands Engage Customers? The Impact of Social Crowding on Brand Preferences," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (6), 99-115.

Scale Items:¹

1. It seems almost as if _____ wants to interact with me.
2. It seems almost as if _____ wants to be part of my everyday activities.
3. It seems almost as if _____ expresses interest in doing things together.

1. The name of the brand should be stated in the blanks. The response format used by Puzakova and Kwak (2017) with these items was not stated. However, based on what the authors did with several other measures, it seems likely this scale had seven points and Likert-type extreme anchors (strongly disagree / strongly agree).

INTERDEPENDENT IDEATION STYLE

The scale uses seven, five-point items to measure the willingness and tendency of a member of a customer ideation group to create product ideas by integrating and combining his/her own thoughts with those of others in the group.

Origin:

Stephen, Zubcsek, and Goldenberg (2016) used the scale in Study 4 with 70 people recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk. The source of the scale was not stated but appears to be the authors. The purpose of the study was to examine if product idea redundancy among a group of consumers affects the innovativeness of individuals' ideation.

Reliability:

The alpha of the scale was .95 (Stephen, Zubcsek, and Goldenberg 2016, p. 274).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Stephen, Zubcsek, and Goldenberg (2016).

Reference:

Stephen, Andrew T., Peter Pal Zubcsek, and Jacob Goldenberg (2016), "Lower Connectivity Is Better: The Effects of Network Structure on Redundancy of Ideas and Customer Innovativeness in Interdependent Ideation Tasks," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (2), 263-279.

Scale Items:¹

1. I tried to see connections between group members' and my ideas.
2. I looked for "common ground" between group members' and my ideas.
3. My ideas came from combining concepts that came up in others' ideas.
4. I linked concepts that came up in others' ideas to form new ideas.
5. I integrated or combined concepts and ideas from previous rounds (mine and others').
6. I built my ideas by combining some aspects of group members' ideas with my previous ideas.
7. Creating my ideas involved blending parts of group members' previous ideas and my previous ideas.

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale used by Stephen, Zubcsek, and Goldenberg (2016) with these statements were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (5).

INTERESTINGNESS OF THE AD

With three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures not only the degree to which a person considers a particular advertisement to be interesting but that he/she was involved in it.

Origin:

Chen, Yang, and Smith (2016) used the scale in their main study. Data were gathered from 283 students attending a major midwestern U.S. university. The authors were not clear about the scale's source. Although they cited Burke and Srull (1988), the latter only used a single item measure of ad interest.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .95 (Chen, Yang, and Smith 2016, p. 341).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Chen, Yang, and Smith (2016).

References:

Burke Raymond R. and Thomas K. Srull (1988), "Competitive Interference and Consumer Memory for Advertising," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15 (1), 55-68.

Chen, Jiemiao, Xiaojing Yang, and Robert E. Smith (2016), "The Effects of Creativity on Advertising Wear-in and Wear-out," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (3), 334-349.

Scale Items:¹

1. I was involved in the ad.
2. I found the ad to be interesting.
3. I was interested in the ad.

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale used by Chen, Yang, and Smith (2016, p. 341) with these items were *Disagree* (1) and *Agree* (7).

INTERNET USAGE (ESCAPE MOTIVATION)

The scale uses eight, five-point items to measure a person's reasons for using the Internet which have to do with boredom, relaxation, and communicating with others.

Origin:

The scale was part of a survey by Kumar et al. (2016) administered to customers of a large retailer of wine and spirits that operated multiple stores in the northeastern United States. Analysis was based upon responses from 1249 of those customers (Kumar et al. 2016, web appendix, p. 1). Kumar et al. (2016) cited Korgaonkar and Wolin (1999) as the source of the scale but a comparison of items show there are none in common though there are some conceptual similarities.

Reliability:

The alpha reported for the scale was .89 (Kumar et al. 2016, web appendix, p. 7).

Validity:

Kumar et al. (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity.

References:

Korgaonkar, Pradeep K. and Lori D. Wolin (1999), "A Multivariate Analysis of Web Usage," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 39 (March/April), 53-68.

Kumar, Ashish (2017), personal correspondence.

Kumar, Ashish, Ram Bezawada, Rishika Rishika, Ramkumar Janakiraman, and P.K. Kannan (2016), "From Social to Sale: The Effects of Firm-Generated Content in Social Media on Customer Behavior," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 7-25.

Scale Items:¹

How likely you are to use the Internet for the following reasons:

1. To keep yourself company?
2. To get advice to help solve your daily problems?
3. To forget about your problems?
4. To tune out what's going on around you?
5. To relax yourself?
6. To chat with people who share the same interest on the network?
7. To make friends with people who share the same interest on the network?
8. To keep yourself from being bored?

1. As clarified by Kumar (2017), the end-points of the response scale used with these items were *never* (1) and *very often* (5).

INVOLVEMENT (COGNITIVE)

With four, five-point items, the Likert scale measures how actively a person thought about an object and, in particular, how useful he/she believed it could be.

Origin:

Hilken et al. (2017) used the scale in Study 3, with analyses being based on a final sample of 321 participants. The scale is a slight adaptation of a four-item measure by Vorderer et al. (2004). The latter also provided six- and eight-item versions of the scale.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale as used by Hilken et al. (2017, p. 895) was .73.

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Hilken et al. (2017).

References:

Hilken, Tim, Ko de Ruyter, Mathew Chylinski, Dominik Mahr, and Debbie I. Keeling (2017), "Augmenting the Eye of the Beholder: Exploring the Strategic Potential of Augmented Reality to Enhance Online Service Experiences," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (6), 884–905.

Vorderer, Peter, Werner Wirth, Feliz Ribeiro Gouveia, Frank Biocca, Timo Saari, Lutz Jäncke, Saskia Böcking, Holger Schramm, Andre Gysbers, Tilo Hartmann, Christoph Klimmt, Jari Laarni, Niklas Ravaja, Ana Sacau, Thomas Baumgartner, and Petra Jäncke (2004), *MEC Spatial Presence Questionnaire (MECSPQ): Short Documentation and Instructions for Application*, Report to the European Community, Project Presence: MEC (IST-2001-37661).

Scale Items:¹

1. I thought most about things having to do with the _____.
2. I thoroughly considered what the things in the _____ had to do with one another.
3. The _____ activated my thinking.
4. I thought about whether the _____ could be of use to me.

1. The name or a brief description of the focal object(s) should be placed in the blanks. As used by Hilken et al. (2017, p. 901), the words were *web app*. The extreme anchors of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (5).

INVOLVEMENT IN THE TASK

Five, seven-point items are used to measure how much effort a person put into a particular task as well as how relevant it was.

Origin:

The scale was used by Mehta, Dahl, and Zhu (2017, pp. 541, 542) in Studies 1 ($n = 140$) and 2 ($n = 93$). In both cases, the data were gathered from undergraduate students attending the University of Illinois. Participants in the two experiments engaged in creative-writing tasks. The source of the scale was not described but appears to have been created by the authors using key words that are common to other measures of task involvement.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .81 and .79 in Studies 1 and 2, respectively, by Mehta, Dahl, and Zhu (2017, pp. 541, 542).

Validity:

Information regarding the scale's validity was not provided by Mehta, Dahl, and Zhu (2017).

References:

Mehta, Ravi (2018), personal correspondence.

Mehta, Ravi, Darren W. Dahl, and Rui (Juliet) Zhu (2017), "Social-Recognition versus Financial Incentives? Exploring the Effects of Creativity-Contingent External Rewards on Creative Performance," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (3), 536–553.

Scale Items:¹

1. How important did you feel it was for you to respond to the _____ task?
2. How relevant would you say the _____ task was for you?
3. How appealing do you think is your _____?²
4. How much effort would you say you spent on the _____ task?
5. How much did responding to the _____ task meant to you?

1. The questions were provided by Mehta (2018). The end points of the response scale were *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7). A brief description of the task should be placed in all blanks except #3. The phrase used by Mehta, Dahl, and Zhu (2017; Mehta 2018) was "creative writing."
2. Mehta, Dahl, and Zhu (2017; Mehta 2018) used the phrase "write up" in the blank. Something suitable to the particular task should replace it depending on the focal activity in which the participants are engaged.

INVOLVEMENT WITH SHOPPING

The scale has four, seven-point Likert-type items that measure how important and fun shopping is to a person, in general.

Origin:

Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017) used the scale in Studies 1a (n = 883) and 1b (n = 501). For three of the four items, the authors borrowed key words from items used to measure involvement by Wakefield and Baker (1998).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .90 and .92 in Studies 1a and 1b, respectively (Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann 2017, p. 737).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017).

References:

Albrecht, Carmen-Maria, Stefan Hattula, and Donald R. Lehmann (2017), "The Relationship Between Consumer Shopping Stress and Purchase Abandonment in Task-Oriented and Recreation-Oriented Consumers," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (5), 720-740.

Wakefield, Kirk L. and Julie Baker (1998), "Excitement at the Mall: Determinants and Effects on Shopping Response," *Journal of Retailing*, 74 (4), 515-539.

Scale Items:¹

1. In general, going shopping is important to me.
2. In general, going shopping is exciting to me.
3. In general, going shopping means a lot to me.
4. In general, going shopping is fun.

1. It appears the end-points of the response scale used by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017, p. 724) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

INVOLVEMENT WITH THE CELEBRITY

Using 13 Likert-type items and a 101-point response format, the scale measures the degree to which a person reports having one-way affiliation behavior and desires with a media celebrity.

Origin:

Escalas and Bettman (2017) modified a measure of parasocial interaction created by Rubin, Perse, and Powell (1985) and used it in three studies (1a, 1b, and 2). Specifically, six of the items in the scale are very similar to ones in the measure by Rubin, Perse, and Powell (1985); seven other ones appear to be new, presumably added by Escalas and Bettman (2017) for their research purposes.

Reliability:

The alphas reported for the scale by Escalas and Bettman (2017, pp. 302, 304) were .88, .87, and .92 for Studies 1, 1b, and 2, respectively.

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Escalas and Bettman (2017).

References:

Escalas, Jennifer Edson and James R. Bettman (2017), "Connecting With Celebrities: How Consumers Appropriately Celebrity Meanings for a Sense of Belonging," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (2), 297-308.

Rubin, Alan M., Elizabeth M. Perse, and Robert Powell (1985), "Loneliness, Parasocial Interaction, and Local Television News Viewing," *Human Communication Research*, 12 (2), 155-180.

Scale Items:¹

1. When _____ shows me how he/she feels about something, it helps me make up my own mind about the issue.
2. I feel sorry for _____ when he/she makes a mistake.
3. _____ makes me feel comfortable, as if I am with friends.
4. I see _____ as a natural, down-to-earth person.
5. I look forward to watching or hearing about _____.
6. If _____ appeared on a (different) television program, I would watch that program.²
7. I sometimes make remarks to _____ during a show, movie, or interview.
8. If there were a story about _____ in a newspaper, magazine, or online, I would read it.
9. I would like to meet _____ in person.
10. I think _____ is like an old friend.
11. I find _____ to be attractive.
12. I follow what _____ is saying and doing.
13. When I'm watching _____ in the media, I feel as if I am part of his/her group.

1. The response scale used by Escalas and Bettman (2017, p. 302) with these items was anchored by *Strongly disagree* (0) and *Strongly agree* (100). The name of the focal celebrity should be placed in the blanks.
2. This item will need to be modified or dropped if it does not fit the research context.

INVOLVEMENT WITH THE READING TASK

Five, seven-point items measure how much cognitive effort a person put into reading some information.

Origin:

Hildebrand et al. (2017) used the scale in a post-test of Study 4 with 94 online participants. The source of the scale was not identified but phrases in the items have strong resemblance to those found in measures of message processing and task involvement used by others in past research, e.g., Cooper-Martin (1993); Wheeler, Petty, and Bizer (2005).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .87 (Hildebrand et al. 2017, p. 746).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Hildebrand et al. (2017).

References:

Cooper-Martin, Elizabeth (1993), "Effects of Information Format and Similarity Among Alternatives on Consumer Choice Processes," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 21 (Summer), 239-246.

Hildebrand, Diogo, Yoshiko DeMotta, and Sankar Sen, and Ana Valenzuela (2017), "Consumer Responses to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Contribution Type," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (4), 738-758.

Wheeler, S. Christian, Richard E. Petty, and George Y. Bizer (2005), "Self-Schema Matching and Attitude Change: Situational and Dispositional Determinants of Message Elaboration," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (March), 787-797.

Scale Items:¹

1. To what extent did you try hard to examine the information?
2. How much effort did you put into examining the information?
3. How much thought did you put into examining the information?
4. How much attention did you pay to the information?
5. How involved were you in reading the task?

1. The end-points of the response scale used with these items by Hildebrand et al. (2017, p. 746) were *not at all* (1) and *a great deal* (7).

KNOWLEDGE OF THE PRODUCT CLASS

The scale has four, seven-point items that measure a consumer's relative level of familiarity with a product category as well as a good understanding of the attributes that will provide satisfaction.

Origin:

Kelting, Duhachek, and Whitler (2017) used the scale in Study 2 with 135 undergraduate students at a large public university in the United States. Participants were presented with a set of competing brands and were asked to pick one. As for the source of the scale, the authors cited Mitchell and Dacin (1996). Indeed, three of the items are exactly as used by Mitchell and Dacin (1996) except for the product category name. One of the items is slightly different (#3, below).

Reliability:

The alpha calculated for the scale in Study 2 was .89 (Kelting, Duhachek, and Whitler 2017, p. 576).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Kelting, Duhachek, and Whitler (2017).

References:

Kelting, Katie, Adam Duhachek, and Kimberly Whitler (2017), "Can Copycat Private Labels Improve the Consumer's Shopping Experience? A Fluency Explanation," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (4), 569-585.

Mitchell, Andrew A. and Peter A. Dacin (1996), "The Assessment of Alternative Measures of Consumer Expertise," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 23 (3), 219-239.

Scale Items:¹

1. How familiar are you with _____?
not at all familiar / extremely familiar
2. How clear of an idea do you have about which characteristics of _____ are important in providing you with maximum satisfaction?
not at all clear / extremely clear
3. How much do you know about _____?
very little / a lot
4. How would you rate your knowledge about _____ relative to the rest of the population?
One of the least knowledgeable / One of the most knowledgeable

1. A seven-point response scale was used with these items. The blanks should be filled with a generic name for the product category from which participants are choosing a brand.

KNOWLEDGE OF THE PRODUCT CLASS (EXPERT)

The scale uses three statements to measure a consumer's belief that he/she has expert level knowledge with respect to a specific product category and is an excellent source of information for friends buying such a product.

Origin:

Alavi, Wieseke, and Guba (2016) used the scale in a field study where data were gathered from 537 salesperson–customer interactions in a car retailing setting. This involved 28 different dealership chains that were located in 11 different cities and offered new and used cars of five different brands. The scale itself is a slight adaptation of a measure developed and used in a business-to-business context by Wagner, Klein, and Keith (2001).

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .89 (Alavi, Wieseke, and Guba 2016, p. 53).

Validity:

Although the details were limited, Alavi, Wieseke, and Guba (2016) indicated that their scales showed evidence of discriminant validity. With respect to product knowledge, the AVE was .72.

References:

- Alavi, Sascha, Jan Wieseke, and Jan H. Guba (2016), "Saving on Discounts through Accurate Sensing – Salespeople's Estimations of Customer Price Importance and Their Effects on Negotiation Success," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (1), 40–55.
- Wagner, Judy A., Noreen M. Klein and Janet E. Keith (2001), "Selling Strategies: The Effects of Suggesting a Decision Structure to Novice and Expert Buyers," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29 (3), 289–306.

Scale Items:¹

1. I understand the features of _____ enough to be considered an expert when evaluating different brands.
2. I know exactly what product characteristics are needed when buying a _____.
3. If a friend of mine were buying a _____, I would be an excellent source of information.

1. The name of the focal product category should be placed in the blanks. The end points on the response scale used with these items were not stated by Alavi, Wieseke, and Guba (2016). The anchors could have been *not at all* (1) and *extremely* (7) because they were used for all of the other multi-item scales in the study.

LIGHTNESS OF THE OBJECT

The extent to which a person believes that an object weighs little is measured in this scale with three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale was created by Weiss (2017) and used in Experiment 3 as a manipulation check (Weiss and Johar 2016, p. 926). Data were gathered from 145 students attending Columbia University.

Reliability:

The alpha reported for the scale by (Weiss and Johar 2016, p. 926) was .87.

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Weiss and Johar (2016). However, because the scale was used as a manipulation check and the manipulation was successful, it provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

References:

Weiss, Liad (2017), personal correspondence.

Weiss, Liad and Gita Venkataramani Johar (2016), "Products as Self-Evaluation Standards: When Owned and Unowned Products Have Opposite Effects on Self-Judgment," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (6), 915-930.

Scale Items:¹

5. The _____ are very light.
6. The _____ are quite heavy. (r)
7. The _____ weigh very little.

1. The items were supplied by Weiss (2017). The extreme anchors of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). The name of the focal object should be placed in the blanks. The object in the experiment by Weiss and Johar (2016) was headphones and that is why plural phrasing was used in the sentences. Of course, if the object is singular then the appropriate subject-verb phrasing should be used, e.g., *the TV is very light*.

LOCAL SELF-IDENTITY

The scale is composed of four Likert-type items that measure the degree to which a person identifies mostly with the people, traditions, and events in his/her local community.

Origin:

Lin and Wang (2016) used the scale in Study 2 with 228 students, apparently at a university in Taiwan. The language appears to have been Chinese.

Tu, Khare, and Zhang (2012) are the source of the scale. They abbreviated a scale that two of the authors had created previously (Zhang and Khare 2008, 2009) and slightly rephrased the items in the process. With multiple studies, the authors provided evidence of the scale's reliability (internal consistency, temporal stability) and validity (convergent, discriminant, predictive). A companion measure (global self-identity) was also refined in this series of studies and CFA showed that the two factors being measured were correlated yet separate.

Reliability:

As used by Lin and Wang (2016, p. 489), the scale's alpha was .88.

Validity:

Lin and Wang (2016) did not address the validity of the scale.

References:

- Lin, Ying-Ching and Kai-Yu Wang (2016), "Local or Global Image? The Role of Consumers' Local – Global Identity in Code-Switched Ad Effectiveness Among Monolinguals," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (4), 482-497.
- Tu, Lingjiang, Adwait Khare, Yinlong Zhang (2012), "A Short 8-Item Scale for Measuring Consumers' Local-Global Identity," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 29 (1), 35-42.
- Zhang, Yinlong and Adwait Khare (2008), "Consumers' Local-Global Identity: Measurement," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, ed. Ann L. McGill and Sharon Shavitt, Duluth, MN: Association for Consumer Research, 43-44.
- Zhang, Yinlong and Adwait Khare (2009), "The Impact of Accessible Identities on the Evaluation of Global versus Local Products," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (3), 524-537.

Scale Items:¹

1. My heart mostly belongs to my local community.
2. I respect my local traditions.
3. I identify that I am a local citizen.
4. I care about knowing local events.

1. Besides stating that the response format was a seven-point scale, Lin and Wang (2016) did not indicate the verbal anchors they employed. They may have been the Chinese equivalent of what Tu, Khare, and Zhang (2012, p. 36) used: *strongly disagree/strongly agree*.

LOCUS OF CONTROL

The scale has three, nine-point Likert-type items that measure the degree to which a person believes him/herself to lack control of things at the current point in time. Unlike some measures of this construct, this scale it does not suggest or identify the entity that is believed to be in control, merely that the respondent believes he/she does not have control. Also, unlike most other measures of the construct, this measure focuses the respondent's attention on the moment rather than being something the person has believed over a long period of time.

Origin:

Durante and Laran (2016, p. 818) used the scale in Experiment 2 with 70 participants recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The authors reverse-scored the items to make the scale a measure of what they called "current perceived control."

The source of the scale is unclear. Durante and Laran (2016) implied the source was Cutright, Bettman, and Fitzsimons (2013). While the latter used a measure of control, they only provided one item and it is not among those used by Durante and Laran (2016).

Reliability:

As used by Durante and Laran (2016), the alpha for the scale was .94.

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Durante and Laran (2016).

References:

Cutright, Keisha, James R. Bettman, and Gavan J. Fitzsimons (2013), "Putting Brands in Their Place: How a Lack of Control Keeps Brands Contained," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 50 (June), 365–377.
Durante, Kristina M. and Juliano Laran (2016), "The Effect of Stress on Consumer Saving and Spending," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (5), 814-828.

Scale Items:¹

1. Right now, things are out of my control.
2. Right now, I feel like I am not in charge of my own fate.
3. Right now, I feel like I have no control over things.

1. The extreme anchors for the response scale used by Durante and Laran (2016, p. 818) were *definitely disagree* (1) and *definitely agree* (9).

LONELINESS (STATE)

Using three, seven-point items, the scale measures how lonely a person reports feeling at a point in time, especially as compared to “other people.”

Origin:

Choi, Rangan, and Singh (2016) used the scale in a pretest (n = 116 college students) as well as in Study 3 (n = 88 participants from MTurk). They described the scale as being “adapted” from Shaver, Furman, and Buhrmester (1985). It is more precise to describe it as adapted from phrases in a scale by Rubenstein and Shaver (1982) sometimes called the NYU Loneliness Scale (Robinson, Shaver, and Wrightsman 1991).

Reliability:

The scale’s alphas were reported by Choi, Rangan, and Singh (2016, pp. 420, 423) to be .92 in both the pretest and Study 3.

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Choi, Rangan, and Singh (2016).

References:

Choi, Jungsil (David), Priyamvadha Rangan, and Surendra N. Singh (2016), “Do Cold Images Cause Cold-Heartedness? The Impact of Visual Stimuli on the Effectiveness of Negative Emotional Charity Appeals,” *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (4), 417-426.

Robinson, John P., Phillip R. Shaver, and Lawrence S. Wrightsman (1991), *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes*, San Diego: Academic Press.

Rubenstein, Carin and Phillip R. Shaver (1982), “The Experience of Loneliness,” in *Loneliness: A Sourcebook of Current Theory, Research and Therapy*, Letitia Anne Peplau and Daniel Perlman eds., New York: Wiley (Interscience), 206-223.

Shaver, Phillip, Wyndol Furman, and Duane Buhrmester (1985), “Transition to College: Network Changes, Social Skills, and Loneliness,” in *Understanding Personal Relationships: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, Steve Duck and Daniel Perlman, eds., London, UK: Sage, 193-219.

Scale Items:¹

1. How lonely are you feeling?
2. Compared to other people, how lonely do you think you are?
3. To what extent do you feel lonely right now?

1. The extreme anchors used by Choi, Rangan, and Singh (2016, pp. 420, 423) with these items were *Not at all* (1) and *Very much* (7).

LOOKING FOR POSSESSIONS TO DONATE

Three items are used to measure a person’s motivation to look for and gather items he/she owns that are not used anymore and could be donated. The scale seems to make most sense to use when there has been an appeal of some sort that asked potential donors to think about things of theirs that could be given away.

Origin:

Winterich, Reczek, and Irwin (2017) used the scale in a supplementary study (described in the article’s web appendix) with 81 female participants recruited from Amazon’s MTurk. The context was that participants were exposed to one of two donation appeals and then asked to think about items of theirs not used anymore that could be given away. The source of the scale was not stated but it seems to have been created by the authors for the study.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .94 (Winterich, Reczek, and Irwin 2017, web appendix).

Validity:

The scale’s validity was not discussed by Winterich, Reczek, and Irwin (2017).

Reference:

Winterich, Karen Page, Rebecca Walker Reczek, and Julie R. Irwin (2017), "Keeping the Memory but Not the Possession: Memory Preservation Mitigates Identity Loss from Product Disposition," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (5), 104-120.

Scale Items:¹

1. I am likely to search through my belongings for items I could donate.
2. I am motivated to see what items I no longer use that I could donate.
3. I do not want to gather items to donate. (r)

1. The instructions for this scale were not stated verbatim but appear to have asked participants to indicate their likelihood of looking for items they currently own but no longer use that could be donated. The end-points of the response scale were not stated either but could have been very unlikely (1) and very likely (7), the same as used in a similar scale by Winterich, Reczek, and Irwin (2017, p. 111).

LOYALTY (COGNITIVE)

A customer's belief that something such as a brand or company is better than the alternatives and that he/she is loyal to it, is measured using three, nine-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Wolter et al. (2017) used the scale in Study 2 with data gathered from 523 undergraduates at a university. The authors implied that Watson et al. (2015) was the source of the scale, however, the scale is not in that article since it primarily reports results of a meta-analysis. Perhaps, Wolter et al. (2017) created the items based on concepts discussed in the article.

Reliability:

The construct reliability for the scale was .83 (Wolter et al. 2017, web appendix).

Validity:

CFA was used by Wolter et al. (2017) in Study 2 in order to provide evidence of the psychometric quality of the measures employed. There was a good fit of the measurement model to the data. Further, support was found for the convergent and discriminant validities of all the scales. With specific regard to the loyalty scale, its AVE was .63 (Wolter et al. 2017, web appendix).

References:

Watson, George F., Joshua T. Beck, Conor M. Henderson, and Robert W. Palmatier (2015), "Building, Measuring, and Profiting from Customer Loyalty," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43 (6), 790-825.

Wolter, Jeremy S., Dora Bock, Jeffery S. Smith, and J. Joseph Cronin (2017), "Creating Ultimate Customer Loyalty Through Loyalty Conviction and Customer-Company Identification," *Journal of Retailing*, 93 (4), 458-476.

Scale Items:¹

1. I consider myself loyal to _____.
2. I prefer _____ over any of the alternatives.
3. _____ is the superior choice.

1. The response scale had nine-points and the extreme verbal anchors were *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree* (Wolter et al. 2017, p. 464). The blanks should be filled with the name of the focal brand or company being evaluated.

LOYALTY TO THE BRAND (CONATIVE)

With four, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the extent to which a consumer likes buying a particular brand and is motivated to buy it frequently in the next few months.

Origin:

Heinberg, Ozkaya, and Taube (2016) identified the source of the scale being Oliver (1999). However, being a conceptual article, the scale was not there although the construct was discussed. Given that, the scale was likely created by Heinberg, Ozkaya, and Taube (2016). Their study was conducted in China with analysis based on data gathered from a sample of 1188 respondents. The back-translation method was employed to ensure that the Chinese version was as close as possible to what is stated in the English version shown below. The Chinese version was then tested for comprehension in a pretest.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .874 (Heinberg, Ozkaya, and Taube 2016, p. 596).

Validity:

A variety of tests were performed on this scale and the other measures used by Heinberg, Ozkaya, and Taube (2016). With regard to the measure of loyalty, evidence was found for its convergent and discriminant validities. The scale's AVE was .635.

References:

Heinberg, Martin, H. Erkan Ozkaya, and Markus Taube (2016), "A Brand Built on Sand: Is Acquiring a Local Brand in an Emerging Market an Ill-Advised Strategy for Foreign Companies?" *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (5), 586–607.

Oliver, Richard L. (1999), "Whence Consumer Loyalty?" *Journal of Marketing*, 63 (October), 33–44.

Scale Items:¹

1. I like to buy _____ anytime.
2. I will buy _____ on my next (shopping) trip.
3. I will buy _____ frequently in the next couple of months.
4. I will buy more _____ than I will buy competitors' products in the future.

1. The brand name should be placed in the blanks. The language and phrasing of these items were a little different when presented to the Chinese participants. The structure has been changed a bit from what was shown in the article to make it more amenable for use in English and other Western languages.

LOYALTY TO THE SERVICE PROVIDER

With three, seven-point Likert items, the scale measures how much a customer will return to receive service from a particular provider in the future. The items are phrased hypothetically but a very slight change in wording can make the scale relevant for use with an actual business relationship.

Origin:

The scale was used by Umashankar, Ward, and Dahl (2017) in Studies 2, 3, 4a, and 4b. They appear to have created the scale for these studies by drawing upon the literature.

Reliability:

Across the four studies in which it was used, the alphas ranged from .85 to .93 (Umashankar, Ward, and Dahl 2017, pp. 87, 90).

Validity:

Umashankar, Ward, and Dahl (2017) did not address the scale's validity.

Reference:

Umashankar, Nita, Morgan K. Ward, and Darren W. Dahl (2017), "The Benefit of Becoming Friends: Complaining After Service Failures Leads Customers with Strong Ties to Increase Loyalty," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (6), 79-98.

Scale Items:¹

1. It is very likely that I would schedule my next session with this service provider.
2. I would be loyal to this service provider in the future.
3. I would consider trying a new service provider next time. (r)

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). Replacing the word "would" in each item with "will" can make the scale suitable for a real situation rather than the hypothetical context used in the studies.

LOYALTY TO THE STORE

The scale has three, seven-point Likert-type items that measure the degree to which a person believes it is likely that he/she will buy from a particular store in the future even if it raises prices and will also recommend the business to friends.

Origin:

The scale was used by Habel et al. (2016) in Studies 1, 3, and 4. Homburg, Wieseke, and Hoyer (2009) were cited as the source. A comparison shows there was only conceptual similarity with two of the items. Given that the concepts in the three items (below) are common to many measures of customer loyalty, it was probably the authors themselves who created the scale by drawing concepts and phrasing that is common in the literature.

Reliability:

The scale's internal consistencies (alpha) in Studies 1, 3, and 4 were .778, .95, and .93, respectively (Habel 2017; Habel et al. 2016, pp. 92, 97).

Validity:

Evidence of the scale's discriminant validity was reported in Study 3 with respect to several other scales based on the Fornell-Larcker (1981) criterion. Further, the scale's AVE was .87.

References:

Habel, Johannes (2017), personal correspondence.

Habel, Johannes, Laura Marie Schons, Sascha Alavi, and Jan Wieseke (2016), "Warm Glow or Extra Charge? The Ambivalent Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility Activities on Customers' Perceived Price Fairness," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 84-105.

Homburg, Christian, Jan Wieseke, and Wayne D. Hoyer (2009), "Social Identity and the Service-Profit Chain," *Journal of Marketing*, 73 (March), 38-54.

Scale Items:¹

It is very likely that I would . . . ²

1. purchase from _____ in the future.
2. recommend _____ to friends.
3. remain a customer if _____ increased its prices.

1. The name of the business should be stated in the blanks. The response scale had seven points with end points labeled as *fully disagree* and *fully agree*.

2. As used by Habel et al. (2016), this scale stem is phrased to measure hypothetical behavior. That is appropriate when subjects in an experiment are asked to imagine themselves being in a fictional scenario. If the context is real, then the word "would" can be replaced with "will."

LOYALTY TO THE TEAM (BEHAVIORAL)

The likelihood that a person will engage in several behaviors that indicate loyalty to a sports team is measured using six, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Woisetschläger, Backhaus, and Cornwell (2017) used the scale in Study 2 with 576 participants from an online panel in Germany. The scale was presented to participants in German and phrased in English for the journal publication (Woisetschläger 2018). The context of the study involved issues related to brand sponsorship of professional soccer clubs. The scale was created by the authors who drew phrases and concepts from a measure of attitudinal loyalty by Biscaia et al. (2013).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .93 (Woisetschläger, Backhaus, and Cornwell 2017, p. 134).

Validity:

There was no discussion of the scale's validity by Woisetschläger, Backhaus, and Cornwell (2017).

References:

Biscaia, Rui, Abel Correia, Antonio F. Rosado, Stephen D. Ross, and Joao Maroco (2013), "Sport Sponsorship: The Relationship Between Team Loyalty, Sponsorship Awareness, Attitude Toward The Sponsor, and Purchase Intentions," *Journal of Sport Management*, 27 (4), 288–302.

Woisetschläger, David M. (2018), personal correspondence.

Woisetschläger, David M., Christof Backhaus, and T. Bettina Cornwell (2017), "Inferring Corporate Motives: How Deal Characteristics Shape Sponsorship Perceptions," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (5), 121-141.

Scale Items:¹

1. It is very likely that I will visit a match of _____ in the future.
2. It is very likely that I will recommend _____ to my friends and colleagues.
3. It is very likely that I will purchase tickets of _____ in the future.
4. It is very likely that I will purchase merchandise (e.g., a scarf, a jersey) of _____ in the future.
5. It is very likely that I will watch games of _____ on the television in the next season.
6. It is very likely that I will follow _____ on its social media channels (e.g., Facebook, Twitter).

1. The response format used with the items was described as a seven-point Likert-type scale (Woisetschläger, Backhaus, and Cornwell 2017, p. 133). The name of the sports team or club should be placed in the each blank of the items. Other adaptations may also be necessary depending upon the sport involved and the *vernacular of the participants*. For example, it would probably make sense in the U.S. to replace the phrase "visit a match" in item #1 with "attend a game."

MASCULINITY

The scale uses three, five-point unipolar items to measure how much a person describes someone as having traits stereotypically associated with males.

Origin:

Brough et al. (2016) used the scale in Study 2 with a sample of 194 students recruited from two universities in the United States. The authors created the scale as well as a companion measure (femininity). Items for the scales were drawn from prior research and the authors' pretests.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .76 (Brough et al. 2016, p. 571).

Validity:

Using both EFA and CFA, the six traits used to measure femininity and masculinity (three items apiece) loaded as expected on two factors. Evidence of the discriminant validity came from the low interfactor correlation.

Comments:

This scale was not created to measure with which gender a person identifies. Instead, it was used to measure how one sees another person. How appropriate it would be to use this scale with regard to one's self or with respect to objects rather than people, is unknown. Further, since ideas about masculinity change over time and around the world, caution is urged in assuming the external validity of the scale for a particular usage.

Reference:

Brough, Aaron R., James E. B. Wilkie, Jingjing Ma, Mathew S. Isaac, and David Gal (2016), "Is Eco-Friendly Unmanly? The Green-Feminine Stereotype and Its Effect on Sustainable Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (4), 567-582.

Scale Items:¹

Please indicate the extent to which you feel each word below describes ____.

1. macho
2. masculine
3. aggressive

1. The name for the person being described should be placed in the blank. The extreme anchors of the response scale used with these items were *not at all* (1) and *perfectly* (5).

MEANINGFULNESS OF SELF

How much a person feels that his/her life is meaningful and has some effect on the world is measured with three, seven-point items.

Origin:

The scale was used by Su et al. (2017) in Study 3 with data collected from 78 U.S. participants via Amazon's MTurk. The scale they used to measure the meaningfulness construct is a slight adaptation of one used by Zadro, Williams, and Richardson (2004).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .77 (Su et al. 2017, p. 106).

Validity:

Su et al. (2017) did not discuss the scale's validity.

References:

Su, Lei, Yuwei Jiang, Zhansheng Chen, and C. Nathan Dewall (2017), "Social Exclusion and Consumer Switching Behavior: A Control Restoration Mechanism," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (1), 99-117.

Zadro, Lisa, Kipling D. Williams, and Rick Richardson (2004), "How Low Can You Go? Ostracism by a Computer Is Sufficient to Lower Self-Reported Levels of Belonging, Control, Self-Esteem, and Meaningful Existence," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40 (4), 560-567.

Scale Items:¹

1. I feel that I have some effect on the world around me.
2. I feel non-existent. (r)
3. My existence is meaningless. (r)

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale used by Su et al. (2017, p. 106) appear to have been *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7).

MINDFULNESS (ACTING WITH AWARENESS)

The scale uses ten items to measure a person's tendency to be engaged in what he/she is doing with undivided attention rather than being distracted such as with multi-tasking and mind-wandering.

Origin:

The measure was developed by Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004) and is one of the four subscales composing the Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness. The items were generated based on theory. As they were written, groups of them were administered to college students and then assessed for keeping, dropping, or modifying. Eventually, a 77-item version received more thorough psychometric analyses which then led to a version with 39 items. Several rigorous studies followed which examined and confirmed multiple aspects of the inventory's reliability and validity. With respect to the Acting with Awareness subscale's internal consistency, the alphas in two studies for which it was reported were .83 and .76. The two-week stability (test-retest correlation) was .86.

van De Veer et al. (2016) used a Dutch translation of the scale in their study. It is provided in the web appendix of their article. The English language version by Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004) is shown below.

Reliability:

As used by van De Veer et al. (2016, p. 787) in Study 1 ($n = 85$), the scale's alpha was .77.

Validity:

van De Veer et al. (2016) did not discuss the Acting With Awareness scale's validity.

References:

Baer, Ruth A., Gregory T. Smith, and Kristin B. Allen (2004), "Assessment of Mindfulness by Self-Report: The Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness Skills," *Assessment*, 11 (3), 191-206.
van De Veer, Evelien, Erica van Herpen, and Hans C. M. van Trijp (2016), "Body and Mind: Mindfulness Helps Consumers to Compensate for Prior Food Intake by Enhancing the Responsiveness to Physiological Cues," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 783-803.

Scale Items:¹

1. When I do things, my mind wanders off and I'm easily distracted. (r)
2. When I'm doing something, I'm only focused on what I'm doing, nothing else.
3. I drive on "automatic pilot" without paying attention to what I'm doing. (r)
4. When I'm reading, I focus all my attention on what I'm reading.
5. When I do things, I get totally wrapped up in them and don't think about anything else.
6. I don't pay attention to what I'm doing because I'm daydreaming, worrying, or otherwise distracted. (r)

7. When I'm doing chores, such as cleaning or laundry, I tend to daydream or think of other things. (r)
8. I tend to do several things at once rather than focusing on one thing at a time. (r)
9. When I'm working on something, part of my mind is occupied with other topics, such as what I'll be doing later, or things I'd rather be doing. (r)
10. I get completely absorbed in what I'm doing, so that all my attention is focused on it.

1. van De Veer et al. (2016, p. 787) used a response format with the Dutch equivalent of *Never/almost never true* (1) and *Almost always/always true* (7) as end points. Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004) used a five-point format with very similar verbal anchors.

MINDFULNESS (ACTING WITHOUT JUDGMENT)

Nine items are used to measure the tendency to accept one's thoughts and feelings as they occur without evaluation or self-criticism.

Origin:

The measure was developed by Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004) and is one of the four subscales composing the Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness. The items were generated based on theory. As they were written, groups of them were administered to college students and then assessed for keeping, dropping, or modifying. Eventually, a 77-item version received more thorough psychometric analyses which then led to a version with 39 items. Several rigorous studies followed which examined and confirmed multiple aspects of the inventory's reliability and validity. With respect to the Acting Without Judgment subscale's internal consistency, the alphas in two studies for which it was reported were both .87. The two-week stability (test-retest correlation) was .83.

van De Veer et al. (2016) used a Dutch translation of the scale in their study. It is provided in the web appendix of their article. The English language version by Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004) is shown below.

Reliability:

As used by van De Veer et al. (2016, p. 787) in Study 1 ($n = 85$), the scale's alpha was .89.

Validity:

van De Veer et al. (2016) did not discuss the Acting With Awareness scale's validity.

Comments:

Note below that all of the items in this scale are stated such that they express a person's belief that something he/she has thought or felt was improper. Because the construct is viewed in the "positive" direction (without judgment) by Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004) as well as van De Veer et al. (2016), each item should be reverse-coded when calculating scale scores.

References:

Baer, Ruth A., Gregory T. Smith, and Kristin B. Allen (2004), "Assessment of Mindfulness by Self-Report: The Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness Skills," *Assessment*, 11 (3), 191-206.
van De Veer, Evelien, Erica van Herpen, and Hans C. M. van Trijp (2016), "Body and Mind: Mindfulness Helps Consumers to Compensate for Prior Food Intake by Enhancing the Responsiveness to Physiological Cues," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 783-803.

Scale Items:¹

1. I criticize myself for having irrational or inappropriate emotions. (r)

2. I tend to evaluate whether my perceptions are right or wrong. (r)
3. I tell myself that I shouldn't be feeling the way I'm feeling. (r)
4. I believe some of my thoughts are abnormal or bad and I shouldn't think that way. (r)
5. I make judgments about whether my thoughts are good or bad. (r)
6. I tend to make judgments about how worthwhile or worthless my experiences are. (r)
7. I tell myself that I shouldn't be thinking the way I'm thinking. (r)
8. I think some of my emotions are bad or inappropriate and I shouldn't feel them. (r)
9. I disapprove of myself when I have irrational ideas. (r)

1. van De Veer et al. (2016, p. 787) used a response format with the Dutch equivalent of *Never/almost never true* (1) and *Almost always/always true* (7) as end points. Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004) used a five-point format with very similar verbal anchors.

MINDFULNESS (ATTENTION TO ONE'S BODY)

The tendency for a person to notice and attend to thoughts and feelings having to do with physical aspects of his/her body is measured with six, seven-point items.

Origin:

The measure was used by van De Veer et al. (2016) in Studies 2 ($n = 85$) and 5 ($n = 467$). The items were taken from the Observe subfactor of the Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness by Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004). Specifically, van De Veer et al. (2016) divided the 12 items measuring the Observe subfactor into three metrics: six items measuring attention to one's body, three items measuring attention to one's environment, and three items measuring attention to one's feelings. The authors also translated the items for use in the Netherlands. The Dutch items are provided in the web appendix of their article as part of the Observe subfactor. The English language version is shown below.

Reliability:

The scale's alphas were .67 and .87 in Studies 1 and 5, respectively (De Veer et al. 2016, pp. 789, 796).

Validity:

van De Veer et al. (2016) did not explicitly address the scale's validity. However, in Study 5, the authors used CFA with the 12 items composing the Observe scale. The results showed a three-factor model fit the data better than a one factor model. At the very least, this is evidence that attention to one's body is distinct from attention to one's feelings and environment.

References:

Baer, Ruth A., Gregory T. Smith, and Kristin B. Allen (2004), "Assessment of Mindfulness by Self-Report: The Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness Skills," *Assessment*, 11 (3), 191-206.
van De Veer, Evelien, Erica van Herpen, and Hans C. M. van Trijp (2016), "Body and Mind: Mindfulness Helps Consumers to Compensate for Prior Food Intake by Enhancing the Responsiveness to Physiological Cues," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 783-803.

Scale Items:¹

1. I notice changes in my body, such as whether my breathing slows down or speeds up.
2. I pay attention to whether my muscles are tense or relaxed.
3. When I'm walking, I deliberately notice the sensations of my body moving.
4. When I take a shower or a bath, I stay alert to the sensations of water on my body.
5. I notice how foods and drinks affect my thoughts, bodily sensations, and emotions.
6. I pay attention to sensations, such as the wind in my hair or sun on my face.

1. van De Veer et al. (2016, p. 787) used a response format with the Dutch equivalent of *Never/almost never true* (1) and *Almost always/always true* (7) as end points.

MINDFULNESS (ATTENTION TO ONE'S ENVIRONMENT)

With three, seven-point items, the scale measures a person's tendency to notice and attend to sounds, smells, and visual aspects of his/her nearby surroundings.

Origin:

The measure was used by van De Veer et al. (2016) in Studies 2 (n = 85) and 5 (n = 467). The items were taken from the Observe subfactor of the Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness by Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004). Specifically, van De Veer et al. (2016) divided the 12 items measuring the Observe subfactor into three metrics: six items measuring attention to one's body, three items measuring attention to one's environment, and three items measuring attention to one's feelings. The authors also translated the items for use in the Netherlands. The Dutch items are provided in the web appendix of their article as part of the Observe subfactor. The English language version is shown below.

Reliability:

The scale's alphas were .72 and .79 in Studies 1 and 5, respectively (De Veer et al. 2016, pp. 789, 796).

Validity:

van De Veer et al. (2016) did not explicitly address the scale's validity. However, in Study 5, the authors used CFA with the 12 items composing the Observe scale. The results showed a three-factor model fit the data better than a one factor model. At the very least, this is evidence that attention to one's environment is distinct from attention to one's feelings and body.

References:

Baer, Ruth A., Gregory T. Smith, and Kristin B. Allen (2004), "Assessment of Mindfulness by Self-Report: The Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness Skills," *Assessment*, 11 (3), 191-206.
van De Veer, Evelien, Erica van Herpen, and Hans C. M. van Trijp (2016), "Body and Mind: Mindfulness Helps Consumers to Compensate for Prior Food Intake by Enhancing the Responsiveness to Physiological Cues," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 783-803.

Scale Items:¹

1. I pay attention to sounds, such as clocks ticking, birds chirping, or cars passing.
2. I notice the smells and aromas of things.
3. I notice visual elements in art or nature, such as colors, shapes, textures, or patterns of light and shadow.

1. van De Veer et al. (2016, p. 787) used a response format with the Dutch equivalent of *Never/almost never true* (1) and *Almost always/always true* (7) as end points.

MINDFULNESS (ATTENTION TO ONE'S FEELINGS)

The scale has three, seven-point items that measure a person's tendency to notice and attend to his/her emotions and changing moods.

Origin:

The measure was used by van De Veer et al. (2016) in Studies 2 ($n = 85$) and 5 ($n = 467$). The items were taken from the Observe subfactor of the Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness by Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004). Specifically, van De Veer et al. (2016) divided the 12 items measuring the Observe subfactor into three metrics: six items measuring attention to one's body, three items measuring attention to one's environment, and three items measuring attention to one's feelings. The authors also translated the items for use in the Netherlands. The Dutch items are provided in the web appendix of their article as part of the Observe subfactor. The English language version is shown below.

Reliability:

The scale's alphas were .69 and .84 in Studies 1 and 5, respectively (De Veer et al. 2016, pp. 789, 796).

Validity:

van De Veer et al. (2016) did not explicitly address the scale's validity. However, in Study 5, the authors used CFA with the 12 items composing the Observe scale. The results showed a three-factor model fit the data better than a one factor model. At the very least, this is evidence that attention to one's feelings is distinct from attention to one's environment and body.

References:

Baer, Ruth A., Gregory T. Smith, and Kristin B. Allen (2004), "Assessment of Mindfulness by Self-Report: The Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness Skills," *Assessment*, 11 (3), 191-206.
van De Veer, Evelien, Erica van Herpen, and Hans C. M. van Trijp (2016), "Body and Mind: Mindfulness Helps Consumers to Compensate for Prior Food Intake by Enhancing the Responsiveness to Physiological Cues," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 783-803.

Scale Items:¹

1. I intentionally stay aware of my feelings.
2. I pay attention to how my emotions affect my thoughts and behavior.
3. I notice when my moods begin to change.

1. van De Veer et al. (2016, p. 787) used a response format with the Dutch equivalent of *Never/almost never true* (1) and *Almost always/always true* (7) as end points.

MINDFULNESS (DESCRIBING)

A person's tendency to express and verbalize his/her thoughts and feelings is measured with eight items.

Origin:

The measure was developed by Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004) and is one of the four subscales composing the Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness. The items were generated based on theory. As they were written, groups of them were administered to college students and then assessed for keeping, dropping, or modifying. Eventually, a 77-item version received more thorough psychometric analyses which then led to a version with 39 items. Several rigorous studies followed which examined and confirmed multiple aspects of the inventory's reliability and validity. With respect to the Describing subscale's internal consistency, the alphas in two studies for which it was reported were .84 and .86. The two-week stability (test-retest correlation) was .81.

van De Veer et al. (2016) used a Dutch translation of the scale in their study. It is provided in the web appendix of their article. The English language version by Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004) is shown below.

Reliability:

As used by van De Veer et al. (2016, p. 787) in Study 1 ($n = 85$), the scale's alpha was .90.

Validity:

van De Veer et al. (2016) did not discuss the Describing scale's validity.

References:

Baer, Ruth A., Gregory T. Smith, and Kristin B. Allen (2004), "Assessment of Mindfulness by Self-Report: The Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness Skills," *Assessment*, 11 (3), 191-206.
van De Veer, Evelien, Erica van Herpen, and Hans C. M. van Trijp (2016), "Body and Mind: Mindfulness Helps Consumers to Compensate for Prior Food Intake by Enhancing the Responsiveness to Physiological Cues," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 783-803.

Scale Items:¹

1. I'm good at finding the words to describe my feelings.
2. I can easily put my beliefs, opinions, and expectations into words.
3. I'm good at thinking of words to express my perceptions, such as how things taste, smell, or sound.
4. It's hard for me to find the words to describe what I'm thinking. (r)
5. I have trouble thinking of the right words to express how I feel about things. (r)
6. When I have a sensation in my body, it's difficult for me to describe it because I can't find the right words. (r)

7. Even when I'm feeling terribly upset, I can find a way to put it into words.
8. My natural tendency is to put my experiences into words.

1. van De Veer et al. (2016, p. 787) used a response format with the Dutch equivalent of *Never/almost never true* (1) and *Almost always/always true* (7) as end points. Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004) used a five-point format with very similar verbal anchors.

MINDFULNESS (OBSERVING)

The tendency for a person to notice or attend to a variety of stimuli, both internal (such as thoughts and feelings) as well as external (such as sights, sounds, and smells) is measured with 12 items.

Origin:

The measure was developed by Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004) and is one of the four subscales composing the Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness. The items were generated based on theory. As they were written, groups of them were administered to college students and then assessed for keeping, dropping, or modifying. Eventually, a 77-item version received more thorough psychometric analyses which then led to a version with 39 items. Several rigorous studies followed which examined and confirmed multiple aspects of the inventory's reliability and validity. With respect to the Observing subscale's internal consistency, the alphas in two studies for which it was reported were .91 and .85. The two-week stability (test-retest correlation) was .65.

van De Veer et al. (2016) used a Dutch translation of the scale in their study. It is provided in the web appendix of their article. The English language version by Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004) is shown below.

Reliability:

As used by van De Veer et al. (2016, p. 787) in Study 1 ($n = 85$), the scale's alpha was .79.

Validity:

van De Veer et al. (2016) did not explicitly address the Observing scale's validity. However, in Study 5, the authors used the 12 items composing the scale to create three subscales (attention to one's body, attention to the environment, and attention to one's feelings. See the individual reviews.) The results of a CFA showed a three-factor model fit the data better than a one factor model.

Comments:

The unidimensionality of the 12 items listed below is in question. It may be justifiable to use those items together to measure the Observing portion of Mindfulness but there should be strong evidence that the three first order factors load significantly on a second order factor.

References:

- Baer, Ruth A., Gregory T. Smith, and Kristin B. Allen (2004), "Assessment of Mindfulness by Self-Report: The Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness Skills," *Assessment*, 11 (3), 191-206.
- van De Veer, Evelien, Erica van Herpen, and Hans C. M. van Trijp (2016), "Body and Mind: Mindfulness Helps Consumers to Compensate for Prior Food Intake by Enhancing the Responsiveness to Physiological Cues," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 783-803.

Scale Items:¹

1. I notice changes in my body, such as whether my breathing slows down or speeds up.
2. I pay attention to whether my muscles are tense or relaxed.
3. When I'm walking, I deliberately notice the sensations of my body moving.
4. When I take a shower or a bath, I stay alert to the sensations of water on my body.
5. I notice how foods and drinks affect my thoughts, bodily sensations, and emotions.
6. I pay attention to sensations, such as the wind in my hair or sun on my face.
7. I pay attention to sounds, such as clocks ticking, birds chirping, or cars passing.
8. I notice the smells and aromas of things.
9. I intentionally stay aware of my feelings.
10. I notice visual elements in art or nature, such as colors, shapes, textures, or patterns of light and shadow.
11. I pay attention to how my emotions affect my thoughts and behavior.
12. I notice when my moods begin to change.

1. van De Veer et al. (2016, p. 787) used a response format with the Dutch equivalent of *Never/almost never true* (1) and *Almost always/always true* (7) as end points. Baer, Smith, and Allen (2004) used a five-point format with very similar verbal anchors.

MORAL VIOLATION OF THE EMPLOYEE(S)

With four, nine-point items, the scale measures the extent to which a person believes that one or more employees of a company engaged in improper activity that deceived and harmed clients.

Origin:

Dong and Zhong (2017) used the scale as a manipulation check in Studies 1 ($n = 210$), 2 ($n = 271$), and 5 ($n = 302$). The manipulation involved participants reading one of three news stories, each story varying in the degree to which a person or group engaged in improper activity. The source of the scale was not stated but appears to be original.

Reliability:

The alphas reported by Dong and Zhong (2017) for the scale as used in Study 1 (p. 781), Study 2 (Dong 2018), and Study 5 (p. 788) were .87, .95, and .95, respectively.

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Dong and Zhong (2017). However, since the scale was used as a manipulation check in the three studies and the manipulations were successful in each case, it provides some support for the scale's predictive validity.

References:

Dong, Ping (2018), personal correspondence.

Dong, Ping and Chen-Bo Zhong (2017), "Witnessing Moral Violations Increases Conformity in Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (4), 778–793.

Scale Items:¹

To what extent do you perceive that the _____ described in the news report had . . . ²

1. done something immoral?
2. done something unfair?
3. done something harmful?
4. deceived their clients?

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale were *not at all* (1) and *a great deal* (9).

2. The person or group should be identified in the blank of the question. For example, Dong and Zhong (2017, p. 781) used the term "bankers" since participants read a news article about fraudulent activities by some banks. The phrasing of the scale stem can be easily adapted to fit various contexts.

MORALITY OF THE EMPLOYEE

Four, nine-point items compose the scale which measures the extent to which a person believes an employee of a company has done something that is either immoral and damaging to his/her company or, at the other extreme, was honest and helpful.

Origin:

Dong and Zhong (2017) used the scale as a manipulation check in Study 4 with a sample of 238 people recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The manipulation involved participants reading one of three versions of a news story, each story varying in the degree to which a CEO did something improper. The source of the scale was not stated but appears to be original.

Reliability:

The alpha reported for the scale was .98 (Dong and Zhong 2017, p. 786).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Dong and Zhong (2017). However, since the scale was used as a manipulation check and the manipulation was successful, it provides some limited support for the scale's predictive validity.

References:

Dong, Ping (2018), personal correspondence.

Dong, Ping and Chen-Bo Zhong (2017), "Witnessing Moral Violations Increases Conformity in Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (4), 778–793.

Scale Items:¹

How do you think of the _____ described in the story?²

1. immoral / moral
2. corrupt / honest
3. deceptive / upright
4. harmful to the company / helpful to the company

1. The items were clarified by Dong (2018).

2. A generic name for the person to be described should be placed in the blanks of the question. For example, Dong and Zhong (2017, p. 786) used the term "CEO" since participants read a news article about a company CEO. The question itself is amenable for rephrasing to fit different contexts.

MORALITY OF THE OBJECT

Four, seven-point semantic-differentials compose the scale and measure how much a person believes that something (person, organization, action) is kind and ethical or, at the other extreme, cruel and immoral.

Origin:

The scale was created by Olson et al. (2016) by drawing heavily on items and concepts from a scale by Stein and Nemeroff (1995). Olson et al. (2016) used the scale once in Experiments 1, 2, and 4. In Experiment 3, it was used twice (pre-treatment and post-treatment) and a two-item version of the scale was used in Experiment 5.

Reliability:

Olson et al. (2016) reported alphas that ranged from .83 (Experiment 1) to .95 (Experiment 3 post-treatment) for the four-item version of the scale. The correlation of the two items used in Experiment 5 was .79.

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Olson et al. (2016).

References:

Olson, Jenny G., Brent McFerran, Andrea C. Morales, and Darren W. Dahl (2016), "Wealth and Welfare: Divergent Moral Reactions to Ethical Consumer Choices," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (6), 879-896.

Stein, Richard I. and Carol J. Nemeroff (1995), "Moral Overtones of Food: Judgments of Others Based on What They Eat," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21 (May), 480-490.

Scale Items:¹

1. cruel / kindhearted,
2. immoral / moral
3. uncaring / caring
4. unethical / ethical

1. The items used in the two-item version of the scale for Experiment 5 were #2 and #4.

MULTI-MEDIA USAGE IN A TASK

Four, seven-point Likert-type items measure a person's usage of two media at the same time to perform one or more tasks. To be clear, the scale focuses on what a person did in a particular situation rather than his/her tendency over time to multi-task.

Origin:

The scale was used by Segijn, Voorveld, and Smit (2016) with a sample of 182 undergraduates attending the University of Amsterdam. "Multi-screening" (usage of multiple screens simultaneously) was the focus of the study. To do this, the authors adapted a measure used by Adler and Benbunan-Fich (2012) with respect to computer-based tasks.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .87 in the study by Segijn, Voorveld, and Smit (2016).

Validity:

Segijn, Voorveld, and Smit (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity.

References:

Adler, Rachel F., and Raquel Benbunan-Fich (2012), "Juggling on a High Wire: Multitasking Effects on Performance," *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 70 (2), 156-168.

Segijn, Claire M., Hilde A.M. Voorveld, and Edith G. Smit (2016), "The Underlying Mechanisms of Multiscreening Effects," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (4), 391-402.

Scale Items:¹

When I used media in the living room . . .²

1. I switched between two media.
2. I tried to use both media at the same time.
3. I used one medium at a time. (r)
4. I was carrying out several media tasks at the same time.

1. The extreme anchors used to respond to these sentences were *Strongly disagree* (1) and *Strongly agree* (7).

2. This phrase was used by Segijn, Voorveld, and Smit (2016) to refer participants to the experiment they had been in. Certainly, other researchers using the scale should modify the phrase in order to match the context.

NARCISSISM (STATE)

This seven-item, seven-point Likert-type scale is used to measure a momentary self-centered and arrogant frame of mind.

Origin:

The scale was used by de Bellis et al. (2016) in the pretests of Studies 2A (n = 112) and 2B (n = 62), with data in both cases gathered from people recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The scale itself was adapted from a measure by Sakellaropoulo and Baldwin (2007) who selected the highest loading item from each of seven first-order factors of the 40-item Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin and Terry 1988).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .82 and .89 in the pretests for Study 2A and 2B, respectively (de Bellis et al. 2016, pp. 167, 168).

Validity:

de Bellis et al. (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity.

Comments:

Although the scale's internal consistency is acceptable, there is concern about the scale's unidimensionality given that it was created from items loading on multiple dimensions (Raskin and Terry 1988).

References:

de Bellis, Emanuel, David E. Sprott, Andreas Herrmann, Hans-Werner Bierhoff, and Elke Rohmann (2016), "The Influence of Trait and State Narcissism on the Uniqueness of Mass-Customized Products," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (2), 162-172.

Raskin, Robert and Howard Terry (1988), "A Principal-Components Analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and Further Evidence of its Construct Validity," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54 (May), 890-902.

Sakellaropoulo, Maya and Mark W. Baldwin (2007), "The Hidden Sides of Self-Esteem: Two Dimensions of Implicit Self-Esteem and Their Relation to Narcissistic Reactions," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43(6), 995-1001.

Scale Items:¹

1. Right now, I feel I deserve more than other people do.
2. Right now, I feel I would make a good leader.
3. Right now, I feel I am more capable than other people.
4. Right now, I feel I should be given more attention than other people.

5. Right now, I feel I am an exceptional person.
6. Right now, I feel I can read people like a book.
7. Right now, I feel like looking at my body.

1. The extreme verbal anchors of the response scale used by de Bellis et al. (2016, p. 170) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

NEED FOR STATUS

A person's motivation to increase his/her social status is measured in this scale with four, seven-point Likert-like items.

Origin:

The scale was used in Study 3 by Gao, Winterich, and Zhang (2016). Data were gathered from 484 undergraduate business students attending either Pennsylvania State University or the University of Texas-San Antonio. As for the scale's source, it is a slight adaptation of a measure used by Dubois, Rucker, & Galinsky (2012).

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .86 (Gao, Winterich, and Zhang 2016, p. 274).

Validity:

Gao, Winterich, and Zhang (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity.

References:

Dubois, David, Derek D. Rucker, and Adam D. Galinsky (2012), "Super Size Me: Product Size as a Signal of Status," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 38 (6), 1047-1062.

Gao, Huachao, Karen Page Winterich, and Yinlong Zhang (2016), "All That Glitters Is Not Gold: How Others' Status Influences the Effect of Power Distance Belief on Status Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (2), 265-281.

Scale Items:¹

Please indicate the extent to which each statement is true as applied to you at this moment:

1. I have a desire to increase my position in the social hierarchy.
2. I want to improve my social standing as compared to others
3. Getting to climb the social ladder is a priority for me.
4. I would like to have higher social standing than others.

1. The extreme verbal anchors of the response scale used by Gao, Winterich, and Zhang (2016) were *definitely false* (1) and *definitely true* (7).

NORMALCY OF UNFRIENDLY BEHAVIOR

The scale measures how common a person believes it is in a certain setting for people to behave in ways that are unfriendly. The scale was made for use in a situation where customers interact with service employees. However, the items appear like they could be used with minimal changes in many other contexts as long as people are interacting with others using verbal and non-verbal means to express unfriendliness. Items for both an eleven-item and a seven-item version are described.

Origin:

The scale was created by Albrecht et al. (2017, p. 832) in a multi-stage process which included item generation based on depth interviews and prior research, experts rating each item, refining items, and then pretesting items. The final eleven-item version of the scale was used in the pilot study with 111 students.

Reliability:

The alpha reported by Albrecht et al. (2017, p. 842) for the full version of the scale was .98.

Validity:

Beyond evidence of content validity from the process used when experts rated the items, CFA was used to show that the measurement model had a good fit with the data (Albrecht et al. 2017, p. 832). Further, the analysis provided support for discriminant validity of this scale with respect to some other measures of employee-related attitudes. The scale's AVE was .76.

Comments:

In the interest of parsimony, Albrecht et al. (2017, p. 832) also created a shorter, seven-item version of the scale. (The items for the abbreviated version are noted below with an asterisk at the end.) The authors said that the psychometric quality of the abbreviated version as well as the results of the analyses were similar to the full scale.)

Reference:

Albrecht, Arne K., Gianfranco Walsh, Simon Brach, Dwayne D. Gremler, and Erica van Herpen (2017), "The Influence of Service Employees and Other Customers on Customer Unfriendliness: A Social Norms Perspective," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (6), 827-847.

Scale Items:¹

1. Apparently people behave a bit unfriendly in this service setting.*
2. In this service setting it seems to be common to be somewhat unfriendly.*
3. For people in this service setting it is common behave friendly. (r)
4. Apparently in this service setting it is common to behave in a friendly way. (r)*

5. In this service setting it seems to be common to have a friendly smile. (r)*
6. In this service setting it seems to be common to have an unfriendly facial expression.
7. In this service setting it seems to be common to talk in an unfriendly way. (r)
8. In this service setting it seems to be common to greet friendly. (r)*
9. In this service setting it seems to be common not to say 'thank you' when appropriate.
10. In this service setting it seems to be common to have friendly eye contact. (r)*
11. In this service setting it seems to be common to have a friendly farewell. (r)*

1. The response format used in the pilot study was not described by Albrecht et al. (2017). It seems likely that it was similar if not exactly the same as what was used by the authors in Study 2 with all their scales in which the extreme anchors of the response scale were *completely disagree* (1) and a *completely agree* (7). Items in the short version are noted with an asterisk (*) at the end.

OPTIMISM (GENERAL)

The degree to which a person has positive expectations about his/her future is measured with five, five-point Likert items.

Origin:

Briley, Rudd, and Aaker (2017) used the scale in Study 6 with data collected from a multi-cultural group of 257 undergraduates at the University of Houston. The items were taken from the six-item scale by Scheier, Carver, and Bridges (1994) called the Revised Life Orientation Test. Those authors provided evidence for the full version's unidimensionality as well as its reliability (internal consistency as well as temporal stability).

Reliability:

The alpha for the five-item version of the scale used by Briley, Rudd, and Aaker (2017, p. 909) was .77.

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Briley, Rudd, and Aaker (2017).

Comments:

Briley, Rudd, and Aaker (2017) indicated that they adapted these items for measuring optimism of one's financial future and optimism about global warming. (The exact phrasing of the items was not provided.)

References:

Briley, Donnel A., Melanie Rudd, and Jennifer Aaker (2017), "Cultivating Optimism: How to Frame Your Future during a Health Challenge," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (4), 895–915.

Scheier, Michael F., Charles S. Carver, and Michael W. Bridges (1994), "Distinguishing Optimism From Neuroticism (and Trait Anxiety, Self-Mastery, and Self-Esteem): A Reevaluation of the Life Orientation Test," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67 (6), 1063-1078.

Scale Items:¹

1. If something can go wrong for me, it will. (r)
2. I'm optimistic about my future.
3. I hardly ever expect things to go my way. (r)
4. I rarely count on good things happening to me. (r)
5. Overall, I expect more good things to happen to me than bad.

1. The response format used by Briley, Rudd, and Aaker (2017, p. 909) had *I disagree a lot* (1) and *I agree a lot* (5) as the extreme anchors.

OPTIMISM (PERSONAL ECONOMIC SITUATION)

This scale has four, seven-point Likert-type items that measure a person's expectation that both his/her income and saving money will be better in the future compared to the present.

Origin:

Yoon and Kim (2016) used the scale in Study 2 with data collected from 208 responses from "urban consumers," apparently in the United States. The scale was borrowed from Tam and Dholakia (2011) who reported the alpha to be .89.

Reliability:

When used by Yoon and Kim (2016), the alpha calculated for the scale was .84.

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Yoon and Kim (2016).

Comments:

The scale can be easily adapted to make the period of optimism more specific than as expressed in the items shown below. This is what Tam and Dholakia (2011, p. 145) did. Depending on the experimental condition in which participants were assigned, the scale items either referred to "next month" or "three months from today."

References:

Tam, Leona and Utpal M. Dholakia (2011), "Delay and Duration Effects of Time Frames on Personal Savings Estimates and Behavior," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 114 (2), 142-152.

Yoon, Sunyee and Hyeongmin Christian Kim (2016), "Keeping the American Dream Alive: The Interactive Effect of Perceived Economic Mobility and Materialism on Impulsive Spending," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (5), 759-772.

Scale Items:¹

1. I will probably have more money to spend in the future than I have now.
2. In the future, my income flow will be a lot higher than it is now.
3. I feel optimistic that I will be able to save more in the future when compared to now.
4. I will be able to control my spending more in the future than I do now.

1. The response scale used by Yoon and Kim (2016, p. 763) with these items was anchored by *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

OUTDOORS LIFESTYLE

Four, seven-point Likert-type items are used in the scale to measure the degree to which a person views self as an “outdoorsy” person and that affects his/her recreation as well as product choices.

Origin:

Summers, Smith, and Reczek (2016) used the scale in Study 4. Data were gathered from 269 members of Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. The authors did not identify the source of the scale; they are assumed to have created the measure.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .81 (Summers, Smith, and Reczek 2016, p. 168).

Validity:

The scale’s validity was not discussed by Summers, Smith, and Reczek (2016).

Reference:

Summers, Christopher A., Robert W. Smith, and Rebecca Walker Reczek (2016), "An Audience of One: Behaviorally Targeted Ads as Implied Social Labels," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (1), 156-178.

Scale Items:¹

1. Camping and hiking are my idea of a good time.
2. I like to explore nature whenever possible.
3. I am someone who chooses products that are suitable for an outdoorsy lifestyle.
4. I am an outdoorsy person.

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

PARENTAL MEDIA MEDIATION (AUTONOMY-SUPPORTIVE ACTIVE)

With four, five-point items, the scale measures an adolescent's belief that his/her parents would care about he/she thought if they said some media content is unsuitable for children, e.g., there is too much violence in movies and video games.

Origin:

Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) used the scale in a study with data collected from 780 young adolescents in the Dutch-speaking area of Belgium. The scale was developed by Valkenburg et al. (2013) as part of the multi-measure instrument they called the Perceived Parental Media Mediation Scale (PPMMS). With multiple studies, those authors provided evidence of their scales' reliabilities and validities.

Reliability:

The construct reliability of the scale as used by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) was .82. Alpha was also .82.

Validity:

The measurement model tested by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) provided a good fit to the data. Items for one of the scales, not the one reviewed here, were removed and the fit improved further. The AVE for the scale measuring Autonomy-Supportive Active Mediation was .53 and a test provided evidence of the scale's discriminant validity.

Comments:

Items for each scale in the PPMMS were not laid out contiguously in the questionnaire but were in a rather unique question-answer configuration. (A question was asked and then answers were provided with items from different scales.) Because of the integratedness of items from the different scales and the way they were configured in the questionnaire, it may be best to use the scales as described by Valkenburg et al. (2013, pp. 464-466).

References:

Vanwesenbeeck, Ina, Michel Walrave, and Koen Ponnet (2016), "Young Adolescents and Advertising on Social Network Games: A Structural Equation Model of Perceived Parental Media Mediation, Advertising Literacy, and Behavioral Intention," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 183-197.

Valkenburg, Patti M., Jessica Taylor Piotrowski, Jo Hermanns, and Rebecca Leeuw (2013), "Developing and Validating the Perceived Parental Media Mediation Scale: A Self-Determination Perspective," *Human Communication Research*, 39 (4), 445-469.

Scale Items:¹

If your parents told you that what you see in movies and video games is different from real life and there is too much rudeness and violence, how would they discuss this with you?²

1. My parents would want to know how I think.
2. My parents would be curious how I think about this.
3. My parents would encourage me to voice my own opinion.
4. My parents would be curious how I feel about this.

1. The response scale used by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) with these items were not described though it appears to have had five points. The format used by Valkenburg et al. (2013, p. 464) had the following anchors: *not true at all* (1), *not true* (2), *neutral* (3), *true* (4), and *completely true* (5).

2. The phrasing of this scale stem is a combination of phrases from four questions used by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) who had a slightly different question per item. As mentioned in the Comments above, items for scales in the PPMMS were not grouped together as shown here for the Autonomy-Supportive Active Mediation scale but rather were provided to respondents as answers to questions along with items from other scales.

PARENTAL MEDIA MEDIATION (AUTONOMY-SUPPORTIVE RESTRICTIVE)

Four, five-point items are used in this scale to measure an adolescent's belief about what his/her parents would say if they did not want him/her to watch television, movies, or video games that contained too much violence. Specifically, this belief is characterized by the parents "restricting" the time the child spends with the unacceptable media content and providing rationale in which the perspective of the adolescent is taken seriously.

Origin:

Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) used the scale in a study with data collected from 780 young adolescents in the Dutch-speaking area of Belgium. The scale was developed by Valkenburg et al. (2013) as part of the multi-measure instrument they called the Perceived Parental Media Mediation Scale (PPMMS). With multiple studies, those authors provided evidence of their scales' reliabilities and validities.

Reliability:

The construct reliability of the scale as used by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) was .82. Alpha was .81.

Validity:

The measurement model tested by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) provided a good fit to the data. Items for one of the scales, not the one reviewed here, were removed and the fit improved further. The AVE for the scale measuring Autonomy-Supportive Restrictive Mediation was .54 and a test provided evidence of the scale's discriminant validity.

Comments:

Items for each scale in the PPMMS were not laid out contiguously in the questionnaire but were in a rather unique question-answer format. (A question was asked and then answers were provided with items from different scales.) Because of the integratedness of items from the different scales and the way they were configured in the questionnaire, it may be best to use the scales as described by Valkenburg et al. (2013, pp. 464-466).

References:

Vanwesenbeeck, Ina, Michel Walrave, and Koen Ponnet (2016), "Young Adolescents and Advertising on Social Network Games: A Structural Equation Model of Perceived Parental Media Mediation, Advertising Literacy, and Behavioral Intention," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 183-197.

Valkenburg, Patti M., Jessica Taylor Piotrowski, Jo Hermanns, and Rebecca Leeuw (2013), "Developing and Validating the Perceived Parental Media Mediation Scale: A Self-Determination Perspective," *Human Communication Research*, 39 (4), 445-469.

Scale Items:¹

If your parents forbid you from watching certain television shows, movies, or video games because of the violence in them, how would they discuss this with you?²

1. My parents would explain to me why it's better not to watch such shows or movies.
2. My parents would explain to me why it's better not to watch these games.
3. My parents would explain to me why it's best not to watch such shows or movies.
4. My parents would tell me why they don't want me to play games too much.

1. The response scale used by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) with these items was not described though it appears to have had five points. The format used by Valkenburg et al. (2013, p. 464) had the following anchors: *not true at all* (1), *not true* (2), *neutral* (3), *true* (4), and *completely true* (5).

2. The phrasing of this scale stem is a combination of phrases from two sets of instructions used by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016). As mentioned in the Comments above, items for scales in the PPMMS were not grouped together as shown here for the Autonomy-Supportive Restrictive Mediation scale but rather were combined with items from other scales to be answers to questions being asked.

PARENTAL MEDIA MEDIATION (CONTROLLING RESTRICTIVE)

The scale has four, five-point items that measure what an adolescent thinks his/her parents would do if they did not want him/her to watch television, movies, or video games that contained too much violence. Specifically, this belief is characterized by the parents "restricting" the time the child spends with unacceptable media content by using anger and threatening punishment.

Origin:

Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) used the scale in a study with data collected from 780 young adolescents in the Dutch-speaking area of Belgium. The scale was developed by Valkenburg et al. (2013) as part of the multi-measure instrument they called the Perceived Parental Media Mediation Scale (PPMMS). With multiple studies, those authors provided evidence of their scales' reliabilities and validities.

Reliability:

The construct reliability of the scale as used by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) was .81.

Validity:

The measurement model tested by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) provided a good fit to the data. Items for one of the scales, not the one reviewed here, were removed and the fit improved further. The AVE for the scale measuring Controlling Restrictive Mediation was .53 and a test provided evidence of the scale's discriminant validity.

Comments:

Items for each scale in the PPMMS were not laid out contiguously in the questionnaire but were in a particular question-answer configuration. (A question was asked and then answers were provided with items from different scales.) Because of the integratedness of items from the different scales and the way they were configured in the questionnaire, it may be best to use the scales as described by Valkenburg et al. (2013, pp. 464-466).

References:

Vanwesenbeeck, Ina, Michel Walrave, and Koen Ponnet (2016), "Young Adolescents and Advertising on Social Network Games: A Structural Equation Model of Perceived Parental Media Mediation, Advertising Literacy, and Behavioral Intention," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 183-197.

Valkenburg, Patti M., Jessica Taylor Piotrowski, Jo Hermanns, and Rebecca Leeuw (2013), "Developing and Validating the Perceived Parental Media Mediation Scale: A Self-Determination Perspective," *Human Communication Research*, 39 (4), 445-469.

Scale Items:¹

If your parents forbid you from watching certain television shows, movies, or video games because of the violence in them, how would they discuss this with you?²

1. My parents would threaten to punish me if I want to watch these shows or movies.
2. My parents would get mad at me if I still want to play these games.
3. My parents would get mad if I still want to watch these shows or movies.
4. My parents would threaten to punish me if I keep on gaming.

1. The response scale used by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) with these items was not described though it appears to have had five points. The format used by Valkenburg et al. (2013, p. 464) had the following anchors: *not true at all* (1), *not true* (2), *neutral* (3), *true* (4), and *completely true* (5).

2. The phrasing of this scale stem is a combination of phrases from two sets of instructions used by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016). As mentioned in the Comments above, items for scales in the PPMMS were not grouped together as shown here for the Controlling Restrictive Mediation scale but rather combined with items from other scales to be answers to questions being asked.

PARENTAL MEDIA MEDIATION (INCONSISTENT RESTRICTIVE)

The scale uses four, five-point items to measure the degree to which an adolescent thinks his/her parents are inconsistent in their restriction of the time he/she can spend with television, movies, and video games that contained too much violence.

Origin:

Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) used the scale in a study with data collected from 780 young adolescents in the Dutch-speaking area of Belgium. The scale was developed by Valkenburg et al. (2013) as part of the multi-measure instrument they called the Perceived Parental Media Mediation Scale (PPMMS). With multiple studies, those authors provided evidence of their scales' reliabilities and validities.

Reliability:

The construct reliability of the scale as used by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) was .82. The alpha for the scale was .81.

Validity:

The measurement model tested by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) provided a good fit to the data. Items for one of the scales, not the one reviewed here, were removed and the fit improved further. The AVE for the scale measuring Inconsistent Restrictive Mediation was .53 and a test provided evidence of the scale's discriminant validity.

Comments:

Items for each scale in the PPMMS were not laid out contiguously in the questionnaire but were in a particular question-answer format. (A question was asked and then answers from different scales were provided.) Because of the way items from the different scales were integrated and configured in the questionnaire, it may be best to use the scales as described by Valkenburg et al. (2013, pp. 464-466).

References:

Vanwesenbeeck, Ina, Michel Walrave, and Koen Ponnet (2016), "Young Adolescents and Advertising on Social Network Games: A Structural Equation Model of Perceived Parental Media Mediation, Advertising Literacy, and Behavioral Intention," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 183-197.

Valkenburg, Patti M., Jessica Taylor Piotrowski, Jo Hermanns, and Rebecca Leeuw (2013), "Developing and Validating the Perceived Parental Media Mediation Scale: A Self-Determination Perspective," *Human Communication Research*, 39 (4), 445-469.

Scale Items:¹

If your parents forbid you from watching certain television shows, movies, or video games because of the violence in them, how would they discuss this with you?²

1. My parents would tell me that I am not allowed to watch these shows or movies, but I know that the next time I want to watch these shows or movies, I will be allowed to.
2. My parents would say that I am not allowed to play those games, but I know that after a while, I can play those games again.
3. My parents would tell me that I am not allowed to watch such TV shows or movies, but I know that the next time I want to watch these shows or movies, I will be allowed to.
4. My parents would tell me I am not allowed to, but I know that most of the time I can just keep on doing it.

1. The response scale used by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) with these items was not described though it appears to have had five points. The format used by Valkenburg et al. (2013, p. 464) had the following anchors: *not true at all* (1), *not true* (2), *neutral* (3), *true* (4), and *completely true* (5).

2. The phrasing of this scale stem is a combination of phrases from two sets of instructions used by Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016). As mentioned in the Comments above, items for scales in the PPMMS were not grouped together as shown here for the Inconsistent Restrictive Mediation scale but rather were combined with items from other scales to be answers to questions being asked.

PARENTAL STYLE (AUTHORITARIAN)

The belief that one's parent(s) firmly directed the children while they were growing up and expected unquestioning obedience is measured with ten Likert items.

Origin:

Vanbergen and Laran (2016) used the scale in Study 1 with 143 undergraduate business students at the University of Miami. The scale is one part of the Parental Authority Questionnaire constructed by Buri (1991). That questionnaire was developed in order to measure Baumrind's (1971) three types of parental authority: permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative. Using multiple studies and tests, Buri (1991) provided support for each subscale's internal consistency, temporal stability, and several forms of validity. Evidence also indicated that scores were not strongly affected by socially desirable responding.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .906 in the study by Vanbergen and Laran (2016; Vanbergen 2017).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Vanbergen and Laran (2016).

References:

- Baumrind, Diana (1971), "Current Patterns of Parental Authority," *Developmental Psychology*, 4 (1, part 2), 1-103.
- Buri, John R. (1991), "Parental Authority Questionnaire," *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57 (1), 110-119.
- Vanbergen, Noah (2017), personal correspondence.
- Vanbergen, Noah and Juliano Laran (2016), "Loss of Control and Self-Regulation: The Role of Childhood Lessons," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (4), 534-548.

Scale Items:¹

Instructions: For each of the following statements, circle the number of the 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*) that best describes how that statement applies to you and your _____. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your _____ during your years of growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don't spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement.

1. Even if her children didn't agree with her, my _____ felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what she thought was right.
2. Whenever my _____ told me to do something as I was growing up, she expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.
3. As I was growing up my _____ did not allow me to question any decision she had made.

4. My _____ has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.
5. My _____ felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.
6. As I was growing up my _____ would get very upset if I tried to disagree with her.
7. As I was growing up my _____ let me know what behavior she expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, she punished me.
8. My _____ has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.
9. As I was growing up my _____ often told me exactly what she wanted me to do and how she expected me to do it.
10. As I was growing up I knew what my _____ expected of me in the family and she insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for her authority.

1. These instructions are those used by Buri (1991). The word *mother* or *father* is typically put in the blanks, however, Vanbergen and Laran (2016, p. 538) used *parents*. Depending upon which word is used, the appropriate pronouns need to be used in several of the sentences, e.g., he, she, they. The response format used by Vanbergen and Laran (2016, p. 538) had the same end-points as those used by Buri (1991) except that the former used a seven-point scale.

PARENTAL STYLE (AUTHORITATIVE)

This scale uses ten Likert items to measure the degree to which a person believes that his/her parent(s) provided clear and firm direction for their kids while they were growing up but were reasonable and flexible as well.

Origin:

Vanbergen and Laran (2016) used the scale in Study 1 with 143 undergraduate business students at the University of Miami. The scale is one part of the Parental Authority Questionnaire constructed by Buri (1991). That questionnaire was developed in order to measure Baumrind's (1971) three types of parental authority: permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative. Using multiple studies and tests, Buri (1991) provided support for each subscale's internal consistency, temporal stability, and several forms of validity. Evidence also indicated that scores were not strongly affected by socially desirable responding.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .895 in the study by Vanbergen and Laran (2016; Vanbergen 2017).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Vanbergen and Laran (2016).

References:

Baumrind, Diana (1971), "Current Patterns of Parental Authority," *Developmental Psychology*, 4 (1, part 2), 1-103.
Buri, John R. (1991), "Parental Authority Questionnaire," *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57 (1), 110-119.
Vanbergen, Noah (2017), personal correspondence.
Vanbergen, Noah and Juliano Laran (2016), "Loss of Control and Self-Regulation: The Role of Childhood Lessons," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (4), 534-548.

Scale Items:¹

Instructions: For each of the following statements, circle the number of the 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*) that best describes how that statement applies to you and your _____. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your _____ during your years of growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don't spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement.

1. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my _____ discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family.
2. My _____ has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable.

3. As I was growing up my _____ directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline.
4. As I was growing up I knew what my _____ expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my _____ when I felt that they were unreasonable.
5. As the children in my family were growing up, my _____ consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways.
6. As I was growing up my _____ took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but she would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it.
7. My _____ had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but she was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family.
8. My _____ gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and she expected me to follow her direction, but she was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.
9. As I was growing up my _____ gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but she was also understanding when I disagreed with her.
10. As I was growing up, if my _____ made a decision in the family that hurt me, she was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if she had made a mistake.

1. These instructions are those used by Buri (1991). The word *mother* or *father* is typically put in the blanks, however, Vanbergen and Laran (2016, p. 538) used *parents*. Depending upon which word is used, the appropriate pronouns need to be used in several of the sentences, e.g., he, she, they. The response format used by Vanbergen and Laran (2016, p. 538) had the same end-points as those used by Buri (1991) except that the former used a seven-point scale.

PARENTAL STYLE (PERMISSIVE)

With ten Likert items, the scale measures the degree to which a person believes that his/her parent(s) made few demands on the kids while they were growing up and allowed them to regulate their own activities.

Origin:

Vanbergen and Laran (2016) used the scale in Study 1 with 143 undergraduate business students at the University of Miami. The scale is one part of the Parental Authority Questionnaire constructed by Buri (1991). That questionnaire was developed in order to measure Baumrind's (1971) three types of parental authority: permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative. Using multiple studies and tests, Buri (1991) provided support for each subscale's internal consistency, temporal stability, and several forms of validity. Evidence also indicated that scores were not strongly affected by socially desirable responding.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .818 in the study by Vanbergen and Laran (2016; Vanbergen 2017).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Vanbergen and Laran (2016).

References:

- Baumrind, Diana (1971), "Current Patterns of Parental Authority," *Developmental Psychology*, 4 (1, part 2), 1-103.
- Buri, John R. (1991), "Parental Authority Questionnaire," *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57 (1), 110-119.
- Vanbergen, Noah (2017), personal correspondence.
- Vanbergen, Noah and Juliano Laran (2016), "Loss of Control and Self-Regulation: The Role of Childhood Lessons," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (4), 534-548.

Scale Items:¹

Instructions: For each of the following statements, circle the number of the 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*) that best describes how that statement applies to you and your _____. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your _____ during your years of growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don't spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement.

1. While I was growing up my _____ felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do.
2. My _____ has always felt that what her children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want.

3. As I was growing up my _____ did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.
4. As I was growing up, my _____ seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior.
5. Most of the time as I was growing up my _____ did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions.
6. My _____ feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up.
7. As I was growing up my _____ allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from her.
8. My _____ did not view herself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up.
9. As I was growing up my _____ allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and she generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do.
10. As I was growing up my _____ did not direct the behaviors, activities, and desires of the children in the family.

1. These instructions are those used by Buri (1991). The word *mother* or *father* is typically put in the blanks, however, Vanbergen and Laran (2016, p. 538) used *parents*. Depending upon which word is used, the appropriate pronouns need to be used in several of the sentences, e.g., he, she, they. The response format used by Vanbergen and Laran (2016, p. 538) had the same end-points as those used by Buri (1991) except that the former used a seven-point scale.

PARTICIPATION (ACTIVE)

The degree to which a person felt involved in an activity rather than just passively observing it is measured with four, seven-point Likert-type items. While the scale was made for use in a product demonstration context, it appears to be amenable for use in other contexts where people can either actively participate in something or just watch.

Origin:

Müller-Stewens et al. (2017) used the scale as a manipulation check in Study 6 (n = 252) in which a presentation about a product innovation was "gamified." Participants were recruited from an online panel. The source of the scale was not stated but appears to have been created by the authors for the study.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .91 (Müller-Stewens et al. 2017, p. 17).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Müller-Stewens et al. (2017). Despite that, the fact that the scale was used as a manipulation check and showed the manipulation was successful, provides some evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

Comments:

The indication of reverse-scoring for two of the items (below) was not shown in the article. Based on a reading of the items, the need for reverse-scoring is evident but should be confirmed via factor analysis before the scale is formed and used in analyses.

Reference:

Müller-Stewens, Jessica, Tobias Schlager, Gerald Häubl, and Andreas Herrmann (2017), "Gamified Information Presentation and Consumer Adoption of Product Innovations," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (2), 8-24.

Scale Items:¹

1. I felt active during the _____.
2. I rather passively observed the _____. (r)
3. My role during the _____ was very active.
4. I felt passive during the _____. (r)

1. The name or a brief description of the activity should be placed in the blanks. The end-points of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

PATRONAGE LIKELIHOOD (RESTAURANT)

The scale is composed of four, seven-point items that measure a consumer's likelihood of going to a particular restaurant in the unspecified future.

Origin:

Xie and Keh (2016) used the scale in a field experiment (Study 3) with data collected from 133 Chinese consumers who were members of a China-based online panel. The source of the scale was not stated and it is assumed to have been created by the authors. They referred to the measure as *purchase intention*.

Reliability:

The alpha was reported to be .94 (Xie and Keh 2016, p. 219).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Xie and Keh (2016).

Comments:

The language in which the scale was phrased for the participants was not stated but would appear to have been Chinese which means the items shown below are translations provided for purposes of the article in English.

Reference:

Xie, Yi and Hean Tat Keh (2016), "Taming the Blame Game: Using Promotion Programs to Counter Product-Harm Crises," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 211-226.

Scale Items:¹

1. Will you eat at _____ in the future?
2. Will you have _____ as your first choice for _____ in the future?
3. How likely will you increase your patronage at _____ in the future?
4. How likely will you choose _____ the next time you want to have _____?

1. The extreme points of the response scale were *Very unlikely* (1) and *Very likely* (7). The name of the focal restaurant should be placed in the blanks of items #1 and #3 and the first blanks of #2 and #4. The second blanks of #2 and #4 should have a word or phrase describing the type of restaurant. Xie and Keh (2016) used the phrase "fast food."

PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT EXPECTANCY

The anticipated level of improvement (or lack thereof) in one's performance of a certain activity from the use of a particular product is measured with three, seven-point items.

Origin:

Garvey, Germann, and Bolton (2016) used variations of the scale in the pretests for Studies 1, 3, 4, and 5. In each case, data were gathered from undergraduate students at the University of Notre Dame. The authors created the scales based on inspiration they received from work by Shiv, Carmon, and Ariely (2005).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .96 as used in the pretests of both Studies 1 and 4 (Garvey, Germann, and Bolton 2016, pp. 936, 941).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Garvey, Germann, and Bolton (2016). It is worth noting, however, that the scale was used as a manipulation check in the pretests. Since the manipulations were successful it provides some limited support for the scale's predictive validity.

Comments:

The general form of the scale used in pretests for Studies 1 and 4 is what is shown below. The form for the other two usages were a little different. One measured how a product was expected to improve concentration in a context while the other measured expected improvement in prestige.

References:

Garvey, Aaron M., Frank Germann, and Lisa E. Bolton (2016), "Performance Brand Placebos: How Brands Improve Performance and Consumers Take the Credit," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (6), 931-951.

Shiv, Baba, Ziv Carmon, and Dan Ariely (2005), "Placebo Effects of Marketing Actions: Consumers May Get What They Pay For," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 42 (November), 383-393.

Scale Items:¹

1. _____ will *harm/help* my _____ performance.
2. I feel that the _____ is *very bad/very good* at improving my _____ performance.
3. To what extent could the _____ improve your _____ performance?²

-
1. The name of the product should be placed in the longer blanks of each item while the type of performance improvement should be put in the shorter blanks. For example, the phrasing of item #1 in the Study 1 pretest was *Using this [brand] golf putter will harm/help my putting performance.* (Either Nike, Starter, or no brand name was used in the three experimental conditions.)
 2. The end points of the response scale used with this item were *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7). The end points for items #1 and #2 are shown in italics.

PERSONAL SAVINGS ORIENTATION

This nine item, seven-point Likert-type scale measures a consumer's chronic tendency to save money that is incorporated into his/her lifestyle.

Origin:

In an impressive set of studies, Dholakia et al. (2016) developed and tested the scale. Briefly, the authors generated over 100 items and in two initial studies reduced the number down to nine. Those items loaded on two factors that were referred to as Day-to-Day Action and Saving Lifestyle. Despite that, the evidence indicated that the dimensions acted "consistently and in concert with respect to external factors" (p. 138). Because of this, the authors decided to use the nine-item scale for purposes of validation and did not discuss the subscales any further.

Reliability:

For the six studies in which reliability was reported, alphas were rather consistent, ranging from .83 (Studies 4A and B) to .86 (Study 2). Temporal stability was examined in Study 2 (n = 123) and the two-month test-retest correlation was .72 (p. 138).

Validity:

Several forms of evidence were provided in the studies conducted by Dholakia et al. (2016) in support of the scale's validity. Possibly the most notable is the number of scales to which personal savings orientation was related and yet distinct (discriminant validity) such as frugality, spendthrift/tightwad, and consumer spending self-control.

Comments:

While Dholakia et al. (2016) decided to treat personal savings orientation as one scale despite its bi-dimensionality, justification for doing that would be strengthened if it could be shown that the dimensions load strongly on the same higher order factor rather than just being correlated.

Reference:

Dholakia, Utpal, Leona Tam, Sunyee Yoon, and Nancy Wong (2016), "The Ant and the Grasshopper: Understanding Personal Saving Orientation of Consumers," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (1), 134-155.

Scale Items:¹

1. I keep a careful watch over my spending on a daily basis.
2. I do not spend money thoughtlessly, I would rather save it for a rainy day.
3. Putting money into personal savings is a habit for me.
4. I actively consider the steps I need to take to achieve my personal savings goals.
5. I like to discuss the topic of saving money with my family and friends.

6. I usually save money without having a specific goal in mind.
7. The goal of saving money is always at the back of my mind.
8. Saving money on a regular basis should be an important part of one's life.
9. Saving money is like a lifestyle, you have to keep at it.

1. A seven-point response scale with *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7) as end points appears to have been used in all of the studies reported by Dholakia et al. (2016). Items #1 to #5 composed the Day-to-Day Action subscale while the other items composed the Saving Lifestyle subscale.

PERSUASIVENESS OF THE AD

This scale uses four items and a seven-point Likert-type response format to measure the degree to which a person believes an advertising message is compelling and convincing.

Origin:

Chang (2017) used the scale in Study 1 with data gathered from 167 people at a university in East Asia. The scale items were taken from Dillard, Weber, and Vail (2007) who, based on the findings of a meta-analysis, identified the four items shown below to be the most commonly used in scholarly questionnaires to measure the "impact" of an ad.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .91 (Chang 2017, p. 493).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Chang (2017).

References:

Chang, Chingching (2017), "A Metacognitive Model of the Effects of Susceptibility to Persuasion Self-Beliefs on Advertising Effects," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (4), 487-502.

Chang, Chingching (2018), personal correspondence.

Dillard, James Prince, Kristen M. Weber, and Renata G. Vail (2007), "The Relationship between the Perceived and Actual Effectiveness of Persuasive Messages: A Meta-Analysis with Implications for Formative Campaign Research," *Journal of Communication*, 57 (4), 613-631.

Scale Items:¹

The message was:

1. persuasive.
2. effective.
3. compelling.
4. convincing.

1. The response scale used with the items had seven points with *strongly disagree* / *strongly agree* as the extreme verbal anchors (Chang 2018).

PLAYFULNESS OF THE OBJECT

The degree to which a person believes an information-related activity or object is enjoyable as well as worthy of exploration is measured with four, seven-point Likert-type items. The scale may make most sense in a context where the object being assessed is a lesson, demonstration, or presentation.

Origin:

Müller-Stewens et al. (2017) used the scale in Studies 5 and 6 in which information about a product innovation was "gamified." The authors created the scale by drawing keywords from a nine-item measure of playfulness by Moon and Kim (2001).

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .92 in both Studies 5 and 6 (Müller-Stewens et al. 2017, pp. 15, 17).

Validity:

In Studies 5 and 6, CFAs provided support for the scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The AVEs for the scale were .77 and .76 in Studies 5 and 6, respectively (Müller-Stewens et al. 2017, pp. 15, 17).

Comments:

While the internal consistency of the scale as well as the convergent and discriminant validities were good, there is some concern about the scale's face validity because of an inconsistency in the object being described. Note how items #1 and #2 (below) refer to the information source whereas items #3 and #4 refer to self. The effect of this inconsistency on the scale's overall validity is unknown.

References:

Moon, Ji-Won, and Young-Gul Kim (2001), "Extending the TAM for a World-Wide-Web Context," *Information & Management*, 38 (4), 217-230.

Müller-Stewens, Jessica, Tobias Schlager, Gerald Häubl, and Andreas Herrmann (2017), "Gamified Information Presentation and Consumer Adoption of Product Innovations," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (2), 8-24.

Scale Items:¹

5. The _____ was fun.
6. The _____ was enjoyable.
7. I was happy.
8. I was explorative.

1. The name of the information object being described should be placed in the blanks. As used by Müller-Stewens et al. (2017, p. 15), the object was a presentation. The end-points of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

POLYCHRONICITY

A person's preference for multitasking (switching attention among several ongoing tasks) rather than performing one task at a time until its completion is measured in the scale with 14 Likert-type items.

Origin:

The original version of the scale was developed by Poposki and Oswald (2012) and called the Multitasking Preference Inventory. Using a multi-step process, a pool of items was created, followed by refinement of the pool, and then the surviving items were examined in terms of reliability and validity. The final version of the inventory had 14 items, high internal consistency ($\alpha = .91$), and good temporal stability (one-week test-retest of .83).

A French version of the scale was created by Atalay, Bodur, and Bressoud (2017) using the back-translation method. The scale was used in Study 2 with data gathered from shoppers at a mall in Paris. Analyses were based on responses from 119 participants.

Reliability:

The French version of the scale used by Atalay, Bodur, and Bressoud (2017, p. 78) had an alpha of .78.

Validity:

Atalay, Bodur, and Bressoud (2017) did not discuss the validity of their French version of the scale.

Comments:

Atalay, Bodur, and Bressoud (2017, p. 199) provided the English version of the scale items in their article. If researchers want the French version, they are urged to contact the authors.

References:

Atalay, A. Selin, H. Onur Bodur, and Etienne Bressoud (2017), "When and How Multitasking Impacts Consumer Shopping Decisions," *Journal of Retailing*, 93 (2), 187-200.

Poposki, Elizabeth M. and Frederick L. Oswald (2010), "The Multitasking Preference Inventory: Toward an Improved Measure of Individual Differences in Polychronicity," *Human Performance*, 23 (3), 247-264.

Scale Items:¹

1. I prefer to work on several projects in a day, rather than completing one project and then switching to another.
2. I would like to work in a job where I was constantly shifting from one task to another, like a receptionist or an air traffic controller.

3. I lose interest in what I am doing if I have to focus on the same task for long periods of time, without thinking about or doing something else.
4. When doing a number of assignments, I like to switch back and forth between them rather than do one at a time.
5. I like to finish one task completely before focusing on anything else. (r)
6. It makes me uncomfortable when I am not able to finish one task completely before focusing on another task. (r)
7. I am much more engaged in what I am doing if I am able to switch between several different tasks.
8. I do not like having to shift my attention between multiple tasks. (r)
9. I would rather switch back and forth between several projects than concentrate my efforts on just one.
10. I would prefer to work in an environment where I can finish one task before starting the next. (r)
11. I don't like when I have to stop in the middle of a task to work on something else. (r)
12. When I have a task to complete, I like to break it up by switching to other tasks intermittently.
13. I have a "one-track" mind. (r)
14. I prefer not to be interrupted when working on a task. (r)

1. The response format used by Poposki and Oswald (2012) was a five-point Likert-type, with end-points labeled *strongly disagree/strongly agree*. Atalay, Bodur, and Bressoud (2017) did not describe the response format used with the items in their study. It is likely to have been the French equivalent of what Poposki and Oswald (2012) used.

POWER FELT (STATE)

Using three questions, this scale measures how much a person believes that at a particular point in time he/she had power over other people.

Origin:

The scale was used in a post-test reported only in the web appendix of the article by Gao, Winterich, and Zhang (2016). Data were gathered from 124 U.S. consumers recruited from MTurk. The authors indicated that they had adapted the scale from Rucker and Galinsky (2008). While it appears the former drew on concepts expressed by the latter, there is only one item in common between the two scales.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .78 as reported by Gao, Winterich, and Zhang (2016, web appendix, p. 10).

Validity:

Gao, Winterich, and Zhang (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity *per se*. However, based on theory and some limited testing, the authors concluded that the type of power measured by the scale below was distinct from two other constructs: *others' status* and *power distance belief*.

References:

Gao, Huachao, Karen Page Winterich, and Yinlong Zhang (2016), "All That Glitters Is Not Gold: How Others' Status Influences the Effect of Power Distance Belief on Status Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (2), 265-281.

Rucker, Derek D. and Adam Galinsky (2008), "Desire to Acquire: Powerlessness and Compensatory Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35 (2), 257-267.

Sundar, Aparna and Theodore J. Noseworthy (2014), "Place the Logo High or Low? Using Conceptual Metaphors of Power in Packaging Design," *Journal of Marketing*, 78 (5), 138-151.

Scale Items:¹

1. At the moment, to what extent do you think you have power over others?
2. At the moment, to what extent do you feel powerful?
3. At the moment, to what extent do you feel powerless? (r)

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale used by Gao, Winterich, and Zhang (2016) with these items were not stated. They were likely to have been something like *not at all* (1) and *to a great extent* (7) as used by Sundar and Noseworthy (2014, p. 144) who also created a measure of this same construct.

POWER FELT (STATE)

Three, seven-point semantic differentials compose the scale and measure the extent to which a person feels strong and in-control at a particular point in time. To be clear, this scale was created to measure a person's state rather than a personality trait or enduring characteristic.

Origin:

Dubois, Rucker, and Galinsky (2016) created the scale and used it in Studies 1, 2, 3, and 4. The scale was used after the end of each experiment as a manipulation check. The first experiment was conducted at HEC Paris, the second at Northwestern University, and the other two at the INSEAD-Sorbonne Behavioural Lab. For Studies, 1, 3, and 4, the survey was written in French. The language used in Study 2 was not identified but is assumed to have been English.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .92, .90, .91, and .89 as used in Studies 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively Dubois, Rucker, and Galinsky (2016).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not directly addressed by Dubois, Rucker, and Galinsky (2016). However, since the scale was used as a manipulation check in all the studies and each was successful, it provides some evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

Reference:

Dubois, David, Derek D. Rucker, and Adam D. Galinsky (2016), "Dynamics of Communicator and Audience Power: The Persuasiveness of Competence versus Warmth," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (1), 68-85.

Scale Items:¹

1. powerless / powerful
2. without control / in control
3. weak / strong

1. The response scale had seven points (Dubois, Rucker, and Galinsky 2016, p. 72). The scale stem and/or instructions were not stated but apparently directed participants to indicate how they felt during the experimental task.

POWERLESSNESS WITH THE BRAND

A consumer's belief that he/she does not have the ability to sway a brand and its employees toward his/her stance with regard to some issue or conflict is measured with four, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Kähr et al. (2016) used in the scale in what they called Preliminary Study 2 with 289 participants recruited from several European countries using the Clickworker platform. The scale was a slight adaptation of a measure created by Grégoire, Laufer, and Tripp (2010). The difference is that Kähr et al. (2016) phrased the items in terms of not having power over a brand whereas Grégoire, Laufer, and Tripp (2010) stated the items as having power over a service-related firm.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .94 (Kähr et al. 2016, p. 30).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Kähr et al. (2016).

References:

Grégoire, Yany, Daniel Laufer, and Thomas M. Tripp (2010), "A Comprehensive Model of Customer Direct and Indirect Revenge: Understanding the Effects of Perceived Greed and Customer Power," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 38 (6), 738-758.

Kähr, Andrea (2018), personal correspondence.

Kähr, Andrea, Bettina Nyffenegger, Harley Krohmer, and Wayne D. Hoyer (2016), "When Hostile Consumers Wreak Havoc on Your Brand: The Phenomenon of Consumer Brand Sabotage," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (3), 25-41.

Scale Items:¹

1. I did not have any leverage over the brand (and its employees).
2. I did not have the ability to influence the decisions made by the brand (and its employees).
3. Despite my conviction, I was unable to get my way with the brand (and its employees).
4. Despite my strong conviction of being right, I was unable to convince the brand (and its employees).

¹ The scale items were provided by Kähr (2018). The labels for the end-points of the seven-point response scale were *I completely disagree* (1) and *I completely agree* (7).

PREFERENCE FOR THE FAMILIAR FOOD BRAND

Three, seven-point items are used to measure how much a person still wants to eat a familiar brand of a product immediately after having tried some of an unknown brand.

Origin:

The three-item scale was used in Study 2 by Arens and Hamilton (2016). (Two item variations were used in a Pilot Study and Study 1.) The source of the scale was not stated. It appears the authors created it by drawing inspiration from their earlier conceptual work (Hamilton et al. 2014).

The context of the study was that participants were initially told they would be given a small sample of a well-known cereal (Cheerios) but were later told they would be given another cereal instead (Merry-Os, a fictitious substitute). The degree of similarity of the substitute's packaging and description to the well-known brand was varied in two conditions. The authors referred to the scale as measuring "desire for the unattained" because a substitute brand was provided rather than the expected one during a single session.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .82 (Arens and Hamilton 2016, p. 455).

Validity:

Arens and Hamilton (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity.

References:

Arens, Zachary G. and Rebecca W. Hamilton (2016), "Why Focusing on the Similarity of Substitutes Leaves a Lot to Be Desired," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (3), 448-459.

Hamilton, Rebecca W., Debora V. Thompson, Zachary G. Arens, Simon J. Blanchard, Gerald Häubl, P. K. Kannan, Uzma Khan, Donald R. Lehmann, Margaret G. Meloy, Neal J. Roese, and Manoj Thomas (2014), "Consumer Substitution Decisions: An Integrative Framework," *Marketing Letters*, 25 (3), 305-317.

Scale Items:¹

1. How much would you like to eat more of _____ right now?
Would not like it at all / Would like it very much
2. After eating _____, how much would you like to eat _____ right now?
Do not want to eat it at all / Would like to eat it very much
3. After eating _____, would you say that you want to eat _____ more or less?
Want it less / Want it more

1. The name of the more familiar brand, the one that participants expect to eat, should be placed in the blank of item #1 and the second blanks of #2 and #3. The name of the substitute brand should be placed in the first blanks of number #2 and #3.

PRESTIGE OF CONSUMING THE PRODUCT

These four, seven-point, Likert-type items measures the degree to which a consumer believes his/her social status can be positively affected by purchasing and using a particular product.

Origin:

The scale was used in Studies 3 and 4 by Gao, Winterich, and Zhang (2016). (The use of the scale in Study 4 was only discussed in the web appendix.) The authors referred to the scale as *signaling effectiveness*. The source of the scale was not stated; it appears to be original to these authors.

Reliability:

The scale's alphas were .89 and .94 as reported by Gao, Winterich, and Zhang (2016) for Study 3 and 4, respectively.

Validity:

Gao, Winterich, and Zhang (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity.

Reference:

Gao, Huachao, Karen Page Winterich, and Yinlong Zhang (2016), "All That Glitters Is Not Gold: How Others' Status Influences the Effect of Power Distance Belief on Status Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (2), 265-281.

Scale Items:¹

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement at this moment:

1. Purchasing this product will improve my social status.
2. Purchasing this product will help establish my position in society.
3. Buying this product would confer prestige to me.
4. Using this product would confer status to me.

1. The extreme verbal anchors of the response scale used by Gao, Winterich, and Zhang (2016) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

PRICE FAIRNESS

This very simple three-item, seven-point Likert-type scale measures a person's attitude about the price of a particular good or service with the emphasis on its acceptability.

Origin:

Koschate-Fischer, Huber, and Hoyer (2016) used the scale in four studies. They created the scale by drawing key words from measures used by Campbell (2007) as well as Kukar-Kinney, Xia, and Monroe et al. (2007) and making them into full sentences appropriate for a Likert-type scale.

Reliability:

The alphas calculated for the scale ranged from .93 to .96 across the four studies (Koschate-Fischer, Huber, and Hoyer 2016, p. 623).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Koschate-Fischer, Huber, and Hoyer (2016).

References:

Campbell, Margaret C. (2007), "'Says Who?!' How the Source of Price Information and Affect Influence Perceived Price (Un)fairness," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 44 (2), 261-271.

Koschate-Fischer, Nicole, Isabel V. Huber (née Stefan), and Wayne D. Hoyer (2016), "When Will Price Increases Associated with Company Donations to Charity be Perceived as Fair?" *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (5), 608-626.

Kukar-Kinney, Monika, Lan Xia, and Kent B. Monroe (2007), "Consumers' Perceptions of the Fairness of Price-Matching Refund Policies," *Journal of Retailing*, 83 (3), 325-337.

Scale Items:¹

1. The price is fair.
2. The price is acceptable.
3. The price is right.

1. The extreme anchors of the seven-point response scale used with these sentences were *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree* (Koschate-Fischer, Huber, and Hoyer 2016, p. 624).

PRICE FAMILIARITY WITH A PRODUCT CATEGORY

With three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree of knowledge a person has about the normal price level of a particular product category.

Origin:

The scale was used by Habel et al. (2016) in Study 3. Using an online survey, data were collected from 885 members of a consumer panel. The source of the scale was indicated to be Lichtenstein, Ridgway, and Netemeyer (1993). Although some of the constructs in that article seem to be related to the construct reviewed here (price familiarity), they are not the same nor are the scales. Given that, it appears that the authors created the price familiarity scale and drew some inspiration from work by Lichtenstein, Ridgway, and Netemeyer (1993).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .947 (Habel 2017).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Habel et al. (2016).

Comments:

As shown below, Habel et al. (2016, p. 103) reverse-coded the items so as to produce scale scores that represented a person's familiarity with the price level of a product category.

References:

Habel, Johannes (2017), personal correspondence.

Habel, Johannes, Laura Marie Schons, Sascha Alavi, and Jan Wieseke (2016), "Warm Glow or Extra Charge? The Ambivalent Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility Activities on Customers' Perceived Price Fairness," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 84-105.

Lichtenstein, Donald R., Nancy M. Ridgway, and Richard G. Netemeyer (1993), "Price Perceptions and Consumer Shopping Behavior: A Field Study," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30 (May), 234-45.

Scale Items:¹

1. I am not familiar with regular price levels for _____. (r)
2. I do not know what one usually has to pay for a(n) _____. (r)
3. I do not know what an adequate price level for a(n) _____ would be. (r)

1. The name of the product category should be stated in the blanks. The response scale had seven points with the end points labeled as *fully disagree* and *fully agree*.

PRICE FORMAT COMPREHENSION

Five semantic differentials are used in the scale to assess how cognitively and time demanding a customer considers a particular price format to be.

Origin:

The scale was created by Wieseke, Kolberg, and Schons (2016, p. 485) when they were not able to find an established scale. They drew items from other convenience scales in the literature. The scale was used several times in Study 3 and its follow-up study as well as at least once in Study 4.

Reliability:

In the multiple times the scale was used by Wieseke, Kolberg, and Schons (2016, p. 491), the alphas ranged from .89 to .92.

Validity:

Although the details were not provided, Wieseke, Kolberg, and Schons (2016, p. 485) indicated that analysis provided support for the scale's factorial structure and discriminant validity. The AVEs in the studies ranged from .62 to .70 (p. 491).

Reference:

Wieseke, Jan, Anika Kolberg, and Laura Marie Schons (2016), "Life Could Be So Easy: The Convenience Effect of Round Price Endings," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (4), 474–494.

Scale Items:¹

1. complicated / simple
2. impractical / practical
3. uncomfortable / comfortable
4. incomprehensible / comprehensible
5. inconvenient / convenient

1. The number of points on the response scale was not explicitly stated by Wieseke, Kolberg, and Schons (2016) but appears to have been seven. Also, the instructions used with the items were not stated.

PRIDE IN TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT

The pride a person feels after accomplishing a particular task is measured with four, seven-point Likert items.

Origin:

Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017, p. 819) used the scale in Study 1 with a final sample of 251 business students recruited to participate in a "marketing experiment." The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

The alpha calculated for the scale was .92 (Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski 2017, p. 820).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017).

Reference:

Kaiser, Ulrike, Martin Schreier, and Chris Janiszewski (2017), "The Self-Expressive Customization of a Product Can Improve Performance," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (5), 816-831.

Scale Items:¹

1. The _____ makes me feel proud.
2. I am proud about the _____.
3. When I think about the _____, I feel good because I accomplished something.
4. When I think about the _____, I feel that I did a good job.

1. The response scale used with these items had the following extreme anchors: *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). The name or brief description of the accomplishment should be placed in the blanks. Depending upon the experimental treatment group, it appears the blanks were either filled with "chosen pen" or "self-designed pen" (Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski 2017, p. 820).

PRIVACY CONCERNS (CONTROL OF INFORMATION)

The degree of control one has over the personal information possessed by a company is measured with four, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017) used the scale in Studies 1 and 3 as part of their examination of data breach vulnerability. Data were collected in both cases from participants recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk. The authors stated that the scale they used was “adapted” from a measure by Mothersbaugh et al. (2012). Beyond that, they gained insight from in-depth interviews, generating a long list of items, and testing those items in iterative surveys to reduce the list (Martin 2018).

Reliability:

The construct reliability in Study 1 was .96 (Martin 2018). In the Study 3 experiment, the construct reliability was .96 (Martin, Borah, and Palmatier 2017, p. 54).

Validity:

The scale’s validity was not discussed by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017). It is worthwhile to note, however, that analysis of Study 1 data showed the scale’s AVE to be .87 (Martin 2018). Analysis of Study 3 data indicated the AVE for the scale was .87 (Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017, p. 54).

References:

Martin, Kelly D. (2018), personal correspondence.

Martin, Kelly D., Abhishek Borah, and Robert W. Palmatier (2017), "Data Privacy: Effects on Customer and Firm Performance," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (1), 36-58.

Mothersbaugh, David L., William K. Foxx II, Sharon E. Beatty, and Sijun Wang (2012), "Disclosure Antecedents in an Online Service Context: The Role of Sensitivity of Information," *Journal of Service Research*, 15 (1), 76-98.

Scale Items:¹

1. I believe I have control over what happens to my personal information.
2. It is up to me how much the company uses my information.
3. I have a say in how my information is used by the company.
4. I have a say in whether my personal information is shared with others.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017, p. 55) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) *strongly agree* (7).

PRIVACY CONCERNS (DATA USE TRANSPARENCY)

The clarity with which a person understands what a particular company does with the data it has on its customers is measured with four, seven-point semantic-differentials.

Origin:

Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017) used the scale in Studies 1 and 3 as part of their examination of data breach vulnerability. The authors developed the scale and several others using insight gained from in-depth interviews, generating long lists of items, and testing those items in iterative surveys in order to reduce the lists (Martin 2018).

Reliability:

The construct reliability in Study 1 was .98 (Martin 2018). In the Study 3 experiment, the construct reliability was .98 (Martin, Borah, and Palmatier 2017, p. 54).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017). It is worthwhile to note that analysis of Study 1 data showed the scale's AVE was .91 (Martin 2018). Analysis of Study 3 data indicated the AVE for the transparency scale was .91 (p. 54).

References:

Martin, Kelly D. (2018), personal correspondence.

Martin, Kelly D., Abhishek Borah, and Robert W. Palmatier (2017), "Data Privacy: Effects on Customer and Firm Performance," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (1), 36-58.

Scale Items:

The company's customer data management activities are:

1. unclear to me / clear to me
2. confusing / straightforward
3. difficult to understand / easy to understand
4. vague / transparent

PRIVACY CONCERNS (FAIRNESS)

The scale has four, seven-point Likert-type items that measure the degree to which a person believes that a company uses his/her customer information in an ethical manner.

Origin:

Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017) used the scale in Study 3 with 202 participants recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk. The authors indicated they had created the scale but, beyond that, no information about its development was provided.

Reliability:

In the Study 3 experiment, the construct reliability was .97 (Martin, Borah, and Palmatier 2017, p. 55).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017). They did, however, indicate that analysis of Study 3 data indicated the AVE for the fairness scale was .89 (p. 55).

Reference:

Martin, Kelly D., Abhishek Borah, and Robert W. Palmatier (2017), "Data Privacy: Effects on Customer and Firm Performance," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (1), 36-58.

Scale Items:¹

Regarding this company's use of your customer information:

1. I believe their use of my customer information is fair.
2. I believe the company accesses my information in a fair way.
3. I believe the company's use of my information is ethical.
4. The company manages my information in an equitable way.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017, p. 55) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) *strongly agree* (7).

PRIVACY CONCERNS (FALSIFYING PERSONAL INFORMATION)

Three, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure how much a person believes it is okay to give misleading or incomplete personal information to a company and that he/she is likely to do it.

Origin:

Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017) used the scale in Study 3 (pre- and post-tests) with 202 participants recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk. The authors created the scale by drawing inspiration from a measure by Lwin, Wirtz, and Williams (2007) called "fabricate."

Reliability:

In the Study 3 experiment, the construct reliability was .96 in both the pre- and post-tests (Martin, Borah, and Palmatier 2017, p. 54).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017). They did, however, indicate that analysis of Study 3 data indicated the AVEs for the falsifying scale were .88 and .89 in the pre- and post-tests, respectively (p. 54).

References:

Lwin, May, Jochen Wirtz, and Jerome D. Williams (2007), "Consumer Online Privacy Concerns and Responses: A Power-Responsibility Equilibrium Perspective," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Research*, 35 (4), 572-585.

Martin, Kelly D., Abhishek Borah, and Robert W. Palmatier (2017), "Data Privacy: Effects on Customer and Firm Performance," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (1), 36-58.

Scale Items:¹

When thinking about how I provide personal information to the company:

1. I am likely to give the company false information.
2. I purposely try to trick the company when providing my personal data.
3. I think it is fine to give misleading answers on personal questions.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017, p. 55) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) *strongly agree* (7).

PRIVACY CONCERNS (TRUST IN THE COMPANY)

With four, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures how much a person has confidence in the reliability with which a company handles the customer data in its possession.

Origin:

Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017) used the scale in Studies 1a, 1b, 1c, and 3 (pre- and post-tests) with participants recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk in each case. The authors developed the scale by drawing some inspiration from a measure used previously by one of the co-authors (Palmatier 2008). Additionally, they conducted in-depth interviews, generated items, and tested those items in iterative surveys in order to reduce the list (Martin 2018).

Reliability:

The construct reliability in Study 1 was .97 (Martin 2018). In the Study 3 experiment, the construct reliability was .96 and .98 in the pre- and post-tests, respectively (Martin, Borah, and Palmatier 2017, p. 54).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017). It is worthwhile to note that analysis of Study 1 data showed the scale's AVE to be .89 (Martin 2018). Analysis of Study 3 data indicated the AVEs for the trust scale were .85 and .94 in the pre- and post-tests, respectively (p. 54).

References:

Martin, Kelly D. (2018), personal correspondence.

Martin, Kelly D., Abhishek Borah, and Robert W. Palmatier (2017), "Data Privacy: Effects on Customer and Firm Performance," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (1), 36-58.

Palmatier, Robert W. (2008), "Interfirm Relational Drivers of Customer Value," *Journal of Marketing*, 72 (July), 76-89.

Scale Items:¹

Regarding this company's customer data activities, I think:

1. I trust the company.
2. The company is very trustworthy.
3. I have confidence in the company's behaviors.
4. The company is reliable.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017, p. 55) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) *strongly agree* (7).

PRIVACY CONCERNS (VIOLATED)

The degree to which a person feels disrespected and betrayed due to a company's customer data activities is measured using four, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017) used the scale in Studies 1a, 1b, 1c, and 3 (pre- and post-tests), with participants recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk in each case. The authors developed the scale by drawing some inspiration and terms from a measure of betrayal by Grégoire and Fisher (2008). Beyond that, they conducted in-depth interviews, generated a list of items, and tested those items in iterative surveys in order to reduce the list (Martin 2018).

Reliability:

The construct reliability in Study 1 was .97 (Martin 2018). In the Study 3 experiment, the construct reliability was .98 in both the pre- and post-test (Martin, Borah, and Palmatier 2017, p. 54).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017). It is worthwhile to note that analysis of Study 1 data showed the scale's AVE to be .82 (Martin 2018). Analysis of Study 3 data indicated the AVEs for the violation scale were .91 in both the pre- and post-tests (p. 54).

References:

Grégoire, Yany and Robert J. Fisher (2008), "Customer Betrayal and Retaliation: When Your Best Customers Become Your Worst Enemies," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36 (2), 247-261.

Martin, Kelly D. (2018), personal correspondence.

Martin, Kelly D., Abhishek Borah, and Robert W. Palmatier (2017), "Data Privacy: Effects on Customer and Firm Performance," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (1), 36-58.

Scale Items:¹

Regarding the company's customer data activities, I feel:

1. violated.
2. betrayed.
3. not respected.
4. taken advantage of.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017, p. 55) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) *strongly agree* (7).

PRIVACY CONCERNS (VULNERABILITY)

Five, seven-point Likert-type items measure a customer's attitude regarding his/her susceptibility to being harmed because of the personal information collected by a company.

Origin:

Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017) used the scale in Studies 1 and 3 as part of their examination of data breach vulnerability. The authors developed the scale and several others using insight gained from in-depth interviews, generating long lists of items, and testing those items in iterative surveys to reduce the lists (Martin 2018).

Reliability:

The construct reliability in Study 1 was .95 (Martin 2018). In the Study 3 experiment, the pre- and post-treatment construct reliabilities were .97 and .99, respectively (Martin, Borah, and Palmatier 2017, p. 54).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017). It is worthwhile to note that analysis of Study 1 data showed the scale's AVE to be .81 (Martin 2018). Analyses of Study 3's pre- and post-treatment data showed that the AVEs for the scale were .84 and .91, respectively (p. 54).

References:

Martin, Kelly D. (2018), personal correspondence.

Martin, Kelly D., Abhishek Borah, and Robert W. Palmatier (2017), "Data Privacy: Effects on Customer and Firm Performance," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (1), 36-58.

Scale Items:¹

The personal information that the company has about me makes me feel:

1. insecure.
2. exposed.
3. threatened.
4. vulnerable.
5. susceptible.

1. The end-points of the response used by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017, p. 55) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) *strongly agree* (7).

PRIVACY CONTROL

The extent to which a person believes that he/she was able to control the level of privacy experienced in a particular situation is measured using four, seven-point, Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale was used by Esmark, Noble, and Breazeale (2017) in Studies 2 ($n = 69$) and 3 ($n = 88$) with data collected from participants who were recruited using Amazon MTurk. The authors cited Brehm (1993) but it was not clear if they were implying that he created the scale or, instead, if his work merely inspired them. It appears to be the latter.

Reliability:

The alphas reported by Esmark, Noble, and Breazeale (2017, p. 341) for the scale were .82 (Study 2) and .93 (Study 3).

Validity:

Evidence for the scale's discriminant validity with respect to three other scales was provided in Studies 2 and 3 by Esmark, Noble, and Breazeale (2017, pp. 342, 343). The AVEs for the privacy control scale were .54 in both studies (pp. 347, 348).

References:

Brehm, Jack W. (1993), "Control, Its Loss, and Psychological Reactance," in *Control and Motivation and Social Cognition*, Vol. 16, Weary Gifford, Faith Gleicher, and Kerry Marsh L., eds. New York: Springer, 3–30.

Esmark, Carol L., Stephanie M. Noble, and Michael J. Breazeale (2017), "I'll Be Watching You: Shoppers' Reactions to Perceptions of Being Watched by Employees," *Journal of Retailing*, 93 (3), 336–349.

Scale Items:¹

1. I was completely satisfied in my ability to control the level of privacy I had _____.
2. I had little reason to be concerned about my privacy _____.
3. I controlled my level of privacy _____.
4. I had control over who I dealt with.

1. The blanks should be filled with a phrase identifying the place or context of concern. For example, Esmark, Noble, and Breazeale (2017, p. 341) used the phrase "in the store." Besides indicating the response format was seven-point Likert-type, the authors did not specify the verbal anchors. They were likely to have been *strongly disagree/strongly agree* or something very similar.

PRIVACY IMPORTANCE

Using four, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a person is sensitive about the way companies handle personal information because he/she believes privacy is very important.

Origin:

Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017) used the scale in Study 3 with 202 participants recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk. Regarding the scale's source, the authors borrowed and adapted phrases from a six-item measure of "global information privacy concern" by Malhotra, Kim, and Agarwal (2004, p. 352).

Reliability:

The scale's construct reliability was .94 (Martin, Borah, and Palmatier 2017, p. 55).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017). They did, however, indicate that analysis of Study 3 data indicated the AVE for the privacy importance scale was .80 (p. 55).

References:

Malhotra, Naresh K., Sung S. Kim, and James Agarwal (2004), "Internet Users' Information Privacy Concerns (IUIPC): The Construct, the Scale, and a Causal Model," *Information Systems Research*, 15 (4), 336-355.

Martin, Kelly D., Abhishek Borah, and Robert W. Palmatier (2017), "Data Privacy: Effects on Customer and Firm Performance," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (1), 36-58.

Scale Items:¹

1. I am sensitive to the way companies handle my personal information.
2. It is important to keep my privacy intact from online companies.
3. Personal privacy is very important, compared to other subjects.
4. I am concerned about threats to my personal privacy.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017, p. 55) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) *strongly agree* (7).

PROCRASTINATION (ONLINE)

With five, five-point Likert-type items, the scale measures a person's tendency to use the Internet for the purpose of avoiding unpleasant tasks and responsibilities.

Origin:

Zanjani, Milne, and Miller (2016) used the scale in two studies. Study 1 was based on data collected from 460 undergraduate students at a large university in the United States (p. 573). For Study 2 (p. 579), analyses were based on data gathered from 390 respondents from Amazon MTurk who were residents of the United States. The items in this scale come from a seven-item measure developed by Davis, Flett, and Besser (2002) that they called *distraction*.

Reliability:

Alphas of .819 (Study 1) and .854 (Study 2) were reported for the scale (Zanjani, Milne, and Miller 2016, p. 576).

Validity:

Low factor loadings led Zanjani, Milne, and Miller (2016) to drop two of the items that were in the version of the scale borrowed from Davis, Flett, and Besser (2002). Beyond that, the final version of that scale and the other scales used by Zanjani, Milne, and Miller (2016) were examined in CFAs for Studies 1 and 2 and confirmed that the measurement models fit the data. Evidence was also provided of their scales' convergent and discriminant validities in both studies. In particular, the AVEs for the online procrastination scale were .501 and .544 for Studies 1 and 2, respectively (p. 576).

References:

Davis, Richard A., Gordon L. Flett, and Avi Besser (2002), "Validation of a New Scale for Measuring Problematic Internet Use: Implications for Pre-Employment Screening," *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 5 (4), 331-345.

Zanjani, Shabnam H. A., George R. Milne, and Elizabeth G. Miller (2016), "Procrastinators' Online Experience and Purchase Behavior," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (5), 568-585.

Scale Items:¹

Consider your experience with the Web. Please rate the degree you agree with each of the following statements:

1. When I am online, I don't think about my responsibilities.
2. I find that I go online more when I have something else I am supposed to do.
3. I sometimes use the Internet to procrastinate.
4. I often use the Internet to avoid doing unpleasant things.
5. Using the Internet is a way to forget about the things I must do but don't really want to do.

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale used by Zanjani, Milne, and Miller (2016, p. 583) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (5).

PROCRASTINATION (TRAIT DECISIONAL)

The scale uses four, five-point items to measure a person's tendency to put off making decisions and acting upon them.

Origin:

The items in this scale come from the five-item measure of procrastination in the Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire (Mann et al. 1997) which was a purified version of the Flinders Decision Making Questionnaire (Mann 1982).

Zanjani, Milne, and Miller (2016) used the scale in two studies. Study 1 was based on data collected from 460 undergraduate students at a large university in the United States (p. 573). For Study 2 (p. 579), analyses were based on data gathered from 390 respondents from Amazon MTurk who were residents of the United States.

Reliability:

Alphas of .820 (Study 1) and .806 (Study 2) were reported for the scale (Zanjani, Milne, and Miller 2016, p. 576).

Validity:

Zanjani, Milne, and Miller (2016) used CFA to confirm that their measurement models fit the data. Also, evidence was provided of their scales' convergent and discriminant validities in both studies. In particular, the AVEs for the procrastination scale were .533 and .511 for Study 1 and 2, respectively (p. 576).

References:

Mann, Leon (1982), *Decision making questionnaires I and II, Unpublished scales*, Flinders University of South Australia, Flinders, South Australia.

Mann, Leon, Paul Burnett, Mark Radford, and Steve Ford (1997), "The Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire: An Instrument for Measuring Patterns for Coping with Decisional Conflict," *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 10 (1), 1-19.

Zanjani, Shabnam H. A., George R. Milne, and Elizabeth G. Miller (2016), "Procrastinators' Online Experience and Purchase Behavior," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (5), 568-585.

Scale Items:¹

People may use the following statements to describe themselves. Decide how well each of the statements characterizes you:

1. I waste a lot of time on trivial matters before getting to the final decision.
2. Even after I make a decision, I delay acting upon it.
3. I delay making decisions until it's too late.

4. I put off making decisions.

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale used by Zanjani, Milne, and Miller (2016, p. 583) with these items were *not like me* (1) *just like me* (5).

PRODUCT CHOICE OVERLOAD IN THE STORE

The extent to which a customer believes that a store carries too many options within a product category of interest is measured in this scale using three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017) used the scale in Studies 1a (n = 883) and 1b (n = 501). Although the authors indicated they “adapted” a measure by Dickson and Albaum (1977), the latter only had one semantic differential and it described how limited the product options were in a store. Given that, it is more precise to say that Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017) created the scale based on inspiration from an item used by Dickson and Albaum (1977).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .93 and .97 in Studies 1a and 1b, respectively (Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann 2017, p. 738).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017).

References:

Albrecht, Carmen-Maria, Stefan Hattula, and Donald R. Lehmann (2017), “The Relationship Between Consumer Shopping Stress and Purchase Abandonment in Task-Oriented and Recreation-Oriented Consumers,” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (5), 720-740.

Dickson, John P. and Gerald Albaum (1977), “A Method for Developing Tailor-made Semantic Differentials for Specific Marketing Content Areas,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14 (February), 87-91.

Scale Items:¹

1. The store offered too many items in the product category I was interested in.
2. In the store, the choice of products I was interested in was too wide.
3. In the store, there was an overchoice of items in the product category I was interested in.²

1. It appears the end-points of the response scale used by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann 2017, p. 724) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

2. Since the term “overchoice” is not familiar to many people, it may be prudent to replace it with something more common such as “overload” or “over abundance.”

PRODUCT CONTAMINATION

The scale has four, seven-point semantic differentials that measure how much a consumer believes that particular product has been touched by other people and is unsanitary. While the items themselves do not explicitly mention food, the scale probably makes most sense when used with a food or beverage product.

Origin:

White et al. (2016) used the scale in Study 4. (The web appendix to the article indicated the scale was also used in Study 5 but the article did not mention it.) The context was that participants saw one of three photos of a grocery product that varied in its level of damage, depending upon the experimental condition. As for the source of the scale, it was not stated and it seems likely that the authors created it.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .84 in Study 4 by White et al. (2016, p. 117).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by White et al. (2016).

Reference:

White, Katherine, Lily Lin, Darren W. Dahl, and Robin J. B. Ritchie (2016), "When Do Consumers Avoid Imperfections? Superficial Packaging Damage as a Contamination Cue," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (1), 110-123.

Scale Items:¹

1. not at all dirty / very dirty
2. not at all unsanitary / very unsanitary
3. not at all contaminated / very contaminated
4. was definitely not touched by other people / was definitely touched by other people

1. The instructions used with the items were not stated by White et al. (2016). They could merely have asked participants to use these items and possibly some others measuring different constructs to describe the product they saw.

PRODUCT CONTAMINATION

Three semantic differentials are used in this scale to measure how much a product appears to have been touched and is considered dirty.

Origin:

The scale was used by Reynolds-McIlnay, Morrin, and Nordfält (2017) in Study 2 with 256 people in the U.S. recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The context of the data collection was that participants were asked to imagine that they were shopping for a t-shirt. They were shown a photograph of a table with three stacks of t-shirts. (The stacks varied in t-shirt color and messiness.) After that, participants responded to the scale along with several other measures. The source of the contamination scale was not stated but it bears a strong resemblance to a measure of the same construct used by White et al. (2016).

Reliability:

The alpha reported for the scale by Reynolds-McIlnay, Morrin, and Nordfält (2017, p. 272) was .71.

Validity:

Reynolds-McIlnay, Morrin, and Nordfält (2017) did not address the scale's validity.

References:

Reynolds-McIlnay, Ryann, Maureen Morrin, and Jens Nordfält (2017), "How Product-Environment Brightness Contrast and Product Disarray Impact Consumer Choice in Retail Environments," *Journal of Retailing*, 93 (3), 266-282.

White, Katherine, Lily Lin, Darren W. Dahl, and Robin J. B. Ritchie (2016), "When Do Consumers Avoid Imperfections? Superficial Packaging Damage as a Contamination Cue," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (1), 110-123.

Scale Items:¹

1. uncontaminated / contaminated
2. untouched / touched
3. clean / dirty

1. The instructions for the scale were not provided in the article by Reynolds-McIlnay, Morrin, and Nordfält (2017). They could have been something as simple as asking participants to describe the product display. Likewise, the number of points the authors used for the response scale were not stated with regard to this scale. A seven-point scale is most typical in scholarly consumer research.

PRODUCT DESIGN (AESTHETIC)

Three, seven-point Likert items are used to measure how visually attractive and appealing a product's design is considered to be.

Origin:

Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017) used the scale in Study 1 with a final sample of 251 business students. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

The alpha calculated for the scale was .91 (Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski 2017, p. 820).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017).

Reference:

Kaiser, Ulrike, Martin Schreier, and Chris Janiszewski (2017), "The Self-Expressive Customization of a Product Can Improve Performance," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (5), 816-831.

Scale Items:¹

The design of the ____:²

1. is appealing.
2. is attractive.
3. looks great.

1. The response scale used with these items had the following extreme anchors: *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).
2. A name or brief description of the product should be placed in the blank.

PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (INNOVATIVE)

How new and surprising a product development process is believed to be is measured using four, seven-point items. The statements composing the scale are flexible enough to be used when comparing two products or when assessing just one product, but the response formats would need to be different.

Origin:

Nishikawa et al. (2017) used the scale in Study 4 with data from 179 students attending a large university in Europe. The source of the scale was not stated and appears to be original. It appears that the authors presented participants with two products that were described as having different developmental processes. One of the products was supposedly developed based on ideas from consumers while the other product was described as being developed in-house by professional designers. After being exposed to both products and learning about their sources, participants filled out the scale to indicate which product had the more innovative developmental process.

Reliability:

The alpha reported for the scale was .70 (Nishikawa et al. 2017, p. 535).

Validity:

EFA was used by Nishikawa et al. (2017) with the items in this scale and the items intended to measure another construct. The results indicated that there were two factors and each scale's items loaded highest on the intended factors. This provides some limited evidence for both scales of their discriminant validity with respect to each other.

Comments:

If a researcher's desire is to simply have participants indicate the innovativeness of one product rather than comparing two products with different developmental processes as done by Nishikawa et al. (2017), then the response format used with the items should be changed to the more typical Likert-type anchors: *strongly agree* and *strongly disagree*.

Reference:

Nishikawa, Hidehiko, Martin Schreier, Christoph Fuchs, and Susumu Ogawa (2017), "The Value of Marketing Crowdsourced New Products as Such: Evidence from Two Randomized Field Experiments," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (4), 525-539.

Scale Items:¹

1. The product development process was surprising.
2. The product development process was somewhat unexpected.
3. The way the application was created is completely new to me.

4. The application is based on a novel and innovative idea.

1. As used by Nishikawa et al. (2017, p. 536), the end-points of the response scale were "more true of _____" (1) and "more true of _____" (7), with the name for one of the products being in one blank while the name for the other product placed in the opposing blank.

PRODUCT EVALUATION (FOOD)

Five semantic differentials compose the scale and measure facets of a food product's quality and taste.

Origin:

White et al. (2016) used the scale in Study 4 and referred to it as *quality perceptions*. The context was that participants saw one of three photos of a grocery food product that varied in its level of damage, depending upon the experimental condition. Note that responses to the scale were made based on the appearance of the product's packaging rather than actually tasting the food. As for the source of the scale, it was not stated, and it seems likely that the authors created it.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .94 in Study 4 by White et al. (2016, p. 117).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by White et al. (2016).

Reference:

White, Katherine, Lily Lin, Darren W. Dahl, and Robin J. B. Ritchie (2016), "When Do Consumers Avoid Imperfections? Superficial Packaging Damage as a Contamination Cue," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (1), 110-123.

Scale Items:¹

1. low quality / high quality
2. not very flavorful / very flavorful
3. unappetizing / appetizing
4. not worthwhile / worthwhile
5. inferior / superior

1. The instructions used with the items were not stated by White et al. (2016). They could merely have asked participants to use these items and possibly some others measuring different constructs to describe the product they saw. The response scale was described in the article as having seven points (White et al. 2016, p. 117) but the web appendix showed it has having nine.

PRODUCT EVALUATION (GENERAL)

How much a person likes a product's quality as well as the way it looks is measured with three, five-point items. The scale is "general" in the sense that it can be easily customized for use with a wide variety of objects.

Origin:

Trudel, Argo, and Meng (2016) used the scale in Study 4 (n = 240) with U.S. participants recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .86 (Trudel, Argo, and Meng 2016, p. 254).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Trudel, Argo, and Meng (2016).

Reference:

Trudel, Remi, Jennifer J. Argo, and Matthew D. Meng (2016), "The Recycled Self: Consumers' Disposal Decisions of Identity-Linked Products, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (2), 246-264.

Scale Items:¹

1. How much do you like the look of this _____?
2. How much do you like the _____ itself?
3. How would you rate the quality of this _____?

1. The end points of the response scale were *not at all* (1) / *very much* (5) for the first two items and *not at all good* (1) / *very good* (5) for #3. The blanks should be filled with a name for the object being evaluated.

PRODUCT PREFERENCE HETEROGENEITY

With three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures a person's attitude regarding how much consumers differ in what they want from a product in a certain category. In other words, do consumers believe that people vary in their beliefs about what makes a product good or bad?

Origin:

Packard and Berger (2017) used the scale in Study 2 with 604 people recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .91 (Packard and Berger 2017, p. 585).

Validity:

Although the scale's validity was not discussed, some evidence comes from its use as a manipulation check. Given that the manipulation was successful, it provides some limited support for the scale's predictive validity.

Reference:

Packard, Grant and Jonah Berger (2017), "How Language Shapes Word of Mouth's Impact," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (4), 572-588.

Scale Items:¹

1. People look for different things when it comes to this kind of _____.
2. Most people want the same things from this kind of _____. (r)
3. People can generally agree on what makes this kind of _____ good or bad. (r)

1. The name of the good or service should be placed in the blanks. For example, the items used by Packard and Berger (2017, p. 585) contained the word *hotel*. The end-points of the scale used to respond to the items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

PRODUCT SCARCITY

Three, nine-point items are used to measure the likelihood that a particular product or brand will be in short supply. The timeframe is not stated in the items themselves but could be easily stated in the instructions.

Origin:

The scale was used in three studies by Mukherjee and Lee (2016) as a manipulation check and was referred to as *expectation of scarcity*. Data were gathered in the pilot study for Study 1 from 82 undescribed respondents. In Study 2, data were collected from 175 undergraduate students from a Korean university. (The study was conducted in English.) Data for Study 3 came from 235 U.S. members of Amazon Mechanical Turk.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .88 (Pilot study 1), .93 (Study 2), and .97 (Study 3).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not explicitly discussed by Mukherjee and Lee (2016). However, since the scale was used as a manipulation check in each study and all the manipulations were successful, it provides some evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

Reference:

Mukherjee, Ashesh and Seung Yun Lee (2016), "Scarcity Appeals in Advertising: The Moderating Role of Expectation of Scarcity," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 256-268.

Scale Items:¹

How likely is it that the _____ will be:

1. in short supply due to high consumer demand.
2. scarce due to high consumer demand.
3. not available in sufficient quantities due to high consumer demand.

1. The name of the product/brand should be stated in the blank of the scale stem. The extreme anchors of the response scale were *not at all likely* (1) and *very likely* (9). Due to the context of the studies, there was some variation in phrasing. The biggest difference was in Study 3 where the focus was on expected scarcity due to supply issues. Given that, the phrase "due to high consumer demand" in #1 and #2 were dropped and in #3 the phrase was replaced with "due to supply chain problems" (p. 263).

PRODUCT USAGE AUTOMATICITY

The extent to which a consumer habitually uses a particular product or brand for a purpose without consciously thinking about its choice is measured using four, five-point Likert-type items. Four versions of the scale are described, varying based on which product and type of usage is being referred to: a product used regularly, a product that was replaced by another product that was used regularly, a product used rarely or not at all, and a product which was replaced by another product that ended up not being used much if at all.

Origin:

Labrecque et al. (2017) used the scale in Study 1 with data gathered from 150 people living in the U.S. and recruited from Amazon's MTurk. All respondents identified two products which they had bought in the previous six months: 1) one of which they expected to use regularly but ended up rarely if ever using it, and 2) another product they did use regularly. For each of the two products, participants completed a version of the scale.

Participants were also asked if the product they bought was replacing a different product, one that was previously purchased for the purpose. If they answered "yes" then they completed yet another version or two of the scale: 1) one version for the product if it was replaced by another product that ended up being used regularly, and 2) a version for a product that was replaced by a different product that ended up being used rarely (Labrecque 2018).

As for the scale's source, the items are from the *Self-Report Habit Index* (SRHI) by Verplanken & Orbell (2003). Specifically, Gardner et al. (2012) examined the 12 items composing the SRHI and selected the four items that best represented automaticity. Those four items were the ones used by Labrecque et al. (2017) with the scale stems being modified for the product usage context.

Reliability:

The alphas for the versions of the scale ranged between .90 and .95 (Labrecque 2018; Labrecque et al. 2017, p. 124).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Labrecque et al. (2017).

References:

Gardner, Benjamin, Charles Abraham, Phillippa Lally, and Gert-Jan de Bruijn (2012), "Towards Parsimony in Habit Measurement: Testing the Convergent and Predictive Validity of an Automaticity Subscale of the Self-Report Habit Index," *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 9 (1), 102-113.

Labrecque, Jennifer S. (2018), personal correspondence.

Labrecque, Jennifer S., Wendy Wood, David T. Neal, and Nick Harrington (2017), "Habit Slips: When Consumers Unintentionally Resist New Products," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (1), 119-133.

Verplanken, Bas and Sheina Orbell (2003), "Reflections on Past Behavior: A Self-Report Index of Habit Strength," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33 (6), 1313-1330.

Scale Items:¹

Using _____ is something . . .²

1. I did automatically.
2. I did without having to consciously remember.
3. I did without thinking.
4. I started doing before I realize I'm doing it.

1. The end-points of the response scale used with the items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (5). According to Labrecque (2018), the phrasing of the items was the same for the following three uses: for the product identified as used rarely or not at all, for the product that was replaced by the product identified as used regularly, and for the product that was replaced by a product that was used rarely or not at all. For the fourth product, the one identified as used regularly, the same items were used but with present tense phrasing, e.g., "I do" vs. "I did."

2. The name of the focal product should be stated in the blank. Further, this phrasing of the scale stem was used with three products (Labrecque 2018): for the product that was identified as used regularly, for the product replaced by another product that was used regularly, and for the product that was replaced by another product that was used rarely or not at all. For the product that was identified as used rarely or not at all, the phrasing was "If you ever used _____, was it something . . . ?"

PROGRAM ENGAGEMENT

How much a person attentively watched a television program and considered it to be fascinating is measured in the scale with three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Segijn, Voorveld, and Smit (2017) used the scale in Studies 1 ($n = 280$) and 2 ($n = 185$). In both studies, participants were shown an excerpt ("clip") of an entertainment show. The authors appear to have created the scale by drawing keywords and phrases from past studies, particularly Moorman, Neijens, and Smit (2007).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .91 and .87 in Studies 1 and 2, respectively (Segijn, Voorveld, and Smit 2017, pp. 462, 466).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Segijn, Voorveld, and Smit (2017).

Comments:

Although Segijn, Voorveld, and Smit (2017) used the scale with reference to an entertainment-related TV show, the items appear to be amenable for use with other TV programming such as sporting events, movies, or news. The items might also work in other contexts such as when watching live events, e.g., parades, stage plays, political rallies.

References:

Moorman, Marjolein, Peter C. Neijens, and Edith G. Smit (2007), "The Effects of Program Involvement on Commercial Exposure and Recall in a Naturalistic Setting," *Journal of Advertising*, 36 (1), 121–137.

Segijn, Claire M., Hilde A.M. Voorveld, and Edith G. Smit (2017), "How Related Multiscreening Could Positively Affect Advertising Outcomes," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (4), 455-472.

Scale Items:¹

1. I found the _____ fascinating.
2. I was interested in the _____.
3. I watched the _____ attentively.

1. The end-points of the response scale used with these items by Segijn, Voorveld, and Smit (2017, p. 462) were *Totally disagree* (1) and *Totally agree* (7). The blanks should be filled with a brief name or description of what participants watched. For example, Segijn, Voorveld, and Smit (2017) used the phrase "TV clip."

PROGRAM INFORMATION VALUE

The extent to which a person believes that a particular program provided him/her with new ideas and other information is measured with three, six-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale was used by Bellman, Wooley, and Varan (2016, p. 74) in their experiment with 318 members of a Southwestern U.S. audience panel. Participants watched a TV program with commercials included. They watched either an informational or a humorous program.

The scale was borrowed from van Reijmersdal, Smit, and Neijens (2010) who calculated its alpha to be .85 in their study.

Reliability:

In the experiment conducted by Bellman, Wooley, and Varan (2016, p. 74), the scale's alpha was .89.

Validity:

Bellman, Wooley, and Varan (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity.

It is worth noting that the article (p. 74) stated that the scale had six items. As clarified by Bellman (2017), that was the expected number, but factor analysis showed only the three items shown below loaded together and composed the final version of the scale used in the analyses.

References:

Bellman, Steven (2017), personal correspondence.

Bellman, Steven, Brooke Wooley, and Duane Varan (2016), "Program-Ad Matching and Television Ad Effectiveness: A Reinquiry Using Facial Tracking Software," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (1), 72-77.

Van Reijmersdal, Eva, Edith Smit, and Peter Neijens (2010), "How Media Factors Affect Audience Responses to Brand Placement," *International Journal of Advertising*, 29 (2), 279-302.

Scale Items:¹

1. This program provided me with new ideas.
2. This program gave me information.
3. This program gave me the opportunity to learn more.

1. The end points of the six-point response scale were *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree* (Bellman 2017).

PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTANCE (CONSUMER-RETAILER)

Using four, nine-point items, the scale measures the degree to which a consumer considers a retailer to be close and tangible rather than distant and abstract. As an example of the construct, a retailer that only has a website would likely be viewed by consumers as more psychologically distant than a brick-and-mortar store that is physically close to them.

Origin:

Darke et al. (2016) concluded that there was no established scale for measuring psychological distance in a consumer-focused study. Given that, the authors created a scale by drawing ideas from an implicit association test by Bar-Anan, Liberman, and Trope (2006). The finished scale was used in Studies 1, 2, and 3, with data collected in each case from undergraduate business students.

Reliability:

The internal consistencies of the scale were good in the three studies, with construct reliabilities ranging from .81 to .92 (Darke et al. 2016, p. 291).

Validity:

CFA was used by Darke et al. (2016) with the data from each study to examine the psychometric properties of their measures. Although specific information about each scale was not provided, the authors did say that their measurement models fit the data well and that there was evidence of each scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

References:

Bar-Anan, Yoav, Nira Liberman and Yaacov Trope (2006), "The Association Between Psychological Distance and Construal Level: Evidence from an Implicit Association Test," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 135 (4), 609–622.

Darke, Peter R., Michael K. Brady, Ray L. Benedictus, and Andrew E. Wilson (2016), "Feeling Close From Afar: The Role of Psychological Distance in Offsetting Distrust in Unfamiliar Online Retailers," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (3), 287-299.

Scale Items:¹

1. When you think about _____ and its characteristics, how physically close are you to the company?
Very Close / Very Distant
2. When you think about the physical features of _____, how abstract are they in your mind? (Abstract means difficult to imagine; concrete means easy to imagine.)
Very Concrete / Very Abstract
3. When you consider _____ and its features, how tangible are the attributes of the company in your mind? (Tangibility is the extent to which you can sense the object of interest, e.g., see,

touch, hear, taste, or smell).

Very Tangible / Very Intangible

4. When you think about the physical features of _____, how real do they seem in your mind?
Very Real / Very Hypothetical

1. The name of the retailer should be placed in the blanks.

PURCHASE ABANDONMENT (STORE)

With reference to a particular shopping trip and store, three, seven-point Likert-type items measure the extent to which a consumer left without making a purchase.

Origin:

Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017) used the scale in Studies 1a, 1b, and 2. The authors created the scale by drawing keywords and phrases from a measure of the frequency of online shopping cart abandonment by Kukar-Kinney and Close (2010).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .89, .95, and .85 for Studies 1a, 1b, and 2, respectively (Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann 2017, p. 737).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017).

References:

Albrecht, Carmen-Maria, Stefan Hattula, and Donald R. Lehmann (2017), "The Relationship Between Consumer Shopping Stress and Purchase Abandonment in Task-Oriented and Recreation-Oriented Consumers," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (5), 720-740.

Kukar-Kinney, Monika and Angeline G. Close (2010), "The Determinants of Consumers' Online Shopping Cart Abandonment," *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 38 (2), 240-250.

Scale Items:¹

1. I abruptly ended my shopping trip in this store.
2. I left the store without buying anything.
3. I abandoned the shopping trip.

1. It appears the end-points of the response scale used by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017, p. 724) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). A particular store and shopping trip should be understood by the participants before completing this scale based on the instructions or the context.

PURCHASE ABANDONMENT (STORE)

Leaving an area within a store or the store itself without buying the product of interest is measured with six, seven-point semantic differentials. Two versions of the scale are described. *Temporary abandonment* has to do with the shopper's intention to return later in the shopping trip to make the purchase while *Permanent Abandonment* means the shopper does not plan to return to buy the product.

Origin:

The scale was used by Esmark, Noble, and Breazeale (2017) in Studies 2 (n = 69) and 3 (n = 88) with data collected from participants who were recruited using Amazon MTurk. The authors appear to have created the scale by drawing some of the items from Oliver and Swan (1989) as well as others whom they did not cite but are listed in the review of Behavioral Intention measures by Bruner (2009, pp. 240-245).

Reliability:

The alphas reported by Esmark, Noble, and Breazeale (2017, p. 341) for Temporary Abandonment were .95 (Study 2) and .97 (Study 3). The alphas for Permanent Abandonment were .94 (Study 2) and .96 (Study 3).

Validity:

Evidence for the scales' discriminant validities with respect to each other and two other scales were provided in Studies 2 and 3 by Esmark, Noble, and Breazeale (2017, pp. 342, 343). The AVEs for Temporary Abandonment were .71 in Study 2 and .63 in Study 3 (pp. 347, 348). For Permanent Abandonment, the AVEs were .66 (Study 2) and .67 (Study 3).

References:

- Bruner II, Gordon C. (2009), *Marketing Scales Handbook: A Compilation of Multi-Item Measures for Consumer Behavior & Advertising (Volume 5)*, Carbondale, IL: GCBII Productions.
- Esmark, Carol L., Stephanie M. Noble, and Michael J. Breazeale (2017), "I'll Be Watching You: Shoppers' Reactions to Perceptions of Being Watched by Employees," *Journal of Retailing*, 93 (3), 336-349.
- Oliver, Richard L. and John E. Swan (1989), "Consumer Perceptions of Interpersonal Equity and Satisfaction in Transactions: A Field Survey Approach," *Journal of Marketing*, 53 (April), 21-35.

Scale Items:¹

1. not at all likely / very likely
2. non-existent / existent
3. not probable / very probable
4. not possible / very possible
5. not certain /very certain

6. probably not / probably

1. The question that preceded these items was not provided in the article by Esmark, Noble, and Breazeale (2017). Based on the information provided (pp. 341), the question for the temporary measure probably asked participants to indicate how likely they were to physically leave the area with the intent to return later during the same shopping trip. For the Permanent Abandonment scale, the question seems to have asked participants about the likelihood of them leaving the area and the store without returning.

PURCHASE LIKELIHOOD (CURRENT PRICE)

The subjective probability expressed by a consumer that indicates he/she would buy a particular product at its present price is measured with five, seven-point items.

Origin:

Gao, Zhang, and Mittal (2017) used the scale in Study 4 (n = 224 undergraduate students) and Study 5 (n = 404 U.S. consumers recruited from MTurk). Given the context of the experiments, the authors sometimes referred to the construct being measured as *price sensitivity*. The scale is an adaptation of items originally used by Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991) as well as Grewal, Monroe and Krishnan (1998).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .95 and .96 in Studies 4 and 5, respectively (Gao, Zhang, and Mittal 2017, pp. 70, 71).

Validity:

In Study 4, the items in this scale as well as those measuring two other constructs (sacrifice mindset and monetary sacrifice) were examined with an EFA and found to load on their intended factors. The same result occurred in a CFA which, additionally, found that a three-factor solution fit the data better than a one-factor solution. This provides some evidence of the purchase likelihood scale having some convergent and discriminant validity.

References:

Dodds, William B., Kent B. Monroe, and Dhruv Grewal (1991), "The Effects of Price, Brand, and Store Information on Buyers' Product Evaluations," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28 (August), 307-319.

Gao, Huachao, Yinlong Zhang, and Vikas Mittal (2017), "How Does Local–Global Identity Affect Price Sensitivity?" *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (3), 62-79.

Grewal, Dhruv, Kent B. Monroe and R. Krishnan (1998), "The Effects of Price-Comparison Advertising on Buyer's Perceptions of Acquisition Value, Transaction Value, and Behavioral Intentions," *Journal of Marketing*, 62 (April), 46-59.

Scale Items:¹

1. If I were going to buy a _____, the probability of buying this _____ at the current price is . . .
2. The likelihood that I would purchase this _____ at the current price is . . .
3. The probability that I would consider buying this _____ at the current price is . . .
4. At the current price, the likelihood that I would seriously consider buying this _____ is . . .
5. The probability that I am willing to buy this _____ at the current price is . . .

1. As used by Gao, Zhang, and Mittal (2017, p. 77), participants completed the sentences with a scale having end-points labeled as were *very low* (1) and *very high* (7). The generic name for the focal product should be placed in the blanks, e.g., coffemaker.

PURCHASE LIKELIHOOD (PRODUCT FROM THE RETAILER)

Three, nine-point Likert-type items measure a person's stated likelihood of buying a particular product/brand from a particular retailer if he/she was in the market for the product.

Origin:

Darke et al. (2016) used the scale in Studies 1, 2, and 3, with data collected in each case from undergraduate business students. The scale itself appears to have been created by the authors by drawing ideas from work by Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1996).

Reliability:

The internal consistency of the scale in each study was very high, with construct reliability being either .92 or .93 (Darke et al. 2016, p. 291).

Validity:

CFA was used by Darke et al. (2016) with the data from each study to examine the psychometric properties of their measures. Although specific information about each scale was not provided, the authors did say that their measurement models fit the data well and that there was evidence of each scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

References:

Darke, Peter R., Michael K. Brady, Ray L. Benedicktus, and Andrew E. Wilson (2016), "Feeling Close From Afar: The Role of Psychological Distance in Offsetting Distrust in Unfamiliar Online Retailers," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (3), 287-299.

Zeithaml, Valerie A., Leonard L. Berry and A. Parasuraman (1996), "The Behavioral Consequences of Service Quality," *Journal of Marketing*, 60 (April), 31-46.

Scale Items:¹

1. If I was purchasing _____, I would purchase from _____.
2. If I was going to buy _____, I would consider buying from _____.
3. If someone asked me, I would say that it was likely that I would buy _____ from _____.

1. The name of the product/brand should be placed in the first blank of each item and the name of the retailer should be placed in the second blank. The labels used for the end-points of the response scale were not stated. Since the scale was described as Likert-type (Darke et al. 2016, pp. 290, 291), it is very likely that the extreme anchors were *Strongly disagree/Strongly agree* or something very similar.

QUALITY OF THE BRAND

Using three, ten-point items, the scale measures a customer's evaluation of the quality of a brand's goods and/or services based on recent consumption experiences.

Origin:

This measure is part of the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI), the only national cross-industry measure of customer satisfaction in the United States. The index is based on a theoretical model by Claes Fornell (Fornell et al. 1996) which views customer beliefs about a brand's quality as one of the three primary drivers of satisfaction.

In the study by Hult et al. (2017), the brand quality scale was used along with the rest of the ACSI to determine how well company managers understand customers' critically important attitudes about the firm's brand(s). Data for their analyses were collected by the ACSI company during 2009 from about 60,000 customers who had recently purchased the products of one of the "significant" companies that were part of the survey (primarily Fortune 500 companies).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale as used in the study by Hult et al. (2017, p. 44) was .975.

Validity:

Using the results of a structural equation model (PLS-SEM), Hult et al. (2017, pp. 44, 45) claimed evidence of their scales' convergent and discriminant validities. The AVE for the brand quality scale was .952. Of concern is that, while all the items for the scales used in the study loaded most strongly on their own factors, there were very high cross-loadings as well. For example, the loadings of the brand quality items on satisfaction were between .904 and .969.

References:

Fornell, Claes, Michael D. Johnson, Eugene W. Anderson, Jaesung Cha, and Barbara Everitt Bryant (1996), "The American Customer Satisfaction Index: Nature, Purpose, and Findings," *Journal of Marketing*, 60 (October), 7-18.

Hult, Tomas M., Forrest V. Morgeson, Neil A. Morgan, Sunil Mithas, and Claes Fornell (2017), "Do Managers Know What Their Customers Think and Why?" *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (1), 37-43.

Scale Items:¹

1. First, please consider all your experiences with _____. How would you rate the overall quality of _____? *not very high / very high*

2. Now, thinking about your personal requirements from _____, please tell me how well _____ has actually met your requirements? *not very well / very well*
3. How often do things go wrong with _____? *very often / not very often*

1. As conducted in an ACSI survey, participants are asked questions with regard to a specific brand rather than the company marketing the brand if there is a difference (Hult et al. 2017, p. 41). Higher scores indicate more positive expectations.

QUALITY OF THE COMPANY'S PRODUCTS

Three, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure how well made a particular company's products are believed to be.

Origin:

The scale was used by Habel et al. (2016) in Study 2. Using an online survey, data were collected from 1,703 customers of a large international retail company. The source of the scale was indicated to be Sweeney and Soutar (2001) but, even though there is similarity at the construct level, the scales are very different. Given that, it appears that the authors created the scale by drawing concepts from Sweeney and Soutar (2001) and common phrases found in measures of attitude toward the product, e.g., Bruner (2009, p. 175).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .886 (Habel 2017).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Habel et al. (2016).

References:

Bruner II, Gordon C. (2009), *Marketing Scales Handbook: A Compilation of Multi-Item Measures for Consumer Behavior & Advertising (Volume 5)*, Carbondale, IL: GCBII Productions.

Habel, Johannes (2017), personal correspondence.

Habel, Johannes, Laura Marie Schons, Sascha Alavi, and Jan Wieseke (2016), "Warm Glow or Extra Charge? The Ambivalent Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility Activities on Customers' Perceived Price Fairness," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 84-105.

Sweeney, Jillian C. and Geoffrey N. Soutar (2001), "Consumer Perceived Value: The Development of a Multiple Item Scale," *Journal of Retailing*, 77 (2), 203-20.

Scale Items:¹

Products of _____ . . .

1. have very poor quality / have very high quality.
2. are inferior / are superior.
3. are poorly made / are well made.

1. The name of the company should be stated in the blanks.

QUALITY OF THE PRODUCT APPLICATION

Three, seven-point items measure a consumer's comparison between two uses of a product in terms of which application is believed to be the better. To be clear, as stated, the items focus on the applications of the product rather than to the product itself.

Origin:

Nishikawa et al. (2017) used the scale in Study 4 with data from 179 students attending a large university in Europe. The source of the scale was not stated and appears to be original. The authors presented participants with two ways a product could be used (applications) in order to determine if one application was considered to be much better than the other.

Reliability:

The alpha reported for the scale was .70 (Nishikawa et al. 2017, p. 535).

Validity:

EFA was used by Nishikawa et al. (2017) with the items in this scale and the items intended to measure another construct they called *newness of the design*. The results indicated that there were two factors and each scale's items loaded highest on the intended factors. This provides some evidence for both scales of their discriminant validity with respect to each other.

Reference:

Nishikawa, Hidehiko, Martin Schreier, Christoph Fuchs, and Susumu Ogawa (2017), "The Value of Marketing Crowdsourced New Products as Such: Evidence from Two Randomized Field Experiments," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (4), 525-539.

Scale Items:¹

1. The application is based on a great idea.
2. The idea underlying the application fits the user's needs well.
3. The application is very useful to consumers.

1. The end-points of the response scale were "more true of ____" (1) and "more true of ____" (7), with the name for one of the applications being in one blank while the name for the other application should be placed in the opposing blank.

QUALITY OF THE RETAILER'S PRODUCTS

The scale is composed of four, nine-point Likert-type items that measure a consumer's belief that a particular retailer is quality conscious and the products it sells are well made.

Origin:

Darke et al. (2016) used the scale in Studies 1 and 3, with data collected in each case from undergraduate business students. The scale itself appears to have been created by the authors by drawing a couple of key words from a measure of new product quality by Sethi (2000).

Reliability:

The internal consistency of the scale in each study by Darke et al. (2016, p. 291) was high, with construct reliability being .91 (Study 1) and .94 (Study 3).

Validity:

CFA was used by Darke et al. (2016) with the data from each study to examine the psychometric properties of their measures. Although specific information about each scale was not provided, the authors did say that their measurement models fit the data well and that there was evidence of each scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

References:

Darke, Peter R., Michael K. Brady, Ray L. Benedictus, and Andrew E. Wilson (2016), "Feeling Close From Afar: The Role of Psychological Distance in Offsetting Distrust in Unfamiliar Online Retailers," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (3), 287-299.

Sethi, Rajesh (2000), "New Product Quality and Product Development Teams," *Journal of Marketing*, 64 (April 2), 1-14.

Scale Items:¹

1. Products sold by _____ are likely to be made well.
2. Products sold by _____ will function as intended.
3. Products sold by _____ are likely to have a long life.
4. _____ is likely to place emphasis on product quality.

1. The name of the retailer should be placed in the blanks. The labels used for the end-points of the response scale were not stated. Since the scale was described as Likert-type (Darke et al. 2016, pp. 290, 291), it is very likely that the extreme anchors were *Strongly disagree/Strongly agree* or something very similar.

REALISM OF THE AD SCENARIO

The degree to which a person believes the information presented or described in an advertisement could actually happen in real life is measured with three items.

Origin:

Gao, Zhang, and Mittal (2017) used the scale in a pretest for Study 6 with 67 participants recruited from MTurk. There were two versions of the scale: one for checking the realism of the way a product was presented in an ad and another version for checking the realism of a company's CMO explaining why the price of a product would be increased. The authors said the scale was "adapted from Darley and Kim (1993)" (p. 73). No such scale was in that article, but those authors did provide some suggestions for measuring realism. Given that, it may be most accurate to say that Gao, Zhang, and Mittal (2017) created the scale using suggestions from Darley and Kim (1993).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .83 (top) and .90 (bottom) for the two versions of the scale shown below (Gao, Zhang, and Mittal 2017, p. 73).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Gao, Zhang, and Mittal (2017) but some evidence of predictive validity was provided since the two versions of the scale confirmed that the manipulation of advertising stimuli worked as intended.

References:

Darley, William K., and Jeen-Su Lim (1993), "Assessing Demand Artifacts in Consumer Research: An Alternative Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20 (3), 489-495.

Gao, Huachao, Yinlong Zhang, and Vikas Mittal (2017), "How Does Local-Global Identity Affect Price Sensitivity?" *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (3), 62-79.

Scale Items:¹

1. I find the advertisement for this _____ to be realistic.
 2. I could imagine an actual _____ as described here.
 3. I believe the _____ could happen in real life.
-
1. I find the _____ advertisement to be realistic.
 2. I could imagine an actual _____ company doing the things described in the advertisement.
 3. I believe the _____ advertisement could be in press in real life.

1. The blanks in the top version of the scale should be filled with the name of the focal activity or event while the generic name for the focal product should be placed in the blanks of the bottom version of the scale. The response format was not described by Gao, Zhang, and Mittal (2017). It appears to have been a seven-point Likert-type scale with the end-points labeled as *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

RECIPROCITY MOTIVATION (MUTUAL INTEREST)

The scale measures the degree to which a customer believes that the relationship between him/her and a particular service firm is such that the parties are genuinely willing to help each other and put the other's needs above their own. Eight, seven-point Likert-type items compose the measure.

Origin:

The scale was created by Guo, Gruen, and Tang (2017) in several stages. Beyond ideas coming from an initial in-depth pretest survey with 35 consumers, the authors drew upon the work of Sorenson, Morse, and Savage (1999) as well as Uhl-Bien and Maslyn (2003) to operationalize the construct. Ultimately, the scale was used in the main study with data gathered from 700 consumers across three different service industries.

Reliability:

The composite reliability of the scale in the main study by Guo, Gruen, and Tang (2017, p. 365) was .89.

Validity:

The authors conducted analyses that provided support for the scale's validity along with the other scales used in the study. In particular, an EFA was conducted on half of the main study sample to help purify the multiple scales used in the study. Then, the surviving items were examined with a CFA using data from the other half of the sample. There was a satisfactory fit of the model. Not only was there support for each scale's unidimensionality but for their convergent and discriminant validities as well. Regarding the mutual interest scale's AVE, it was .62 (Guo, Gruen, and Tang 2017, p. 365).

References:

- Guo, Lin, Thomas W. Gruen, and Chuanyi Tang (2017), "Seeing Relationships Through the Lens of Psychological Contracts: The Structure of Consumer Service Relationships," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (3), 357–376.
- Sorenson, Ritch L., Eric A. Morse, and Grant T. Savage (1999), "A Test of the Motivations Underlying Choice of Conflict Strategies in the Dual-Concern Model," *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 10 (1), 25–44.
- Uhl-Bien, Mary and John M. Maslyn (2003), "Reciprocity in Manager-Subordinate Relationships: Components, Configurations, and Outcomes," *Journal of Management*, 29 (4), 511–532.

Scale Items:¹

1. This service firm and I would help each other without expectation for any return.
2. If I saw that this service firm needed something, I would do it for the firm without being asked.
3. This service firm and I go out of way to help each other.
4. If necessary, this service firm would place my needs above its own.

5. This service firm and I would forgive each other if the other party makes mistakes.
6. If necessary, I would place this service firm's needs above my own.
7. This service firm would do something for me without any strings attached.
8. If something out of the ordinary occurs, this service firm will respond to it as a special situation and try to accommodate my needs.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Guo, Gruen, and Tang (2017, p. 364) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

RECIPROCITY MOTIVATION (SELF-INTEREST)

Four, seven-point Likert-type items measure a customer's belief that his/her relationship with a particular service firm is such that the parties look out for their own interests first and foremost.

Origin:

The scale was created by Guo, Gruen, and Tang (2017) in several stages. Beyond ideas coming from an initial in-depth pretest survey with 35 consumers, the authors drew upon the work of Sorenson, Morse, and Savage (1999) as well as Uhl-Bien and Maslyn (2003) to operationalize the construct. Ultimately, the scale was used in the main study with data gathered from 700 consumers across three different service industries.

Reliability:

The composite reliability of the scale in the main study by Guo, Gruen, and Tang (2017, p. 365) was .79.

Validity:

The authors conducted analyses that provided support for the scale's validity along with the other scales used in the study. In particular, an EFA was conducted on half of the main study sample to help purify the multiple scales used in the study. Then, the surviving items were examined with a CFA using data from the other half of the sample. There was a satisfactory fit of the model. Not only was there support for each scale's unidimensionality but for their convergent and discriminant validities as well. Regarding the self-interest scale's AVE, it was .50 (Guo, Gruen, and Tang 2017, p. 365).

References:

- Guo, Lin, Thomas W. Gruen, and Chuanyi Tang (2017), "Seeing Relationships Through the Lens of Psychological Contracts: The Structure of Consumer Service Relationships," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (3), 357–376.
- Sorenson, Ritch L., Eric A. Morse, and Grant T. Savage (1999), "A Test of the Motivations Underlying Choice of Conflict Strategies in the Dual-Concern Model," *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 10 (1), 25–44.
- Uhl-Bien, Mary and John M. Maslyn (2003), "Reciprocity in Manager-Subordinate Relationships: Components, Configurations, and Outcomes," *Journal of Management*, 29 (4), 511–532.

Scale Items:¹

1. If this service firm does something extra for me, it expects me to pay it back as soon as possible.
2. This service firm looks out for itself first.
3. I have learned to look out for myself in this relationship.
4. I worry that my loyalty to the service firm will never be rewarded.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Guo, Gruen, and Tang (2017, p. 364) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

REFLECTION ON THE STORY

The degree to which a person thinks about the meaning of a story is measured with three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Hamby and Brinberg (2016) created the scale using inspiration from work by Graesser, Singer, and Trabasso (1994). The measure was used by Hamby and Brinberg (2016) in Studies 1A, 1B, and 2 in which participants read a story and then completed several measures, including this one measuring their reflection on the story’s meaning.

Reliability:

The alphas reported for the scale were .85, .96, and .92 in Studies 1A, 1B, and 2, respectively (Hamby and Brinberg, pp. 501-503).

Validity:

The discriminate validity of the scale was assessed by Hamby and Brinberg (2016, pp. 501-503) with respect to a related construct called *transportation*, meaning in this case that a participant was absorbed in the story that was read. CFA was used in all three studies and provided evidence that *reflection* was distinct from *transportation*.

Comments:

The scale is easily adaptable for use with other media such as movies, songs, and plays. As always, it is prudent to re-test the modified scale’s psychometric quality before use in theory testing.

References:

Graesser, Arthur C., Murray Singer, and Tom Trabasso (1994), "Constructing Inferences during Narrative Text Comprehension," *Psychological Review*, 101 (3), 371–395.
Hamby, Anne and David Brinberg (2016), "Happily Ever After: How Ending Valence Influences Narrative Persuasion in Cautionary Stories," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (4), 498-508.

Scale Items:¹

1. I thought about the meaning of the story.
2. I thought about the ‘message’ of the story.
3. I thought about what the story was trying to express, overall.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Hamby and Brinberg (2016, p. 501) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

REGRET (DECISION)

Three Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a person would make a different choice if possible given an outcome that has occurred to a decision he/she made.

Origin:

This measure of regret was used in Study 8 by Parker, Lehmann, and Xie (2016, p. 128). Analyses were based on data collected from 355 participants from Amazon Mechanical Turk. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

The alpha calculated for the scale was .86 (Parker, Lehmann, and Xie 2016, p. 128).

Validity:

Parker, Lehmann, and Xie (2016) did not address the validity of the scale.

Reference:

Parker, Jeffrey R., Donald R. Lehmann, and Yi Xie (2016), "Decision Comfort," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (1), 113-133.

Scale Items:¹

1. Despite the outcome, I do not regret my _____ choice. (r)
2. Based on this outcome, I regret my _____.
3. If I could go back in time and choose again, I would choose differently.

1. The end points of the response scale used by Parker, Lehmann, and Xie (2016, p. 128) with these items were *strongly disagree* (-5) and *strongly agree* (+5). The blanks in the first two items should have a short phrase that refers to the decision that was made. For example, the context in Study 8 was that participants were asked to choose between two investment options. Given that, the phrase used in items #1 and #2 was "mutual fund."

RELATIONAL BENEFITS WITH THE SALESPERSON (FUNCTIONAL)

The scale has four, seven-point Likert-type items that measure how much a customer enjoys the relationship with a particular salesperson and believes he/she provides extra service in order to improve the relationship.

Origin:

The scale was used by Wan, Chan, and Chen (2016) in Study 3 with data gathered from 220 matched pairs of customers and service agents from a global insurance institution near Hong Kong. The survey instrument was created in English but was prepared for administration in Chinese using the back-translation method. Based on their citations, the authors seem to have drawn concepts and phrases for creating the scale from work by Chan, Yim, and Lam (2010) as well as Dabholkar (1990).

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .91 (Wan, Chan, and Chen 2016, p. 767).

Validity:

CFA was used by Wan, Chan, and Chen (2016) to examine their model and the psychometric quality of their measures. The results indicated a satisfactory model fit as well as evidence of convergent and discriminant validities for their scales. The AVE for the relational benefits scale was .68.

References:

Chan, Kimmy Wa, Chi Kin (Bennett) Yim, and Simon S.K. Lam (2010), "Is Customer Participation in Value Creation a Double-Edged Sword? Evidence from Professional Financial Services Across Cultures," *Journal of Marketing*, 74 (3), 48-64.
Dabholkar, Pratibha A. (1990), "How to Improve Perceived Service Quality by Improving Customer Participation," *Developments in Marketing Science*, 13, 483-487.
Wan, Echo Wen, Kimmy Wa Chan, and Rocky Peng Chen (2016), "Hurting or Helping? The Effect of Service Agents' Workplace Ostracism on Customer Service Perceptions," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (6), 746-769.

Scale Items:¹

To what extent do you agree that the agent performs in the following ways so as to build a better relationship with you?

1. I have an enjoyable relationship with the service agents because he/she willingly goes out of his/her way to satisfy my needs.
2. I am always served with his/her extra care that goes above and beyond the "call of duty."
3. This agent will voluntarily assist me for building a better relationship with me.
4. This agent is always willing to give me help for forging a better relationship with me.

1. The extreme verbal anchors of the response scale used with these items were *strongly disagree* (7) and *strongly agree* (7).

RELATIONSHIP EQUITY (CUSTOMER WITH COMPANY)

The degree to which a consumer is committed to a company and believes the company knows what he/she wants is measured with three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Ou, Verhoef, and Wiesel (2017) developed this scale along with two other scales in order to measure three crucial drivers of company equity. The authors drew ideas for the scales from several sources, principally Rust et al. (2000), Verhoef (2003), and Vogel et al. (2008). One of the authors' goals in developing the scales was to limit the number of scale items in order increase response rates. A second goal was to have items that would be applicable to a variety of industries and products. After a couple of pre-tests used to purify the scales, the analyses referred to below were based on data in the final study from 8924 customers in the Netherlands.

Reliability:

The alpha of the relationship equity scale was .85 (Ou, Verhoef, and Wiesel 2017, p. 346).

Validity:

Results of a principal component analysis showed that the items composing this scale as well as the measures of the other two drivers of company equity loaded on the expected factors. Using SEM, the analysis indicated that the AVE of the relationship equity scale was .77 and it had discriminant validity with respect to the other two drivers.

References:

- Ou, Yi-Chun, Peter C. Verhoef, and Thorsten Wiesel (2017), "The Effects of Customer Equity Drivers on Loyalty Across Services Industries and Firms," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (3), 336–356.
- Rust, Roland T., Valerie A. Zeithaml, and Katherine N. Lemon (2000), *Driving Customer Equity: How Customer Lifetime Value is Reshaping Corporate Strategy*, New York: Free Press.
- Verhoef, Peter C. (2003), "Understanding the Effect of Customer Relationship Management Efforts on Customer Retention and Customer Retention and Customer Share Development," *Journal of Marketing*, 67 (October), 30-45.
- Vogel, Verena, Heiner Evanschitzky, and B. Ramaseshan (2008), "Customer Equity Drivers and Future Sales," *Journal of Marketing*, 72 (6), 98-108.

Scale Items:¹

1. I have the feeling that the company knows exactly what I want.
2. I feel at home with this company.
3. I feel committed to this company.

1. The end-points of the response scale were *totally disagree* (1) and *totally agree* (7).

RELATIONSHIP FEEDBACK

The scale uses three, seven-point Likert items to measure the degree to which the feedback provided by a customer to a service provider is meant to show concern for the future of their relationship.

Origin:

The scale was used by Umashankar, Ward, and Dahl (2017) in Study 3 with data gathered from 146 people at a university in the southeastern United States. Since the authors did not identify the source of the scale, it seems likely that they created it specifically for the study.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .94 (Umashankar, Ward, and Dahl 2017, p. 89).

Validity:

Umashankar, Ward, and Dahl (2017) did not discuss the scale's validity.

Comments:

The scale was used in the study with respect to service providers. The phrases seem amenable for use with other persons such as friends and relatives.

Reference:

Umashankar, Nita, Morgan K. Ward, and Darren W. Dahl (2017), "The Benefit of Becoming Friends: Complaining After Service Failures Leads Customers with Strong Ties to Increase Loyalty," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (6), 79-98.

Scale Items:¹

My feedback . . .

1. shows that I care.
2. is an investment in the relationship.
3. is a display of effort.

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale used by Umashankar, Ward, and Dahl (2017, p. 86) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

RELATIONSHIP ORIENTATION OF THE BRAND

This three-item scale measures the belief that a brand is attempting to build a sense of closeness between itself and the consumer (the respondent).

Origin:

Puzakova and Kwak (2017) used the scale as a manipulation check in a second pretest (n = 101) for Study 1. Even though the authors had already created a measure of a brand's interaction orientation, they decided to create another scale "to ensure that consumers interpreted interaction-oriented brands as sending a relationship closeness signal" (p. 104). They drew inspiration for the items from measures of relational communication by Burgoon and Hale (1987).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .90 (Puzakova and Kwak 2017, p. 104).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Puzakova and Kwak (2017). However, since the scale was used in the pretest as a manipulation check and showed the manipulation was successful, it provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

References:

Burgoon, Judee K. and Jerold L. Hale (1984), "The Fundamental Topoi of Relational Communication," *Communication Monographs*, 51 (September), 193-214.

Puzakova, Marina and Hyokjin Kwak (2017), "Should Anthropomorphized Brands Engage Customers? The Impact of Social Crowding on Brand Preferences," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (6), 99-115.

Scale Items:¹

1. The brand seems to be trying to establish more intimate relationships between us.
2. The brand seems to be building a closer relationship with me.
3. The brand seems to be initiating a sense of closeness between us.

1. The response format used by Puzakova and Kwak (2017) with these items was not stated. However, based on what the authors did with several other measures, it seems likely that this scale had seven points and Likert-type extreme anchors (strongly disagree / strongly agree).

RELATIONSHIP STRENGTH (DUE TO GIFT)

The five, nine-point, Likert-type scale measures how much a person expresses satisfaction with his/her relationship with a person as a result of a gift that person has given.

Origin:

Chan and Mogilner (2017) used the scale in Study 4 with analyses based on data gathered from 995 people who were recruited from Amazon MTurk. Participants were asked to recall a gift they had received from someone they have known and then to respond to the relationship scale as well as some other measures. The scale is an adaptation of the items used by Rusbult, Martz, and Agnew (1998) to measure the satisfaction level component of their Investment Model Scale.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale used by Chan and Mogilner (2017, p. 923) was .95.

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Chan and Mogilner (2017).

References:

Chan, Cindy and Cassie Mogilner (2017), "Experiential Gifts Foster Stronger Social Relationships Than Material Gifts," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (6), 913-931.

Rusbult, Caryl E., John M. Martz, and Christopher R. Agnew (1998), "The Investment Model Scale: Measuring Commitment Level, Satisfaction Level, Quality of Alternatives, and Investment Size," *Personal Relationships*, 5 (4), 357-391.

Scale Items:¹

1. I feel more satisfied with our relationship as a result of the gift.
2. Our relationship is closer to ideal as a result of the gift.
3. Our relationship is much better than others' relationships as a result of the gift.
4. Our relationship makes me very happy as a result of the gift.
5. Our relationship does a good job of fulfilling my needs for intimacy, companionship, etc. as a result of the gift.

1. The end-points of the scale that Chan and Mogilner (2017, p. 923) provided to participants for responding to these items were *don't agree at all* (1) and *agree completely* (9).

RELATIONSHIP TERMINATION RESPONSIBILITY (COMPANY)

Using three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a person blames a specific entity (store, company, organization) and its strategies for him/her terminating the relationship between them.

Origin:

The scale was called *locus* by Pick et al. (2016) and was used in a study conducted with subscribers of a publisher that sold romance novels in Germany. The final sample consisted of 540 respondents. The language in which the scale was presented to participants was not stated, however, it is clear that the data were collected in Germany.

As for the source of the scale, the authors cited Tsiros et al. (2004). However, the scale was not used by the latter. It appears Pick et al. (2016) created their scale based on inspiration they received from the following item used by Tsiros et al. (2004) to measure the "responsibility" construct: *Company Alpha is responsible for the recent level of performance.*

Reliability:

The composite reliability of the scale used by Pick et al. (2016, p. 238) was .92.

Validity:

Pick et al. (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity.

References:

Pick, Doreén, Jacquelyn S. Thomas, Sebastian Tillmanns, and Manfred Krafft (2016), "Customer Win-back: The Role of Attributions and Perceptions in Customers' Willingness to Return," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (2), 218-240.

Tsiros, Michael, Vikas Mittal and William T. Ross, Jr. (2004), "The Role of Attributes in Consumer Satisfaction: A Reexamination," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (September), 476-483.

Scale Items:¹

1. _____ is responsible for my decision to terminate the relationship.
2. _____ is responsible for my decision to terminate the relationship.
3. The strategies and orientation of _____ are responsible for my decision to terminate the relationship.

1. The entity viewed as the cause for the respondent deciding to end the relationship should be stated in the blanks. In items #1 and #3, Pick et al. (2016, p. 238) used the phrase "your publishing house" while in item #2 they used "your staff." The response scale that Pick et al. (2016, p. 238) used with these items had end-points labeled as *I do not agree at all* (1) and *I fully agree* (7).

RELATIONSHIP TYPE (ECONOMIC EXCHANGE)

With six, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures a consumer's belief that the relationship he/she has with a service firm is based on the fulfillment of specified and quantifiable obligations in the short term.

Origin:

The scale was created by Guo, Gruen, and Tang (2017) in several stages. Beyond ideas coming from an initial in-depth pretest survey with 35 consumers, the authors drew upon the work of Uhl-Bien and Maslyn (2003) as well as Shore et al. (2006) to operationalize the construct. Ultimately, the scale was used in the main study with data gathered from 700 consumers across three different service industries.

Reliability:

The composite reliability of the scale in the main study by Guo, Gruen, and Tang (2017, p. 365) was .85.

Validity:

The authors conducted analyses that provided support for the scale's validity along with the other scales used in the study. In particular, an EFA was conducted on half of the main study sample to help purify the multiple scales used in the study. Then, the surviving items were examined with a CFA using data from the other half of the sample. There was a satisfactory fit of the model. Not only was there support for each scale's unidimensionality but for their convergent and discriminant validities as well. With regard to the economic exchange scale's AVE, it was .51 (Guo, Gruen, and Tang 2017, p. 365).

References:

- Guo, Lin, Thomas W. Gruen, and Chuanyi Tang (2017), "Seeing Relationships Through the Lens of Psychological Contracts: The Structure of Consumer Service Relationships," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (3), 357–376.
- Shore, Lynn M., Lois E. Tetrick, Patricia Lynch, and Kevin Barksdale (2006), "Social and Economic Exchange: Construct Development and Validation," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36 (4), 837–867.
- Uhl-Bien, Mary and John M. Maslyn (2003), "Reciprocity in Manager-Subordinate Relationships: Components, Configurations, and Outcomes," *Journal of Management*, 29 (4), 511–532.

Scale Items:¹

1. As long as this service firm and I fulfill our responsibilities to each other, we will do business with each other.
2. As long as good quality service is provided, I will stay in business with this service firm.

3. As long as reasonable and affordable prices are offered, I will stay in business with this service firm.
4. What this service firm and I expect from each other is clearly specified.
5. The most accurate way to describe my purchase situation with this service firm is to say that I give a fair payment for a fairly good service.
6. The price I pay for the service is comparable to the level of service I get.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Guo, Gruen, and Tang (2017, p. 364) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

RELATIONSHIP TYPE (SOCIAL EXCHANGE)

The scale measures a customer's belief that the relationship he/she has with a service firm is based on the long-term, reciprocal contributions of both parties and benefits to those parties. Five, seven-point Likert-type items compose the measure.

Origin:

The scale was created by Guo, Gruen, and Tang (2017) in several stages. Beyond ideas coming from an initial in-depth pretest survey with 35 consumers, the authors drew upon the work of Uhl-Bien and Maslyn (2003) as well as Shore et al. (2006) to operationalize the construct. Ultimately, the scale was used in the main study with data gathered from 700 consumers across three different service industries.

Reliability:

The composite reliability of the scale in the main study by Guo, Gruen, and Tang (2017, p. 365) was .83.

Validity:

The authors conducted analyses that provided support for the scale's validity along with the other scales used in the study. In particular, an EFA was conducted on half of the main study sample to help purify the multiple scales used in the study. Then, the surviving items were examined with a CFA using data from the other half of the sample. There was a satisfactory fit of the model. Not only was there support for each scale's unidimensionality but for their convergent and discriminant validities as well. Regarding the social exchange scale's AVE, it was .64 (Guo, Gruen, and Tang 2017, p. 365).

References:

- Guo, Lin, Thomas W. Gruen, and Chuanyi Tang (2017), "Seeing Relationships Through the Lens of Psychological Contracts: The Structure of Consumer Service Relationships," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (3), 357–376.
- Shore, Lynn M., Lois E. Tetrick, Patricia Lynch, and Kevin Barksdale (2006), "Social and Economic Exchange: Construct Development and Validation," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36 (4), 837–867.
- Uhl-Bien, Mary and John M. Maslyn (2003), "Reciprocity in Manager-Subordinate Relationships: Components, Configurations, and Outcomes," *Journal of Management*, 29 (4), 511–532.

Scale Items:¹

1. This service firm rewards customers who support its business.
2. I am motivated to contribute to this service firm (e.g., refer new customers, help fill out surveys) in return for future customer benefits.
3. I feel this service firm reciprocates the effort put in by its customers.

4. I do not mind investing in the relationship with this service firm today-I know I will eventually be rewarded by this organization.
5. The longer that I patronize this service firm, the greater recognition I get as its loyal customer.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Guo, Gruen, and Tang (2017, p. 364) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

RELIGIOSITY

Five, six-point items are used to measure the extent to which a person describes his/her faith (unspecified) as providing meaning to life and affecting aspects of how he/she lives.

Origin:

Zheng et al. (2016) used the scale in most if not all the studies reported in the article. The authors stated that they "adapted" the scale from a measure by Koenig, Parkerson, and Meador (1997). That scale, called the Duke University Index, does have five items and covers similar concepts as the one used by Zheng et al. (2016). Beyond that surface similarity, however, the phrasing of the items is different.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale in Study 1A was .96 (Zheng et al. 2016, p. 1052). The alphas for the scale in the other studies were not reported.

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Zheng et al. (2016).

Comments:

Curiously, the items do not specify what one's faith is in. The terms "GOD," "religion," and "spiritual" are not stated explicitly though they are implied. To better focus responses, the context of the study or the instructions used with the scale could give greater clarity to what type of faith is being measured.

References:

Koenig, Harold, George R. Parkerson Jr., and Keith G. Meador (1997), "Religion Index for Psychiatric Research," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 154 (6), 885-886.
Zheng, Yanmei, Stijn M.J. Van Osselaer, and Joseph W. Alba (2016), "Belief in Free Will: Implications for Practice and Policy," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (6), 1050-1064.

Scale Items:¹

1. I pray daily.
2. I look to my faith as providing meaning and purpose in my life.
3. I consider myself active in my faith or church.
4. I enjoy being around others who share my faith.
5. My faith impacts many of my decisions.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Zheng et al. (2016, p. 1052) were *Not at all true for me* (1) and *Very true for me* (6).

REMINISCING ENJOYMENT

The scale is composed of eight, nine-point Likert-type items that measure the pleasure one derives from recalling happy memories.

Origin:

Huang et al. (2016) used the scale in Studies 4 (n = 149) and 5 (n = 212) with data gathered from participants recruited from Amazon's MTurk. They referred to the measure as *savoring-the-past*. The authors borrowed the scale from Bryant (2003). The scale was one of three subscales of the Savoring Beliefs Inventory. Six studies were conducted by Bryant (2003) which provided support for the scale's psychometric quality. Alphas for the reminiscing scale ranged from .75 to .84.

Reliability:

As used by Huang et al. (2016, pp. 378, 380), the alphas for the scale in Studies 4 and 5 were .97 and .94, respectively.

Validity:

The scale's validity was not addressed by Huang et al. (2016).

References:

Bryant, Fred B. (2003), "Savoring Beliefs Inventory (SBI): A Scale for Measuring Beliefs about Savoring," *Journal of Mental Health*, 12 (2), 175-196.

Huang, Xun (Irene), Zhongqiang (Tak) Huang, and Robert S. Wyer (2016), "Slowing Down in the Good Old Days: The Effect of Nostalgia on Consumer Patience," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (3), 372-387.

Scale Items:¹

1. I enjoy looking back on happy times.
2. I don't like to look back afterwards. (r)
3. I can feel good by remembering the past.
4. I feel disappointed when I reminisce. (r)
5. I like to store memories for later recall.
6. Reminiscing is a waste of time. (r)
7. It is easy to rekindle joy from happy memories.
8. It is best not to recall past fun times. (r)

1. The response scale provided by Huang et al. (2016, p. 378) to participants for responding to the items was anchored by *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (9). Phrases were provided by Bryant (2003, p. 181). Judgment was used here to create complete sentences.

REPATRONAGE INTENTION

Three, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure a customer's intention to purchase a specified good or service from the same specified business in the future as purchased from in the past. Given the phrasing of the items, the scale might also be viewed as a measure of commitment or attitudinal loyalty.

Origin:

The scale was called *customer attitudinal loyalty* by Steinhoff and Palmatier (2016). It was used in the authors' three studies of loyalty programs with respect to a hypothetical retail store in Study 1, a hypothetical hotel in Study 2, and real airlines in Study 3. Because Studies 1 and 2 were very similar lab experiments, their data were combined for some of the analyses. Study 3 data were gathered in a survey and were analyzed separately. The scale was an adaptation of a measure used by Wagner, Hennig-Thurau, and Rudolph (2009).

Reliability:

Alphas of .93 and .95 were reported for the scale in Studies 1 and 2 (combined) and Study 3, respectively (Steinhoff and Palmatier 2016, p. 99).

Validity:

In analyses of data for both the combined samples of Studies 1 and 2 as well as Study 3, CFAs were used by Steinhoff and Palmatier (2016, p. 98) to assess the psychometric qualities of the scales. In all cases, including the measure of repatronage, evidence was found of the scales' convergent and discriminant validities. The AVEs for the repatronage scale were .79 (Studies 1 and 2 data combined) and .86 (Study 3).

References:

Steinhoff, Lena and Robert W. Palmatier (2016), "Understanding Loyalty Program Effectiveness: Managing Target and Bystander Effects," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (1), 88-107.

Wagner, Tillmann, Thorsten Hennig-Thurau, and Thomas Rudolph (2009), "Does Customer Demotion Jeopardize Loyalty?" *Journal of Marketing*, 73 (3), 69-85.

Scale Items:¹

1. I will continue buying at _____.
2. The next time I _____, I will buy at _____.²
3. In the future, I will purchase at _____.

1. The name of the company or store should be placed in all of the blanks except the long one in item #2. The extreme verbal anchors of the response scale used by Steinhoff and Palmatier (2016, p. 98) with the three statements were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

2. The long space should be filled with a brief description of what the customer plans to buy. Steinhoff and Palmatier (2016, p. 98) used "go to a coffee shop" in Study 1, "need to book a hotel" in Study 2, and "need to book a flight" in Study 3.

REVIEWER'S EFFORT

With three, nine-point items, the scale measures how much time and thought a person believes another person put into writing a product review.

Origin:

Yin, Bond, and Zhang (2017) used a two-item version of the scale in Study 2 and a three-item version in Studies 3 and 4. Each study examined attitudes and reactions of participants after reading reviews about mobile phone apps. As for the scale's source, the authors stated that they had "adapted" their measure from work by Huddy, Feldman, and Cassese (2007). While there is one item in that article from which the authors received some inspiration, the bulk of the scale is of unknown origin. Interestingly, either by design or coincidence, the scale bears much stronger resemblance to three items in a measure by Menon, Raghubir, and Schwarz (1995).

Reliability:

The alpha for the two-item scale used in Study 2 was .9886 (Yin 2018). In Study 3, alphas ranged from .939 to .954 for three different reviews presented to participants. Similarly, the range of alphas for the four different reviews presented in Study 4 ranged from .916 to .936.

Validity:

The scale's validity was not addressed by Yin, Bond, and Zhang (2017).

References:

Huddy, Leonie, Stanley Feldman, and Erin Cassese (2007), "On the Distinct Political Effects of Anxiety and Anger," in *The Affect Effect: Dynamics of Emotion in Political Thinking and Behavior*, Ann N. Crigler, Michael Mackuen, George E. Marcus, and W. Russell Neuman, eds. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 202–230.

Menon, Geeta, Priya Raghubir, and Norbert Schwarz (1995), "Behavioral Frequency Judgments: An Accessibility-Diagnosticity Framework," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22 (September), 212–228.

Yin, Dezhi (2018), personal correspondence.

Yin, Dezhi, Samuel D. Bond, and Han Zhang (2017), "Keep Your Cool or Let It Out: Nonlinear Effects of Expressed Arousal on Perceptions of Consumer Reviews," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (3), 447–463.

Scale Items:¹

1. In your opinion, how much effort did the reviewer put into writing this review?
2. In your opinion, how much thought did the reviewer give to this review?
3. In your opinion, how much time did the reviewer spend writing this review?

1. The two-items used in Study 2 by Yin, Bond, and Zhang (2017) were #1 and #2 and the extreme verbal anchors of the response scale were *very little* and *very much*. All three items composed the scale in Study 3 and the end points were *not at all* and *very much*.

REVIEWING MOTIVE (ALTRUISTIC)

Composed of three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a person's reason for providing a product review to others was a sincere concern to help them make better decisions. The items are general enough for use with regard to posting product reviews online or privately sharing opinions with friends.

Origin:

Packard and Berger (2017) used the scale in Study 2 with 604 people recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .86 (Packard and Berger 2017, p. 585).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Packard and Berger (2017).

Reference:

Packard, Grant and Jonah Berger (2017), "How Language Shapes Word of Mouth's Impact," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (4), 572-588.

Scale Items:¹

1. I was motivated by a desire to help people.
2. I wanted to assist others who may be choosing a _____.²
3. I was concerned about being useful to other people.

1. The end-points of the scale used to respond to the items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).
2. The name of the good or service should be placed in the blank. For example, "hotel" was used by Packard and Berger (2017, p. 585).

RISKINESS OF REVIEWING THE PRODUCT (SOCIAL)

This three-item, seven-point scale measures how concerned a person is about being embarrassed if he/she reviewed a particular good or service and it was not accepted well by others. The items are general enough for use with regard to posting product reviews online or privately sharing one's opinion with friends.

Origin:

Packard and Berger (2017) used the scale in Study 2 with 604 people recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The source of the scale was not stated. The authors referred to it as *signaling cost of making a bad recommendation*. What construct is measured with these items is not clear. It could also be viewed as concern about losing face or anticipated regret. It is viewed here as measuring the consequence component of risk and the social type of loss because of the emphasis in the items on the embarrassment a person could experience if the result of the decision is ultimately bad (e.g., Bauer 1960; Roselius 1971).

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .88 (Packard and Berger 2017, p. 585).

Validity:

Although the scale's validity was not discussed, some evidence comes from the scale's use as a manipulation check (Packard and Berger 2017, p. 577). Given that the manipulation was successful, it provides some limited support for the scale's predictive validity.

References:

- Bauer, Raymond A. (1960), "Consumer Behavior as Risk Taking," in *Proceedings of the 43rd Conference of the American Marketing Association*, R. S. Hancock, ed. Chicago: American Marketing Association, 389-398.
- Packard, Grant and Jonah Berger (2017), "How Language Shapes Word of Mouth's Impact," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (4), 572-588.
- Roselius, Ted (1971), "Consumer Rankings of Risk Reduction Methods," *Journal of Marketing*, 35 (January), 56-61.

Scale Items:¹

1. How much would you have to lose if you approved of a bad _____?
2. How costly would it be to your sense of self if people disagreed with your assessment of the _____?
3. How embarrassed would you feel if other people didn't like the _____ that you did?

1. The name of the good or service should be placed in the blanks. For example, the items used by Packard and Berger (2017, p. 585) contained the word *hotel*. The end-points of the scale used to respond to the items were *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7).

RISKINESS OF THE PURCHASE (PRODUCT/WEBSITE)

The degree to which a consumer believes that a buying a particular product from a particular retailer's website would be risky is measured with three, nine-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Darke et al. (2016) used the scale in Studies 1 and 3, with data collected in each case from undergraduate business students. The scale itself appears to have been created by the authors by drawing a couple of key words from a scale by Campbell and Goodstein (2001).

Reliability:

The internal consistency of the scale in each study by Darke et al. (2016, p. 291) was high, with construct reliability being .91 (Study 1) and .94 (Study 3).

Validity:

CFA was used by Darke et al. (2016) with the data from each study to examine the psychometric properties of their measures. Although specific information about each scale was not provided, the authors did say that their measurement models fit the data well and that there was evidence of each scale's convergent and discriminant validity.

References:

Campbell, Margaret C. and Ronald C. Goodstein (2001), "The Moderating Effect of Perceived Risk on Consumers' Evaluations of Product Incongruity: Preference for the Norm," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (December), 439-449.

Darke, Peter R., Michael K. Brady, Ray L. Benedictus, and Andrew E. Wilson (2016), "Feeling Close From Afar: The Role of Psychological Distance in Offsetting Distrust in Unfamiliar Online Retailers," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (3), 287-299.

Scale Items:¹

1. Purchasing a _____ from _____ would be risky.
2. There is a good chance of a problem if I purchased a _____ from the _____ website.
3. I would be worried about being disappointed if I purchased the _____ from the _____ website.

1. The name of the product should be placed in the first blank of each item and the name of the retailer should be placed in the second blank. The labels used for the end-points of the response scale were not stated. However, since the scale was described as Likert-type (Darke et al. 2016, pp. 290, 291), it is very likely that the extreme anchors were *Strongly disagree/Strongly agree* or something very similar.

RUMINATION OF BRAND-RELATED MISTREATMENT

The scale measures a consumer's belief that if he/she was wronged in some way by a brand and/or some employees associated with it then the memories of the unfair behavior would be an obsession. Six, seven-point Likert-type items compose the scale.

Origin:

Kähr et al. (2016) used in the scale in what they called Preliminary Study 2 with 289 participants recruited from several European countries using the Clickworker platform. The scale was a slight adaptation of a measure created by Wade et al. (2008). The primary difference is that Kähr et al. (2016) phrased the items in terms of *thinking* about a brand whereas the items by Wade et al. (2016) focused on the *harm* caused by a brand.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .93 (Kähr et al. 2016, p. 30).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Kähr et al. (2016).

References:

Kähr, Andrea (2018), personal correspondence.

Kähr, Andrea, Bettina Nyffenegger, Harley Krohmer, and Wayne D. Hoyer (2016), "When Hostile Consumers Wreak Havoc on Your Brand: The Phenomenon of Consumer Brand Sabotage," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (3), 25-41.

Wade, Nathaniel G., David L. Vogel, Kelly Yu-Hsin Liao, and Daniel B. Goldman (2008), "Measuring State-Specific Rumination: Development of the Rumination About an Interpersonal Offense Scale," *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 55 (3), 419-426.

Scale Items:¹

1. I would not be able to stop thinking about how I was wronged by the brand (and its employees).
2. Memories about the unfair behavior and the statements of the brand (and its employees) would limit my enjoyment of life.
3. I would have a hard time getting thoughts of how I was mistreated by the brand (and its employees) out of my head.
4. The wrong I suffered would never be far from my mind.
5. I would replay the events over and over in my mind.
6. I would try to figure out the reasons why the brand (and its employees) treated me so badly.

1. The scale items were provided by Kähr (2018). The labels for the end-points of the seven-point response scale were *I completely disagree* (1) and *I completely agree* (7).

SACRIFICE FOR A CAUSE

The degree to which a person is willing to make sacrifices for the long-term good of society as well as for other causes of personal importance is measured with seven, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Gao, Zhang, and Mittal (2017) used the scale in Study 4 (n = 224 undergraduate students) and Study 5 (n = 404 U.S. consumers recruited from MTurk). The authors intended to measure a construct that they referred to as *sacrifice mindset*. The scale was apparently created by the authors by drawing ideas and some phrasing from Davis, Le, and Coy (2011) as well as Swann et al. (2014).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .89 and .82 in Studies 4 and 5, respectively (Gao, Zhang, and Mittal 2017, pp. 70, 71).

Validity:

In Study 4, the items in this scale as well as those measuring two other constructs (monetary sacrifice and purchase likelihood) were examined with an EFA and found to load on their intended factors. The same result occurred in a CFA which, additionally, found that a three-factor solution fit the data better than a one-factor solution. This provides some evidence of the sacrifice scale having some degree of convergent and discriminant validity. Some evidence of predictive validity was provided in Study 5 since the scale confirmed that the manipulation of sacrifice in the experiment was successful.

References:

- Davis, Jody L., Benjamin Le, and Anthony E. Coy (2011), "Building a Model of Commitment to the Natural Environment to Predict Ecological Behavior and Willingness to Sacrifice," *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 31 (3), 257–276.
- Gao, Huachao, Yinlong Zhang, and Vikas Mittal (2017), "How Does Local–Global Identity Affect Price Sensitivity?" *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (3), 62–79.
- Swann, William B., Jr., Michael D. Buhrmester, Angel Gomez, Jolanda Jetten, Brock Bastian, Alexandra Vazquez, Amarina Ariyanto, Tomasz Besta, Oliver Christ, Lijuan Cui, Gillian Finchilescu, Roberto González, Nobuhiko Goto, Matthew Hornsey, Sushama Sharma, Harry Susianto, and Airong Zhang (2014), "What Makes a Group Worth Dying For? Identity Fusion Fosters Perception of Familial Ties, Promoting Self-Sacrifice," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106 (6), 912–926.

Scale Items:¹

1. I believe sacrifice is a great virtue.
2. I am willing to give up my personal benefits for a bigger cause.

3. Sacrificing is important and seems easy at the moment.
4. I feel the need to give up things I like doing.
5. I feel the urge to make the necessary sacrifice.
6. Sacrifices are necessary to achieve long-term goals for oneself and for society.
7. I am willing to forgo desired activities for something more important.

1. The end-points used by Gao, Zhang, and Mittal (2017, p. 77) in the response scale with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

SALESPERSON'S CUSTOMER ORIENTATION

Three, seven-point items compose the scale and measure how much a customer believes his/her best interests are guiding a particular salesperson's efforts to solve one's problem.

Origin:

Alavi, Wieseke, and Guba (2016) used the scale in a field study where data were gathered from 537 salesperson–customer interactions in a car retailing setting. This involved 28 different dealership chains that were located in 11 different cities and offered new and used cars of five different brands.

The scale is an adaptation of a five-item customer orientation subscale by Thomas, Soutar and Ryan (2001) which was an adaptation of the much longer scale (SOCO) created by Saxe and Weitz (1982).

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .84 (Alavi, Wieseke, and Guba 2016, p. 53).

Validity:

Although the details were limited, Alavi, Wieseke, and Guba (2016) indicated that their scales showed evidence of discriminant validity. With respect to customer orientation, the AVE was .67.

References:

Alavi, Sascha, Jan Wieseke, and Jan H. Guba (2016), "Saving on Discounts through Accurate Sensing – Salespeople's Estimations of Customer Price Importance and Their Effects on Negotiation Success," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (1), 40–55.

Saxe, Robert and Barton A. Weitz (1982), "The SOCO Scale: A Measure of the Customer Orientation of Salespeople," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19 (August), 343–351.

Thomas, Raymond W., Geoffrey N. Soutar, and Maria M. Ryan (2001), "The Selling Orientation–Customer Orientation (SOCO) Scale: A Proposed Short Form," *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 21 (1), 63–69.

Scale Items:¹

1. The salesperson has taken a problem-solving approach in selling products or services to me.
2. The salesperson had my best interests in mind.
3. The salesperson has recommended products or services to me that are best suited to solve my problems.

1. The end points on the response scale used by Alavi, Wieseke, and Guba (2016) with these items were *not at all* (1) and *extremely* (7).

SALESPERSON'S PRESSURE (AGGRESSIVE)

With four, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a customer believes a salesperson was using high-pressure sales tactics and pushing him/her to make a decision prematurely.

Origin:

Using a very thorough process, the scale was developed along with a companion measure by Zboja, Clark, and Haytko (2016). In fact, the authors developed an eight-step process that updated the framework originally advocated by Churchill (1979). Briefly, the researchers began by defining the constructs they called *consumer perceptions of sales pressure* (aggressive and directive), generated items, and had those items examined by eight people who were expert in the domain. The items surviving that stage were examined in several more steps for the qualities of internal consistency, dimensionality, and validity. The main study reported in the article tested the full structural model with data from a quota sample of 275 consumers in the United States.

Reliability:

The scale's construct reliability in the main study was .86 (Zboja, Clark, and Haytko 2016, p. 817).

Validity:

Beyond the early stages of the scale development process that provided evidence of face and content validity, Zboja, Clark, and Haytko (2016) conducted several quantitative studies which provided evidence supporting a claim of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent, discriminant, and nomological validities. With respect to the scale's AVE, it was .60 in the main study (referred to above).

References:

Churchill, Gilbert A., Jr. (1979), "A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Constructs," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16 (February), 64-73.

Zboja, James J., Ronald A. Clark, and Diana L. Haytko (2016), "An Offer You Can't Refuse: Consumer Perceptions of Sales Pressure," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (6), 806-821.

Scale Items:

Instructions: Please think about your most recent shopping episode for a specific product that required the help of a salesperson and at least a moderate level of thought and effort on your part. Based on your memory of this buying situation, please circle the number indicating your level of agreement with each of the following statements (with 1 meaning "strongly disagree," 7 meaning "strongly agree").

1. The salesperson used high pressure sales tactics.

2. The salesperson forced me to make a decision before I was ready.
3. The salesperson attempted to close the sale before all of my concerns were addressed.
4. I felt like I had been “played” by the salesperson.

SALESPERSON'S PRESSURE (DIRECTIVE)

The belief that a salesperson was "redirecting" one's attention by pushing him/her to purchase a product other than the intended one is measured using three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Using a very thorough process, the scale was developed along with a companion measure by Zboja, Clark, and Haytko (2016). In fact, the authors developed an eight-step process that updated the framework originally advocated by Churchill (1979). Briefly, the researchers began by defining the constructs they called *consumer perceptions of sales pressure* (aggressive and directive), generated items, and had those items examined by eight people who were expert in the domain. The items surviving that stage were examined in several more steps for the qualities of internal consistency, dimensionality, and validity. The main study reported in the article tested the full structural model with data from a quota sample of 275 consumers in the United States.

Reliability:

The construct reliability of the scale in the main study was .90 (Zboja, Clark, and Haytko 2016, p. 817).

Validity:

Beyond the early stages of the scale development process that provided evidence of face and content validity, Zboja, Clark, and Haytko (2016) conducted several quantitative studies which provided evidence supporting a claim of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent, discriminant, and nomological validities. With respect to the scale's AVE, it was .75 in the main study (referred to above).

References:

Churchill, Gilbert A., Jr. (1979), "A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Constructs," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16 (February), 64-73.

Zboja, James J., Ronald A. Clark, and Diana L. Haytko (2016), "An Offer You Can't Refuse: Consumer Perceptions of Sales Pressure," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (6), 806-821.

Scale Items:

Instructions: Please think about your most recent shopping episode for a specific product that required the help of a salesperson and at least a moderate level of thought and effort on your part. Based on your memory of this buying situation, please circle the number indicating your level of agreement with each of the following statements (with 1 meaning "strongly disagree," 7 meaning "strongly agree").

1. The salesperson kept pushing me toward one product when I was interested in another.

2. I felt pressure to buy what the salesperson insisted on, as opposed to what I originally wanted.
3. The salesperson was more interested in selling me his or her recommendation than the product I wanted.

SATISFACTION (COGNITIVE)

With three, nine-point items, the scale measures a customer's belief that the performance of a particular store or company met his/her expectations and that a good decision was made.

Origin:

Wolter et al. (2017) used the scale in Studies 1 and 2. The authors implied that Oliver (1999) was the source of the scale, however, the scale is not in that article since it is a theoretical piece rather than empirical. Perhaps, Wolter et al. (2017) created the items based on concepts expressed by Oliver (1999). Certainly, there is some conceptual similarity between this measure of cognitive satisfaction with measures used by Oliver (e.g., 1993).

Reliability:

The construct reliabilities calculated for the scale in Studies 1 and 2 were .88 and .80, respectively (Wolter et al. 2017, web appendix).

Validity:

CFA was used by Wolter et al. (2017) in Studies 1 and 2 to provide evidence of the psychometric quality of the measures employed. In both studies, there was a good fit of the measurement model to the data. Further, support was found for the convergent and discriminant validities of the scales. With specific regard to the satisfaction scale, its AVEs were .72 and .58 in Studies 1 and 2, respectively (Wolter et al. 2017, web appendix).

References:

Oliver, Richard L. (1993), "Cognitive, Affective, and Attribute Bases of the Satisfaction Response," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20 (December), 418-430.

Oliver, Richard L. (1999), "Whence Consumer Loyalty?" *Journal of Marketing*, 63 (4), 33-44.

Wolter, Jeremy S., Dora Bock, Jeffery S. Smith, and J. Joseph Cronin (2017), "Creating Ultimate Customer Loyalty Through Loyalty Conviction and Customer-Company Identification," *Journal of Retailing*, 93 (4), 458-476.

Scale Items:¹

1. My decisions to shop at/use _____ were the correct decisions.
2. The performance of _____ meets my expectations.
3. Overall, how would you rate your experience with _____?

1. The response scale used with each item had nine-points (Wolter et al. 2017, p. 464). The extreme verbal anchors for items #1 and #2 were *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree*. The end-points for item #3 were *very dissatisfied* and *very satisfied*. The blank should be filled with the name of the focal business being evaluated.

SATISFACTION WITH THE BRAND

Three, ten-point items are used in this scale to measure how well a customer's experiences with a brand compare to his/her expectations and the ideal product.

Origin:

This measure is part of the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI), the only national cross-industry measure of customer satisfaction in the United States. The index is based on a theoretical model by Claes Fornell (Fornell et al. 1996) which focuses on the primary drivers of satisfaction and its key outcomes.

In the study by Hult et al. (2017), the brand satisfaction scale was used along with the rest of the ACSI to determine how well company managers understand customers' critically important attitudes about the firm's brand(s). Data for their analyses were collected by the ACSI company during 2009 from about 60,000 customers who had recently purchased the products of one of the "significant" companies that were part of the survey (primarily Fortune 500 companies).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale as used in the study by Hult et al. (2017, p. 44) was .975.

Validity:

Using the results of a structural equation model (PLS-SEM), Hult et al. (2017, pp. 44, 45) claimed evidence of their scales' convergent and discriminant validities. The AVE for the brand satisfaction scale was .953. Of concern is that, while all the items for the scales used in the study loaded most strongly on their own factors, there were very high cross-loadings as well. For example, the loadings of the brand satisfaction items on brand quality were between .926 and .962.

Comments:

The empirical definition of customer satisfaction by ASCI treats it is a weighted average of the scores of the three items which measure different facets of the construct (Hult et al. 2017, p. 40). ASCI determines weights using proprietary software (ASCI website.)

References:

- ASCI (2018), *The Science of Customer Satisfaction*, www.theacsi.org/about-acsi/the-science-of-customer-satisfaction.
- Fornell, Claes, Michael D. Johnson, Eugene W. Anderson, Jaesung Cha, and Barbara Everitt Bryant (1996), "The American Customer Satisfaction Index: Nature, Purpose, and Findings," *Journal of Marketing*, 60 (October), 7-18.
- Hult, Tomas M., Forrest V. Morgeson, Neil A. Morgan, Sunil Mithas, and Claes Fornell (2017), "Do Managers Know What Their Customers Think and Why?" *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (1), 37-43.

Scale Items:¹

1. First, please consider all your experiences to date with _____. How satisfied are you with _____?
very dissatisfied / very satisfied
2. To what extent has _____ fallen short of your expectations or exceeded your expectations?
falls short of expectations / exceeds expectations
3. Forget _____ for a moment. Now, I want you to imagine an ideal _____. How well do you think _____ compares with that ideal _____?
not very close to the ideal / very close to the ideal²

1. As conducted in an ACSI survey, participants were asked questions with regard to a specific brand rather than the company marketing the brand if there was a difference (Hult et al. 2017, p. 41). Higher scores indicate more positive expectations.

2. The first and third blanks should have the name of the brand whereas the second and fourth blanks should have a generic name for the good or service.

SATISFACTION WITH THE CO-PRODUCED PRODUCT

Four, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a consumer expresses having an enjoyable experience with a purchased product he/ worked to create with the producer.

Origin:

Ranjan and Read (2016) created the scale along with several others, tested them with a sample in India, and then used them in an online survey of people drawn from the U.S. and India. Usable data were received from 230 respondents.

Reliability:

Alpha for the scale was .89 (Ranjan and Read 2016, p. 304).

Validity:

Some aspects of the scale's validity were addressed by the authors (Ranjan 2017; Ranjan and Read 2016, p. 304). Results of the CFA conducted on this measure along with two other measures provided some evidence in support of their convergent and discriminant validities. In particular, the scale's AVE was 0.669.

References:

Ranjan, Kumar Rakesh (2017), personal correspondence.

Ranjan, Kumar Rakesh and Stuart Read (2016), "Value Co-Creation: Concept and Measurement," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (3), 290-315.

Scale Items:¹

1. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with this _____?
2. My experience with this _____ is usually enjoyable.
3. I think that I did the right thing when I purchased this _____.
4. My experience with this _____ is more enjoyable than expected.

1. The name of the co-produced good or service should be placed in the blanks. As described by Ranjan (2017), the end points of the response scale used with item #1 were *extremely dissatisfied* and *extremely satisfied*. For the other items, the verbal anchors were *extremely disagree* and *extremely agree*. The response scales had seven points.

SATISFACTION WITH THE RESORT

The degree to which a person is happy with a resort and pleased with his/her service experience there is measured with a seven-point Likert-type scale. Three slightly different versions are described. One directly measures satisfaction, another directly measures dissatisfaction, and the third one has greater emphasis on the service experience.

Origin:

Lim, Lee, and Foo (2017) created three versions of the scale by drawing ideas from a measure by Maxham and Netemeyer (2002). A three-item positive version was used in Study 1, a three-item negative version (dissatisfaction) was used in Study 2, and a five-item positive version was used in Study 4.

Reliability:

The alphas for the three versions of the scale were .96, .86, and .94 for Studies, 1, 2, and 4, respectively (Lim, Lee, and Foo 2017, pp. 663, 667, 670).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Lim, Lee, and Foo (2017).

References:

Lim, Elison Ai Ching, Yih Hwai Lee, and Maw-Der Foo (2017), "Frontline Employees' Nonverbal Cues in Service Encounters: A Double-Edged Sword," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (5), 657–676.

Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2002), "Modeling Customer Perceptions of Complaint Handling Over Time: The Effect of Perceived Justice on Satisfaction and Intent," *Journal of Retailing*, 78 (4), 239-252.

Scale Items:¹

1. I am satisfied with my overall experience with the resort.²
2. As a whole, I am happy with the resort.³
3. Overall, I am pleased with the service experience at the resort so far.⁴
4. I am satisfied with the service provided by the employee I interacted with.
5. I am satisfied with the outcome of the service experience.

1. The version used in Study 1 was composed of items #1 - #3. The version used in Study 2 made minor changes in order to more directly measure dissatisfaction. (See the following footnotes.) The version used in Study 4 included all five items. The extreme anchors used to respond to the sentences in all three versions were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

2. The negative version replaced "satisfied" with "dissatisfied."

3. The negative version added "not" before "happy."

4. The negative version replaced "pleased" with "displeased."

SATISFACTION WITH THE SERVICE AGENT

A customer's belief that a service agent's performance was good and, in fact, better than expected is measured with three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale was used by Wan, Chan, and Chen (2016) in Study 3 with data gathered from 220 matched pairs of customers and service agents from a global insurance institution near Hong Kong. The survey instrument was created in English but was prepared for administration in Chinese using the back-translation method. Based on their citation, the authors seem to have drawn concepts and phrases for creating the scale from work by Hartline and Ferrell (1996). The scale was referred to as *customers' perceived service performance*.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .96 (Wan, Chan, and Chen 2016, p. 767).

Validity:

CFA was used by Wan, Chan, and Chen (2016) to examine their model and the psychometric quality of their measures. The results indicated a satisfactory model fit as well as evidence of convergent and discriminant validities for their scales. The AVE for the satisfaction scale was .88.

References:

Wan, Echo Wen, Kimmy Wa Chan, and Rocky Peng Chen (2016), "Hurting or Helping? The Effect of Service Agents' Workplace Ostracism on Customer Service Perceptions," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (6), 746-769.
Hartline, Michael D. and O.C. Ferrell (1996), "The Management of Customer-Contact Service Employees: An Empirical Investigation," *Journal of Marketing*, 60 (October), 52-70.

Scale Items:¹

1. This service agent's service performance is good.
2. This service agent's service performance is better than I expected.
3. I am happy with this service agent's performance.

1. The extreme verbal anchors of the response scale used with these items were *strongly disagree* (7) and *strongly agree* (7).

SCARCITY IN THE JOB MARKET

Three questions with seven-point response alternatives measure the extent to which a person believes a particular person is sought after in the job market.

Origin:

The scale was used in several studies reported by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017) in the main body of their article as well as in the web appendix. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

In the many uses of the scale by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017), the alphas ranged from .79 (Study 4B) to .95 (Study 2B).

Validity:

Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017) conducted tests of discriminant validity in several of the studies and each time they found support for this scale with respect to measures of constructs related to scarcity in the job market. For the studies in which AVE was reported, the value ranged from .724 (Study 4B) to .901 (Study 2B).

Comments:

The scale was used by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017) to measure one person's attitude about another person rather than assessing one's own scarcity in the job market. While it seems likely that the scale is amenable for self-assessment, further testing is suggested to confirm the adapted scale's psychometric quality.

Reference:

Bellezza, Silvia, Neeru Paharia, and Anat Keinan (2017), "Conspicuous Consumption of Time: When Busyness and Lack of Leisure Time Become a Status Symbol," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (1), 118-138.

Scale Items:¹

1. To what extent is _____ in demand?
In very low demand (1) / In very high demand (7)
2. Do you perceive _____ as a "scarce resource"?
Definitely no (1) / Definitely yes (7)
3. Do you imagine _____ is sought after in the job market?
Not sought after at all (1) / Very much sought after (7).

1. The name of the person being assessed should be placed in the blanks. The end-points of the response scale used by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017, p. 124) with these items are shown below the questions.

SELF-CONGRUENCE (UNIQUENESS)

The degree to which a person thinks that an object, such as a product, expresses his/her personal uniqueness is measured with three, seven-point Likert items.

Origin:

Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017, p. 819) used the scale in Study 1 with a final sample of 251 business students recruited to participate in a "marketing experiment." The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

The alpha calculated for the scale was .91 (Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski 2017, p. 820).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017).

Comments:

A variation of this scale was used in Study 3 as well as in Ancillary Study 3A discussed in the article's web appendix.

Reference:

Kaiser, Ulrike, Martin Schreier, and Chris Janiszewski (2017), "The Self-Expressive Customization of a Product Can Improve Performance," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (5), 816-831.

Scale Items:¹

1. The _____ expresses my unique personality.
2. When I think about the _____, I feel unique.
3. The _____ reflects my uniqueness.

1. The response scale used with these items had the following extreme anchors: *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). The product (generic) and/or brand name should be placed in the blanks.

SELF-EFFICACY

Four, seven-point Likert items are used to measure the degree of confidence a person has in his/her capability to learn a particular task and competently perform it.

Origin:

Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017, Web Appendix B) used the scale in Ancillary Study 1A with a final sample of 234 business student participants. The source of the scale was not stated. It appears the authors created the scale by drawing terminology and concepts from Bandura's (1986) definition of the construct.

Reliability:

The alpha calculated for the scale was .95 (Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski 2017, Web Appendix B).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017).

References:

Bandura, Albert (1986), *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kaiser, Ulrike, Martin Schreier, and Chris Janiszewski (2017), "The Self-Expressive Customization of a Product Can Improve Performance," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (5), 816-831.

Scale Items:¹

1. I am confident that I will master the upcoming task well.
2. I have confidence in my ability to solve the task.
3. When thinking about the upcoming task, I feel competent.
4. I am convinced that I will do well.

1. The response scale used with these items had the following extreme anchors: *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). The task referred to in the items should be identified in the instructions or clearly understood from the context.

SELF-EFFICACY (FINANCIAL)

Six, seven-point Likert-type items measure how much a person believes he/she can stick to a budget, avoid spending when necessary, and accomplish financial goals.

Origin:

Romero and Craig (2017, p. 88) used the scale in Study 4 with data collected from 99 participants via Amazon MTurk. The scale was created by the authors who drew heavily upon phrases from a general measure of self-efficacy by Chen, Gully, and (Eden 2001). Romero and Craig (2017, p. 91) created another measure of financial self-efficacy for use in Study 5 in order to help rule out alternative explanations for observed effects (Romero 2018). While there are similarities between the two scales, they are different enough to be reviewed separately.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .89 (Romero and Craig 2017, p. 89).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Romero and Craig (2017).

References:

Chen, Gilad, Stanley M. Gully, and Dov Eden (2001), "Validation of a New General Self Efficacy Scale," *Organizational Research Methods*, 4 (1), 62-83.

Romero, Marisabel (2018), personal correspondence.

Romero, Marisabel, and Adam W. Craig (2017), "Costly Curves: How Human-Like Shapes Can Increase Spending," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (1), 80-98.

Scale Items:¹

1. I feel like I would be able to stay committed to my long-term financial goals.
2. I feel like I know how to stay in line with my financial goals.
3. When feeling upset, I am certain that I will accomplish my financial goals.
4. Compared to other people, I can stick to a spending budget very well.
5. Even when I'm feeling down, I can avoid spending.
6. Compared to other people, I feel like I am able to avoid spending on things I want but don't need.

1. The full set of items was provided by Romero (2018). The end points of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

SELF-EFFICACY (FINANCIAL)

A person's confidence in his/her ability to accomplish financial goals is measured with seven Likert items.

Origin:

Romero and Craig (2017, pp. 90, 91) used the scale in Study 5 with analyses based on data collected from 127 students attending a large university in the United States. The scale was created by the authors who drew heavily upon phrases from a general measure of self-efficacy by Chen, Gully, and Eden (2001). Even though Romero and Craig (2017, p. 88) had already created a measure of financial self-efficacy for Study 4, they decided to create another one for Study 5 that was better suited to help rule out alternative explanations for observed effects (Romero 2018). While there are similarities between the two scales, they are different enough to be reviewed separately.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .83 (Romero 2018).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Romero and Craig (2017).

References:

- Chen, Gilad, Stanley M. Gully, and Dov Eden (2001), "Validation of a New General Self Efficacy Scale," *Organizational Research Methods*, 4 (1), 62-83.
- Romero, Marisabel (2018), personal correspondence.
- Romero, Marisabel, and Adam W. Craig (2017), "Costly Curves: How Human-Like Shapes Can Increase Spending," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (1), 80-98.

Scale Items:¹

1. I am able to achieve most of the financial goals I set for myself.
2. When feeling upset, I am certain that I can accomplish my financial goals.
3. In general, I think that I can obtain financial outcomes that are important to me.
4. I believe I can succeed at almost any financial endeavor to which I set my mind.
5. I am able to successfully overcome challenges to maintain my financial goals.
6. Compared to other people, I can stick to a spending budget very well.
7. Even when I'm feeling down, I can avoid spending.

1. The full set of items was provided by Romero (2018). The end points of the response scale were not described by Romero and Craig (2017) but appear to have been *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

SELF-EFFICACY (HEALTH)

Five, nine-point Likert-type items compose the scale and measure a person's confidence that one will successfully manage his/her health by engaging in a certain activity. (The activity can be specified by the researcher.)

Origin:

Han, Duhachek, and Agrawal (2016) used the scale in Study 3 with 608 participants recruited from Amazon MTurk. The scale may have been used in the study's pretest as well (online appendix C, p. 4). As used in the main study, the measure was completed after participants saw an ad from a fitness club. The metric was adapted from a scale that Keller (2006, p. 111) used to measure the health efficacy of using sunscreen.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .93 (Han, Duhachek, and Agrawal 2016, p. 438).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Han, Duhachek, and Agrawal (2016).

References:

Han, Dahee, Adam Duhachek, and Nidhi Agrawal (2016), "Coping and Construal Level Matching Drives Health Message Effectiveness via Response Efficacy or Self-Efficacy Enhancement," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (3), 429-447.
Keller, Punam (2006), "Regulatory Focus and Efficacy of Health Messages," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33 (June), 109-14.

Scale Items:¹

1. How good do you feel about taking care of your own health by _____?
2. How confident are you to pursue the health goal by _____?
3. How confident are you to be able to engage in healthy behaviors suggested by _____?
4. How confident are you to maintain your health goal everyday by _____?
5. How confident are you to take turns reminding your friends to engage in healthy behavior proposed by _____?

1. The extreme anchors used by Han, Duhachek, and Agrawal (2016, online appendix D) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (9). The blanks should be filled with the focal activity. Depending upon the item, the authors either used either "joining the fitness club" or "the fitness club."

SELF-ENHANCEMENT WHEN TALKING TO SOMEONE

Three, seven-point items are used to measure how much a person believes that talking to another person about a particular topic could produce a favorable impression for him/herself.

Origin:

Chen (2017) used the scale in Study 1A with 224 participants recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The author examined if word-of-mouth about a purchase will be more positive with a stranger than a friend due to the self-enhancement motivation. The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .87 (Chen 2017, p. 617).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Chen (2017).

Comments:

The context of the study by Chen (2017) as well as the phrasing of the items had to do with the purchase of a product. The items can be easily adapted for use in other contexts such as when talking about non-purchase experiences and beliefs, e.g., marital roles, religion, politics.

Reference:

Chen, Zoey (2017), "Social Acceptance and Word of Mouth: How the Motive to Belong Leads to Divergent WOM with Strangers and Friends," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (3), 613–632.

Scale Items:¹

1. How do you think talking about _____ will change the person you are talking to's impression of you?
negatively / positively
2. Do you think the person you are talking to will view you more or less favorably because you shared your thoughts about _____?
less favorably / more favorably
3. Do you think the person you are talking to will like or dislike you because you shared your thoughts about _____?
dislike / like

1. The topic of discussion should be stated in the blanks. For example, the blank in item #1 was filled with this phrase by Chen (2017, p. 617): "your camera purchase."

SELF-REGULATORY ORIENTATION (ASSESSMENT)

A person's chronic motivation to critically evaluate alternatives in order to improve the quality of decisions that are made is measured with twelve, six-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Mathmann et al. (2017) used this scale in Studies 1 (n = 49 recruits from Amazon's MTurk) and 3 (n = 81 students from a Dutch university). The measure was developed along with a companion measure by Kruglanski et al. (2000) to capture two self-regulatory functions: assessment and locomotion. Ten studies and numerous samples were utilized in the process of examining the psychometric properties of the scales. The results provided strong support for each scales' unidimensionality, internal consistency, and temporal stability as well as various forms of validity.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .87 and .61 for Study 1 and 3, respectively (Mathmann et al. 2017, pp. 216, 218).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Mathmann et al. (2017, p. 216) though they did indicate that, as found by Kruglanski et al. (2000), there was no significant correlation between this scale and the one measuring a locomotion orientation.

Comments:

It is concerning that the scale's internal consistency was very good in Study 1 and poor in Study 3. One possibility is that there may have been a negative cultural or language effect in Study 3. This issue should be examined further before the scale is used again to test theory in a cross- cultural context.

References:

Kruglanski, Arie W. (2018), personal correspondence.

Kruglanski, Arie W., Erik P. Thompson, Edward T. Higgins, Mohammed N. Atash, Antonio Pierro, James Y. Shah, and Scott Spiegel (2000), "To 'Do the Right Thing' or to 'Just Do It': Locomotion and Assessment as Distinct Self-Regulatory Imperatives," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79 (November), 793-815.

Mathmann, Frank, Mathew Chylinski, Ko de Ruyter, and E. Tory Higgins (2017), "When Plentiful Platforms Pay Off: Assessment Orientation Moderates the Effect of Assortment Size on Choice Engagement and Product Valuation," *Journal of Retailing*, 93 (2), 212-227.

Scale Items:¹

1. I never evaluate my social interactions with others after they occur. (r)

2. I spend a great deal of time taking inventory of my positive and negative characteristics.
3. I like evaluating other people's plans.
4. I often compare myself with other people.
5. I don't spend much time thinking about ways others could improve themselves. (r)
6. I often critique work done by myself or others.
7. I often feel that I am being evaluated by others.
8. I am a critical person.
9. I am very self-critical and self-conscious about what I am saying.
10. I often think that other people's choices and decisions are wrong.
11. I rarely analyze the conversations I have had with others after they occur. (r)
12. When I meet a new person, I usually evaluate how well he or she is doing on various dimensions (e.g., looks, achievements, social status, clothes).

1. The end-points of the response scale as used by Mathmann et al. (2017) as well as Kruglanski et al. (2000) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (6). The items are provided here with the permission of Kruglanski (2018).

SELF-REGULATORY ORIENTATION (LOCOMOTION)

The scale has twelve, six-point Likert-type items that measure a person's chronic motivation to make progress towards achieving a goal in a direct manner without deviation and distraction.

Origin:

Mathmann et al. (2017) used this scale in Studies 1 ($n = 49$ recruits from Amazon's MTurk) and 3 ($n = 81$ students from a Dutch university). The measure was developed along with a companion measure by Kruglanski et al. (2000) to capture two self-regulatory functions: assessment and locomotion. Ten studies and numerous samples were utilized in the process of examining the psychometric properties of the scales. The results provided strong support for each scales' unidimensionality, internal consistency, and temporal stability as well as various forms of validity.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .84 and .79 for Study 1 and 3, respectively (Mathmann et al. 2017, pp. 216, 218).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Mathmann et al. (2017, p. 216) though they did indicate that, as found by Kruglanski et al. (2000), there was no significant correlation between this scale and the one measuring an assessment orientation.

References:

Kruglanski, Arie W. (2018), personal correspondence.

Kruglanski, Arie W., Erik P. Thompson, Edward T. Higgins, Mohammed N. Atash, Antonio Pierro, James Y. Shah, and Scott Spiegel (2000), "To 'Do the Right Thing' or to 'Just Do It': Locomotion and Assessment as Distinct Self-Regulatory Imperatives," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79 (November), 793-815.

Mathmann, Frank, Mathew Chylinski, Ko de Ruyter, and E. Tory Higgins (2017), "When Plentiful Platforms Pay Off: Assessment Orientation Moderates the Effect of Assortment Size on Choice Engagement and Product Valuation," *Journal of Retailing*, 93 (2), 212-227.

Scale Items:¹

1. I don't mind doing things even if they involve extra effort.
2. I am a "workaholic."
3. I feel excited just before I am about to reach a goal.
4. I enjoy actively doing things, more than just watching and observing.
5. I am a "doer."
6. When I finish one project, I often wait awhile before getting started on a new one. (r)
7. When I decide to do something, I can't wait to get started.
8. By the time I accomplish a task, I already have the next one in mind.

9. I am a "low energy" person. (r)
10. Most of the time my thoughts are occupied with the task I wish to accomplish.
11. When I get started on something, I usually persevere until I finish it.
12. I am a "go-getter."

1. The end-points of the response scale as used by Mathmann et al. (2017) as well as Kruglanski et al. (2000) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (6). The items are provided here with the permission of Kruglanski (2018).

SELF-WORTH (COMPETENCE)

This five-item, seven-point Likert scale measures a person's belief that his/her self-worth is based on performing better than others on a task or skill.

Origin:

The scale was used in Study 1 (n = 92) and Study 3 (n = 127) by Batra and Ghoshal (2017) with data collected from students at the Indian School of Business, Hyderabad. The source of the scale is Crocker and Park (2003) who developed an instrument called Contingencies of Self-Worth scale. The instrument has seven subscales, one of which measures the competition "contingency."

Reliability:

As used by Batra and Ghoshal (2017, pp. 923, 927), the scale's alphas were .88 (Study 1) and .81 (Study 3).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Batra and Ghoshal (2017).

References:

Batra, Rishtee K. and Tanuka Ghoshal (2017), "Fill Up Your Senses: A Theory of Self-Worth Restoration through High-Intensity Sensory Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (4), 916-938.

Crocker, Jennifer and Lora E. Park (2003), "Seeking Self-Esteem: Construction, Maintenance, and Protection of Self-Worth," in *Handbook of Self and Identity*, eds. Mark Leary and June Tangney, New York: Guilford Press, 291-313.

Scale Items:¹

1. I feel worthwhile when I perform better than others on a task or skill.
2. Knowing that I am better than others on a task raises my self-esteem.
3. Doing better than others gives me a sense of self-respect.
4. My self-worth is affected by how well I do when I am competing with others.
5. My self-worth is influenced by how well I do on competitive tasks.

1. The end-points of the response scale used with these items by Batra and Ghoshal (2017, p. 922) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

SELF-WORTH (OVERALL)

Four, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a person has an overall respect of self and feeling of inherent value.

Origin:

The scale was used in four studies by Batra and Ghoshal (2017). The source of the scale was not explicitly stated. It appears to be original, with the items based on phrases and concepts from previous measures, particularly Rosenberg's (1965) self-esteem scale.

Reliability:

The alphas calculated for the scale ranged from .66 to .89 in the studies by Batra and Ghoshal (2017). This range of alphas is a concern since it indicates that in some circumstances the scale could have low reliability.

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Batra and Ghoshal (2017).

References:

Batra, Rishtee K. and Tanuka Ghoshal (2017), "Fill Up Your Senses: A Theory of Self-Worth Restoration through High-Intensity Sensory Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (4), 916-938.

Rosenberg, Morris (1965), *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Scale Items:¹

1. I feel respect for myself.
2. I feel a sense of prestige.
3. I feel that I am on an equal plane with others.
4. I am a person of worth.

1. The end-points of the response scale used with these items by Batra and Ghoshal (2017, p. 922) were *completely disagree* (1) and *completely agree* (7).

SENSE OF COMPLETION WITH NEGOTIATED PRICE

The scale measures the degree to which a person who sold an item to a buyer experienced a feeling of completeness and closure due to the price that was negotiated. Four, seven-point Likert-type items compose the scale.

Origin:

Yan (2017) used the scale in Study 4 with 71 people recruited from Amazon's MTurk. Participants were asked to imagine they were students who were selling a textbook at the end of a semester and one person made an offer to buy it. The source of the scale was not stated but appears to have been created by the author.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .84 (Yan 2017, p. 389).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Yan (2017).

Reference:

Yan, Dengfeng and Jorge Pena-Marin (2017), "Round Off the Bargaining: The Effects of Offer Roundness on Willingness to Accept," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (2), 381-395.

Scale Items:¹

1. This price brought me a sense of completeness.
2. This price brought me a sense of closure.
3. This price brought me a sense of perfection.
4. I think the buyer wanted to close the deal.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Yan (2017, p. 388) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

SENSE OF CONTROL

Six, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure one's self-efficacy with regard to accomplishing goals in life despite obstacles.

Origin:

The scale was used by Su et al. (2017) in a pilot study as well as Studies 3, 4, and 5. The items for the sense of control scale came from measures of the construct used by Lachman and Weaver (1998). Those authors viewed the construct as having two dimensions, calling one *personal mastery* and the other *perceived constraints*. The results of several factor analyses indicated the items measured distinct dimensions.

Reliability:

The alphas reported by Su et al. (2017) for the scale ranged from .76 (Study 4, p. 107) to .92 (pilot study, p. 102).

Validity:

Su et al. (2017) did not discuss the scale's validity.

Comments:

As confirmed by Su (2018), no factor analysis was conducted on the items composing their scale. Given that, the dimensionality of the scale and the propriety of measuring the construct with one scale vs. two, as did Lachman and Weaver (1998), remains unresolved. This issue should be examined further before use of the scale to test theory.

References:

- Lachman, Margie E. and Suzanne L. Weaver (1998), "The Sense of Control as a Moderator of Social Class Differences in Health and Well-Being," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74 (3), 763-773.
- Su, Lei (2018), personal correspondence.
- Su, Lei, Yuwei Jiang, Zhansheng Chen, and C. Nathan Dewall (2017), "Social Exclusion and Consumer Switching Behavior: A Control Restoration Mechanism," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (1), 99-117.

Scale Items:¹

1. I can do just about anything I really set my mind to.
2. When I really want to do something, I will find a way to succeed at it.
3. There is little I can do to change the important things in my life. (r)
4. I feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life. (r)
5. Other people determine most of what I can and cannot to. (r)

6. What happens in my life is beyond my control. (r)

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale used by Su et al. (2017, p. 102) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). Items #1 and #2 were among the items used by Lachman and Weaver (1998, p. 765) to measure *personal mastery* while the items #3 - #6 were part of the set used to measure *perceived constraints*.

SENSORY PLEASURE EXPECTATION (FOOD PORTION)

The scale uses three, nine-point items to measure a person's belief that a particular portion of food is a sufficient quantity for enjoying the taste of a specified food.

Origin:

The scale appears to have been used by Cornil and Chandon (2016, p. 853) only in Study 3. Analyses were based on data collected from 100 people recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The portion size and type of food were communicated to participants via a photograph. The source of the scale was not stated but seems to have been created by the authors.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .89 (Cornil and Chandon 2016, p. 853).

Validity:

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by the authors.

Comments:

As used by Cornil and Chandon (2016, p. 853), two of the items in the scale referred to cake but the scale seems to be quite amenable for use with other foods.

Reference:

Cornil, Yann and Pierre Chandon (2016), "Pleasure as a Substitute for Size: How Multisensory Imagery Can Make People Happier with Smaller Food Portions," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (5), 847-864.

Scale Items:¹

1. This portion would be just right for me to have a pleasurable sensory experience.
2. This portion would be just right for me to enjoy the taste of this _____.
3. This portion would be just right for me to savor the _____.

1. The blanks in #2 and #3 should be filled with the name of the food, e.g., cake. The end points of the response scale were *not at all* (1) and *absolutely* (9). The instructions used with these items were not given explicitly but were described by Cornil and Chandon (2016, p. 853) as asking participants how much they believed a portion was "just right" in terms of sensory pleasure and "to choose a higher rating if the size was just right and a lower rating if it was too small or too large."

SEVERITY OF THE EVENT

The scale has four, seven-point bi-polar adjectives that measure how much an event is viewed not only as bad but also as a crisis.

Origin:

Xie and Keh (2016) used the scale in Studies 1 and 2 as well as the pretests for those studies. Respondents read a news report about a product-harm case. As for the scale itself, three of the items came from a measure by Dahlen and Lange (2006) that they called *valence*.

Reliability:

The scale's alphas were .78 and .73 in Studies 1 and 2, respectively (Xie 2017).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Xie and Keh (2016). It is worth noting, however, that since the scale was used as a manipulation check in the Study 1 pretest and the manipulation was successful, it provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

References:

Dahlen, Micael, and Fredrik Lange (2006), "A Disaster Is Contagious: How a Brand in Crisis Affects Other Brands," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 46 (4), 388-397.

Xie, Yi (2017), personal correspondence.

Xie, Yi and Hean Tat Keh (2016), "Taming the Blame Game: Using Promotion Programs to Counter Product-Harm Crises," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 211-226.

Scale Items:¹

1. Severe / Not severe
2. Positive / Negative
3. Favorable / Unfavorable
4. No crisis / Crisis

1. The instructions used with these items were not stated but could have been something like this: Using the words below, please evaluate the event described in the article.

SHOPPING FOR NEW IDEAS

How much a consumer indicates that the purpose of a particular shopping trip was to look for new ideas and products is measured with three, seven-point items.

Origin:

Böttger et al. (2017) used the scale in Study 3a with data gathered from 230 members of a U.S.-based online panel. Another scale was used to measure the construct in three other studies reported in the article, but this scale was apparently used in Study 3a because the focus was on a particular shopping trip rather than a tendency exhibited over many trips. The source of the scale was not stated but appears to have been created by the authors by drawing ideas from Arnold and Reynolds (2003).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .93 (Böttger et al. 2017, web appendix, p. 11).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not explicitly examined and discussed by Böttger et al. (2017). However, the scale was used as a manipulation check in Study 3a and the manipulation was successful which provides evidence of the scale's predictive validity. Further, the items in the scale loaded high on the same factor which supports scale unidimensionality. Finally, the AVE for the scale was .81 which provides some evidence of convergent validity.

References:

Arnold, Mark J. and Kristy E. Reynolds (2003), "Hedonic Shopping Motivations," *Journal of Retailing*, 79 (2), 77-95.

Böttger, Tim, Thomas Rudolph, Heiner Evanschitzky, and Thilo Pfrang (2017), "Customer Inspiration: Conceptualization, Scale Development, and Validation," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (6), 116-131.

Scale Items:¹

1. I was looking for new ideas in the store.
2. I went shopping to get new ideas.
3. I wanted to discover products that are new to me.

1. Böttger et al. (2017, web appendix, p. 11) stated that all of the response scales used in the study had seven-points. The extreme verbal anchors of the scales were not described but are likely to have been the typical Likert-type, e.g., *strongly disagree* / *strongly agree*.

SHOPPING STRESS

The degree to which a consumer felt rushed and tense during a particular shopping trip to a store is measured with five, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017) used the scale in Studies 1a (n = 883) and 1b (n = 501). The authors borrowed the scale from Baker and Wakefield (2012). In that study, evidence of the scale's internal consistency and discriminant validity was strong.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .90 and .88 in Studies 1a and 1b, respectively (Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann 2017, p. 737).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017).

References:

Albrecht, Carmen-Maria, Stefan Hattula, and Donald R. Lehmann (2017), "The Relationship Between Consumer Shopping Stress and Purchase Abandonment in Task-Oriented and Recreation-Oriented Consumers," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (5), 720-740.

Baker, Julie and Kirk L. Wakefield (2012), "How Consumer Shopping Orientation Influences Perceived Crowding, Excitement, and Stress at the Mall," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 40 (6), 791-806.

Scale Items:¹

While I was shopping in the store, I felt . . .

1. tense
2. panicky
3. hectic
4. frenzied
5. rushed.

1. It appears the end-points of the response scale used by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann 2017, p. 724) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). The study context or instructions developed for the scale should focus participants' attention on a particular store and shopping trip before this scale is completed.

SIDE EFFECTS SEVERITY (DRUG)

Four questions and a seven-point response scale are used to measure how much a person believes the side effects of a medicinal drug are serious and threatening.

Origin:

Khan and Kupor (2017) used the scale in Studies 1, 3A & B, and 5 reported in their article. They referred to the measure as "perceived negativity of the drug." The source of the scale was not explicitly stated but seems to have been created by the authors.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale ranged from .81 to .97 (Khan and Kupor 2017, pp. 774, 777, 778, 781).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not addressed by Khan and Kupor (2017). They did say, however, that in each study in which the scale was used, a factor analysis indicated that all of the items loaded on the same factor.

Reference:

Khan, Uzma and Daniella M. Kupor (2017), "Risk (Mis)Perception: When Greater Risk Reduces Risk Valuation," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (5), 769-786.

Scale Items:¹

1. How threatening do you perceive the drug to be?
2. How likely would you be to take the drug if you had _____.² (r)
3. How dangerous do you think the drug is?
4. How serious do you think the drug's side effects are?

1. The end-points of the response scale were *not at all* (1) and *extremely* (7).
2. The name of the medical condition should be stated in the blank, e.g., hypertension.

SIMILARITY TO ANOTHER PERSON (EXPRESSIVENESS)

The scale has three, seven-point Likert-type items and measures the degree to which a person believes another person is like him/her in terms of communication style, with an emphasis on nonverbal expression.

Origin:

Lim, Lee, and Foo (2017) created the scale and used it in a pilot study with data collected from 79 students from a large university. The scale was used with respect to an encounter with an employee in a service context.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .91 in the pilot study (Lim, Lee, and Foo 2017, p. 662). (The alpha was not reported for the scale's usage in Study 2.)

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Lim, Lee, and Foo (2017).

Reference:

Lim, Elison Ai Ching, Yih Hwai Lee, and Maw-Der Foo (2017), "Frontline Employees' Nonverbal Cues in Service Encounters: A Double-Edged Sword," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (5), 657–676.

Scale Items:¹

1. _____ is like me in terms of our communication style.
2. _____ is similar to me in terms of how he/she uses body language to express him/herself.
3. _____ is like me when it comes to using nonverbal communication.

1. The blanks should be filled with the name or description of the person being rated. For example, the phrase used by Lim, Lee, and Foo (2017, p. 662) was "This service employee." The extreme anchors used to respond to the sentences were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

SIMILARITY TO ANOTHER PERSON (OVERALL)

How similar a person believes he/she is compared to another person is measured with three, seven-point semantic differentials.

Origin:

Packard, Gershoff, and Wooten (2016) used the scale in Study 1 with data from 127 undergraduate students attending the University of Michigan. The scale was used as a manipulation check to determine how similar respondents thought a particular person was to themselves. The source of the scale was not identified.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .97 (Packard, Gershoff, and Wooten 2016, p. 30).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not addressed by Packard, Gershoff, and Wooten (2016). However, since the scale was used as a manipulation check and the manipulation was successful, it provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

Reference:

Packard, Grant, Andrew D. Gershoff, and David B. Wooten (2016), "When Boastful Word of Mouth Helps versus Hurts Social Perceptions and Persuasion," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (1), 26-43.

Scale Items:¹

1. not at all similar to me / very much similar to me
2. not at all like me / very much like me
3. nothing in common with me / very much in common with me

1. The instructions used with these items were not provided. The authors apparently asked respondents to indicate how similar the other person was to them (Packard, Gershoff, and Wooten 2016, p. 30).

SIMILARITY TO OTHER CUSTOMERS

How much a person feels close to and identifies with other customers of a particular company is measured with four, five-point items.

Origin:

Nishikawa et al. (2017) used the scale in Study 3 with data from 3,296 Japanese consumers. The source of the scale was not stated. The language in which the scale was presented to the participants was not identified but it is assumed to have been Japanese.

Reliability:

The alpha reported for the scale was .70 (Nishikawa et al. 2017, p. 535).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Nishikawa et al. (2017).

Comments:

If the scale was presented to participants in Japanese, then that means the phrasing provided in the article was translated into English merely for the purpose of publication. Further, the information provided about the phrasing of the scale items and the response format was confusing. Together, these issues suggest that the scale (shown below) should be examined carefully before it is used in theory testing.

Reference:

Nishikawa, Hidehiko, Martin Schreier, Christoph Fuchs, and Susumu Ogawa (2017), "The Value of Marketing Crowdsourced New Products as Such: Evidence from Two Randomized Field Experiments," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (4), 525-539.

Scale Items:¹

How "close" and "similar" do you feel to _____ customers?

1. I feel similar to _____ customers.
2. I feel close to _____ customers
3. I can identify with _____ customers
4. There are similarities between me and _____ customers.

1. The question, the items, and the response scale were provided by Nishikawa et al. (2017) in the web appendix of their article but some issues that made the scale confusing have been removed here. The end-points of the response scale were *low similarity* (1) and *high similarity* (5). The name of the company should be placed in the blanks.

SKEPTICISM OF NEGATIVE INFORMATION

ABOUT THE COMPANY

The scale has three, seven-point items which measure a person's disbelief that a particular company is one of the worst ones in its industry as reported by a major consumer organization. The scale instructions frame the situation as hypothetical but minor changes could make the scale amenable for use with an actual event.

Origin:

Wolter and Cronin (2016) used the scale in a study with data collected from 628 participants representing a broad range of demographics who were recruited from Amazon.com's MTurk. The scale was created by the authors.

Reliability:

The scale's composite reliability was reported to be .85 (Wolter and Cronin 2016, p. 408).

Validity:

Using CFA, Wolter and Cronin (2016) showed that their measurement model adequately fit the data. Further, a test of discriminant validity provided evidence that the scale measuring skepticism toward negative information was distinct from the other measures in the model. The scale's AVE was .66.

References:

Wolter, Jeremy S. (2017), personal correspondence.

Wolter, Jeremy S. and J. Joseph Cronin Jr. (2016), "Re-Conceptualizing Cognitive and Affective Customer-Company Identification: The Role of Self-Motives and Different Customer-Based Outcomes," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (3), 397-413.

Scale Items:¹

If a *Consumer Reports* article reported that _____ was rated as one of the worst companies in its industry, what would you think about the information?²

1. There is no way that _____ could be one of the worst companies in its industry.
2. I would refuse to believe the article.
3. This article can't be trusted.

1. The response scale had seven points (Wolter and Cronin 2016, p. 405) and Wolter (2017) clarified that the end-points were *strongly disagree* / *strongly agree*.

2. The name of the company should be placed in the blank of this question as well as in item #1.

SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE CONCERN (POSTING)

Three, seven-point items are used to measure how much a person is concerned about posting something in a social medium because of what others will think and whether the posting will affect his/her acceptance.

Origin:

Chen (2017) used the scale in a pretest for Study 3A with 78 participants (undescribed but probably undergraduate students). The scale was used to confirm that concern about social acceptance (salient or reduced) could be appropriately manipulated in the main experiment.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .86 (Chen 2017, p. 624).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not explicitly discussed by Chen (2017). However, since the scale showed that the experimental manipulation was successful, it provides some evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

Reference:

Chen, Zoey (2017), "Social Acceptance and Word of Mouth: How the Motive to Belong Leads to Divergent WOM with Strangers and Friends," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (3), 613–632.

Scale Items:

1. To what extent are you concerned about being socially accepted by others when deciding whether or not to post?
not at all concerned / very concerned
2. To what extent do you care about others' acceptance of you when deciding whether or not to post?
did not care at all / cared a lot
3. To what extent are you motivated to be socially accepted by others on the website?
not at all / very

SOCIAL ATTRACTION

The degree to which a person expresses liking of and attachment to another person is measured with three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Bagchi and Ince (2016; Bagchi 2017) created the scale for use in Study 3b with data gathered from 241 panelists. The participants were asked to imagine that they were thinking about investing in the stock market and read a report about a company ostensibly written by an investment analyst.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .80 (Bagchi and Ince 2016, p. 39).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Bagchi and Ince (2016).

References:

Bagchi, Rajesh (2017), personal correspondence.

Bagchi, Rajesh and Elise Chandon Ince (2016), "Is a 70% Forecast More Accurate Than a 30% Forecast? How Level of a Forecast Affects Inferences About Forecasts and Forecasters," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (1), 31-45.

Scale Items:¹

1. I like this person.
2. I feel close to this person.
3. I would like to spend leisure time with this person.

1. Based upon Bagchi (2017), the extreme anchors of the response scale were something like *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

SOCIAL AVOIDANCE (PLACE SPECIFIC)

The extent to which a person would avoid interacting with others if he/she were in a certain physical environment is measured with three, seven-point items.

Origin:

Puzakova and Kwak (2017) used the scale in Study 3 (n = 392 undergraduate students) and Study 4 (n = 424 consumers from Amazon MTurk). The authors created the scale by adapting items from previous studies (Harrist et al. 1997; Leary, Herbst, and McCrary 2003).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .70 and .82 for Studies 3 and 4, respectively (Puzakova and Kwak 2017, pp. 107, 110).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Puzakova and Kwak (2017).

Comments:

The scale questions were phrased hypothetically because participants were exposed to a picture of a place created in the experiments and showing specific visual stimuli being studied. With very minor changes, the questions could be used with respect to an environment where the person has actually been or is in currently.

References:

- Harrist, Amanda W., Anthony F. Zaia, John E. Bates, Kenneth A. Dodge, and Gregory S. Pettit (1997), "Subtypes of Social Withdrawal in Early Childhood: Sociometric Status and Social-Cognitive Differences Across Four Years," *Child Development*, 68 (2), 278–294.
- Puzakova, Marina and Hyokjin Kwak (2017), "Should Anthropomorphized Brands Engage Customers? The Impact of Social Crowding on Brand Preferences," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (6), 99–115.
- Leary, Mark R., Kenneth C. Herbst, and Felicia McCrary (2003), "Finding Pleasure in Solitary Activities: Desire for Aloneness or Disinterest in Social Contact?" *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35 (1), 59–68.

Scale Items:¹

1. How interested would you be in interacting with people around you? (r)
2. Is this a place in which you feel talkative to a stranger who happens to be near you? (r)
3. Is this a place where you might try to avoid other people?

-
1. The response format used by Puzakova and Kwak (2017, p. 107) with these items was *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7).

SOCIAL EXCLUSION

How much a person has experienced the feeling of being isolated and ostracized is measured with three, seven-point items. Clear instructions should be provided to participants so that they respond with respect to a particular time period.

Origin:

The scale was used by Su et al. (2017) in a pretest for Study 2 and later in Studies 3 and 4. While not stated explicitly, the scale appears to have been created by the authors, drawing the items from work by Williams, Cheung, and Choi (2000).

Reliability:

The alphas reported by Su et al. (2017, pp. 105-107) for the scale were .95 (Study 2 pretest), .93 (Study 3), and .96 (Study 4).

Validity:

Su et al. (2017) did not discuss the scale's validity. However, since the scale was used as a manipulation check in three studies and in each case the manipulations were found to be successful, it provides some evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

References:

Su, Lei, Yuwei Jiang, Zhansheng Chen, and C. Nathan Dewall (2017), "Social Exclusion and Consumer Switching Behavior: A Control Restoration Mechanism," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (1), 99-117.

Williams, Kipling D., Christopher K. T. Cheung, and Wilma Choi (2000), "Cyberostracism: Effects of Being Ignored over the Internet," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79 (5), 748-762.

Scale Items:¹

To what extent did you feel . . .²

1. excluded?
2. rejected?
3. left out?

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale used by Su et al. (2017, p. 106) were *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7).

2. The exact phrasing of the scale stem/instructions were not provided by Su et al. (2017) but it is clear that the key words for each item are as shown.

SOCIAL GROUP IDENTITY

How much a person views a particular social group as important and central to his/her self-image is measured in this scale with eight, seven-point items.

Origin:

Trudel, Argo, and Meng (2016) used the scale in Study 4 ($n = 240$) as well as in its pretest ($n = 60$). In both cases, participants were recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The authors indicated that they adapted the scale from one used by White and Dahl (2007). While there is similarity at the construct level, the items in the two scales are not the same. Given that, the eight-item scale shown below is presumed to have been created by Trudel, Argo, and Meng (2016).

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .98 in Study 4 (Trudel, Argo, and Meng 2016, p. 253). (Alpha was not reported for the pretest.)

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Trudel, Argo, and Meng (2016).

References:

Trudel, Remi, Jennifer J. Argo, and Matthew D. Meng (2016), "The Recycled Self: Consumers' Disposal Decisions of Identity-Linked Products, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (2), 246-264.

White, Katherine M. and Darren W. Dahl (2007), "Are All Out-Groups Created Equal? Consumer Identity and Dissociative Influence," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34 (4), 525-536.

Scale Items:¹

Please respond to the following statements based on how you currently feel when you think about being a(n) _____ and your membership in this social group.

1. How important is being _____ to how you see yourself?
2. How central is being _____ to how you view yourself?
3. How significant is being _____ to your self-image?
4. How personally relevant (i.e., important to you as a person) is being _____ to you?
5. How committed are you to your _____ identity (i.e., being _____)?
6. To what degree do you feel a sense of connectedness to your _____ identity (i.e., being _____)?
7. How strong are the ties you feel to your _____ identity?
8. How much do you value being _____?

1. The end points of the response scale were *not at all strong* (1) and *extremely* (7). The blanks should be filled with the name of the group being studied. Trudel, Argo, and Meng (2016) used the word "American."

SOCIAL MEDIA USAGE

Four, five-point Likert-type items are used to measure the integration of social media usage into a person's lifestyle, particularly as it pertains to following companies and brands.

Origin:

The scale is original to Kumar et al. (2016) and was referred to as *customer social network proneness*. The details of the development were not clear but involved examining answers from some undergraduates to open-ended questions about their social media usage. That feedback along with insights from the literature led to the generation of some potential scale items. Those items were then administered to another set of students with factor analysis apparently being used to help determine the final set composing the scale. Ultimately, the final version of the scale was administered to customers of a large retailer of wine and spirits that operated multiple stores in the northeastern United States. Analysis was based upon responses from 1249 of those customers (Kumar et al. 2016, web appendix, p. 1).

Reliability:

The alpha reported for the scale was .78 (Kumar et al. 2016, web appendix, p. 6).

Validity:

As noted above, factor analysis was used in determining the final composition of the scale. Beyond that, Kumar et al. (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity.

Reference:

Kumar, Ashish, Ram Bezawada, Rishika Rishika, Ramkumar Janakiraman, and P.K. Kannan (2016), "From Social to Sale: The Effects of Firm-Generated Content in Social Media on Customer Behavior," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 7-25.

Scale Items:¹

1. Social networking websites such as Facebook are a part of my everyday activity.
2. I follow companies and their brands using social networking websites or online blogs.
3. I would be sorry if my social network website shuts down.
4. I feel out of touch when I do not log onto a social networking website.

1. The end points of the response scale used by Kumar et al. (2016, web appendix, p. 6) with these items were *Strongly Disagree* (1) and *Strongly Agree* (5).

SOCIAL MEDIA USAGE

The scale has four, five-point items that measure how much a person uses social media by tweeting, posting Comments, and following others' posts.

Origin:

The scale was called *Customer FGC Susceptibility* by Kumar et al. (2016). The researchers administered the scale in a survey of customers of a large wine and spirits retailer that operated multiple stores in the northeastern United States. Analysis was based upon responses from 1249 of those customers (Kumar et al. 2016, web appendix, p. 1). The source of the scale was not identified.

Reliability:

The alpha reported for the scale was .839 (Kumar 2017).

Validity:

Kumar et al. (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity.

References:

Kumar, Ashish (2017), personal correspondence.

Kumar, Ashish, Ram Bezawada, Rishika Rishika, Ramkumar Janakiraman, and P.K. Kannan (2016), "From Social to Sale: The Effects of Firm-Generated Content in Social Media on Customer Behavior," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 7-25.

Scale Items:¹

1. I am proud to tell people that I am on a social networking website.
2. I follow user comments on social networking websites and online blogs.
3. I often post comments on blogs and social networking websites.
4. I often tweet.

1. The end-points of the response scale used with these items were *never* (1) and *very often* (5).

SOCIAL MOBILITY

Using three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures how much a person believes that people can achieve success over time if they work hard.

Origin:

The scale was used in a pilot study as well as Studies 2A and 2B by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017). The authors appear to have created the scale by borrowing items used in work by Bjørnskov et al. (2013).

Reliability:

The scale's alphas were .80 (pilot study), .59 (Study 2A), and .79 (Study 1B).

Validity:

Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017) did not address the validity of the measure.

References:

Bellezza, Silvia, Neeru Paharia, and Anat Keinan (2017), "Conspicuous Consumption of Time: When Busyness and Lack of Leisure Time Become a Status Symbol," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (1), 118-138.

Bjørnskov, Christian, Axel Dreher, Justina V. Fischer, Jan Schnellenbach, and Kai Gehring (2013), "Inequality and Happiness: When Perceived Social Mobility and Economic Reality Do Not Match," *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 91 (July), 75-92.

Scale Items:¹

1. Hard work brings success in the long run.
2. People are poor due to laziness, not injustice.
3. People have a chance to escape poverty.

¹ The end-points of the response scale used by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017, p. 127) with these items were *Strongly disagree* (1) and *Strongly agree* (7).

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

The extent to which a person is described as having high social status and economic resources is measured in this scale with three, seven-point items.

Origin:

The scale was used in several studies reported by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017) in the main body of their article as well as in the web appendix. The authors appear to have developed the scale by creating items based on views of status by Bourdieu (1984), Scott, Mende, and Bolton (2013), as well as Veblen (1899/2007).

Reliability:

In the many uses of the scale by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017), the alphas ranged from .78 (Study 4B replication) to .90 (Studies 1B, 2B, and 3).

Validity:

Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017) conducted tests of discriminant validity in several of the studies and each time they found support for this scale with respect to the other measures of the main constructs related to socioeconomic status. For the studies in which AVE was reported, the values ranged from .724 (Study 1A) to .840 (Study 2B).

Comments:

The scale was used by Bellezza, Paharia, and Keinan (2017) to measure one person's attitude about another person rather than assessing one's own socioeconomic status. While it seems likely that the scale is amenable for self-assessment, further testing is suggested in order to confirm the adapted scale's psychometric quality.

References:

- Bellezza, Silvia, Neeru Paharia, and Anat Keinan (2017), "Conspicuous Consumption of Time: When Busyness and Lack of Leisure Time Become a Status Symbol," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (1), 118-138.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1984), *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Scott, Maura L., Martin Mende, and Lisa E. Bolton (2013), "Judging the Book by Its Cover? How Consumers Decode Conspicuous Consumption Cues in Buyer – Seller Relationships," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 50 (3), 334-347.
- Veblen, Thorstein (1899/2007), *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Scale Items:¹

1. How would you rank the social status of _____?
Low social status / High social status
2. Do you think _____ is financially wealthy?
Not wealthy / Extremely wealthy
3. _____ has a high income level.
Strongly disagree / Strongly agree

1. The name of the person being assessed should be placed in the blanks.

SOFTNESS OF THE SEAT

How soft a person judges a particular seat to be is measured with three, nine-point items. Given the phrasing of the items, the object should be something a person can sit on and has arms such as with a sofa, chair, or car seat.

Origin:

The scale was used by Jiang et al. (2016) in Experiment 2 of the five studies reported in the article. Respondents were shown ads for a sofa that varied between two treatment groups only in the shape of the logo associated with the product. The source of the scale was not stated but appears to have been the authors.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .86 (Jiang et al. 2016, p. 714).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not addressed by Jiang et al. (2016).

Comments:

Care should be taken in assuming the items in this scale are unidimensional since it is possible, for example, that the arms of a seat could be judged as hard while the back cushion is believed to be soft. If the items are not unidimensional then it is inappropriate to combine them in the form of a reflective measure of the construct. In that case, a formative measure should be considered or the three attributes could be measured separately.

Reference:

Jiang, Yuwei, Gerald J. Gorn, Maria Galli, and Amitava Chattopadhyay (2016), "Does Your Company Have the Right Logo? How and Why Circular- and Angular-Logo Shapes Influence Brand Attribute Judgments," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 709-726.

Scale Items:¹

1. back cushion
2. seat cushion
3. arms

1. The extreme anchors used by Jiang et al. (2016) with these items were *very hard* (1) and *very soft* (9).

SOPHISTICATED CONSUMPTION

The degree to which a person buys products that he/she believes help develop a sense of refinement and sophistication is assessed with four, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Summers, Smith, and Reczek (2016) used the scale in Study 2. Analysis appears to have been based on a final sample of 147 undergraduate students attending The Ohio State University. The source of the scale was not identified and it is assumed to be original to the authors.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .86 (Summers, Smith, and Reczek 2016, p. 162).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Summers, Smith, and Reczek (2016).

Reference:

Summers, Christopher A., Robert W. Smith, and Rebecca Walker Reczek (2016), "An Audience of One: Behaviorally Targeted Ads as Implied Social Labels," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (1), 156-178.

Scale Items:¹

1. I am a sophisticated consumer.
2. I seek out sophisticated versions of most products because I enjoy being refined.
3. I would describe myself as a sophisticated consumer.
4. When it comes to the products I buy and the situations in which I use them, I like to cultivate a sense of refinement.

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

SPATIAL PRESENCE (PRODUCT)

The Likert scale has eight, five-point items that measure how much a person has had an experience in a virtual environment which allowed interaction with a simulated representation of a product.

Origin:

Hilken et al. (2017) used the scale in Studies 2, 3, and 4. The scale is an adaptation of four items from each of two subscales by Vorderer et al. (2004). The focus of those subscales was on self, feeling that one is in another environment whereas the version created by Hilken et al. (2017) shifted the focus to a product.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale as used by Hilken et al. (2017, pp. 894, 895, 897) were .92, .90, and .93, respectively.

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed explicitly by Hilken et al. (2017). In a related issue, however, the authors addressed the concern that they had adapted items from what Vorderer et al. (2004) had treated as distinct subscales. Hilken et al. (2017, p. 894) ran several tests with data from Studies 2, 3, and 4 to show that their eight-item scale was unidimensional.

References:

Hilken, Tim, Ko de Ruyter, Mathew Chylinski, Dominik Mahr, and Debbie I. Keeling (2017), "Augmenting the Eye of the Beholder: Exploring the Strategic Potential of Augmented Reality to Enhance Online Service Experiences," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (6), 884–905.

Vorderer, Peter, Werner Wirth, Feliz Ribeiro Gouveia, Frank Biocca, Timo Saari, Lutz Jäncke, Saskia Böcking, Holger Schramm, Andre Gysbers, Tilo Hartmann, Christoph Klimmt, Jari Laarni, Niklas Ravaja, Ana Sacau, Thomas Baumgartner, and Petra Jäncke (2004), *MEC Spatial Presence Questionnaire (MECSPQ): Short Documentation and Instructions for Application*, Report to the European Community, Project Presence: MEC (IST-2001-37661).

Scale Items:¹

1. I felt like the _____ was actually there in the real world.
2. It was as though the true location of the _____ had shifted into the real world environment.
3. I felt like the _____ meshed with the real world surroundings.
4. It seemed as if the _____ actually took part in the action in the real world.
5. I had the impression that I could be active with the _____ in the real world.
6. I felt like I could move the _____ around in the real world.
7. The _____ gave me the feeling I could do things with it.
8. It seemed to me that I could do whatever I wanted with the _____.

1. The name of the product should be placed in the blanks. The extreme anchors of the response scale used by Hilken et al. (2017, p. 894) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (5).

SPENDING FREEDOM

The degree to which a person believes that a particular individual has the right to make his/her own purchase choices is measured with three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale was called *deservingness index* by Olson et al. (2016) and was used in Experiment 3 with 181 adults recruited from Amazon MTurk. The source of the scale was not stated and appears to have been created by the authors.

Reliability:

Olson et al. (2016, p. 887) reported the scale's alpha to be .92.

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Olson et al. (2016).

Comments:

As used by Olson et al. (2016), the name referred to a person described in a scenario presented to respondents. The items would also make sense if used with respect to a relative or friend in the respondent's life. For example, the blanks could be filled with "my child" if respondents were parents or filled with "my spouse" if respondents were married. With a few minor changes, the scale could even be used with reference to self, e.g., *I deserve to spend my money as I choose*.

Reference:

Olson, Jenny G., Brent McFerran, Andrea C. Morales, and Darren W. Dahl (2016), "Wealth and Welfare: Divergent Moral Reactions to Ethical Consumer Choices," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (6), 879-896.

Scale Items:¹

1. _____ deserves to spend his/her money as he/she chooses.
2. _____ has the right to make his/her own spending choices.
3. How _____ spends his/her money is up to him/her.

1. The name of a person or a personal pronoun should be placed in the blanks. The extreme anchors of the response scale used with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

SPONSOR/SPONSEE CONGRUENCE

The degree to which a sponsoring entity and a sponsee are viewed as fitting together well is measured with three, seven-point semantic differentials. (A sponsee is the entity being sponsored, such as an event, an organization, or a cause.)

Origin:

The scale was used by Madrigal and King (2017) in Studies 1, 2A, 2B, and the Study 4 pretest. They referred to the scale as either *sponsor-property fit* or just *fit*. The source of the scale was not stated. It was probably created by the authors using items found in measures of fit and congruence reported in past research, e.g., (David 2016).

Reliability:

The alphas reported by Madrigal and King (2017) were very high, ranging from .95 to .99 in the main studies and pretest (.95 to .99).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Madrigal and King (2017).

References:

David, Meredith E. (2016), "The Role of Attachment Style in Shaping Consumer Preferences for Products Shown in Advertisements that Depict Consensus Claims," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 227-243.

Madrigal, Robert (2018), personal correspondence.

Madrigal, Robert and Jesse King (2017), "Creative Analogy as a Means of Articulating Incongruent Sponsorships," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (4), 521-535.

Scale Items:¹

Directions: When you think about how _____ and _____ match up with one another, would you say that the sponsorship is a:

1. a poor match / a good match
2. poor fit / good fit
3. poor alignment / good alignment

1. The scale stem was provided by Madrigal (2018). The name of the sponsoring company should be placed in the first blank while the name of the sponsee (who or what was being sponsored) should go in the second blank.

STORE DESIGN (CONFUSING INTERIOR LAYOUT)

With three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures how much a shopper believes that a store's layout and arrangement of shelves make it difficult to find desired products.

Origin:

Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017) used the scale in Studies 1a (n = 883) and 1b (n = 501). The authors appear to have created the scale by drawing upon concepts and wording from a scale by Dickson and MacLachlan (1990).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .93 and .95 in Studies 1a and 1b, respectively (Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann 2017, p. 737).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017).

References:

Albrecht, Carmen-Maria, Stefan Hattula, and Donald R. Lehmann (2017), "The Relationship Between Consumer Shopping Stress and Purchase Abandonment in Task-Oriented and Recreation-Oriented Consumers," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (5), 720-740.

Dickson, John P. and Douglas L. MacLachlan (1990), "Social Distance and Shopping Behavior," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 18 (Spring), 153-161.

Scale Items:¹

1. In the store, it was difficult for me to find the product required because of the arrangement of the shelves.
2. The store layout did not really make it easy for me to find certain products.
3. The arrangement of the shelves in the store did not make it easy to find my way.

1. It appears the end-points of the response scale used by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017, p. 724) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

STORE DESIGN (CRAMPED)

The scale measures how much a shopper believes that a store's layout and shelving do not provide customers with enough space. Three, seven-point Likert-type items compose the measure.

Origin:

Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017) used the scale in Studies 1a (n = 883) and 1b (n = 501). The authors appear to have created the scale using some concepts and wording from two measures of crowding used by Machleit, Kellaris, and Eroglu (1994).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .89 and .95 in Studies 1a and 1b, respectively (Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann 2017, p. 737).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017).

References:

Albrecht, Carmen-Maria, Stefan Hattula, and Donald R. Lehmann (2017), "The Relationship Between Consumer Shopping Stress and Purchase Abandonment in Task-Oriented and Recreation-Oriented Consumers," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (5), 720-740.

Machleit, Karen A., James J. Kellaris, and Sevin A. Eroglu (1994), "Human versus Spatial Dimensions of Crowding Perceptions in Retail Environments: A Note on Their Measurement and Effect on Shopper Satisfaction," *Marketing Letters*, 5 (2), 183-194.

Scale Items:¹

1. There was not enough space between the shelves in the store.
2. The arrangement of the shelves and counters in the store did not allow the customers enough space for shopping.
3. The store was not designed to be spacious.

1. It appears the end-points of the response scale used by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann 2017, p. 724) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). The instructions used with the scale were not provided but likely asked participants to describe a particular store using the items.

STRESS MINDSET

The scale has eight, seven-point Likert-type items that measure the degree to which a person believes, in general, that stress can enhance rather than debilitate his/her learning and productivity.

Origin:

Garvey, Germann, and Bolton (2016) used the scale in Study 4 with data gathered from 84 students at the University of Notre Dame. The scale was developed by Crum, Salovey, and Achor (2013). In their studies, those authors provided evidence of the scale's internal consistency, temporal stability, and discriminant validity.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .78 as used by Garvey, Germann, and Bolton (2016, p. 941).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Garvey, Germann, and Bolton (2016).

References:

Crum, Alia J., Peter Salovey, and Shawn Achor (2013), "Rethinking Stress: The Role of Mindsets in Determining the Stress Response," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104 (April), 716-733.

Garvey, Aaron M., Frank Germann, and Lisa E. Bolton (2016), "Performance Brand Placebos: How Brands Improve Performance and Consumers Take the Credit," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (6), 931-951.

Scale Items:¹

1. The effects of stress are negative and should be avoided. (r)
2. Experiencing stress facilitates my learning and growth.
3. Experiencing stress depletes my health and vitality. (r)
4. Experiencing stress enhances my performance and productivity.
5. Experiencing stress inhibits my learning and growth. (r)
6. Experiencing stress improves my health and vitality.
7. Experiencing stress debilitates my performance and productivity. (r)
8. The effects of stress are positive and should be utilized.

1. The end points of the response scale used with these items by Garvey, Germann, and Bolton (2016, p. 941) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

SUBMITTING IDEAS TO THE COMPANY

With three, seven-point items, this scale measures a consumer's expressed probability of providing ideas and feedback to a particular business entity in the future.

Origin:

Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016) used the scale in Studies 1a, 1b, 2, and 3a and referred to it as "future idea sharing." It seems that the scale was created by them though they drew some peripheral phrasing from a scale by Netemeyer et al. (2005).

Reliability:

Across the several uses of the scales, the alphas were extremely strong, ranging from .97 to .99 (Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon 2016, p. 693).

Validity:

The scale's validity was examined several different ways in the studies via EFAs, CFAs, and other methods. Evidence was provided of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities. The scale's AVEs across the studies ranged from .93 to .96 (Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon 2016, p. 693).

References:

Fombelle, Paul W., Sterling A. Bone, and Katherine N. Lemon (2016), "Responding to the 98%: Face-Enhancing Strategies for Dealing with Rejected Customer Ideas," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (6), 685-706.

Netemeyer, Richard G., James G. Maxham III, and Chris Pullig (2005), "Conflicts in the Work-Family Interface: Links to Job Stress, Customer Service Employee Performance, and Customer Purchase Intent," *Journal of Marketing*, 69 (April), 130-143.

Scale Items:¹

1. I will submit ideas in the future.
2. How likely are you to submit ideas to this bank in the future?
3. How likely are you to provide feedback to this _____ in the future?²

1. The response format used with these items by Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016, p. 690) was merely described as "seven-point Likert scales." However, a different format is necessary for items #2 and #3 compared to #1. Probably, the end points used with #1 were *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree* while those used with the other two items were something like *very unlikely* and *very likely*.

2. A generic name for the business should be placed in the blank. For example, Fombelle, Bone, and Lemon (2016, p. 690) used "bank."

SUNSCREEN USE INTENTION

Using four, nine-point items, the scale measures a person's intention to engage in behaviors related to using sunscreen.

Origin:

Han, Duhachek, and Agrawal (2016) used the scale in Study 4 with 609 participants recruited from Amazon MTurk. The measure was completed by participants after they saw an ad promoting the use of sunscreen. The authors viewed the scale as a measure of purchase intention but it was not called that here because only one item speaks of buying the product whereas the emphasis seems to be more on using the product.

The scale was borrowed from Keller (2006, p. 111) who seems to have created it. She reported the scale's alpha to be .82 based on small sample (n= 61) of middle school children.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .88 (Han, Duhachek, and Agrawal 2016, p. 440).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Han, Duhachek, and Agrawal (2016).

References:

Han, Dahee, Adam Duhachek, and Nidhi Agrawal (2016), "Coping and Construal Level Matching Drives Health Message Effectiveness via Response Efficacy or Self-Efficacy Enhancement," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (3), 429-447.

Keller, Punam (2006), "Regulatory Focus and Efficacy of Health Messages," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33 (June), 109-14.

Scale Items:¹

1. I intend to use sunscreen.
2. I intend to buy a bottle of sunscreen if I don't have any.
3. I intend to check whether I have sunscreen on before I go out.
4. I intend to get more information on the advantages of sunscreen.

1. The extreme anchors used by Han, Duhachek, and Agrawal (2016, online Appendix D) as well as Keller (2006, p. 111) with these items were very unlikely (1) and very likely (9).

SUSCEPTIBILITY TO PERSUASION

A person's beliefs about the degree to which he/she is prone to changing attitudes or having them changed is measured with sixteen, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Chang (2017) used the scale in Studies 1 ($n = 167$) and 3A ($n = 319$), with data gathered in both studies from people recruited at a university in East Asia. The items were created by Briñol et al. (2004). A study by Shakarchi and Haugtvedt (2004) provided evidence of that scale's internal consistency as well as some support (though not rigorous) of its discriminant validity with respect to several other measures related to resistance to persuasion. Chang (2017, p. 493) wanted to measure susceptibility to persuasion rather than resistance to it and that is why in her studies "the responses were rotated and averaged so that higher scores indicated higher susceptibility."

Reliability:

The alphas for the scales were .86 and .85 in Studies 1 and 3A, respectively (Chang 2017, pp. 493, 497).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Chang (2017).

References:

- Briñol, Pablo, Derek D. Rucker, Zakary L. Tormala, and Richard E. Petty (2004), "Individual Differences in Resistance to Persuasion: The Role of Beliefs and Meta-Beliefs," in *Resistance and Persuasion*, Eric S. Knowles and Jay A. Linn, eds., Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 83–104.
- Chang, Chingching (2017), "A Metacognitive Model of the Effects of Susceptibility to Persuasion Self-Beliefs on Advertising Effects," *Journal of Advertising*, 46 (4), 487–502.
- Chang, Chingching (2018), personal correspondence.
- Shakarchi, Richard J. and Curtis P. Haugtvedt (2004), "Differentiating Individual Differences in Resistance to Persuasion," in *Resistance and Persuasion*, Eric S. Knowles and Jay A. Linn, eds., Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 105–113.

Scale Items:¹

1. I am strongly committed to my own beliefs. (r)
2. My own beliefs are very clear. (r)
3. It is hard for me to change my ideas. (r)
4. I usually do not change what I think after a discussion. (r)
5. I find my opinions to be changeable.
6. After participating in an informal debate, I always have the feeling that I was right. (r)
7. It could be said that I am likely to shift my attitudes.
8. I often vary or alter my views when I discover new information.

9. After forming an impression of something, it's often hard for me to modify that impression. (r)
10. My ideas are very stable and remain the same over time. (r)
11. I have never changed the way I see most things. (r)
12. What I think is usually right. (r)
13. My opinions fluctuate a lot.
14. I often have doubts about the validity of my attitudes.
15. If it is necessary, I can easily alter my beliefs.
16. I have often changed my opinions.

1. The response scale used with the items had seven points with *strongly disagree* / *strongly agree* as the extreme verbal anchors (Chang 2018). The extreme verbal anchors used by Briñol et al. (2004), as shown in Shakarchi and Haugtvedt (2004, p. 110) were *extremely uncharacteristic of you* / *extremely characteristic of you*. A close reading of the items indicates some of them measure resistance to persuasion while others measure susceptibility to persuasion. Indications of reverse-scoring were not provided by Shakarchi and Haugtvedt (2004, p. 110) or Chang (2017). If the desire is to measure susceptibility to persuasion, the items in this list that seem to measure resistance to persuasion are indicated as (r). That assumption should be tested and confirmed before creating scale scores.

SUSPICIOUS OF OTHER PEOPLE

The degree to which a person is apprehensive and distrusting of other people in general is measured with four, seven-point unipolar items.

Origin:

Packard, Gershoff, and Wooten (2016) used the scale with college students in Study 3 ($n = 179$) as well as its pretest ($n = 78$). The scale was used as a manipulation check to confirm that a significant difference between two experimental conditions was primed in the participants. The source of the scale was not identified.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale as used in the Study 3 pretest was .96 (Packard, Gershoff, and Wooten 2016, p. 34). (Alpha was not reported for the scale as used in the main study.)

Validity:

The scale's validity was not addressed by Packard, Gershoff, and Wooten (2016). However, since the scale was used as a manipulation check and the manipulation was successful, it provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

Reference:

Packard, Grant, Andrew D. Gershoff, and David B. Wooten (2016), "When Boastful Word of Mouth Helps versus Hurts Social Perceptions and Persuasion," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (1), 26-43.

Scale Items:¹

1. suspicious
2. concerned
3. wary
4. mistrustful

1. The extreme anchors used by Packard, Gershoff, and Wooten (2016, p. 34) with these items were *Not at all* (1) and *Very much* (7). The directions used with the scale were not stated. They appear to have asked respondents to indicate how they felt about other people in general (Packard, Gershoff, and Wooten 2016, p. 34).

TAKING MONEY FROM SAVINGS (FUTURE-MINDEDNESS)

The seven-point Likert-type scale has three items that measure the degree to which a person believes there would be a negative impact on the achievement of his/her long-term goals if money was drawn from savings that was set aside.

Origin:

Sussman and O'Brien (2016) seem to have only used the scale in Study 5. Data were gathered from 203 participants in the U.S. recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The measure of future-mindedness was one of three scales created to measure the expected dimensions of the attitude about taking money from savings (p. 798).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .86 (Sussman and O'Brien 2016, p. 799).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed. However, an EFA showed that the items measuring the future-mindedness scale loaded together (Sussman and O'Brien 2016, web appendix). In contrast, the items measuring the other two dimensions loaded together. (See the review of Taking Money From Savings [Irresponsibility]).

Reference:

Sussman, Abigail B. and Rourke L. O'Brien (2016), "Knowing When to Spend: Unintended Financial Consequences of Earmarking to Encourage Savings," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (5), 790-803.

Scale Items:¹

1. Taking money from savings that was set aside would lead to bad financial outcomes down the road.
2. Taking money from savings that was set aside would slow me down in achieving my life goals.
3. Taking money from savings that was set aside would be adding a roadblock to my long-term goals.

1. The end points of the response scale used by Sussman and O'Brien (2016, p. 798) with the items were *completely disagree* (1) and *completely agree* (7).

TAKING MONEY FROM SAVINGS (IRRESPONSIBILITY)

Multiple versions of a seven-point Likert-type scale measure the degree to which a person believes he/she would feel guilty and irresponsible about withdrawing money from savings that was set aside for some purpose.

Origin:

Sussman and O'Brien (2016) used various versions of the scale in Studies 3, 5 and 6. The version in Study 3 had three items. Then, in order to "tease apart distinctions" that were expected in the construct, they created separate scales for use in Study 5 to measure the assumed responsibility, guilt, and future-mindedness dimensions (p. 798).

Reliability:

The three-item version used in Study 3 had an alpha of .86 (Sussman and O'Brien 2016, p. 796). In Study 5, the alphas for the separate three-item measures of responsibility and guilt had alphas of .90 and .94, respectively (p. 799). The six-item combined scale had alphas of .96 and .94 in Studies 5 and 6, respectively (pp. 799, 801).

Validity:

The validities of the various versions of the scale were not discussed. However, EFA was used in Study 3 to show that the three items composing the irresponsibility scale loaded together and not on some other financial constructs. Likewise, the results of an EFA in Study 5 showed that the six-items measuring the responsibility and guilt dimensions loaded together rather than separately and they did not load on the future-mindedness factor (Sussman and O'Brien 2016, web appendix).

Comments:

Depending on the study and the experimental condition, the scale statements were sometimes augmented with phrases that indicted the purpose for which the money was set aside, e.g., child's education, retirement, vacation.

Reference:

Sussman, Abigail B. and Rourke L. O'Brien (2016), "Knowing When to Spend: Unintended Financial Consequences of Earmarking to Encourage Savings," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (5), 790-803.

Scale Items:¹

1. I would feel irresponsible for taking money from savings that was set aside.
2. Taking money from savings that was set aside would make me feel like I was losing control of my life.
3. I would feel like a less dependable person if I took money from savings that was set aside.

4. Taking money from savings that was set aside makes me feel like a bad person.
5. I would feel guilty taking money from savings that was set aside because I would be breaking a commitment to myself.
6. I would feel like I failed myself if I took money from savings that was set aside.
7. Others would judge me negatively for taking money from savings that was set aside for my retirement.

1. Items #1, #4, and #7 composed the scale used in Study 3 by Sussman and O'Brien (2016, web appendix). Items #1-#3 composed the scale used in Study 5 to measure "responsibility" while items #4-#6 were used to measure "guilt." Finally, all the items except #7 composed what the authors called the guilt/responsibility scale in Studies 5 and 6. The end points of the response scale used with the items were *completely disagree* (1) and *completely agree* (7).

TARGETEDNESS OF THE AD

With three, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a person believes that a particular advertisement has been aimed at him/her due to some behavior or characteristic inferred by the advertiser.

Origin:

In a series of studies about behavioral targeting, the scale was viewed as a measure of “implied social labels” by Summers, Smith, and Reczek (2016). Variations in the scale were made across the studies based on the scenario of the experiments. Data were collected in Studies 1, 2, and 3 from undergraduate students attending The Ohio State University while participants in Study 4 were from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. The source of the scale was not identified and it is assumed to be original to the authors.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale varied from .81 to .91 across the studies. The version shown below used in Study 2 had an alpha of .88 (Summers, Smith, and Reczek 2016, p. 163).

Validity:

The scale’s validity was not discussed by Summers, Smith, and Reczek (2016).

Comments:

As noted above, the scale items were modified for each study. Item #1 was the most similar item in each case with items #2 and #3 varying more. The version of the scale shown below was used in Study 2 and referred to an advertisement that participants saw for a “sophisticated” product. For comparison, Study 1 referred to a restaurant, Study 3 focused on a product described as environmentally friendly, and a beverage was the focal object in Study 4. Keep in mind that the more changes are made to the phrasing of the items, the more advisable that the researcher reconfirm the scale’s psychometric quality.

Reference:

Summers, Christopher A., Robert W. Smith, and Rebecca Walker Reczek (2016), “An Audience of One: Behaviorally Targeted Ads as Implied Social Labels,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (1), 156-178.

Scale Items:¹

1. The advertiser thinks I am the kind of person who likes _____ products.²
2. I received this ad because the marketer inferred that I have _____.³
3. The advertisement I received was selected for me based on an inference about the type of person I am.

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). These items were used in Study 2 by Summers, Smith, and Reczek (2016).
2. A descriptor of the type of focal product should be placed in the blank. The term "sophisticated" was used by Summers, Smith, and Reczek (2016).
3. A phrase describing the characteristic or behavior of the participant should go in the blank. The phrase "sophisticated taste in products" was used by Summers, Smith, and Reczek (2016).

TASK DIFFICULTY

How complex and time-consuming a task is considered to be is measured with three, seven-point Likert items.

Origin:

Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017, p. 819) used the scale in Study 1 with a final sample of 251 business students recruited to participate in a "marketing experiment." The source of the scale was not stated.

Reliability:

The alpha calculated for the scale was .82 (Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski 2017, p. 820).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017).

Reference:

Kaiser, Ulrike, Martin Schreier, and Chris Janiszewski (2017), "The Self-Expressive Customization of a Product Can Improve Performance," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (5), 816-831.

Scale Items:¹

_____ was:²

1. difficult.
2. complex.
3. time-consuming.

1. The response scale used with these items had the following extreme anchors: *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

2. A phrase identifying or describing the task should be placed in the blank. For example, the phrase used by Kaiser, Schreier, and Janiszewski (2017, p. 820) with half of the participants in the experiment was "Choosing a pen . . ." and the phrase used with the other participants was "Designing a pen"

TASK ENJOYMENT

How much a person enjoyed a particular activity is measured with five, seven-point uni-polar items.

Origin:

Etkin (2016) used the scale in three experiments in which data were collected from college students. (Studies 1 and 6 were conducted at the Wharton Behavioral Lab and Study 3 was at the Cornell Behavioral Lab). The source of the scale was not stated by Etkin (2016). Since it is distinct from other known measures of the construct, it is likely to have been created by the author.

Reliability:

The scale's alphas were .89, .81, and .88 in Studies 1, 3, and 6, respectively (Etkin 2016, pp. 970, 973, 979).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Etkin (2016).

Reference:

Etkin, Jordan (2016), "The Hidden Cost of Personal Quantification," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (6), 967-984.

Scale Items:¹

To what extent do you find _____:²

1. enjoyable
2. boring (r)
3. interesting
4. a waste of time (r)
5. fun

1. The end points for the response scale used by Etkin (2016, p. 970) with these items were *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7).
2. The name of the task or activity should be placed in the blank. In the studies by Etkin (2016), the activities were coloring (Study 1, p. 970), walking (Study 3, p. 973), and reading (Study 6, p. 979).

TASK ENJOYMENT

The scale uses three, seven-point items to measure the degree to which a person believes a particular task in which he/she has participated was fun and interesting.

Origin:

Woolley and Fishbach (2016) used the scale in Study 4 with data from 156 students in a Florida high school. The authors called the construct *immediate rewards* because the students were allowed to use colorful writing instruments to complete the task and could select healthy snacks to consume while working on the assignment. The source of the scale was not identified and was probably created by the authors.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .93 (Woolley and Fishbach 2016, p. 962).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Woolley and Fishbach (2016).

Reference:

Woolley, Kaitlin and Ayelet Fishbach (2016), "For the Fun of It: Harnessing Immediate Rewards to Increase Persistence in Long-Term Goals," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (6), 952-966.

Scale Items:¹

1. How much did you enjoy working on this task?
Did not enjoy / Enjoyed a lot
2. Was working on this task fun?
Not at all fun / Very fun
3. Was working on this task interesting?
Not at all interesting / Very interesting

1. The response scale had seven points, running from 0 to 6. To make the scale more useful in a wide variety of situations, the word "assignment," used by Woolley and Fishbach (2016, p. 962), has been replaced here with "task." Other terms might also be appropriate.

TEAM PREFERENCE

The extent to which a person says he/she will be excited about a particular sports team beating another team it is playing against and the likelihood he/she will engage in behaviors to express support for the team during the event is measured with four, nine-point items. The scale items are flexible for sporting events which have two teams playing against each other or when the researcher's desire is to focus only on two of several teams in a multi-team event such as the Olympics.

Origin:

Torelli et al. (2017) used the scale in Study 3 with data gathered from 130 Americans recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The same scale was also used in an extra study reported in the web appendix of the article. In that case, data were gathered from 161 undergraduate students at an American university. The source of the scale was not identified but is very likely to have been created by the authors.

Reliability:

The alphas reported for the scale in Study 3 and the additional study were .70 and .92, respectively (Torelli et al. 2017, pp. 53 and online appendix 2).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Torelli et al. (2017).

Comments:

The disparate alphas reported for the scale is a concern. A hint at the reason comes from the results of the studies by Torelli et al. (2017). When the sample is composed of avid fans for both teams the scores will cluster at the extremes whereas a more random sample of people watching the game is likely to have a very different distribution of scores. The effect of these radically different score distributions on the internal consistency of the scale is unknown. This issue should be examined further prior to the scale being used again in theory testing.

Reference:

Torelli, Carlos J., Rohini Ahluwalia, Shirley Y. Y. Cheng, Nicholas J. Olson, and Jennifer L. Stoner (2017), "Redefining Home: How Cultural Distinctiveness Affects the Malleability of In-Group Boundaries and Brand Preferences," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (1), 44-61.

Scale Items:¹

1. At the game, which team will you cheer for?
Definitely X (1) / Definitely Y (9)

2. How likely is it that you will wear clothing such as a T-shirt or hat that identifies you as a X fan?
Not at all likely (1) / Extremely likely (1) (r)
3. How excited will you be if the Y team wins?
Not at all excited / Extremely excited (9)
4. How excited will you be if X wins the game?
Not at all excited (1) / Extremely excited (9) (r)

1. The X and the Y in the questions should be replaced with the names of the two competing teams.

TEAM RIVALRY (GAME INDUCED)

Using three, seven-point items, the scale measures the extent to which a person believes the rivalry between two teams is intensified because of the game in which they are pitted against each other. The scale is most suitable for sporting events which have two teams playing against each other or when the researcher's desire is to focus participants' attention on two of several teams in a multi-team event such as the Olympics.

Origin:

Torelli et al. (2017) used the scale in Study 4 with data gathered from 126 undergraduate students attending the University of Minnesota who were residents of the state. The scale may also have been used in a study described in an online appendix to the article. The source of the scale was not identified but is very likely to have been created by the authors.

Reliability:

The alpha reported for the scale in Study 4 was .89 (Torelli et al. 2017, p. 54).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Torelli et al. (2017).

Reference:

Torelli, Carlos J., Rohini Ahluwalia, Shirley Y. Y. Cheng, Nicholas J. Olson, and Jennifer L. Stoner (2017), "Redefining Home: How Cultural Distinctiveness Affects the Malleability of In-Group Boundaries and Brand Preferences," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (1), 44-61.

Scale Items:¹

1. To what extent does this game make salient notions of rivalry with _____?²
2. How much of a rivalry with _____ is elicited by this game?
3. How much does thinking about this game remind you of a rivalry with _____?

1. The end points of the response scale were labeled by Torelli et al. (2017, p. 60) with *Not at all* (1) and *A great deal* (7). The name of the rival team should be placed in the blanks. The name of the other team, which is likely to be the preferred or "home" team, should be identified in the instructions.

2. The phrase "make salient notions of rivalry" is awkward and might not be understood appropriately by some participants. Strong consideration should be given to replacing the phrase with something clearer such as "intensify the rivalry."

TEMPORAL PROXIMITY TO THE HEALTH PROBLEM

With three, 101-point items, the purpose of the scale is to measure how far into the future a certain health problem is believed to be.

Origin:

Murdock and Rajagopal (2017) used the scale in each of the five studies reported in their article but did not specify the source of the scale. The authors examined how various health-related messages could affect the temporal proximity of a specific health problem. Across the studies, several different health problems were examined with the scale: gingivitis, obesity, mouth cancer, skin cancer, and skin damage.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale as used in the five studies ranged from .91 to .93.

Validity:

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Murdock and Rajagopal (2017).

Comments:

Not only does the scale appear to be amenable for use when studying a wide variety of health problems but it also seems like it could be easily adapted for studying non-health events as well, e.g., buying a new car, moving to another city, changing marital status. However, the greater the difference in context, the greater the need to carefully test the scale's psychometric quality before using it in theory testing.

Reference:

Murdock, Mitchel R. and Priyali Rajagopal (2017), "The Sting of Social: How Emphasizing Social Consequences in Warning Messages Influences Perceptions of Risk," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (2), 83-98.

Scale Items:¹

1. How far away does _____ seem to you?
not far at all / very far
2. How long does the time period between now and when you could start developing _____ seem to you?
not long at all / very long
3. How distant in the future does _____ seem to you?
not distant at all / very distant

1. The points on the response scale range used by Murdock and Rajagopal (2017) ranged from 0 to 100, with more points indicating a longer period of time. The name of the health problem should be placed in the blanks, e.g., skin cancer.

THREAT TO SOCIAL ORDER

The scale uses four, nine-point items to measure the extent to which it is believed that something, such as a particular person or group, is corrupting society and harming social order.

Origin:

Dong and Zhong (2017) used the scale in Study 4 ($n = 238$) as well as its pretest ($n = 97$), with participants recruited in both cases from Amazon's MTurk. The items for the scale are adaptations and creations based on a three-item measure of the construct by Fischer et al. (2007).

Reliability:

The alphas reported by Dong and Zhong (2017) for the scale as used in the pretest (web appendix, p. 21) and Study 4 (p. 786) were .94 and .95, respectively.

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Dong and Zhong (2017). However, they did indicate that a factor analysis of these items yielded only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1.

References:

Dong, Ping (2018), personal correspondence.

Dong, Ping and Chen-Bo Zhong (2017), "Witnessing Moral Violations Increases Conformity in Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (4), 778–793.

Fischer, Peter, Tobias Greitemeyer, Andreas Kastenmüller, Dieter Frey, and Silvia Oßwald (2007), "Terror Salience and Punishment: Does Terror Salience Induce Threat to Social Order?" *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43 (6), 964–971.

Scale Items:¹

1. To what extent do you perceive the _____'s behavior would threaten the order of society?²
2. To what extent do you perceive corruption would harm the order of society?
3. to what extent do you perceive the corruption situation in current society is threatening?
4. To what extent do you perceive the current corruption situation is problematic for society?

1. The items were provided by Dong (2018). The end-points of the response scale were *not at all* (1) / *very much* (9).

2. The person or group to be evaluated by participants should be identified in the blank. For example, Dong and Zhong (2017, p. 786) used the term "CEO" since participants read a news article about a company CEO.

TIE STRENGTH

Three, seven-point Likert items are used to measure the degree to which a person indicates having a social connection with a particular person in the past.

Origin:

The scale was used by Umashankar, Ward, and Dahl (2017) in Studies 2, 3, 4a, and 4b. Since they did not identify the source of the scale, it seems likely that they created it specifically for these studies.

Reliability:

Across the four studies in which it was used, the alphas ranged from .83 to .94 (Umashankar, Ward, and Dahl 2017, pp. 89, 91).

Validity:

Although Umashankar, Ward, and Dahl (2017) did not explicitly address the scale's validity, some evidence of its predictive validity is provided given that the scale was used as a manipulation check and, indeed, the manipulations were confirmed.

Comments:

The scale was used in the studies with respect to service providers. The phrases seem amenable for use with other persons such as friends, politicians, celebrities, etc.

Reference:

Umashankar, Nita, Morgan K. Ward, and Darren W. Dahl (2017), "The Benefit of Becoming Friends: Complaining After Service Failures Leads Customers with Strong Ties to Increase Loyalty," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (6), 79-98.

Scale Items:¹

1. I liked _____.
2. I felt connected to _____.
3. I felt chemistry with _____.

1. A word or phrase identifying the other person should be placed in the blanks. Umashankar, Ward, and Dahl (2017, p. 86) used the phrase "the service provider." The extreme anchors of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

TRANSFERRED ESSENCE

Three, nine-point Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a person believes an object has a special intangible quality, something that can be viewed as its “essence” or “aura.”

Origin:

Smith, Newman, and Dhar (2016) used the scale in Study 5. Analysis was based on data collected from 396 members of Amazon’s MTurk. The authors created the scale by drawing heavily on past work of one of the authors (Newman and Dhar 2014; Newman et al. 2011).

Reliability:

Alpha for the scale was .90 (Smith, Newman, and Dhar 2016, p. 664).

Validity:

The scale’s validity was not discussed by Smith, Newman, and Dhar (2016).

References:

Newman, George E. and Ravi Dhar (2014), “Authenticity Is Contagious: Brand Essence and the Original Source of Production,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 51 (3), 371–386.

Newman, George E., Gil Diesendruck, and Paul Bloom (2011), “Celebrity Contagion and the Value of Objects,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 38 (2), 215–228.

Smith, Rosanna K., George E. Newman, and Ravi Dhar (2016), “Closer to the Creator: Temporal Contagion Explains the Preference for Earlier Serial Numbers,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 653–668.

Scale Items:¹

1. This item contains a certain essence.
2. This item embodies an essential identity.
3. There is some special quality or essence that this item embodies.

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale used with the items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (9).

TRUST IN THE RETAILER

The degree to which a person believes a particular retailer could be reliable and depended upon is measured with four, nine-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Darke et al. (2016) used the scale in Studies 1, 2, and 3, with data collected in each case from undergraduate business students. The scale itself appears to have been created by the authors by drawing ideas from work by Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekar (1998). Keywords in each item are common to many trust-related measures.

Reliability:

The internal consistency of the scale in each study by Darke et al. (2016, p. 291) was very high, with construct reliability being .92 (Study 2) and .97 (Studies 1 and 3).

Validity:

CFA was used by Darke et al. (2016) with the data from each study to examine the psychometric properties of their measures. Although specific information about each scale was not provided, the authors did say that their measurement models fit the data well and that there was evidence of each scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

References:

Darke, Peter R., Michael K. Brady, Ray L. Benedictus, and Andrew E. Wilson (2016), "Feeling Close From Afar: The Role of Psychological Distance in Offsetting Distrust in Unfamiliar Online Retailers," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (3), 287-299.

Tax, Stephen S., Stephen W. Brown, and Murali Chandrashekar (1998), "Customer Evaluations of Service Complaint Experiences: Implications for Relationship Marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, 62 (April), 60-76.

Scale Items:¹

1. I believe that I could trust this retailer.
2. I could depend on this retailer.
3. I think this retailer would be reliable in meeting its promises.
4. This retailer probably has high integrity.

1. The labels used for the end-points of the response scale were not stated. Since the scale was described as Likert-type (Darke et al. 2016, pp. 290, 291), it is very likely that the extreme anchors were *Strongly disagree/Strongly agree* or something very similar.

TRUST IN THE SALESPERSON

The scale has six items that are used to measure the degree to which a customer believes a particular salesperson is competent and has high integrity.

Origin:

The scale was used by Zboja, Clark, and Haytko (2016) in the main study reported in the article with data from a quota sample of 275 consumers in the United States. The scale was created by the authors using phrases from trust scales by Morgan and Hunt (1994) as well as Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

Reliability:

The construct reliability of the scale in the main study was .90 (Zboja, Clark, and Haytko 2016, p. 817).

Validity:

The results of the measurement model used by Zboja, Clark, and Haytko (2016) indicated that the 25 items representing seven constructs (one of which was trust) loaded significantly on their intended factors and the model had an adequate fit to the data. Further, there was evidence supporting a claim of convergent and discriminant validity for each scale. With respect to the trust scale's AVE, it was .75.

References:

- Morgan, Robert M. and Shelby D. Hunt (1994), "The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (July), 20-38.
- Sirdeshmukh, Deepak, Jagdip Singh, and Barry Sabol (2002), "Consumer Trust, Value, and Loyalty in Relational Exchanges," *Journal of Marketing*, 66 (January), 15-37.
- Zboja, James J. (2018), personal correspondence.
- Zboja, James J., Ronald A. Clark, and Diana L. Haytko (2016), "An Offer You Can't Refuse: Consumer Perceptions of Sales Pressure," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (6), 806-821.

Scale Items:¹

This salesperson . . .

1. Can be trusted at all times.
2. Cannot be depended on to do what is right (r)
3. Has high integrity.
4. Is not competent (r)
5. Is very dependable.
6. Is unresponsive (r)

1. The items were provided by Zboja (2018). Although not explicitly stated in the article, the extreme verbal anchors of the response scale used with these items seem to have been *strongly disagree* (7) and *strongly agree* (7).

TRUSTWORTHINESS (GENERAL)

Four, seven-point semantic-differentials are used to measure how much a person believes some entity is honest and not manipulative. The focus of the measure is commonly a person, but the scale is general enough to be used with other entities such as a company, an ad, or a website.

Origin:

Kirmana et al. (2017) created the scale, referring to it as "morality," and used it in three studies. They indicated the items were from Leach, Ellemers, and Barreto (2007) but it is more accurate to say the former created three semantic differentials by borrowing key words used by the latter and adding a fourth item of their own. The reason the scale is called *trustworthiness* here is because the items have more similarity to measures of trustworthiness and related scales used in consumer research than to items used to measure morality, e.g., Lichtenstein and Bearden (1989), Jain and Posovac (2004), Campbell and Kirmani (2000).

Reliability:

Across the three studies, Kirmana et al. (2017) used the scale six times and the alphas ranged from .68 to .88, with all the alphas being above .80 except one.

Validity:

Although Kirmana et al. (2017, p. 110) did not address the scale's validity *per se*, they did report the results of an EFA conducted with Study 3 data on the items in this measure along with items measuring competence and warmth. The results showed clearly that the items used to measure each of the three constructs loaded highest on the expected constructs and much lower on the others.

References:

- Campbell, Margaret C. and Amna Kirmani (2000), "Consumer's Use of Persuasion Knowledge: The Effects of Accessibility and Cognitive Capacity on Perceptions of an Influence Agent," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27 (1), 69-83.
- Jain, Shailendra Pratap and Steven S. Posavac (2004), "Valenced Comparisons," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 41 (1), 46-58.
- Kirmani, Amna, Rebecca W. Hamilton, Debora V. Thompson, and Shannon Lantzy (2017), "Doing Well Versus Doing Good: The Differential Effect of Underdog Positioning on Moral and Competent Service Providers," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (1), 103-117.
- Leach, Colin W., Naomi Ellemers, and Manuela Barreto (2007), "Group Virtue: The Importance of Morality (vs. Competence and Sociability) in the Positive Evaluations of In-Groups," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93 (2), 234-249.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R. and William O. Bearden (1989), "Contextual Influences on Perceptions of Merchant-Supplied Reference Prices," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16 (June), 55-66.

Scale Items:¹

1. dishonest / honest
2. insincere / sincere
3. manipulative / not manipulative
4. not trustworthy / trustworthy

1. The directions or scale stem used with these items were not provided by Kirmana et al. (2017). They might have been something as simple as this: "Using the items below, please describe the _____. " The blank should be filled with the name of the person or other entity that the participants should be aware of and are to focus on.

UNFRIENDLINESS TOWARDS EMPLOYEES (OTHER CUSTOMERS)

The three item, seven-point Likert scale measures how much a person believes other customers in the store treat employees in an unfriendly manner.

Origin:

The scale was used by Albrecht et al. (2017) in Study 2 with 215 participants approached in service locations, particularly cafes and cafeterias. The authors created the three-item scale by adapting items from other scales they had developed that measured various attitudes about unfriendly behavior.

Reliability:

The alpha reported by Albrecht et al. (2017, p. 844) for the scale was .91.

Validity:

CFA was used to show that the measurement model had a good fit with the data (Albrecht et al. 2017, p. 836). Further, the analysis provided support for discriminant validity of this scale with respect to the other friendliness-related attitudes. The scale's AVE was .79.

Reference:

Albrecht, Arne K., Gianfranco Walsh, Simon Brach, Dwayne D. Gremler, and Erica van Herpen (2017), "The Influence of Service Employees and Other Customers on Customer Unfriendliness: A Social Norms Perspective," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (6), 827-847.

Scale Items:¹

- 1. Other customers were friendly toward the employees in the shop. (r)
- 2. The other customers were unfriendly toward the employees in the shop.
- 3. The other customers behaved in a friendly way toward the employees. (r)

1. The response scale used with the items had *completely disagree* (1) and a *completely agree* (7) as end-points (Albrecht et al. 2017, p. 836).

UNIQUENESS OF THE OBJECT

The rarity and scarcity of an object, such as a product, is measured in this scale with three, nine-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Smith, Newman, and Dhar (2016) used the scale in Study 5 and referred to it as *scarcity*. Analysis was based on data collected from 396 members of Amazon's MTurk. The authors did not indicate the source of the scale; it appears to have been created by them for use in the study.

Reliability:

Alpha for the scale was .81 (Smith, Newman, and Dhar 2016, p. 664).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Smith, Newman, and Dhar (2016).

Reference:

Smith, Rosanna K., George E. Newman, and Ravi Dhar (2016), "Closer to the Creator: Temporal Contagion Explains the Preference for Earlier Serial Numbers," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 653-668.

Scale Items:¹

1. This _____ is rare.
2. This _____ is unique.
3. This _____ is scarce.

1. The name or description of the focal object should be placed in the blanks. The extreme anchors of the response scale used with the items by Smith, Newman, and Dhar (2016, p. 663) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (9).

UNIQUENESS OF THE OBJECT

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type items that measure how much a person believes an object or experience is different from others he/she has had.

Origin:

Bastos and Brucks (2017) used the scale in Experiment 2 ($n = 153$) with data gathered from Amazon MTurk participants. The source of the scale was not stated and is assumed to have been created by the authors using keywords found in many measures of the construct. They referred to the scale as *purchase uniqueness* because participants were asked to recall a past purchase.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .88 (Bastos and Brucks 2017, p. 602).

Validity:

Although Bastos and Brucks (2017) did not explicitly discuss the scale's validity, they did report that an EFA of the items from five scales used in Experiment 2 indicated that the items expected to measure uniqueness loaded high on the same factor, providing some evidence of the scale's unidimensionality.

Reference:

Bastos, Wilson and Merrie Brucks (2017), "How and Why Conversational Value Leads to Happiness for Experiential and Material Purchases," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (3), 598–612.

Scale Items:¹

1. I perceive that _____ as unique.
2. That _____ is different from others I have had.
3. That _____ is distinct.

1. The blanks should be filled with a name or description of the focal object or experience. The endpoints of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).

USEFULNESS OF THE ONLINE SHOPPING APP

This Likert scale has three, five-point items that measure how much a technological application helps a customer shopping at an online store be more effective and, in particular, better evaluate a product.

Origin:

Hilken et al. (2017) used the scale in Studies 1, 2, and 3. The experimental context was that participants used and then evaluated a product based on an augmented reality exercise. The scale is an adaptation of items from a scale by Childers et al. (2001) who, in turn, had drawn upon a measure of usefulness by Davis (1989).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .85, .90, and .89 in Studies 1, 2, and 3, respectively (Hilken et al. 2017, pp. 892, 894, 895).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed explicitly by Hilken et al. (2017).

Comments:

The scale appears to be amenable for use in physical stores by simply dropping the word "online" from each item.

References:

- Childers, Terry L., Christopher L. Carr, Joann Peck, and Stephen Carson (2001), "Hedonic and Utilitarian Motivations for Online Retail Shopping Behavior," *Journal of Retailing*, 77 (Winter), 511-535.
- Davis, Fred D. (1989), "Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology," *MIS Quarterly*, 19 (September), 319-340.
- Hilken, Tim, Ko de Ruyter, Mathew Chylinski, Dominik Mahr, and Debbie I. Keeling (2017), "Augmenting the Eye of the Beholder: Exploring the Strategic Potential of Augmented Reality to Enhance Online Service Experiences," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (6), 884-905.

Scale Items:¹

1. Using the app improves my performance in evaluating the product during online shopping.²
2. I find the app to be useful for online shopping.
3. Using the app enhances my effectiveness in online shopping.

1. The extreme anchors of the response scale used by Hilken et al. (2017) were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (5).
2. The product referred to in this item should be identified in the instructions that are provided to participants unless it is very obvious from the context. Alternatively, to make the scale more general to online shopping, the phrase "evaluating the product during" could be dropped.

USEFULNESS OF THE SHOPPING TECHNOLOGY

This three item Likert scale with a seven-point response format measures the degree to which a person believes that a particular in-store shopping technology would add value to the shopping experience. As currently phrased, the items are stated hypothetically because participants will not actually have used the technology when responding to the scale but merely have read about it. The sentences could be easily changed to measure a shopper's actual experience with the technology.

Origin:

Inman and Nikolova (2017, p. 25) used the scale in a supplementary study with 302 participants recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk. Participants were asked to imagine that a local supermarket with which they were familiar began using a new in-store shopping technology. Six technologies (apps or devices) with varying capabilities and benefits were examined. As for the source of the scale, the authors created it by drawing some phrases from a measure of usefulness by Froehle and Roth (2004).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .95 (Inman and Nikolova 2017, p. 25).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Inman and Nikolova (2017).

References:

Froehle, Craig M. and Aleda V. Roth (2004), "New Measurement Scales for Evaluating Perceptions of the Technology-Mediated Customer Service Experience," *Journal of Operations Management*, 22 (1), 1–21.

Inman, J. Jeffrey and Hristina Nikolova (2017), "Shopper-Facing Retail Technology: A Retailer Adoption Decision Framework Incorporating Shopper Attitudes and Privacy Concerns," *Journal of Retailing*, 93 (1), 7–28.

Scale Items:¹

1. I believe that having this technology in the store will be a useful experience.
2. I believe that having this technology in the store will add additional value to my shopping experience.
3. I believe that having this technology in the store will add value to the overall service.

1. The end points of the response scale used by Inman and Nikolova (2017) with these items were *Strongly Disagree* (1) and *Strongly Agree* (7).

VALUE EQUITY OF THE PRODUCT

The scale has three, seven-point Likert-type items that measure the degree to which a consumer believes that what is received when buying a good or service is greater than what is given up.

Origin:

Ou, Verhoef, and Wiesel (2017) developed this scale along with two other scales in order to measure three crucial drivers of company equity. The authors drew ideas for the scales from several sources, principally Rust et al. (2000), Verhoef (2003), and Vogel et al. (2008). One of the authors' goals in developing the scales was to limit the number of items in order increase response rates. A second goal was to have items that would be applicable to a variety of industries and products. After a couple of pre-tests used to purify the scales, the analyses referred to below were based on data in the final study from 8924 customers in the Netherlands.

Reliability:

The alpha of the value equity scale was .73 (Ou, Verhoef, and Wiesel 2017, p. 346).

Validity:

Results of a principal component analysis showed that the items composing this scale as well as the measures of the other two drivers of company equity loaded on the expected factors. Using SEM, the analysis indicated that the AVE of the value equity scale was .65 and it had discriminant validity with respect to the other two drivers.

References:

Ou, Yi-Chun, Peter C. Verhoef, and Thorsten Wiesel (2017), "The Effects of Customer Equity Drivers on Loyalty Across Services Industries and Firms," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (3), 336–356.

Rust, Roland T., Valerie A. Zeithaml, and Katherine N. Lemon (2000), *Driving Customer Equity: How Customer Lifetime Value is Reshaping Corporate Strategy*, New York: Free Press.

Verhoef, Peter C. (2003), "Understanding the Effect of Customer Relationship Management Efforts on Customer Retention and Customer Retention and Customer Share Development," *Journal of Marketing*, 67 (October), 30-45.

Vogel, Verena, Heiner Evanschitzky, and B. Ramaseshan (2008), "Customer Equity Drivers and Future Sales," *Journal of Marketing*, 72 (6), 98-108.

Scale Items:¹

1. The price-quality ratio of the _____ the company is offering is good.
2. I can buy this _____ at places that are convenient for me.
3. I can make use of the _____ of this company at any time and place I want.

1. If the scale is used with one industry or product category, the generic name of the product could be placed in the blanks. However, if that does not make sense due to the variety of products involved, putting the word "product" in the blank, or something like it such as "good" or "service," may be acceptable. The end-points of the response scale were *totally disagree* (1) and *totally agree* (7).

VALUE OF THE COMPANY'S PRODUCTS

With three, seven-point semantic differentials, the scale measures the degree to which a customer believes that, in general, the prices of a company's products are appropriate given the value of the products.

Origin:

The scale was used by Habel et al. (2016) in Study 2. Using an online survey, data were collected from 1,703 customers of a large international retail company. The source of the scale was indicated to be Sweeney and Soutar (2001) but, even though there is similarity at the construct level, the scales are very different. Given that, it appears that the authors created the scale by drawing concepts from Sweeney and Soutar (2001) and common phrases in scales by others.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .913 (Habel 2017).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Habel et al. (2016).

References:

Habel, Johannes (2017), personal correspondence.

Habel, Johannes, Laura Marie Schons, Sascha Alavi, and Jan Wieseke (2016), "Warm Glow or Extra Charge? The Ambivalent Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility Activities on Customers' Perceived Price Fairness," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 84-105.

Sweeney, Jillian C. and Geoffrey N. Soutar (2001), "Consumer Perceived Value: The Development of a Multiple Item Scale," *Journal of Retailing*, 77 (2), 203-20.

Scale Items:¹

Products of _____ . . .

1. have a very poor price-value ratio / have a very high price-value ratio.
2. do not offer value for money / offer value for money.
3. are not good products for their prices / are good products for their prices.

1. The name of the company should be stated in the blanks.

VALUE OF THE OBJECT

Three semantic differentials are used to measure how valuable a particular object is considered to be. Unlike most other measures of value, this one does not explicitly measure the object's economic value and has more to do with the object's subjective value based on its desirability.

Origin:

Sharma and Roy (2016) used the scale in an experiment with 102 undergraduates at an Australian university. They cited Eisend (2008) as the source.

The scale was also used in three studies by Mukherjee and Lee (2016). Two of the studies gathered data from members of Amazon Mechanical Turk in the U.S. ($n = 450$ in Study 1, $n = 235$ in Study 3). In Study 2, data were collected from 175 undergraduate students from a Korean university. (The study was conducted in English.)

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale when used by Sharma and Roy (2016, p. 81) was .86. In Studies 1, 2, and 3 by Mukherjee and Lee (2016) the alphas were .87, .96, and .89, respectively.

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed in any of the studies.

References:

Eisend, Martin (2008), "Explaining the Impact of Scarcity Appeals in Advertising: The Mediating Role of Perceptions of Susceptibility," *Journal of Advertising*, 37 (3), 33-40.

Mukherjee, Ashesh and Seung Yun Lee (2016), "Scarcity Appeals in Advertising: The Moderating Role of Expectation of Scarcity," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 256-268.

Sharma, Piyush and Rajat Roy (2016), "Looking Beyond First-Person Effects (FPEs) in the Influence of Scarcity Appeals in Advertising: A Replication and Extension of Eisend (2008)," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (1), 78-84.

Scale Items:¹

1. less attractive / very attractive²
2. undesirable / desirable
3. nonvaluable / valuable³

1. The number of points on the response scale were not stated by Sharma and Roy (2016) but, based on what the authors used with other scales in the same experiment, it appears to have been seven. A nine-point scale was used by Mukherjee and Lee (2016).

2. The extreme verbal anchors used by Mukherjee and Lee (2016) were *unattractive* and *attractive*.

3. The extreme verbal anchors used by Mukherjee and Lee (2016) were *not valuable* and *valuable*.

VALUE OF THE OBJECTS (COMPARISON)

The scale uses four, nine-point items to measure which of two objects a person considers to be more valuable and preferable to own.

Origin:

Smith, Newman, and Dhar (2016) used the scale in Study 3, referring to it as *valuation*. Analysis was based on data collected from 301 members of Amazon's MTurk. The authors did not indicate the source of the scale; it appears to have been created by them for use in the experiment. The purpose of the study was to see if certain types of information affected which of two otherwise similar objects would be considered more valuable. The items used in the experiment were limited edition art prints by Andy Warhol.

Reliability:

Alpha for the scale was .92 (Smith, Newman, and Dhar 2016, p. 664).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Smith, Newman, and Dhar (2016).

Reference:

Smith, Rosanna K., George E. Newman, and Ravi Dhar (2016), "Closer to the Creator: Temporal Contagion Explains the Preference for Earlier Serial Numbers," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 653-668.

Scale Items:¹

1. Assuming you had the opportunity to purchase them, which _____ would you be willing to pay more money for?
2. Which _____ would you rather own?
3. Which _____ would you rather see in person?
4. In your opinion, which do you think is more valuable?

1. An appropriate general term that refers to the two items should be placed in the blanks. Smith, Newman, and Dhar (2016, p. 660) used the term *prints*, referring to limited edition art prints by Andy Warhol. The extreme anchors of the response scale used with the items were the two prints to be compared and the information that differentiated them (e.g., serial numbers).

VALUE OF THE PRODUCT

Five, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure a consumer's judgment of a product's quality and the enjoyment it would bring. As written, the implication of some items is that the consumer has not experienced the product yet. In that sense, the scale measures *anticipated* value.

Origin:

Mathmann et al. (2017) used this scale in Studies 2 (n = 80 people from a U.S. panel) and 3 (n = 81 students at a Dutch university). The scale is a combination of items taken from two of the four subscales composing the nineteen-item PERVAL (perceived value) instrument by Sweeney and Soutar (2001).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .82 and .85 in Studies 2 and 3, respectively (Mathmann et al. 2017, pp. 217, 218).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Mathmann et al. (2017).

Comments:

Two of the items below (#1 and #2) were taken from the quality subscale of PERVAL (Sweeney and Soutar 2001) and three were taken from the emotional subscale (#3 - #5). Because the items were taken from two subscales, there is concern is that this scale may not be unidimensional. The considerable evidence from multiple studies conducted by Sweeney and Soutar (2001) indicate that the items measure different aspects of perceived value. This issue should be addressed by potential users of this scale before it is used in theory testing.

References:

Mathmann, Frank, Mathew Chylinski, Ko de Ruyter, and E. Tory Higgins (2017), "When Plentiful Platforms Pay Off: Assessment Orientation Moderates the Effect of Assortment Size on Choice Engagement and Product Valuation," *Journal of Retailing*, 93 (2), 212-227.

Sweeney, Jillian C. and Geoffrey N. Soutar (2001), "Consumer Perceived Value: The Development of a Multiple Item Scale," *Journal of Retailing*, 77 (Summer), 203-220.

Scale Items:¹

Instructions: Please indicate whether the following statements are true about the _____ you chose.
The _____:²

1. . . . has consistent quality.

2. . . . has an acceptable standard of quality.
3. . . . is one that I would enjoy.
4. . . . would make me feel good.
5. . . . would give me pleasure.

1. The end-points of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7).
2. The generic name of the product should be placed in the blanks.

VALUE OF THE REWARD

How much a person believes the nature of a specific reward is not only acceptable but motivates him/her to accomplish something is measured with three, seven-point uni-polar items.

Origin:

Mehta, Dahl, and Zhu (2017) referred to the scale as *perceived equivalence of rewards* because they used the scale in two supplemental studies to confirm that a monetary and a non-monetary reward were viewed similarly. The source of the scale was not described but appears to have been created by the authors.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .81 and .79 in two supplemental studies (Mehta, Dahl, and Zhu (2017, web appendix pp. 2, 6).

Validity:

Information regarding the scale's validity was not provided by Mehta, Dahl, and Zhu (2017).

Comments:

While some details regarding this scale were provided in the body of the article, other information came from the article's web appendix and, as mentioned in the footnote, some clarification came from the lead author (Mehta 2018).

Despite the scale being used by Mehta, Dahl, and Zhu (2017) to compare the value of two different rewards, the measure can certainly be used with respect to just one reward and is treated as such here in terms of its name and description.

References:

Mehta, Ravi (2018), personal correspondence.

Mehta, Ravi, Darren W. Dahl, and Rui (Juliet) Zhu (2017), "Social-Recognition versus Financial Incentives? Exploring the Effects of Creativity-Contingent External Rewards on Creative Performance," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (3), 536–553.

Scale Items:¹

How much do you think this reward is:

1. engaging?
2. inspiring?
3. acceptable?

1. The scale stem and structure of the scale were clarified by Mehta (2018). The end points of the response scale were *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7).

VALUE-IN-USE (PRODUCT)

This Likert scale uses four, seven-point items to measure the degree to which a person believes that the benefit or value a consumer experiences with respect to a product is dependent upon the individual, i.e., some consumers enjoy more value from a product than others do. Although the construct measured by this scale shares some similarity to the construct by the same name used in accounting, it is treated as an attitude in this scale rather than as a form of net present value.

Origin:

Ranjan and Read (2016) viewed value-in-use as a dimension of value co-creation. They created a measure of the former along with measures of other constructs, tested them with a sample in India, and then used them in an online survey of people drawn from the U.S. and India. Usable data were received from 230 respondents.

Reliability:

Alpha for the scale was .788 (Ranjan and Read 2016, p. 304).

Validity:

Some aspects of the scale's validity were addressed by the authors (Ranjan 2017; Ranjan and Read 2016, p. 304). Results of the CFA conducted on this measure along with two others provided some evidence in support of their convergent and discriminant validities. However, this scale's AVE was 0.483, a little lower than the recommended .50 (Fornell and Larcker 1981).

References:

Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (February), 39-50.

Ranjan, Kumar Rakesh (2017), personal correspondence.

Ranjan, Kumar Rakesh and Stuart Read (2016), "Value Co-Creation: Concept and Measurement," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (3), 290-315.

Scale Items:¹

1. The benefit or value derived by a particular consumer is individual specific (i.e., some consumers may find more value than others from the same _____).
2. The benefit or value derived is consumer specific, depending on his or her state (e.g., financial situation).
3. The benefit or value derived is dependent on an individual consumer, and the extent one enjoys such a _____.
4. The benefit or value derived are dependent on a consumer, and the extent one enjoys such an experience.

1. The name of the co-produced good or service should be placed in the blanks of items #1 and #3. As described by Ranjan (2017), the extreme anchors of the seven-point scale were *extremely disagree* and *extremely agree*.

VARIETY AMONG THE ACTIVITIES

Three questions with a seven-point response format are used to measure how much difference a person believes there to be in the activities he/she has engaged in during a specific time period.

Origin:

Etkin and Mogilner (2016) used the scale in Study 2B with a final sample of 100 U.S. adults recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The source of the scale was not identified but appears to have been created by the authors for the study.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .81 (Etkin and Mogilner 2016, p. 216).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Etkin and Mogilner (2016).

Reference:

Etkin, Jordan and Cassie Mogilner (2016), "Does Variety Among Activities Increase Happiness?" *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (2), 210-229.

Scale Items:¹

1. How much variety is there among the activities you did _____?
Very little variety / A lot of variety
2. How different are the activities you did _____?
Not very different / Very different
3. How similar are the activities you did _____?
Not very similar / Very similar (r)

1. The blanks should be filled with a phrase that specifies the time period participants should focus on when responding. For example, one of the experimental conditions used the phrase "over the past 30 minutes" while the other condition used "over the past day" (Etkin and Mogilner 2016, p. 216).

VARIETY-SEEKING TENDENCY

Five, seven-point Likert-type items measure a person's enjoyment of trying unfamiliar experiences. Although three of the statements are general and do not indicate what is being experienced, two items mention products.

Origin:

The scale was used by Pick et al. (2016) in a study conducted with subscribers of a publisher that sold romance novels in Germany. The final sample consisted of 540 respondents. The language in which the scale was presented to participants was not stated, however, it is clear that the data were collected in Germany.

As for the source of the scale, the authors cited Van Trijp et al. (1996). The latter, in turn, used five items from the 39 items in a scale by Raju (1980). Yet, the items in the version used by Pick et al. (2016) are not among those in Raju's (1980) instrument though there is some similarity in phrases and concepts.

Reliability:

The composite reliability of the scale used by Pick et al. (2016, p. 238) was .93.

Validity:

Pick et al. (2016) did not discuss the scale's validity but they did use CFA to analyze the fit of their measurement model which included this scale. The results indicated there was a good model fit.

References:

- Pick, Doreén, Jacquelyn S. Thomas, Sebastian Tillmanns, and Manfred Krafft (2016), "Customer Win-back: The Role of Attributions and Perceptions in Customers' Willingness to Return," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (2), 218-240.
- Raju, P. S. (1980), "Optimum Stimulation Level: Its Relationship to Personality, Demographics, and Exploratory Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 7 (December), 272-282.
- Van Trijp, Has C. M., Wayne D. Hoyer, and J. Jeffrey Inman (1996), "Why Switch? Product Category-Level Explanations for True Variety-Seeking Behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 33 (August), 281-292.

Scale Items:¹

1. I enjoy taking chances by trying out unfamiliar companies, products/contracts to provide variety to my life.
2. I like trying things out that I am not familiar with.
3. I always try something different.
4. I like to try something I am not very sure of.
5. I enjoy trying out new products.

1. The response scale that Pick et al. (2016, p. 238) used with these items had end-points labeled as *I do not agree at all* (1) and *I fully agree* (7).

VERSATILITY OF THE PRODUCT

With four, seven-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the extent to which a person believes that a product can be used in a variety of situations.

Origin:

The scale was used by Wu et al. (2017, web appendix p. 8) in a Study 5 pretest (n = 81 recruits from Amazon MTurk). The authors created the scale (Wu 2018).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .91 (Wu et al. 2017, p. 662).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Wu et al. (2017).

References:

Wu, Freeman (2018), personal correspondence.

Wu, Freeman, Adriana Samper, Andrea C. Morales, and Gavan J. Fitzsimons (2017), "It's Too Pretty to Use! When and How Enhanced Product Aesthetics Discourage Usage and Lower Consumption Enjoyment," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (3), 651–672.

Scale Items:¹

1. This _____ is useful.
2. This _____ could be used in a variety of situations.
3. This _____ would be a good fit in a variety of contexts.
4. This _____ is quite versatile in where it could be used.

1. The generic name of the product should be placed in the blanks. The response scale that Wu et al. (2017, web appendix p. 8) used with these items had end-points labeled as *completely disagree* (1) and *completely agree* (7).

VISUAL APPEAL OF THE PRODUCT

The scale has five semantic differentials that measure how attractive and appealing a product appears to be. Although the scale was made for use with a product, it seems to be amenable for use with a wide variety of objects.

Origin:

White et al. (2016) used the scale in Study 4. The context was that participants saw one of three photos of a grocery food product that varied in its level of damage, depending upon the experimental condition. As for the source of the scale, it was not identified. It seems likely that the authors created it.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .97 in Study 4 by White et al. (2016, p. 117).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by White et al. (2016).

Reference:

White, Katherine, Lily Lin, Darren W. Dahl, and Robin J. B. Ritchie (2016), "When Do Consumers Avoid Imperfections? Superficial Packaging Damage as a Contamination Cue," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (1), 110-123.

Scale Items:¹

1. not very aesthetically pleasing / very aesthetically pleasing
2. flawed / perfect
3. unattractive / attractive
4. unappealing /appealing
5. bad looking / good looking

1. The instructions used with the items were not stated by White et al. (2016). They could merely have asked participants to use these items and possibly some others measuring different constructs to describe the product they saw. The response scale was described in the article as having seven points (White et al. 2016, p. 117) but the web appendix showed it having nine.

VISUAL PROCESSING FLUENCY (GENERAL)

The degree to which a person reports being able to “see” in his/her mind a particular object or action is measured with three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Lee et al. (2017) used the scale in Experiment 2C of the nine experiments described in the article. Data were gathered from 99 people via Amazon Mechanical Turk. The source of the scale was not identified.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .86 (Lee et al. 2017, p. 715).

Validity:

The scale’s validity was not discussed by Lee et al. (2017). However, the authors did conduct principal axis factor analysis with varimax rotation on five items having to do with visualization. The results indicated there were two factors, with the three items listed below loading high on one of the factors and low on the other. This provides evidence of the scale’s unidimensionality.

Reference:

Lee, Hyojin, Kentaro Fujita, Xiaoyan Deng, and H. Rao Unnava (2017), "The Role of Temporal Distance on the Color of Future-Directed Imagery: A Construal-Level Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (5), 707-725.

Scale Items:¹

1. It was difficult to visualize the _____. (r)
2. I could clearly visualize the _____.
3. I was able to “see” the _____ in my mind.

1. The end-points of the response scale were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). The blanks should be filled with the name of the object or action participants are instructed to visualize. The word used by Lee et al. (2017) was “scene” because measurement occurred after participants were told to visualize a particular scenario they had read about.

VULNERABILITY

Composed of five, seven-point items, the scale measures how unprotected and unprepared a person feels with respect to the threats coming from the “world” around him/her.

Origin:

Rahinel and Nelson (2016) referred to the measure as *preparedness for unsafe environment* and used it in Study 4 with 145 undergraduate students attending the University of Kansas. The source of the scale was not identified.

Reliability:

The scale’s alpha was reported by Rahinel and Nelson (2016, pp. 489) to be .91.

Validity:

No information regarding the scale’s validity was provided by Rahinel and Nelson (2016).

Reference:

Rahinel, Ryan and Noelle M. Nelson (2016), "When Brand Logos Describe the Environment: Design Instability and the Utility of Safety-Oriented Products," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (3), 478-496.

Scale Items:¹

1. I feel unprotected from the world around me.
2. I feel susceptible to threats in the world around me.
3. I feel unprepared for bad things in the world around me that could happen to me.
4. I feel vulnerable to negative changes in the world around me.
5. I feel like I would incur the harshest possible consequences if something happened in the world around me.

1. The extreme scale anchors used by Rahinel and Nelson (2016, p. 489) with these sentences were *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7).

WAIT TIME IN THE STORE

A shopper's belief that the wait time in a store was too long, particularly due to the checkout process, is measured with three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017) used the scale in Studies 1a (n = 883) and 1b (n = 501). Although the authors indicated they "adapted" a measure by Grewal et al. (2003), the items in the two measures are not similar. Given that, it is more precise to say that Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017) created the scale based on inspiration from a two-item measure of "wait expectations" created by Grewal et al. (2003).

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .96 and .98 in Studies 1a and 1b, respectively (Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann 2017, p. 738).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann (2017).

References:

Albrecht, Carmen-Maria, Stefan Hattula, and Donald R. Lehmann (2017), "The Relationship Between Consumer Shopping Stress and Purchase Abandonment in Task-Oriented and Recreation-Oriented Consumers," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (5), 720-740.

Grewal, Dhruv, Julie Baker, Michael Levy, and Glenn B. Voss (2003), "The Effects of Wait Expectations and Store Atmosphere Evaluations on Patronage Intentions in Service Intensive Retail Stores," *Journal of Retailing*, 79 (4), 259-268.

Scale Items:¹

1. The waiting time in the store (e.g., at the checkout counter) was too long.
2. I had to wait too long in the store (e.g., at the checkout counter).
3. It seemed to me as if I had to wait forever in the store (e.g., at the checkout counter).

1. It appears the end-points of the response scale used by Albrecht, Hattula, and Lehmann 2017, p. 724) with these items were *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (7). The instructions used with the scale were not provided but likely asked participants to describe the wait time experienced during a specific shopping trip to a store.

WARM GLOW

With four, nine-point items in a semantic differential format, the scale purports to measure a person's emotional response from doing "good," such as charitable giving and other prosocial behavior.

Origin:

Giebelhausen et al. (2016) created the scale after concluding that there were very few scales measuring the construct or that measured it as fully as they believed it should be. The scale was used in Studies 1, 3, and 4 discussed in the article.

Reliability:

The alphas for the scale were .92, .96, and .94 for Studies 1, 3, and 4, respectively (Giebelhausen et al. 2016, pp. 60, 64, 67).

Validity:

CFAs were conducted by Giebelhausen et al. (2016) that showed warm glow was distinct from the different forms of satisfaction in the three studies, thus, providing evidence of the scale's discriminant validity.

Comments:

A concern about the scale is that the items themselves are much more like beliefs about the behavior rather than affective responses to it. If the scale is meant to measure an affective construct rather than a cognitive one, the instructions and/or scale stem should emphasize how one "feels" about the behavior.

Reference:

Giebelhausen, Michael, HaeEun Helen Chun, J. Joseph Cronin Jr., and G. Tomas M. Hult (2016), "Adjusting the Warm-Glow Thermostat: How Incentivizing Participation in Voluntary Green Programs Moderates Their Impact on Service Satisfaction," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (4), 56-71.

Scale Items:¹

1. ashamed / proud
2. in the wrong / in the right
3. wicked / virtuous
4. unethical / ethical

1. A nine-point response format was used by Giebelhausen et al. (2016, p. 60). The instructions and/or scale stem used with these items was not provided by Giebelhausen et al. (2016). Most likely, it asked participants how they felt after engaging in the prosocial behavior.

WARMTH OF THE PERSON

Four, seven-point uni-polar items are used to measure how much a person is described as being kind and friendly. (Two versions of the scale are described, both having four items and three of them being in common.)

Origin:

Wang et al. (2017) used one version of the scale in Study 1a and a slightly different version in Studies 2a and 2b as described in the footnote. The change in item composition was not explained. The authors created the scales by drawing items from measures by Aaker, Vohs, and Mogilner (2010) as well as Cuddy, Fiske, and Glick (2007).

Reliability:

The alphas reported for the scale were .94, .92, and .94 in Studies 1a, 2a, and 2b, respectively (Wang et al. 2017, pp. 789, 793, 796).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Wang et al. (2017).

References:

Aaker, Jennifer, Kathleen D. Vohs, and Cassie Mogilner (2010), "Nonprofits Are Seen as Warm and For-Profits as Competent: Firm Stereotypes Matter," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37 (2), 224–237.

Cuddy, Amy, Susan T. Fiske, and Peter Glick (2007), "The BIAS Map: Behaviors from Intergroup Affect and Stereotypes," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92 (4), 631–648.

Wang, Ze, Huifang Mao, Yexin Jessica Li, and Fan Liu (2017), "Smile Big or Not? Effects of Smile Intensity on Perceptions of Warmth and Competence," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (5), 787–805.

Scale Items:¹

1. warm
2. kind
3. friendly
4. sincere
5. approachable

1. The version of the scale used in Study 1a was composed of items #1-#4 while the version used in Studies 2a and 2b had items #1-#3 and #5. The end points of the response scale used with these items were *not at all* (1) and *very much so* (7). The instructions were not provided by Wang et al. (2017) but apparently asked participants to indicate how well each of the items described the focal person.

WARMTH OF THE PERSON

How friendly and sociable a person appears to be is measured with four, seven-point semantic differentials.

Origin:

Kirmana et al. (2017) used the scale in Study 3 with 382 graduate students. Participants were told to imagine they were going to start working with one of two personal exercise trainers. Participants read reviews about the trainers that were varied in several ways, one of which was how “warm” the trainers were described. As for the source of the scale, it was not stated. The first two items (below) have been used frequently in measures of warmth and related constructs (e.g., Whittler and Dimeo (1991).

Reliability:

The scale was used two times in Study 3, one for each trainer that participants read about (Kirmana et al. 2017, p. 110). The alphas were .91 and .83 for the “warmer” and the “colder” trainer, respectively.

Validity:

Although Kirmana et al. (2017, p. 110) did not address the scale’s validity *per se*, they did report the results of an EFA on the items in this measure along with items measuring competence and morality. The results showed clearly that the items used to measure each of the three constructs, indeed, loaded highest on the expected constructs and much lower on the others.

References:

Kirmani, Amna, Rebecca W. Hamilton, Debora V. Thompson, and Shannon Lantzy (2017), "Doing Well Versus Doing Good: The Differential Effect of Underdog Positioning on Moral and Competent Service Providers," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (1), 103-117.

Whittler, Tommy E. and Joan DiMeo (1991), "Viewer's Reaction to Racial Cues in Advertising Stimuli," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 6 (31), 37-46.

Scale Items:¹

1. unfriendly / friendly
2. cold / warm
3. unsociable / sociable
4. not nice / nice

1. The directions or scale stem used with these items were not provided by Kirmana et al. (2017). They might have been something as simple as this: "Using the items below, please describe the _____.“ The blank should be filled with the name of the person whom the participants should be focusing on as they respond.

WEBSITE DESIGN (AESTHETICS)

With three, five-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a person believes a particular website has a visually pleasing design.

Origin:

The scale was used by Blut (2016) in an impressive study of e-service quality. Data for the study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and that they were to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer.

The scale itself was created by Loiacono, Watson, and Goodhue (2002) to measure what they called the "visual appeal" dimension of website quality in their WebQual instrument. Although specifics about individual scales were lacking, in general, it appears evidence was found in support of the scale's reliability and validity.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .94 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Blut (2016, p. 509) provided some evidence in support of the scale's face and discriminant validities. The AVE of the scale was .83.

References:

Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.

Loiacono, Eleanor T., Richard T. Watson, and Dale L. Goodhue (2002), "WebQual: A Measure of Website Quality," *Marketing Theory and Applications*, 13 (3), 432–438.

Scale Items:¹

1. The website is visually pleasing.
2. The website displays a visually pleasing design.
3. The website is visually appealing.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

WEBSITE DESIGN (INFORMATION QUALITY)

Using three, five-point Likert-type items, the scale measures a person's attitude about the adequacy of the information provided at a particular website to meet his/her needs.

Origin:

The scale was used by Blut (2016) in an impressive study of e-service quality. Data for the study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and that they were to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer.

The scale itself was created by Loiacono, Watson, and Goodhue (2002) to measure what they called the "informational fit-to-task" dimension of website quality in their WebQual instrument. Although specifics about individual scales were lacking, in general, it appears evidence was found in support of the scale's reliability and validity.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .84 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Blut (2016, p. 509) provided some evidence in support of the scale's face and discriminant validities. The AVE of the scale was .65.

References:

Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.

Loiacono, Eleanor T., Richard T. Watson, and Dale L. Goodhue (2002), "WebQual: A Measure of Website Quality," *Marketing Theory and Applications*, 13 (3), 432–438.

Scale Items:¹

1. The information on the website is pretty much what I need to carry out my tasks.
2. The website adequately meets my information needs.
3. The information on the website is effective.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

WEBSITE DESIGN (INTERACTIVITY)

The degree to which a person believes a particular website has interactive features which allow him/her to customize information is measured in this Likert scale with three, five-point items.

Origin:

The scale was called "website personalization" by Blut (2016) and was used in an impressive study of e-service quality. Data for the study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and that they were to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer.

The scale was created by Loiacono, Watson, and Goodhue (2002) to measure the interactivity dimension of website quality in their WebQual instrument. Although specifics about individual scales were lacking, in general, it appears evidence was found in support of the scale's reliability and validity.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .89 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Blut (2016, p. 509) provided some evidence in support of the scale's face and discriminant validities. The AVE of the scale was .73.

References:

Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.

Loiacono, Eleanor T., Richard T. Watson, and Dale L. Goodhue (2002), "WebQual: A Measure of Website Quality," *Marketing Theory and Applications*, 13 (3), 432–438.

Scale Items:¹

1. The website allows me to interact with it to receive tailored information.
2. The website has interactive features, which help me accomplish my task.
3. I can interact with the website in order to get information tailored to my specific needs.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

WEBSITE DESIGN (LOW PRICES)

Using three, five-point Likert-type items, the scale measures the degree to which a customer believes a particular website has low prices on products and shipping.

Origin:

The scale was used by Blut (2016) in an impressive study of e-service quality. Data for the study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and that they were to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer. Blut (2016) seems to have created the scale by using phrases suggested by Holloway and Beatty (2008) based on analyses of the critical drivers of satisfaction in the online service environment.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .75 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Blut (2016, p. 509) provided some evidence in support of the scale's face and discriminant validities. The AVE of the scale was .53.

References:

Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.

Holloway, Betsy Bugg and Sharon E. Beatty (2008), "Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers in the Online Environment: A Critical Incident Assessment," *Journal of Service Research*, 10 (4), 347–364.

Scale Items:¹

1. The website offers discount or free shipping.
2. The website has low prices.
3. The website has lower prices than offline stores.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

WEBSITE DESIGN (PRODUCT SELECTION)

Three, five-point Likert-type items compose the scale and are used to measure the degree to which a person believes the assortment of products available at a particular website is adequate for what he/she is interested in buying.

Origin:

The scale was used by Blut (2016) in an impressive study of e-service quality. Data for the study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and that they were to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer.

The scale was created by Blut (2016) from several sources. One of the items (#1 below) is from the WebQual instrument by Loiacono, Watson, and Goodhue (2002) and another item (#2 below) was borrowed from the eTailQ instrument by Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003). The source of the third item is less clear though it is very similar to one used by Ganesh et al. (2010) in a scale.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .79 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Blut (2016, p. 509) provided some evidence in support of the scale's face validity. He also appeared to say that evidence of this scale's discriminant validity was lacking with respect to some scales in his study using the Fornell and Larcker (1981) test but that the scale passed the more lenient test suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). The AVE of the scale was .61.

References:

- Anderson, James C. and David W. Gerbing (1988), "Structural Equation Modeling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-Step Approach," *Psychological Bulletin*, 103 (3), 411–423.
- Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.
- Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39–50.
- Ganesh, Jaishankar, Kristy E. Reynolds, Michael Lockett, and Nadia Pomirleanu (2010), "Online Shopper Motivations, and e-Store Attributes: An Examination of Online Patronage Behavior and Shopper Typologies," *Journal of Retailing*, 86 (1), 106–115.
- Loiacono, Eleanor T., Richard T. Watson, and Dale L. Goodhue (2002), "WebQual: A Measure of Website Quality," *Marketing Theory and Applications*, 13 (3), 432–438.
- Wolfinbarger, Mary and Mary C. Gilly (2003), "eTailQ: Dimensionalizing, Measuring and Predicting eTail Quality," *Journal of Retailing*, 79 (3), 183–198.

Scale Items:¹

1. All my business with the company can be completed via the website.
2. This website has a good selection.
3. The site has a wide variety of products that interest me.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following extreme anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

WEBSITE DESIGN (PURCHASING PROCESS)

The scale uses three, five-point Likert-type items to measure the degree to which a customer believes activities relating to the purchasing process at a particular website are easily accomplished.

Origin:

The scale was used by Blut (2016) in an impressive study of e-service quality. Data for the study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and that they were to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer. One item in the scale below (#3) came from a measure created by Loiacono, Watson, and Goodhue (2002) that they called the "better than alternative channels" dimension of website quality in their WebQual instrument. The source of the other two items in Blut's scale is unknown.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .81 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Blut (2016, p. 509) provided some evidence in support of the scale's face validity. He also appeared to say that evidence of the scale's discriminant validity was lacking with respect to some scales in his study using the Fornell and Larcker (1981) test but that the scale passed the more lenient test suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). The AVE of the scale was .61.

References:

Anderson, James C. and David W. Gerbing (1988), "Structural Equation Modeling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-Step Approach," *Psychological Bulletin*, 1003 (3), 411–423.
Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.
Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39–50.
Loiacono, Eleanor T., Richard T. Watson, and Dale L. Goodhue (2002), "WebQual: A Measure of Website Quality," *Marketing Theory and Applications*, 13 (3), 432–438.

Scale Items:¹

1. The website has no difficulties with making a payment online.
2. The purchasing process was not difficult.
3. It is easier to use the website to complete my business with the company than it is to use a telephone or fax or mail a representative.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following extreme anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

WEBSITE DESIGN (READABILITY)

The degree to which a person believes the text at a particular website is easy to read and understand is measured with three, five-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

The scale was called "website convenience" and was used by Blut (2016) in an impressive study of e-service quality. Data for the study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. Participants were screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store within the previous six months and that they were to respond to the survey with respect to that retailer. The scale was created by Loiacono, Watson, and Goodhue (2002) to measure what they called the "ease of understanding" dimension of website quality in their WebQual instrument. Although specifics about individual scales were lacking, in general, it appears evidence was found in support of the scale's reliability and validity.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .91 (Blut 2016, p. 508).

Validity:

Blut (2016, p. 509) provided some evidence in support of the scale's face validity. He also appeared to say that evidence of the scale's discriminant validity was lacking with respect to some scales in his study based on the Fornell and Larcker (1981) test but that the scale passed the test suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). The AVE of the scale was .78.

References:

Anderson, James C. and David W. Gerbing (1988), "Structural Equation Modeling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-Step Approach," *Psychological Bulletin*, 1003 (3), 411–423.
Blut, Markus (2016), "E-Service Quality: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (4), 500–517.
Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39–50.
Loiacono, Eleanor T., Richard T. Watson, and Dale L. Goodhue (2002), "WebQual: A Measure of Website Quality," *Marketing Theory and Applications*, 13 (3), 432–438.

Scale Items:¹

1. The display pages within the website are easy to read.
2. The text on the website is easy to read.
3. The website labels are easy to understand.

1. The response format used with these items by Blut (2016, p. 506) had the following extreme anchors: *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5).

WILLINGNESS OF THE BUSINESS TO ACCOMMODATE A SPECIAL REQUEST

With three, nine-point items, the scale is intended to measure a person's opinion about how willing a company would be to listen to a customer's request and agree to it. The underlying tone of the sentences, which can be made more explicit by the study's context, is that the request is unusual or against the rules.

Origin:

The scale was used by Jiang et al. (2016) in Experiment 4 of the five studies reported in the article. The measure was referred to as *customer sensitivity* and was created by the lead author (Jiang 2017). Respondents filled out the scale after reading a scenario about an airline passenger who had a piece of luggage that was overweight for carry-on but wanted permission to do it anyway.

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .90 (Jiang et al. 2016, p. 717).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not addressed by Jiang et al. (2016).

Comments:

Although the scale was made for use when respondents are judging what happened to another person, it seems the items are amenable for use when the respondents are the customers. In that case, the second blank of each item (below) would be filled with the appropriate pronoun. For example, the last phrase of item #1 would be *listen to my explanation*.

References:

Jiang, Yuwei (2017), personal correspondence.

Jiang, Yuwei, Gerald J. Gorn, Maria Galli, and Amitava Chattopadhyay (2016), "Does Your Company Have the Right Logo? How and Why Circular- and Angular-Logo Shapes Influence Brand Attribute Judgments," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 709-726.

Scale Items:¹

1. How willing do you think _____ will be to listen to _____ explanation?
2. How willing do you think _____ will be to show empathy towards _____?
3. How willing do you think _____ will be to attempt to accommodate _____ request?

1. The instructions used with this scale were not explicitly stated in the article by Jiang et al. (2016) but it is clear that participants were asked to fill out the items after reading a scenario. (See Origin section above.) The extreme verbal anchors of the response scale used with these items were *Not willing at all* (1) *Very willing* (9). The name of the business or salesperson should be stated in the first blank of each item, while the name or description of the customer goes in the second blank.

WILLINGNESS TO PAY MORE

The scale has three, seven-point Likert-type items that measure a person's desire to remain a customer of a retail business and willingness to pay more rather than buying from the competitors.

Origin:

The scale was used by Habel et al. (2016) in Study 2. Using an online survey, data were collected from 1,703 customers of a large international retail company. The source of the scale was indicated to be Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1996) but, even though the constructs seem to be the same, the scales are very different. Given that, it appears that the authors created the scale by drawing concepts from Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1996) and possibly others who have measured the construct (e.g., Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu 2002; Folse, Netemeyer, and Burton 2012).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .938 (Habel 2017).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Habel et al. (2016).

References:

- Folse, Judith Anne Garretson, Richard G. Netemeyer, and Scot Burton (2012), "Spokescharacters: How the Personality Traits of Sincerity, Excitement, and Competence Help to Build Equity," *Journal of Advertising*, 41 (1), 17-32.
- Habel, Johannes (2017), personal correspondence.
- Habel, Johannes, Laura Marie Schons, Sascha Alavi, and Jan Wieseke (2016), "Warm Glow or Extra Charge? The Ambivalent Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility Activities on Customers' Perceived Price Fairness," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (1), 84-105.
- Srinivasan, Srinu S., Rolph Anderson, and Kishore Ponnnavolu (2002), "Customer Loyalty in E-commerce: An Exploration of its Antecedents and Consequences," *Journal of Retailing*, 78 (1), 41-50.
- Zeithaml, Valerie A., Leonard L. Berry and A. Parasuraman (1996), "The Behavioral Consequences of Service Quality," *Journal of Marketing*, 60 (April), 31-46.

Scale Items:¹

1. I am willing to pay a higher price at _____ than at its competitors.
2. I would like to keep buying at _____, even if other companies were cheaper.
3. For the advantages I have as a customer of _____ I would be willing to pay a higher price.

1. The name of the company/store should be stated in the blanks. The response scale had seven points with the extreme verbal anchors labeled as *fully disagree* and *fully agree*.

WILLINGNESS TO PURCHASE

The likelihood of a consumer seeking out and trying to buy a particular product or brand of product is measured in this scale with five, seven-point semantic differentials.

Origin:

The scale was called *purchase intention* by Zúñiga (2016) and used in an experiment with data gathered from 287 African-American students from two large Mid-Atlantic universities in the United States. The author borrowed the scale from Sierra, Hyman, and Torres (2009) who had created it by drawing items from scales by Holmes and Crocker (1987) as well as Mackenzie, Lutz, and Belch (1986). They provided evidence of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities, unidimensionality, and internal consistency ($\alpha = .90$).

Reliability:

Zúñiga (2016, p. 97) reported the scale's alpha to be .96 in his experiment.

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Zúñiga (2016).

References:

- Holmes, John H. and Kenneth E. Crocker (1987), "Predispositions and the Comparative Effectiveness of Rational, Emotional and Discrepant Appeals for Both High Involvement and Low Involvement Products," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 15 (March), 27-35.
- Mackenzie, Scott B., Richard J. Lutz, and George E. Belch (1986), "The Role of Attitude Toward the Ad as a Mediator of Advertising Effectiveness: A Test of Competing Explanations," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 23 (May), 130-143.
- Sierra, Jeremy J., Michael R. Hyman, and Ivonne M. Torres (2009), "Using a Model's Apparent Ethnicity to Influence Viewer Responses to Print Ads: A Social Identity Theory Perspective," *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 31 (2), 41-66.
- Zúñiga, Miguel A. (2016), "African American Consumers' Evaluations of Ethnically Primed Advertisements," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (1), 94-101.

Scale Items:¹

1. Would not try / Would try
2. Would not seek out / Would seek out
3. Not very likely / Very likely
4. Improbable / Probable
5. Would not consider / Would consider

1. The instructions and/or scale stem used by Zúñiga (2016) with these items were not stated. Neither was a description provided by Sierra, Hyman, and Torres (2009). In some way, participants were asked to indicate the likelihood of them purchasing the product featured in the advertisement they had seen.

WILLINGNESS TO PURCHASE

The extent to which a consumer expresses an inclination to purchase a particular product is measured in this scale with three, nine-point semantic differentials.

Origin:

White et al. (2016), used the scale in Study 2 with 138 participants. Although this scale appears to be new to this study, the measure shares phrasing in common with several other scales that were created by the lead author in previous research to measure willingness and intention-related constructs, e.g., White and Peloza (2009); White and Simpson (2013); White, Simpson, and Argo (2014).

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .94 (White et al. 2016, p. 114).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by White et al. (2016).

References:

White, Katherine, Lily Lin, Darren W. Dahl, and Robin J. B. Ritchie (2016), "When Do Consumers Avoid Imperfections? Superficial Packaging Damage as a Contamination Cue," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (1), 110-123.

White, Katherine and John Peloza (2009), "Self-Benefit Versus Other-Benefit Marketing Appeals: Their Effectiveness in Generating Charitable Support," *Journal of Marketing*, 73 (4), 109-124.

White, Katherine and Bonnie Simpson (2013), "When Do (and Don't) Normative Appeals Influence Sustainable Consumer Behaviors?" *Journal of Marketing*, 77 (2), 78-95.

White, Katherine, Bonnie Simpson, and Jennifer J. Argo (2014), "The Motivating Role of Dissociative Out-Groups in Encouraging Positive Consumer Behaviors," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 51 (4), 433-447.

Scale Items:

How likely would you be to buy the _____?¹

1. very unlikely to buy this product / very likely to buy this product
2. very unwilling to buy this product / very willing to buy this product
3. very uninclined to buy this product / very inclined to buy this product

1. The name of the product and/or a longer phrase identifying the focal object should go in the blank. For example, the phrase used by White et al. (2016, web appendix) was "box of baking soda from the convenience store."

WILLINGNESS TO PURCHASE A PRODUCT AS A GIFT

The scale has three, seven-point items that measure a person's inclination to purchase a product from a particular store that will be given as a gift to a friend or family member. As currently phrased, the scale makes the most sense for use with a hypothetical scenario.

Origin:

Wolter and Cronin (2016) used the scale in a study with data collected from 628 participants recruited from Amazon.com's MTurk who represented a broad range of demographics. The scale was created by the authors.

Reliability:

The scale's composite reliability was reported to be .90 (Wolter and Cronin 2016, p. 408).

Validity:

Using CFA, Wolter and Cronin (2016) showed that their measurement model adequately fit the data. Further, a test of discriminant validity provided evidence that the scale measuring willingness to purchase a product as a gift was distinct from the other measures in the model. The scale's AVE was .75.

References:

Wolter, Jeremy S. (2017), personal correspondence.

Wolter, Jeremy S. and J. Joseph Cronin Jr. (2016), "Re-Conceptualizing Cognitive and Affective Customer-Company Identification: The Role of Self-Motives and Different Customer-Based Outcomes," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (3), 397-413.

Scale Items:¹

Imagine you have to purchase a gift for a friend or family member who is very different from who you are and what you stand for. Would you do any of the following?

1. Purchase a gift card to _____ for the friend or family member.
2. Purchase a product from _____ to give as a gift for this friend or family member.
3. Buy a product from _____ to be used as one gift among many for this friend or family member.

1. The name of the store should be placed in the blanks. The response scale had seven points and Wolter (2017) clarified that the end-points were *definitely would not do it / definitely would do it*.

WILLINGNESS TO SWITCH COMPANIES

The willingness of a consumer to shift companies with which he/she does business is measured with three, seven-point Likert-type items.

Origin:

Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017) used the scale twice in Study 3 (pre- and post-tests) with 202 participants recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk. The study had to do with data privacy. The authors created the scale by drawing some inspiration from multiple measures used previously by one of the co-authors (Palmatier, Scheer, and Steenkamp 2007).

Reliability:

In the Study 3 experiment, the construct reliabilities were .95 and .96 in the pre- and post-tests, respectively (Martin, Borah, and Palmatier 2017, p. 54).

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017). They did, however, indicate that analysis of Study 3 data indicated the AVEs for the switching scale were .85 and .90 in the pre- and post-tests, respectively (p. 54).

Comments:

A close reading of the scale's three items appears to indicate they refer to different stages or types of switching behaviors. One type is a willingness to simply try a new company (#2) while the other extreme expresses the willingness to pay a premium in order to make the switch. Another way to look at the problem is that it seems quite possible for a person to agree to try a new company (item #2) yet have no interest in switching his/her business for a premium (#3). That potential inconsistency in responses indicates that further testing of the scale's unidimensionality is called for.

References:

Martin, Kelly D., Abhishek Borah, and Robert W. Palmatier (2017), "Data Privacy: Effects on Customer and Firm Performance," *Journal of Marketing*, 81 (1), 36-58.

Palmatier, Robert W., Lisa K. Scheer, and Jan-Benedict E.M. Steenkamp (2007), "Customer Loyalty to Whom? Managing the Benefits and Risks of Salesperson-Owned Loyalty," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 44 (May), 185-199.

Scale Items:¹

If another company _____, how likely would you be to:²

1. shift all of my business to this new company.

2. try this new company's offering.
3. pay a premium to use this new company.

1. The end-points of the response scale used by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017, p. 55) with these items appear to have been *strongly disagree* (1) / *strongly agree* (7). If those verbal anchors seem awkward, a more typical set of anchors would be *highly unlikely* / *very likely*.
2. A phrase that briefly describes the other company's offer should be placed in the blank. For example, the following was used by Martin, Borah, and Palmatier (2017, p. 54): "offered the same product/services but did not collect any data about your activities."

WORD-OF-MOUTH (NEGATIVE)

Using three, seven-point items, the scale measures the degree to which a person is inclined to complain about a specified entity to other people. As currently phrased, the scale makes the most sense for use with a hypothetical scenario rather than as feedback about an actual event that has already occurred.

Origin:

Wolter and Cronin (2016) used the scale in a study with data collected from 628 participants recruited from Amazon.com's MTurk who represented a broad range of demographics. The authors created the scale by drawing heavily from a measure by Alexandrov, Lilly, and Babakus (2013) for two items and adding a third item from an unknown source.

Reliability:

Wolter and Cronin (2016, p. 408) reported the scale's composite reliability to be .85.

Validity:

Using CFA, Wolter and Cronin (2016) showed that their measurement model adequately fit the data. Further, a test of discriminant validity provided evidence that the scale measuring negative word-of-mouth was distinct from the other measures in the model. The AVE of negative word-of-mouth was .66.

References:

Alexandrov, Aliosha, Bryan Lilly, and Emin Babakus (2013), "The Effects of Social- and Self-Motives on The Intentions to Share Positive and Negative Word of Mouth," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 41 (5), 531-546.

Wolter, Jeremy S. and J. Joseph Cronin Jr. (2016), "Re-Conceptualizing Cognitive and Affective Customer-Company Identification: The Role of Self-Motives and Different Customer-Based Outcomes," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (3), 397-413.

Scale Items:¹

Imagine you had a bad experience with _____. How would you react to this experience?

1. I would complain to my friends about _____.
2. I would discuss my frustration with _____ publicly.
3. I would say negative things about _____ to other people.

1. The name of the offending entity (person, business, organization) should be placed in the blanks. The response scale had seven points and was anchored by *Definitely would not* / *Definitely would* (Wolter and Cronin 2016, pp. 405, 406).

WORD-OF-MOUTH INTENTION TOWARD THE RESORT

The scale has three, seven-point items that measure a person's intention to say good things about a resort and encourage friends to go there. It appears the scale is easily adaptable for other places that involve lodging.

Origin:

Lim, Lee, and Foo (2017) used the scale in Study 4 with data collected in an experiment from 163 students at a large university. Two versions of the scale were created by the authors, one positive and one negative, and referred to them as positive and negative *voice-to-public*. Since the phrasing of the two versions is very similar, both are described here. The authors indicated the items were adapted from Maxham and Netemeyer (2002).

Reliability:

The alphas were .94 and .95 for the positive and negative versions, respectively (Lim, Lee, and Foo 2017, p. 670).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Lim, Lee, and Foo (2017).

References:

Lim, Elison Ai Ching (2018), personal correspondence.

Lim, Elison Ai Ching, Yih Hwai Lee, and Maw-Der Foo (2017), "Frontline Employees' Nonverbal Cues in Service Encounters: A Double-Edged Sword," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45 (5), 657-676.

Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2002), "Modeling Customer Perceptions of Complaint Handling Over Time: The Effect of Perceived Justice on Satisfaction and Intent," *Journal of Retailing*, 78 (4), 239-252.

Scale Items:¹

1. I will spread positive word of mouth about this resort.²
2. I will recommend this resort to my friends.³
3. I will encourage my friends to stay at this resort.⁴

1. The items were provided by Lim (2018). The extreme anchors used to respond to the sentences were *not at all* (1) and *very likely* (7).
2. The negative version is the same as this except that the word "negative" replaces the word "positive."
3. The negative version is the same as this except that the word "not" should be placed before the word "recommend."
4. The negative version is the same as this except that the word "discourage" replaces the word "encourage."

Subject Index¹

■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Acceptance: 59, 219, 408, 427, 431 | 153, 243, 260- 267, 270, 307 | Change: 59, 226, 449 | Competence: 94, 21, 404, 413, 416 |
| Achievement: 102, 318, 406, 411 | Attractiveness: 39, 428, 482, 494 | Character: 32, 467 | Competition: 95, 413, 462 |
| Activity: 24, 490 | Attributions: 52, 82, 83 | Charities: 18, 154, 192, 252 | Complaining: 152, 521 |
| Advertising: 3, 4, 7, 26-36, 47, 60, 156, 193, 236, 304, 360, 455 | Authenticity: 120, 467 | Children: 284-296 | Complexity: 317, 457 |
| Advice: (see <i>Recommend & WOM</i>) | Authority: 292, 294 | Choice: 63, 76, 84, 86, 141, 143, 333, 366, 442 | Co-production: 64, 110, 318, 398 |
| Aesthetics: 5, 41, 336, 494 | Autonomy: 284, 296 | Clean: 104, 335 | Concern: 83, 169, 427 |
| Affect: 6, 45, 46 | Availability: 172, 342 | Closure: 105, 415 | Confidence: 17, 37, 97, 276, 404, 407, 416 |
| Affordability: 72, 191 | Avoidance: 103, 145, 329, 331, 429 | Cognition: 238, 260 | Conflict: 144, 152 |
| Aggression: 258, 391 | Awareness: 260 | Color: 41, 266, 271 | Conformity: 98, 292 |
| Anthropomorphism: 52, 54, 234 | Banks: 37, 162, 185 | Comfortable: 88, 141, 187, 190, 438 | Confusion: 84, 333 |
| Anxiety: 13, 281 | Beliefs: 71, 449 | Commitment: 89, 165 167, 369, 381, 449 | Congruence: 99, 100, 192, 403, 424, 443 |
| Appealing: 336, 494, 50 | Behavioral: 170, 232, 279 | Communication: 284, 286, 290, 423 | Consequences: (see <i>Outcomes</i>) |
| Appearance: 41, 52, 54, 340 | Benefits: 29, 115, 181, 228, 367, 488 | Community: 112, 248 | Control: 54, 107, 250, 310, 319, 327 |
| Appreciation: 10 | Benevolence (<i>action</i>): 18, 42, 114-116 | Company: 89-93, 110-118, 137, 138, 165, 167, 181-183, 210, 222, 224, 228, 319-328, 357, 369, 374, 426, 447, 481, 511, 513, 519 | Cooperation: 95, 110, 235 |
| Appropriateness: 56, 221, 315 | Body: 226, 264, 268, 270, 423 | Comparison: 143, 195, 251, 424, 483 | Cost: 114, 198 |
| Approval: 11, 385 | Brand: 38-40, 54, 69, 72-78, 128-132, 192, 217, 234, 254, 311, 312, 355, 372, 387, 396 | | Creativity: 27, 120, 121, 134 |
| Art: 5, 27, 120 | Capability: 94, 276 | | Credibility: 26, 122, 360, 426 |
| Attachment: 13, 15, 149 | Celebrity: 241 | | Credit: 163 |
| Attention: 7, 16, 70, | Certainty: 17, 143 | | Crisis: 169, 419 |
| | Challenge: 152, 406 | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Crowded: 124, 126, 445 | Distraction: 153, 329 | Excitement: 8, 240 | Frustration: 217, 521 |
| CSR ² : 18, 42, 82, 83, 111-118 | Dominance: 309, 310 | Exercise: (see <i>Fitness</i>) | Fun: 45, 46, 240, 305, 458, 459 |
| Culture: 127 | Donate: 42, 154, 252 | Expectations: 8, 73, 78, 92, 148, 281, 300, 395, 396, 400 | Future: 281, 282, 463 |
| Damage: 173, 217, 218 | Drugs: 422 | Expensive: 38, 198 | Games: 148, 201, 305, 462 |
| Deals: 58, 72, 150 | Eat: 212, 312, (see <i>also Food</i>) | Experiences: 45, 46 | Gender: 186, 202, 258 |
| Decision-making: 19, 84, 86, 141-145, 331 | Effectiveness: 160, 215, 161, 197, 201, 304, 502 | Expertise: 244, 246 | Gift: 373, 518 |
| Deception: 273, 322 | Effort: 10, 24, 239, 243, 382 | Fairness: 71, 138, 185, 272, 315, 321, 387 | Global: 204 |
| Delight: 146 | Embarrassment: 103, 162, 183, 385 | Faith: 379 | Goals: 3, 60, 145, 206, 405, 452 |
| Delivery: 67, 173, 174, 504 | Emotions: 6, 7, 8, 15, 141, 146, 151, 190, 222, 262, 267-270 | Familiarity: 31, 244 | Groups: 235, 432 |
| Demonstrations: 201, 298 | Employees: 11, 112, 164, 200, 272, 273, 473 | Family: 21, 188, 518, | Guilt: 151, 212, 453 |
| Dependability: 468, 469 | Engagement: 7, 16, 128-132, 153, 236, 345 | Fan: 460 | Habitual: 302, 343 |
| Design: 64, 66, 336, 444, 445, 501-503, 505-509 | Enjoyment: 45, 46, 305, 380, 458, 459, 491 | Features: 244, 246 | Happiness: 6, 62, 101, 146, 187, 189 |
| Desirability: 55, 148, 149, 312, 482 | Environmentalism: 23, 101, 104, 112, 165-170 | Feedback: 129, 371, 447 | Harmful: 23, 47, 50, 51, 169, 170, 214, 272, 324, 334, 465 |
| Development: 337 | Equity: 181, 375, 479 | Fear: 13, 103, 326 | Hazard: 140, 214, 218, 419, 496 |
| Differentiation: 127, 475 | Esteem: 413, 414 | Financial: 187-190, 405, 406 | Health: 22, 48, 50-52, 161, 194, 195, 198, 214, 215, 334, 407, 422, 448, 463 |
| Difficulty: 84, 144, 156, 157, 163, 196, 317, 444, 457, 495, 507 | Ethics: 274, 498 | Fitness: 161, 197 | Helpfulness: 42, 229, 384 |
| Disagreement: 341 | Evaluation: 55, 262, 339, 409 | Fluency: 193-196, 495 | Home: 149, 218 |
| Discomfort: 6, 124 | | Food: 47-51, 158, 197, 198, 221, 339, 418 | Honesty: 185, 273, 471 |
| Disposal: 23, 151 | | Freedom: 296, 442 | Hostility: 217 |
| | | Frequency: 254, 434 | Hotel: 104, 399, 522 |
| | | Friendly: 11, 44, 164, 199, 200, 279, 473, 499, 500 | |
| | | Friends: 87, 132, 522 | |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Ideas: 134, 182, 183, 232, 235, 346, 358, 420, 447 | Involvement: 35, 236, 238-243, 298 | <i>Groups</i>) | Participation: 3, 4, 298 |
| Identification: 202, 248, 204, 222, 224, 258, 425, 432 | Job: 80, 401 | Memory: 30, 380, 387 | Patronage: (see <i>Loyalty</i>) |
| Image: 59, 230, 278, 408, 436 | Judgment: 262 | Message: 3, 4, 29, 160, 465 | Perception: 347, 440, 495 |
| Importance: 239, 328 | Kindness: 199, 274, 499, 500 | Money: 37, 93, 163, 189, 302, 452, 453 | Performance: 102, 111, 300, 395, 400, 446 |
| Improvement: 129 278, 300, 435, 446 | Knowledge: 86, 244, 246, 316 | Morality: 56, 272-274 | Personal: 228, 319 |
| Impulsive: 145, 343 | Labels: (see <i>packaging</i>) | Motivation: 82, 135, 252, 384, 411 | Personality (<i>traits</i>): 95, 186, 202, 258, 260, 281, 331, 409, 499 |
| Incentives: 132, 486 | Language: 31, 423 | Name: 39, 192 | Persuasion: 4, 35, 156, 160, 304, 449 |
| Income: 21, 282, 435, 436 | Leadership: 276 | Nature: 101, 169, 283 | Play: (see <i>Games</i>) |
| Influence: 128, 132, 156, 408 | Leisure: 80, 399, 522 | Needs: 34, 278, 361 | Pleasure: 5, 30, 145, 418, 484 |
| Information: 16, 97, 228-230, 319-328, 502 | Lifestyle: 283, 302, 433 | Negotiation: 181, 415 | Policies: 152, 178 |
| Innovative: 231, 337 | Likeability: 41, 55, 340, 428, 466 | News: 122, 272 | Political: 168 |
| Integrity: 120, 468, 469 | Listen: 294, 511 | Newness: 231, 420 | Popularity: 342 |
| Intelligence: 94 | Local: 154, 248 | Nonprofit: (see <i>Charities</i>) | Possessions: 154, 252 |
| Intention: 58, 104, 254, 255, 299, 350, 381, 447, 517 | Logo: 52-54 | Norms: 11, 98, 200 | Power: 250, 309-311 |
| Interaction: 44, 107, 234, 241, 372, 429, 440, 503 | Loneliness: 251, 431 | Nostalgia: 30, 380 | Preference 64, 76, 253, 341 |
| Interest: 39, 109, 236, 345, 458, 459 | Loss: 29, 385 | Novelty: 27, 121 | Price: 40, 72, 116, 150, 315-317, 352, 415, 479, 504, 513 |
| Internet: 237, 329 (see also <i>Website</i>) | Love: 13, 428 | Nutrition: 49-51, 194 | Pride: 89, 208, 276, 318, 414, 481, 498 |
| | Loyalty: 77, 89, 131, 253-257, 299, 377, 381, 513, 519 | Obligation: 24, 78 | Privacy: 68, 176, 319- 328 |
| | Luxuries: 38, 314 | Openness: 134, 491 | |
| | Manipulation: 391, 393, 471 | Optimism: 281, 282 | |
| | Manufacturer: (see <i>Production</i>) | Order: 67, 175, 465 | |
| | Media: 275, 284-290 | Organizational: 59, 210 | |
| | Medical: 215, 422 | Orientation: 95, 302, 372, 390, 409, 411 | |
| | Members: (see | Outcomes: 366, 385, 452 | |
| | | Packaging: 75, 194, 195, 231 | |
| | | Parents: 294-296 | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Product: 10, 15, 16, 22, 34, 60-64, 97, 110, 111, 155, 162, 168, 235, 244, 246, 300, 314, 334, 316, 333-343, 352-354, 357, 359, 360, 386, 438-440, 475, 479, 481, 484, 491, 493, 505, 515-518 | Reality: 347, 360, 440 Reciprocity: 361, 363 Recommend: 256, 390, 393, 522 Recycling: 23, 151 Regret: 151, 212, 366 Relationships: 13, 44, 77, 87, 222, 224, 241, 361, 363, 367-377, 431, 466 Relevance: 34, 259 Reliability: 155, 175, 355, 468 Religion: 379 Reputation: 91, 102, 103, 118, 426 Resources: 100, 188, 189 Respect: 91, 182 Responsibility: 374, 375 Restaurant: 299 Restriction: 286-290 Retailer: 65-68, 347, 354, 359, 468 Reviews: 382-385 Rewards: 377, 486 Risk: 19, 218, 385, 386 Rules: 98, 511 Sacrifice: 388 Sadness: (<i>see</i> <i>Happiness</i>) Safety: 49, 140, 496 | Sales: 72, 117, 150, 391 Salespeople: 107, 367, 390-394, 469 Satisfaction: 73, 373, 395-400 Saving: 93, 163, 282, 302, 452, 453 Scarcity: 188, 342, 401, 474 Search: 97, 515 Security: 68, 179 Selection: 63, 505 Self: 230, 259, 413 Self-concept: 15, 100, 202, 204, 208, 224, 283, 403, 432 Self-efficacy: 311, 327, 404-407, 416 Self-regulation: 409, 411 Sensitivity: 264, 267, 270 Services: 65, 172- 179, 255, 279, 361, 363, 375, 377, 399, 400 Severity: 56, 214, 419, 422 Sharing: 182, 183, 229, 230 Shopping: 126, 157, 206, 249, 349, 420, 421, 439, | 476, 478 Similarity: 75, 192, 423-425, 490 Size: 150, 247 Skepticism: 426, 451 Skills: 21, 94 Smell: 158, 266 Smoking: 160 Social Class: 435, 436 Social Media: 19, 44, 382, 427, 433, 434 Sociability: 199, 429, 500 Society: 98, 140, 465, 496 Sound: 266, 268, 270 Spatial: 124, 126, 445 Speed: 163, 174, 215 Spiritual: 379 Sponsor: 78, 121, 443 Sports: 257, 460, 461 Stability: 226 Status: 38, 102, 137, 208, 219, 278, 314, 436, 439 Stimulation: 134, 135, 158, 232 Store: 126, 164, 206, 256, 333, 349, 350, 395, 421, 444, 445, 473, 478, 497 |
|--|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Story: 32, 122, 365 | Team: 257, 460, 462 | 144, 320, 451 | Verbal: 69, 268 |
| Strength: 310, 466 | Technology: 157, | Understand: 31, 294, | Visual: 158, 266, 494, |
| Stress: 187, 190, | 476, 478 | 193, 196, 317, | 495, 501 |
| 421, 446 | Telephone: 172, 507 | 365, 509 | Wait: 411, 497 |
| Success: 21, 91, 92 | Television: 345, 346 | Unique: 231, 403, | Watch: 70, 284, 288, |
| Superiority: 253, 309, | Threats: 217, 328, | 474, 475 | 290, 345, 345 |
| 357 | 422, 465, 496 | Usage: 22, 62, 157, | Website: 65-68, 172- |
| Support: 35, 82, 460 | Time: 80, 307, 329, | 237, 314, 343, | 179, 501- 509 |
| Switching: 206, 275, | 457, 463, 497 | 433, 434, 448, 493 | Weight: 226, 247 |
| 307, 519 | Touch: 334, 335 | Usefulness: 238, 358, | Willingness: 154, 352, |
| Talk: (<i>see WOM</i>) | Trash: (<i>see Disposal</i>) | 476, 478, 493 | 354, 388, 511-519 |
| Tangible: (<i>see</i> | Treatment: 71, 137, | Vacation: 399, 522 | Win: 148, 460, 486 |
| <i>Reality</i>) | 138, 215, 473 | Value: 40, 53, 58, 60, | WOM ³ : 109, 128, 408, |
| Targeting: 455 | Truth: 26, 120, 175 | 69, 93, 109, 219, | 521, 522 |
| Task: 153, 239, 275, | Trust: 37, 77, 176, | 259, 401, 414, | Work: 24, 80, 435 |
| 307, 318, 404, | 185, 323, 451, | 479-488 | Worry: 13, 190, 386 |
| 457-459 | 468-471 | Values: 71, 83, 388 | Wrong: 387, 498 |
| Taste: 339 (<i>see also</i> | Typical: 279, 316 | Variety: 490, 491, | |
| <i>Food</i>) | Uncertainty: 8, 86, | 505 | |

.

1. The keyword "attitude" is not in this index because many if not most of the scales in the book are measures of attitudes. Other words such as "customer" and "marketing" are not in the list for a similar reason.
2. Corporate Social Responsibility
3. Word-of-Mouth

About the Author

• • • • •

Dr. Gordon C. Bruner II (Professor Emeritus, Southern Illinois University) received a B.B.A. and a M.S. in marketing from Texas A&M University. His Ph.D. is from the University of North Texas, with a major in marketing and a minor in music. It was during his doctoral work that he learned about scales, worked with them as he assisted his professors in their research, and eventually created scales of his own that were critical to his dissertation.

After several years of developing scales as part of his empirical research activities as a professor, Dr. Bruner realized the difficulty marketing researchers had in finding scales that had already been used in scholarly studies. The development of the first *Marketing Scales Handbook* began at Southern Illinois University in the late 1980s with a colleague (Dr. Paul Hensel). When that volume was published in 1992, it was the first book of its kind in the field of marketing. Eventually, Dr. Bruner was left as the sole author and the work continued in a more focused format. The handbooks are now used by thousands of professors, students, and practitioners around the world. Although the earliest volumes in the series are no longer available in print, the reviews of scales they contained having to do with consumer research can be found in revised form in the repository at *MarketingScales.com*. Indeed, the database is the largest collection of psychometrics that have been used in published marketing research, well over 4,100 scales at this time.

During his years in academia, Dr. Bruner's primary empirical research streams were consumer problem recognition and technology acceptance. His research has been published in the *Journal of Marketing*, the *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, the *Journal of Advertising Research*, the *Journal of Advertising*, the *Journal of Retailing*, *Psychology & Marketing*, the *Journal of Business Research*, as well as many other journals. Throughout his teaching career, his specialties were strategic promotion and consumer behavior.

Dr. Bruner has retired from his long academic career but remains active in reviewing scales. Along with his role as author, he is also a devoted husband, father, and grandfather. Additionally, he is an amateur musician, loving to write and record his own songs. Last but definitely not least, he is a devout Christian, an adherent of the faith though not the religion.