



# **Marketing Scales Handbook**

---

A Compilation of Multi-Item Measures  
for Consumer Behavior & Advertising Research

Volume 5

**Gordon C. Bruner II**

# **Marketing Scales Handbook**

---

A Compilation of Multi-Item Measures  
for Consumer Behavior & Advertising Research

Volume 5

Gordon C. Bruner II



*GCBII Productions*  
Carbondale, Illinois USA

Marketing Scales Handbook, V5. Copyright © 2009, GCBII Productions.  
All rights reserved.

ISBN 978-0-615-27327-3

GCBII Productions  
63 Rivendell Rd.  
Carbondale, Illinois 62902-7744 USA

Reviews of measurement scales provided in this book are the intellectual property of GCBII Productions. The scales themselves are the intellectual property of the cited authors and the publishers of the journals in which the scales appeared. Permission to use the scales should be addressed to those sources since they may consider the scales to be covered by copyright law.

Published in the United States of America.

# Table of Contents

. . . . .

Preface	xviii
Acknowledgements	xix
Introduction	xx

Scale #	Construct Name	Page #
#001	Abstractness	1
#002	Acceptability of Alternative Service Providers	2
#003	Account Planner Evaluation (Awards)	3
#004	Account Planner Evaluation (Market Metrics)	4
#005	Account Planner Evaluation (Personal Feedback)	5
#006	Accountability (Outcome)	6
#007	Accountability (Procedural)	7
#008	Accountability Degree	8
#009	Achievement Importance	9
#010	Action Tendency	11
#011	Ad-evoked Product Usage Thoughts	12
#012	Aesthetic Appeal of Interior Design	13
#013	Aesthetic Evaluation	14
#014	Affective Response (General)	15
#015	Affective Response (Negative)	16
#016	Affective Response (Negative)	20
#017	Affective Response (Negative)	21
#018	Affective Response (Positive)	22
#019	Affective Response (Positive)	25
#020	Affective Response (Positive)	26
#021	Affective Response (Positive)	27
#022	Affective Response (Positive)	28
#023	Affective Response to the Ad (Approval)	29
#024	Affective Response to the Ad (Disapproval)	31
#025	Affective Response to the Ad (Empathy)	32
#026	Affective Response to the Ad (Positive)	34
#027	Affective Response to the Ad (Positive)	35
#028	Affective Response to the Ad (Positive)	37
#029	Affective Response to the Ad (Sympathy)	38
#030	Ambivalence of Product Evaluation	39
#031	Anger	40
#032	Anxiety	42
#033	Anxiety (Technological)	44
#034	Arousal	45
#035	Attention to Ad (Message Relevance)	48
#036	Attention to the Ad (General)	50
#037	Attention to the Commercials	52
#038	Attitude Strength	53

## Table of Contents

#039	Attitude Toward Advertising (Role Portrayals)	54
#040	Attitude Toward Advertising (Skepticism)	55
#041	Attitude Toward Health Risk	57
#042	Attitude Toward Political Advertising (Negative)	58
#043	Attitude Toward Private Label Brands	59
#044	Attitude Toward Product Placement	61
#045	Attitude Toward Selling the Object	63
#046	Attitude Toward Store Background Music	64
#047	Attitude Toward Teenage Smokers	66
#048	Attitude Toward the Act (General)	67
#049	Attitude Toward the Act (Boycotting)	71
#050	Attitude Toward the Act (Purchase)	72
#051	Attitude Toward the Ad (General)	73
#052	Attitude Toward the Ad (Affective)	75
#053	Attitude Toward the Ad (Affective)	79
#054	Attitude Toward the Ad (Believability)	80
#055	Attitude Toward the Ad (Cognitive)	82
#056	Attitude Toward the Ad (Confusion)	84
#057	Attitude Toward the Ad (Entertaining)	86
#058	Attitude Toward the Ad (Evaluative Judgments)	87
#059	Attitude Toward the Ad (General)	89
#060	Attitude Toward the Ad (Humor)	102
#061	Attitude Toward the Ad (Humor)	104
#062	Attitude Toward the Ad (Informativeness)	105
#063	Attitude Toward the Ad (Informativeness)	106
#064	Attitude Toward the Ad (Intrusiveness)	107
#065	Attitude Toward the Ad (Nostalgia)	109
#066	Attitude Toward the Ad (Unipolar)	110
#067	Attitude Toward the Advertiser	112
#068	Attitude Toward the Advertiser	114
#069	Attitude Toward the Article	115
#070	Attitude Toward the Brand	116
#071	Attitude Toward the Brand & Product Category	117
#072	Attitude Toward the Brand (Search Costs)	119
#073	Attitude Toward the Brand (Trustworthiness)	120
#074	Attitude Toward the Brand Name	121
#075	Attitude Toward the Charity	122
#076	Attitude Toward the Company (Employee Relations)	123
#077	Attitude Toward the Company (General)	124
#078	Attitude Toward the Company (General)	125
#079	Attitude Toward the Company (General)	127
#080	Attitude Toward the Company (Social Responsibility)	128
#081	Attitude Toward the Company's Altruism (Negative)	129
#082	Attitude Toward the Company's Altruism (Positive)	130
#083	Attitude Toward the Company's Altruism (Positive)	131
#084	Attitude Toward the Coupon Promotion	132
#085	Attitude Toward the Loyalty Program	133
#086	Attitude Toward the Manufacturer (Trust)	134
#087	Attitude Toward the Object (Affective)	136
#088	Attitude Toward the Object (Disgusting)	137
#089	Attitude Toward the Object (Fun)	138

## Table of Contents

#090	Attitude Toward the Object (General)	139
#091	Attitude Toward the Object (General)	141
#092	Attitude Toward the Political Ad	142
#093	Attitude Toward the Product	144
#094	Attitude Toward the Product (Achievement Goal)	145
#095	Attitude Toward the Product (Affective)	147
#096	Attitude Toward the Product (High Tech)	148
#097	Attitude Toward the Product (Knowledge Function)	149
#098	Attitude Toward the Product (Necessity-Luxury Status)	150
#099	Attitude Toward the Product (Nutritiousness)	151
#100	Attitude Toward the Product (Protection Goal)	152
#101	Attitude Toward the Product (Public-Private Consumption)	154
#102	Attitude Toward the Product (Social-Adjustive Function)	156
#103	Attitude Toward the Product (Utilitarian Function)	157
#104	Attitude Toward the Product (Value-Expressive Function)	158
#105	Attitude Toward the Product in the Ad	159
#106	Attitude Toward the Product Price	160
#107	Attitude Toward the Product Price	161
#108	Attitude Toward the Product-Brand (General Evaluative)	162
#109	Attitude Toward the Product-Brand (General Evaluative)	181
#110	Attitude Toward the Product-Brand (Healthiness)	183
#111	Attitude Toward the Product-Brand (Hedonic)	184
#112	Attitude Toward the Product-Brand (Hedonic)	186
#113	Attitude Toward the Product-Brand (Utilitarian)	187
#114	Attitude Toward the Spokesperson (General)	189
#115	Attitude Toward the Spokesperson (Likeability)	190
#116	Attitude Toward the TV Program	191
#117	Attitude Toward the Website (Absence of Errors)	192
#118	Attitude Toward the Website (Affective)	193
#119	Attitude Toward the Website (Attractiveness)	194
#120	Attitude Toward the Website (Clarity of Privacy Policy)	195
#121	Attitude Toward the Website (Cognitive)	196
#122	Attitude Toward the Website (Community Features)	197
#123	Attitude Toward the Website (Community)	198
#124	Attitude Toward the Website (Content Interactivity)	199
#125	Attitude Toward the Website (Credibility)	200
#126	Attitude Toward the Website (Cultivation)	201
#127	Attitude Toward the Website (Customer Care)	202
#128	Attitude Toward the Website (Customization)	203
#129	Attitude Toward the Website (Design Clarity)	204
#130	Attitude Toward the Website (Design)	205
#131	Attitude Toward the Website (Economic Value)	206
#132	Attitude Toward the Website (Entertaining)	208
#133	Attitude Toward the Website (Entertaining)	210
#134	Attitude Toward the Website (Escapism)	211
#135	Attitude Toward the Website (Fulfillment Reliability)	213
#136	Attitude Toward the Website (General)	214
#137	Attitude Toward the Website (General)	216
#138	Attitude Toward the Website (Order Fulfillment)	217
#139	Attitude Toward the Website (Pleasantness)	218
#140	Attitude Toward the Website (Product Assortment)	219

## Table of Contents

#141	Attitude Toward the Website (Quality Image)	220
#142	Attitude Toward the Website (Safety)	221
#143	Attitude Toward the Website (Security)	222
#144	Attitude Toward the Website (Service)	223
#145	Attitude Toward the Website (Shopping Assistance)	224
#146	Attitude Toward the Website (Shopping Efficiency)	225
#147	Attitude Toward the Website (Trust)	227
#148	Attitude Toward the Website (Visual Appeal)	228
#149	Attitude Toward the Website (Visual Appeal)	230
#150	Attitude Toward Voting	231
#151	Attitude Towards the Spokesperson	232
#152	Attractiveness of Competitors	234
#153	Authenticity Evidence	236
#154	Behavioral Control	237
#155	Behavioral Intention (Brand)	239
#156	Behavioral Intention (General)	240
#157	Behavioral Intention Toward the Product in the Ad	246
#158	Behavioral Intention Toward the Product in the Ad	247
#159	Believability of the Information	248
#160	Benevolence Importance	250
#161	Benevolence of the Business	252
#162	Benevolence of the Employees	253
#163	Biotech Companies' Compliance with Regulation	254
#164	Biotech Companies' Efficacy	255
#165	Biotech Regulation	256
#166	Boycotting Counterarguments	257
#167	Boycotting Effectiveness	259
#168	Brand Community Engagement	260
#169	Brand Community Identification	261
#170	Brand Community Interest	262
#171	Brand Community Loyalty	263
#172	Brand Equity	264
#173	Brand Expansion Plausibility	266
#174	Brand Extension Fit (General)	267
#175	Brand Extension Fit (General)	268
#176	Brand Extension Fit (Usage-Based)	269
#177	Brand Personality (Excitement)	271
#178	Brand Personality (Integrity)	273
#179	Brand Personality (Nurturance)	274
#180	Brand Personality (Ruggedness)	275
#181	Brand Personality (Sincerity)	277
#182	Brand Personality (Sophistication)	279
#183	Brand Prominence	281
#184	Brand Similarity	282
#185	Brand Switcher	283
#186	Calmness	284
#187	Change Seeking	285
#188	Charity Donation Requests (Corporate)	287
#189	Charity Support Importance	288
#190	Choice Difficulty	289
#191	Closure Concern	290

## Table of Contents

#192	Commitment to the Brand	291
#193	Commitment to the Brand	293
#194	Commitment to the Company (Affective)	294
#195	Commitment to the Company (Affective)	296
#196	Commitment to the Company (Affective)	298
#197	Commitment to the Company (Calculative)	299
#198	Commitment to the Company (Calculative)	301
#199	Commitment to the Company (Continuance)	302
#200	Commitment to the Company (General)	303
#201	Commitment to the Company (General)	304
#202	Commitment to the Company (General)	306
#203	Commitment to the Company (Normative)	307
#204	Commitment to the Dealership	308
#205	Commitment to the Service Provider	309
#206	Commitment to the Store (Affective)	310
#207	Communication Openness (Patient-Physician)	311
#208	Community Value	312
#209	Comparison Shopping Necessity	313
#210	Comparison Valence of the Ad	314
#211	Compatibility of the Product	315
#212	Competence of the Airline	316
#213	Competence of the Employee (Social)	317
#214	Competence of the Employee (Task)	319
#215	Competence of the Employees	320
#216	Competence of the Store	321
#217	Complaint Behavior	322
#218	Complaint Intentions (Third Party)	323
#219	Complaint Success Likelihood	325
#220	Complementarity of Products	327
#221	Complexity of the Service	328
#222	Compliance with Physician's Instructions	329
#223	Compliance with Weight Loss Program	330
#224	Compulsive Buying	331
#225	Computer Importance in the Home	333
#226	Computer's Effect on Home Activities	334
#227	Confidence (General)	335
#228	Confidence (Voter)	337
#229	Conflict (Decision)	338
#230	Conformity Importance	340
#231	Congruence (General)	342
#232	Congruence (Self with Brand )	343
#233	Congruence of the Ad	344
#234	Congruence of the Ad (External)	345
#235	Connectedness with Television Program	346
#236	Consistency Motivation (Internal)	348
#237	Consumption Affect	349
#238	Consumption Affect (Anticipated)	350
#239	Consumption Assortment Aesthetic Evaluation	351
#240	Consumption Occasion (Hedonic-Utilitarian)	352
#241	Control of Shopping Process	353
#242	Coping Strategy (Action)	354

## Table of Contents

#243	Coping Strategy (Avoidance)	355
#244	Coping Strategy (Denial)	356
#245	Coping Strategy (Emotional Support)	357
#246	Coping Strategy (Emotional Venting)	358
#247	Coping Strategy (Instrumental Support)	359
#248	Coping Strategy (Positive Thinking)	360
#249	Coping Strategy (Rational Thinking)	361
#250	Corporate Community Relations	362
#251	Corporate Social Responsibility (Treatment of Workers)	364
#252	Credibility (Attractiveness)	365
#253	Credibility (Expertise)	367
#254	Credibility (Expertise)	370
#255	Credibility (General)	371
#256	Credibility (Trustworthiness)	372
#257	Credibility (Trustworthiness)	376
#258	Credibility of the Company	377
#259	Crowding	379
#260	Cultural Orientation (Horizontal Collectivism)	381
#261	Cultural Orientation (Horizontal Individualism)	383
#262	Curiosity about the Product	385
#263	Cynicism (Political)	386
#264	Cynicism (Political)	387
#265	Depression	389
#266	Depression	391
#267	Desirable Responding	393
#268	Discomfort (Psychological)	396
#269	Discomfort (Psychological)	397
#270	Disconfirmation	398
#271	Dissatisfaction	401
#272	Donation Likelihood	402
#273	Ease of Generating Reasons	403
#274	Ease of Use	404
#275	Ease of Use	406
#276	Ease of Use	407
#277	Ease of Use	409
#278	Easiness	410
#279	Efficacy (Political)	411
#280	Efficacy (Website Quality Judgment)	412
#281	Employee Effort	413
#282	Envy	414
#283	Ethicality	416
#284	Ethnocentrism	418
#285	Expertise (General)	422
#286	Expertise (Personal)	423
#287	Expertise (Product Prices)	425
#288	Expertise (Source)	426
#289	Exploratory Consumer Tendencies	428
#290	Expressiveness of Product Usage	432
#291	Extra-Role Behaviors (Service Rep)	433
#292	Factory Closing Egregiousness	434
#293	Fairness of the Offer	435

## Table of Contents

#294	Fallibility	436
#295	Familiarity of the Object	437
#296	Familiarity of the Object	438
#297	Familiarity with the Product Category & Brand	440
#298	Family Communication (Concept-Oriented, Child's View)	442
#299	Family Communication (Socio-Oriented, Child's View)	444
#300	Family Importance	446
#301	Family Resources	447
#302	Family Stressors	449
#303	Fear of Disapproval	451
#304	Fearfulness	452
#305	Financial Needs	453
#306	Fit (Company with Industry)	454
#307	Flow (Shopping)	455
#308	Food Fat Knowledge (Subjective)	456
#309	Fun	457
#310	Generality of Product Image	459
#311	Generosity	460
#312	Goal Attainment	462
#313	Goal Similarity (Fit)	463
#314	Goal Similarity (Ideal Attributes)	465
#315	Headline Meaning Openness	467
#316	Help Provision Likelihood (Customer to Business)	468
#317	Honesty	469
#318	Iconicity with Fiction	470
#319	Iconicity with History	471
#320	Iconicity with Old Things	472
#321	Identification with Brand	473
#322	Identification with Brand	474
#323	Identification with Role	475
#324	Identity Appraisal (Reflected)	476
#325	Identity Appraisal (Self)	477
#326	Image of the Political Candidate	478
#327	Imagery Vividness (Multiple Senses)	479
#328	Imagery Vividness (Visual)	483
#329	Importance (Product Attribute)	485
#330	Impulse Buying	486
#331	Independence	488
#332	Independence-Interdependence	489
#333	Indexicality (Actual Contact)	492
#334	Indexicality (Hypothetical Contact)	493
#335	Indexicality (Telepresence)	494
#336	Indexicality With Era	495
#337	Innovativeness (Product Trial)	496
#338	Innovativeness (Use)	497
#339	Intangibility (Mental)	498
#340	Intention to Get a Mammogram	499
#341	Intention to Recommend	500
#342	Interdependence	502
#343	Interest (General)	503
#344	Interest in Advertisements	505

## Table of Contents

#345	Interest in the Ad Vehicle	506
#346	Internet Search Skill	507
#347	Internet Shopping (Convenience)	508
#348	Internet Shopping (Site Design)	510
#349	Internet Usage (Convenience Motivation)	512
#350	Internet Usage (Entertainment Motivation)	513
#351	Internet Usage (Information Motivation)	514
#352	Internet Usage (Social Motivation)	515
#353	Internet Usage (Time)	516
#354	Internet Usage Control	517
#355	Internet Usage Skill	518
#356	Intimacy with Company	519
#357	Investment Strategy (Prevention Benefits)	520
#358	Investment Strategy (Promotion Benefits)	521
#359	Involvement (Enduring)	522
#360	Involvement (Situational)	528
#361	Involvement in the Experimental Task	530
#362	Involvement in the Message (Motivation)	531
#363	Involvement in the Message (Processing Effort)	532
#364	Involvement in the Task (Distraction)	533
#365	Involvement in the Task (Processing Effort)	534
#366	Involvement with Coupons	535
#367	Involvement with Politics	538
#368	Involvement with Reading Task	539
#369	Involvement with Sales Promotion Deals	540
#370	Involvement with Store Type	542
#371	Involvement with the Brand (Interest)	543
#372	Involvement with the Brand (Pleasure)	545
#373	Involvement with the Brand (Risk Importance)	547
#374	Involvement with the Brand (Risk Probability)	549
#375	Involvement with the Brand (Signal)	551
#376	Involvement with the Product	553
#377	Involvement with the Product	554
#378	Involvement with the Product Category	555
#379	Involvement with the Product's Description	557
#380	Involvement with the Voting Decision	559
#381	Joy	560
#382	Justice (Distributive)	563
#383	Justice (Distributive)	565
#384	Justice (Distributive)	567
#385	Justice (Interactional)	568
#386	Justice (Interactional)	570
#387	Justice (Interactional)	572
#388	Justice (Procedural)	573
#389	Justice (Procedural)	575
#390	Justifiability of the Decision	576
#391	Knowledge (Subjective)	577
#392	Knowledge of the Brand	578
#393	Knowledge of the Product Class	579
#394	Knowledge of the Product Class	581
#395	Knowledge of the Product Class	583

## Table of Contents

#396	Knowledge of the Product Class	584
#397	Knowledge of the Product Class	585
#398	Knowledge of the Product Class	587
#399	Knowledge of the Product Class	588
#400	Locus of Control (General)	589
#401	Locus of Control (Health)	591
#402	Loyalty (Action)	593
#403	Loyalty (Active)	594
#404	Loyalty (Active)	597
#405	Loyalty (Affective)	598
#406	Loyalty (Brand)	599
#407	Loyalty (Cognitive)	600
#408	Loyalty (Conative)	601
#409	Loyalty (Passive)	602
#410	Loyalty Proneness (Product)	603
#411	Loyalty to Company (Post-Complaint)	605
#412	Loyalty to the Airline	606
#413	Loyalty to the e-Retailer	607
#414	Loyalty to the Financial Adviser	608
#415	Loyalty to the Store	609
#416	Loyalty to the Store	610
#417	Machiavellianism (Mach IV)	612
#418	Mammogram Costs	614
#419	Market Mavenism	615
#420	Materialism (Centrality)	616
#421	Materialism (General)	619
#422	Materialism (Happiness)	621
#423	Materialism (Success)	624
#424	Meaningfulness (General)	627
#425	Mood	629
#426	Need for Cognition	630
#427	Need for Cognitive Closure	635
#428	Need For Evaluation	637
#429	Need for Humor	639
#430	Need for Interaction (Service Encounters)	641
#431	Need for Touch (Autotelic)	642
#432	Need for Touch (Instrumental)	644
#433	Need for Touch (Instrumental)	646
#434	Need for Unique Products	647
#435	Need for Uniqueness (General)	649
#436	Neuroticism	652
#437	New Product Attributes (Value Added)	654
#438	Normative Compliance (Usage of Product)	656
#439	Novelty (General)	657
#440	Nutrition Information Interest	659
#441	Nutrition Interest	660
#442	Nutrition Knowledge (Subjective)	661
#443	Optimism	662
#444	Ordering Option Beliefs (Ease of Use)	663
#445	Organizational Prestige	665
#446	Originality	667

## Table of Contents

#447	Outcome Status	669
#448	Participative Decision-Making (Patient-Physician Interaction)	670
#449	Patronage Frequency	671
#450	Performance Quality	672
#451	Persuasiveness of the Ad	674
#452	Persuasiveness of the Ad	675
#453	Persuasiveness of the Information	676
#454	Planning (Product Usage)	678
#455	Pleasantness	679
#456	Pleasure	681
#457	Popularity of the Object	684
#458	Possessiveness	685
#459	Power (Expert)	687
#460	Power Importance	689
#461	Powerlessness	691
#462	Price as a Quality Indicator	692
#463	Price Comparison Likelihood	693
#464	Price Fairness	694
#465	Price Perception (Internal Reference)	695
#466	Price Perception (Store Comparison)	696
#467	Price Perception (Store Comparison)	697
#468	Price-Consciousness	698
#469	Price-Consciousness	701
#470	Price-Consciousness	703
#471	Price-Quality Relationship	704
#472	Price-Quality Relationship	705
#473	Pride	706
#474	Problem-Solving Orientation of the Airline	707
#475	Problem-Solving Orientation of the Employees	708
#476	Problem-Solving Orientation of the Store	709
#477	Processing Goals (Advertisement)	710
#478	Product Innovativeness	711
#479	Product Replacement Motivation	712
#480	Product-Story Connection	714
#481	Proximity	715
#482	Purchase Experience	716
#483	Purchase Intention	717
#484	Purchase Intention	720
#485	Purchase Intention	722
#486	Purchase Intention	723
#487	Purchase Intention	725
#488	Purchase Intention	726
#489	Purchase Intention Toward the Product in the Ad	727
#490	Purchase Intention Toward the Product in the Ad	729
#491	Purchase Secrecy	730
#492	Purchase-Related Communication (Parent's View)	731
#493	Quality of the Brand	733
#494	Quality of the Clothing	735
#495	Quality of the Food	736
#496	Quality of the Grocer's Products	737
#497	Quality of the Product	738

## Table of Contents

#498	Quality of the Product	740
#499	Quality of the Product	741
#500	Quality of the Restaurant	742
#501	Reason Generation Difficulty	743
#502	Reciprocity (Organization-Individual)	744
#503	Recycling (Social Norms)	745
#504	Refund Claim Likelihood	746
#505	Regret (Decision)	747
#506	Relational Bonds (Financial)	748
#507	Relational Bonds (Social)	749
#508	Relational Bonds (Structural)	750
#509	Relative Advantage of the Product	751
#510	Relevance of the Information	752
#511	Relevance of the Product Attribute	754
#512	Religion Importance	755
#513	Repatronage Intention	756
#514	Repatronage Intention	757
#515	Resource Demands	758
#516	Response Difficulty	759
#517	Results of the Store's High Prices	761
#518	Risk (Financial)	762
#519	Risk (Food Product Quality)	763
#520	Risk (General)	765
#521	Risk (Performance)	766
#522	Risk (Performance)	767
#523	Risk (Personal)	768
#524	Risk of Self-Service Technology	770
#525	Sadness	771
#526	Satisfaction (General)	773
#527	Satisfaction (General)	776
#528	Satisfaction (General)	778
#529	Satisfaction (General)	781
#530	Satisfaction (Voter)	782
#531	Satisfaction with Car Brand	531
#532	Satisfaction with Car Dealership	784
#533	Satisfaction with Choice of Service Provider	785
#534	Satisfaction with Company (Post Complaint)	786
#535	Satisfaction with Complaint Process	787
#536	Satisfaction with Educational Institution	788
#537	Satisfaction with Encounter	789
#538	Satisfaction with Grocer's Customer Service	790
#539	Satisfaction with Health Plan	791
#540	Satisfaction with Hypothetical Experience	792
#541	Satisfaction with Internet Search Process	793
#542	Satisfaction with Life	794
#543	Satisfaction with Most Recent Experience	795
#544	Satisfaction with Performance	796
#545	Satisfaction with Problem Resolution	798
#546	Satisfaction with Purchase Experience	800
#547	Satisfaction with Retailers	802
#548	Satisfaction with Service	804

## Table of Contents

#549	Satisfaction with Service	805
#550	Satisfaction with Service	807
#551	Satisfaction with Service Provider	808
#552	Satisfaction with Service Provider	809
#553	Satisfaction with Shopping Experience	810
#554	Satisfaction with Store	811
#555	Satisfaction with Weight Loss Program	812
#556	Security Importance	813
#557	Security of Internet Financial Transactions	815
#558	Self-Confidence (Bargaining Tactics)	816
#559	Self-Confidence (Expressing Opinions in Stores)	817
#560	Self-Confidence (Judgment Correctness)	818
#561	Self-Consciousness (Private)	819
#562	Self-Consciousness (Public)	820
#563	Self-Direction Importance	822
#564	Self-Efficacy	824
#565	Self-Efficacy (Resisting Pressure to Smoke)	825
#566	Self-Monitoring	826
#567	Self-Referencing	828
#568	Self-Regulatory Focus (Prevention)	829
#569	Self-Regulatory Focus (Promotion)	831
#570	Self-View in Choice Task	833
#571	Service Failure Attributions (Internal)	834
#572	Service Failure Cause Permanency	835
#573	Service Failure Severity	836
#574	Service Failure Typicality	837
#575	Service Personalization Effort	838
#576	Service Quality (Empathy)	839
#577	Service Quality (Global)	840
#578	Service Quality (Heterogeneity)	841
#579	Service Quality (Outcome-Related for Financial Adviser)	842
#580	Service Quality (Process-Related for Financial Adviser)	843
#581	Service Quality of the Employee	844
#582	Service Quality of the Employees	845
#583	Service Quality of the Store's Employees	846
#584	Service Quality of the Website	848
#585	Service Quality of the Website	850
#586	Service Recovery Expectations	852
#587	Service Usage Breadth	853
#588	Shame	854
#589	Shame	856
#590	Shame	858
#591	Shopping Convenience (Check-Out)	859
#592	Shopping Convenience (Finding Products)	860
#593	Shopping Convenience (Post-Purchase Activities)	861
#594	Shopping Convenience (Store Access)	862
#595	Shopping Convenience (Store Selection)	863
#596	Shopping Costs	864
#597	Shopping Enjoyment	865
#598	Shopping Enjoyment	866
#599	Shopping Enjoyment	867

## Table of Contents

#600	Shopping Intention	868
#601	Shopping Orientation (Adventure)	870
#602	Shopping Orientation (Apathetic)	871
#603	Shopping Orientation (Economic)	872
#604	Shopping Orientation (Gratification)	873
#605	Shopping Orientation (Personalizing)	874
#606	Shopping Orientation (Personalizing)	875
#607	Shopping Orientation (Role)	876
#608	Shopping Orientation (Staying Informed)	877
#609	Shopping Orientation (Value)	878
#610	Shopping Smart	879
#611	Shopping with Friends	880
#612	Smoking Intention	881
#613	Smoking Intention	882
#614	Smoking-Related Beliefs (Negative)	883
#615	Social Acceptance Importance	885
#616	Social Acceptance of Smoking	886
#617	Social Attraction	887
#618	Social Comparison Tendency	888
#619	Social Desirability Bias	890
#620	Social Desirability of Eating Particular Food	895
#621	Social Identification	896
#622	Social Identification	898
#623	Social Identification	899
#624	Special Treatment from the Service Provider	900
#625	Speed	901
#626	Sponsor's Self-Interest	902
#627	Spousal Influence Strategy (Coercive)	903
#628	Spousal Influence Strategy (Non-Coercive)	904
#629	Stimulation Importance	905
#630	Stimulation Potential	907
#631	Stimulation Preference	908
#632	Store Atmosphere	909
#633	Store Atmosphere	911
#634	Store Design	913
#635	Store Personnel (Quantity & Quality)	915
#636	Store's Provision of Information	917
#637	Stress	918
#638	Susceptibility to Peer Influence	920
#639	Switching Costs (Benefits Lost)	923
#640	Switching Costs (Brand Relationship Loss)	924
#641	Switching Costs (Economic)	925
#642	Switching Costs Evaluation	926
#643	Switching Costs (General)	927
#644	Switching Costs (General)	929
#645	Switching Costs (Learning)	930
#646	Switching Costs (Personal Relationships Lost)	931
#647	Switching Costs (Setup)	932
#648	Switching Costs (Setup)	933
#649	Switching Experience	934
#650	Switching Experience	935

## Table of Contents

#651	Switching Intention	936
#652	Tangibility (Physical)	937
#653	Taste-Fat Relationship	938
#654	Thought Focus (Others)	939
#655	Thought Focus Self)	940
#656	Time Pressure	941
#657	Tolerance for Ambiguity	942
#658	Tradition Importance	944
#659	Trust (General)	946
#660	Trust in the Company	948
#661	Trust in the Company	950
#662	Trust in the Company	952
#663	Trust in the Employees	953
#664	Trust in the Service Provider	955
#665	Trust in the Service Provider	956
#666	TV Viewing (Attention)	957
#667	TV Viewing (Time Spent)	958
#668	Uniqueness of Product's Attributes	959
#669	Unity in the Object	960
#670	Universalism Importance	961
#671	Usage Clarity	963
#672	Usefulness (General)	964
#673	Usefulness of the Object	965
#674	Value Consciousness	966
#675	Value of External Information	968
#676	Value of Supermarket Offers	970
#677	Value of the Added Service	971
#678	Value of the Loyalty Program	972
#679	Value of the Offer	973
#680	Value of the Offer	975
#681	Value of the Offer	976
#682	Value of the Offer	977
#683	Value of the Offer	978
#684	Value of the Product	979
#685	Value of the Product	980
#686	Value of the Store's Products	981
#687	Value of the Store's Products	983
#688	Value of the Store's Products	984
#689	Value of the Transaction	985
#690	Variability	987
#691	Variety Within Assortment	988
#692	Verbal-Visual Processing Style	989
#693	Visibility of Product (Social)	992
#694	Visual Aesthetics Centrality	993
#695	Visual Appeal	995
#696	Vividness (General)	996
#697	Vividness of Product Presentation at Website	997
#698	Website Comparison Shopping	998
#699	Website Ease-of-Use	999
#700	Website Ease-of-Use	1000
#701	Website Ease-of-Use	1001

## Table of Contents

#702	Website Interactivity (Content Usefulness)	1002
#703	Website Interactivity (Engaging)	1003
#704	Website Interactivity (General)	1005
#705	Website Interactivity (Human-Human)	1006
#706	Website Interactivity (Real-Time Communication)	1007
#707	Website Interactivity (Speed)	1009
#708	Website Preference (Exciting)	1011
#709	Website Usage Intention	1012
#710	Website Usefulness	1013
#711	Website Usefulness	1014
#712	Website Visit Intention	1015
#713	Well-Being	1016
#714	Word-of-Mouth (Positive)	1017
#715	Word-of-Mouth (Positive)	1018
#716	Work Importance	1019
	Subject Index	1020

# Preface

. . . . .

This book was begun with the expectation of it being published in typical book form just as the previous volumes had been. However, as the book was being written, particularly at the end, it became more and more clear that a change was coming. The first three volumes had been published by the American Marketing Association (AMA). By the time the fourth volume was to be published, the AMA had entered into a co-publishing agreement with Thompson Publishing. A few years after that, Thompson sold that part of its business to Cengage. In turn, Cengage stopped publishing small niche books such as this one and that led to me searching for another publisher. Consideration was given for a short while to managing the printing and physical distribution myself but the challenges of doing that eventually led me to doing something much simpler: e-publishing. I had already prepared a pdf version of the book to pass on to a printer so no great change was required to simply make the document available for download.

One of the benefits of this ebook is that it is much easier for users to find a construct or author compared to the effort required with a paper book. The Subject Index and Table of Contents are included but are not as necessary given the Find function available in Adobe Acrobat. One of the few things I did decide to do especially for the ebook that would not have been necessary if it was printed was linking. There are many occasions in the book where in the discussion of one scale another scale in the book is referred to. I tried to locate all of those instances and link them together for easier access.

It is far from clear if there will be a Volume 6 in this series. The Marketing Scales Database site ([www.marketingscales.com](http://www.marketingscales.com)) is the likely successor. It will probably become the medium through which the scales that have been previously reviewed as well as those yet to be reviewed will be “published.” Check out the website for further information regarding the status of the database and how to access it.

# Acknowledgements

. . . . .

I want to express my appreciation to those researchers who personally provided me with information beyond what was available in print. Many authors were contacted when more information was needed about a scale. Not all of them responded and that caused descriptions of some scales to be less complete or left out of the book entirely due to the lack of critical information. My gratitude goes out to the following researchers who kindly responded to my requests for more information:

- |                             |                        |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Rashmi Adaval               | Chris Manolis          |
| Pankaj Aggarwal             | Sally McMillan         |
| Julie Baker                 | Satya Menon            |
| Siva Balsubramanian         | Robert S. Moore        |
| Anick Bosmans               | Marjolein Moorman      |
| James Burroughs             | Aron O’Cass            |
| Amitav Chakravarti          | Se-Bum Park            |
| Thomas Cline                | Connie Pechmann        |
| Patrick De Pelsmacker       | Nora J. Rifon          |
| Dwayne Hal Dean             | James Roberts          |
| Stephanie Dellande          | Cristel Russell        |
| Kalpesh Desai               | Janas Sinclair         |
| Adam Duhachek               | Marla Stafford         |
| Judith Anne Garretson Folse | Srinivasan Swaminathan |
| Zeynep Gurhan-Canli         | Valerie Taylor         |
| Rebecca Hamilton            | Debora Viana Thompson  |
| David Hardesty              | Peter Verhoef          |
| Michael Hui                 | Kevin Voss             |
| Subin Im                    | Tiffany B. White       |
| Barbara Kahn                | Patti Williams         |
| Punam Anand Keller          | Jochen Wirtz           |
| Shun Yin Lam                | Yinlong Zhang          |
| Katherine N. Lemon          | Rongrong Zhou          |
| Elzbieta Lepkowska-White    |                        |

At Southern Illinois University, thanks go to Raj Murthy who helped for several years with many aspects of producing this volume as well as the preparing the companion database that will, hopefully, be available to researchers online soon.

*May your measures always be valid!*

Gordon C. Bruner II  
Carbondale, Illinois  
January 2009

# Introduction

. . . . .

Volumes 1 to 4 of this series contained multi-item psychometric scales that had been included in articles published in the top marketing journals between 1980 and 2001. This fifth volume covers the scales that were reported in articles published from 2002 to 2005. 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 predominately new. The only scales reported in the previous volumes that were reported in this volume are ones that were used again during the review period. Thus, the first four volumes have hundreds of scales not contained here. Given that, V5 should be viewed as *complementing* the preceding volumes rather than superseding them.

A key difference in this volume and the first four is that is predominantly composed of scales that were used with consumers. By the time V4 came to be published it was clear that one bound book could not contain both consumer scales (CB) as well as those for use in studying aspects of organizational behavior (OB). At about the same time, a reduction in the number of authors led to a refocusing of efforts. That led to just CB scales being reviewed. Unfortunately, the review of OB scales was discontinued. Another difference in this volume is that advertising-related scales are included along with the other scales in one section. (Previous volumes segregated them in different sections.)

To be included in this volume, scales had to be composed of three or more items, have empirical evidence of their psychometric quality, and were treated by their users as reflective measures rather than formative. With those general rules in mind, a review was conducted of the many hundreds of articles published in six of the top marketing journals between 2002 and 2005. Ultimately, information from about 270 of those articles led to the 716 scales composing this volume.

A rule followed in the *Marketing Scales Handbook* series has been to attempt to describe multiple uses of a scale in the same review. The problem has been deciding when two scales that are not exactly the same in their content should be included in the same review. The simple answer is that uses were combined into the same review when they appeared to be measuring the same construct and had about half or more items in common. In some cases, this meant that multiple reviews were written for the same construct or very similar ones because the scales for measuring the construct were substantially different in content (e.g., #393-#399, #483-#488, #679-#683). In other cases, the rule about similarity of items was very difficult to apply. This was most notably true with the semantic differential versions of Attitude Toward the Ad (#59) and Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (#108). Although these two have been the most popular constructs to measure in scholarly marketing research using multi-item scales, there has been little agreement on how to measure them. They both have been measured dozens of ways over the last few decades. Several years of working with the hodgepodge of Attitude Toward the Ad scales led to an initial grouping (Bruner 1998). Unfortunately, a similar effort to unravel the jumble of scales for measuring Attitude Toward the Product/Brand has not been as successful in finding subgroups that could be reviewed

separately. Given that, those scales and several others have been written up together because, at least on the surface, they appear to be measuring the same construct in roughly the same way (multiple semantic differentials) and authors have been cherry picking from a reasonably similar pool of items.

Details of the typical information found in each scale review are provided below.

## TABLE

### Description of Scale Review Format

---

**SCALE NAME:** A short, descriptive title for the scale is assigned for each scale (or set of scales) that have been reviewed. The name may not be the one used by the author. The goal was to use a name that was as consistent as possible with the content of a scale and with other known measures of the construct yet without being overly long and/or cumbersome.

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:** A few sentences are used to describe the construct apparently being assessed and the structure of the measure. The number of items, the number of points on the scale, and the response format (e.g., Likert, semantic differential) are typically specified. If significantly different names were used by authors for the measure then they are usually noted in this field.

**SCALE ORIGIN:** Limited information is given about the creation of the scale, if known. Many, if not most, of the scales were developed for use in one study and were not known to have been used again during the review period.

**RELIABILITY:** For the most part, reliability is described in terms of internal consistency, most typically with Cronbach's alpha. In rare cases, scale stability (test-retest correlations) is reported as well. For those scales which have had lots of uses (e.g., #59, #108), their reliabilities are summarized in general terms in this field and the reliabilities for each of the many individual uses are provided in the Scale Items field, as explained further below.

**VALIDITY:** Most studies did not report much if any helpful information regarding the various aspects of a scale's validity. At the other extreme, some scale authors provided so much information that it is only summarized in this field and readers are urged to see the article for more details.

**COMMENTS:** This field was only used occasionally when something significant was observed in reviewing and was deemed important to point out to potential users. For example, if something about the scale was judged to be seriously deficient then improvement is urged before further use of the scale is made. Also, when other studies were considered to be potentially relevant to the scale's usage but were not fully described in the review for some reason then they were cited as "see also."

**REFERENCES:** Every source cited in a review is referenced in this section using the *Journal of Marketing* style. Titles of the six primary journals which were reviewed and from which scales were taken (the review domain) are abbreviated as follows:

*Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* = *JAMS*

*Journal of Advertising* = *JA*

*Journal of Consumer Research* = *JCR*

*Journal of Marketing* = *JM*

*Journal of Marketing Research* = *JMR*

*Journal of Retailing* = *JR*

Titles of additional journals, books, proceedings, and other sources are written out in full. As stated in the Acknowledgements, in many cases the scale users themselves were contacted and provided information that helped with the description. Depending upon the extent of their assistance, they may have been cited as well.

**SCALE ITEMS:** The statements, adjectives, or questions composing a scale are listed in this field. Also, an indication of the response format is provided unless it has been adequately specified in the Scale Description section. Where an item is followed by an (r) it means that the numerical response should be reverse coded when calculating scale scores. Other idiosyncrasies may be noted as well. For example, when slightly different versions of the same scale are discussed in the same review then an indication is given as to which items were used in particular studies. Finally, for those few scales that have been used dozens of times (e.g., #59, #108), the reliability of the scale is indicated at the end of a line which also states who the authors were and which items were used from a larger set. If a study had more than two reliabilities for a scale due to multiple uses, then just the range is reported. However, if a scale has been described more than once in an article with slightly different sets of items then the reliability for each usage is reported separately.

---

**SCALE NAME: Abstractness**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four bi-polar adjectives are used to measure the degree to which a person perceives a stimulus to have a quality characteristic of a broader class of stimuli rather than one particular stimulus. Aggarwal and Law (2005) used the scale as a manipulation check to make sure two scenarios were similar in their levels of abstraction.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Aggarwal and Law (2005) said that they adapted their scale from work by Newell and Olejnik (1982-1983).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .86 (Study 1) and .81 (Study 3) were reported for the scale (Aggarwal and Law 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Aggarwal and Law (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Aggarwal, Pankaj and Sharmistha Law (2005), "Role of Relationship Norms in Processing Brand Information," *JCR*, 31 (June), 87-101.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. abstract / concrete
2. broad / detailed
3. general / specific
4. indirect / direct

## #2 Acceptability of Alternative Service Providers

### **SCALE NAME: Acceptability of Alternative Service Providers**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four item scale measures the extent to which a customer believes that there are alternative providers of a service, they are all about the same, and there is no point in switching.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Patterson and Smith (2003) received inspiration from previous study of this construct, the scale seems to be original to them. A two-country (two language), multi-stage process was used to develop and refine the measure.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Patterson and Smith (2003) reported alphas for three different types of service providers that ranged from .77 to .89 in Australia and from .77 to .84 in Thailand.

#### **VALIDITY:**

With the results of confirmatory factor analysis and other tests, Patterson and Smith (2003) provided support for the unidimensionality as well as the convergent and discriminant validities of their scales. Average variances extracted ranged from .61 to .65 in Australia and from .61 to .75 in Thailand.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Patterson, Paul G. and Tasman Smith (2003), "A Cross-Cultural Study of Switching Barriers and Propensity to Stay with Service Providers," *JR*, 79 (2), 107-120.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. All \_\_\_\_\_ are much the same, so it would not matter if I changed.
2. All \_\_\_\_\_ offer a similar range of services.
3. All things considered, most \_\_\_\_\_ are similar.
4. All \_\_\_\_\_ give a similar level of service.

---

<sup>1</sup> Details regarding the response format were not provided by Patterson and Smith (2003). It was likely to have been a five- or seven-point Likert-type response scale. The generic name for the type of service provider being studied should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Account Planner Evaluation (Awards)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, five-point items that are intended to measure the extent to which a person believes the job performance of advertising agency account planners is judged by the awards and media attention received for the advertising. There were two versions of the scale, one to measure the way planners are currently being evaluated and another to measure the way they should be evaluated.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Morrison and Haley (2003). Based on what little had been written regarding industry practice, the authors generated some scale items. There were two rounds of reviews by account planners which led to some rewording of items and a couple of items being added. A factor analysis of the main study's results led to parallel three-factor solutions for the "currently used" and the "should be used" versions.

**RELIABILITY:**

Morrison and Haley (2003) stated that the scale had alphas of .76 (currently used) and .80 (should be used).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond the exploratory factor analysis that showed these items loading together, no examination of the scale's validity was reported by Morrison and Haley (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Morrison, Margaret A. and Eric Haley (2003), "Account Planners Views on How Their Work Should Be Evaluated," *JA*, 32 (2), 7-16.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Planning awards
2. Creative awards
3. Other awards
4. Media coverage of the advertising

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stems used with the two versions of the scale were "How is work of planners currently being evaluated?" and "How should the work of planners be evaluated?"

#### #4 Account Planner Evaluation (Market Metrics)

### **SCALE NAME: Account Planner Evaluation (Market Metrics)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Eight, five-point items are used to measure the extent to which a person believes that standard measures that are primarily market-based are used to evaluate the job performance of advertising agency account planners. There were two versions of the scale, one to measure the way planners are currently being evaluated and another to measure the way they should be evaluated.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Morrison and Haley (2003). Based on what little had been written regarding industry practice, the authors generated some scale items. There were two rounds of reviews by account planners which led to some rewording of items and a couple of items being added. A factor analysis of the main study's results led to parallel three-factor solutions for the "currently used" and the "should be used" versions.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Morrison and Haley (2003) stated that the scale had alphas of .94 (currently used) and .91 (should be used).

#### **VALIDITY:**

Beyond the exploratory factor analyses that showed these items loading together, no examination of the scale's validity was reported by Morrison and Haley (2003).

#### **REFERENCES:**

Morrison, Margaret A. and Eric Haley (2003), "Account Planners Views on How Their Work Should Be Evaluated," *JA*, 32 (2), 7-16.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Target-market recall of advertising message
2. Target-market recall of advertisements
3. Target-market awareness of advertising
4. Target-market awareness of brand
5. Attitude change by target market toward product
6. Purchase intention of target market
7. Achievement of advertising objectives
8. Increased sales or market share

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stems used with the two versions of the scale were "How is work of planners currently being evaluated?" and "How should the work of planners be evaluated?"

**SCALE NAME: Account Planner Evaluation (Personal Feedback)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, five-point items and assesses the degree to which a person believes that feedback from agency personnel as well as from the client are used to evaluate the job performance of advertising agency account planners. There were two versions of the scale, one to measure the way planners are currently being evaluated and another to measure the way they should be evaluated.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Morrison and Haley (2003). Based on what little had been written regarding industry practice, the authors generated some scale items. There were two rounds of reviews by account planners which led to some rewording of items and a couple of items being added. A factor analysis of the main study's results led to parallel three-factor solutions for the "currently used" and the "should be used" versions.

**RELIABILITY:**

Morrison and Haley (2003) stated that the scale had alphas of .75 (currently used) and .82 (should be used).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond the exploratory factor analysis that showed these items loading together, no examination of the scale's validity was reported by Morrison and Haley (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Morrison, Margaret A. and Eric Haley (2003), "Account Planners Views on How Their Work Should Be Evaluated," *JA*, 32 (2), 7-16.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Feedback from the account team
2. Feedback from the creative team
3. Feedback from the client

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stems used with the two versions of the scale were "How is work of planners currently being evaluated?" and "How should the work of planners be evaluated?"

## #6 Accountability (Outcome)

### **SCALE NAME: Accountability (Outcome)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has four, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure how much a person places emphasis on the consequences of a decision being made rather than the process being used because of the belief that he/she is responsible for the former rather than the latter.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

No source for the scale was cited by Zhang and Mittal (2005) but it appears to be original to them.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

The alpha calculated for the scale was .71 (Zhang 2008; Zhang and Mittal 2005).

#### **VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Zhang and Mittal (2005). However, since the scale was successfully used as a manipulation check, that provides some limited evidence of its predictive validity.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Zhang, Yinlong (2008), Personal Correspondence.

Zhang, Yinlong and Vikas Mittal (2005), "Decision Difficulty: Effects of Procedural and Outcome Accountability," *JCR*, 32 (December), 465-472.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. When making this decision, I concentrated on the outcome of choosing.
2. I believed that I would have to explain the outcome of choosing to the researcher.<sup>1</sup>
3. I worried mostly about getting the correct decision outcome, not about the decision process.
4. I was concerned mostly about getting the correct decision outcome.

---

<sup>1</sup> To make this item more flexible for use in a variety of situations, the last two words could be replaced with something more relevant such as *my spouse, my friends, my employer, etc.*

**SCALE NAME: Accountability (Procedural)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, seven-point Likert-type items that are used to measure the degree to which a person places emphasis on the process of making a decision because of the belief he/she is responsible for the procedure used to make the decision rather than the outcome.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No source for the scale was cited by Zhang and Mittal (2005) but it appears to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .75 (Zhang 2008; Zhang and Mittal 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Zhang and Mittal (2005). However, since the scale was used as a manipulation check and was successful, that provides some limited evidence of its predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Zhang, Yinlong (2008), Personal Correspondence.

Zhang, Yinlong and Vikas Mittal (2005), "Decision Difficulty: Effects of Procedural and Outcome Accountability," *JCR*, 32 (December), 465-472.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. When making this decision, I concentrated on the process of choosing.
2. I believed that I would have to explain the process of choosing to the researcher.<sup>1</sup>
3. I worried mostly about using the correct decision process, not about the final outcome.
4. I was concerned mostly about using the correct decision process.

---

<sup>1</sup> To make this item more flexible for use in a variety of situations, the last two words could be replaced with something more relevant such as *my spouse, my friends, my employer, etc.*

## #8 Accountability Degree

### **SCALE NAME: Accountability Degree**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point items are used to measure the level of personal importance a person places on the outcome of a decision he/she is making.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Zhang and Mittal (2005) cited Lerner, Goldberg, and Tetlock (1998) as the source of the scale, no such scale is in their article. Thus, it appears Zhang and Mittal (2005) received some inspiration from the work of Lerner, Goldberg, and Tetlock (1998) but developed the scale themselves.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .70 (Zhang 2008; Zhang and Mittal 2005).

#### **VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Zhang and Mittal (2005). However, since the scale was used as a manipulation check and was successful, that provides some limited evidence of its predictive validity.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Lerner, Jennifer S., Julie H. Goldberg, and Philip E. Tetlock (1998), "Sober Second Thought: The Effects of Accountability, Anger, and Authoritarianism on Attributions of Responsibility," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24 (June), 563-74.
- Zhang, Yinlong (2008), Personal Correspondence.
- Zhang, Yinlong and Vikas Mittal (2005), "Decision Difficulty: Effects of Procedural and Outcome Accountability," *JCR*, 32 (December), 465-472.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. How much responsibility did you feel for the outcome of this decision?  
*very little/very much*
2. How concerned did you feel about the possibility of making a poor choice?  
*not at all concerned/very concerned*
3. How important is this decision to you?  
*very unimportant/very important*
4. How much will this decision affect you?  
*very little impact/very high impact*

**SCALE NAME: Achievement Importance**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, nine-point statements are used to assess the value placed by a person on personal success with an emphasis on demonstration of competence in accordance with social standards so as to gain social approval.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005) was derived from Schwartz (e.g., 1992). It is part of the Schwartz Value Survey which has been tested in many different countries and is intended to capture ten important human values. Due to the unconventional psychometric techniques used to develop the instrument, many issues regarding each scale's dimensionality and validity are worthy of further testing.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) was .725 (Burroughs 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002).

**COMMENTS:**

See also Richins (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.
- Richins, Marsha L. (2004), "The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form," *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.
- Schwartz, Shalom H. (1992), "Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, V. 25, Mark P. Zanna, ed., San Diego: Academic Press, Inc, 1-65.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> The same nine-point response scale and anchors were used by Schwartz (1992) and Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005). The directions shown here were recreated based on a description by Schwartz (1992, p. 17).

## #9 *Achievement Importance*

Directions: Rate each value listed below as a guiding principle in your life using the following nine-point scale: *opposed to my values* (-1), *not important* (0), (1 and 2, unlabeled), *important* (3), (4 and 5, unlabeled), *very important* (6), and *of supreme importance* (7).

1. SUCCESSFUL (achieving goals)
2. CAPABLE (competent, effective, efficient)
3. AMBITIOUS (hardworking, aspiring)
4. INFLUENTIAL (having an impact on people and events)
5. INTELLIGENT (logical, thinking)

**SCALE NAME: Action Tendency**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven point statements are used to measure the degree to which a person is resolved to take a particular course of action with regard to a certain decision.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Chandran and Morwitz (2005) appear to have adapted their scale from work by Gollwitzer and Kinney (1989).

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .89 (Chandran and Morwitz 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Chandran and Morwitz (2005) did not report any examination of the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Chandran, Sucharita and Vicki G. Morwitz (2005), "Effects of Participative Pricing on Consumers' Cognitions and Actions: A Goal Theoretic Perspective," *JCR*, 32 (September), 249-259.

Gollwitzer, Peter M. and Ronald F. Kinney (1989), "Effects of Deliberative and Implemental Mind-Sets on Illusion of Control," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56 (April), 531-542.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. How determined do you feel at the moment with respect to the decision on hand?  
*not at all determined / very determined*
2. How determined do you feel to a certain course of action?  
*not at all committed / very committed*
3. How prepared do you feel to use specific occasions or opportunities to act?  
*not at all prepared / very prepared*

**SCALE NAME: Ad-evoked Product Usage Thoughts**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three statements measuring how much the respondent reports thinking about personally using a product while watching a commercial in which the product is featured, particularly as it pertains to integrating the product into the daily routine.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the source of the scale was stated by Escalas and Luce (2004), thus, it would appear to have been developed by them.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alphas reported for the scale by Escalas and Luce (2004) were .86 (experiment 1) and .89 (experiment 2).

**VALIDITY:**

No explicit examination of the scale's validity was discussed by Escalas and Luce (2004). However, since the scale was used as a manipulation check, it is relevant to note that the manipulation was successful in two experiments conducted by the authors.

**REFERENCES:**

Escalas, Jennifer Edson and Mary Francis Luce (2004), "Understanding the Effects of Process-Focused versus Outcome-Focused Thought in Response to Advertising," *JCR*, 31 (September), 274-285.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. While viewing the ad, did you think about using the product on a daily basis?
2. While viewing the ad, how much did you think about the possibility of changing your current habits or behavior in order to use the product effectively?
3. While viewing the ad, how much did you think about incorporating the product into your daily routine?

---

<sup>1</sup> The extreme scale anchors were *not at all* and *very much*. The number of points on the response scale was not specified.

**SCALE NAME: Aesthetic Appeal of Interior Design**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The Likert-type scale measures the extent to which a consumer expresses a tendency to devote attention to design characteristics of some type of structure such as a store, mall, or office complex.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Bloch, Ridgway, and Dawson (1994) developed the scale as part of a study of shopping mall behaviors. Two pretests and a main study were used to purify their scales.

**RELIABILITY:**

Arnold and Reynolds (2003) reported .90 as the alpha they calculated for the scale. No information regarding the scale's reliability was reported by Bloch, Ridgway, and Dawson (1994).

**VALIDITY:**

Although Arnold and Reynolds (2003) did not directly examine the validity of this scale, they used it in the process of testing the nomological validity of some other scales. The factor analysis reported by Bloch, Ridgway, and Dawson (1994) shows that the four items loaded strongest on the same factor with no split-loadings, providing evidence in support of the scale's unidimensionality.

**REFERENCES:**

- Arnold, Mark J. and Kristy E. Reynolds (2003), "Hedonic Shopping Motivations," *JR*, 79 (2), 77-95.
- Bloch, Peter, Nancy Ridgway, and Scott Dawson (1994), "The Shopping Mall as Consumer Habitat," *JR*, 70 (1), 23-42.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The interior design of \_\_\_\_\_ usually attracts my attention.
2. I notice colors and textures in \_\_\_\_\_ interiors.
3. I notice things in \_\_\_\_\_ interiors and architecture that pass other people by.
4. Compared to most people, I pay less attention to the interior designs of \_\_\_\_\_.  
(r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The type of structure should be specified in the blanks, e.g., shopping malls. Bloch, Ridgway, and Dawson (1994) used all four items with a five-point Likert-type response format. Arnold and Reynolds (2003) used a seven-point Likert-type format and three of these items but, apart from #2, the identity of the other two items is unknown.

## #13 Aesthetic Evaluation

### **SCALE NAME: Aesthetic Evaluation**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has six, seven-point semantic differentials that are intended to measure the degree to which a person views something as being visually attractive.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Lam and Mukherjee (2005) was developed by Bell, Holbrook, and Solomon (1991). The latter reported the alpha of the scale to be .95.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Lam and Mukherjee (2005) reported composite reliabilities for the scale ranging from .96 to .97 for three different conditions for men's wear. For women's wear the reliabilities ranged from .95 to .97.

#### **VALIDITY:**

Evidence in support of the convergent and discriminant validities of the scale were provided by Lam and Mukherjee (2005). The average variance extracted ranged from .81 to .87 for the men's wear sample and .81 to .85 for the women's wear sample.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Bell, Stephen S., Morris B. Holbrook, and Michael R. Solomon (1991), "Combining Esthetic and Social Value to Explain preferences for Product Styles with the Incorporation of Personality and Ensemble Effect," *Journal of Social behavior and Personality*, 6 (6), 243-273.
- Lam, Shun Yin and Avinandan Mukherjee (2005), "The Effects of Merchandise Coordination and Juxtaposition on Consumers' Product Evaluation and Purchase Intention in Store-Based Retailing," *JR*, 81 (3), 231-250.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Offensive / enjoyable
2. Poor-looking / nice-looking
3. displeasing / pleasing
4. unattractive / attractive
5. bad appearance / good appearance
6. ugly / beautiful

**SCALE NAME: Affective Response (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three semantic differential items measuring one's affective response to some stimulus.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Kim, Allen, and Kardes (1996) as well as Kim, Lim, and Bhargava (1998) was borrowed from Stuart, Shimp, and Engle (1987). It appears the scale was original to the latter.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .95 (n = 90) was reported by Kim, Allen, and Kardes (1996). Alphas of .95 (n = 36) and .94 (n = 84) were reported by Kim, Lim, and Bhargava (1998) for use of the scale in study 1 and 2, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by either Kim, Allen, and Kardes (1996) or Kim, Lim, and Bhargava (1998).

**COMMENTS:**

See also Priluck and Till (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Kim, John, Chris T. Allen, and Frank R. Kardes (1996), "An Investigation of the Mediation Mechanisms Underlying Attitudinal Conditioning," *JMR*, 33 (August), 318-328.
- Kim, John, Jeen-Su Lim, and Mukesh Bhargava (1998), "The Role of Affect in Attitude Formation: A Classical Conditioning Approach," *JAMS*, 26 (2), 143-152.
- Priluck, Randi and Brian D. Till (2004), "The Role of Contingency Awareness, Involvement, and Need for Cognition in Attitude formation," *JAMS*, 32 (3), 329-344.
- Stuart, Elnora W., Terence A. Shimp, and Randall W. Engle (1987), "Classical Conditioning of Consumer Attitudes: Four Experiments in an Advertising Context," *JCR*, 14 (December), 334-349.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. unpleasant/pleasant
2. dislike very much/like very much
3. left me with a bad feeling/left me with a good feeling

---

<sup>1</sup> The number of points on the response scales used by Kim, Allen, and Kardes (1996) were not specified. Kim, Lim, and Bhargava (1998) used a seven point response format.

## #15 Affective Response (Negative)

### **SCALE NAME: Affective Response (Negative)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Various versions of the scale have been used to measure the degree of negative affect one has toward some specified stimulus. Some of the scales differ in their temporal instructions while others vary in the items used. The items can be used to measure one's mood state at a particular point in time or, at the other extreme, reference to a year's time may be used as something more like a trait measure of affect. Richins' (1991) version in particular is somewhat different in that it focuses just on a fear emotion rather than a broader negative affect. Similarly, Beatty and Ferrell (1998) were interested in the level of negative affect felt during a particular shopping trip and used a three item, seven-point version of the scale.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used in several of the studies (Dubé and Morgan 1996; Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer 2002; Lord, Lee, and Sauer 1994; Mano and Oliver 1993; Mano 1999) was developed by Watson, Clark, and Tellegen (1988). The ten negative items along with ten positive items comprise the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS). Sharing the same items, seven versions of the scale were tested varying in whether the time period of interest was "right now" or "during the last year." Alphas ranged from .84 to .87 using data from college students. Stability of each of these versions were tested using 101 students and with eight week intervals. The resulting test-retest correlations ranged from .39 to .71. A factor analysis of the ten positive and ten negative items indicated that the positive items all had high loadings (>.50) on the same factor. Evidence of the scale's validity was also provided. By design, the scales were supposed to be independent (uncorrelated) and the evidence bore this out.

Although Luce (1998; 2001) drew heavily upon the PANAS items she also added some descriptors of her own. She thought they would be especially relevant to the type of decision-making she was studying.

Richins (1997) drew terms from previous measures as well as her own series of studies to develop and refine several emotion-related scales into the CES (Consumption Emotion Set).

#### **RELIABILITY:**

The internal consistency of the scale based upon the studies in which it has been reported has been acceptable to very good ranging from .74 (Richins 1997, study 5) to .92 (Dubé and Morgan 1996).

#### **VALIDITY:**

Although all of the details were not provided in the study by Beatty and Ferrell (1998), the implication was that this scale was unidimensional and showed sufficient evidence of convergent and discriminant validity.

The two-dimensional structure of the positive and negative PANAS items was generally supported in the analysis by Dubé and Morgan (1996) as well as Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002).

Caution was urged by Mano (1999) in use of the scale due to the lack of evidence he found in support of a one-dimensional model.

Results of the study by Mano and Oliver (1993) showed how this scale correlates with many other emotion and satisfaction scales which could be used to support the discriminant and convergent validity of the scale. On the other hand, their data also showed that when 43 emotion-related items were factor analyzed the ten Negative PANAS items did not load together. However, eight of the items loaded together when the analysis was constrained to a two-factor solution.

Richins (1997) expended a great deal of effort in a creative use of MDS (multi-dimensional scaling) to note whether items composing each scale she was creating clustered together.

### COMMENTS:

See also Aggarwal (2004), Aggarwal and Law (2005), Garg, Inman, and Mittal (2005), as well as Shiv and Nowlis (2004).

### REFERENCES:

- Aggarwal, Pankaj (2004), "The Effects of Brand Relationship Norms on Consumer Attitudes and Behavior," *JCR*, 31 (June), 87-101.
- Aggarwal, Pankaj and Sharmistha Law (2005), "Role of Relationship Norms in Processing Brand Information," *JCR*, 31 (June), 87-101.
- Beatty, Sharon E. and M. Elizabeth Ferrell (1998), "Impulse Buying: Modeling Its Precursors," *JR*, 74 (2), 169-191.
- Dubé, Laurette and Michael S. Morgan (1996), "Trend Effects and Gender Differences in Retrospective Judgments of Consumption Emotions," *JCR*, 23 (September), 156-162.
- Ferraro, Rosellina, Baba Shiv and James R. Bettman (2005), "Let Us Eat and Drink, for Tomorrow We Shall Die: Effects of Morality Salience and Self-Esteem on Self-Regulation in Consumer Choice," *JCR*, 32 (June), 65-75.
- Garg, Nitika, J. Jeffrey Inman and Vikas Mittal (2005), "Incidental and Task-Related Affect: A Re-Inquiry and Extension of the Influence of Affect on Choice," *JCR*, 32 (June), 154-159.
- Keller, Punan Anand, Issac M. Lipkus, and Barbara K. Rimer (2002), "Depressive Realism and Health Risk Accuracy: The Negative Consequences of Positive Mood," *JCR*, 29 (June), 57-69.
- Lord, Kenneth R., Myung-Soo Lee, and Paul L. Sauer (1994), "Program Context Antecedents of Attitude toward Radio Commercials," *JAMS*, 22 (1), 3-15.
- Luce, Mary Frances, (2001), Personal Correspondence.
- Luce, Mary Frances (1998), "Choosing to Avoid: Coping With Negatively Emotion-Laden Consumer Decisions," *JCR*, 24 (March), 409-433.
- Mano, Haim (1999), "The Influence of Pre-Existing Negative Affect on Store Purchase Intentions," *JR*, 75 (2), 149-172.

## #15 Affective Response (Negative)

- Mano, Haim and Richard L. Oliver (1993), "Assessing the Dimensionality and Structure of the Consumption Experience: Evaluation, Feeling, and Satisfaction," *JCR*, 20 (December), 451-466.
- Richins, Marsha L. (1997), "Measuring Emotions in the Consumption Experience," *JCR*, 24 (September), 127-146.
- Shiv, Baba and Stephen M. Nowlis (2004), "The Effect of Distractions While Tasting a Food Sample: the Interplay of Informational and Affective Components in Subsequent Choice," *JCR*, 31 (December), 599-608.
- Watson, David, Lee Anna Clark, and Auke Tellegen (1988), "Development and Validation of Brief Measures of Positive and Negative Affect: The PANAS Scales," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54 (6), 1063-1070.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. scared
2. afraid
3. upset
4. distressed
5. jittery
6. nervous
7. ashamed
8. guilty
9. irritable
10. hostile
11. panicky
12. troubled
13. sad
14. worried
15. regretful
16. remorseful
17. angry
18. edgy
19. depressed
20. uncomfortable
21. uneasy
22. tense

Beatty and Ferrell (1998): 3, 4, 9 7-point [.76]

Dubé and Morgan (1996): 1-10 7-point [.92]

Ferraro, Shiv and Bettman (2005): 1-10 ?-point [.77]

Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002): 1-10 5-point [.82]

Lord, Lee, and Sauer (1994): 1-10 [.89]

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors for the scale used by Dubé and Morgan (1996) as well as Mano and Oliver (1993) were *not at all/very much*. Similarly, Richins (1997) used *not at all/strongly*. In contrast, Beatty and Ferrell (1998) used *disagree/agree*, Luce (1998) used *not well at all/extremely well*, and Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002) used *very slightly or not at all/extremely*.

*#15 Affective Response (Negative)*

Luce (1998): 1-10, 12-22 5-point [.91]

Mano (1999): 1-10 5-point [.86, .87]

Mano and Oliver (1993): 1-10 5-point [.87]

Richins (1997): 1, 2, 11 4-point [.74, .82]

## #16 Affective Response (Negative)

### **SCALE NAME: Affective Response (Negative)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has four, seven-point uni-polar items that are used to measure the extent to which a person experiences negative affect after exposure to some stimulus.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale used by Spangenberg et al. (2003) was not stated but its origin is Elliot and Devine (1994). The latter reported that the alpha was .75 for Experiment 1 and that it “exceeded .80” in Experiment 2.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale as used by Spangenberg et al. (2003) was .88.

#### **VALIDITY:**

The scale was used by Spangenberg et al. (2003) in a “separate study” (footnote 2, p. 54) that was apparently conducted to provide evidence of another scale’s (psychological discomfort) psychometric quality. In that study the negative affect scale was shown to have discriminant validity with respect to psychological discomfort and positive affect.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Elliot, Andrew J. and Patricia G. Devine (1994), “On the Motivational Nature of Cognitive Dissonance: Dissonance as Psychological Discomfort,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67 (September), 382-394.
- Spangenberg, Eric R., David E. Sprott, Bianca Grohmann, and Ronn J. Smith (2003), “Mass-Communicated Prediction Requests: Practical Application and Cognitive Dissonance Explanation for Self-Prophecy,” *JM*, 67 (July), 47-62.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. disappointed
2. annoyed
3. guilty
4. self-critical

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format used by Spangenberg et al. (2003) had the following anchors: *does not apply at all* (1) and *applies very much* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Affective Response (Negative)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The five item, seven-point Likert-type scale appears to measure a person's negative affective reaction to some specific stimulus.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Moorman, Neijens, and Smit (2002) although the items were drawn from various previous studies. The items shown below are abbreviated English translations; the actual items were statements in Dutch.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .81 was reported for the scale (Moorman, Neijens, and Smit 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not explicitly addressed by Moorman, Neijens, and Smit (2002). They did describe, however, how the items intended for this scale were factor analyzed (Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation) along with items intended to measure one's positive affective response to and involvement with a stimulus. The items shown below loaded strongly on the same dimension.

**REFERENCES:**

Moorman, Marjolein, Peter C. Neijens and Edith G. Smit (2002), "The Effects of Magazine-Induced Psychological Responses and Thematic Congruence on Memory and Attitude Toward the Ad in a Real-Life Setting," *JA*, 31 (4), 27-39.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. anger
2. agitation
3. annoying
4. disturbing
5. sadness

---

<sup>1</sup> Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement that these items described how they felt about the object using a seven-point scale anchored by *no agreement at all* (1) and *total agreement* (7).

## #18 Affective Response (Positive)

### **SCALE NAME: Affective Response (Positive)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The full version of the scale is composed of ten item, five point items and measure the degree of positive affect one has toward some specified stimulus. As noted below, several versions of the scale were created and tested which vary in their temporal instructions. Therefore, the items can be used to measure one's mood state at a particular point in time or, at the other extreme, reference to a year's time may be used as something more like a trait measure of affect. Depending upon the set of items used it may be more accurate to describe a scale as measuring arousal rather than affect *per se*.

A four item variation of the scale was used by Babin, Boles, and Darden (1995) and was referred to as *interest*. The three item subset used by Hung (2001) was referred to as *arousal*. Richins' (1997) version of the scale was composed of three, four-point items and was intended to capture the level of excitement a person felt during a consumption experience. Similarly, Beatty and Ferrell (1998) were interested in the level of positive affect felt during a particular shopping trip and used a four item, seven-point version of the scale.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Watson, Clark, and Tellegen (1988). The ten positive items along with ten negative items comprise the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS). Sharing the same items, seven versions of the scale were tested varying in whether the time period of interest was "right now" or "during the last year." Alphas ranged from .86 to .90 using data from college students. Stability of each of these versions were tested using 101 students and with eight week intervals. The resulting test-retest correlations ranged from .47 to .68. A factor analysis of the ten positive and ten negative items indicated that the positive items all had high loadings (>.50) on the same factor. Evidence of the scale's validity was also provided. By design, the scales were supposed to be independent (uncorrelated) and the evidence bore this out.

Babin, Boles, and Darden (1995) modified a scale developed by Holbrook and Batra (1988). The latter developed a three item scale to measure *activation* but the former added the item *interested* and viewed the scale as measuring "the extent to which one's system is energized with respect to allocating attention capacity" to some stimulus (p. 103).

Richins (1997) drew upon terms in previous measures as well as her own series of studies to develop and refine several emotion-related scales into the CES (Consumption Emotion Set).

#### **RELIABILITY:**

A wide range of internal consistency estimates have been reported for the scale and the various subsets of items that have been used. For example, the ten-item version of the scale has had alphas ranging from .74 (Ferraro, Shiv and Bettman 2005) to .93 (Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not specifically addressed in any of the studies conducted by Babin, Boles, and Darden (1995), Lord, Lee, and Sauer (1994), or Mano and Oliver (1993). Dubé and Morgan (1996) as well as Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002) stated that a factor analysis was conducted on this scale's items along with those for another scale (#015, Affective Response [Negative]) and revealed a two-factor structure. One item (*excited*) loaded on the other factor and was, presumably, dropped from the final version of the scale. Likewise, the analyses conducted by Hung (2001) on twelve items showed three items loaded together in a factor analysis and having an average variance extracted of .79.

Richins (1997) did not directly examine the validity of her scale either. A great deal of effort was expended, however, in a creative use of MDS (multi-dimensional scaling) to note whether items composing each scale clustered together.

Although all of the details were not provided in the study by Beatty and Ferrell (1998), the implication was that this scale was unidimensional and showed sufficient evidence of convergent and discriminant validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Kelley and Hoffman (1997), Aggarwal (2004), Aggarwal and Law (2005), and Shiv and Nowlis (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Aggarwal, Pankaj (2004), "The Effects of Brand Relationship Norms on Consumer Attitudes and Behavior," *JCR*, 31 (June), 87-101.
- Aggarwal, Pankaj and Sharmistha Law (2005), "Role of Relationship Norms in Processing Brand Information," *JCR*, 31 (June), 87-101.
- Babin, Barry J., James S. Boles, and William R. Darden (1995), "Salesperson Stereotypes, Consumer Emotions, and Their Impact on Information Processing," *JAMS*, 23 (Spring), 94-105.
- Beatty, Sharon E. and M. Elizabeth Ferrell (1998), "Impulse Buying: Modeling Its Precursors," *JR*, 74 (2), 169-191.
- Dubé, Laurette and Michael S. Morgan (1996), "Trend Effects and Gender Differences in Retrospective Judgments of Consumption Emotions," *JCR*, 23 (September), 156-162.
- Ferraro, Rosellina, Baba Shiv and James R. Bettman (2005), "Let Us Eat and Drink, for Tomorrow We Shall Die: Effects of Morality Salience and Self-Esteem on Self-Regulation in Consumer Choice," *JCR*, 32 (June), 65-75.
- Holbrook, Morris B. and Rajeev Batra (1988), "Toward a Standardized Emotional Profile (SEP) Useful in Measuring Responses to the Nonverbal Components of Advertising," in *Nonverbal Communication in Advertising*, Sidney Hecker and David W. Stewart Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 95-109.
- Hung, Kineta (2001), "Framing Meaning Perceptions with Music: The Case of Teaser Ads," *JA*, 30 (3), 39-49.

## #18 Affective Response (Positive)

- Keller, Punan Anand, Issac M. Lipkus, and Barbara K. Rimer (2002), "Depressive Realism and Health Risk Accuracy: The Negative Consequences of Positive Mood," *JCR*, 29 (June), 57-69.
- Kelley, Scott W. and K. Douglas Hoffman (1997), "An Investigation of Positive Affect, Prosocial Behaviors and Service Quality," *JR*, 73 (3), 407-427.
- Lord, Kenneth R., Myung-Soo Lee, and Paul L. Sauer (1994), "Program Context Antecedents of Attitude toward Radio Commercials," *JAMS*, 22 (1), 3-15.
- Mano, Haim (1999), "The Influence of Pre-Existing Negative Affect on Store Purchase Intentions," *JR*, 75 (2), 149-172.
- Mano, Hain and Richard L. Oliver (1993), "Assessing the Dimensionality and Structure of the Consumption Experience: Evaluation, Feeling, and Satisfaction," *JCR*, 20 (December), 451-466.
- Richins, Marsha L. (1997), "Measuring Emotions in the Consumption Experience," *JCR*, 24 (September), 127-146.
- Shiv, Baba and Stephen M. Nowlis (2004), "The Effect of Distractions While Tasting a Food Sample: the Interplay of Informational and Affective Components in Subsequent Choice," *JCR*, 31 (December), 599-608.
- Watson, David, Lee Anna Clark, and Auke Tellegen (1988), "Development and Validation of Brief Measures of Positive and Negative Affect: The PANAS Scales," *JA*, 54 (6), 1063-1070.

### SCALE ITEMS:

1. enthusiastic
2. interested
3. determined
4. excited
5. inspired
6. alert
7. active
8. strong
9. proud
10. attentive
11. aroused
12. thrilled

Babin, Boles, and Darden (1995): 2, 4, 7, 11 7-point [.77]

Beatty and Ferrell (1998): 1, 4, 5, 9 7-point [.82]

Dubé and Morgan (1996): 1-10 7-point [.88]

Ferraro, Shiv and Bettman (2005): 1-10 ?-point [.74]

Hung (2001): 4, 7, 11 7-point [.92]

Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002): 1-10 5-point [.93]

Lord, Lee, and Sauer (1994): 1-10 5-point [.78]

Mano (1999): 1-10 5-point [.86, .88]

Mano and Oliver (1993): 1-10 5-point [.90]

Richins (1997): 1, 4, 12 4-point [.88, .89]

**SCALE NAME: Affective Response (Positive)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point uni-polar items are used to measure the extent to which a person expresses experiencing a positive affective reaction to some stimulus.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale used by Spangenberg et al. (2003) was not stated but its origin is Elliot and Devine (1994). The latter reported that the alpha was .93 for Experiment 1 and that it “exceeded .80” in Experiment 2.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale as used by Spangenberg et al. (2003) was .94.

**VALIDITY:**

The scale was used by Spangenberg et al. (2003) in a “separate study” (footnote 2, p. 54) that was apparently conducted to provide evidence of another scale’s (psychological discomfort) psychometric quality. In that study the positive affect scale was shown to have discriminant validity with respect to psychological discomfort and negative affect.

**REFERENCES:**

- Elliot, Andrew J. and Patricia G. Devine (1994), “On the Motivational Nature of Cognitive Dissonance: Dissonance as Psychological Discomfort,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67 (September), 382-394.
- Spangenberg, Eric R., David E. Sprott, Bianca Grohmann, and Ronn J. Smith (2003), “Mass-Communicated Prediction Requests: Practical Application and Cognitive Dissonance Explanation for Self-Prophecy,” *JM*, 67 (July), 47-62.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. good
2. happy
3. optimistic
4. friendly

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format used by Spangenberg et al. (2003) had the following anchors: *does not apply at all* (1) and *applies very much* (7).

## #20 Affective Response (Positive)

### **SCALE NAME: Affective Response (Positive)**

### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The eight item, seven-point Likert-type scale appears to measure a person's positive affective reaction to some specific stimulus.

### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Moorman, Neijens, and Smit (2002) although the items were drawn from various previous studies. The items shown below are abbreviated English translations; the actual items were statements in Dutch.

### **RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .89 was reported for the scale (Moorman, Neijens, and Smit 2002).

### **VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not explicitly addressed by Moorman, Neijens, and Smit (2002). They did describe, however, how the scale was a combination of items originally intended for two different scales. Specifically, items for measuring a person's liking of an object (a magazine) were factor analyzed with items intended to measure one's affective response to and involvement with a stimulus. Items intended to form a *liking* scale did not load by themselves but instead loaded on three other dimensions. Ultimately, the scale used to measure a positive affective response included three items originally intended to measure *liking*. Since liking an object (*It is fun*) and one's affective reaction to the object (*I feel happy*) are related but distinct constructs, the content validity of the scale is suspect.

### **REFERENCES:**

Moorman, Marjolein, Peter C. Neijens and Edith G. Smit (2002), "The Effects of Magazine-Induced Psychological Responses and Thematic Congruence on Memory and Attitude Toward the Ad in a Real-Life Setting," *JA*, 31 (4), 27-39.

### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Fun
2. Entertaining
3. Amusing
4. Comfortable
5. Feeling good
6. Happy
7. Satisfaction
8. Joy

**SCALE NAME: Affective Response (Positive)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, nine-point Likert-type statements that are intended to measure the extent to which a person reports having a positive feeling at some point in time. Given that one of the key terms is “relieved,” the implication is that the scale may be most suited for situations where the person has just been involved in something that could have potentially been unpleasant.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Zhou and Soman (2003) did not explicitly state the origin of the scale but they seem to have developed it for use in their studies. They said that a “preliminary analysis” indicated that these items might produce an acceptable scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .72 was reported for the scale based on data from Study 2 (Zhou 2005; Zhou and Soman 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale’s validity was reported by Zhou and Soman (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Zhou, Rongrong (2005), Personal Correspondence.  
Zhou, Rongrong and Dilip Soman (2003), “Looking back: Exploring the Psychology of Queuing and the Effect of the Number of People Behind,” *JCR*, 29 (March), 517-530.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Directions: Please indicate your extent of agreement with each of the following phrases that describe how you feel at this point in time.<sup>1</sup>

1. I feel very calm.
2. I feel very happy.
3. I feel very relieved.

---

<sup>1</sup> These directions were provided by Zhou (2005).

## #22 Affective Response (Positive)

### **SCALE NAME: Affective Response (Positive)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure a person's description of an emotional reaction to some stimulus with an emphasis on the most intense pleasurable feelings, e.g., delight, ecstasy. The product examined by subjects in the Shiv and Nowlis (2004) study was ice cream while the focal stimulus used by Nowlis and Shiv (2005) was chocolate.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale seems to be original to Shiv and Nowlis (2004). It was used in Experiment 3. It was used by Nowlis and Shiv (2005) in their Experiments 3 and 4.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Shiv and Nowlis (2004) reported an alpha of .88 (n = 87) for the scale. The alphas reported by Nowlis and Shiv (2005) were .86 (n = 197) and .88 (n = 305).

#### **VALIDITY:**

No evidence of the scale's validity was reported by Shiv and Nowlis (2004) or Nowlis and Shiv (2005).

#### **REFERENCES:**

Nowlis, Stephen M. and Baba Shiv (2005), "The Influence of Consumer Distractions on the Effectiveness of Food-Sampling Programs," *JMR*, 42 (May), 157-168.  
Shiv, Baba and Stephen M. Nowlis (2004), "The Effect of Distractions While Tasting a Food Sample: the Interplay of Informational and Affective Components in Subsequent Choice," *JCR*, 31 (December), 599-608.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. very little pleasure / a lot of pleasure
2. very little joy / a lot of joy
3. very little delight / a lot of delight
4. very little ecstasy / a lot of ecstasy
5. very little gratification / a lot of gratification

**SCALE NAME: Affective Response to the Ad (Approval)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of nine, semantic differential phrases measuring a person's reaction to an ad he/she has been exposed to with the emphasis on the positive and/or pleasurable types of feelings that were experienced.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Bhat, Leigh, and Wardlow (1998) conducted a pretest that exposed students to the ads used in the main study and asked them to write down thoughts and emotions they experienced while viewing the ads. These comments were independently coded by two people as falling into twelve emotion categories. Two items were selected for representing each of the twelve emotions and were employed in the main study.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .893 was reported for the scale by Bhat, Leigh, and Wardlow (1998).

**VALIDITY:**

No explicit examination of the scale's validity was reported by Bhat, Leigh, and Wardlow (1998). However, the 24 feeling items (referred to under Origin above) were subjected to exploratory factor analysis. The nine items of this scale loaded high on the same factor and provides a sense of their unidimensionality.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Orth and Holancova (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Bhat, Subodh, Thomas W. Leigh, and Daniel L. Wardlow (1998), "The Effect of Consumer Prejudices on Ad Processing: Heterosexual Consumers' Responses to Homosexual Imagery in Ads," *JA*, 27 (4), 9-28.
- Orth, Ulrich R., and Denisa Holancova (2004), "Consumer Response to Sex Role Portrayals in Advertisements," *JA*, 32 (4), 77-89.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. not at all stimulated / very stimulated
2. not at all interested / very interested
3. not at all involved / very involved
4. not at all happy / very happy
5. not at all envious / very envious
6. not at all curious / very curious
7. not at all loving / very loving
8. not at all excited / very excited

*#23 Affective Response to the Ad (Approval)*

9. not at all wishful / very wishful

**SCALE NAME: Affective Response to the Ad (Disapproval)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of ten, semantic differential phrases measuring a person's reaction to an ad he/she has been exposed to with the emphasis on the negative types of feelings that were experienced.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Bhat, Leigh, and Wardlow (1998) conducted a pretest that exposed students to the ads used in the main study and asked them to write down thoughts and emotions they experienced while viewing the ads. These comments were independently coded by two people as falling into twelve emotion categories. Two items were selected for representing each of the twelve emotions and were employed in the main study.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .933 was reported for the scale by Bhat, Leigh, and Wardlow (1998).

**VALIDITY:**

No explicit examination of the scale's validity was reported by Bhat, Leigh, and Wardlow (1998). However, the 24 feeling items (referred to under Origin above) were subjected to exploratory factor analysis. The ten items of this scale loaded high on the same factor and provides a sense of their unidimensionality.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Orth and Holancova (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Bhat, Subodh, Thomas W. Leigh, and Daniel L. Wardlow (1998), "The Effect of Consumer Prejudices on Ad Processing: Heterosexual Consumers' Responses to Homosexual Imagery in Ads," *JA*, 27 (4), 9-28.
- Orth, Ulrich R., and Denisa Holancova (2004), "Consumer Response to Sex Role Portrayals in Advertisements," *JA*, 32 (4), 77-89.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. not at all skeptical / very skeptical
2. not at all disgusted / very disgusted
3. not at all contemptuous / very contemptuous
4. not at all angry / very angry
5. not at all distrustful / very distrustful
6. not at all irritated / very irritated
7. not at all uneasy / very uneasy
8. not at all scornful / very scornful

*#24 Affective Response to the Ad (Disapproval)*

- 9. not at all revolted / very revolted
- 10. not at all worried / very worried

**SCALE NAME: Affective Response to the Ad (Empathy)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five, seven-point items that are intended to measure the extent to which a person reports feeling what the characters in an advertising drama are feeling. This is not just an awareness of what the characters are feeling but absorption or “feeling into” another’s affective experience. Thus, although empathy is related to sympathy, this scale is intended to measure something different. The scale was referred to as *ad response empathy* by Escalas and Stern (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Escalas and Stern (2003) who argued that it was important to have separate measures of sympathy and empathy. Based on a literature review and several pretests they reduced an original set of items down to the ten tested in the article (five items for sympathy and five for empathy).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .95 (Experiment 1) and .96 (Experiment 2) were reported by Escalas and Stern (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

In addition to the analyses performed in the pretests, Escalas and Stern (2003) reported the results of confirmatory factor analyses in both experiments which provided evidence of each scale’s unidimensionality as well as their convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Escalas, Jennifer Edson and Barbara B. Stern (2003), “Sympathy and Empathy: Emotional Responses to Advertising Dramas,” *JCR*, 29 (March), 566-578.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Directions: For the television commercial you just saw, please rate how descriptive each of the following statements is of how you personally reacted to this ad.<sup>1</sup>

1. While watching the ad, I experienced feeling as if the events were really happening to me.
2. While watching the ad, I felt as though I were one of the characters.
3. While watching the ad, I felt as though the events in the ad were happening to me.
4. While watching the commercial, I experienced many of the same feelings that the characters portrayed.
5. While watching the commercial, I felt as if the characters' feelings were my own.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response scale was anchored by *not at all descriptive* and *very descriptive*.

## #26 *Affective Response to the Ad (Positive)*

### **SCALE NAME: Affective Response to the Ad (Positive)**

### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four-item, seven-point semantic differential measures the emotional reaction a person has to an object. The object in the studies using this scale was an advertisement.

### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not specifically stated, it would appear that the scale is original to Yi (1990).

### **RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .90 was reported by both Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003) and Yi (1990).

### **VALIDITY:**

No explicit examination of scale's validity was reported in any of the studies. However, because it was used as a manipulation check by Yi (1990) and showed the treatments were successful, it provides some support for the scale's predictive validity.

### **REFERENCES:**

- Cline, Thomas W., Moses B. Altsech and James J. Kellaris (2003), "When Does Humor Enhance or Inhibit As Responses: The Moderating Role of the Need for Humor," *JA*, 32 (3), 31-45.
- Yi, Youjae (1990), "Cognitive and Affective Priming Effects of the Context for Print Advertisements," *JA*, 19 (2), 40-48.

### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. extremely unhappy / extreme happy
2. uninteresting / interesting
3. dislike / like
4. not irritating / irritating

**SCALE NAME: Affective Response to the Ad (Positive)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven-point uni-polar terms are purported to evaluate the strength of a person's overall emotional reaction to an ad. The scale is apparently intended to measure the intensity of a global positive emotional reaction rather than a particular type of emotion.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Moore and Harris (1996) drew on the literature for their items, the scale as a whole appears to be original to their study. Williams and Drolet (2005) indicated that they drew items for their scale from Edell and Burke (1987). However, those items were part of two *different* scales measuring *different* constructs. Thus, using the items together as a set is original to Williams and Drolet (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

Three alphas were reported by Moore and Harris (1996): .90, .88, and .79 for positive emotion, negative emotion, and nonemotional ads, respectively. The alpha for the scale used by Williams and Drolet (2005) was .96.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by the authors of either study.

**REFERENCES:**

Edell, Julie E. and Marian C. Burke (1987), "The Power of Feelings in Understanding Advertising Effects," *JCR*, 14 (December), 421-33.

Moore, David J. and William D. Harris (1996), "Affect Intensity and the Consumer's Attitude Toward High Impact Emotional Advertising Appeals," *JA*, 25 (Summer), 37-50.

Williams, Patti and Aimee Drolet (2005), "Age-Related Differences in Response to Emotional Advertisements," *JCR*, 32 (December), 343-354.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

While exposed to the advertisement, how strongly did you feel \_\_\_\_\_?

1. Emotional
2. Happy
3. Joyous

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem is from Moore and Harris (1996). They used items #1-#8 and the verbal anchors for the response scale were *not at all* (1) and *very* (7). Williams and Drolet (2005) used items #2, #4, #6, #9, #10 and one similar to #3 (joyful). The verbal anchors for their scale were *not at all* and *extremely*.

*#27 Affective Response to the Ad (Positive)*

4. Warm
5. Moved
6. Touched
7. Sympathetic
8. Sad (r)
9. sentimental
10. delighted

**SCALE NAME: Affective Response to the Ad (Positive)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven, nine-point unipolar items are used to measure one's positive emotional reaction to a certain advertisement.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although drawing upon a variety of previous attitude scales, this particular set of items as applied to measurement of ad-evoked affect seems to be original to Ahluwalia and Burnkrant (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .87 was reported by Ahluwalia and Burnkrant (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Ahluwalia and Burnkrant (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Ahluwalia, Rohini and Robert E. Burnkrant (2004), "Answering Questions about Questions: A Persuasion Knowledge Perspective for Understanding the Effects of Rhetorical Questions," *JCR*, 31 (June), 26-42.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. sad (r)
2. frustrated (r)
3. cheerful
4. bad mood (r)
5. happy
6. good mood

**SCALE NAME: Affective Response to the Ad (Sympathy)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point items are used to assess the degree to which a viewer reports an awareness and understanding of what the characters in an advertising drama are feeling. This is in contrast to reporting that one actually feels what the characters are feeling. Thus, although sympathy is related to empathy, this scale is intended to measure something different. The scale was referred to as *ad response sympathy* by Escalas and Stern (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Escalas and Stern (2003) who argued that it was important to have separate measures of sympathy and empathy. Based on a literature review and several pretests they reduced an original set of items down to the ten tested in the article (five items for sympathy and five for empathy).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .88 (Experiment 1) and .89 (Experiment 2) were reported by Escalas and Stern (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

In addition to the analyses performed in the pretests, Escalas and Stern (2003) reported the results of confirmatory factor analyses in both experiments which provided evidence of each scale's unidimensionality as well as their convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Escalas, Jennifer Edson and Barbara B. Stern (2003), "Sympathy and Empathy: Emotional Responses to Advertising Dramas," *JCR*, 29 (March), 566-578.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Directions: For the television commercial you just saw, please rate how descriptive each of the following statements is of how you personally reacted to this ad.<sup>1</sup>

1. Based on what was happening in the commercial, I understood what the characters were feeling.
2. Based on what was happening in the commercial, I understood what was bothering the characters.
3. While watching the ad, I tried to understand the events as they occurred.
4. While watching the ad, I tried to understand the characters' motivation.
5. I was able to recognize the problems that the characters in the ad had.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response scale was anchored by *not at all descriptive* and *very descriptive*.

**SCALE NAME: Ambivalence of Product Evaluation**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, eleven point statements assessing the extent to which a person reports having mixed feelings in making some evaluation. As written, the items relate to a product evaluation but they seem to be amenable for adaptation to other types of evaluations.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Nowlis, Kahn, and Dhar (2002) adapted a measure by Priester and Petty (1996).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .92 was reported for the scale by Nowlis, Kahn, and Dhar (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Nowlis, Kahn, and Dhar (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

- Nowlis, Stephen M., Barbara E. Kahn and Ravi Dhar (2002), "Coping with Ambivalence: The Effect of Removing a Neutral Option on Consumer Attitude and Preference Judgments," *JCR*, 29 (December), 319-334.
- Priester, Joseph R. and Richard E. Petty (1996), "The Gradual Threshold Model of Ambivalence: Relating the Positive and Negative Bases of Attitudes to Subjective Ambivalence," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71 (September), 431-449.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How indecisive are you when evaluating these products?
2. How conflicted do you feel when evaluating these products?
3. How much mixed emotion do you feel when evaluating these products?

---

<sup>1</sup> The response scale used by Nowlis, Kahn, and Dhar (2002) had anchors ranging from *feel no indecision at all* (0) to *feel very indecisive* (10).

**SCALE NAME: Anger**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point items are used to assess a person's anger-related emotions. The directions and response scale can be worded so as to measure the intensity of the emotional state at the present time, or they can be adjusted to measure the frequency with which a person has experienced the emotional trait during some specified time period. One-word items were used in the studies by Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) and Westbrook and Oliver (1991) while phrases based on those same items were used by Allen, Machleit, and Kleine (1992).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The measure was developed by Izard (1977) and is part of the Differential Emotions Scale (DES II). The instrument was designed originally as a measure of a person's emotional "state" at a particular point in time, but adjustments in the instrument's instructions allow the same items to be used in the assessment of emotional experiences as perceived over a longer time period. The latter was viewed by Izard as measure of one's emotional "trait" (1977, p. 125). Test-retest reliability for the anger subscale of the DES II was reported to be .68 (n = 63) and item-factor correlations were .74 and above (Izard 1977, p. 126).

Beyond this evidence, several other studies have provided support for the validity of the scale, even in consumption settings (e.g., Westbrook 1987). The items in DES II were composed solely of one word. In contrast, the items in DES III are phrases describing the target emotion. They were developed by Izard, although the first published validity testing was conducted by Kotsch, Gerbing, and Schwartz (1982). A study by Allen, Machleit, and Marine (1988) provides some insight to the factor structure of both DES II and III. The results indicate that when presented with the other DES items, the anger items tended to load with other items such as sadness and disgust. Because of this, the scale may have low discriminant validity.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .89, .921, and .92 were calculated for the scale by Allen, Machleit, and Kleine (1992; Allen 1994), Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003), and Westbrook and Oliver (1991), respectively. Oliver (1993) reported alphas of .94 (n = 125) and .86 (n = 178).

**VALIDITY:**

Examination of the scale's validity was not reported in most of the studies. Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) did state that the items in their anger scale were analyzed using CFA along with some items composing a dissatisfaction scale (#271). A two-factor structure fit the data better than did the one factor model providing some evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Allen, Chris T. (1994), Personal Correspondence.
- Allen, Chris T., Karen A. Machleit, and Susan Schultz Kleine (1992), "A Comparison of Attitudes and Emotions as Predictors of Behavior at Diverse Levels of Behavioral Experience," *JCR*, 18 (March), 493-504.
- Allen, Chris T., Karen A. Machleit, and Susan S. Marine (1988), "On Assessing the Emotionality of Advertising Via Izard's Differential Emotions Scale," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 11, Tom Kinnear, ed. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 226-231.
- Bougie, Roger, Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2003), "Angry Customers Don't Come Back, They Get Back: The Experience and Behavioral Implications of Anger and Dissatisfaction in Services," *JAMS*, 31 (4), 377-393.
- Izard, Carroll E. (1977), *Human Emotions*, New York: Plenum Press.
- Kotsch, William E., Davis W. Gerbing, and Lynne E. Schwartz (1982), "The Construct Validity of the Differential Emotions Scale as Adapted for Children and Adolescents," in *Measuring Emotions in Infants and Children*, Carroll E. Izard, ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 251-278.
- Oliver, Richard L. (1993), "Cognitive, Affective, and Attribute Bases of the Satisfaction Response," *JCR*, 20 (December), 418-430.
- Westbrook, Robert A. (1987), "Product/Consumption-based Affective Responses and Postpurchase Processes," *JMR*, 24 (August), 258-270.
- Westbrook, Robert A. and Richard L. Oliver (1991), "The Dimensionality of Consumption Emotion Patterns and Consumer Satisfaction," *JCR*, 18 (June), 84-91.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

#### DES II

1. enraged
2. angry
3. mad

#### DES III

1. feel like screaming at somebody or banging on something
2. feel angry, irritated, annoyed
3. feel so mad you're about to blow up

---

<sup>1</sup> Here are some possible directions for the frequency version of the scale: "Below is a list of words that you can use to show how you feel. You can tell us how often you felt each of these feelings on the list by marking one of the numbers next to each question." The anchors that can be used with that version's response scale are *almost never* and *very often*. The directions for the intensity version of the scale could be: "Below is a list of words that you can use to show how you feel. You can tell us how strongly you feel each of these feelings on the list by marking one of the numbers next to each question." The anchors that can be used with that version's response scale are *very weak* and *very strong*.

**SCALE NAME: Anxiety**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree that a person indicates experiencing negative physiological and emotional symptoms, most likely as a reaction to stress.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Burroughs (Burroughs 2005; Burroughs and Rindfleisch 2002) is a slight adaptation of a scale developed by Lovibond and Lovibond (1995). The former phrased the items in the present tense while the latter phrased them in the past tense. Also, the former used a seven-point *agree disagree* response scale while the latter used a four-point response format ranging from *did not apply to me at all* to *applied to me very much or most of the time*. The seven-item scale is the short version of the fourteen-item anxiety subscale of a larger instrument called DASS (depression, anxiety, and stress scales).

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale as used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) was .86 ( $n \approx 373$ ).

**VALIDITY:**

Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) reported that the scale was negatively related to happiness and life satisfaction while being positively related to neuroticism, depression, and stress. This pattern of correlations along with general evidence from the LISREL analysis of all their measures provided evidence in support of the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.  
Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.  
Lovibond. P. F. and S. H. Lovibond (1995) (1995), "The Structure of Negative Emotional States: Comparison of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) with the Beck Depression and Anxiety Inventories," *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 33 (3), 335-343.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I am often aware of the action of my heart in the absence of physical exertion (e.g. heart racing, skipping a beat).
2. I often experience dryness in my mouth.
3. I often experience difficulty breathing (e.g. excessively rapid breathing, breathlessness in the absence of physical exertion).
4. I often experience trembling (e.g. in the hands).

5. I worry about situations in which I might panic and make a fool of myself.
6. I often feel close to panic.
7. I often feel scared without any good reason.

### #33 Anxiety (Technological)

#### **SCALE NAME: Anxiety (Technological)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a consumer expresses apprehension of technology and avoiding its usage. This construct is sometimes referred to by the more provocative term *technophobia* (e.g., Brosnan 1998; Rosen, Sears, and Weil 1987).

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Meuter et al. (2005) cited Raub (1981) as the source from which they adapted items.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .93 was reported by Meuter et al. (2005) for use of the scale in both of their studies.

#### **VALIDITY:**

At a general level, Meuter et al. (2005) tested a measurement model containing all of their constructs and indicators. Its fit was acceptable. The factor loadings were reported to be significant and evidence of discriminant validity was provided for each construct using two different tests (confidence interval, variance extracted).

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Brosnan, Mark J. (1998), *Technophobia: The Psychological Impact of Information Technology*, London: Routledge.
- Meuter, Matthew L., Mary Jo Bitner, Amy L. Ostrom, and Stephen W. Brown (2005), "Choosing Among Alternative Service Delivery Modes: An Investigation of Customer Trial of Self-Service Technologies," *JM*, 69 (April), 61-83.
- Raub, Annalyse Callahan (1981), "Correlates of Computer Anxiety in College Students," doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Rosen, Larry D., Deborah C. Sears, and Michelle M. Weil (1993), "Treating Technophobia: A Longitudinal Evaluation of the Computerphobia Reduction Program," *Computers in Human Behavior*, 9 (1), 27-50.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I feel apprehensive about using technology.
2. Technical terms sound like confusing jargon to me.
3. I have avoided technology because it is unfamiliar to me.
4. I hesitate to use most forms of technology for fear of making mistakes I cannot correct.

**SCALE NAME: Arousal****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is typically composed of six semantic differentials that are intended to measure one's arousal-related emotional reaction to some stimulus in the person's environment.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

This scale is taken from the work of Mehrabian and Russell (1974). Given previous work by others as well as their own research, they proposed that there are three factors which compose all emotional reactions to environmental stimuli. They referred to the three factors as pleasure, arousal, and dominance. A series of studies were used to develop measures of each factor. A study of the "final" set of items used 214 University of California undergraduates, each of whom used the scales to evaluate a different subset of six situations. (The analysis was based, therefore, on 1284 observations.) A principal components factor analysis with oblique rotation was used and the expected three factors emerged. Pleasure, arousal, and dominance explained 27%, 23%, and 14% of the available evidence, respectively. Scores on the pleasure scale had correlations of -0.07 and 0.03 with arousal and dominance, respectively. Dominance had a correlation of 0.18 with arousal.

**RELIABILITY:**

The following estimates of reliability (e.g., alpha) have been reported in the various studies: .77 (Donovan et al.1994); .73 (Fisher and Dubé 2005); .89 (Holbrook et al.1984); .81 (Kempf and Smith 1998); .83 (Mattila and Wirtz 2001); .82 (Neelamegham and Jain 1999); .97 (Olney, Holbrook, and Batra 1991); .96 (Simpson, Horton, and Brown 1996); and .87 and .86 (Wirtz, Matilla and Tan 2000). Alphas of .87 (pretest) and .96 (main study) were reported by Shapiro, MacInnis, and Park (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No explicit examination of the scale's validity was reported in most of the articles. Some evidence of the scale's unidimensionality came from a principal components factor analysis performed by Donovan et al.(1994) where all six of the arousal-related items loaded highest on the same dimension and low on one related to pleasure. Wirtz, Matilla and Tan (2000) performed a confirmatory factor analysis on this scale and a couple of others with the results providing some evidence of each scale's convergent and discriminant validity. Further evidence of the arousal scale's discriminant validity came from noting that its average variance extracted (.82) was higher than it was for the squared correlation between it and any of the other two constructs (Fornell and Larcker 1981). Some evidence of nomological validity came from noting, as expected from previous research, arousal was not related to satisfaction.

**COMMENTS:**

### #34 Arousal

As noted above, this scale was developed along with two other scales, dominance and pleasure. Although scored separately, they are typically used together in a study.

See also Havlena and Holbrook (1986), and Menon and Kahn (1995), Mitchell, Kahn, and Knasko (1995), and Morrin and Ratneshwar (2003).

#### REFERENCES:

- Donovan, Robert J., John R. Rossiter, Gilian Marcoolyn, and Andrew Nesdale (1994), "Store Atmosphere and Purchasing Behavior," *JA*, 70 (3), 283-294.
- Fisher, Robert J. and Laurette Dubé (2005), "Gender Differences in Responses to Emotional Advertising: A Social Desirability Perspective," *JCR*, 31 (March), 850-858.
- Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *JMR*, 18 (February), 39-50.
- Havlena, William J. and Morris B. Holbrook (1986), "The Varieties of Consumption Experience: Comparing Two Typologies of Emotion in Consumer Behavior," *JCR*, 13 (December), 394-404.
- Holbrook, Morris B., Robert W. Chestnut, Terence A. Oliva, and Eric A. Greenleaf (1984), "Play as a Consumption Experience: The Roles of Emotions, Performance, and Personality in the Enjoyment of Games," *JCR*, 11 (September), 728-739.
- Kempf, Deanna S. and Robert E. Smith (1998), "Consumer Processing of Product Trial and the Influence of Prior Advertising: A Structural Modeling Approach," *JMR*, 35 (August), 325-338.
- Mattila, Anna S. and Jochen Wirtz (2001), "Congruency of Scent and Music as a Driver of In-store Evaluations and Behaviour," *JR*, 77 (2), 273-289.
- Mehrabian, Albert and James A. Russel (1974), *An Approach to Environmental Psychology*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Menon, Satya and Barbara E. Kahn (1995), "The Impact of Context on Variety Seeking in Product Choices," *JCR*, 22 (December), 285-295.
- Mitchell, Deborah, Barbara E. Kahn, and Susan C. Knasko (1995), "There's Something in the Air: Effects of Congruent or Incongruent Ambient Odor on Consumer Decision Making," *JCR*, 22 (September), 229-238.
- Morrin, Maureen and S. Ratneshwar (2003), "Does it Make Sense to Use Scents to Enhance Brand Memory?" *JMR*, 40 (February), 10-25.
- Neelamegham, Ramya and Dipak Jain (1999), "Consumer Choice Process for Experience Goods: An Econometric Model and Analysis," *JMR*, 36 (August), 373-386.
- Olney, Thomas J., Morris B. Holbrook, and Rajeev Batra (1991), "Consumer Responses to Advertising: The Effects of Ad Content, Emotions, and Attitude toward the Ad on Viewing Time," *JCR*, 17 (March), 440-453.
- Shapiro, Stewart, Deborah J. MacInnis and C. Whan Park (2002), "Understanding Program-Induced Mood Effects: Decoupling Arousal from Valence," *JA*, 31 (4), 16-26.
- Simpson, Penny M., Steve Horton, and Gene Brown (1996), "Male Nudity in Advertisements: A Modified Replication and Extension of Gender and Product Effects," *JAMS*, 24 (Summer), 257-262.

Wirtz, Jochen, Anna S. Matilla and Rachel L.P. Tan (2000), "The Moderating Role of Target-Arousal on the Impact of Affect on Satisfaction-An Examination in the Context of Service Experience," *JR*, 76 (3), 347-365.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

Directions: Rate your emotions according to the way the \_\_\_\_\_ made you feel.

1. stimulated / relaxed
2. excited / calm
3. frenzied / sluggish
4. jittery / dull
5. wide-awake / sleepy
6. aroused / unaroused

---

<sup>1</sup> Most of the studies appear to have used a seven-point response scale. Also, all of the reported studies appear to have used the full set of items except for Kempf and Smith (1998) who just used items #1, #2, and #6, and Neelamegham and Jain (1999) as well as Fisher and Dubé (2005) who used #1-#3 and #6.

### #35 Attention to Ad (Message Relevance)

#### **SCALE NAME: Attention to Ad (Message Relevance)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A ten-item, seven-point Likert-type scale is used in measuring the relevance of the message or the information in the ad.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Laczniak and Muehling (1993) indicated that this scale was used previously by Andrews and Durvasula (1991). Muehling, Stoltman, and Grossbart (1990) indicated that this scale was adapted from Lastovicka (1983), Wells (1986), Wells, Leavitt, and McConville (1971), and Zaichkowsky (1985).

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Laczniak and Muehling (1993) reported a Cronbach's alpha of .96. Muehling, Stoltman, and Grossbart (1990) reported a Cronbach's alpha of .96. The variation of the scale used by Williams and Drolet (2005) had alphas of .92 (Experiment 1) and .90 (Experiment 2).

#### **VALIDITY:**

No examination of scale validity was reported.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Andrews, J. Craig and Srinivas Durvasula (1991), "Suggestions for Manipulating and Measuring Involvement in Advertising Message Content," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 18, Rebecca H. Holman and Michael R. Solomon, eds. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 194-201.
- Laczniak, Russell N. and Darrel D. Muehling (1993), "The Relationship Between Experimental Manipulations and Tests of Theory in an Advertising Message Involvement Context," *JA*, 22 (3), 59-74.
- Lastovicka, John L. (1983), "Convergent and Discriminant Validity of Television Commercial Rating Scales," *JA*, 12 (2), 14-23.
- Muehling, Darrel D., Jeffrey J. Stoltman, and Sanford Grossbart (1990), "The Impact of Comparative Advertising on Levels of Message Involvement," *JA*, 19 (4), 41-50.
- Wells, William D. (1986), "Three Useful Ideas," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 13, Richard J. Lutz, ed. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Association for Consumer Research, 9-11.
- Wells, William D., C. Leavitt, and M. McConville (1971), "A Reaction Profile for T.V. Commercials," *JAR*, 11 (6), 11-18.
- Williams, Patti and Aimee Drolet (2005), "Age-Related Differences in Response to Emotional Advertisements," *JCR*, 32 (December), 343-354.
- Zaichkowsky, Judith L. (1985), "Measuring the Involvement Construct," *JCR*, 12 (December), 341-352.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. . . . might be important to me.
2. . . . might be meaningful to me.
3. . . . might be “for me.”
4. . . . might be worth remembering.
5. . . . might be of value to me.
6. . . . might be relevant to my needs.
7. . . . might be useful to me.
8. . . . might be worth paying attention.
9. . . . might be interesting to me.
10. . . . would give me new ideas.

---

<sup>1</sup> As a scale stem, Lacznia and Muehling (1993) used the phrase “When I saw the ad for 35mm cameras, I felt the information in it . . .” whereas the version used by Muehling, Stoltman, and Grossbart (1990) used the phrase “When I saw the ad for personal cassette player with headphones, I felt the information in it . . . .” Williams and Drolet (2005) used items similar to #1, #2, and #6 with scale anchors being *not at all* and *very much*.

**SCALE NAME: Attention to the Ad (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of multiple statements using a seven-point response format to indicate the extent of cognitive resources a person indicates having devoted to an advertisement, the product in an ad, or a portion of an ad.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scales were originally developed by Laczniak, Muehling, and Grossbart (1989). Muehling, Stoltman, and Grossbart (1990) indicated that the scale had previously been used by Cohen (1983) and Mitchell (1979). They used two versions of the scale, the first version measuring the amount of attention paid to the written message in an ad while the second version measured the visual aspects of the ad. A slightly modified version of the scale was used with broadcast ads by Bucholz and Smith (1991) to measure the amount of attention paid to a computer. Laczniak and Muehling (1993) used the scale to measure the attention paid to the written message in an ad. Stevenson, Bruner, and Kumar (2000) adapted the scale slightly for use with a commercial run at a website.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .91, .95, .90, .94, .76 were reported for the versions of the scale used by Bruner and Kumar (2000), Bucholz and Smith (1991), Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003), Laczniak and Muehling (1993), and Stevenson, Bruner, and Kumar (2000), respectively. Muehling, Stoltman, and Grossbart (1990) reported alphas of .94 (written message) and .86 (visual aspects).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of scale validity was reported in any of the studies.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bruner II, Gordon C. and Anand Kumar (2000), "Web Commercials and Advertising Hierarchy-of-Effects," *JAR*, 40 (Jan-Apr), 35-42.
- Bucholz, Laura M. and Robert E. Smith (1991), "The Role of Consumer Involvement in Determining Cognitive Response to Broadcast Advertising," *JA*, 1 (20), 4-17.
- Cline, Thomas W., Moses B. Altsech and James J. Kellaris (2003), "When Does Humor Enhance or Inhibit As Responses: The Moderating Role of the Need for Humor," *JA*, 32 (3), 31-45.
- Laczniak, Russell N., Darrel D. Muehling, and Sanford Grossbart (1989), "Manipulating Message Involvement in Advertising Research," *JA*, 18 (2), 28-38.
- Laczniak, Russell N. and Darrel D. Muehling (1993), "The Relationship Between Experimental Manipulations and Tests of Theory in an Advertising Message Involvement Context," *JA*, 3 (22), 59-74.

- Moore, Robert S., Claire Allison Stammerjohan, and Robin A. Coulter (2005), "Banner Advertiser-Web Site Context Congruity and Color Effects on Attention and Attitudes," *JA*, 34 (2), 71-84.
- Muehling, Darrel D., Russell N. Laczniak, and Jeffrey J. Stoltman (1991), "The Moderating Effects of Ad Message Involvement: A Reassessment," *JA*, 20 (2), 29-38.
- Muehling, Darrel D., Jeffrey J. Stoltman, and Sanford Grossbart (1990), "The Impact of Comparative Advertising on Levels of Message Involvement," *JA*, 4 (19), 41-50.
- Stevenson, Julie, Gordon C. Bruner II, and Anand Kumar (2000), "Webpage Background and Viewer Attitudes," *JAR*, 40 (January/April), 29-34.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. How much attention did you pay to \_\_\_\_\_.
2. How much did you concentrate on \_\_\_\_\_.
3. How involved were you with \_\_\_\_\_.
4. How much thought did you put into evaluating \_\_\_\_\_.
5. How much did you notice \_\_\_\_\_.

Bruner and Kumar (2000): 1, 2, 5

Bucholz and Smith (1991): 1-5

Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003): 1, 2, 5

Laczniak and Muehling (1993): 1-5

Moore, Stammerjohan, and Coulter (2005): 1-5

Muehling, Stoltman, and Grossbart (1990): 1, 2, 5

Muehling, Stoltman, and Grossbart (1990): 1, 2, 5

Stevenson, Bruner, and Kumar (2000): 1, 2, 5

---

<sup>1</sup> Most if not all of the studies used verbal anchors on their response scales ranging from *none / not at all* to *very much*.

**SCALE NAME: Attention to the Commercials**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point statements that are intended to measure the extent to which a person was motivated to watch some ads during the commercial break of a certain program. Unlike some other measures of attention, this one focuses on the motivation to watch commercials in general during a certain show rather than one's attention to a particular ad.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Two of the items in the scale used by Jin (2004) were adapted from items in a scale by Speck and Elliot (1997). (See V.4, #522).

**RELIABILITY:**

Jin (2004) reported an alpha of .94 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Some limited evidence was mentioned by Jin (2004) in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Jin, Hyun Seung (2004), "Compounding Consumer Interest," *JA*, 32 (4), 29-41.  
Speck, Paul Surgi and Michael T. Elliot (1997), "Predictors of Advertising Avoidance in Print and Broadcast Media," *JA*, 26 (Fall), 61-76.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I did not want to leave the room during the commercial breaks because I did not want to miss the ads.
2. I did not want to change the channel during the commercial break because I wanted to watch the ads.
3. How much attention did you pay to the ads during \_\_\_\_\_?<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> A Likert-type response format (*strongly agree/strongly disagree*) was used with the first two items while the anchors for the last item were *not very much/very much*.

<sup>2</sup> The name of the show should be placed in the blank, e.g., the Super Bowl.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Strength**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, eleven-point semantic differentials are used to measure the intensity of a person's attitude towards some object. The response format used by Priester et al. (2004) ranged from 0 to 10.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated explicitly by Priester et al. (2004), the scale appears to have been developed by the authors for use in their studies. They said that the scale items were selected to reflect cognitive elaboration as well as its antecedents and consequences.

**RELIABILITY:**

Priester et al. (2004) reported an alpha of .92 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Priester et al. (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Priester, Joseph R., Dhananjay Nayakankuppam, Monique A. Fleming, and John Godek (2004), "The A<sup>2</sup>SC<sup>2</sup> Model: The Influence of Attitudes and Altitude Strength on Consideration and Choice," *JCR*, 30 (March), 574-587.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. not at all important / extremely important
2. not at all self-relevant / extremely self-relevant
3. not certain at all / extremely certain
4. have not thought about it at all / have thought about it a great deal

### #39 Attitude Toward Advertising (Role Portrayals)

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward Advertising (Role Portrayals)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has twelve, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure a consumer's perceptions of sex-role portrayals in advertising.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Ford and LaTour (1993) indicated that they adapted the scale from previous work by Lundstrom and Sciglimpaglia (1977).

**RELIABILITY:**

Cronbach's alpha was reported by Ford and LaTour (1993) to be greater than **.80**.

**VALIDITY:**

Ford and LaTour (1993) did not report examining the validity of the scale.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Orth and Holancova (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Ford, John B. and Michael LaTour (1993), "Differing Reactions to Female Role Portrayals in Advertising," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 33 (5), 43-52.
- Lundstrom, William J. and D. Sciglimpaglia (1977), "Sex Role Portrayals in Advertising," *JM*, 41 (3), 72-79.
- Orth, Ulrich R., and Denisa Holancova (2004), "Consumer Response to Sex Role Portrayals in Advertisements," *JA*, 32 (4), 77-89.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Ads which I see show women as they really are.
2. Ads suggest that women are fundamentally dependent upon men.
3. Ads which I see show men as they really are.
4. Ads treat women mainly as "sex objects."
5. Ads which I see accurately portray women in most of their daily activities.
6. Ads suggest that women make important decisions.
7. Ads which I see accurately portray men in most of their daily activities.
8. Ads suggest that women don't do important things.
9. Ads suggest that a woman's place is in the home.
10. I'm more sensitive to the portrayal of women in advertising than I used to be.
11. I find the portrayal of women in advertising to be offensive.
12. Overall, I believe that the portrayal of women in advertising is changing for the better.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward Advertising (Skepticism)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The nine item, five-point Likert-type scale measures a consumer's general disbelief of advertising claims. It is not intended to be specific to any one medium but, instead, to be a consumer's view of how the marketplace as a whole operates.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed in an admiral series of studies by Obermiller and Spangenberg (1998). In brief, evidence from the studies was provided in support of the scale's unidimensionality, internal consistency, temporal stability, content validity, nomological validity, and predictive validity.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .92 was reported for the scale by Hardesty, Carlson, and Bearden (2002). Obermiller, Spangenberg, and MacLachlan (2005) used the scale in three studies with the alphas ranging from .808 to .9226.

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond the evidence provided by Obermiller and Spangenberg (1998), Hardesty, Carlson, and Bearden (2002) provided evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity with a CFA of several measures used in their study. The results of the confirmatory factor analyses conducted on the scale by Obermiller, Spangenberg, and MacLachlan (2005) in their three studies did not show a good fit. However, it appears that was due to their very small samples sizes.

**REFERENCES:**

- Hardesty, David M., Jay P. Carlson, and William O. Bearden (2002), "Brand Familiarity and Invoice Price Effects on Consumer Evaluations: The Moderating Role of Skepticism Toward Advertising," *JA*, 31 (2), 1-15.
- 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.
- Obermiller, Carl, Eric Spangenberg, and Douglas L. MacLachlan (2005), "Ad Skepticism," *JA*, 34 (3), 7-17.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> As used by both Obermiller and Spangenberg (1998) as well as Hardesty, Carlson, and Bearden (2002), the response anchors were *strongly agree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (5). Given this, a higher score would suggest greater skepticism.

#### #40 *Attitude Toward Advertising (Skepticism)*

1. We can depend on getting the truth in most advertising.
2. Advertising's aim is to inform the consumer.
3. I believe advertising is informative.
4. Advertising is generally truthful.
5. Advertising is a reliable source of information about the quality and performance of products.
6. Advertising is truth well told.
7. In general, advertising presents a true picture of the product being advertised.
8. I feel I've been accurately informed after viewing most advertisements.
9. Most advertising provides consumers with essential information.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward Health Risk**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three item, seven point scale measures a person's concern about a particular health risk and motivation to be tested for it. The health risk examined by Menon, Block, and Ramanathan (2002) was hepatitis C.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not identified by Menon, Block, and Ramanathan (2002) but was probably developed by them for their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .83 was reported for the scale by Menon, Block, and Ramanathan (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was discussed in any of the studies.

**REFERENCES:**

Menon, Geeta, Lauren G. Block, and Suresh Ramanathan (2002), "We're At As Much Risk As We Are Led to Believe: Effects of Message Cues on Judgments of Health Risk," *JCR*, 28 (March), 533-549.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How concerned are you about \_\_\_\_\_?  
*Not at all / Very*
2. How interested are you in learning more about \_\_\_\_\_?  
*Not at all / Very*
3. Do you intend to be tested for \_\_\_\_\_?  
*Will definitely not / Will definitely*

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the particular health risk of concern should be placed in the blanks.

## #42 Attitude Toward Political Advertising (Negative)

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward Political Advertising (Negative)**

### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to assess a person's attitude about political campaigns with the emphasis on the degree to which political advertising and other campaign communications are negative.

### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Pinkleton, Um, and Austin (2002) implied that they drew their scale from previous work by the lead author (Pinkleton, Austin, and Fortman 1998). In the earlier work, the construct ended up being examined with two scales (campaigns and media); although the later scale draws some inspiration from them it is distinct from them.

### **RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .76 and .88 were reported for the scale as used by Pinkleton, Um, and Austin (2002) in a pretest and posttest, respectively.

### **VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Pinkleton, Um, and Austin (2002).

### **REFERENCES:**

- Pinkleton, Bruce E., Erica Weintraub Austin, and Kristine K.J. Fortman (1998), "Relationships of Media Use and Political Disaffection to Political Efficacy and Voting Behavior," *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 42 (Winter), 34-49.
- Pinkleton, Bruce E., Nam-Hyun Um, and Erica Weintraub Austin (2002), "An Exploration of the Effects of Negative Political Advertising on Political Decision Making," *JA*, 31 (1), 13-25.

### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Political campaigns are too mean-spirited.
2. Political campaigns are too negative.
3. It seems like political ads are *against* something more than they are *for* something.
4. Political advertising is too negative.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward Private Label Brands**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure a consumer's attitude about private distributor brands. Not only does the scale capture a consumer's opinion of the general quality level of private brands but it also provides a sense of the consumer's tendency to buy them or not.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to the study of Burton et al. (1998). They used the following definition of the construct when developing the scale, "a predisposition to respond in a favorable or unfavorable manner due to product evaluations, purchase evaluations, and/or self-evaluations associated with private label grocery products" (p. 298). Twelve items were generated based on this definition and were assessed in a pretest with 140 nonstudent respondents. After several rounds of factor analysis six items remained once weak items or, at the other extreme, redundant items were deleted. This set of items was then subjected to confirmatory factor analysis where it was confirmed to fit a one factor model. The alpha for the scale was .89.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .873 (n = 333) and .89 (n = 300) have been reported for the scale by Burton et al. (1998) and Garretson, Fisher, and Burton (2002), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

The purpose of the study by Burton et al. (1998) was to develop and test a scale of private label attitude. Given this, much information was provided in the article that supported the scale's validity, only a portion of which is mentioned here. Confirmatory factor analysis not only supported the unidimensionality of the items but provided evidence of their convergent validity as well. Three separate tests provided support for the scale's discriminate validity. By examining the relationship between the scale and measures of several other constructs with which it was hypothesized to be related, support was found for claims of the scale's nomological and predictive validity.

Garretson, Fisher, and Burton (2002) examined the scale along with the items for several other scales using confirmatory factor analysis. The acceptable fit of the model along with some other typical tests provided support for the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**COMMENTS:**

Based on data gathered in the main study, the mean score on the scale was 25.7 with a median of 26 and standard deviation of 7.5. Scores ranged between 6 and 42 with quartile splits at 21, 26, and 31.

Although the items do not explicitly refer to grocery products, they make the most sense in that context. Further, it was in that context that the items were tested. Further

### #43 *Attitude Toward Private Label Brands*

testing would be necessary to determine the appropriateness of the scale for use in a non-grocery product situation.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Burton, Scot, Donald R. Lichtenstein, Richard G. Netemeyer, and Judith A. Garretson (1998), "A Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward Private Label Products and an Examination of Its Psychological and Behavioral Correlates," *JAR*, 26 (4), 293-306.

Garretson, Judith A., Dan Fisher, and Scot Burton (2002), "Antecedents of Private Label Attitude and National Brand Promotion Attitude: Similarities and Differences," *JR*, 78 (2), 91-99.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Buying private label brands makes me feel good.
2. I love it when private label brands are available for the product categories I purchase.
3. For most product categories, the best buy is usually the private label brand.
4. In general, private label brands are poor-quality products. (r)
5. Considering the value for the money, I prefer private label brands to national brands.
6. When I buy a private label brand, I always feel that I am getting a good deal.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward Product Placement**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Fifteen statements are used to measure a viewer's attitude regarding the use (placement) of a branded products within the storyline of TV shows.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Eight of fifteen items were adapted for the TV context from two scales by Gupta and Gould (1997). The rest of the items were apparently written by Russell (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .80 was calculated for the scale (Russell 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Russell (2002).

**COMMENTS:**

Given that eight of the items in the scale were determined by Gupta and Gould (1997) as well as Gould, Gupta, and Grabner-Kräuter (2000) to belong to two different scales, the dimensionality of this even longer, more diverse set of items is in doubt. Further work is called for to determine if these fifteen items should be used as a set or more appropriately should be used in smaller, unidimensional subsets.

**REFERENCES:**

Russell, Cristel Antonia (2002), "Investigating the Effectiveness of Product Placements in Television Shows: The Role of Modality and Plot Connection Congruence on Brand Memory and Attitude," *JCR*, 29 (December), 306-318.  
Russell, Cristel Antonia (2005), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I hate seeing brand name products in TV shows if they are placed for commercial purposes. (r)
2. I don't mind if TV producers receive compensation from manufacturers for placing their brands in their shows.
3. It is highly unethical to influence a TV audience by using brand name products in TV shows. (r)
4. Manufacturers are misleading the audience by disguising brands as props in TV shows. (r)
5. The government should regulate the use of brand name products in TV shows. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> Reverse coding is necessary for some of these items before scale scores are calculated. Identification of which ones should be reverse coded was not noted by Russell (2002). Judgment has been used here to indicate the ones which are likely to require reversal.

#### *#44 Attitude Toward Product Placement*

6. I prefer to see real brands in TV shows rather than fake/fictitious brands.
7. TV shows should use fictitious brands rather than existing brands. (r)
8. The presence of brand name products in TV shows makes the program more realistic.
9. I don't mind if brand name products appear in TV shows.
10. The placement of brands in TV shows should be completely banned. (r)
11. TV shows should only contain those brands that are essential to a program's realism.  
(r)
12. I don't mind seeing brand name products in TV shows as long as they are not unrealistically shown.
13. I would consider using real brands as "commercials in disguise." (r)
14. TV viewers are subconsciously influenced by the brands they see in TV shows. (r)
15. I often buy brands I see TV characters using or holding in TV shows.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward Selling the Object**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point statements are used to measure a person's attitude regarding the sale of an object in his/her possession. The scale makes the most sense to use when the focal object potentially has some symbolic and/or emotional value to the respondent. McGraw, Tetlock, and Kristel (2003) called the scale *predicted stress* because the items (as shown below) were stated hypothetically. If desired, the sale could be easily adapted to become a more direct measure if the items are stated in the present tense, e.g., "I reject the idea as completely inappropriate."

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not explicitly stated, the scale seems to have been developed by McGraw, Tetlock, and Kristel (2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .79 was reported for the scale by McGraw, Tetlock, and Kristel (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by McGraw, Tetlock, and Kristel (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

McGraw, Peter A., Philip E. Tetlock and Ori V. Kristel (2003), "The Limits of Fungibility: Relational Schemata and the Value of Things," *JCR*, 30 (September), 219-229.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I would reject the idea as completely inappropriate.
2. I would be happy to sell the object at the right price. (r)
3. I would find the request strange or out of the ordinary.
4. I would be insulted by the offer to buy the object.
5. I would find it difficult to sell the object at the right price.

## #46 Attitude Toward Store Background Music

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward Store Background Music**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven point Likert-type items and measures a shopper's attitude about the appeal of the background music played in a store. Although the scale was described as measuring "the store ambient factor" in a couple of studies (Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman 1994; Baker, Levy, and Grewal 1992), it is clear from an examination of the items that only the music aspect of the retail atmosphere is being assessed.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Baker, Levy, and Grewal (1992), Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994), as well as Baker et al. (2002) was original to the 1992 study (Baker 1993).

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .91 and .90 were reported for the version of the scale used by Baker, Levy, and Grewal (1992) and Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994), respectively. Construct reliabilities of .90 (Study 1) and .87 (Study 2) were reported by Baker et al. (2002) for the version they used.

#### **VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not specifically addressed by Baker, Levy, and Grewal (1992) or Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994). However, a sense of the scale's unidimensionality is provided in Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994) where it is stated that the results of a principal components factor analysis conducted on items from this scale as well as two others supported a three factor solution. Baker et al. (2002) conducted several tests of their scales' discriminant validities. This particular scale showed evidence of discriminant validity in each test. Its average variance extracted was .75 (Study 1) and .70 (Study 2).

#### **COMMENTS:**

Some slight modification in the wording of the items might be necessary if the scale is used with actual shoppers who had been in a store rather than subjects simulating a shopping experience as in the studies cited here.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Baker, Julie (1993), Personal Correspondence.  
Baker, Julie, Dhruv Grewal, and A. Parasuraman (1994), "The Influence of Store Environment on Quality Inferences and Store Image," *JAMS*, 22 (4), 328-339.  
Baker, Julie, Michael Levy, and Dhruv Grewal (1992), "An Experimental Approach to Making Retail Store Environmental Decisions," *JR*, 68 (Winter), 445-460.

#### #46 Attitude Toward Store Background Music

Baker, Julie, A. Parasuraman, Dhruv Grewal, and Glenn B. Voss (2002), "The Influence of Multiple Store Environment Cues on Perceived Merchandise Value and Patronage Intentions," *JM*, 66 (April), 120-141.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The background music would make shopping in this store pleasant.
2. If I shopped at this store, the background music would bother me. (r)
3. The background music was appropriate.

## #47 Attitude Toward Teenage Smokers

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward Teenage Smokers**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of twelve, nine-point semantic differentials assessing a person's stereotypic beliefs about teenage smokers.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale appears to have been developed for the study reported by Pechmann and Knight (2002).

#### **RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .97 was reported for the scale by Pechmann and Knight (2002).

#### **VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Pechmann and Knight (2002).

#### **REFERENCES:**

Pechmann, Cornelia and Susan J. Knight (2002), "An Experimental Investigation of the Joint Effects of Advertising and Peers on Adolescents' Belief and Intentions about Cigarette Consumption," *JCR*, 29 (June), 5-19.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. fun / boring
2. well-liked / disliked
3. sexy / not sexy
4. desirable to date / undesirable to date
5. successful / unsuccessful
6. smart / dumb
7. intelligent / stupid
8. healthy / unhealthy
9. well / sickly
10. natural smelling / stinky
11. cool / uncool
12. winner / loser

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Act (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is characterized by several bi-polar adjectives presumed to measure the subject's overall evaluation of engaging in an activity. In most cases the "activity" is a hypothetical purchase or product usage situation the subject is asked to consider. In the study by Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005), it had to do with one's attitude toward switching service providers.

Theoretically, the construct is viewed as lying between *attitude-toward-the-object* and one's *behavioral intention* with respect to the object. Most of the versions of the scale discussed here have between three and five items. They are similar in that they have at least two or more items in common with several other versions in the set. Although most users did not describe the number of points on their scales, it appears that the majority employed seven point scales.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Oliver and Bearden (1985) cited Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) as the source of their scale. Although none of the other studies were as explicit in describing the origins of their measures, the overlap between their sets of items and those offered in Ajzen and Fishbein (1980, pp. 261, 262, and 267) is too similar to be coincidental. Two of the items below (#1 and #4) are also among the set of items recommended by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) for measuring the evaluative dimension of semantic judgment.

**RELIABILITY:**

Although estimates of internal consistency have ranged from .72 (Allen, Machleit, Kleine 1992) to .97 (Gardner, Mitchell, and Russo 1985) it appears that most versions of the scale have had reliabilities between .85 and .95. Estimates related to each usage are provided under Scale Items (below).

**VALIDITY:**

Bagozzi (1981, 1982) provided some evidence of convergent validity for his six item version of the scale. Bagozzi, Baumgartner, and Yi (1992) did make a general observation that all of their measures had an average variance extracted of over .50, with the mean being .74. Allen, Machleit, Kleine (1992) used LISREL to confirm their scale's unidimensionality. The scale was used by Shimp and Sharma (1987) to provide evidence of their CETSCALE's nomological validity.

Discriminant validity was assessed by Childers et al. (2001) using two different tests (the latent variable confidence interval tests and the  $\chi^2$  difference test). For both studies the evidence indicated that each scale they used, including *attitude*, was measuring a distinctive construct.

Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) used both exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis to refine the many scales in their study. Once some poorly loading items for other scales were eliminated, the model fit the data. They also provided

#### #48 Attitude Toward the Act (General)

further evidence of the scale's convergent validity based on factor loadings and squared multiple correlations.

#### COMMENTS:

See also Haugtvedt and Wegener (1994) for a variation on the scale as used to measure attitude toward implementation of a new graduation testing procedure and attitude toward building more nuclear power plants.

#### REFERENCES:

- Ajzen, Icek and Martin Fishbein (1980), *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*, Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Allen, Chris T., Karen A. Machleit, and Susan Schultz Kleine (1992), "A Comparison of Attitudes and Emotions as Predictors of Behavior at Diverse Levels of Behavioral Experience," *JCR*, 18 (March), 493-504.
- Bagozzi, Richard P. (1981), "Attitudes, Intentions, and Behavior: A Test of Some Key Hypotheses," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41 (4), 607-627.
- Bagozzi, Richard P. (1982), "A Field Investigation of Causal Relations Among Cognitions, Affect, Intentions, and Behavior," *JMR*, 19 (November), 562-584.
- Bagozzi, Richard P. (1994), Personal Correspondence.
- Bagozzi, Richard P., Hans Baumgartner, and Youjiae Yi (1992), "State versus Action Orientation and the Theory of Reasoned Action: An Application to Coupon Usage," *JCR*, 18 (March), 505-518.
- Bansal, Harvir S., Shirley F. Taylor, and Yannik St. James (2005), "'Migrating' to New Service Providers: Toward a Unifying Framework of Consumers' Switching Behaviors," *JAMS*, 33 (1), 96-115.
- Childers, Terry L., Christopher L. Carr, Joann Peck, and Stephen Carson (2001), "Hedonic and Utilitarian Motivations for Online Retail Shopping Behavior," *JR*, 77 (Winter), 511-535.
- Gardner, Meryl Paula, Andrew A. Mitchell, and J. Edward Russo (1985), "Low Involvement Strategies for Processing Advertisements," *JA*, 14 (2), 44-56.
- Grossbart, Sanford, Darrel D. Muehling, and Norman Kangun (1986), "Verbal and Visual References to Competition in Comparative Advertising," *JA*, 15 (1), 10-23.
- Hastak, Manoj (1990), "Does Retrospective Thought Measurement Influence Subsequent Measures of Cognitive Structure in an Advertising Context?" *JA*, 19 (3), 3-13.
- Haugtvedt, Curtis P. and Duane T. Wegener (1994), "Message Order Effects in Persuasion: An Attitude Strength Perspective," *JCR*, 21 (June), 205-218.
- Miniard, Paul W. and Joel B. Cohen (1983), "Modeling Personal and Normative Influences on Behavior," *JCR*, 10 (September), 169-180.
- Mitchell, Andrew A. (1986), "The Effect of Verbal and Visual Components of Advertisements on Brand Attitudes and Attitude Toward the Advertisement," *JCR*, 13 (June), 12-24.
- Mitchell, Andrew A. and Jerry C. Olson (1981), "Are Product Attribute Beliefs the Only Mediator of Advertising Effects on Brand Attitude?" *JMR*, 18 (August), 318-32.
- Muehling, Darrel D. (1987), "Comparative Advertising: The Influence of Attitude-Toward-The-Ad on Brand Evaluation," *JA*, 16 (4), 43-49.

- Netemeyer, Richard G. and William O. Bearden (1992), "A Comparative Analysis of Two Models of Behavioral Intention," *JAMS*, 20 (Winter), 49-59.
- Nysveen, Herbjørn, Per E. Pederson and Helge Thorbjørnsen (2005), "Intentions to Use Mobile Services: Antecedents and Cross-Service Comparisons," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 330-346.
- Oliver, Richard L. and William O. Bearden (1985), "Crossover Effects in the Theory of Reasoned Action: A Moderating Influence Attempt," *JCR*, 12 (December), 324-340.
- Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum (1957), *The Measurement of Meaning*, Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Raju, P. S. and Manoj Hastak (1983), "Pre-Trial Cognitive Effects of Cents-Off Coupons," *JA*, 12 (2), 24-33.
- Sawyer, Alan G. and Daniel J. Howard (1991), "Effects of Omitting Conclusions in Advertisements to Involved and Uninvolved Audiences," *JMR*, 28 (November), 467-474.
- Shimp, Terence A. and Subhash Sharma (1987), "Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of the CETSCALE," *JMR*, 24 (August), 280-289.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. bad / good
2. foolish / wise
3. harmful / beneficial
4. unpleasant / pleasant
5. unsafe / safe
6. punishing / rewarding
7. unsatisfactory / satisfactory
8. unfavorable / favorable
9. negative / positive
10. inferior / superior
11. poor /excellent
12. useless / useful
13. undesirable / desirable

Allen, Machleit, Kleine (1992): 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 [.72]

Bagozzi (1982): 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 [.95]

Bagozzi, Baumgartner, and Yi (1992; Bagozzi 1994): 1, 4, 8 [.86]

Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005): 1, 2, 3, 4, 12, 13 [.9523]

Childers et al. (2001): 1, 4, 10, 11 7-point [.89 & .93]

Gardner, Mitchell, and Russo (1985): 1, 2, 3 [.97]

Grossbart, Muehling, and Kangun (1986): 1, 2, 3 [.95]

Hastak (1990): 1, 2, 3, 4 [> .90]

Mitchell (1986): 1, 2, 3 [.85 and .88]

Mitchell and Olson (1981): 1, 2, 3 [.85]

---

<sup>1</sup> The items used in particular studies are indicated below with reference to the numbered bi-polar adjectives listed above. Scale reliabilities are shown in brackets.

#### *#48 Attitude Toward the Act (General)*

Muehling (1987): 1, 2, 3 [.90 and .95]

Netemeyer and Bearden (1992): 1, 2, 3 [.90 and .89]

Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005): 1, 2, 8, 9 [.93]

Oliver and Bearden (1985): 1, 2, 4 [.86]

Raju and Hastak (1983): 1, 2, 3, 4 [.87]

Sawyer and Howard (1991): 1, 7, 8, 9 [.96]

Shimp and Sharma (1987): 1, 2, 3 [.92 and .90]

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Act (Boycotting)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four statements that have a ten-point Likert-type response format are used to measure the degree to which a consumer expresses personal motivations to boycott a company, in particular, by not purchasing products made by the company. The scale was called *self-enhancement* by Klein, Smith, and John (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated explicitly by Klein, Smith, and John (2004), the scale appears to be original to their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

Klein, Smith, and John (2004) reported an alpha of .73 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Klein, Smith, and John (2004). However, the factor analysis they conducted of the items in this scale and three others provided evidence that each set of items was unidimensional.

**REFERENCES:**

Klein, Jill Gabrielle, Craig N. Smith, and Andrew John (2004), "Why We Boycott: Consumer Motivations for Boycott Participation," *JM*, 68 (July), 92-109.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I would feel guilty if I bought \_\_\_\_\_ products.
2. I would feel uncomfortable if other people who are boycotting saw me purchasing or consuming \_\_\_\_\_ products.
3. My friends/my family are encouraging me to boycott \_\_\_\_\_.
4. I feel better about myself if I boycott \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the company should be placed in the blank.

## #50 Attitude Toward the Act (Purchase)

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Act (Purchase)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, seven-point Likert-types statements that are used to measure the likelihood of someone buying a certain product if in the market for such a product. Although called *purchase intention* by Berens, Riel, and Bruggen (2005), it is viewed here as more a measure of attitude toward the act due to its hypothetical phrasing and the third item which has to do with *recommending* the product to another person.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Berens, Riel, and Bruggen (2005) cited Petroschius and Monroe (1987). (See V1, #25). However, comparing the two sets of items suggests that at most Berens, Riel, and Bruggen (2005) received inspiration from the earlier work rather than borrowing or adapting those items. Also, the scale items were apparently stated in Dutch when the data were collected.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .81 was reported for the scale (Berens, Riel, and Bruggen 2005).

#### **VALIDITY:**

While Berens, Riel, and Bruggen (2005) used confirmatory factor analysis to examine the total set of items they used, the statistics with respect to this scale were not reported. Even though there were problems with some other scales, this scale apparently performed adequately.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Berens, Guido, Cees B.M. van Riel, and Gerrit H. van Bruggen (2005), "Corporate Associations and Consumer Product Responses: the Moderating Role of Corporate Brand Dominance," *JM*, 69 (July), 35-48.
- Petroschius, Susan M. and Kent B. Monroe (1987), "Effect of Product-Line Pricing Characteristics on Product Evaluations," *JCR*, 13 (March), 511-519.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. If you were planning to buy a product of this type, would you choose this product?
2. Would you purchase this product?
3. If a friend were looking for a product of this type, would you advise him or her to purchase this product?

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Ad (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The six item, seven-point Likert-type scale seems to measure a person's reaction to an ad he/she has been exposed to.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

De Pelsmacker, Geuens and Anckaert (2002) cited previous work by two of the themselves as the source of the scale (De Pelsmacker, Decock, and Geuens 1998). As discussed below under Validity, the items composing this scale were part of a larger set thought to capture various aspects of one's attitude toward an ad. This set of six items was referred to as likeability although other facets are tapped into as well.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .9098 was reported for the scale (De Pelsmacker, Geuens and Anckaert 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not explicitly discussed by De Pelsmacker, Geuens and Anckaert (2002). They did indicate that an EFA was conducted of this scale's six items as well as several other items, all having something to do with attitude toward the ad. The authors noted that, as in their previous study (De Pelsmacker, Decock, and Geuens 1998), a three factor solution was found. The six items composing this scale loaded together and were called "likeability" while the other two dimensions (with two items a piece) were described as "clarity" and "informativeness."

**COMMENTS:**

The scale was originally phrased in Dutch but was translated into English for purposes of publication (De Pelsmacker 2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- De Pelsmacker, Patrick (2004), Personal Correspondence.
- De Pelsmacker, Patrick, Ben Decock, and Maggie Geuens (1998), "Advertising Characteristics and the Attitude Toward the Ad – A Study of 100 Likeable TV Commercials," *Marketing and Research Today*, 27 (4), 166-179.
- De Pelsmacker, Patrick, Maggie Geuens, and Pascal Anckaert (2002), "Media Context and Advertising Effectiveness: The Role of Context Appreciation and Context/Ad Similarity," *JA*, 31 (2), 49-61.

*#51 Attitude Toward the Ad (General)*

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

While watching/looking at this commercial/advertisement . . .

1. I got a positive impression.
2. I found it really something for me.
3. I found it interesting.
4. I found it credible.
5. I found it exaggerated.(r)
6. I found it attractive.

---

<sup>1</sup> The items were provided by De Pelsmacker (2004). Depending upon the type of ad the subjects saw (TV vs. magazine), the phrasing of the scale stem must change slightly.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Ad (Affective)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Most of these scales grouped here consist of various bi-polar adjectives presumed to measure more of the *affective* component of a person's attitude about a particular advertisement as opposed to the cognitive component. Some of these scales were part of a pair used together to measure the cognitive and affective components of a person's attitude. Some of the scales were developed with the apparent notion that they were general evaluative measures. However, the work done by Bruner (1995, 1998) suggests that they have more in common with measures of the *affective* component than they do with general evaluative measures. Work conducted by Petty (Crites, Fabrigar, and Petty 1994; Petty, Wegener, and Fabrigar 1997) supports the notion of separately measuring the affective, cognitive, and general evaluative aspects of attitudes. The majority of the scales described below used bi-polar adjectives but a few (e.g., Stafford 1998; Stafford, Stafford, and Day 2002) built simple Likert-type statements using key positive adjectives.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of most of the scales is unclear because most authors did not specify their origin. However, using methods described by Bruner (1995, 1998), a large portion, maybe as much as half, appear to be original with the remaining being either borrowed or modified from previous research. In a general sense, the basis for these scales can be traced to the work with semantic differentials pioneered by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957). Another source used by several authors, especially those who have wanted to measure both the affective and cognitive components of an attitude, is Baker and Churchill (1977).

**RELIABILITY:**

The internal consistencies reported for the various versions of the scale have ranged from .75 (Petroshius and Crocker (1989) to .95 (Olney, Holbrook, and Batra 1991).

**VALIDITY:**

Little validity information was provided, per se, in most of the studies. Petroshius and Crocker (1989) used factor analysis as a reliability check, noting that the affective and cognitive components in attitude toward the ad comprised 56% of the variance. Janiszewski (1988) reported unidimensionality (ML Confirmatory analysis) and support for an assumption of independence of errors in measure. Zinkhan and Zinkhan (1985) used factor analysis to reduce the items in the Response Profile (Schlinger 1979) to four semantic differential scales applicable to print ads for financial services.

**COMMENTS:**

## #52 Attitude Toward the Ad (Affective)

See also Leong, Ang, and Tham (1996) and Zinkhan and Zinkhan (1985). Also, five of the adjectives listed below were used by Chang (2004) but in a uni-polar format rather than a semantic-differential.

### REFERENCES:

- Baker, Michael J. and Gilbert A. Churchill (1977), "The Impact of Physically Attractive Models on Advertising Evaluations," *JMR*, 14 (November), 538-555.
- Bruner II, Gordon C. (1995), "The Psychometric Quality of Aad Scales," Office of Scale Research Technical Report #9501, Dept. of Marketing, Southern Illinois University.
- Bruner II, Gordon C. (1998), "Standardization & Justification: Do Aad Scales Measure Up," *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 20 (Spring), 1-18.
- Burton Scot and Donald R. Lichtenstein (1988), "The Effect of Ad Claims and Ad Context on Attitude Toward the Advertisement," *JA*, 17 (1), 3-11.
- Chang, Chingching (2004), "The Interplay of Product Class Knowledge And Trial Experience In Attitude Formation," *JA*, 33 (1), 83-92.
- 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 (December), 619-634.
- Janiszewski, Chris (1988), "Preconscious Processing Effects: The Independence of Attitude Formation and Conscious Thought," *JCR*, 15 (September), 199-209.
- Kilbourne, William E., Scott Painton and Danny Ridley (1985), "The Effect of Sexual Embedding on Responses to Magazine Advertisements," *JA*, 14 (2), 48-56.
- Kilbourne, William E. (1986), "An Exploratory Study of the Effect of Sex Role Stereotyping on Attitudes Toward Magazine Advertisements," *JAMS*, 14 (Winter), 43-46.
- Krishnamurthy, Parthasarathy and Anuradha Sivaraman (2002), "Counterfactual Thinking and Advertising Responses," *JCR*, 28 (March), 650-658.
- Laczniak, Russell N., and Darrel D. Muehling (1993), "The Relationship Between Experimental Manipulations and Tests of Theory in an Advertising Message Involvement Context," *JA*, 22 (3), 59-74.
- Leong, Siew Meng, Swee Hoon Ang, and Lai Leng Tham (1996), "Increasing Brand Name Recall in Print Advertising Among Asian Consumers," *JA*, 25 (Summer), 65-81.
- McQuarrie, Edward F. and David G. Mick (1992), "On Resonance: A Critical Pluralistic Inquiry into Advertising Rhetoric," *JCR*, 19 (September), 180-197.
- McQuarrie, Edward F. and David G. Mick (1999), "Visual Rhetoric in Advertising: Text-Interpretive, Experimental, and Reader-Response Analyses," *JCR*, 26 (June), 37-54.
- McQuarrie, Edward F. and David Glen Mick (2003), "Visual and Verbal Rhetorical Figures under Directed Processing versus Incidental Exposure to Advertising," *JCR*, 29 (March), 579-587.
- Okechuku, Chike and Gongrong Wang (1988), "The Effectiveness of Chinese Print Advertisements in North America," *JAR*, 28 (October/November), 25-34.
- Olney, Thomas J., Morris B. Holbrook, and Rajeev Batra (1991), "Consumer Responses to Advertising: The Effects of Ad Content, Emotions, and Attitude toward the Ad on Viewing Time," *JCR*, 17 (March), 440-453.

- Perrien, Jean, Christian Dussart and Francoise Paul (1985), "Advertisers and the Factual Content of Advertising," *JA*, 14 (1), 30-35, 53.
- Petroshius, Susan M. and Kenneth E. Crocker (1989), "An Empirical Analysis of Spokesperson Characteristics on Advertisement and Product Evaluations," *JAMS*, 17 (Summer), 217-225.
- Petty, Richard E., Duane T. Wegener, and Leandre R. Fabrigar (1997), "Attitudes and Attitude Change," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48, 609-647.
- Pham, Michel Tuan and Tamar Avnet (2004), "Ideals and Oughts and the Reliance on Affect versus Substance in Persuasion," *JCR*, 30 (March), 503-518.
- Rosenberg, Edward, Rik Pieters, and Michel Wedel (1997), "Visual Attention to Advertising: A Segment-Level Analysis," *JCR*, 24 (December), 305-314.
- Schlinger, Mary Jane (1979), "A Profile of Responses to Commercials," *JAR*, 19 (2), 37-46.
- Sorescu, Alina B. and Betsy D. Gelb (2000), "Negative Competitive Advertising: Evidence Favoring Fine-Tuning," *JA*, 29 (Winter), 25-40.
- Stafford, Marla Royne (1998), "Advertising Sex-Typed Services: The Effects of Sex, Service Type, and Employee Type on Consumer Attitudes," *JA*, 27 (2), 65-82.
- Stafford, Marla Royne, Thomas F. Stafford and Ellen Day (2002), "A Contingency Approach: The Effects of Spokesperson Type and Service Type on Service Advertising Perceptions," *JA*, 31 (2), 17-34.
- Zhang, Yong (1996), "Responses to Humorous Advertising: The Moderating Effect of Need for Cognition," *JA*, 25 (Spring), 15-32.
- Zhang, Yong and Betsy D. Gelb (1996), "Matching Advertising Appeals to Culture: The Influence of Products' Use Conditions," *JA*, 25 (Fall), 29-46.
- Zinkhan, George M. and Christian F. Zinkhan (1985), "Response Profiles and Choice Behavior: An Application to Financial Services," *JA*, 14 (3), 39-51, 66.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. good / bad
2. not irritating / irritating
3. interesting / boring
4. appealing / unappealing
5. impressive / unimpressive
6. attractive / unattractive
7. eye-catching / not eye-catching
8. pleasant / unpleasant
9. likable / unlikable
10. soothing / not soothing
11. warm hearted / cold hearted

---

<sup>1</sup> Scale items used in specific studies are listed below with indication whether item sums or means were used in the research analysis. The number of response points used for a scale is noted if known. Although two studies may be shown below to have used one or more of the same items it should not automatically be concluded that the items were exactly the same. Judgment was used to determine when a bi-polar adjective was similar to one used before or when it was unique. Slight differences in the bi-polar adjectives used such as *extremely good* versus *good* and *uninteresting* versus *not interesting* were counted the same for purposes of the list here.

*#52 Attitude Toward the Ad (Affective)*

12. uplifting / depressing
13. affectionate / not affectionate
14. dynamic / dull
15. refreshing / depressing
16. enjoyable / not enjoyable
17. worth watching / not worth watching
18. beautiful / ugly
19. entertaining / not entertaining
20. agreeable / disagreeable

Burton and Lichtenstein (1988): 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13 9-point [.86]

Janiszewski (1988): 1, 4, 6, 8, 9 9-point [.91, .93]

Kilbourne (1986): 4, 5, 6 7-point [.88]

Kilbourne, Painton and Ridley (1985): 4, 5, 6 [.77]

Krishnamurthy and Sivaraman (2002): 1, 8, 9\*, 16 [.94]

Laczniak and Muehling (1993): 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16 7-point [.93]

McQuarrie and Mick (1992): 8, 9,\* 16\* 7-point [.92]

McQuarrie and Mick (1999): 8, 9,\* 16\* [.90]

McQuarrie and Mick (2003): 8, 9,\* 16\* [.91]

Okechuku and Wang (1988): 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 [.88, .86]

Olney, Holbrook, and Batra (1991): 8, 16, 17, 19 [.95]

Perrien, Dussart and Paul (1985): 3, 6, 8, 20 7-point [.80]

Petroshius and Crocker (1989): 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 7-point [.75-.87]

Pham and Avnet (2004): 3\*, 4\*, 8\*, 16\* 7-point [.93]

Rosenberg, Pieters, and Wedel (1997): 1, 6, 17 5-point [.77]

Sorescu and Gelb (2000): 1, 9\*, 16, 18 7-point [.88, .92]

Stafford (1998): 4, 5, 6, 7 7-point Likert-type [.87]

Stafford, Stafford, and Day (2002): 4, 5, 6, 7 7-point Likert-type [.85]

Zhang (1996): 2, 3, 8, 9 9-point [.92]

Zhang and Gelb (1996): 2, 3, 8, 9 9-point [.92]

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Ad (Affective)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure the degree to which a person describes an ad as stimulatingly pleasing.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Pham and Avnet (2004) but it appears to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .80 was reported for the scale by Pham and Avnet (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Pham and Avnet (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Pham, Michel Tuan and Tamar Avnet (2004), "Ideals and Oughts and the Reliance on Affect versus Substance in Persuasion," *JCR*, 30 (March), 503-518.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. catchy / not catchy
2. appeals to me / doesn't appeal to me
3. excites me / doesn't excite me

## #54 Attitude Toward the Ad (Believability)

**SCALE NAME:** Attitude Toward the Ad (Believability)

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of ten, seven-point, bi-polar adjectives measuring a person's attitude about a specific advertisement with an emphasis on the credibility and likelihood of it being true. An abbreviated, three-item version of the scale was used by Kukar-Kinney and Walters (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was created by Beltramini (1982, p.1) to provide researchers with a way to measure the "extent to which an advertisement is capable of evoking confidence in its truthfulness to render it acceptable to consumers." An initial pool of items was generated and then reduced through pretesting to ten scale items and five distracter items. The scale was tested on three ads and the alphas were all above .93. Some evidence was cited in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validity but it would not be considered strong evidence by current standards.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .90 and .97 were reported for the scale by Beltramini (1988) and Beltramini and Stafford (1993), respectively. O'Cass used the scale to measure the believability of two political campaigns, both times producing alphas of .96. The short version of the scale used by Kukar-Kinney and Walters (2003) had an alpha of .86.

**VALIDITY:**

O'Cass claimed evidence for the scale's discriminant validity using a simple but less popular technique (Gaski 1984) whereby the internal consistency of a scale is compared to its correlations with every other scale in a study. To the extent that the internal consistency is higher than the correlations then some evidence for discriminant validity is shown. O'Cass implied that the believability scale successfully met this criterion.

Evidence from the confirmatory factor analysis of the measurement model used by Kukar-Kinney and Walters (2003) provided evidence in support of the abbreviated scale's discriminant validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Beltramini and Evans (1985).

**REFERENCES:**

Beltramini, Richard F. (1982), "Advertising Perceived Believability Scale," in *Proceedings of the Southwest Marketing Association*, Daniel R. Corrigan, Frederic B.

## #54 Attitude Toward the Ad (Believability)

- Kraft, and Robert H. Ross. Cape Girardeau, MO: Southeast Missouri State University, 1-3.
- Beltramini, Richard F. (1988), "Perceived Believability of Warner Label Information Presented in Cigarette Advertising," *JA*, 17 (1), 26-32.
- Beltramini, Richard F. and Kenneth R. Evans (1985), "Perceived Believability of Research Results Information in Advertising," *JA*, 14 (3), 18-24, 31.
- Beltramini, Richard F. and Edwin R. Stafford (1993), "Comprehension and Perceived Believability of Seals of Approval Information in Advertising," *JA*, 22 (3), 3-13.
- Gaski, John (1984), "The Theory of Power and Conflict in Channels of Distribution," *JM*, 48 (Summer), 9-29.
- Kukar-Kinney, Monika and Rockney G. Walters (2003), "Consumer Perceptions of Refund Depth and Competitive Scope in Price-matching Guarantees: Effects on Store Patronage," *JR*, 79 (3), 153-160.
- O'Cass, Aron (2002), "Political Advertising Believability and Information Source Value During Elections," *JA*, 31 (1), 63-73.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. unbelievable / believable
2. untrustworthy / trustworthy
3. not convincing / convincing
4. not credible / credible
5. unreasonable / reasonable
6. dishonest / honest
7. questionable / unquestionable
8. inconclusive / conclusive
9. not authentic / authentic
10. unlikely / likely

---

<sup>1</sup> The version of the scale used by Kukar-Kinney and Walters (2003) was composed of items #1, #4, and #10 with a seven-point response format. The other scale users apparently employed all ten items.

## #55 Attitude Toward the Ad (Cognitive)

**SCALE NAME:** Attitude Toward the Ad (Cognitive)

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale appears to measure one's attitude toward some specific advertisement with an emphasis on the beliefs one holds about particular attributes the ad may or may not have. These characteristics would be generally considered as positive and desirable. The scale used by Homer (1995) was called the "*design*" factor.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although the specific versions used by Homer (1995) and Stafford (1998) appear to be original to their studies they both draw on key descriptors used many times previously in semantic differential versions of the scale to capture the *cognitive* component of an attitude.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .89, .78, and .7646 were reported for the versions of the scale used by Homer (1995), Stafford (1998), and Stafford, Stafford, and Day (2002; Stafford 2004), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Homer (1995) or Stafford (1998). The former did state, however, that a factor analysis was conducted and the items in this scale loaded on the same dimension. Stafford, Stafford, and Day (2002) presented the results of a CFA of the three items they used to measure the cognitive component of Aad along with items for measuring five other constructs. All items loaded significantly on the appropriate factors.

**REFERENCES:**

- Homer, Pamela M. (1995), "Ad Size as an Indicator of Perceived Advertising Costs and Effort: The Effects on Memory and Perceptions," *JA*, 24 (Winter), 1-12.
- Stafford, Marla Royne (1998), "Advertising Sex-Typed Services: The Effects of Sex, Service Type, and Employee Type on Consumer Attitudes," *JA*, 27 (2), 65-82.
- Stafford, Marla Royne (2004), Personal Correspondence.
- Stafford, Marla Royne, Thomas F. Stafford and Ellen Day (2002), "A Contingency Approach: The Effects of Spokesperson Type and Service Type on Service Advertising Perceptions," *JA*, 31 (2), 17-34.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Homer (1995) used the first six items (above) with the following scale anchors: *not at all descriptive of the ad/described the ad very well*. In contrast, Stafford (1998; 2004; Stafford, Stafford, and Day 2002) used items #1, #3, and #7 with a Likert-type response format. Each of the studies used seven point scales.

The ad . . .

1. was believable
2. was interesting
3. was informative
4. was well-designed
5. was easy-to-follow
6. was attention-getting
7. clear

## #56 Attitude Toward the Ad (Confusion)

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Ad (Confusion)**

### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This is a five-item, six-point Likert-like scale purporting to measure the degree of confusion experienced by a viewer of a TV commercial. Stout and Rust (1993) used a modified, three-item version of the scale.

### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed in a study by Lastovicka (1983) on the basis of items from a longer list from the Leo Burnett Storyboard Test (1977). Subjects were exposed by Lastovicka (1983) in small groups to one of six different 60 second television commercials, then answered one open-ended question in which they were asked to list retrospectively the thoughts they had while viewing the commercial. The products advertised were six real, branded products (beer, blue jeans, soft drinks, and automobiles). Results of item measurements were factor analyzed, resulting in three factors representing relevance, confusion, and entertainment. Each factor was treated as a scale measuring that respective construct and subjected to multitrait-multimethod testing per Kalleberg and Kluegel (1975). The comparison method was a content analysis of verbatim responses to the open ended question.

### **RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .731 (Lastovicka 1983) and .74 (Stout and Rust 1993) have been reported for the scale.

### **VALIDITY:**

Although support was found for the unidimensionality of these items, confirmatory factor analysis of multitrait-multimethod data indicated that there was an unacceptably high level of random error associated with this scale when compared to an open-ended measure.

### **COMMENTS:**

See Ewing, Salzberger, and Sinkovics (2005) for an in depth analysis of a four-item version of the scale.

### **REFERENCES:**

Ewing, Michael T., Thomas Salzberger, and Rudolf R. Sinkovics (2005), "An Alternative Approach to Assessing Cross-Cultural Measurement Equivalence in Advertising Research," *JA*, 34 (1), 17-36.

Kalleberg, A.L. and J.R. Kluegel (1975), "Analysis of the Multitrait-Multitrait Matrix: Some Limitations and an Alternative," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60 (February), 1-9.

## #56 Attitude Toward the Ad (Confusion)

Lastovicka, John L. (1983), "Convergent and Discriminant Validity of Television Rating Scales," *JA*, 12 (2), 14-23, 52.

Leo Burnett Company, Inc. (1977), *Manual for the Leo Burnett Storyboard Test System*, Chicago: Leo Burnett Co.

Stout, Patricia A. and Roland T. Rust (1993), "Emotional Feelings and Evaluative Dimensions of Advertising: Are They Related?" *JA*, 22 (1), 61-71.

### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. I clearly understood the commercial. (r)
2. The commercial was too complex.
3. I was not sure what was going on in the commercial.
4. I was so busy watching the screen, I did not listen to the talk.
5. The commercial went by so quickly that it just did not make an impression on me.
6. It required a lot of effort to follow the commercial.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lastovicka (1983) used items #1-#5. Stout and Rust (1993) used items #4, #6, and an item that combined the key phrases from items #2 and #3.

#57 *Attitude Toward the Ad (Entertaining)*

**SCALE NAME:**     **Attitude Toward the Ad (Entertaining)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four descriptors with a seven-point Likert-type response format and is used to measure the extent to which a person perceives an advertisement to be attractive and enjoyable.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although the scale items had been used individually in various advertising-related measures over time, their use as a set appears to be original to the study by Edwards, Li, and Lee (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .94 (n = 371) was reported for the scale by Edwards, Li, and Lee (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond some evidence from a CFA which showed the scale was unidimensional, the authors did not address the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Edwards, Steven M., Hairong Li, and Joo-Hyun Lee (2002), "Forced Exposure and Psychological Reactance: Antecedents and Consequences of the Perceived Intrusiveness of Pop-Up Ads," *JA*, 29 (3), 83-95.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

The \_\_\_\_\_ ad I saw was . . .

1. attractive
2. enjoyable
3. entertaining
4. fun to watch

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors used by Edwards, Li, and Lee (2002) ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (7). The blank in the scale stem is used to specify a particular ad that respondents have been exposed to.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Ad (Evaluative Judgments)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of unipolar items used to capture a general evaluative dimension of one's attitude about a certain advertisement. This is in contrast to measures of one's *affective reaction* to an ad. (See #23 to #29 for measures of that construct.). The subset of items used by both Edwards, Li, and Lee (2002) and Li, Edwards, and Lee (2002) is intended to measure how *irritating* an ad is.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

In one sense, the source of the scale is Burke and Edell (1986). However, they in turn drew all of the items from the pool of words used in construction of the Reaction Profile Scales by Wells, Leavitt and McConville (1971).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .77 (n = 56), .93 (n = 184), .89 (n = 191), .91 (n = 379), .88 (n = 59) were reported for the versions of the scale used by Aylesworth, Goodstein, and Kalra (1999), Burke and Edell (1986), Burke and Edell (1989), Edwards, Li, and Lee (2002), and Li, Edwards, and Lee (2002), respectively. Edell and Burke (1987) reported alphas of .93 (n = 29) and .90 (n = 32) for the versions they used for study 1 and 2, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

In several studies, Burke and Edell (1986, 1989; Edell and Burke 1987) factor analyzed a large number of descriptors. Virtually identical factors were found in each case. Three factors emerged and were labeled evaluation, activity and gentleness. This three factor structure was also found by Aylesworth, Goodstein, and Kalra (1999, p.76). Based on a CFA, Edwards, Li, and Lee (2002) provided evidence of their scale's unidimensionality. Some evidence of the scale's nomological validity was provided by Li, Edwards, and Lee (2002) with results from a model that showed ad intrusiveness had a strong impact on ad irritation which in turn influenced a couple of forms of ad avoidance.

**REFERENCES:**

- Aylesworth, Andrew B., Ronald C. Goodstein, and Ajay Kalra (1999), "Effect of Archetypal Embeds on Feelings: An Indirect Route to Affecting Attitudes?" *JA*, 28 (3), 73-81.
- Burke, Marian C. and Julie A. Edell (1986), "Ad Reactions Over Time: Capturing Changes in the Real World," *JCR*, 13 (June), 114-18.
- Burke, Marian C. and Julie A. Edell (1989), "The Impact of Feelings on Ad Based Affect and Cognitions," *JMR*, 26 (February), 69-83.
- Edell, Julie E. and Marian C. Burke (1987), "The Power of Feelings in Understanding Advertising Effects," *JCR*, 14 (December), 421-33.

## #58 Attitude Toward the Ad (Evaluative Judgments)

Edwards, Steven M., Hairong Li, and Joo-Hyun Lee (2002), "Forced Exposure and Psychological Reactance: Antecedents and Consequences of the Perceived Intrusiveness of Pop-Up Ads," *JA*, 29 (3), 83-95.

Li, Hairong, Steven M. Edwards, and Joo-Hyun Lee (2002), "Measuring the Intrusiveness of Advertisements: Scale Development and Validation," *JA*, 31 (2), 37-47.

Wells, William D., Clark Leavitt and Maureen McConville (1971), "A Reaction Profile for TV Commercials," *JAR*, 11 (December), 11 17.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

Directions: Please tell us how well you think each of the words listed below describes the ad you have just seen by putting a number to the right of the word. Here, we are interested in your thoughts about the ad, not the brand or product class. If you think the word describes the ad extremely well, put a 5; very well, put a 4; fairly well, put a 3; not very well, put a 2; not at all well, put a 1.

1. Believable
2. For me
3. Informative
4. Interesting
5. Irritating (r)
6. Meaningful to me
7. Phony (r)
8. Ridiculous (r)
9. Terrible (r)
10. Valuable
11. Worth remembering
12. Convincing
13. Important to me
14. Stupid (r)
15. Bad (r)

Aylesworth, Goodstein, and Kalra (1999): 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 15 5-point

Burke and Edell (1986): 1-14 5-point

Burke and Edell (1989): 1-11 5-point

Edell and Burke (1987, Study 1): 1-14 5-point

Edell and Burke (1987, Study 2): 1-11 5-point

Edwards, Li, and Lee (2002): 5, 7-9, 14 7-point

Li, Edwards, and Lee (2002): 5, 7-9, 14 7-point

---

<sup>1</sup> These directions and scale anchors were used by Edell and Burke (1987) as well as Burke and Edell (1989). In contrast, Aylesworth, Goodstein, and Kalra (1999) used the following to anchor their response scale: does not describe the ad well at all (1) and describes the ad extremely well (5). The scale stem used by Edwards, Li, and Lee (2002) stated "When the ad popped up, I thought it was ..." and the response anchors were agree/disagree.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Ad (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scales consist of various bi-polar adjectives presumed to measure the subject's general evaluation of an advertisement. The scales are similar in that their items are not specific to the advertisements under investigation although certain adjectives may or may not be appropriate for every advertisement one may wish to assess.

Seven-point scales seem to be the most popular response format but five- and nine-point scales have been used as well. These scales are commonly symbolized by  $A_{ad}$  and appear to be considered overall evaluations of an ad as opposed to measuring just the affective (e.g., #52) or cognitive (e.g., #55) components of an attitude.

Work conducted in recent years both in general psychology (Crites, Fabrigar, and Petty 1994; Petty, Wegener, and Fabrigar 1997) as well as with advertising (Bruner 1995, 1998) support the notion of separately measuring the affective, cognitive, and general evaluative aspects of attitudes.

With the potential exception of attitude-toward-the-brand (#108), this scale and its variations have been used more than any other in scholarly marketing research.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of most of the scales is unclear because authors did not specify their origin. However, related investigation suggests that about a third are original with the remaining being either borrowed or modified from previous research (Bruner 1995, 1998). In a general sense, the basis for these scales can be traced to the work with semantic differentials pioneered by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957). With specific reference to work in marketing, the most common source is Mitchell and Olson (1981). There is a common form of the scale to use when one wants to measure an overall evaluative response to an ad.

Taylor, Miracle, and Wilson (1997) developed a Korean version of the scale using the back-translation method. The set of items used by Choi and Miracle (2004) with Koreans was parallel with the translations used with Americans.

**RELIABILITY:**

Reported internal consistencies have ranged from below .69 (Kamins, Marks, and Skinner 1991) to as high as .98 (Sujan, Bettman, and Baumgartner 1993; Goodstein 1993). See last section for specific reliabilities.

**VALIDITY:**

Little validity information, per se, was provided in most of the studies. Mitchell and Olson (1981) developed the background for using evaluative belief statements as measures of attitude from Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) and Ahtola (1975) and utilized only those four items loading together out of seven original ones in their study. Stout and Burda (1989) used a manipulation check to assess the manipulation of brand dominance, but not for  $A_{ad}$ .

## #59 Attitude Toward the Ad (General)

A factor analysis was performed by Bezjian-Avery, Calder, and Iacobucci (1998) on items composing their attitude toward the brand (#108) and attitude toward the ad scales. Each set of items appeared to be unidimensional with no cross-loadings greater than .34.

Madden, Allen, and Twibble (1988) reported substantive discriminant validity between ad evaluation and a measure of positive affect. Marginal discriminant validity between ad evaluation and a measure of negative affect is claimed. Both principle components and confirmatory factor analysis support the unidimensionality of the scale measure of the ad evaluation construct.

Machleit and Wilson (1988) tested their eight-item scale for dimensionality since they acknowledged the possibility that it might tap into both affective and cognitive factors. Their results indicated that there “was not evidence to support discriminant validity between the affective and cognitive dimensions” and they decided to treat the items as a overall measure of  $A_{ad}$ .

### COMMENTS:

While these scales represent a generally recognized method for measuring attitude toward an ad they have relied heavily on researcher judgment with respect to which specific adjective pairs are appropriate for a given situation. In addition, there has been little rigorous testing of validity. Given this and all of the alternatives that are available, future users are urged to not generate more items or unique sets of items. Instead, it is suggested that they examine the previously published alternatives and select the one that is most appropriate for their study and has shown the most evidence of validity.

An additional concern is that there seems to be a lack of concern regarding the premise underlying use of the semantic differential. The semantic differential should be constructed so that the items are anchored by adjectives describing opposites on the semantic continuum. It is arguable whether this requirement is being met in those many cases where researchers have used bi-polar adjectives of the form X/not X. Scale items of this form violate the assumption that the midpoint of the scale is meant to be used when the respondent associates the object with neither pole of the adjective pair (Dawes and Smith 1985, p. 534; Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum 1957, pp. 29, 83). For example, the mid-point between *interesting* and *boring* would be *neither boring nor interesting*. That is different from the mid-point of a uni-polar set such as *interesting/not interesting*. There the mid-point would be something like *slightly interesting*. The degree to which this violation affects scale scores and interpretation is unknown.

See also Braun-LaTour et al. (2004), Fennis and Bakker (2001), Mooradian (1996), Moore and Harris (1996), Orth and Holancova (2004), Rubin, Mager, and Friedman (1982), and Sicilia, Ruiz, and Munuera (2005). Additionally, a scale called *copy effectiveness* by Whipple and McManamon (2002) has four of its five items from the list below but in unipolar form.

### REFERENCES:

Aaker, Jennifer L. (2000b), “Accessibility or Diagnosticity? Disentangling the Influence of Culture on Persuasion Processes and Attitudes,” *JCR*, 26 (March), 340-357.

- Aaker, Jennifer L. and Patti Williams (1998), "Empathy versus Pride: The Influence of Emotional Appeals Across Cultures," *JCR*, 25 (December), 241-261.
- Ahtola, Olli T. (1975), "The Vector Model of PREFERENCES: An Alternative to the Fishbein Model," *JMR*, 12 (February), 52-59.
- Andrews, J. Craig (2001), Personal Correspondence.
- Andrews, J. Craig, Scot Burton, and Richard G. Netemeyer (2001), "Are Some Comparative Nutrition Claims Misleading? The Role of Nutrition Knowledge, Ad Claim Type and Disclosure Conditions," *JA*, 29 (3), 29-42.
- Andrews, J. Craig, Richard G. Netemeyer, and Scot Burton (1998), "Consumer Generalization of Nutrient Content Claims in Advertising," *JM*, 62 (October), 62-75.
- Appiah, Osei (2001), "Ethnic Identification on Adolescents' Evaluations of Advertisements," *JAR*, 41 (5), 7-22.
- Arias-Bolzmann, Leopoldo, Goutam Chakraborty, and John C. Mowen (2000), "Effects of Absurdity in Advertising: The Moderating Role of Product Category Attitude and the Mediating Role of Cognitive Responses," *JA*, 29 (1), 35-48.
- Aylesworth, Andrew B., Ronald C. Goodstein, and Ajay Kalra (1999), "Effect of Archetypal Embeds on Feelings: An Indirect Route to Affecting Attitudes?" *JA*, 28 (3), 73-81.
- Aylesworth, Andrew B. and Scott B. MacKenzie (1998), "Context Is Key: The Effect of Program-Induced Mood on Thoughts about the Ad," *JA*, 27 (Summer), 17-31.
- Babin, Laurie and Alvin C. Burns (1997), "Effects of Print Ad Pictures and Copy Containing Instructions to Imagine on Mental Imagery That Mediates Attitudes," *JA*, 26 (Fall), 33-44.
- Baker, William E., Heather Honea, and Cristel Antonia Russell (2004), "Do Not Wait to Reveal the Brand Name," *JA*, 33 (3), 78-85.
- Baumgartner, Sujan, and Padgett (1997), "Patterns of Affective Reactions to Advertisements: The Integration of Moment-to-Moment Responses into Overall Judgments," *JMR*, 34 (May), 219-232.
- Bezjian-Avery, Alexa, Bobby Calder, and Dawn Iacobucci (1998), "New Media Interactive Advertising vs. Traditional Advertising," *JAR*, 38 (July/August), 23-32.
- Bhat, Subodh, Thomas W. Leigh, and Daniel L. Wardlow (1998), "The Effect of Consumer Prejudices on Ad Processing: Heterosexual Consumers' Responses to Homosexual Imagery in Ads," *JA*, 27 (4), 9-28.
- Boles, James and Scot Burton (1992), "An Examination of Free Elicitation and Response Scale Measures of Feelings and Judgments Evoked by Television Advertisements," *JAMS*, 20 (Summer), 225-233.
- Braun-LaTour, Kathryn A., Michael LaTour, Jacqueline E. Pickrell, and Elizabeth F. Loftus (2004), "How and When Advertising Can Influence Memory for Consumer Experience," *JA*, 33 (4), 7-25.
- Brumbaugh, Anne M. (2002), "Source and nonsource Cues in Advertising and Their Effects on the Activation of Cultural and Subcultural Knowledge on the Route to Persuasion," *JCR*, 29 (September), 258-269.
- Brunel, Frederic F. and Michelle R. Nelson (2001), "Explaining Gendered Responses to "Help-Self" and "Help-Others" Charity Ad Appeals: The Mediating Role of World-Views," *JA*, 29 (3), 15-28.

## #59 Attitude Toward the Ad (General)

- Bruner II, Gordon C. (1995), "The Psychometric Quality of Aad Scales," *Office of Scale Research Technical Report #9501*, Dept. of Marketing, Southern Illinois University.
- Bruner II, Gordon C. (1998), "Standardization and Justification: Do Aad Scales Measure Up?" *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 20 (Spring), 1-18.
- Bruner II, Gordon C. and Anand Kumar (2000), "Web Commercials and Advertising Hierarchy-of-Effects," *JAR*, 40 (Jan-Apr), 35-42.
- Bucholz, Laura M. and Robert E. Smith (1991), "The Role of Consumer Involvement in Determining Cognitive Response to Broadcast Advertising," *JA*, 1 (20), 4-17.
- Burnkrant, Robert E. and H. Rao Unnava (1995), "Effects of Self-Referencing on Persuasion," *JCR*, 22 (June), 17-26.
- Burns, Alvin C., Abhijit Biswas, and Laurie A. Babin (1993), "The Operation of Visual Imagery as a Mediator of Advertising Effects," *JA*, 2 (22), 71-85.
- Campbell, Margaret C. and Kevin Lane Keller (2003), "Brand Familiarity and Advertising Repetition Effects," *JCR*, 30 (September), 292-304.
- Chang, Chingching (2003), "Party Bias in Political-Advertising Processing," *JA*, 32 (2), 55-67.
- Chattopadhyay, Amitava and Kumal Basu (1990), "Humor in Advertising: The Moderating Role of Prior Brand Evaluation," *JMR*, 27 (November), 466-476.
- Chattopadhyay, Amitava and Prakash Nedungadi (1992), "Does Attitude toward the Ad Endure? The Moderating Effects of Attention and Delay," *JCR*, 19 (June), 26-33.
- Choi, Yung Kyun and Gordon E. Miracle (2004), "The Effectiveness of Comparative Advertising in Korea and the United States," *JA*, 33 (4), 75-87.
- Cline, Thomas W., Moses B. Altsech and James J. Kellaris (2003), "When Does Humor Enhance or Inhibit As Responses: The Moderating Role of the Need for Humor," *JA*, 32 (3), 31-45.
- Coulter, Keith S. (1998), "The Effects of Affective Responses to Media Context on Advertising Evaluations," *JA*, 27 (4), 41-51.
- Coulter, Keith S. and Girish N. Punj (2004), "The Effects of Cognitive Resource Requirement, Availability, and Argument Quality on Brand Attitudes," *JA*, 33 (4), 53-64.
- Cox, Dena Saliagas and William B. Locander (1987), "Product Novelty: Does It Moderate the Relationship Between Ad Attitudes and Brand Attitudes?" *JA*, 16 (3), 39-44.
- Cox, Dena S. and Anthony D. Cox (1988), "What Does Familiarity Breed? Complexity as a Moderator of Repetition Effects in Advertisement Evaluation," *JCR*, 15 (June), 111-116.
- 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 (December), 619-634.
- Dahlén, Miceal (2005), "The Medium as a Contextual Cue," *JA*, 34 (3), 89-98.
- Darley, William K. and Robert E. Smith (1993), "Advertising Claim Objectivity: Antecedents and Effects," *JM*, 57 (October), 100-113.
- Darley, William K. and Robert E. Smith (1995), "Gender Differences in Information Processing Strategies: An Empirical Test of the Selectivity Model in Advertising Response," *JA*, 24 (Spring), 41-56.

- Dawes, Robyn M. and Tom L. Smith (1985), "Attitude and Opinion Measurement," in *Handbook of Social Psychology, 3rd ed., Vol. 1*, Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson, eds. New York: Random House, 509-566.
- Day, Ellen and Marla Royne Stafford (1997), "Age-Related Cues in Retail Services Advertising: Their Effects on Younger Consumers," *JR*, 73 (2), 211-233.
- Dimofte, Claudie V., Mark R. Forehand, and Rohit Deshpandé (2004), "Ad Schema Incongruity as Elicitor of Ethnic Self-Awareness and Differential Advertising Response," *JA*, 32 (4), 7-17.
- Droge, Cornelia (1989), "Shaping the Route to Attitude Change: Central Versus Peripheral Processing Through Comparative Versus Noncomparative Advertising," *JMR*, 26 (May), 193-204.
- Ellen, Pam Scholder and Paula Fitzgerald Bone (1998), "Does It Matter If It Smells? Olfactory Stimuli As Advertising Executional Cues," *JA*, 27 (4), 29-39.
- Escalas, Jennifer Edson and Barbara B. Stern (2003), "Sympathy and Empathy: Emotional Responses to Advertising Dramas," *JCR*, 29 (March), 566-578.
- Fennis, Bob M. and Arnold B. Bakker (2001), "Stay Tuned-We Will Be Back Right After These Messages: Need to Evaluate Moderates the Transfer of Irritation in Advertising," *JA*, 30 (3), 15-25.
- Fishbein, Martin and Icek Ajzen (1975), *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Forehand, Mark R., and Rohit Deshpande (2001), "What We see Makes Us Who We Are: Priming Ethnic Self-Awareness and Advertising Response," *JMR*, 38 (August), 336-348.
- Gardner, Meryl Paula (1985), "Does Attitude Toward the Ad Affect Brand Attitude Under a Brand Evaluation Set?" *JMR*, 22 (May), 192-198.
- Goldsmith, Ronald E., Barbara A. Lafferty, and Stephen J. Newell (2001), "The Impact of Corporate Credibility and Celebrity Credibility on Consumer Reaction to Advertisements and Brands," *JA*, 29 (3), 30-54.
- Goodstein, Ronald C. (1993), "Category-based Applications and Extensions in Advertising: Motivating More Extensive Ad Processing," *JCR*, 20 (June), 87-99.
- Ha, Louisa (1997), Personal Correspondence.
- Ha, Louisa (1996), "Advertising Clutter in Consumer Magazines: Dimensions and Effects," *JAR*, 36 (July/August), 76-84.
- Hastak, Manoj and Jerry C. Olson (1989), "Assessing the Role of Brand Related Cognitive Responses as Mediators of Communications Effects on Cognitive Structure," *JCR*, 15 (March), 444-456.
- Hill, Ronald Paul (1988), "An Exploration of the Relationship Between AIDS-Related Anxiety and the Evaluation of Condom Advertisements," *JA*, 17 (Winter), 35-42.
- Hill, Ronald Paul (1989), "An Exploration of Voter Responses to Political Advertisements," *JA*, 18 (Winter), 14-22.
- Homer, Pamela M. (1995), "Ad Size as an Indicator of Perceived Advertising Costs and Effort: The Effects on Memory and Perceptions," *JA*, 24 (Winter), 1-12.
- Homer, Pamela M. and Lynn Kahle (1990), "Source Expertise, Time of Source Identification, and Involvement in Persuasion: An Elaborative Processing Perspective," *JA*, 1 (19), 30-39.

## #59 Attitude Toward the Ad (General)

- Kalra, Ajay and Ronald C. Goodstein (1998), "The Impact of Advertising Positioning Strategies on Consumer Price Sensitivity," *JMR*, 35 (May), 210-224.
- Kamins, Michael A. (1990), "An Investigation into the 'Match-Up' Hypothesis in Celebrity Advertising: When Beauty May be Only Skin Deep," *JA*, 19 (Spring), 4-13.
- Kamins, Michael A., Lawrence J. Marks, and Deborah Skinner (1991), "Television Commercial Evaluation in the Context of Program Induced Mood: Congruency Versus Consistency Effects," *JA*, 20 (Summer), 1-14.
- Kellaris, James J., Anthony D. Cox, and Dena Cox (1993), "The Effect of Background Music on Ad Processing: A Contingency Explanation," *JM*, 57 (October), 114-124.
- Keller, Kevin Lane (1987), "Memory Factors in Advertising: The Effect of Advertising Retrieval Cues on Brand Evaluations," *JCR*, 14 (December), 316-333.
- Keller, Kevin Lane (1991a), "Cue Compatibility and Framing in Advertising," *JMR*, 28 (February), 42-57.
- Keller, Kevin Lane (1991b), "Memory and Evaluation Effects in Competitive Advertising Environments," *JCR*, 17 (March), 463-476.
- Kempf, Deanna S. and Robert E. Smith (1998), "Consumer Processing of Product Trial and the Influence of Prior Advertising: A Structural Modeling Approach," *JMR*, 35 (August), 325-338.
- Kirmani, Amna (1997), "Advertising Repetition as a Signal of Quality: If It's Advertised So Much, Something Must Be Wrong," *JA*, 26 (Fall), 77-86.
- Krishnamurthy, Parthasarathy and Mita Sujana (1999), "Retrospection versus Anticipation: The Role of the Ad under Retrospective and Anticipatory Self-Referencing," *JCR*, 26 (June), 55-69.
- Lepkowska-White, Elzbieta, Thomas G. Brashear and Marc G. Weinberger (2003), "A Test of Ad Appeal Effectiveness in Poland and the United States: The Interplay of Appeal, Product and Culture," *JA*, 32 (3), 57-67.
- Lohse, Gerald L. and Dennis L. Rosen (2001), "Signaling Quality and Credibility in Yellow Pages Advertising: The Influence of Color and Graphics on Choice," *JA*, 30 (2), 73-85.
- Lord, Kenneth R., Myung-Soo Lee, and Paul L. Sauer (1994), "Program Context Antecedents of Attitude toward Radio Commercials," *JAMS*, 22 (1), 3-15.
- Lord, Kenneth R., Myung-Soo Lee, and Paul L. Sauer (1995), "The Combined Influence Hypothesis: Central and Peripheral Antecedents of Attitude Toward the Ad," *JA*, 24 (Spring), 73-85.
- Machleit, Karen A. and R. Dale Wilson (1988), "Emotional Feelings and Attitude Toward the Advertisement: The Roles of Brand Familiarity and Repetition," *JA*, 17 (3), 27-35.
- Machleit, Karen A., Chris T. Allen, and Thomas J. Madden (1993), "The Mature Brand and Brand Interest: An Alternative Consequence of Ad-Evoked Affect," *JM*, 57 (October), 72-82.
- MacInnis, Deborah J. and C. Whan Park (1991), "The Differential Role of Characteristics of Music on High- and Low-Involvement Consumers' Processing of Ads," *JCR*, 18 (September), 161-173.

- MacInnis, Deborah J. and Douglas M. Stayman (1993), "Focal and Emotional Integration: Constructs, Measures, and Preliminary Evidence," *JA*, 22 (Winter), 51-65.
- MacKenzie, Scott B. and Richard J. Lutz (1989), "An Empirical Examination of the Structural Antecedents of Attitude Toward the Ad in an Advertising Pretesting Context," *JM*, 53 (April), 48-65.
- MacKenzie, Scott B. and Richard A. Spreng (1992), "How Does Motivation Moderate the Impact of Central and Peripheral Processing on Brand Attitudes and Intentions?" *JCR*, 18 (March), 519-529.
- Macklin, M. Carole, Norman T. Bruvold, and Carol Lynn Shea (1985), "Is it Always as Simple as 'Keep It Simple!'" *JA*, 14 (4), 28-35.
- Madden, Thomas J. Chris T. Allen, and Jacquelyn L. Twibble (1988), "Attitude Toward the Ad: An Assessment of Diverse Measurement Indices Under Different Processing Sets," *JMR*, 25 (August), 242-252.
- Martin, Brett A.S., Bodo Lang, and Stephanie Wong (2004), "Conclusion Explicitness in Advertising," *JA*, 32 (4), 57-65.
- Martin, Brett A. S., Christina Kwai-Choi Lee, and Feng Yang (2004), "The Influence of Ad Model Ethnicity and Self-Referencing on Attitudes," *JA*, 33 (4), 27-37.
- Miniard, Paul W., Sunil Bhatla, and Randall L. Rose (1990), "On the Formation and Relationship of Ad and Brand Attitudes: An Experimental and Causal Analysis," *JMR*, 27 (August), 290-303.
- Mitchell, Andrew A. (1986), "The Effect of Verbal and Visual Components of Advertisements on Brand Attitudes and Attitude Toward the Advertisement," *JCR*, 13 (June), 12-24.
- Mitchell, Andrew A. and Jerry C. Olson (1981), "Are Product Attribute Beliefs the Only Mediator of Advertising Effects on Brand Attitude?" *JMR*, 18 (August), 318-332.
- Miller, Darryl W. and Lawrence J. Marks (1992), "Mental Imagery and Sound Effects in Radio Commercials," *JA*, 4 (21), 83-93.
- Mooradian, Todd A. (1996), "Personality and Ad-Evoked Feelings: The Case for Extraversion and Neuroticism," *JAMS*, 24 (Spring), 99-109.
- Moore, David J. and William D. Harris (1996), "Affect Intensity and the Consumer's Attitude Toward High Impact Emotional Advertising Appeals," *JA*, 25 (Summer), 37-50.
- Moorman, Marjolein, Peter C. Neijens and Edith G. Smit (2002), "The Effects of Magazine-Induced Psychological Responses and Thematic Congruence on Memory and Attitude Toward the Ad in a Real-Life Setting," *JA*, 31 (4), 27-39.
- Muehling, Darrel D. (1987), "Comparative Advertising: The Influence Attitude-Toward-The-Ad on Brand Evaluation," *JA*, 16 (4), 43-49.
- Muehling, Darrel D. and David E. Sprott (2004), "The Power of Reflection," *JA*, 33 (3), 25-35.
- Murry, John P. Jr., John L. Lastovicka, Surendra N. Singh (1992), "Feeling and Liking Responses to Television Programs: An Examination of Two Explanations for Media-Context Effects," *JCR*, 18 (March), 441-451.
- Orth, Ulrich R., and Denisa Holancova (2004), "Consumer Response to Sex Role Portrayals in Advertisements," *JA*, 32 (4), 77-89.

## #59 Attitude Toward the Ad (General)

- Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum (1957), *The Measurement of Meaning*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Petty, Richard E., Duane T. Wegener, and Leandre R. Fabrigar (1997), "Attitudes and Attitude Change," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48 (1), 609-647.
- Pham, Michel Tuan (1996), "Cue Representation and Selection Effects of Arousal on Persuasion," *JCR*, 22 (March), 373-387.
- Phillips, Barbara J. (2000), "The Impact of Verbal Anchoring on Consumer Response to Image Ads," *JA*, 29 (1), 15-24.
- Prakash, Ved (1992), "Sex Roles and Advertising Preferences," *JAR*, 3 (32), 43-52.
- Rubin, Vicky, Carol Mager, and Hershey H. Friedman (1982), "Company President Versus Spokesperson in Television Commercials," *JAR*, 22 (August/September), 31-33.
- Schuhwerk, Melody E. and Roxanne Lefkoff-Hagius (1995), "Green or Non-Green? Does Type of Appeal Matter When Advertising a Green Product?" *JA*, 24 (Summer), 45-54.
- Severn, Jessica, George E. Belch, and Michael A. Belch (1990), "The Effects of Sexual and Non-Sexual Advertising Appeals and Information Level on Cognitive Processing and Communication Effectiveness," *JA*, 19 (Spring), 14-22.
- Shiv, Baba, Julie A. Edell, and John W. Payne (1997), "Factors Affecting the Impact of Negatively and Positively Framed Ad Messages," *JCR*, 24 (December), 285-294.
- Sicilia, Maria, Salvador Ruiz, and Jose L. Munuera (2005), "Effects of Interactivity in a Web Site," *JA*, 34 (3), 31-45.
- Simpson, Penny M., Steve Horton, and Gene Brown (1996), "Male Nudity in Advertisements: A Modified Replication and Extension of Gender and Product Effects," *JAMS*, 24 (Summer), 257-262.
- Sinclair, Janas and Tracy Irani (2005), "Advocacy Advertising for Biotechnology," *JA*, 34 (3), 59-73.
- Singh, Surendra N. and Catherine A. Cole (1993), "The Effects of Length, Content, and Repetition on Television Commercial Effectiveness," *JMR*, 30 (February), 91-104.
- Singh, Surendra N., V. Parker Lessig, Dongwook Kim, Reetika Gupta, and Mary Ann Hocutt (2000), "Does Your Ad Have Too Many Pictures?" *JAR*, 40 (Jan-Apr), 11-27.
- Smith, Robert E. (1993), "Integrating Information From Advertising and Trial: Processes and Effects on Consumer Response to Product Information," *JMR*, 30 (May), 204-219.
- Stafford, Marla Royne (1996), "Tangibility in Services Advertising: An Investigation of Verbal Versus Visual Cues," *JA*, 25 (Fall), 13-28.
- Stafford, Marla Royne (1998), "Advertising Sex-Typed Services: The Effects of Sex, Service Type, and Employee Type on Consumer Attitudes," *JA*, 27 (2), 65-82.
- Stafford, Marla Royne (1999), Personal Correspondence.
- Stafford, Marla Royne and Ellen Day (1995), "Retail Services Advertising: The Effects of Appeal, Medium, and Service," *JA*, 24 (Spring), 57-71.
- Steenkamp, Jan-Benedict E. M., and Hans Baumgartner (1992), "The Role of Optimum Stimulation Level in Exploratory Consumer Behavior," *JCR*, 19 (December), 434-448.
- Stevenson, Julie, Gordon C. Bruner II, and Anand Kumar (2000), "Webpage Background and Viewer Attitudes," *JAR*, 40 (January/April), 29-34.

- Stout, Patricia A. and Benedicta L. Burda (1989), "Zipped Commercials: Are They Effective?" *JA*, 18 (4), 23-32.
- Sujan, Mita, James R. Bettman, and Hans Baumgartner (1993), "Influencing Consumer Judgments Using Autobiographical Memories: A Self-Referencing Perspective," *JMR*, 30 (November), 422-436.
- Taylor, Charles R., Gordon E. Miracle, and R. Dale Wilson (1997), "The Impact of Information Level on the Effectiveness of U.S. and Korean Television Commercials," *JA*, 26 (Spring), 1-18.
- Toncar, Mark and James Munch (2001), "Consumer Responses to Tropes in Print Advertising," *JA*, 30 (1), 55-65.
- Tripp, Carolyn, Thomas D. Jensen, and Les Carlson (1994), "The Effects of Multiple Product Endorsements by Celebrities on Consumers' Attitudes and Intentions," *JCR*, 20 (March), 535-547.
- Whipple, Thomas W. and Mary K. McManamon (2002), "Implications of Using Male and Female Voices in Commercials: An Exploratory Study," *JA*, 31 (2), 79-91.
- Whittler, Tommy E. and Joan DiMeo (1991), "Viewer's Reaction to Racial Cues in Advertising Stimuli," *JAR*, 6 (31), 37-46.
- Williams, Patti and Jennifer L. Aaker (2002), "Can Mixed Emotions Peacefully Coexist?" *JCR*, 28 (March), 636-649.
- Williams, Patti and Aimee Drolet (2005), "Age-Related Differences in Response to Emotional Advertisements," *JCR*, 32 (December), 343-354.
- Yi, Youjae (1990), "Cognitive and Affective Priming Effects of the Context for Print Advertisements," *JA*, 19 (Summer), 40-48.
- Yi, Youjae (1993), "Contextual Priming Effects in Print Advertisements: The Moderating Role of Prior Knowledge," *JA*, 1 (22), 1-10.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. good / bad
2. like / dislike
3. not irritating / irritating
4. interesting / boring
5. inoffensive / offensive
6. persuasive / not at all persuasive
7. informative / uninformative
8. believable / unbelievable

---

<sup>1</sup> For ease of reporting, the positive anchors (when clear) are listed on the left. Below that, scale items used in specific studies are listed with an indication of the points on the response scale, if known. Although two studies may be shown to have used one or more of the same items it should not automatically be concluded that the items were exactly the same. Judgment was used to determine the similarity of adjectives. Slight differences in the bi-polar adjectives used such as *extremely bad* versus *bad* and *uninteresting* versus *not interesting* or *boring* were counted the same for purposes of the list here but are noted with an asterisk (\*). If every truly different set of bi-polar adjectives were listed separately here the list of items would have been much longer. Finally, for each study in which it is known, the reliability of the particular set of items that was used is shown in brackets.

*#59 Attitude Toward the Ad (General)*

9. effective / ineffective
10. appealing / unappealing
11. attractive / unattractive
12. favorable / unfavorable
13. fair / unfair
14. pleasant / unpleasant
15. fresh / stale
16. nice / awful
17. honest / dishonest
18. convincing / unconvincing
19. likable / unlikable
20. agreeable / disagreeable
21. tasteful / tasteless
22. artful / artless
23. valuable / not valuable
24. familiar / unfamiliar
25. positive / negative
26. dynamic / dull
27. refreshing / depressing
28. enjoyable / not enjoyable
29. useful / useless
30. entertaining / not entertaining
31. satisfactory / unsatisfactory
32. well made / poorly made
33. fond of / not fond of
34. not insulting / insulting
35. original / unoriginal
36. refined / vulgar
37. sensitive / insensitive
38. appropriate / inappropriate
39. clear / not clear
40. simple / complex
41. overall liking / overall disliking
42. not annoying / annoying
43. outstanding / poor
44. for me / not for me
45. strong / weak
46. high quality / low quality

Aaker (2000b): 1, 12, 19\* 7-point [.87]

Aaker and Williams (1998): 1, 12, 19\* 7-point [.95]

Appiah (2001): 1, 4, 10\*, 11\*, 19\*, 23\*, 25, 29, 43, 44, 45 7-point [.94-.96]

Arias-Bolzmann, Chakraborty, and Mowen (2000): 1, 2, 12, 25 7-point [.95]

Aylesworth, Goodstein, and Kalra (1999): 1, 12, 19\* 7-point [.95]

Andrews, Burton and Netemeyer (2001): 1, 12, 25 7-point [.93]

Andrews, Netemeyer, and Burton (1998; Andrews 2001): 1, 12, 25 7-point [.93]

- Aylesworth and MacKenzie (1998): 1, 12, 14 7-point  
Babin and Burns (1997): 1, 4, 12, 14, 16 7-point [.89]  
Baker, Honea, Russell (2004): 1, 2, 25 101-point [.90]  
Baumgartner, Sujan, and Padgett (1997): 1, 12, 14, 25 9-point [.92]  
Bezjian-Avery, Calder, and Iacobucci (1998): 1, 6, 10, 11, 18, 39, 40, 41 7-point  
Bhat, Leigh, and Wardlow (1998): 1, 2, 12 7-point [.94]  
Boles and Burton (1992): 1, 2, 12 7-point\* [.91]  
Brumbaugh (2002): 1, 2, 12 7-point [.85]  
Brunel and Nelson (2001): 1, 2\*, 3, 14 7-point  
Bruner and Kumar (2000): 1, 2, 3, 4\* 7-point [.87]  
Bucholz and Smith (1991): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.92]  
Burnkrant and Unnava (1995): 1, 12, 25 7-point [.95]  
Burns, Biswas, and Babin (1993): 1, 4, and three unidentified items [.88]  
Campbell and Keller (2003): 1, 10, 14, 46 7-point [.91, .95]  
Chang (2003): 1, 2, 8, 13, 14 7-point [.92]  
Chattopadhyay and Basu (1990): 3, 4\*, 14, 19 9-point [.91]  
Chattopadhyay and Nedungadi (1992): 1, 4, 14, 19 9-point [.86]  
Choi and Miracle (2004): 1, 3, 25, 29\* 7-point [.71-.76]  
Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003): 1, 12, 14 7-point [.90]  
Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003): 1, 14, 19, 21 7-point [.84]  
Coulter (1998): 1, 2\*, 12, 25 7-point [.90]  
Coulter and Punj (2004): 1, 2, 12, 25 7-point [.88]  
Cox and Cox (1988): 1, 14, 19 9-point [.90]  
Cox and Locander (1987): 1, 14, 19 9-point [.90]  
Dahlén (2005): 1, 12, 14 7-point [.89]  
Darley and Smith (1993): 1, 3, 4\* 7-point [.75]  
Darley and Smith (1995): 1, 3, 4\*, 14 7-point [.81]  
Day and Stafford (1997): 1, 2, 12, 25 7-point [.92]  
Dimofte, Forehand, and Deshpandé (2004): 1, 2, 7, 14, 29 7-point [.91]  
Droge (1989): 1, 3, 4, 5 7-point [.806, .893]  
Ellen and Bone (1998): 1, 3, 4\*, 14, 19, 28 7-point [.93]  
Escalas and Stern (2003): 1\*, 12\*, 25\* 7-point [.95, .96]  
Forehand and Deshpande (2001): 1, 2, 7, 14, 29 7-point [.91]  
Gardner (1985): 1, 2, 3, 4 7-point [.78 and .86]  
Goldsmith, Lafferty and Newell (2001): 1, 12, 14 7-point [.93]  
Goodstein (1993): 1, 12, 19 7-point [.98]  
Ha (1996): 2, 4\*, 14, 29, 30 7-point [.95]  
Hastak and Olson (1989): 1, 2, 14, 16 7-point [.90]  
Hill (1988): 1, 2, 3, 4, 12 5-point [.89-.92]  
Hill (1988): 14, 16, 21, 37 5-point [.82-.94]  
Hill (1989): 1, 2, 3, 4, 12 5-point [.86]  
Hill (1989): 14, 16, 21, 37 5-point [.83]  
Homer (1995): 1, 2, 12, 14, 20, 23, 25, 29, 38 9-point [.95]  
Homer and Kahle (1990): 4, 12, 25 9-point [.82]  
Kalra and Goodstein (1998): 1\*, 2\*, 12\* 7-point [.97, .91]

## #59 Attitude Toward the Ad (General)

- Kamins (1990): 1, 14, 20, 31 7-point [.85]  
Kamins, Marks, and Skinner (1991): 1, 14, 31 5-point [.69]  
Kellaris, Cox, and Cox (1993): 1, 4, 14, 19, 21 7-point [.88]  
Keller (1987): 1, 4, 10, 19 7-point [.92]  
Keller (1991a): 1, 4, 10, 19 7-point [.89]  
Keller (1991b): 1, 2, 4, 10 7-point [.89]  
Kempf and Smith (1998): 1, 2, 14 [.90]  
Kirmani (1997): 1, 3, 4, 14 7-point [.84]  
Krishnamurthy and Sujan (1999): 1, 14, 19\*, 28 9-point [.89]  
Lepkowska-White, Brashear, and Weinberger (2003): 1, 2, 3, 4\* 5-point [.75]  
Lohse and Rosen (2001): 1, 12, 14 7-point [.92]  
Lord, Lee, and Sauer (1994, 1995): 1, 12, 14 7-point [.86]  
Machleit and Wilson (1988): 1, 2\*, 3, 12, 28\*, 32, 33, 34 7-point [.95, .96]  
Machleit, Allen, and Madden (1993): 1, 4, 14, 19, 21, 22 [.91, .93]  
MacInnis, and Park (1991): 1, 10, 12, 19 7-point [.95]  
MacInnis and Stayman (1993): 1, 2, 10, 25 7-point [.93]  
MacKenzie and Lutz (1989): 1, 12, 14 7-point [.88]  
MacKenzie and Spreng (1992): 1, 12, 14 7-point [.88]  
Macklin, Bruvold and Shea (1985): 1, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 7-point [.85]  
Madden, Allen and Twibble (1988): 1, 4, 14, 19, 21, 22 [.88]  
Martin, Lang, and Wong (2004): 1, 2, 3, 4\* 7-point [.78]  
Martin, Lee, and Yang (2004): 1, 4\*, 7, 14, 18, 19\*, 28 5-point [.85]  
Miller and Marks (1992): 1, 2, 3, 4 5-point [.86]  
Miniard, Bhatla, and Rose (1990): 1, 2, 3, 4, 9\* 7-point [.92]  
Mitchell (1986): 1, 2, 3, 4 5-point [.90]  
Mitchell and Olsen (1981): 1, 2, 3, 4 5-point [.87]  
Moorman, Neijens, and Smit (2002): 1, 4\*, 28\* 7-point [.84]  
Muehling (1987): 1, 10, 11, 14, 26, 27, 28 7-point  
Muehling and Sprott (2004): 1, 12, 14, 25 7-point [.95]  
Murry, Lastovicka, Singh (1992): 1, 2, 3, 4, 12 [.88]  
Pham (1996): 1, 2, 12, 31 5-point [.95, .93]  
Phillips (2000): 1, 2, 28 7-point [.89]  
Prakash (1992): 1, 2, 3, 4 7-point [.82]  
Schuhwerk and Lefkoff-Hagius (1995): 1, 4, 8, 12, 14, 18 7-point [.87]  
Severn, Belch, and Belch (1990): 4, 5, 12, 30, 35 7-point  
Shiv, Edell, and Payne (1997): 1, 10, 19\* 7-point [.85]  
Simpson, Horton, and Brown (1996): 1, 2, 12, 25 9-point [.965]  
Sinclair and Irani (2005): 1, 12, 14 [.84]  
Singh and Cole (1993): 1, 4, 7, 8, 14, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30, 34, 36 7-point [.93]  
Singh et al. (2000): 1, 4, 7, 8, 14, 18, 19\*, 21, 22, 24\*, 30\* 7-point [.91]  
Smith (1993): 1, 12, 14 7-point [.92]  
Stafford (1996): 1, 2, 12, 25 [.96]  
Stafford (1998): 1, 2, 12, 25 7-point [.95]  
Stafford and Day (1995): 1, 2, 3, 4\* 7-point [.90]  
Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1992): 1, 12, 14, 25 7-point [.93, .89]  
Stout and Burda (1989): 2, 12 7-point [.89]

*#59 Attitude Toward the Ad (General)*

- Stevenson, Bruner, and Kumar (2000): 1, 2, 3, 4\* 7-point [.91]  
Sujan, Bettman, and Baumgartner (1993): 1, 12, 14, 25 9-point [.98]  
Taylor, Miracle, and Wilson (1997): 1, 2, 25, 32 7-point [.95, .96]  
Toncar, Mark and James Munch (2001): 1, 14, 25 7-point [.89]  
Tripp, Jensen, and Carlson (1994): 1, 3\*, 4\*, 19 7-point [.84]  
Whittler and DiMeo (1991): 6, 11, 12 15-point [.87]  
Williams and Aaker (2002): 1, 12, 19\* 7-point [.90-.95]  
Williams and Drolet (2005): 1, 2, 3, 4\*, 8, 9, 12, 14, 16, 25, 42 [.98]  
Yi (1990): 1, 2, 3, 4 7-point [.85]  
Yi, (1993): 1, 2, 3, 4 7-point [.80]

## #60 Attitude-Toward-the-Ad (Humor)

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude-Toward-the-Ad (Humor)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This semantic differential scale measures how amusing and funny an ad is perceived to be.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not always cited by its subsequent users, the scale appears to be original to Chattopadhyay and Basu (1990).

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .92, .97, and .91 were reported for the versions of the scale used by Chattopadhyay and Basu (1990), Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003), and Zang (1996), respectively.

#### **VALIDITY:**

None of the studies addressed the scale's validity. However, Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003) used the scale as a manipulation check and found that it clearly differentiated between two ads that were created (and pretested) to be different in perceived humor. This provides some limited evidence of the scale's concurrent validity.

#### **COMMENTS:**

See also Elpers, Mukherjee, and Hoyer (2004).

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Chattopadhyay, Amitava and Kunal Basu (1990), "Humor in Advertising: The Moderating Role of Prior Brand Evaluation," *JMR*, 27 (November), 466-76.
- Cline, Thomas W., Moses B. Altsech and James J. Kellaris (2003), "When Does Humor Enhance or Inhibit As Responses: The Moderating Role of the Need for Humor," *JA*, 32 (3), 31-45.
- Elpers, Josephine L.C.M. Woltman, Ashesh Mukherjee, and Wayne D. Hoyer (2004), "Humor in Television Advertising: A Moment to Moment Analysis," *JCR*, 31 (December), 592-598.
- Zhang, Yong (1996), "Responses to Humorous Advertising: The Moderating Effect of Need for Cognition," *JA*, 25 (Spring), 15-32.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. not humorous / humorous
2. not funny / funny

---

<sup>1</sup> The original version of the scale as used by Chattopadhyay and Basu (1990) used all six items and a nine-point response format. Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003) used items #1, #2, and #4 with a seven-point response format while Zang (1996) used #1-#5 with a nine-point format.

#60 *Attitude-Toward-the-Ad (Humor)*

3. not playful / playful
4. not amusing / amusing
5. dull / not dull
6. boring / not boring

## #61 Attitude Toward the Ad (Humor)

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Ad (Humor)**

### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point unipolar items are used to assess the degree to which a person believes that an ad was amusing.

### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003) did not state the source of their scale but it seems to be original to them.

### **RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .85 was reported for the scale by Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003).

### **VALIDITY:**

Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003) did not address the scale's validity. However, they used the scale as a manipulation check and found that it clearly differentiated between two ads that were created and judged by "experts" to be different in perceived humor. This provides some limited evidence of the scale's concurrent validity.

### **REFERENCES:**

Cline, Thomas W., Moses B. Altsech and James J. Kellaris (2003), "When Does Humor Enhance or Inhibit As Responses: The Moderating Role of the Need for Humor," *JA*, 32 (3), 31-45.

### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

The ad I saw was . . .

1. humorous
2. funny
3. amusing
4. serious (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003) apparently used *strongly disagree/strongly agree* as scale anchors.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Ad (Informativeness)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four descriptors with a seven-point Likert-type response format and is used to measure the degree that a person perceives an advertisement was helpful and useful.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although the scale items had been used individually in various advertising-related measures over time, their use as a set appears to be original to the study by Edwards, Li, and Lee (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .82 (n = 370) was reported for the scale by Edwards, Li, and Lee (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond some evidence from a CFA which showed the scale was unidimensional, the authors did not address the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Edwards, Steven M., Hairong Li, and Joo-Hyun Lee (2002), "Forced Exposure and Psychological Reactance: Antecedents and Consequences of the Perceived Intrusiveness of Pop-Up Ads," *JA*, 29 (3), 83-95.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

The \_\_\_\_\_ ad I saw was . . .

1. helpful
2. unimportant (r)
3. uninformative (r)
4. useless (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors used by Edwards, Li, and Lee (2002) ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (7). The blank in the scale stem is used to specify a particular ad that respondents have been exposed to.

#63 *Attitude Toward the Ad (Informativeness)*

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Ad (Informativeness)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point semantic differentials that are used to measure the degree to which an advertisement is described as being informative and thought-provoking.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Pham and Avnet (2004) but it appears to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .86 was reported for the scale by Pham and Avnet (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Pham and Avnet (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Pham, Michel Tuan and Tamar Avnet (2004), "Ideals and Oughts and the Reliance on Affect versus Substance in Persuasion," *JCR*, 30 (March), 503-518.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. gives me additional information about \_\_\_\_\_ / doesn't give me additional information about \_\_\_\_\_
2. explains the link between \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ / doesn't explain the link between \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_
3. stimulates my thoughts about \_\_\_\_\_ / does not stimulate my thoughts about \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the issue or product should be placed in the blanks of items #1 and #3. In item #2, the blanks are filled with the name of the issue/product and something else it is related to such as its consequences or benefits.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Ad (Intrusiveness)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven descriptors with a seven-point Likert-type response format are used to measure the extent to which a person perceives that an advertisement has interfered with his/her processing of the non-advertising content of a medium, e.g., watching a TV program, surfing the web, reading articles in a magazine. Although the construct is theorized to lead to negative affective reactions (irritation) and behavioral responses (avoidance), it is viewed as distinct from them.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Using a literature review, a thesaurus, and some advertising researchers, the authors (Li, Edwards, and Lee 2002) generated 11 items that were then tested in two studies. The results of those studies yielded a seven item scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .90 (interstitials), .85 (TV commercials), and .88 (magazine ads) were reported for the scale (Li, Edwards, and Lee 2002). Edwards, Li, and Lee (2002) reported an alpha of .91 based on the interstitials in their study.

**VALIDITY:**

Several forms of validity were provided for the scale by Li, Edwards, and Lee (2002). The process used for item generation provided some degree of content validity. The final set of seven items was unidimensional for three media contexts (web, TV, magazine). Finally, evidence of nomological validity was provided by showing that the construct measured by the scale had a strong impact on ad irritation which in turn influenced a couple of forms of ad avoidance. See a different form of the model tested by Edwards, Li, and Lee (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

- Edwards, Steven M., Hairong Li and Joo-Hyun Lee (2002), "Forced Exposure and Psychological Reactance: Antecedents and Consequences of the Perceived Intrusiveness of Pop-Up Ads," *JA*, 29 (3), 83-95.
- Li, Hairong, Steven M. Edwards, and Joo-Hyun Lee (2002), "Measuring the Intrusiveness of Advertisements: Scale Development and Validation," *JA*, 31 (2), 37-47.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors used by Edwards, Li, and Lee (2002) as well as Li, Edwards, and Lee (2002) ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (7).

*#64 Attitude Toward the Ad (Intrusiveness)*

When the ad was shown, I thought it was . . .

1. Distracting
2. Disturbing
3. Forced
4. Interfering
5. Intrusive
6. Invasive
7. Obtrusive

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Ad (Nostalgia)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The ten-item, seven point Likert-type scale is intended to measure the degree to which a person experiences positive affect toward an advertisement because it evokes some memory of the person's past. The scale was called *evoked nostalgia* by Muehling and Sprott (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Pascal, Sprott, and Muehling (2002). An initial bank of items was examined by two researchers knowledgeable of the nostalgia construct. Based on this, some items were eliminated or reworded. The remaining ten items were tested with a pre-test sample (n = 56) and 16 different ads. For all 16 ads, the items consistently loaded on just one factor and the average Cronbach's alpha was .90. In their main study, the items were also found to be unidimensional with an alpha of .96.

**RELIABILITY:**

Muehling and Sprott (2004) reported an alpha of .96.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was provided by Muehling and Sprott (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Muehling, Darrel D. and David E. Sprott (2004), "The Power of Reflection," *JA*, 33 (3), 25-35.
- Pascal, Vincent J., David E. Sprott, and Darrel D. Muehling (2002), "The Influence of Evoked Nostalgia on Consumers' Responses to Advertising: An Exploratory Study," *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 24 (1), 39-49.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

The ad:

1. reminds me of the past.
2. helps me recall pleasant memories.
3. makes me feel nostalgic.
4. makes me reminisce about a previous time.
5. makes me think about when I was younger.
6. evokes fond memories.
7. is a pleasant reminder of the past.
8. brings back memories of good times from the past.
9. reminds me of the good old days.
10. reminds me of good times in the past.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Ad (Unipolar)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This multi-item summated scale is intended to capture a person's overall evaluation of an ad. Although the uses described vary in both the number of items employed and the points on their response scales, they are alike in that they used a unipolar format rather than the more typical bipolar approach to measure the construct. Furthermore, a high degree of commonality exists among the items employed in the various versions of the scales.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Henthorne, LaTour, and Natarajan (1993) cited LaTour and Pitts (1989) as the source of the items used in their scale; however, only two of their six items actually were taken from that study. LaTour and Henthorne (1994) used two items from the Henthorne, LaTour, and Natarajan (1993) version of the scale and one item from a measure by LaTour, Pitts, and Snook-Luther (1990). LaTour, Snipes, and Bliss (1996) appear to have drawn on several of these studies, as well as on Madden, Ellen, and Ajzen (1992).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .77, .71, .85, and .84 were reported for the versions of the scale used by Henthorne, LaTour, and Natarajan (1993); LaTour and Henthorne (1994); LaTour, Snipes, and Bliss (1996); and LaTour and Rotfeld (1997), respectively. Moore, Stammerjohan, and Coulter (2005) reported alphas of .91 (experiment 1) and .89 (experiment 2).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported in any of the studies, but Henthorne, LaTour, and Natarajan (1993), LaTour, Snipes, and Bliss (1996), and LaTour and Rotfeld (1997) indicated that the factor analyses they performed provided evidence of their scales' unidimensionality.

**COMMENTS:**

See uses of related versions of the scale made by LaTour and Pitts (1989) and LaTour, Pitts, and Snook-Luther (1990). Also, a semantic differential version of the scale was developed by Pope, Voges, and Brown (2004) by simply adding the negation to each pair of items by Henthorne, LaTour, and Natarajan (1993), e.g., good/not good.

**REFERENCES:**

Henthorne, Tony L., Michael S. LaTour, and Rajan Natarajan (1993), "Fear Appeals in Print Advertising: An Analysis of Arousal and Ad Response," *JA*, 22 (2), 59-69.

- LaTour, Michael S. and Tony L. Henthorne (1994), "Ethical Judgments of Sexual Appeals in Print Advertising," *JA*, 23 (September), 81-90.
- LaTour, Michael S. and Robert E. Pitts (1989), "Using Fear Appeals in Advertising for AIDS Prevention in the College-Age Population," *Journal of Health Care Marketing*, 9 (September), 5-14.
- LaTour, Michael S. and Robert E. Pitts, and David C. Snook-Luther (1990), "Female Nudity, Arousal, and Ad Response: An Experimental Investigation," *JA*, 19 (4), 51-62.
- LaTour, Michael S. and Herbert J. Rotfeld (1997), "There are Threats and (Maybe) Fear-Caused Arousal: Theory and Confusions of Appeals to Fear and Fear Arousal Itself," *JA*, 26 (Fall), 45-59.
- LaTour, Michael S., Robin L. Snipes, and Sara J. Bliss (1996), "Don't Be Afraid to Use Fear Appeals: An Experimental Study," *JAR*, 36 (March/April), 59-67.
- Madden, Thomas J., Pamela Scholder Ellen, and Icek Ajzen (1992), "A Comparison of the Theory of Planned Behavior and the Theory of Reasoned Action," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18 (1), 3-9.
- Moore, Robert S., Claire Allison Stammerjohan, and Robin A. Coulter (2005), "Banner Advertiser-Web Site Context Congruity and Color Effects on Attention and Attitudes," *JA*, 34 (2), 71-84.
- Pope, Nigel K., Kevin E. Voges, and Mark R. Brown (2004), "The Effect of Provocation in the Form of Mild Erotica on Attitude to the Ad and Corporate Image," *JA*, 33 (1), 69-82.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. Good
2. Interesting
3. Informative
4. Appropriate
5. Easy to understand
6. Objective
7. Irritating
8. Offensive
9. Distinctive

---

<sup>1</sup> Henthorne, LaTour, and Natarajan (1993) used items 1 to 6 and a 4-point response format. LaTour and Henthorne (1994) used items 1, 3, 7, and 8. LaTour and Rotfeld (1997) used 1 to 6 with a 6-point format. LaTour, Snipes, and Bliss (1996) used 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9 with a 6-point scale. Moore, Stammerjohan, and Coulter (2005) apparently used the first six items and a nine-point response format.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Advertiser**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scales consist of various bi-polar adjectives designed to capture a consumer's overall evaluation of a specified advertiser. As used by Rifon et al. (2004), the scale measured attitude toward the sponsor of a website.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Each of the studies described here uses a slightly different version of the scale and it is not clear what the origin is. Simpson, Horton, and Brown (1996) as well as Rifon et al. (2004) cited MacKenzie and Lutz (1989) as the source.

**RELIABILITY:**

The internal consistency of the scale is uniformly high. Cronbach's alphas of .93 (Lohse and Rosen 2001), .96 (Muehling 1987), .90 (Mackenzie and Lutz 1989), .90 (Rifon et al. 2004), .96 (Simpson, Horton, and Brown 1996), .84 (Sinclair and Irani 2005), and .97 (Speed and Thompson 2000) were reported for the various versions of the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported in any of the studies.

**REFERENCES:**

- Lohse, Gerald L. and Dennis L. Rosen (2001), "Signaling Quality and Credibility in Yellow Pages Advertising: The Influence of Color and Graphics on Choice," *JA*, 30 (2), 73-85.
- Mackenzie, Scott B. and Richard J. Lutz (1989), "An Empirical Examination of the Structural Antecedents of Attitude Toward the Ad in an Advertising Pretesting Context," *JM*, 53 (April), 48-65.
- Muehling, Darrel D. (1987), "Comparative Advertising: The Influence of Attitude-Toward-the-Brand on Brand Evaluation," *JA*, 16 (4), 43-49.
- Rifon, Nora J., Sejung Marina Choi, Carrie S. Trimble and Hairong Li (2004), "Congruence Effects In Sponsorship," *JA*, 33 (1), 29-42.
- Simpson, Penny M., Steve Horton, and Gene Brown (1996), "Male Nudity in Advertisements: A Modified Replication and Extension of Gender and Product Effects," *JAMS*, 24 (Summer), 257-262.
- Sinclair, Janas and Tracy Irani (2005), "Advocacy Advertising for Biotechnology," *JA*, 34 (3), 59-73.
- Speed, Richard and Peter Thompson (2000), "Determinants of Sports Sponsorship Response," *JAMS*, 28 (2), 226-238.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Please rate the advertiser of this ad using the following scales.

1. good / bad
2. pleasant / unpleasant
3. favorable / unfavorable
4. positive / negative
5. reputable / not reputable

Lohse and Rosen (2001): 1, 2, 3 7-point

Mackenzie and Lutz (1989): 1, 2, 3 7-point

Muehling (1987): 1, 3, 4 7-point

Rifon et al. (2004): 1, 2, 3 7-point

Simpson, Horton, and Brown (1996): 1, 2, 3, 5 9-point

Sinclair and Irani (2005): 1, 2, 3

Speed and Thompson (2000): 1, 2, 3, 6 7-point

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem could be stated something like what is shown here. The “advertiser” might also be referred to as “the sponsor” or “the company.”

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Advertiser**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven, nine point semantic differential items are used to measure a person's attitude towards the advertiser of a product with an emphasis on the degree to which the advertiser is viewed as being honest in what is communicated about the product.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Jain and Posovac (2004) stated that the scale they used was adapted from work by Eagly, Wood and Chaiken (1978).

**RELIABILITY:**

Jain and Posovac (2004) used the scale in three studies and the alphas ranged from .77 to .89.

**VALIDITY:**

No validity testing was conducted by Jain and Posovac (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Eagly, Alice H., Wendy Wood, and Shelly Chaiken (1978), "Causal Inferences About Communicators and Their Effect on Opinion Change," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36 (April), 424-435.
- Jain, Shailendra Pratap and Steven S. Posovac (2004), "Valenced Comparisons," *JMR*, 41 (1), 46-58.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. dishonest / honest
2. close-minded / open-minded
3. manipulative / nonmanipulative
4. biased / unbiased
5. insincere / sincere
6. opportunistic / nonopportunistic
7. subjective / objective

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Article**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The seven item, seven point semantic differential scale measures a person's evaluation of a written stimulus. The stimulus used by Menon, Block, and Ramanathan (2002) was an article but the scale appears to be appropriate for other stimuli such as books, pamphlets, web pages, etc. that have some sort of threat aspect that would make the information potentially "scary."

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not identified by Menon, Block, and Ramanathan (2002) but was probably developed by them for their study. However, most of the items have routinely been used in measures of attitude-toward-the-ad (e.g., #59).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .84 was reported for the scale by Menon, Block, and Ramanathan (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was discussed in any of the studies.

**REFERENCES:**

Menon, Geeta, Lauren G. Block, and Suresh Ramanathan (2002), "We're At As Much Risk As We Are Led to Believe: Effects of Message Cues on Judgments of Health Risk," *JCR*, 28 (March), 533-549.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Not informative / very informative
2. Not credible / very credible
3. Not interesting / very interesting
4. Not useful to me / very useful to me
5. Boring / exciting
6. Not scary / very scary
7. Not well-written / very well-written

## #70 Attitude Toward the Brand

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Brand**

### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type statements that are intended to measure a consumer's opinion of a certain brand of a product.

### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's origin was provided by Sengupta and Johar (2002), however, it appears to be original to them.

### **RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .93 was reported for the scale (Sengupta and Johar 2002).

### **VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Sengupta and Johar (2002).

### **REFERENCES:**

Sengupta, Jaideep and Gita Venkataramani Johar (2002), "Effects of Inconsistent Attribute Information on the Predictive Value of Product Attitudes: Toward a Resolution of Opposing Perspectives," *JCR*, 29 (June), 39-56.

### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I think the \_\_\_\_\_ is a very good \_\_\_\_\_.
2. I think the \_\_\_\_\_ is a very useful \_\_\_\_\_.
3. My opinion of the \_\_\_\_\_ is very favorable.

---

<sup>1</sup> The brand name or model number of the product should be placed in the first blank of items #1 and #2 as well as the only blank in #3. The product category name should be placed in the second blank of the first two statements.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Brand & Product Category**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six statements attempting to assess a consumer's attitude toward a brand and the category of products it represents.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Martin and Stewart (2001) stated that their scale was based on measures used by Park, Milberg, and Lawson (1991) as well as Shavitt (1989).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was used twice by Martin and Stewart (2001; Martin, Stewart, and Matta 2005), once with regard to the core brand and once with regard to a brand extension. The alphas were .83 (core brand) and .86 (extension).

**VALIDITY:**

The typical aspects of scale validity were not provided by Martin and Stewart (2001; Martin, Stewart, and Matta 2005) although the items in the scale were said to have loaded on one factor (Martin 2004).

**COMMENTS:**

On the face of it, the items in this scale refer to two different though related things (a brand and its product category). It is quite possible for consumers to be favorable towards a product category yet not like a particular brand. Thus, it is difficult to see how the scale could be unidimensional. Care should be taken in using the scale until its psychometric quality can be confirmed.

**REFERENCES:**

- Martin, Ingrid M. (2004), Personal Correspondence.
- Martin, Ingrid M. and David W. Stewart (2001), "The Differential Impact of Goal Congruency on Attitudes, Intentions, and the Transfer of Brand Equity," *JMR*, 38 (November), 471-484.
- Martin, Ingrid M., David W. Stewart and Sashi Matta (2005), "Branding Strategies, Marketing Communication, and Perceived Brand Meaning: The Transfer of Purposive, Goal-Oriented Brand Meaning to Brand Extensions," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 275-294.
- Park, C. Whan, Sandra Milberg, and Robert Lawson (1991), "Evaluation of Brand Extensions: The Role of Product Feature Similarity and Brand Concept Consistency," *JCR*, 18 (2), 185-193.
- Shavitt, Sharon (1989), "Operationalizing Functional Theories of Attitudes," in *Attitude Structure and Functions*, Anthony R. Pratkanis, Steven J. Breckler, and Anthony G. Greenwald, eds. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 311-337.

## #71 Attitude Toward the Brand & Product Category

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. How favorable are \_\_\_\_\_?  
*not at all favorable / very favorable*
2. How likable are \_\_\_\_\_?  
*not at all likable / very likable*
3. How pleasing are \_\_\_\_\_?  
*not at all pleasing / very pleasing*
4. How favorable is the category of \_\_\_\_\_?  
*not at all favorable / very favorable*
5. How likable is the category of \_\_\_\_\_?  
*not at all likable / very likable*
6. How pleasing is the category of \_\_\_\_\_?  
*not at all pleasing / very pleasing*

---

<sup>1</sup> When measuring attitudes toward the core brand, Martin and Stewart (2001; Martin, Stewart, and Matta 2005) placed the name/description of the brand in the first three items and placed the name of the product category in the blanks of the last three items.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Brand (Search Costs)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This scale is composed of four, nine-point Likert-type items intended to measure the degree to which a person believes that a brand can be depended upon and, thereby, reduce the time and effort that would otherwise be expended by the consumer to gather information useful for making the brand selection.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The items used by Erdem and Swait (2004) are from an earlier study of theirs (Erdem and Swait 1998). It is not clear, however, that the composition of the scales was exactly the same in both studies.

**RELIABILITY:**

Erdem and Swait (2004) reported an alpha of .75 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Erdem and Swait (2004). They claim all of their scales were validated in their earlier study (Erdem and Swait 1998). However, critical details of the validation were not provided by Erdem and Swait (1998) nor is it even clear that the items shown below were unidimensional.

**REFERENCES:**

- Erdem, Tulin and Joffre Swait (1998), "Brand Equity as a Signaling Phenomenon," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 7 (April), 131-157.  
Erdem, Tulin and Joffre Swait (2004), "Brand Credibility, Brand Consideration and Choice," *JCR*, 31 (June), 191-198.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I need lots more information about this brand before I'd buy it. (r)
2. I know what I'm going to get from this brand, which saves time shopping around.
3. I know I can count on this brand being there in the future.
4. This brand gives me what I want, which saves me time and effort trying to do better.

### #73 Attitude Toward the Brand (Trustworthiness)

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Brand (Trustworthiness)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This scale is composed of five, nine-point Likert-type items intended to measure the degree to which a person believes that a brand will continue to deliver what it has promised.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Most of the items used by Erdem and Swait (2004) come directly from or are variations on items used by Erdem and Swait (1998).

**RELIABILITY:**

Erdem and Swait (2004) reported an alpha of .89 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Erdem and Swait (2004). They claim all of their scales were validated by Erdem and Swait (1998). However, critical details of the validation were not provided by Erdem and Swait (1998) and the phrasing of all scale items was not exactly the same.

**REFERENCES:**

Erdem, Tulin and Joffre Swait (1998), "Brand Equity as a Signaling Phenomenon," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 7 (April), 131-157.

Erdem, Tulin and Joffre Swait (2004), "Brand Credibility, Brand Consideration and Choice," *JCR*, 31 (June), 191-198.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. This brand delivers what it promises.
2. This brand's product claims are believable.
3. Over time, my experiences with this brand have led me to expect it to keep its promises, no more and no less.
4. This brand has a name you can trust.
5. This brand doesn't pretend to be something it isn't.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Brand Name**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, nine-point semantic differentials. It attempts to assess the appeal and suitability of a certain brand name for a product.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although bearing similarity to past measures of the same construct, especially one by Schmitt, Pan, and Tavassoli (1994), Desai and Keller (2002) apparently created their scale for use in Pretest 2 of their series of studies. The scale was used to ensure that the brand names created for use in the main study would be viewed as likable by subjects.

**RELIABILITY:**

Desai and Keller (2002) reported an alpha of .95 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Desai and Keller (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Desai, Kalpesh Kaushik and Kevin Lane Keller (2002), "The Effects of Ingredient Branding Strategies on Host Brand Extendibility," *JM*, 66 (January), 73-93.  
Schmitt, Bernd H., Yigang Pan, and Nader T. Tavassoli (1994), "Language and Consumer Memory: The Impact of Linguistic Differences Between Chinese and English," *JCR*, 21 (December), 419-431.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: A leading marketing company in the country is considering using the brand name \_\_\_\_\_ for its new \_\_\_\_\_. Using the scale items below please indicate your opinion about the brand name.

1. bad name / good name
2. dislike the name / like the name
3. unappealing name / appealing name
4. less appropriate name / more appropriate name

---

<sup>1</sup> These directions are based on the description provided by Desai and Keller (2002, p. 80) but have been generalized somewhat to make them amenable for use in a greater variety of contexts. The brand name being tested should be placed in the first blank while the generic product name or description goes in the second blank.

## #75 Attitude Toward the Charity

**SCALE NAME:** Attitude Toward the Charity

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four item, seven-point Likert-type scale measures a person's attitude about a particular charity, or more specifically, the organization that manages the charity.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not explicitly stated, the source of the scale appears to be Dean (2002). The charity referred to in his study was the Special Olympics.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .89 (Dean 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Based on the results of the CFA, evidence was provided in support of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities. Its AVE was .69.

**REFERENCES:**

Dean, Dwane Hal (2002), "Associating the Corporation with a Charitable Event Through Sponsorship: Measuring the Effects on Corporate Community Relations," *JA*, 31 (4), 77-87.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. I admire the organization that puts together the \_\_\_\_\_.
2. I respect the \_\_\_\_\_ organization.
3. The \_\_\_\_\_ is a worthy cause.
4. The objectives of the \_\_\_\_\_ are worthwhile.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the charity should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Company (Employee Relations)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's attitude about an aspect of a company's social responsibility that involves treatment of its foreign and domestic workers (e.g., hiring, compensation, working conditions). The scale was called *CSR Record Manipulation Check* by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .98 (Study 2) and .97 (Study 3) were reported for the scale by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Although some aspects of the scale's validity were probably assessed by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004), none were reported in the article.

**REFERENCES:**

Lichtenstein, Donald R., Minette E. Drumwright, and Bridgette M. Braig (2004), "The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Customer Donations to Corporate-Supported Nonprofits," *JM*, 68 (October), 16-32.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ has a strong record on fair labor practices in its overseas manufacturing plants.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ has a strong record of compensating foreign employees fairly.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ has a strong record of providing fair benefit packages for all of its employees.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ has a record of not hiring underage children in its overseas manufacturing plants.
5. \_\_\_\_\_'s working conditions in overseas factories are equal to those in U.S. factories.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal company should be placed in the blanks.

## #77 Attitude Toward the Company (General)

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Company (General)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's attitude about a company and its products. The scale was called *attitude toward the brand* by Mathwick and Rigdon (2004).

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Mathwick and Rigdon (2004) indicated that the scale was developed was Gremler (1995).

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Mathwick and Rigdon (2004) reported an alpha of .88 for the scale.

#### **VALIDITY:**

Explicit details regarding validation efforts were not provided by Mathwick and Rigdon (2004), but they did use CFA to examine their measurement model and no changes were apparently made in the scale as a result. They also implied that there was evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Gremler, Dwayne D. (1995), "The Effect of Satisfaction, Switching Costs, and Interpersonal Bonds on Service Loyalty," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Marketing Department, Arizona State University.

Mathwick, Charla and Edward Rigdon (2004), "Play, Flow, and the Online Search Experience," *JCR*, 31 (September), 324-332.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I say positive things about \_\_\_\_\_'s products to other people.
2. I have a favorable attitude toward doing business with \_\_\_\_\_ over the next few years.
3. To me, \_\_\_\_\_ is clearly the best company of its kind with which to do business.
4. I believe this is a good company.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the business should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Company (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point semantic differentials are used to assess a person's general opinion of a company. The scale was called *liking* in the pretest by Becker-Olson (2003) and the version used by Rodgers (2004) was referred to as *attitude toward the sponsor*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No source was specified by any of the authors for their scales. However, the items have been used in all sorts of attitude-toward-the-object type measurements in scholarly marketing research such as Attitude-Toward-the-Brand (#108) and Attitude-Toward-the-Ad (#59).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .96 (pretest) and .94 (main study) were reported for the version of the scale used by Becker-Olson (2003). The version used by Goldsmith, Lafferty and Newell (2001) had an alpha of .94 while the alpha for the version used by Rodgers (2004) was .92.

**VALIDITY:**

Becker-Olson (2003) and Rodgers (2004) did not provide any support for their scales' validity. As for Goldsmith, Lafferty and Newell (2001), although no rigorous evaluation of the scale's validity was discussed in the article, it was stated that the scale's items along with those measuring the other constructs were examined via principle axis factor analysis with oblique rotation. All of the items were described as loading as expected. This provides some rudimentary evidence of the scale's convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Becker-Olson, Karen L. (2003), "And Now, A Word from our Sponsor: A look at the effects of Sponsored Content and Banner Advertising," *JA*, 32 (2), 17-32.
- Goldsmith, Ronald E. (2003), Personal Correspondence.
- Goldsmith, Ronald E., Barbara A. Lafferty, and Stephen J. Newell (2001), "The Impact of Corporate Credibility and Celebrity Credibility on Consumer Reaction to Advertisements and Brands," *JA*, 29 (3), 30-54.
- Rodgers, Shelly (2004), "The Effects of Sponsor Relevance on Consumer Reactions to Internet Sponsorships," *JA*, 32 (4), 67-76.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: Please rate the following statements on each of the seven-point scales below

---

<sup>1</sup> These are the instructions and scale stem used by Goldsmith, Lafferty and Newell (2001; Goldsmith 2003). They used the first three items and the name of the company being studied was placed in the blank. The items used by Becker-Olson (2003) were #1, #2, and #4. Items #1, #2, and #5 were used by Rodgers (2004) with a five-point response scale.

*#78 Attitude Toward the Company (General)*

and circle the number that best represents your answer.

My overall impression of the \_\_\_\_\_ company is:

1. good / bad
2. favorable / unfavorable
3. satisfactory / unsatisfactory
4. negative / positive
5. disliked / liked

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Company (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five, seven-point semantic-differential phrases that assess the image a person has of a company.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Pope, Voges, and Brown (2004) modified a scale developed by Javalgi et al. (1994). They dropped one of the items used by the latter and turned each of the remaining items into a semantic-differential by adding the negation of the existing phrase, e.g., is well managed / is not well managed.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .86 was reported for the scale (Pope, Voges, and Brown 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No evidence regarding the scale's validity was provided by Pope, Voges, and Brown (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Javalgi, Rajshekhar G., Mark B. Traylor, Andrew C. Gross, and Edward Lampman (1994), "Awareness of Sponsorship and Corporate Image: An Empirical Investigation," *JA*, 23 (4), 47-58.
- Pope, Nigel K. Ll, Kevin E. Voges, and Mark R. Brown (2004), "The Effect of Provocation in the Form of Mild Erotica on Attitude to the Ad and Corporate Image," *JA*, 33 (1), 69-82.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. has good products / does not have good products
2. is well managed / is not well managed
3. is involved in the community / is not involved in the community
4. responds to consumer needs / does not respond to consumer needs
5. is a good company to work for / is not a good company to work for

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Company (Social Responsibility)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This scale uses five, seven-point Likert-type statements to measure a person's attitude regarding a particular company's support for nonprofit organizations, with an emphasis on those nonprofits in the local community.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .90 was reported for the scale by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Although some aspects of the scale's validity were probably assessed by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004), none were reported in the article.

**REFERENCES:**

Lichtenstein, Donald R., Minette E. Drumwright, and Bridgette M. Braig (2004), "The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Customer Donations to Corporate-Supported Nonprofits," *JM*, 68 (October), 16-32.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ is committed to using a portion of its profits to help nonprofits.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ gives back to the communities in which it does business.
3. Local nonprofits benefit from \_\_\_\_\_'s contributions.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ integrates charitable contributions into its business activities.
5. \_\_\_\_\_ is involved in corporate giving.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal company should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Company's Altruism (Negative)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to assess the extent to which a person thinks that the support provided by a particular business organization to a charity is done to benefit itself rather than being motivated by altruism. The scale was called anti-altruism by Dean (2002).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not explicitly stated, the source of the scale appears to be Dean (2002). The company and charity referred to in his study were Food Lion (grocery chain) and the Special Olympics, respectively.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .89 (Dean 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Based on the results of the CFA, evidence was provided in support of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities. Its AVE was .66.

**REFERENCES:**

Dean, Dwane Hal (2002), "Associating the Corporation with a Charitable Event Through Sponsorship: Measuring the Effects on Corporate Community Relations," *JA*, 31 (4), 77-87.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ would have an ulterior motive if it sponsored the \_\_\_\_\_.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ would be acting in its own self-interest if it sponsored the \_\_\_\_\_.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ would be acting to benefit itself if it sponsored the \_\_\_\_\_.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ would have something other than altruistic intentions if it sponsored the \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the business should be placed in the first blank of each statement while the name of the charity should be placed in the second blank.

#82 *Attitude Toward the Company's Altruism (Positive)*

**SCALE NAME:** Attitude Toward the Company's Altruism (Positive)

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four item, seven-point Likert-type scale measures the degree to which a consumer believes that the support provided by a particular business organization to a charity is generous and unselfish.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not explicitly stated, the source of the scale appears to be Dean (2002). The company and charity referred to in his study were Food Lion (grocery chain) and the Special Olympics, respectively.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .79 (Dean 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Based on the results of the CFA, evidence was provided in support of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities. Its AVE was .52.

**REFERENCES:**

Dean, Dwane Hal (2002), "Associating the Corporation with a Charitable Event Through Sponsorship: Measuring the Effects on Corporate Community Relations," *JA*, 31 (4), 77-87.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. \_\_\_\_\_ sponsorship of the \_\_\_\_\_ would be an act of corporate altruism.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ sponsorship of the \_\_\_\_\_ would be a generous act.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ would be acting unselfishly if it sponsored the \_\_\_\_\_.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ sponsorship of the \_\_\_\_\_ would be an act of kindness.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the business should be placed in the first blank of each statement while the name of the charity should be placed in the second blank.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Company's Altruism (Positive)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, five-point Likert-type statements intended to assess a person's belief that a company cares about its customers, particularly in some specific aspect of their lives, e.g., health.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was created by Rifon et al. (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

Rifon et al. (2004) reported an alpha of .80 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Although the validity of the scale was not examined by Rifon et al. (2004), they did examine its dimensionality using exploratory factor analysis. Eight items were generated to measure a social responsibility type of construct and a four factor solution fit the data best. The three items in this scale loaded on the same dimension.

**REFERENCES:**

Rifon, Nora J., Sejung Marina Choi, Carrie S. Trimble and Hairong Li (2004), "Congruence Effects In Sponsorship," *JA*, 33 (1), 29-42.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ cares about its customers.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ has no concern about its customers' welfare. (r)
3. \_\_\_\_\_ cares about \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the company should be the first word in each statement. For the second blank in item #3, the name or description of some topic relevant to the study can be placed, e.g., health, the environment, equal rights, et cetera.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Coupon Promotion**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three item, seven-point semantic-differential scale that is intended to measure a consumer's attitude regarding the usefulness of a coupon and intent to clip it for usage.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale is unknown but it would appear to have been developed by Raghurir (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .82 was reported for the scale by Raghurir (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Raghurir (2004). However, it was noted that in a factor analysis of five items, the three items composing this scale loaded together.

**REFERENCES:**

Raghurir, Priya (2004), "Coupons in Context: Discounting Prices or Discounting Profits?" *JR*, 80 (1), 1-12.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. good / bad
2. worthwhile / worthless
3. definitely clip the coupon / definitely not clip the coupon

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Loyalty Program**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point statements that measure the degree to which a person has a positive opinion of a business' loyalty program and is likely to recommend it to others.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Yi and Jeon (2003) but it appears to have been developed by them.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .86 (high involvement) and .88 (low involvement) were reported for the scale by Yi and Jeon (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

Yi and Jeon (2003) used confirmatory factor analysis and, based on that as well as supplementary analyses, they stated that all of their scales showed evidence of convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Yi, Youjae and Hoseong Jeon (2003), "Effects of Loyalty Programs on Value Perception, Program Loyalty, and Brand Loyalty," *JAMS*, 31 (3), 229-240.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I like the proposed loyalty program more so than other programs.
2. I have a strong preference for the proposed loyalty program.
3. I would recommend the proposed loyalty program to others.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although not explicitly stated by Yi and Jeon (2003), the anchors for the seven-point response scale appear to have been *not at all* and *quite a lot*.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Manufacturer (Trust)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type statements measuring the degree to which a consumer has a positive attitude toward the company that makes a product featured in an ad the consumer has been exposed to. The emphasis is on the high regard and respect felt by the consumer toward the manufacturer, thus, the scale was called *manufacturer esteem* by Dean (1999). It was referred to more generally by Dean and Biswas (2001) as *attitude toward the manufacturer*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Dean (1999; Dean and Biswas 2001) but it would appear to be original to him.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .83 (n = 185) was reported for the scale used in Dean (1999); alphas of .92 (n = 229) and .90 (n = 237) were reported for the version of the scale used in Dean and Biswas (2001).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Dean (1999). However, Dean and Biswas (2001) described the results of an EFA as well as a CFA of the items composing the four multi-item scales used in their two studies. All items loaded as expected. The AVE of the scale was above .70 in both studies and met a strict criterion of discriminant validity (Fornell and Larcker 1981).

**COMMENTS:**

See also an apparently similar scale called *regard* used by Dean (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Dean, Dwane Hal (1999), "Brand Endorsement, Popularity, and Event Sponsorship as Advertising Cues Affecting Consumer Pre-Purchase Attitudes," *JA*, 28 (3), 1-12.
- Dean, Dwane Hal (2003), Personal Correspondence.
- Dean, Dwane Hal and Abhijit Biswas (2001), "Third-Party Organization Endorsement of Products: An Advertising Cue Affecting Consumer Prepurchase Evaluation of Goods and Services," *JA*, 30 (4), 41-57.
- Dean, Dwane Hal (2004), "Consumer Perception of Corporate Donations," *JA*, 32 (4), 91-102.
- Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *JMR*, 18 (February), 39-50.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. Compared to other \_\_\_\_\_ brands, I hold the manufacturer of the advertised \_\_\_\_\_ in high regard.
2. The company that makes the advertised \_\_\_\_\_ deserves my respect.
3. I can trust the company that makes the advertised \_\_\_\_\_.
4. I admire the advertised \_\_\_\_\_ company.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response scale had seven points and used anchors of *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree*. The name for the product category should be placed in the blanks. Dean (1999) reported using the first three items (above) while items 1 and 4 as well as items similar to 2 and 3 were used by Dean and Biswas (2001; Dean 2003).

## #87 Attitude Toward the Object (Affective)

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Object (Affective)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, nine-point semantic-differentials are used to assess a person's response to a stimulus. The items mix aspects of describing an object with description of one's reaction to the object. The commonality of the items is affect, such that the scale appears to measure the extent to which a person believes the object has the ability to evoke a positive feeling.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although the individual items in the scale are the same or similar to ones that have been used previously, as a whole they appear to have been used first by Cohen and Andrade (2004).

#### **RELIABILITY:**

The scale was used in three of the four experiments described by Cohen and Andrade (2004) with the alphas ranging from .86 to .95. Andrade (2005) reported the scale to have alphas of .91 (Experiment 1) and .93 (Experiment 2).

#### **VALIDITY:**

No information about the scale's validity was provided by the authors except indirectly, by noting that it showed the experimental manipulations to be successful (Cohen and Andrade 2004; Andrade 2005)

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Andrade, Eduardo B. (2005), "Behavioral Consequences of Affect: Combining Evaluative and Regulatory Mechanisms," *JCR*, 32 (December), 355-362.
- Cohen, Joel B. and Eduardo B. Andrade (2004), "Affective Intuition and Task-Contingent Affect Regulation," *JCR*, 31 (September), 358-367.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. It's depressing / It's upbeat
2. I felt sad / I felt happy
3. It created a negative mood / It created a positive mood

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Object (Disgusting)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, nine-point semantic-differentials intended to measure the degree to which a person views some object as repulsive. The difference between this and some apparently similar scales is that the items in this scale describe an object apart from self whereas other measures of disgust describe one's affective reaction to some object.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No source for the scale was stated by Shimp and Stuart (2004) but the items themselves have been used previously in a couple of similar scales (Bhat, Leigh, and Wardlow 1998; Izard 1977). The difference between these scales is that, as noted above, the Shimp and Stuart (2004) scale measures how one describes some object whereas the others attempt to capture a person's own affective response to an object. While similar on the surface, these actually represent different constructs.

**RELIABILITY:**

In two applications of the scale, alphas of .90 and .94 were reported by Shimp and Stuart (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Shimp and Stuart (2004) though they did indicate that the items were unidimensional .

**REFERENCES:**

- Bhat, Subodh, Thomas W. Leigh, and Daniel L. Wardlow (1998), "The Effect of Consumer Prejudices on Ad Processing: Heterosexual Consumers' Responses to Homosexual Imagery in Ads," *JA*, 27 (4), 9-28.
- Izard, Carroll E. (1977), *Human Emotions*, New York: Plenum Press.
- Shimp, Terrence A. and Elnora W. Stuart (2004), "The Role Of Disgust As An Emotional Mediator of Advertising Effects," *JA*, 33 (1), 43-53.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. unappealing / appealing
2. disgusting / not disgusting
3. distasteful / tasteful
4. revolting / not revolting

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem or instructions should specify a particular object of interest which respondents are expected to describe using the scale items.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Object (Fun)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the extent that a person views something as providing high arousal and pleasure. Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) referred to the scale as *enjoyment*. They used the scale with mobile services but it appears to be amenable for use with activities as well, e.g., browsing the web, grocery shopping, playing cards, etc. The phrasing of the items might not work quite as well with goods, however.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) though they drew ideas for items from the literature. Four mobile services were examined in their study: text messaging, contact, payment, and gaming.

**RELIABILITY:**

The construct reliability for the scale across four mobile services studied was .95 (Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) supported the scale's validity by testing their measurement model. The model had 26 items measuring eight factors. The results indicated that each construct shared more variance with its indicators than with the other constructs in the study. Further, the fit indices indicated that the measurement model was acceptable for each of the four applications.

**REFERENCES:**

Nysveen, Herbjørn, Per E. Pederson and Helge Thorbjørnsen (2005), "Intentions to Use Mobile Services: Antecedents and Cross-Service Comparisons," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 330-346.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I find \_\_\_\_\_ entertaining.
2. I find \_\_\_\_\_ pleasant.
3. I find \_\_\_\_\_ exciting.
4. I find \_\_\_\_\_ fun.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the object should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Object (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The semantic-differential scale measures how much a person likes a specified object. Even though these items have been used many times with reference to ads and products, the uses reviewed here have to do with other types of applications. The scale has been used with the following objects in the various studies: a written editorial (Ahluwalia and Burnkrant 2004), a word (Allen and Janiszewski 1989), a radio program (Lord, Lee, and Sauer 1994), slogans (Luna, Lerman, and Peracchio 2005), scents (Morrin and Ratneshwar 2003), a magazine (Putrevu 2004), a film (Schlosser 2005), and plant biotechnology (Sinclair and Irani 2005).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information was provided in the articles about the source of the scales. Although they are similar enough to be reviewed together here they are probably original to their respective authors and developed independently. They all appear to have drawn on the items typically used in ad and brand attitude scales (#59 and #108).

**RELIABILITY:**

Ahluwalia and Burnkrant (2004) reported an alpha of .88 for their version of the scale. Alpha values of .87 and .89 were reported by Allen and Janiszewski (1989) for their two samples, respectively. Alphas of .89 were reported for the version of the scale by Lord, Lee, and Sauer (1994) as well as Putrevu (2004). Luna, Lerman, and Peracchio (2005) reported a mean alpha of .98 for their version of the scale. In two small pretests of scents, Morrin and Ratneshwar (2003) found alphas of .95 and .98 for their version of the scale. The scale used by Schlosser (2005) had an alpha of .91. As used with regard to attitudes toward plant biotechnology, the alpha for the scale was .90 (Sinclair and Irani 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not specifically addressed in the studies.

**REFERENCES:**

- Ahluwalia, Rohini and Robert E. Burnkrant (2004), "Answering Questions about Questions: A Persuasion Knowledge Perspective for Understanding the Effects of Rhetorical Questions," *JCR*, 31 (June), 26-42.
- Allen, Chris T. and Chris A. Janiszewski (1989), "Assessing the Role of Contingency Awareness in Attitudinal Conditioning With Implications for Advertising Research," *JMR*, 26 (February), 30-43.
- Lord, Kenneth R., Myung-Soo Lee, and Paul L. Sauer (1994), "Program Context Antecedents of Attitude Toward Radio Commercials," *JAMS*, 22 (1), 3-15.

## #90 Attitude Toward the Object (General)

- Luna, David, Dawn Lerman, and Laura A. Peracchio (2005), "Structural Constraints in Code-Switched Advertising," *JCR*, 32 (December), 416-423.
- Morrin, Maureen and S. Ratneshwar (2003), "Does it Make Sense to Use Scents to Enhance Brand Memory?" *JMR*, 40 (February), 10-25.
- Putrevu, Sanjay (2004), "Communicating with the Sexes," *JA*, 33 (Fall), 51-62.
- Schlosser, Ann E. (2005), "Posting Versus Lurking: Communicating in a Multiple Audience Context," *JCR*, 32 (September), 260-265.
- Sinclair, Janas and Tracy Irani (2005), "Advocacy Advertising for Biotechnology," *JA*, 34 (3), 59-73.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. bad / good
2. unpleasant / pleasant
3. unfavorable / favorable
4. dislike / like
5. useless / useful
6. undesirable / desirable
7. negative / positive
8. uninteresting / interesting
9. irritating / not irritating
10. poor quality / excellent quality
11. not at all familiar / very familiar

---

<sup>1</sup> Ahluwalia and Burnkrant (2004) used items #1, #3, and #6 with the verbal poles being modified by the word *very*. Items #1, #2, #7, and a variation on #4 (*likeable/unlikable*) were used by Allen and Janiszewski (1989). Lord, Lee, and Sauer (1994) as well as Sinclair and Irani (2005) used the first three items whereas Putrevu (2004) used #1, #2, #4, and #5. #1, #4, #8, and #9 composed the version of the scale used by Schlosser (2005). The items used by Luna, Lerman, and Peracchio (2005) were #1, #2, #4, #7, #8, and #10 and all included the term *very*. The version used by Morrin and Ratneshwar (2003) was composed of #11 and items similar to #2 and #4.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Object (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, seven-point statements that measure the degree to which a person has a positive opinion of an object and is likely to recommend it to others. Yi and Jeon (2003) referred to the scale as *brand loyalty* and used it with reference to a retailer. As it is generalized here, it appears to be amenable for use with products as well.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Yi and Jeon (2003) but it appears to have been developed by them.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .89 (high involvement) and .93 (low involvement) were reported for the scale by Yi and Jeon (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

Yi and Jeon (2003) used confirmatory factor analysis and, based on that as well as supplementary analyses, they stated that all of their scales showed evidence of convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Yi, Youjae and Hoseong Jeon (2003), "Effects of Loyalty Programs on Value Perception, Program Loyalty, and Brand Loyalty," *JAMS*, 31 (3), 229-240.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I like \_\_\_\_\_ more so than other \_\_\_\_\_s.
2. I have a strong preference for \_\_\_\_\_.
3. I give prior consideration to \_\_\_\_\_ when I have a need for a \_\_\_\_\_ of this type.
4. I would recommend \_\_\_\_\_ to others.

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors for the seven-point response scale were *not at all* and *quite a lot*. The first blank in each statement should be filled with a unique identifier such as the store name or brand name. The second blank in #1 and #3 should be filled with a name for the category or group to which the object belongs.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Political Ad**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of multiple seven-point semantic differentials that measure a person's attitude toward a specific political advertisement he/she has been exposed to.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Pinkleton (1997) stated that he drew upon several previous studies that also examined negative political advertising (e.g., Johnson-Cartee and Copeland 1991). The set of items used in Pinkleton's (1997) study focused the scale on a credibility facet whereas the set used in the 2002 study was intended as a measure of advertising utility.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .73 and .81 were reported for the versions of the scale used by Pinkleton (1997) and Pinkleton, Um, and Austin (2002), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No specific examination of the scale's validity was reported in either study. However, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted of these items and three others as part of the Pinkleton (1997) study with the results providing some support for the unidimensionality of this scale except that one item (#1, below) loaded high (>.57) on two factors (Pinkleton 1999).

**REFERENCES**

- Johnson-Cartee, Karen S. and Gary A. Copeland (1991), *Negative Political Advertising: Coming of Age*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pinkleton, Bruce (1997), "The Effects of Negative Comparative Political Advertising on Candidate Evaluations and Advertising Evaluations: An Exploration," *JA*, 26 (Spring), 19-29.
- Pinkleton, Bruce (1999), Personal Correspondence.
- Pinkleton, Bruce, Nam-Hyun Um and Erica Weintraub Austin (2002), "An Exploration of the Effects of Negative Political Advertising on Political Decision Making," *JA*, 31 (1), 13-25.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: Please rate the political advertisement on the following characteristics by circling the appropriate number.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pinkleton (1997) used items #1-#3 as well as the directions shown (Pinkleton 1999). Pinkleton, Um, and Austin (2002) used items #1, #3-#5 and it is not known what differences there were in the directions.

1. Not believable / Believable
2. Biased / Unbiased
3. Unfair / Fair
4. Informative / Uninformative
5. Interesting / Uninteresting

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, nine-point statements are used to measure a consumer's opinion of a product and inclination to use it. Given the way the items are currently phrased, the scale makes most sense to use with a new subscription-type service that is expected to be viewed as innovative.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not explicitly stated, the scale appears to have been developed by Ziamou and Ratneshwar (2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

Ziamou and Ratneshwar (2003) used the scale in three of the four studies they reported. The alphas ranged from .79 to .86.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Ziamou and Ratneshwar (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Ziamou, Paschalina and S. Ratneshwar (2003), "Innovations in Product Functionality: When and Why are Explicit Comparisons Effective," *JM*, 67 (April), 49-61.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. What is your overall opinion of \_\_\_\_\_?  
*very negative / very positive*
2. How useful is \_\_\_\_\_?  
*not at all useful / very useful*
3. How innovative is \_\_\_\_\_?  
*minor variation of existing product / completely new product*
4. How likely are you to subscribe to \_\_\_\_\_?  
*very unlikely / very likely*

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product (Achievement Goal)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, five-point Likert-type statements measuring the degree to which a person views a product or brand as helping to achieve desirable outcomes and life goals. The underlying construct has been alternatively referred to as the *approach goal* (Carver and Scheier 1990) or a *promotion focus* (Higgins 1997).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Bosmans and Baumgartner (2005; Bosman 2008) though the authors received their inspiration from Lockwood, Jordan, and Kunda (2002). It should be noted that the scale was actually phrased and tested in Dutch. The items provided below are translations from Bosman (2008).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was just used in a pretest and the alpha was .68 (Bosmans and Baumgartner 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Information regarding the scale's validity was not reported by Bosmans and Baumgartner (2005). However, given that the scale was successfully used as a manipulation check, it provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bosmans, Anick (2008), Personal Correspondence.
- Bosmans, Anick and Hans Baumgartner (2005), "Goal-Relevant Emotional Information: When Extraneous Affect Leads to Persuasion and When It Does Not," *JCR*, 32 (December), 424-434.
- Carver, Charles S., Steven K. Sutton, and Michael F. Scheier (2000), "Action, Emotion, and Personality: Emerging Conceptual Integration," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26 (June), 741-751.
- Higgins, E. Tory (1997), "Beyond Pleasure and Pain," *American Psychologist*, 52 (December), 1280-1300.
- Lockwood, Penelope, Christian H. Jordan, and Ziva Kunda (2002), "Motivation by Positive or Negative Role Models: Regulatory Focus Determines Who Will Best Inspire Us," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83 (October), 854-864.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ can enhance my performance.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ can help me obtain my desires.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product should be placed in the blanks.

*#94 Attitude Toward the Product (Achievement Goal)*

3. If I would use \_\_\_\_\_, then I would use it to achieve positive outcomes (e.g., success and prestige) in my life.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ can help me to achieve my ideals and dreams.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product (Affective)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A consumer's attitude toward a certain product is assessed with three, five-point Likert-type statements. The emphasis of the scale is on the affective component of one's attitude. The scale was referred to as *owner-product relationship* by McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig (2002).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig (2002). Creation of the items was based upon a literature review of brand communities as well as the authors' own ethnographic work and pretests.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .90 was reported for the scale (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

This scale was one of four that were used by McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig (2002) to capture customer-centered relationships. Acceptable fit was found for a four-factor confirmatory model. In addition, the results of a second-order model showed the four dimensions were an adequate reflection of a single higher-order construct (integrated brand community). The average variance extracted for this dimension was .74.

**REFERENCES:**

McAlexander, James H., John W. Schouten, and Harold F. Koenig (2002), "Building Brand Community," *JM*, 66 (January), 38-54.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I love my \_\_\_\_\_.
2. My \_\_\_\_\_ is one of my favorite possessions.
3. My \_\_\_\_\_ is fun to use.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product should be placed in the blanks. As used by McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig (2002), the brand-category combination was named, e.g., Jeep vehicle.

<sup>2</sup> McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig (2002) used the term *drive* rather than *use*. Depending upon the product being referred to, other terms might be more appropriate.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product (High Tech)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Thirteen, seven-point bi-polar items are used to measure a person's evaluation of a high technology product or at least a product that could be viewed as having a technology component to it. Tybout et al. (2005) used the scale with cars.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although most of the items have been used previously in various brand attitude scales, this set of items is unique and appears to have been used first as a scale by Tybout et al. (2005). Apparently, the scale was used in Experiment 1 with American consumers whereas in Experiment 2 the items were translated into Korean and used with Korean consumers.

**RELIABILITY:**

Two alphas were reported for the scale by Tybout et al. (2005): .97 (Experiment 1) and .93 (Experiment 2).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Tybout et al. (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Park, Se-bum (2008), Personal Correspondence.  
Tybout, Alice M., Brian Sternthal, Prashant Malaviya, Georgios A. Bakamitsos, and Se-bum Park (2005), "Information Accessibility as a Moderator of Judgments: The Role of Content versus Retrieval Ease," *JCR*, 32 (June), 76-85.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. dislike / like
2. unfavorable / favorable
3. unreliable / reliable
4. low quality / high quality
5. not valuable / valuable
6. bad / good
7. undesirable / desirable
8. poor performance / good performance
9. common / advanced
10. outdated technology / cutting edge technology
11. not durable / durable
12. not impressive / impressive
13. simple / sophisticated

---

<sup>1</sup> The items were supplied by Park (2008).

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product (Knowledge Function)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the knowledge-related functional base of a person's attitude toward a certain product. This function has to do with helping one to organize large amounts of information and assist in decision-making.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) developed the scale along with three others to measure four functional bases of attitudes.

**RELIABILITY:**

Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) reported a construct reliability of .98 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Using confirmatory factor analysis, Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) examined a measurement model of the four attitude functions. The analysis provided evidence in support of each scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Grewal, Rajdeep, Raj Mehta, Frank R. Kardes (2004), "The Timing of Repeat Purchases of Consumer Durable Goods: The Role of Functional Bases of Consumer Attitudes," *JMR*, 41 (February), 101-115.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. My \_\_\_\_\_ makes my world more predictable.
2. My \_\_\_\_\_ makes it easier for me to structure and organize my daily life.
3. My \_\_\_\_\_ facilitates in understanding what happens in everyday life.
4. If I woke up and realized that I no longer had my \_\_\_\_\_, I would be totally lost.
5. My \_\_\_\_\_ makes me feel secure and safe in an uncertain world.
6. I would be confused without my \_\_\_\_\_.
7. My \_\_\_\_\_ makes it easier for me to comprehend my surroundings.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product should be placed in the blanks.

#98 *Attitude Toward the Product (Necessity-Luxury Status)*

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product (Necessity-Luxury Status)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This scale has six, six-point Likert-type items that are intended to measure the degree to which a person believes that a product is either a “luxury” or a “necessity” for the majority of people.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Bearden and Etzel (1982). However, no information regarding the scale’s psychometric quality was provided.

**RELIABILITY:**

Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) reported a construct reliability of .99 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Using confirmatory factor analysis, Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) examined a measurement model of this scale and two others (public-private consumption and degree of product innovativeness). The analysis provided evidence in support of each scale’s convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bearden, William O. and Michael J. Etzel (1982), “Reference Group Influence on Product and Brand Purchase Decision,” *JCR*, 9 (September), 183-194.
- Grewal, Rajdeep, Raj Mehta, Frank R. Kardes (2004), “The Timing of Repeat Purchases of Consumer Durable Goods: The Role of Functional Bases of Consumer Attitudes,” *JMR*, 41 (February), 101-115.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: We are interested in knowing whether \_\_\_\_\_ are luxury or necessity products. We define luxuries and necessities as follows: luxuries are not needed for ordinary, day-to-day living; necessities are necessary for day-to-day living.

\_\_\_\_\_ are a:

1. Luxury for everyone.
2. Luxury for almost all people.
3. Luxury for the majority of people.
4. Necessity for the majority of people. (r)
5. Necessity for almost all people. (r)
6. Necessity for everyone. (r)

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product (Nutritiousness)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point statements are used to measure a person's attitude about the healthiness of a consuming a particular product based upon the information provided about it.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is apparently original to the studies by Kozup, Creyer, and Burton (2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

Kozup, Creyer, and Burton (2003) used the scale in three studies with the alphas ranging from .84 to .85.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Kozup, Creyer, and Burton (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Kozup, John C., Elizabeth H. Creyer, and Scot Burton (2003), "Making Heathful Food Choices: The Influence of Health Claims and Nutrition Information on Consumers' Evaluations of Packaged Food Products and Restaurant Menu Items," *JM*, 67 (April), 19-34.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I think the nutrition level of this product is:  
*poor / good*
2. Based on the information provided, how important would this product be as a part of a healthy diet?  
*not important at all / very important*
3. This product is:  
*bad for your heart / good for your heart.*
4. Overall, how would you rate the level of nutritiousness suggested by the information provided?  
*not nutritious at all / very nutritious*

## #100 Attitude Toward the Product (Protection Goal)

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product (Protection Goal)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, five-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a person views a product or brand as helping to prevent failures and negative outcomes in life. The underlying construct has been alternatively referred to as the *avoidance goal* (Carver and Scheier 1990) or a *prevention focus* (Higgins 1997).

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Bosmans and Baumgartner (2005; Bosman 2008) though the authors received their inspiration from Lockwood, Jordan, and Kunda (2002). It should be noted that the scale was actually phrased and tested in Dutch. The items provided below are translations from Bosman (2008).

#### **RELIABILITY:**

The scale was just used in a pretest and the alpha was .60 (Bosmans and Baumgartner 2005). That is such a low level of internal consistency that it raises some doubt about the scale's reliability.

#### **VALIDITY:**

Information regarding the scale's validity was not reported by Bosmans and Baumgartner (2005). However, given that the scale was successfully used as a manipulation check, it provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Bosmans, Anick (2008), Personal Correspondence.
- Bosmans, Anick and Hans Baumgartner (2005), "Goal-Relevant Emotional Information: When Extraneous Affect Leads to Persuasion and When It Does Not," *JCR*, 32 (December), 424-434.
- Carver, Charles S., Steven K. Sutton, and Michael F. Scheier (2000), "Action, Emotion, and Personality: Emerging Conceptual Integration," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26 (June), 741-751.
- Higgins, E. Tory (1997), "Beyond Pleasure and Pain," *American Psychologist*, 52 (December), 1280-1300.
- Lockwood, Penelope, Christian H. Jordan, and Ziva Kunda (2002), "Motivation by Positive or Negative Role Models: Regulatory Focus Determines Who Will Best Inspire Us," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83 (October), 854-864.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ is able to protect me.
2. With \_\_\_\_\_ I obtain a sense of security.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product should be placed in the blanks.

*#100 Attitude Toward the Product (Protection Goal)*

3. If I would use \_\_\_\_\_, then I would use it to prevent negative outcomes (e.g., illness or accidents) in my life.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ can prevent problems.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product (Public-Private Consumption)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six, six-point Likert-type items measuring the degree to which a person believes that a product is either “public” or “private” in its character based upon the perception of how the majority of people consume it.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Bearden and Etzel (1982). However, no information regarding the scale’s psychometric quality was provided.

**RELIABILITY:**

Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) reported a construct reliability of .99 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Using confirmatory factor analysis, Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) examined a measurement model of this scale and two others (necessity-luxury product character and degree of product innovativeness). The analysis provided evidence in support of each scale’s convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bearden, William O. and Michael J. Etzel (1982), “Reference Group Influence on Product and Brand Purchase Decision,” *JCR*, 9 (September), 183-194.
- Grewal, Rajdeep, Raj Mehta, Frank R. Kardes (2004), “The Timing of Repeat Purchases of Consumer Durable Goods: The Role of Functional Bases of Consumer Attitudes,” *JMR*, 41 (February), 101-115.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: We are interested in knowing whether \_\_\_\_\_ are publicly or privately consumed. A public product is one that other people are aware you possess and use. If others want to, they can identify the brand of the product with little or no difficulty. A private product is used at home or in private at some location. Except for your immediate family, people would be unaware that you own or use the product.

\_\_\_\_\_ are a:

1. Public product for everyone.
2. Public product for almost all people.
3. Public product for the majority of people.
4. Private product for the majority of people. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product should be placed in the blanks.

*#101 Attitude Toward the Product (Public-Private Consumption)*

5. Private product for almost all people. (r)
6. Private product for everyone. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product (Social-Adjustive Function)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has six, seven-point Likert-type items that are intended to measure the social-adjustive functional base of a person's attitude toward a certain product. This function has to do with helping one to gain approval in social settings.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) developed the scale along with three others to measure four functional bases of attitudes.

**RELIABILITY:**

Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) reported a construct reliability of .98 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Using confirmatory factor analysis, Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) examined a measurement model of the four attitude functions. The analysis provided evidence in support of each scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Grewal, Rajdeep, Raj Mehta, Frank R. Kardes (2004), "The Timing of Repeat Purchases of Consumer Durable Goods: The Role of Functional Bases of Consumer Attitudes," *JMR*, 41 (February), 101-115.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. It is important for my friends to know the brand of \_\_\_\_\_ I possess.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ are a symbol of social status.
3. My \_\_\_\_\_ helps me in fitting into important social situations.
4. I like to be seen with my \_\_\_\_\_.
5. The brand of \_\_\_\_\_ that a person owns tells me a lot about that person.
6. My \_\_\_\_\_ indicates to others the kind of person I am.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product (Utilitarian Function)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six, seven-point Likert-type items measuring the utilitarian functional base of a person's attitude toward a certain product. This function has to do with helping one to maximize the ultimate rewards and minimize punishments of a behavior.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) developed the scale along with three others to measure four functional bases of attitudes.

**RELIABILITY:**

Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) reported a construct reliability of .97 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Using confirmatory factor analysis, Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) examined a measurement model of the four attitude functions. The analysis provided evidence in support of each scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Grewal, Rajdeep, Raj Mehta, Frank R. Kardes (2004), "The Timing of Repeat Purchases of Consumer Durable Goods: The Role of Functional Bases of Consumer Attitudes," *JMR*, 41 (February), 101-115.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ make it possible for people to maximize life's rewards.
2. My \_\_\_\_\_ instills confidence in me.
3. Whenever I am using my \_\_\_\_\_, I am at ease.
4. My \_\_\_\_\_ helps in minimizing life's punishments.
5. I become more poised knowing that I own my \_\_\_\_\_.
6. With \_\_\_\_\_, daily worries vanish.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product should be placed in the blanks.

#104 *Attitude Toward the Product (Value-Expressive Function)*

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product (Value-Expressive Function)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six statements with seven-point Likert-type response formats are used to measure the value-expressive functional base of a product-related attitude. This function has to do with a product facilitating one's expression of central values and self-identity to others.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) along with three others to measure four functional bases of attitudes.

**RELIABILITY:**

Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) reported a construct reliability of .99 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Using confirmatory factor analysis, Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) examined a measurement model of the four attitude functions. The analysis provided evidence in support of each scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Grewal, Rajdeep, Raj Mehta, Frank R. Kardes (2004), "The Timing of Repeat Purchases of Consumer Durable Goods: The Role of Functional Bases of Consumer Attitudes," *JMR*, 41 (February), 101-115.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ reflect the kind of person I see myself to be.
2. My \_\_\_\_\_ helps ascertain my self-identity.
3. My \_\_\_\_\_ makes me feel good about myself.
4. My \_\_\_\_\_ is an instrument of my self-expression.
5. My \_\_\_\_\_ plays a critical role in defining my self-concept.
6. My \_\_\_\_\_ helps me to establish the kind of person I see myself to be.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product in the Ad**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, five-point Likert-type statements are used to assess a person's attitude about a product that was featured in an advertisement.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's source was provided by Lepkowska-White, Brashear, and Weinberger (2003). The key terms in the items could have easily been taken from any number of previously developed measures but the scale as a whole is not known to have been used previously.

The authors developed an English version of the scale for use with an American sample and a Polish version of the scale for use in Poland. The Polish version was apparently developed after the English version utilizing a double-back translation method.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .75 (English) and .84 (Polish) were reported for the scale by Lepkowska-White, Brashear, and Weinberger (2003; Lepkowska-White 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Little evidence was provided in support of the scale's validity though Lepkowska-White, Brashear, and Weinberger (2003) said that profile analysis indicated there was no response bias (Mullen 1995).

**REFERENCES:**

- Lepkowska-White, Elzbieta (2005), Personal Correspondence.  
Lepkowska-White, Elzbieta, Thomas G. Brashear and Marc G. Weinberger (2003), "A Test of Ad Appeal Effectiveness in Poland and the United States: The Interplay of Appeal, Product and Culture," *JA*, 32 (3), 57-67.  
Mullen, Michael R. (1995), "Diagnosing Measurement Equivalence in Cross-National Research," *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26 (3), 573-596.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The product in this ad is attractive.
2. It is a good product.
3. I like this product.
4. It is a satisfactory product.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product Price**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, eleven-point semantic differentials are used to measure a consumer's attitude regarding price of a product with an emphasis on how expensive it is believed to be. The scale was referred to as a measure of *sacrifice* by Adaval and Monroe (2002).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Adaval and Monroe (2002) but it appears to be original to their work.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had an alpha of .9172 in Experiment 1 and then in Experiment 4 it had alphas of .9319 and .9250 for low- and high-priced products, respectively (Adaval and Monroe 2002; Adaval 2005)

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Adaval and Monroe (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Adaval, Rashmi (2005), Personal Correspondence.

Adaval, Rashmi and Kent B. Monroe (2002), "Automatic Construction and Use of Contextual Information for Product and Price Evaluations," *JCR*, 28 (March), 572-588.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. extremely inexpensive / extremely expensive
2. hurts very little to pay / hurts a lot to pay
3. very low cost / very high cost

---

<sup>1</sup> The response scale used with these items ranged from -5 to 5 including a 0 (zero) point thus producing an eleven point scale.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product Price**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point statements that measure the degree to which a person believes that the advertised price for a product is high. The scale was called *perceptions of sacrifice* by Suri and Monroe (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information about the scale's origin was provided by Suri and Monroe (2003). The items bear some similarity with various other pricing-related scales but, as a whole, the scale is different enough to be treated separately here.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .96 (Suri and Monroe 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

Suri and Monroe (2003) conducted confirmatory factor analysis with items from this scale and one measuring product quality (#497). The results provided evidence for both scales' convergent and discriminant validities. The variance extracted was .70.

**REFERENCES:**

Suri, Rajineesh and Kent B. Monroe (2003), "The Effects of Time Constraints on Consumers' Judgments of Prices and Products," *JCR*, 30 (June), 92-104.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The advertised price for this \_\_\_\_\_ was:  
*very low / very high*
2. I felt that the \_\_\_\_\_ was:  
*very cheap / very expensive*
3. I felt that the manufacturer's advertised price for the \_\_\_\_\_ was:  
*very low / very high*

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scales consist of various bi-polar adjectives presumed to measure the subject's overall evaluation of the product or brand. The various versions of the scale are similar in that they are not specific to any particular product or brand under investigation although certain adjectives may not be appropriate in some cases. Note that some scale users have referred to their measures by other names such as *product evaluation*, (e.g., Muthukrishnan and Ramaswami (1999), Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004), and *product utility* (Thompson et al. 2005).

In Lane (2000), a version of this scale was used as a brand extension evaluation. Stafford and Day (1995) made slightly different use of the scale than most of the others by measuring attitudes toward a *service* rather than a *good*. Given the directions used by Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000), their scale had the sense of a country-of-origin evaluation of a class of products. One of the three uses of the scale by Ruth and Simonin (2003) was with an event (parade) sponsored by two companies. Attitude toward a hotel chain was measured by Posavac et al. (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

There is no common origin for these scales and many of them are unique in that the sets of items of which they are composed have been used as a set in just one or two studies. Some items have been used much more than others but *good/bad* is by far the most commonly used bi-polar adjective. Many of the scales have used *favorable/unfavorable* and/or *pleasant/unpleasant*. At the other extreme, there are several items (e.g., #22 to #25) that appear to have been used just once.

Versions of the scale in languages other than English have been reported such as Korean (Choi and Miracle 2004; Taylor, Miracle, and Wilson 1997) and Chinese (Zhang and Schmitt 2001).

**RELIABILITY:**

Reported internal consistencies have ranged from below .70 (Iyer 1988) to .98 (Kozup, Creyer, and Burton 2003). However, the reliabilities have tended to be on the high side with most of them being greater than .80 if not .90. See last section for specific reliabilities for each study.

**VALIDITY:**

Little if any evidence of scale validity was provided in the majority of the studies. A few authors conducted some testing, however, of unidimensionality (e.g., Anand and Sternthal 1990; MacInnis and Park).

Batra and Stayman (1990) performed confirmatory factor analysis on their ten-item scale and indicated that there were two factors, one more hedonic and the other more utilitarian. However, since use of the two scales separately led to findings not

## #108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

significantly different from those of the combined items, the latter was not discussed any further in the article.

A factor analysis was performed by Bezjian-Avery, Calder, and Iacobucci (1998) on items composing their attitude toward the brand and attitude toward the ad scales (#59). Each set of items appeared to be unidimensional with no cross-loadings greater than .34.

Darley and Smith (1993) conducted several tests to determine if the three multi-item measures they used (brand attitude, ad attitude, and ad credibility) were sufficiently representative of their respective latent constructs. Among the findings was that a three factor model fit the data better than a one factor model. This provides some evidence of the scale's discriminant validity.

Miller and Marks (1992) performed a factor analysis of nine items expected to measure either attitude-toward-the-ad or attitude-toward-the-brand. All of the items had loadings of .65 or higher on the expected factors and was used to support a claim of each scale's discriminant validity.

### COMMENTS:

See also Debevec and Iyer (1986), Desai and Keller (2002), Health, McCarthy, and Mothersbaugh (1994), Holmes and Crocker (1987), Kamins and Marks (1987), Maheswaran (1994), Nyer (1997), Orth and Holancova (2004), Pham et al.(2001), Prakash (1992), Priluck and Till (2004), Sheffet (1983), Sicilia, Ruiz, and Munuera (2005), Smith and Swinyard (1983), Tripp, Jensen, and Carlson (1994), and Unnava, Burnkrant, and Erevelles (1994). Some variations on the scale can also be found in Batra and Stayman (1990), Braun-LaTour et al. (2004), Chang (2004), Grossman and Till (1998), as well as Stayman and Batra (1991).

As is obvious from the material presented here, a wide-variety of bi-polar adjectives have been used over the years to measure brand attitude. No one set of items has been declared the optimal scale. Definitive studies of the psychometric quality of alternative versions of the measure are certainly needed. In the meantime, it is clear that some items are much more widely used than others and one should strongly consider using a set that has been used before rather than generating yet another unique set with unknown comparability to previous studies of the construct. Further, some items listed below (13, 37, 41) are probably less suited for measuring Ab and more appropriate for measuring different, though related constructs, e.g., attitude toward the act, behavioral intention.

### REFERENCES:

- Aaker, Jennifer L. (2000b), "Accessibility or Diagnosticity? Disentangling the Influence of Culture on Persuasion Processes and Attitudes," *JCR*, 26 (March), 340-357.
- Aaker, Jennifer L. and Durairaj Maheswaran (1997), "The Effect of Cultural Orientation on Persuasion," *JCR*, 24 (December), 315-328.
- Adaval, Rashmi (2001), "Sometimes It Just Feels Right: The Differential Weighting of Affected-Consistent and Affected-Inconsistent Product Information," *JCR*, 28 (June), 1-17.
- Adaval, Rashmi (2005), Personal Correspondence.

## #108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

- Adaval, Rashmi and Kent B. Monroe (2002), "Automatic Construction and Use of Contextual Information for Product and Price Evaluations," *JCR*, 28 (March ), 572-588.
- Aggarwal, Pankaj (2004), "The Effects of Brand Relationship Norms on Consumer Attitudes and Behavior," *JCR*, 31 (June), 87-101.
- Agrawal, Nidhi and Durairaj Maheswaran (2005a), "Motivated Reasoning in Outcome-Bias Effects," *JCR*, 31 (March), 798-805.
- Agrawal, Nidhi and Durairaj Maheswaran (2005b), "The Effects of Self-Construal and Commitment on Persuasion," *JCR*, 31 (March), 841-849.
- Ahluwalia, Rohini (2000), "Examination of Psychological Processes Underlying Resistance to Persuasion," *JCR*, 27 (2), 217-232.
- Ahluwalia, Rohini and Robert E. Burnkrant (2004), "Answering Questions about Questions: A Persuasion Knowledge Perspective for Understanding the Effects of Rhetorical Questions," *JCR*, 31 (June), 26-42.
- Ahluwalia, Rohini, Robert E. Burnkrant, and H. Rao Unnava (2000), "Consumer Response to Negative Publicity: The Moderating Role of Commitment," *JMR*, 37 (May), 203-214.
- Ahluwalia, Rohini and Zeynep Gurhan-Canli (2000), "The Effects of Extensions on the Family Brand Name: An Accessibility-Diagnosticity Perspective," *JCR*, 27 (3), 371-381.
- Ahluwalia, Rohini, H. Rao Unnava, and Robert E. Burnkrant (2001), "The Moderating Role of Commitment on the Spillover Effect of Marketing Communications," *JMR*, 38 (November), 458-470.
- Alpert, Frank H. and Michael A. Kamins (1995), "An Empirical Investigation of Consumer Memory, Attitude, and Perceptions Toward Pioneer and Follower Brands," *JM*, 59 (October), 34-45.
- Anand, Punam and Brian Sternthal (1990), "Ease of Message Processing as a Moderator of Repetition Effects in Advertising," *JMR*, 27 (August), 345-353.
- Andrews, J. Craig , (2001), Personal Correspondence.
- Andrews, J. Craig, Scot Burton and Richard G. Netemeyer (2001), "Are Some Comparative Nutrition Claims Misleading? The Role of Nutrition Knowledge, Ad Claim Type and Disclosure Conditions," *JA*, 29 (3), 29-42.
- Andrews, J. Craig, Richard G. Netemeyer, and Scot Burton (1998), "Consumer Generalization of Nutrient Content Claims in Advertising," *JM*, 62 (October), 62-75.
- Aylesworth, Andrew B., Ronald C. Goodstein, and Ajay Kalra (1999), "Effect of Archetypal Embeds on Feelings: An Indirect Route to Affecting Attitudes?," *JA*, 28 (3), 73-81.
- Babin, Laurie and Alvin C. Burns (1997), "Effects of Print Ad Pictures and Copy Containing Instructions to Imagine on Mental Imagery That Mediates Attitudes," *JA*, 26 (Fall), 33-44.
- Baker, William E. (1999), "When Can Affective Conditioning and Mere Exposure Directly Influence Brand Choice?" *JA*, 28 (4), 31-46.
- Baker, William E., Heather Honea, and Cristel Antonia Russell (2004), "Do Not Wait to Reveal the Brand Name," *JA*, 33 (3), 78-85.
- Barone, Michael J., Paul W. Miniard, and Jean B. Romeo (2000), "The Influence of Positive Mood on Brand Extension Evaluations," *JCR*, 26 (March), 386-400.

#108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

- Batra, Rajeev and Michael L. Ray (1986), "Affective Responses Mediating Acceptance of Advertising," *JCR*, 13 (September), 234-249.
- Batra, Rajeev and Stayman (1990), "The Role of Mood in Advertising Effectiveness," *JCR*, 17 (September), 203-214.
- Bello, Daniel C., Robert E. Pitts, and Michael J. Etzel (1983), "The Communication Effects of Controversial Sexual Content in Television Programs and Commercials," *JA*, 12 (3), 32-42.
- Berger, Ida E. and Andrew A. Mitchell (1989), "The Effect of Advertising on Attitude Accessibility, Attitude Confidence, and the Attitude Behavior Relationship," *JCR*, 16 (December), 269-279.
- Bezjian-Avery, Alexa, Bobby Calder, and Dawn Iacobucci (1998), "New Media Interactive Advertising vs. Traditional Advertising," *JAR*, 38 (July/August), 23-32.
- Bhat, Subodh, Thomas W. Leigh, and Daniel L. Wardlow (1998), "The Effect of Consumer Prejudices on Ad Processing: Heterosexual Consumers' Responses to Homosexual Imagery in Ads," *JA*, 27 (4), 9-28.
- Bone, Paula Fitzgerald and Pam Scholder Ellen (1992), "The Generation and Consequences of Communication Evoked Imagery," *JCR*, 19 (June), 93-104.
- Bosmans, Anick and Hans Baumgartner (2005), "Goal-Relevant Emotional Information: When Extraneous Affect Leads to Persuasion and When It Does Not," *JCR*, 32 (December), 424-434.
- Bower, Amanda B. and Stacy Landreth (2001), "Is Beauty Best? Highly Versus Normally Attractive Models in Advertising," *JA*, 30 (1), 1-12.
- Braun-LaTour, Kathryn A., Michael LaTour, Jacqueline E. Pickrell, and Elizabeth F. Loftus (2004), "How and When Advertising Can Influence Memory for Consumer Experience," *JA*, 33 (4), 7-25.
- Briñol, Pablo, Richard E. Petty and Zakary L. Tormala (2004), "Self-Validation of Cognitive Responses to Advertisements," *JCR*, 30 (March), 559-573.
- Bruner, Gordon C. and Anand Kumar (2000), "Web Commercials and Advertising Hierarchy-of-Effects," *JAR*, 40 (Jan-Apr), 35-42.
- Burnkrant, Robert E. and H. Rao Unnava (1995), "Effects of Self-Referencing on Persuasion," *JCR*, 22 (June), 17-26.
- Campbell, Margaret C. and Ronald C. Goodstein (2001), "The Moderating Effect of Perceived Risk on Consumers' Evaluations of Product Incongruity: Preference for the Norm," *JCR*, 28 (December), 439-449.
- Campbell, Margaret C. and Kevin Lane Keller (2003), "Brand Familiarity and Advertising Repetition Effects," *JCR*, 30 (September), 292-304.
- Chang, Chingching (2004), "The Interplay of Product Class Knowledge and Trial Experience in Attitude Formation," *JA*, 33 (1), 83-92.
- Chattopadhyay, Amitava and Kunal Basu (1990), "Humor in Advertising: The Moderating Role of Prior Brand Evaluation," *JMR*, 27 (November), 466-476.
- Chattopadhyay, Amitava and Prakash Nedungadi (1992), "Does Attitude Toward the Ad Endure? The Moderating Effects of Attention and Delay," *JCR*, 19 (June), 26-33.
- Chao, Paul (2001), "The Moderating Effects of Country of Assembly, Country of Parts, and Country of Design on Hybrid Product Evaluations," *JA*, 30 (Winter), 67-81.
- Chao, Paul (2003), Personal Correspondence.

## #108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

- Choi, Yung Kyun and Gordon E. Miracle (2004), "The Effectiveness of Comparative Advertising in Korea and the United States," *JA*, 33 (4), 75-87.
- Cline, Thomas W., Moses B. Altsech and James J. Kellaris (2003), "When Does Humor Enhance or Inhibit As Responses: The Moderating Role of the Need for Humor," *JA*, 32 (3), 31-45.
- Coulter, Keith S. and Girish N. Punj (2004), "The effects of Cognitive Resource Requirement, Availability, and Argument Quality on Brand Attitudes," *JA*, 33 (4), 53-64.
- Cox, Dena Saliagas and Anthony D. Cox (1988), "What Does Familiarity Breed? Complexity as a Moderator of Repetition Effects in Advertisement Evaluations," *JCR*, 15 (June), 111-116.
- Cox, Dena Saliagas and Anthony D. Cox (2002), "Beyond First Impressions: The Effects of Repeated Exposure on Consumer Liking of Visually Complex and Simple Product Designs," *JAMS*, 30 (2), 119-130.
- Cox, Dena Saliagas and William B. Locander (1987), "Product Novelty: Does It Moderate the Relationship Between Ad Attitudes and Brand Attitudes," *JA*, 16 (3), 39-44.
- Dabholkar, Pratibha A. and Richard P. Bagozzi (2002), "An Attitudinal Model of Technology-Based Self-Service: Moderating Effects of Consumer Traits and Situational Factors," *JAMS*, 30 (3), 184-201.
- Dahlén, Miceal (2005), "The Medium as a Contextual Cue," *JA*, 34 (3), 89-98.
- Darley, William K. and Robert E. Smith (1993), "Advertising Claim Objectivity: Antecedents and Effects," *JM*, 57 (October), 100-113.
- Darley, William K. and Robert E. Smith (1995), "Gender Differences in Information Processing Strategies: An Empirical Test of the Selectivity Model in Advertising Response," *JA*, 24 (Spring), 41-56.
- Debevec, Kathleen and Easwar Iyer (1986), "The Influence of Spokespersons in Altering a Product's Gender Image: Implications for Advertising Effectiveness," *JA*, 15 (4), 12-20.
- Desai, Kalpesh Kaushik and Kevin Lane Keller (2002), "The Effects of Ingredient Branding Strategies on Host Brand Extendibility," *JM*, 66 (January), 73-93.
- Despande, Rohit and Douglas Stayman (1994), "A Tale of Two Cities: Distinctiveness Theory and Advertising Effectiveness," *JMR*, 31 (February), 57-64.
- Droge, Cornelia (1989), "Shaping the Route to Attitude Change: Central Versus Peripheral Processing Through Comparative Versus Noncomparative Advertising," *JMR*, 26 (May), 193-204.
- Edell, Julie and Kevin Lane Keller (1989), "The Information Processing of Coordinated Media Campaigns," *JMR*, 26 (May), 149-63.
- Ellen, Pam Scholder and Paula Fitzgerald Bone (1998), "Does It Matter If It Smells? Olfactory Stimuli As Advertising Executional Cues," *JA*, 27 (4), 29-39.
- Fennis, Bob M. (2003), Personal Correspondence.
- Fennis, Bob M. and Arnold B. Bakker (2001), "Stay Tuned-We Will Be Back Right After These Messages: Need to Evaluate Moderates the Transfer of Irritation in Advertising," *JA*, 30 (3), 15-25.
- Gardner, Meryl Paula, Andrew A. Mitchell, and J. Edward Russo (1985), "Low Involvement Strategies for Processing Advertisements," *JA*, 14 (2), 4-12, 56.

#108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

- Garretson, Judith A. and Scot Burton (2005), "The Role of Spokescharacters as Advertisement and Package Cues in Integrated Marketing Communications," *JM*, 69 (October), 118-132.
- Gelb, Betsy G. and George M. Zinkhan (1986), "Humor and Advertising Effectiveness After Repeated Exposures to a Radio Commercial," *JA*, 15 (2), 15-20.
- Gill, James D., Sanford Grossbart, and Russel N. Laczniak (1988), "Influence of Involvement, Commitment, and Familiarity on Brand Beliefs and Attitudes of Viewers Exposed to Alternative Advertising Claim Strategies," *JA*, 17 (2), 33-43.
- Goodstein, Ronald C. (1993), "Category based Applications and Extensions in Advertising: Motivating More Extensive Ad Processing," *JCR*, 20 (June), 87-99.
- Gotlieb, Jerry B. and John E. Swan (1990), "An Application of the Elaboration Likelihood Model," *JAMS*, 18 (Summer), 221-228.
- Grant, Susan Jung, Prashant Malaviya and Brian Sternthal (2004), "The Influence of Negation on Product Evaluations," *JCR*, 31 (December), 583-591.
- Grier, Sonya A. and Rohit Deshpandé (2001), "Social Dimensions of Consumer Distinctiveness: The Influence of Social Status on Group Identity and Advertising Persuasion," *JMR*, 38 (May), 216-224.
- Griffith, David A. and Qimei Chen (2004), "The Influence of Virtual Direct Experience (VDE) on On-Line Ad Message Effectiveness," *JA*, 33 (1), 55-68.
- Grossbart, Sanford, Darrel D. Muehling, and Norman Kangun (1986), "Verbal and Visual References to Competition in Comparative Advertising," *JA*, 15 (1), 10-23.
- Grossman, Randi Priluck and Brian D. Till (1998), "The Persistence of Classically Conditioned Brand Attitudes," *JA*, 27 (Spring), 23-31.
- Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep (2003), "The Effect of Expected Variability of Product Quality and Attribute Uniqueness on Family Brand Evaluations," *JCR*, 30 (June), 105-114.
- Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep and Rajeev Batra (2004), "When Corporate Image Affects Product Evaluations: The Moderating Role of Perceived Risk," *JMR*, 41 (2), 197-205.
- Gürhan-Canli, Zeynep and Durairaj Maheswaran (1998), "The Effects of Extensions on Brand Name Dilution and Enhancement," *JMR*, 35 (November), 464-473.
- Gürhan-Canli, Zeynep and Durairaj Maheswaran (2000a), "Determinants of Country-of-Origin Evaluations," *JCR*, 27 (1), 96-108.
- Gürhan-Canli, Zeynep and Durairaj Maheswaran (2000b), "Cultural Variations in Country of Origin Effects," *JMR*, 37 (3), 309-317.
- Hastak, Manoj (1990), "Does Retrospective Thought Measurement Influence Subsequent Measures of Cognitive Structure in an Advertising Context?" *JA*, 19 (3), 3-13.
- Hastak, Manoj and Jerry C. Olson (1989), "Assessing the Role of Brand Related Cognitive Responses as Mediators of Communication Effects," *JCR*, 15 (March), 444-56.
- Health, Timothy B., Michael S. McCarthy, and David L. Mothersbaugh (1994), "Spokesperson Fame and Vividness Effects in the Context of Issue-relevant Thinking: The Moderating Role of Competitive Setting," *JCR*, 20 (March), 520-534.
- Herr, Paul M., Frank R. Kardes, and John Kim (1991), "Effects of Word of Mouth and Product Attribute Information on Persuasion: An Accessibility Diagnosticity Perspective," *JCR*, 17 (March), 454-462.
- Holbrook, Morris B. and Rajeev Batra (1987), "Assessing the Role of Emotions as Mediators of Consumer Responses to Advertising," *JCR*, 14 (December), 404-420.

### #108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

- 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," *JAMS*, 15 (Spring), 27-35.
- Homer, Pamela M. (1990), "The Mediating Role of Attitude Toward the Ad: Some Additional Evidence," *JMR*, 27 (February), 78-86.
- Homer, Pamela M. and Lynn R. Kahle (1990), "Source Expertise, Time of Source Identification, and Involvement in Persuasion: An Elaborative Processing Perspective," *JA*, 19 (1), 30-39.
- Howard, Daniel J. and Charles Gengler (2001), "Emotional Contagion Effects on Product Attitudes," *JCR*, 28 (September), 189-201.
- Iyer, Easwar S. (1988), "The Influence of Verbal Content and Relative Newness on the Effectiveness of Comparative Advertising," *JA*, 17 (3), 15-21.
- Jain, Shailendra Pratap and Steven S. Posavac (2004), "Valenced Comparisons," *JMR*, 41 (February), 46-58.
- Kalra, Ajay and Ronald C. Goodstein (1998), "The Impact of Advertising Positioning Strategies on Consumer Price Sensitivity," *JMR*, 35 (May), 210-224.
- Kamins, Micheal A. and Lawrance J. Marks (1987), "Advertising Puffery: The Impact of Using Two Sided Claims on Product Attitude and Purchase Intention," *JA*, 16 (4), 6-15.
- Kardes, Frank R. and Gurumurthy Kalyanaram (1992), "Order of Entry Effects on Consumer Memory and Judgment: An Information Integration Perspective," *JMR*, 29 (August), 343-357.
- Keller, Kevin Lane (1991a), "Cue Compatibility and Framing in Advertising," *JMR*, 28 (February), 42-57.
- Keller, Kevin Lane (1991b), "Memory and Evaluation Effects in Competitive Advertising Environments," *JCR*, 17 (March), 463-476.
- Kelleris, James J., Anthony D. Cox, and Dena Cox (1993), "The Effect of Background Music on Ad Processing: A Contingency Explanation," *JM*, 57 (October), 114-125.
- Kempf, DeAnna S. and Russell N. Laczniak (2001), "Advertising's Influence on Subsequent Product Trial Processing," *JA*, 30 (3), 27-38.
- Kempf, DeAnna S. and Robert E. Smith (1998), "Consumer Processing of Product Trial and the Influence of Prior Advertising: A Structural Modeling Approach," *JMR*, 35 (August), 325-338.
- Kim, Allen, and Frank R. Kardes (1996), "An Investigation of the Mediational Mechanisms Underlying Attitudinal Conditioning," *JMR*, 33 (August), 318-328.
- Kim, John, Jeen-Su Lim, and Mukesh Bhargava (1998), "The Role of Affect in Attitude Formation: A Classical Conditioning Approach," *JAMS*, 26 (2), 143-152.
- Ko, Hanjun, Chang-Hoan Cho, and Marilyn S. Roberts (2005), "Internet Uses and Gratifications: A Structural Equation Model of Interactive Advertising," *JA*, 34 (2), 57-70.
- Kozup, John C., Elizabeth H. Creyer, and Scot Burton (2003), "Making Heathful Food Choices: The Influence of Health Claims and Nutrition Information on Consumers' Evaluations of Packaged Food Products and Restaurant Menu Items," *JM*, 67 (April), 19-34.
- Krishnamurthy, Parthasarathy and Anuradha Sivaraman (2002), "Counterfactual Thinking and Advertising Responses," *JCR*, 28 (March), 650-658.

#108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

- Krishnamurthy, Parthasarathy and Mita Sujun (1999), "Retrospection Versus Anticipation: The Role of the Ad under Retrospective and Anticipatory Self-Referencing," *JCR*, 26 (June), 55-69.
- Laczniak, Russell N. and Darrel D. Muehling (1993), "The Relationship Between Experimental Manipulations and Tests of Theory in an Advertising Message Involvement Context," *JA*, 22 (September), 59-74.
- Lam, Shun Yin and Avinandan Mukherjee (2005), "The Effects of Merchandise Coordination and Juxtaposition on Consumers' Product Evaluation and Purchase Intention in Store-Based Retailing," *JR*, 81 (3), 231-250.
- Lane, Vicki R. (2003), Personal Correspondence.
- Lane, Vicki R. (2000), "The Impact of Ad Repetition and Ad Content on Consumer Perceptions of Incongruent Extensions," *JM*, 64 (2), 80-91.
- Leclerc, France (1998), Personal Correspondence.
- Leclerc, France and John D. C. Little (1997), "Can Advertising Copy Make FSI Coupons More Effective?," *JMR*, 34 (November), 473-484.
- Li, Hairong, Terry Daugherty, and Frank Biocca (2002), "Impact of 3-D Advertising on Product Knowledge, Brand Attitude, and Purchase Intention: The Mediating Role of Presence," *JA*, 29 (3), 43-57.
- Lim, Jeon-Su, William K. Darley, and John O. Summers (1994), "An Assessment of Country of Origin Effects Under Alternative Presentation Formats," *JAMS*, 22 (3), 272-282.
- Loken, Barbara and James Ward (1990), "Alternative Approaches to Understanding the Determinants of Typicality," *JCR*, 17 (September), 111-126.
- Lord, Kenneth R., Myung-Soo Lee, and Paul L. Sauer (1994), "Program Context Antecedents of Attitude toward Radio Commercials," *JAMS*, 22 (1), 3-15.
- Lord, Kenneth R., Myung-Soo Lee, and Paul L. Sauer (1995), "The Combined Influence Hypothesis Central and Peripheral Antecedents of Attitude Toward the Ad," *JA*, 24 (Spring), 73-85.
- Machleit, Karen A., Chris T. Allen, and Thomas J. Madden (1993), "The Mature Brand and Brand Interest: An Alternative Consequence of Ad Evoked Affect," *JM*, 57 (October), 72-82.
- MacInnis, Deborah J. and C. Whan Park (1991), "The Differential Role of Characteristics of Music on High and Low Involvement Consumers' Processing of Ads," *JCR*, 18 (September), 161-173.
- MacKenzie, Scott B. and Richard J. Lutz (1989), "An Empirical Examination of the Structural Antecedents of Attitude Toward the Ad in an Advertising Pretesting Context," *JM*, 53 (April), 48-65.
- 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," *JMR*, 23 (May), 130-143.
- MacKenzie, Scott B. and Richard A. Spreng (1992), "How Does Motivation Moderate the Impact of Central and Peripheral Processing on Brand Attitudes and Intentions," *JCR*, 18 (March), 519-529.
- Macklin, M. Carole, Norman T. Bruvold, and Carole Lynn Shea (1985), "Is It Always as Simple as 'Keep It Simple'?", *JA*, 14 (4), 28-35.

## #108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

- Maheswaran, Durairaj (1994), "Country of Origin as a Stereotype: Effects of Consumer Expertise and Attribute Strength on Product Evaluations," *JCR*, 21 (September), 354-365.
- Martin, Brett A.S., Bodo Lang, and Stephanie Wong (2004), "Conclusion Explicitness in Advertising," *JA*, 32 (4), 57-65.
- Martin, Brett A. S., Christina Kwai-Choi Lee, and Feng Yang (2004), "The Influence of Ad Model Ethnicity and Self-Referencing on Attitudes," *JA*, 33 (4), 27-37.
- Matilla, Anna S. (2003), "The Impact of Cognitive Inertia on Postconsumption Evaluation Processes," *JAMS*, 31 (3), 287-299.
- McQuarrie, Edward F. and David Glen Mick (1992), "On Resonance: A Critical Pluralistic Inquiry into Advertising Rhetoric," *JCR*, 19 (September), 180-197.
- Mick, David Glen (1992), "Levels of Subjective Comprehension in Advertising Processing and Their Relations to Ad Perceptions, Attitudes, and Memory," *JCR*, 18 (March), 411-424.
- Miller, Darryl W. and Lawrence J. Marks (1992), "Mental Imagery and Sound Effects in Radio Commercials," *JA*, 21 (4), 83-93.
- Miniard, Paul W., Sunil Bhatla, and Randall L. Rose (1990), "On the Formation and Relationship of Ad and Brand Attitudes: An Experimental and Causal Analysis," *JMR*, 27 (August), 290-303.
- Miniard, Paul W., Sunil Bhatla, Kenneth R. Lord, Peter R. Dickson, and H. Rao Unnava (1991), "Picture based Persuasion Processes and the Moderating Role of Involvement," *JCR*, 18 (June), 92-107.
- Miniard, Paul W., Deepak Sirdeshmukh, and Daniel E. Innis (1992), "Peripheral Persuasion and Brand Choice," *JCR*, 19 (September), 226-239.
- Mitchell, Andrew A. (1986), "The Effect of Verbal and Visual Components of Advertisements on Brand Attitudes and Attitude Toward the Advertisement," *JCR*, 13 (June), 12-24.
- Mitchell, Andrew A. and Jerry C. Olson (1981), "Are Product Attribute Beliefs the Only Mediator of Advertising Effects on Brand Attitude?," *JMR*, 18 (August), 318-332.
- Mittal, Banwari (1990), "The Relative Roles of Brand Beliefs and Attitude Toward the Ad as Mediators of Brand Attitude: A Second Look," *JMR*, 27 (May), 209-219.
- Moore, David J., John C. Mowen, and Richard Reardon (1994), "Multiple Sources in Advertising Appeals: When Product Endorsers Are Paid by the Advertising Sponsor," *JAMS*, 22 (Summer), 234-243.
- Mothersbaugh, David L., Bruce A. Huhmann, and George R. Franke (2002), "Combinatory and Separative Effects of Rhetorical Figures on Consumers' Effort and Focus in Ad Processing," *JCR*, 28 (March), 589-602.
- Muehling, Darrel D., Russell N. Laczniaak, and Jeffrey J. Stoltman (1991), "The Moderating Effects of Ad Message Involvement: A Reassessment," *JA*, 20 (June), 29-38.
- Muehling, Darrel D. and David E. Sprott (2004), "The Power of Reflection," *JA*, 33 (3), 25-35.
- Mukherjee, Ashesh and Wayne D. Hoyer (2001), "The Effect of Novel Attributes on Product Evaluation," *JCR*, 28 (December), 462-472.
- Munch, James M. and John L. Swasy (1988), "Rhetorical Question, Summarization Frequency, and Argument Strength Effects on Recall," *JCR*, 15 (June), 69-76.

#108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

- Murry, John P. Jr., John L. Lastovicka, and Surendra N. Singh (1992), "Feeling and Liking Responses to Television Programs: An Examination of Two Explanations for Media-Context Effects," *JCR*, 18 (March), 441-451.
- Muthukrishnan, A. V. and S. Ramaswami (1999), "Contextual Effects on the Revision of Evaluative Judgments: An Extension of the Omission-Detection Framework," *JCR*, 26 (June), 70-84.
- Niedrich, Ronald W. and Scott D. Swain (2003), "The Influence of Pioneer Status and Experience Order on Consumer Brand Preference: A Mediated-Effects Model," *JAMS*, 31 (4), 468-480.
- Nyer, Prashanth U. (1997), "A Study of the Relationships Between Cognitive Appraisals and Consumption Emotions," *JAMS*, 25 (Fall), 296-304.
- Orth, Ulrich R., and Denisa Holancova (2004), "Consumer Response to Sex Role Portrayals in Advertisements," *JA*, 32 (4), 77-89.
- Peracchio, Laura A., and Joan Meyers-Levy (2005), "Using Stylistic Properties of Ad Pictures to Communicate with Consumers," *JCR*, 32 (June), 29-40.
- Peterson, Robert A., William R. Wilson, and Steven P. Brown (1992), "Effects of Advertised Customer Satisfaction Claims on Consumer Attitudes and Purchase Intentions," *JAR*, 32 (March/April), 34-40.
- Petrova, Petia K. and Robert B. Cialdini (2005), "Fluency of Consumption Imagery and the Backfire Effects of Imagery Appeals," *JCR*, 32 (December), 442-452.
- Pham, Michel Tuan (1996), "Cue Representation and Selection Effects of Arousal on Persuasion," *JCR*, 22 (March), 373-387.
- Pham, Michel Tuan and Tamar Avnet (2004), "Ideals and Oughts and the Reliance on Affect versus Substance in Persuasion," *JCR*, 30 (March), 503-518.
- Pham, Michel Tuan and A.V. Muthukrishnan (2002), "Search and Alignment in Judgment Revision: Implications for Brand Positioning," *JMR*, 39 (February), 18-30.
- Pham, Michel Tuan, Joel B. Cohen, Johan W. Pracejus, and G. David Hughes (2001), "Affect Monitoring and the Primacy of Feelings in Judgment," *JCR*, 28 (September), 167-188.
- Posavac, Steven S., David M. Sanbonmatsu, Frank R. Kardes and Gavan J. Fitzsimons (2004), "The Brand Positivity Effect: When Evaluation Confers Preference," *JCR*, 31 (December), 643-651.
- Prakash, Ved (1992), "Sex Roles and Advertising Preferences," *JAR*, 32 (May/June), 43-52.
- Priester, Joseph R., Dhananjay Nayakankuppam, Monique A. Fleming, and John Godek (2004), "The A<sup>2</sup>SC<sup>2</sup> Model: The Influence of Attitudes and Altitude Strength on Consideration and Choice," *JCR*, 30 (March), 574-587.
- Priluck, Randi and Brian D. Till (2004), "The Role of Contingency Awareness, Involvement, and Need for Cognition in Attitude formation," *JAMS*, 32 (3), 329-344.
- Putrevu, Sanjay (2004), "Communicating with the Sexes," *JA*, 33 (Fall), 51-62.
- Raju, P.S. and Manoj Hastak (1983), "Pre Trial Cognitive Effects of Cents Off Coupons," *JA*, 12 (2), 24-33.
- Roehm, Michelle L., Ellen Bolman Pullins, and Harper A. Roehm, Jr. (2002), "Designing Loyalty-Building Programs for Packaged Goods Brands," *JMR*, 39 (May), 202-213.
- Rosenberg, Edward, Rik Pieters, and Michel Wedel (1997), "Visual Attention to Advertising: A Segment-Level Analysis," *JCR*, 24 (December), 305-314.

## #108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

- Rossiter, John R. and Larry Percy (1980), "Attitude Change Through Visual Imagery in Advertising," *JA*, 9 (2), 10-16.
- Samu, Sridhar, H. Shanker Krishnan, and Robert E. Smith (1999), "Using Advertising Alliances for New Product Introduction: Interactions Between Product Complementarity and Promotional Strategies," *JM*, 63 (January), 57-74.
- Sanbonmatsu, David and Frank R. Kardes (1988), "The Effects of Physiological Arousal on Information Processing and Persuasion," *JCR*, 15 (December), 379-385.
- Sengupta, Jaideep and Gavan J. Fitzsimons (2000), "The Effects of Analyzing Reasons for Brand Preferences: Disruption or Reinforcement?" *JMR*, 37 (3), 318-330.
- Sengupta, Jaideep and Gerald J. Gorn (2002), "Absence Makes the Mind Grow Sharper: Effects of Element Omission on Subsequent Recall," *JMR*, 39 (May), 186-201.
- Sengupta, Jaideep and Gita Venkataramani Johar (2002), "Effects of Inconsistent Attribute Information on the Predictive Value of Product Attitudes: Toward a Resolution of Opposing Perspectives," *JCR*, 29 (June), 39-56.
- Sheffet, Mary Jane (1983), "An Experimental Investigation of the Documentation of Advertising Claims," *JA*, 12 (2), 19-29.
- Shiv, Baba, Julie A. Edell Britton and John W. Payne (2004), "Does Elaboration Increase or Decrease the Effectiveness of Negatively versus Positively Framed Messages?" *JCR*, 31 (June), 199-208.
- Shiv, Baba, Julie A. Edell, and John W. Payne (1997), "Factors Affecting the Impact of Negatively and Positively Framed Ad Messages," *JCR*, 24 (December), 285-294.
- Sicilia, Maria, Salvador Ruiz, and Jose L. Munuera (2005), "Effects of Interactivity in a Web Site," *JA*, 34 (3), 31-45.
- Simonin, Bernard L. and Julie A. Ruth (1998), "Is a Company Known by the Company It Keeps? Assessing the Spillover Effects of Brand Alliances on Consumer Brand Attitudes," *JMR*, 35 (February), 30-42.
- Simpson, Penny M., Steve Horton, and Gene Brown (1996), "Male Nudity in Advertisements: A Modified Replication and Extension of Gender and Product Effects," *JAMS*, 24 (Summer), 257-262.
- Sirgy, M. Joseph, Dhruv Grewal, Tamara F. Mangleburg, Jae-ok Park, Kye-Sung Chon, C. B. Claiborne, J. S. Johar, and Harold Berkman (1997), "Assessing the Predictive Validity of Two Methods of Measuring Self-Image Conguence," *JAMS*, 25 (Summer), 229-241.
- Singh, Mandeep, Siva K. Balasubramanian, and Goutam Chakraborty (2000), "A Comparative Analysis of Three Communication Formats: Advertising, Infomercial, and Direct Experience," *JA*, 29 (Winter), 59-75.
- Singh, Surendra N. and Catherine Cole (1993), "The Effects of Length, Content, and Repetition on Television Commercial Effectiveness," *JMR*, 30 (February), 91-104.
- Singh, Surendra, V. Parker Lessig, Dongwook Kim, Reetika Gupta, and Mary Ann Hocutt (2000), "Does Your Ad Have Too Many Pictures?" *JAR*, 40 (Jan-Apr), 11-27.
- Smith, Robert E. (1993), "Integrating Information From Advertising and Trial: Processes and Effects on Consumer Response to Product Information," *JMR*, 30 (May), 204-219.
- Smith, Robert E. and William R. Swinyard (1983), "Attitude Behavior Consistency: The Impact of Product Trial Versus Advertising," *JMR*, 20 (August), 257-267.

## #108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

- Sorescu, Alina B. and Betsy D. Gelb (2000), "Negative Competitive Advertising: Evidence Favoring Fine-Tuning," *JA*, 29 (Winter), 25-40.
- Stafford, Marla Royne and Ellen Day (1995), "Retail Services Advertising: The Effects of Appeal, Medium, and Service," *JA*, 24 (Spring), 57-71.
- Stevenson, Julie, Gordon C. Bruner II, and Anand Kumar (2000), "Webpage Background and Viewer Attitudes," *JAR*, 40 (January/April), 29-34.
- Stayman, Douglas M. and Rajeev Batra (1991), "Encoding and Retrieval of Ad Affect in Memory," *JMR*, 28 (May), 232-239.
- Stout, Patricia and Benedicta L. Burda (1989), "Zipped Commercials: Are They Effective?," *JA*, 18 (Number 4), 23-32.
- Stuart, Shimp, and Engle (1987), "Classical Conditioning of Consumer Attitudes: Four Experiments in an Advertising Context," *JCR*, 14 (December), 334-349.
- Sujan, Mita and James R. Bettman (1989), "The Effects of Brand Positioning Strategies on Consumers' Brand and Category Perceptions: Some Insights from Schema Research," *JMR*, 26 (November), 454-467.
- Sujan, Mita, James R. Bettman, and Hans Baumgartner (1993), "Influencing Consumer Judgments Using Autobiographical Memories: A Self Referencing Perspective," *JMR*, 30 (November), 422-436.
- Szymanski, David M. (2001), "Modality and Offering Effects in Sales Presentations for a Good Versus a Service," *JAMS*, 29 (2), 179-189.
- Tavassoli, Nader T. and Yih Hwai Lee (2003), "The Differential Interaction of Auditory and Visual Advertising Elements with Chinese and English," *JMR*, 60 (November), 468-480.
- Taylor, Charles R., Gordon E. Miracle, and R. Dale Wilson (1997), "The Impact of Information Level on the Effectiveness of U.S. and Korean Television Commercials," *JA*, 26 (Spring), 1-18.
- Thompson, Debora Viana, Rebecca W. Hamilton, and Roland T. Rust (2005), "Feature Fatigue: When Product Capabilities Become Too Much of a Good Thing," *JMR*, 42 (November), 431-442.
- Till, Brian D. and Daniel W. Baack (2005), "Recall and Persuasion," *JA*, 34 (3), 47-57.
- Till, Brian D. and Michael Busler (2001), "The Match-Up Hypothesis: Physical Attractiveness, Expertise, and the Role of Fit on Brand Attitude, Purchase Intent and Brand Beliefs," *JA*, 29 (3), 1-14.
- Till, Brian D. and Terence A. Shimp (1998), "Endorsers In Advertising: The Case of Negative Celebrity Information," *JA*, 27 (Spring), 67-82.
- Toncar, Mark and James Munch (2001), "Consumer Responses to Tropes in Print Advertising," *JA*, 30 (1), 55-65.
- Tripp, Carolyn, Thomas D. Jensen, and Les Carlson (1994), "The Effects of Multiple Product Endorsements by Celebrities on Consumers' Attitudes and Intentions," *JCR*, 20 (March), 535-547.
- Unnava, H. Rao, Robert E. Burnkrant, and Sunil Erevelles (1994), "Effects of Presentation Order and Communication Modality on Recall and Attitude," *JCR*, 21 (September), 481-490.
- Viswanathan, Madhubalan and Terry L. Childers (1999), "Understanding How Product Attributes Influence Product Categorization: Development and Validation of Fuzzy

## #108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

- Set-Based Measures of Gradedness in Product Categories,” *JMR*, 36 (February), 75-94.
- Voss, Kevin E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Voss, Kevin E., Eric R. Spangenberg, and Bianca Grohmann (2003), “Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Dimensions of Consumer Attitude,” *JMR*, 40 (August), 310-320.
- Wansink, Brian and Michael L. Ray (1992), “Estimating and Advertisement's Impact on One's Consumption of a Brand,” *JAR*, 32 (May/June), 9-16.
- Ward, James C., Mary Jo Bitner, and John Barnes (1992), “Measuring the Prototypicality and Meaning of Retail Environments,” *JR*, 68 (Summer), 194-220.
- Wheeler, S. Christian, Richard E. Petty, and George Y. Bizer (2005), “Self-Schema Matching and Attitude Change: Situational and Dispositional Determinants of Message Elaboration,” *JCR*, 31 (March), 787-797.
- Whittler, Tommy E. (1991), “The Effects of Actors' Race in Commercial Advertising: Review and Extension,” *JA*, 20 (1), 54-60.
- Whittler, Tommy E. and Joan DiMeo (1991), “Viewers' Reactions to Racial Cues in Advertising Stimuli,” *JAR*, 31 (December), 37-46.
- Yi, Youjae (1990a), “Cognitive and Affective Priming Effects of the Context for Print Advertisements,” *JA*, 19 (2), 40-48.
- Yi, Youjae (1990b), “The Effects of Contextual Priming in Print Advertisements,” *JCR*, 17 (September), 215-222.
- Zhang, Shi and Bernd H. Schmitt (2001), “Creating Local Brands in Multilingual International Markets,” *JMR*, 38 (August), 313-325.
- Zhang, Shi and Sanjay Sood (2002), “‘Deep’ and ‘Surface’ Cues: Brand Extension Evaluations by Children and Adults,” *JCR*, 29 (June), 129-141.
- Zhang, Yong (1996), “Responses to Humorous Advertising: The Moderating Effect of Need for Cognition,” *JA*, 25 (Spring), 15-32.
- Zhang, Yong and Richard Buda (1999), “Moderating Effects of Need for Cognition on Responses to Positively versus Negatively Framed Advertising Messages,” *JA*, 28 (2), 1-15.
- Zhang, Yong and Betsy D. Gelb (1996), “Matching Advertising Appeals to Culture: The Influence of Products’ Use Conditions,” *JA*, 25 (Fall), 29-46.
- Zinkhan, George M., William B. Locander, and James H. Leigh (1986), “Dimensional Relationships of Aided Recall and Recognition,” *JA*, 15 (1), 38-46.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. good / bad
2. like / dislike

---

<sup>1</sup> For ease of reporting, the positive anchors (when clear) are listed on the left. Scale items used in specific studies are listed with an indication of the number of response alternatives, if known. Some authors have used scale anchors that have essentially the same meaning but with minor semantic differences, such as *like very much/dislike very much* instead of *like/dislike*. For purposes of parsimony, one version is reported and slight variations are noted with an asterisk (\*). For each study, the reliability of a particular set of items is shown in brackets. In several cases, more than one reliability or a range is given because the article reported use of the scale with multiple samples, experiments, et cetera.

*#108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)*

3. pleasant / unpleasant
4. high quality / poor quality
5. agreeable / disagreeable
6. satisfactory / dissatisfactory
7. wise / foolish
8. beneficial / harmful
9. favorable / unfavorable
10. distinctive / common
11. likable / dislikable
12. positive / negative
13. buy / would not buy
14. attractive / unattractive
15. enjoyable / unenjoyable
16. useful / useless
17. desirable / undesirable
18. nice / awful
19. important / unimportant
20. harmless / harmful
21. valuable / worthless
22. appetizing / unappetizing
23. unique / not unique
24. expensive / inexpensive
25. needed / not needed
26. fond of / not fond of
27. superior / inferior
28. interesting / boring
29. tasteful / tasteless
30. appealing / unappealing
31. for me / not for me
32. appropriate / inappropriate
33. reasonable / unreasonable
34. value for money / no value for money
35. fast / slow
36. healthy / unhealthy
37. would definitely consider buying it / would definitely not consider buying it
38. effective / ineffective
39. strong / weak
40. responsible / irresponsible
41. would like to try / would not like to try
42. favorite / least favorite
43. acceptable / unacceptable
44. carefully produced / not carefully produced
45. works well / works poorly
46. convincing / unconvincing
47. consistent / inconsistent

## #108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

48. impresses me / does not impress me

- Aaker (2000b): 1, 9, 11\* 7-point [.82-.93]  
Aaker and Maheswaran (1997): 1\*, 9\*, 13\*, 16\* 9-point [.89]  
Adaval (2001): 1\*, 14\*, 17\* 11-point [>.91]  
Adaval and Monroe (2002; Adaval 2005): 2\*, 14\*, 17\* 11-point [.9208-.9776]  
Aggarwal (2004): 2, 6\*, 9 7-point [.88-.95]  
Aggarwal and Law (2005): 1, 2, 3, 4\* 7-point [.96]  
Agrawal and Maheswaran (2005a): 1, 9, 17 9-points [.85-.91]  
Agrawal and Maheswaran (2005b): 1\*, 9\*, 16\*, 17\*, 27\*, 37 7-point [.93]  
Ahluwalia (2000): 1, 8, 17 9-point [.96]  
Ahluwalia and Burnkrant (2004): 1, 9, 18 9-point [.80]  
Ahluwalia, Burnkrant, and Unnava (2000; Ahluwalia, Unnava, and Burnkrant (2001): 1, 8, 17, 18 9-point [.97]  
Ahluwalia, and Gurhan-Canli (2000): 1\*, 9\*, 12\* 7-point [.95]  
Alpert and Kamins (1995): 2\*, 9\*, 12\* 7-point [.81 & .77]  
Anand and Sternthal (1990): 1, 2, 3, 13, 15 7-point [.91]  
Andrews, Burton and Netemeyer (2001): 1, 9, 12 7-point [.96]  
Andrews, Netemeyer, and Burton (1998; Andrews 2001): 1, 9, 12 7-point [.96]  
Aylesworth, Goodstein, and Kalra (1999): 1, 9, 11 7-point [.90]  
Babin and Burns (1997): 1, 14, 17, 28\*, 30, 31, 32, 33 7-point [.91]  
Baker (1999): 1, 4\*, 8, 16 7-point [.84 & .85]  
Baker, Honea, Russell (2004): 1, 2, 12 101-point [.89]  
Barone, Miniard, and Romeo (2000): 4\*, 9, 17 7-point [.82-.89+]  
Batra and Ray (1986): 1, 3, 16, 18, 19 7-point [.80]  
Batra and Ray (1986): 3, 16, 18, 19 [.93]  
Batra and Stayman (1990): 1, 2, 3, 4\*, 5, 8\*, 9, 12, 16, 21 [.94]  
Bello, Pitts, and Etzel (1983): 1\*, 4\*, 7\*, 8\*, 10\*, 16\*, 17\* 7-point [.86]  
Berger and Mitchell (1989): 1, 2\* 7-point [.94]  
Bezjian-Avery, Calder, and Iacobucci (1998): 1, 2\*, 4\*, 12, 18, 27, 28, 36 7-point [.88]  
Bhat, Leigh, and Wardlow (1998): 2, 9, 12 7-point [.84]  
Bone and Ellen (1992): 1, 7, 9, 16 [.86 & .82]  
Bosmans and Baumgartner (2005): 12, 14, 21, 28\* 5-point [.82]  
Bosmans and Baumgartner (2005): 1, 2\*, 12, 14, 16, 17, 28\*, 48 7-point [.93]  
Bower and Landreth (2001): 1, 2, 4\*, 9, 12, 38, 39 7-point [.92]  
Briñol, Petty, and Tormala (2004): 1, 3, 9, 12, 14\*, 16\*, 17, 28 9-point [.87]  
Briñol, Petty, and Tormala (2004): 1, 7, 8, 12 9-point [.81]  
Bruner and Kumar (2000): 1, 9, 12 7-point [.94]  
Burnkrant and Unnava (1995): 1, 3, 8, 17, 18, 27 7-point [.91]  
Campbell and Goodstein (2001): 1, 9, 17, 30 7-point [.92-.95]  
Campbell and Keller (2003): 1, 3, 4\*, 30 7-point [.88, .95]  
Chao (2001; Chao 2003): 1, 6\*, 9 7-point [.97]  
Chattopadhyay and Basu (1990): 1, 2, 18\* 9-point [.93]  
Chattopadhyay and Nedungadi (1992): 1, 2, 18\* 9-point [.87]  
Choi and Miracle (2004): 1, 2, 6\*, 9, 12, 45 7-point [.90-.92]  
Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003): 1, 17, 28\*, 30, 43 7-point [.91]

#108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

- Coulter and Punj (2004): 1, 2, 9, 12 7-point [.92]  
Cox and Cox (1988): 1, 3, 11 9-point [.94]  
Cox and Cox (2002): 1, 3, 11\* 7-point [.89]  
Cox and Locander (1987): 1, 3, 11 9-point [.90]  
Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002): 1, 3, 8, 9 7-point [.85]  
Dahlén (2005): 1, 6\*, 12 7-point [.92]  
Darley and Smith (1993): 1, 4, 11\* [.83]  
Darley and Smith (1995): 1, 3, 4, 11\* [.85]  
Deshpande and Stayman (1994): 1, 3, 4\*, 12, 16, 21 7-point [.94]  
Droge (1989): 1, 3, 5, 6\*, 7, 8 7-point [.942 & .941]  
Edell and Keller (1989): 1\*, 2\* 7-point [.97]  
Ellen and Bone (1998): 1, 7, 8, 9, 7-point [.91]  
Fennis and Bakker (2001; Fennis 2003): 1, 2\*, 3, 7, 12, 14, 16\*, 18\*, 19, 20, 40, 41 [.89]  
Gardner, Mitchell, and Russo (1985): 1, 2\*, 4 [.94]  
Garretson and Burton (2005): 1, 2, 9, 12 7-point [.95 - .96]  
Gelb and Zinkhan (1986): 1, 6\*, 9 [.91]  
Gill, Grossbart, and Laczniak (1988): 1\*, 2\*, 9\*, 21\* 7-point [.95]  
Goodstein (1993): 1, 9, 11 7-point [.97 & .98]  
Gotlieb and Swan (1990): 1, 6\*, 9 [.93]  
Grant, Malaviya, and Sternthal (2004): 1, 2, 4\*, 13\* 7-point [.89 & .95]  
Grier and Despondé (2001): 1, 3, 4\*, 9 7-point [.915]  
Griffith and Chen (2004): 1, 2, 3 7-point [.87]  
Griffith and Chen (2004): 1, 6\*, 9, 11 7-point [.86 & .77]  
Grossbart, Muehling, and Kangun (1986): 1, 9, 12 7-point [.96 & .97]  
Gurhan-Canli (2003): 1\*, 9\*, 12\*, 17\* 9-point [.90-.93]  
Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004): 1\*, 9\*, 12\* 9-point [.92]  
Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran (1998): 1, 9\*, 12 7-point [.98]  
Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000a): 1, 9\*, 12 7-point [.91]  
Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000b): 1, 9\*, 12, 37 7-point [.97]  
Hastak and Olson (1989; Hastak 1990): 1, 2, 4 7-point [.90+]  
Health, McCarthy, and Mothersbaugh (1994): 1, 6\*, 9 9-point [.88 - .96]  
Herr, Kardes, and Kim (1991): 1, 9, 17 11-point [.95]  
Holbrook and Batra (1987): 1\*, 2\*, 9\*, 12\* 7-point [.98]  
Homer (1990): 1, 2, 9 9-point [.85 & .91]  
Homer and Kahle (1990): 1, 6\*, 17 [.86]  
Howard and Gengler (2001): 1, 3, 17 7-point [.94 & .87]  
Iyer (1988): 1, 8, 16 7-point [.698]  
Jain and Posavac (2004): 1\*, 9\*, 16\* 9-point [.83-.91]  
Kalra and Goodstein (1998): 1\*, 2\*, 9\* 7-point [.92]  
Kardes and Kalyanaram (1992): 1\*, 6, 9\* 11-point [.92+ & .94+]  
Keller (1991a): 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 16, 18, 19 7-point [.94]  
Keller (1991b): 1, 3, 4, 11 7-point [.90]  
Kelleris, Cox, and Cox (1993): 1, 2, 11\*, 28\*, 29 7-point [.91]  
Kempf and Laczniak (2001): 1, 2, 9 7-point [.97]  
Kempf and Smith (1998): 1, 3, 9 7-point [.91]  
Kim, Allen, and Kardes (1996): 1, 2\*, 3, 4, 14, 27, 28 7-point (?) [.79]

## #108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

- Kim, Lim, and Bhargava (1998): 1, 2\*, 3, 4, 14, 27, 28 [.92]  
Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005): 1, 3, 9 7-point [.83]  
Kozup, Creyer, and Burton (2003): 1, 2, 9 7-point [.97-.99]  
Krishnamurthy and Sivaraman (2002): 1, 9, 12 [.97]  
Krishnamurthy and Sujana (1999): 1, 9, 12 9-point [.97]  
Laczniak and Muehling (1993): 1\*, 2\*, 4, 9\*, 21 7-point [.94]  
Lam and Mukherjee (2005): 1, 2, 9, 16\*, 17 7-point [.94, .96]  
Lane (2000, 2003): 4\*, 6\*, 30 7-point [.83-.90]  
Leclerc and Little (1997): 1, 6\*, 9 9-point [.95 & .92]  
Li, Daugherty, and Biocca (2002): 1, 2, 3, 14, 28, 30 7-point [.91 & .89]  
Lim, Darley, and Summers (1994): 1, 9, 11\* 7-point [.92 - .94]  
Loken and Ward (1990): 1, 4, 6\* 11-point [.979]  
Lord, Lee, and Sauer (1994, 1995): 1, 3, 9 7-point [.85]  
Machleit, Allen, and Madden (1993): 1, 7\*, 17 7-point [.86 - .96]  
MacInnis and Park (1991): 1\*, 9, 11\*, 30 7-point [.95]  
MacKenzie and Lutz (1989): 1, 3, 9 7-point [.86]  
MacKenzie, Lutz, and Belch (1986): 1, 7, 9 7-point [.92]  
MacKenzie and Spreng (1992): 1, 3, 9 7-point [.85]  
Macklin, Bruvold, and Shea (1985): 1, 3, 18, 21, 27, 28 7-point [.83]  
Maheswaran (1994): 1, 9, 16\* 9-point [.80 - .92]  
Martin, Lang, and Wong (2004): 1, 2\*, 3, 4\* 7-point [.90]  
Martin, Lee, and Yang (2004): 1, 2, 3, 27 5-point [.79]  
Mattila (2003): 1, 2, 4\* 7-point [.89]  
McQuarrie and Mick (1992): 1\*, 4\*, 21 7-point [.88 & .92]  
Mick (1992): 1, 3, 21 9-point [.87]  
Miller and Marks (1992): 1, 2\*, 3, 4, 25 7-point [.84]  
Miniard, Bhatla, and Rose (1990): 2, 9, 12 7-point [.97]  
Miniard et al.(1991): 2\*, 9, 12 7-point [.95]  
Miniard, Sirdeshmukh, and Innis (1992) {initial measure}: 9, 12, 30 11-point [.91 - .97]  
Miniard, Sirdeshmukh, and Innis (1992) {final measure}: 1, 14, 17 7-point [.91 - .97]  
Mitchell (1986): 1, 2, 3 7-point [.89 - .92]  
Mitchell and Olson (1981): 1, 2\*, 3, 4 5-point [.88]  
Mittal (1990): 1, 2, 17 7-point [.81 & .90]  
Moore, Mowen, and Reardon (1994): 1, 8, 9 7-point [.90]  
Mothersbaugh, Huhmann, and Franke (2002): 1, 2, 9, 12, 42 9-point [.96]  
Muehling, Laczniak, and Stoltman (1991): 1, 9, 12 7-point [.93]  
Muehling and Sprott (2004): 1, 2, 9, 21 7-point [.90]  
Mukherjee and Hoyer (2001): 1, 2, 4\*, 9, 16\*, 17 9-point [.92]  
Munch and Swasy (1988): 1, 3, 12 7-point [.89]  
Murry, Lastovicka, Singh (1992): 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 11\* 5-point (?) [.91]  
Muthukrishnan and Ramaswami (1999): 1, 2, 9 9-point [.89]  
Niedrich and Swain (2003): 1, 6\*, 9 9-point [.867 - .958]  
Peracchio and Meyers-Levy (2005): 13\*, 27, 30, 47 7-point [.75, .88]  
Peterson, Wilson, and Brown (1992): 4, 16\*, 17\*, 23, 24 [.80]  
Petrova and Cialdini (2005): 1, 9, 12 9-point [.91, .92]  
Pham (1996): {experiment 1} 1, 6\*, 9 7-point [.98]

#108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

- Pham (1996): {experiments 2 & 3} 1, 2, 6\*, 9 ?-point [.86 & .96]  
Pham and Avnet (2004): 1, 2, 9 7-point [.94]  
Pham and Muthukrishnan (2002): 1, 2, 9 9-point [.85-.93]  
Posavac et al. (2004): 1\*, 4\*, 9\* 9-point [.92, .96]  
Priester et al. (2004): 1, 9, 12 9-point [.97]  
Priester et al. (2004): 1, 7, 8, 9, 11\*, 12, 30 9-point [.94]  
Putrevu (2004): 1, 2, 9, 16 7-point [.85-.95]  
Raju and Hastak (1983): 1, 2\*, 4 7-point [.90]  
Rosenberg, Pieters, and Wedel (1997): 1, 4\*, 34 5-point [.85]  
Roehm, Pullins, and Roehm (2002): 1, 4\*, 12 7-point [.90, .92]  
Rossiter and Percy (1980): 1, 3, 27, 28 7-point [.86]  
Ruth and Simonin (2003): 1, 9, 12 7-point [.77-.98]  
Samu, Krishnan, and Smith (1999): 1, 3, 9 7-point (?) [.94]  
Sanbonmatsu and Kardes (1988): 1, 6, 9 9-point [.98]  
Sengupta and Fitzsimons (2000): 1\*, 2\*, 9\*, 29\* ?-point [.94]  
Sengupta and Gorn (2002): 1, 2, 12 7-point [.86]  
Sengupta and Johar (2002): 1, 9, 16\* 7-point [.84]  
Sengupta and Johar (2002): 2, 9, 12 7-point [.97]  
Shiv, Britton, and Payne (2004): 1, 11\*, 16, 17 7-point [.94]  
Shiv, Edell, and Payne (1997): 1, 3, 4\*, 11\*, 30 7-point [.91 & .90]  
Simonin and Ruth (1998): 1, 9, 12 7-point [.957 - .982]  
Simpson, Horton, and Brown (1996): 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8\*, 9, 12, 16, 21 9-point [.978]  
Singh, Balasubramanian, and Chakraborty (2000): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.93]  
Singh, Balasubramanian, and Chakraborty (2000): 1, 3, 5 7-point [.94]  
Singh and Cole (1993): 2\*, 8\*, 15, 16, 19, 21, 26 7-point [.95]  
Singh et al.(2000): 2\*, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 26 7-point [.94]  
Sirgy et al. (1997): 1\*, 6\*, 9\* 5-point [.77]  
Smith (1993): 1, 3, 9 [.97]  
Sorescu and Gelb (2000): 1, 9, 12 7-point [.84-.95]  
Stafford and Day (1995): 1, 9, 12 7-point [.97]  
Stevenson, Bruner, and Kumar (2000): 1, 9, 12 7-point [.89]  
Stout and Burda (1989): 2, 9 7-point [.75]  
Stuart, Shimp, and Engle (1987): 1, 2\*, 3, 4, 14, 27, 28 7-point [.96]  
Sujan and Bettman (1989): 1, 9, 12 7-point [.94]  
Sujan, Bettman, and Baumgartner (1993): 1, 3, 9, 12 9-point [.97 & .98]  
Szymanski (2001): 2, 9, 12 7-point [.78]  
Tavassoli and Lee (2003): 1, 2\*, 13, 17, 41 7-point [.94 & .97]  
Taylor, Miracle, and Wilson (1997): 3, 8, 9, 12 7-point [.96]  
Thompson et al. (2005): 1, 4\*, 9, 11, 16\*, 17 7-point [.88-.94]  
Till and Baack (2005): 1, 2, 9, 12, 27 7-point [> .97]  
Till and Busler (2000): 2\*, 9, 12 9-point [.92 & .96]  
Till and Shimp (1998): 1, 2, 4, 9, 12, 27, 35 9-point [.93]  
Toncar, Mark and James Munch (2001): 1, 3, 12 7-point [.89]  
Tripp, Jensen, and Carlson (1994): 1, 2\*, 3, 4\* 7-point [.88]  
Unnava, Burnkrant, and Erevelles (1994): 1\*, 14, 17\*, 18\* 7-point [.78 & .92]  
Viswanathan and Childers (1999): 1, 4\*, 6\* 10-point [.91]

*#108 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)*

Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003; Voss 2005): 1, 2, 3, 9, 12 7-point [.91]  
Wansink and Ray (1992): 1\*, 4\*, 11, 22 7-point [.936]  
Ward, Bitner, and Barnes (1992): 1, 4, 6\* 11-point [.95]  
Wheeler, Petty, and Bizer (2005): 1, 8, 9, 12, 17, 46 7-point [.96]  
Whittler and DiMeo (1991): 1, 4\*, 6\* 15-point [.88]  
Whittler (1991): 1, 4\*, 6\* 15-point [.91 & .88]  
Yi (1990a): 1, 2, 3 7-point [.92]  
Yi (1990b): 1, 2, 9 7-point [.90]  
Zhang (1996): 1, 11\*, 18\* 9-point [.95]  
Zhang and Budda (1999): 1, 11\*, 18\* 7-point [.86]  
Zhang and Gelb (1996): 1, 11\*, 18\* 9-point [.88]  
Zhang and Schmitt (2001): 1, 2, 6\* 7-point [.91]  
Zhang and Sood (2002): 1, 3, 4\*, 11 7-point [.83-.92]  
Zinkhan, Locander, and Leigh (1986): 1, 3, 21 8-point [.93]

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of various semantic differentials used to measure a consumer's evaluation of a product. Depending upon the mix of items used, the scale has some similarity to measures of purchase intention and/or product quality.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not specifically stated in the article, the scale appears to be original to Peracchio and Meyers-Levy (1994). Some modifications were made in later uses of the scale by Meyers-Levy and Peracchio (1995), Peracchio and Meyers-Levy (1997), and Luna and Peracchio (2001).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .71 (experiment one, bicycle), .91 (experiment two, bicycle), and .92 (experiment two, clothing) were reported for the scale by Meyers-Levy and Peracchio (1995). An alpha of .89 was reported for scale for both jeans and beer by Peracchio and Meyers-Levy (1994). Peracchio and Meyers-Levy (1997) reported alphas of .85 and .92 for evaluations of beer and ski products, respectively. (No alphas for the scale as used in their second experiment were reported.) Alphas of .85 and .96 were reported for the somewhat different versions of the scale used in Luna and Peracchio (2001) and (2005a), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No specific evidence of the scale's validity was provided in any of the studies. However, in a couple of the studies the authors stated that the items loaded on a single factor (Luna and Peracchio 2001; Peracchio and Meyers-Levy 1994).

**COMMENTS:**

Despite the limited evidence that suggests the scale is internally consistent and unidimensional, more rigorous testing may show that it is tapping into two or more factors. It is not clear except in some general sense what high scores on this scale mean: it could mean that consumers are willing to purchase the item; it could mean that they believe the product is of high quality; or, it could mean they think it represents a good value for the money. These have been considered separate constructs in past research and strong consideration should be given to measuring them with different scales so it is clearer to researchers what a score on the scale means.

See also a variation on this scale used in a small pilot test by Luna and Peracchio (2005b).

**REFERENCES:**

### #109 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (General Evaluative)

- Luna, David and Laura A. Peracchio (2001), "Moderators of Language Effects in Advertising to Bilinguals: A Psycholinguistic Approach," *JCR*, 28 (September), 284-295.
- Luna, David and Laura A. Peracchio (2005a), "Sociolinguistic Effects on Code-Switched Ads Targeting Bilingual Customers," *JA*, 34 (2), 43-56.
- Luna, David and Laura A. Peracchio (2005b), "Advertising to Bilingual Consumers: The Impact of Code-Switching on Persuasion," *JCR*, 31 (March), 760-765.
- Meyers-Levy, Joan and Laura A. Peracchio (1995), "Understanding the Effects of Color: How the Correspondence between Available and Required Resources Affects Attitudes," *JCR*, 22 (September), 121-138.
- Peracchio, Laura A. and Joan Meyers-Levy (1994), "How Ambiguous Cropped Objects in Ad Photos Can Affect Product Evaluations," *JCR*, 21 (June), 190-204.
- Peracchio, Laura A. and Joan Meyers-Levy (1997), "Evaluating Persuasion-Enhancing Techniques from a Resource-Matching Perspective," *JCR*, 24 (September), 178-191.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I would not purchase this product / I would purchase this product
2. mediocre product / exceptional product
3. not at all high quality / extremely high quality
4. poor value / excellent value
5. poorly made / well made
6. boring / exciting
7. not a worthwhile product / a worthwhile product
8. unappealing product / appealing product
9. common / unique
10. I would not recommend it to a friend / I would recommend it to a friend
11. very bad / very good

---

<sup>1</sup> Peracchio and Meyers-Levy (1994) used items 1 to 5. Meyers-Levy and Peracchio (1995) used items 4, 5, 6, 7, and one similar to 1. Peracchio and Meyers-Levy (1997) used items the same or similar to 3, 4, 5, and 7 as well as an additional one (8). Variations were made in item 5 in each of those studies depending upon the product being evaluated (e.g., crafted, designed). See articles for specific terms. Luna and Peracchio (2001) used items the same or similar to 3, 4, and 6 as well as another one (9). Luna and Peracchio (2005a) used items #2, #10, and #11 as well as items similar to #1, #3, and #8.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (Healthiness)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point unipolar items are used to measure a person's attitude about a product with an emphasis on how appropriate it is to eat/use due to its healthiness. The product examined by subjects in the Shiv and Nowlis (2004) study was brands of chocolate bars.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale seems to be original to Shiv and Nowlis (2004). It was used in a pretest (n = 31) before Experiment 2.

**RELIABILITY:**

Shiv and Nowlis (2004) reported an alpha of .97 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No evidence of the scale's validity was reported by Shiv and Nowlis (2004). However, since the scale was used successfully as a manipulation check, that provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Shiv, Baba and Stephen M. Nowlis (2004), "The Effect of Distractions While Tasting a Food Sample: the Interplay of Informational and Affective Components in Subsequent Choice," *JCR*, 31 (December), 599-608.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. healthy
2. wise
3. prudent

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem used by Shiv and Nowlis (2004) apparently asked subjects to describe how a particular chocolate bar they just tasted compared to chocolates they normally eat. The response scale had *much less* (-3) and *much more* (+3) as extreme verbal anchors.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (Hedonic)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five, seven-point semantic differentials that are intended to measure the portion of a person's attitude resulting from sensations derived from experience or the sensations one imagines would be experienced. The scale is amenable for use with product categories or more specifically with brands.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) along with a companion scale (the utilitarian dimension of attitude) as a result of theoretical and psychometric concerns with previous measures (Batra and Ahtola 1991). The article reports on a set of six studies that in total provide considerable support for the unidimensionality, internal consistency, and validity of the scales.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .95 was reported for the scale by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) as applied to brand names and generic products in both Study 1 and 2. Internal consistencies were somewhat lower in some of the other studies, depending upon the stimulus being responded to. (See Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann 2003, p. 315.)

**VALIDITY:**

As noted above, a variety of validation tests were conducted. Specifically, evidence from LISREL supported a two-factor model (hedonic and utilitarian dimensions) and evidence was provided to show the scales were measuring something distinct from product involvement (discriminant validity). Evidence was reported in support of criterion and nomological validities as well.

**REFERENCES:**

- Batra, Rajeev and Olli T. Ahtola (1991), "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Sources of Consumer Attitudes," *Marketing Letters*, 2 (April), 159-170.
- Voss, Kevin E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Voss, Kevin E., Eric R. Spangenberg, and Bianca Grohmann (2003), "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Dimensions of Consumer Attitude," *JMR*, 40 (August), 310-320.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Directions: For each statement below, place a check mark closer to the adjective that you believe best describes your feelings about the product. The more appropriate the adjective seems, the closer you should place your mark to it.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The directions were supplied by Voss (2005).

*#111 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (Hedonic)*

1. not fun / fun
2. dull / exciting
3. not delightful / delightful
4. not thrilling / thrilling
5. unenjoyable / enjoyable

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (Hedonic)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point unipolar items are used to measure a person's attitude about a product with an emphasis on how enjoyable it is perceived to be relative to alternatives that the consumer is used to. The product examined by subjects in the Shiv and Nowlis (2004) study was brands of chocolate bars.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although sharing an item or two with some previous measures, this complete set appears to be original to Shiv and Nowlis (2004). The scale was used in a pretest (n = 31) before Experiment 2.

**RELIABILITY:**

Shiv and Nowlis (2004) reported an alpha of .96 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No evidence of the scale's validity was reported by Shiv and Nowlis (2004). However, since the scale was used successfully as a manipulation check, that provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Shiv, Baba and Stephen M. Nowlis (2004), "The Effect of Distractions While Tasting a Food Sample: the Interplay of Informational and Affective Components in Subsequent Choice," *JCR*, 31 (December), 599-608.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. pleasurable
2. delightful
3. gratifying

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem used by Shiv and Nowlis (2004) apparently asked subjects to describe how a chocolate bar tasted in comparison to chocolates they normally eat. The response scale had *much less* (-3) and *much more* (+3) as extreme verbal anchors.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (Utilitarian)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five, seven-point semantic differentials that are intended to measure the portion of a person's attitude resulting from perceptions of the functional performance of the product/brand or its expected performance.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) along with a companion scale (the hedonic dimension of attitude) as a result of theoretical and psychometric concerns with previous measures (Batra and Ahtola 1991). The article reports on a set of six studies that in total provide considerable support for the unidimensionality, internal consistency, and validity of the scales.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .95 was reported for the scale by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) as applied to brand names and generic products in Study 1. It was a little lower when used with product categories in Study 2 ( $\alpha = .92$ ). Internal consistencies were yet a little lower in some of the other studies, depending upon the stimulus being responded to. (See p. 315.)

**VALIDITY:**

As noted above, a variety of validation tests were conducted. Specifically, evidence from LISREL supported a two-factor model (hedonic and utilitarian dimensions) and evidence was provided to show the scales were measuring something distinct from product involvement (discriminant validity). Evidence was reported in support of criterion and nomological validities as well.

**REFERENCES:**

- Batra, Rajeev and Olli T. Ahtola (1991), "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Sources of Consumer Attitudes," *Marketing Letters*, 2 (April), 159-170.
- Voss, Kevin E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Voss, Kevin E., Eric R. Spangenberg, and Bianca Grohmann (2003), "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Dimensions of Consumer Attitude," *JMR*, 40 (August), 310-320.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Directions: For each statement below, place a check mark closer to the adjective that you believe best describes your feelings about the product. The more appropriate the adjective seems, the closer you should place your mark to it.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The directions were supplied by Voss (2005).

*#113 Attitude Toward the Product/Brand (Utilitarian)*

1. effective / not effective
2. helpful / not helpful
3. functional / not functional
4. necessary / not necessary
5. practical / not practical

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Spokesperson (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, five-point bi-polar adjectives are used to measure a person's attitude toward the individual featured in an ad. This person might be a celebrity or an average person endorsing the product. Martin, Lee, and Yang (2004) referred to the scale as *attitude toward the model*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was apparently developed by Martin, Lee, and Yang (2004). The items have been frequently in past studies, especially when evaluating ads themselves, but this is the first known time that the items were used as a set with regards to a person.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .80 was reported for the scale (Martin, Lee, and Yang 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Analysis of the scale's validity was not reported by Martin, Lee, and Yang (2004) but they did indicate that the items loaded together in a factor analysis.

**REFERENCES:**

Martin, Brett A. S., Christina Kwai-Choi Lee, and Feng Yang (2004), "The Influence of Ad Model Ethnicity and Self-Referencing on Attitudes," *JA*, 33 (4), 27-37.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Not believable / Very believable
2. Not attractive / Very attractive
3. Not competent / Very competent
4. Not persuasive / Very persuasive
5. Not likeable / Very likeable

## #115 Attitude Toward the Spokesperson (Likeability)

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Spokesperson (Likeability)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four sets of bi-polar adjectives are used to assess a person's opinion of the actor or spokesperson featured in an advertisement with an emphasis on the person's favorability.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale appears to have been developed by Whittler and Dimeo (1991).

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .94, .94, and .87 were reported by Dimofte, Forehand, and Deshpandé (2004), Forehand and Deshpande (2001), and Whittler and Dimeo (1991), respectively.

#### **VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported in the studies.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Dimofte, Claudie V., Mark R. Forehand, and Rohit Deshpandé (2004), "Ad Schema Incongruity as Elicitor of Ethnic Self-Awareness and Differential Advertising Response," *JA*, 32 (4), 7-17.
- Forehand, Mark R. and Rohit Deshpande (2001), "What We see Makes Us Who We Are: Priming Ethnic Self-Awareness and Advertising Response," *JMR*, 38 (August), 336-348.
- Whittler, Tommy E. and Joan DiMeo (1991), "Viewer's Reaction to Racial Cues in Advertising Stimuli," *JAR*, 6 (31), 37-46.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. warm / cold
2. likeable / unlikable
3. sincere / insincere
4. friendly / unfriendly

---

<sup>1</sup> Forehand and Deshpande (2001) as well as Dimofte, Forehand, and Deshpandé (2004) used a typical seven-point response format contrasted with Whittler and Dimeo (1991) who used a fifteen-point scale.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the TV Program**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure a viewer's global evaluation of a television show.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information was provided by Russell (2002) regarding the scale's origin. The set of items is not new and have been used together in many studies, most popularly when measuring brand attitude (#108) and attitude toward the ad (#59). Thus, the application is new but the items are not.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .94 (n = 107) and .80 (n = 11,000) were calculated for the scale by Russell (2002, 2005) and (2007; Russell, Norman, and Heckler 2004), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity has been reported in any of the studies.

**REFERENCES:**

- Russell, Cristel Antonia (2002), "Investigating the Effectiveness of Product Placements in Television Shows: The Role of Modality and Plot Connection Congruence on Brand Memory and Attitude," *JCR*, 29 (December), 306-318.
- Russell, Cristel Antonia, Andrew T. Norman and Susan E. Heckler (2004), "The Consumption of Television Programming and Validation of the Connectedness Scale," *JCR*, 31 (June), 150-161.
- Russell, Cristel Antonia (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Russell, Cristel Antonia (2007), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I liked it / I disliked it
2. Good / Bad
3. Favorable / Unfavorable

#117 *Attitude Toward the Website (Absence of Errors)*

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Absence of Errors)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three statements that are intended to measure a person's belief that a particular website is free from technical glitches as far as the customer's experience is concerned such as busy server messages, "under construction" signs, or crashing.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's origin was provided by Bart et al. (2005). It appears to be original to their work.

**RELIABILITY:**

The authors reported the scale to have an alpha of .91 (Bart et al. 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

The authors provided evidence that the measurement model was acceptable. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of this scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for this construct was .76.

**REFERENCES:**

Bart, Yakov, Venkatesh Shankar, Fareena Sultan, and Glen L. Urban (2005), "Are the Drivers and Role of Online Trust the Same for All Web Sites and Consumers? A Large-Scale Exploratory Study," *JM*, 69 (October), 133-152.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. There were no errors or crashing.
2. There were no busy server messages.
3. There were no pages "under construction."

---

<sup>1</sup> The nature of the response format was not described by Bart et al. (2005).

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Affective)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The seven-point scale uses four uni-polar items that seem to primarily tap into the affective dimension of one's attitude about a certain website.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's source was stated by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004). Given that, the authors probably developed the scale for use in this study.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .89 was reported by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was discussed by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004) but they did report the results of an exploratory factor analysis. Data were collected on twelve descriptors and the results indicated that the four composing this scale loaded together. Five of the other items loaded on another factor and were used to create another scale (#121).

**REFERENCES:**

Sundar, Shyam S. and Sriram Kalyanaraman (2004), "Arousal, Memory and Impression-Formation Effects of Animation Speed in Web Advertising," *JA*, 33 (1), 7-17.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. appealing
2. attractive
3. exciting
4. high quality

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale anchors used by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004) were *describes very poorly* and *describes very well*.

## #119 Attitude Toward the Website (Attractiveness)

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Attractiveness)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point Likert-type statements are used in the scale. Together they measure the degree to which a person believes that an e-retail website is pleasing to look at and use. The scale was referred to as *character* by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) as part of a larger set of scales that the authors ultimately called the 8Cs since all of the scales began with the letter S. The in-depth interviews helped to identify eight factors that seemed to influence e-loyalty. Following that, more in-depth interviews were conducted to help generate scale items. They were evaluated by a group of academics and then pretested with a small sample.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .87 was reported for the scale by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

#### **VALIDITY:**

Beyond what was stated (above) regarding the Origin of the scale, Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) divided the main study's sample into three parts. One part was for an exploratory factor analysis (n=180) and one was for a confirmatory factor analysis (n=180). These analyses led to the scales being purified for model estimation using the largest portion of the main study's sample (n=851). Having said that, specific evidence in support of this scale's validity was not provided.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Srinivasan, Srini S., Rolph Anderson, and Kishore Ponnnavolu (2002), "Customer Loyalty in E-commerce: An Exploration of its Antecedents and Consequences," *JR*, 78 (1), 41-50.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. This website design is attractive to me.
2. For me, shopping at this website is fun.
3. This website does not feel inviting to me. (r)
4. I feel comfortable shopping at this website.
5. This website does not look appealing to me. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Clarity of Privacy Policy)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three statements that assess how easy it is for a person to understand the way a user's private information is used by a website.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's origin was provided by Bart et al. (2005). It appears to be original to their work.

**RELIABILITY:**

The authors reported the scale to have an alpha of .90 (Bart et al. 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

The authors provided evidence that the measurement model was acceptable. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of this scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for this construct was .76.

**REFERENCES:**

Bart, Yakov, Venkatesh Shankar, Fareena Sultan, and Glen L. Urban (2005), "Are the Drivers and Role of Online Trust the Same for All Web Sites and Consumers? A Large-Scale Exploratory Study," *JM*, 69 (October), 133-152.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The text of the privacy policy is easy to understand.
2. The site clearly explains how user information is used.
3. The site explains clearly how my information will be shared with other companies.

---

<sup>1</sup> The nature of the response format was not described by Bart et al. (2005).

## #121 Attitude Toward the Website (Cognitive)

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Cognitive)**

### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point uni-polar items are used to measure a person's attitude about a certain website with a slight emphasis on the cognitive aspect of the attitude.

### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's source was stated by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004). Given that, the authors probably developed the scale for use in this study.

### **RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .89 was reported by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004).

### **VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was discussed by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004) but they did report the results of an exploratory factor analysis. Data were collected on twelve descriptors and the results indicated that the five composing this scale loaded together. Four of the other items loaded on another factor and were used to create another scale (#118).

### **COMMENTS:**

See also Brown and Krishna (2004).

### **REFERENCES:**

- Brown, Christina L. and Aradhna Krishna (2004), "The Skeptical Shopper: A Metacognitive Account for the Effects of Default Options on Choice," *JCR*, 31 (December), 529-539.
- Sundar, Shyam S. and Sriram Kalyanaraman (2004), "Arousal, Memory and Impression-Formation Effects of Animation Speed in Web Advertising," *JA*, 33 (1), 7-17.

### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. informative
2. useful
3. positive
4. favorable
5. good

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale anchors used by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004) were *describes very poorly* and *describes very well*.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Community Features)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three items compose the scale and measure a person's belief that a certain website has social elements, in particular, that it enables posting of comments by customer about their experiences and indication of the site's charitable activity.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's origin was provided by Bart et al. (2005). It appears to be original to their work.

**RELIABILITY:**

The authors reported the scale to have an alpha of .85 (Bart et al. 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

The authors provided evidence that the measurement model was acceptable. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of this scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for this construct was .66.

**REFERENCES:**

Bart, Yakov, Venkatesh Shankar, Fareena Sultan, and Glen L. Urban (2005), "Are the Drivers and Role of Online Trust the Same for All Web Sites and Consumers? A Large-Scale Exploratory Study," *JM*, 69 (October), 133-152.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The site allows user direct input or posting to site (e.g., bulletin board, e-mail, personals).
2. Evidence of the site participating in philanthropy/charity is present.
3. A chat room is available where consumers can discuss their experience with the site and/or its products.

---

<sup>1</sup> The nature of the response format was not described by Bart et al. (2005).

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Community)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has five, seven-point Likert type statements and measures the extent to which a person believes that an e-retailer provides customers the opportunity to share information useful to making a purchase decision at the website.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) as part of a larger set of scales that the authors ultimately called the 8Cs since all of the scales began with the letter S. The in-depth interviews helped to identify eight factors that seemed to influence e-loyalty. Following that, more in-depth interviews were conducted to help generate scale items. They were evaluated by a group of academics and then pretested with a small sample.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .68 was reported for the scale by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond what was stated (above) regarding the Origin of the scale, Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) divided the main study's sample into three parts. One part was for an exploratory factor analysis (n=180) and one was for a confirmatory factor analysis (n=180). These analyses led to the scales being purified for model estimation using the largest portion of the main study's sample (n=851). Having said that, specific evidence in support of this scale's validity was not provided.

**REFERENCES:**

Srinivasan, Srini S., Rolph Anderson, and Kishore Ponnnavolu (2002), "Customer Loyalty in E-commerce: An Exploration of its Antecedents and Consequences," *JR*, 78 (1), 41-50.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Customers share experiences about the website/product online with other customers of the website.
2. The customer community supported by this website is not useful for gathering product information. (r)
3. Customers of this website benefit from the community sponsored by the website.
4. Customers share a common bond with other members of the customer community sponsored by the website.
5. Customers of this website are not strongly affiliated with one another. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Content Interactivity)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five, seven-point Likert type statements intended to assess a person's attitude regarding the degree to which a website has a "dynamic nature" enabling customers to search for, view, and compare products.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) as part of a larger set of scales that the authors ultimately called the 8Cs since all of the scales began with the letter S. The in-depth interviews helped to identify eight factors that seemed to influence e-loyalty. Following that, more in-depth interviews were conducted to help generate scale items. They were evaluated by a group of academics and then pretested with a small sample.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .63 was reported for the scale by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002). This value is low enough to suggest that further refinement is called for.

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond what was stated (above) regarding the Origin of the scale, Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) divided the main study's sample into three parts. One part was for an exploratory factor analysis (n=180) and one was for a confirmatory factor analysis (n=180). These analyses led to the scales being purified for model estimation using the largest portion of the main study's sample (n=851). Having said that, specific evidence in support of this scale's validity was not provided.

**REFERENCES:**

Srinivasan, Srini S., Rolph Anderson, and Kishore Ponnnavolu (2002), "Customer Loyalty in E-commerce: An Exploration of its Antecedents and Consequences," *JR*, 78 (1), 41-50.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. This website enables me to view the merchandise from different angles.
2. This website has a search tool that enables me to locate products.
3. This website does not have a tool that makes product comparisons easy. (r)
4. I feel that this is a very engaging website.
5. I believe that this website is not a very dynamic one. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Credibility)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale uses eleven, seven-point semantic differentials to measure the degree to which a person believes that the information provided at a website is unbiased and trustworthy.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Rodgers (2004) implied that Haley (1996) was the source, his study examined source credibility but did not employ any scales. In contrast, most of the items come from the trustworthiness (#256) and expertise (#253) subscales of credibility developed by Ohanian (1990). A few of the items were added by Rodgers (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

Rodgers (2004) indicated that the scale's alpha was .89.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Rodgers (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Haley, Eric (1996), "Exploring the Construct of Organization as Source: Consumers' Understandings of Organizational Sponsorship of Advocacy Advertising," *JA*, 25 (2), 19-35.
- Ohanian, Roobina (1990), "Construction and Validation of a Scale to Measure Celebrity Endorsers' Perceived Expertise, Trustworthiness, and Attractiveness," *JA*, 19 (3), 39-52.
- Rodgers, Shelly (2004), "The Effects of Sponsor Relevance on Consumer Reactions to Internet Sponsorships," *JA*, 32 (4), 67-76.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. untrustworthy / trustworthy
2. not credible / credible
3. biased / unbiased
4. not believable / believable
5. not reputable / reputable
6. not experienced / experienced
7. not knowledgeable / knowledgeable
8. not qualified / qualified
9. compromising / uncompromising
10. unethical / ethical
11. not objective / objective

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Cultivation)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point Likert type statements are used to assess a person's attitude regarding the degree to which an e-retailer has engaged in activities to develop and nurture business with the consumer, particularly by sending relevant information (presumably in e-mail form).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnayolu (2002) as part of a larger set of scales that the authors ultimately called the 8Cs since all of the scales began with the letter S. The in-depth interviews helped to identify eight factors that seemed to influence e-loyalty. Following that, more in-depth interviews were conducted to help generate scale items. They were evaluated by a group of academics and then pretested with a small sample.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .79 was reported for the scale by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnayolu (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond what was stated (above) regarding the Origin of the scale, Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnayolu (2002) divided the main study's sample into three parts. One part was for an exploratory factor analysis (n=180) and one was for a confirmatory factor analysis (n=180). These analyses led to the scales being purified for model estimation using the largest portion of the main study's sample (n=851). Having said that, specific evidence in support of this scale's validity was not provided.

**REFERENCES:**

Srinivasan, Srini S., Rolph Anderson, and Kishore Ponnayolu (2002), "Customer Loyalty in E-commerce: An Exploration of its Antecedents and Consequences," *JR*, 78 (1), 41-50.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I do not receive reminders about making purchases from this website. (r)
2. This website sends me information that is relevant to my purchases.
3. I feel that this website appreciates my business.
4. I feel that this website makes an effort to increase its share of my business.
5. This website does not proactively cultivate its relationship with me. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Customer Care)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point Likert type items are used to measure a customer's attitude regarding the extent to which a website has been responsive to problems and shown that it cares, particularly in the post-sales phase of the purchase process (billing, delivery, returns).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) as part of a larger set of scales that the authors ultimately called the 8Cs since all of the scales began with the letter S. The in-depth interviews helped to identify eight factors that seemed to influence e-loyalty. Following that, more in-depth interviews were conducted to help generate scale items. They were evaluated by a group of academics and then pretested with a small sample.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .76 was reported for the scale by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond what was stated (above) regarding the Origin of the scale, Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) divided the main study's sample into three parts. One part was for an exploratory factor analysis (n=180) and one was for a confirmatory factor analysis (n=180). These analyses led to the scales being purified for model estimation using the largest portion of the main study's sample (n=851). Having said that, specific evidence in support of this scale's validity was not provided.

**REFERENCES:**

Srinivasan, Srini S., Rolph Anderson, and Kishore Ponnnavolu (2002), "Customer Loyalty in E-commerce: An Exploration of its Antecedents and Consequences," *JR*, 78 (1), 41-50.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I have experienced problems with billing with respect to my earlier purchases at this website. (r)
2. The goods that I purchased in the past from this website have been delivered on time.
3. I feel that this website is not responsive to any problems that I encounter. (r)
4. The return policies laid out in this website are customer friendly.
5. I believe that this website takes good care of its customers.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Customization)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five, seven-point Likert type statements intended to measure a person's attitude about the extent that a website tailors its products, promotion, and transactional environment to individual customers.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) as part of a larger set of scales that the authors ultimately called the 8Cs since all of the scales began with the letter S. The in-depth interviews helped to identify eight factors that seemed to influence e-loyalty. Following that, more in-depth interviews were conducted to help generate scale items. They were evaluated by a group of academics and then pretested with a small sample.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .80 was reported for the scale by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond what was stated (above) regarding the Origin of the scale, Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) divided the main study's sample into three parts. One part was for an exploratory factor analysis (n=180) and one was for a confirmatory factor analysis (n=180). These analyses led to the scales being purified for model estimation using the largest portion of the main study's sample (n=851). Having said that, specific evidence in support of this scale's validity was not provided.

**REFERENCES:**

Srinivasan, Srini S., Rolph Anderson, and Kishore Ponnnavolu (2002), "Customer Loyalty in E-commerce: An Exploration of its Antecedents and Consequences," *JR*, 78 (1), 41-50.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. This website makes purchase recommendations that match my needs.
2. This website enables me to order products that are tailor-made for me.
3. The advertisements and promotions that this website sends to me are tailored to my situation.
4. This website makes me feel that I am a unique customer.
5. I believe that this website is customized to my needs.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Design Clarity)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three statements are used to assess a person's attitude regarding the layout of a website, with emphasis on its visual appeal and ease of use. The scale was called *navigation and presentation* by Bart et al. (2005).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's origin was provided by Bart et al. (2005). It appears to be original to their work.

**RELIABILITY:**

The authors reported the scale to have an alpha of .85 (Bart et al. 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

The authors provided evidence that the measurement model was acceptable. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of this scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for this construct was .68.

**REFERENCES:**

Bart, Yakov, Venkatesh Shankar, Fareena Sultan, and Glen L. Urban (2005), "Are the Drivers and Role of Online Trust the Same for All Web Sites and Consumers? A Large-Scale Exploratory Study," *JM*, 69 (October), 133-152.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Overall layout of the site is clear.
2. The process for browsing is clear.
3. The site is visually appealing.

---

<sup>1</sup> The nature of the response format was not described by Bart et al. (2005).

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Design)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The five item, seven-point Likert-type scale measures a person's attitude regarding a variety of aspects experienced at a website, excluding customer service.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is one of four developed by Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) referred to in total as eTailQ. As a group they are intended to help measure the primary dimensions of one's "etail" experience which, in turn, predict etail quality. The scales were constructed using three studies.

**RELIABILITY:**

Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) reported an alpha of .83 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Evidence was provided by Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) in support of the scale's unidimensionality and discriminant validity. However, the scale did not pass the most conservative test of discriminant validity. Further, comparison of various models of the four scales composing the instrument showed that all three-factor models (each including the design dimension) had acceptable fits. The fit of the four-factor models (with and without a higher order factor) were better.

**REFERENCES:**

Wolfinbarger, Mary and Mary C. Gilly (2003), "eTailQ: Dimensionalizing, Measuring and Predicting eTail Quality," *JR*, 79 (3), 183-198.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The website provides in-depth information.
2. The site doesn't waste my time.
3. It is quick and easy to complete a transaction at this website.
4. The level of personalization at this site is about right, not too much or too little.
5. This website has good selection.

## #131 Attitude Toward the Website (Economic Value)

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Economic Value)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type statements and appears to measure the extent to which a consumer views the prices charged by a specific website for the products it carries to be reasonable. Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) also used the scale with reference to a catalog.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Several steps were followed by Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2001) in developing this scale as well as the others used in their study. First, they drew upon previous scales of similar constructs along with qualitative research by the Catalog Coalition (1993) to generate items. Then, various types of pretesting followed which helped reduced the set of items and provide a sense of content validity. Ultimately, the study produced an instrument that the authors referred to as the *experiential value scale* which has seven dimensions and 19 items.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .78 was reported for the scale by Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2001). The composite reliability was also .83. Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) apparently pooled the data from the website and catalog samples and reported the composite reliability for the scale to be .80.

#### **VALIDITY:**

Confirmation factor analysis was used to provide evidence of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent validity (Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon 2001). Discriminant validity was difficult to test due to the multidimensional, hierarchically organized constructs that were hypothesized to compose the model. However, some limited evidence of discriminant validity was provided.

Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) did not specifically address the validity of this scale although the seven factor model it was a part of showed full metric invariance across four groups of shoppers.

#### **COMMENTS:**

Although developed as part of the *experiential value scale*, this subscale appears to be useful by itself if a researcher so desires to use it apart from the rest of the subscales.

#### **REFERENCES:**

A Commercial research project sponsored by a consortium of catalog retailers led by Sears Shop At Home Services (1993), *Catalog Coalition Research Project*, Hoffman Estates, IL: Sears Shop At Home Services.

### #131 Attitude Toward the Website (Economic Value)

Mathwick, Charla, Naresh Malhotra, and Edward Rigdon (2001), "Experiential Value: Conceptualization, Measurement and Application in the Catalog and Internet Shopping Environment," *JR*, 77 (Spring), 39-56.

Mathwick, Charla, Naresh K. Malhorta and Edward Rigdon (2002), "The Effect of Dynamic Retail Experiences on Experiential Perceptions of Value: An Internet and Catalog Comparison," *JR*, 78 (Spring), 51-60.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_'s products are a good economic value.
2. Overall, I am happy with \_\_\_\_\_'s prices.
3. The prices of the product(s) I purchased from \_\_\_\_\_'s Internet site are too high, given the quality of the merchandise. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the company should be placed in the blanks. In item #3, Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) used the word "catalog" instead of "Internet site" when the scale was used with the catalog shopper sample.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Entertaining)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three-item, seven-point Likert-type scale is intended to measure how entertaining a person believes a website to be. Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) also used the scale with reference to a catalog.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Several steps were followed by Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2001) in developing the scales used in their study. First, they drew upon previous scales of similar constructs along with qualitative research by the Catalog Coalition (1993) to generate items. Then, various types of pretesting followed which helped reduced the set of items and provide a sense of content validity. Ultimately, the study produced an instrument that the authors referred to as the *experiential value scale* which has seven dimensions and 19 items.

With specific reference to this scale, the fundamental phrases in the items are extremely similar to some from the entertainment dimension of the Viewer Response Profile developed by members of the Leo Burnett research department (Schlinger 1979). (See V1, #301).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .88 was reported for the scale by Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2001). The composite reliability was .91. Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) apparently pooled the data from the website and catalog samples and reported the composite reliability for the scale to be .89.

**VALIDITY:**

Confirmation factor analysis was used to provide evidence of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent validity (Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon 2001). Discriminant validity was difficult to test due to the multidimensional, hierarchically organized constructs that were hypothesized to compose the model. However, some limited evidence of discriminant validity was provided.

Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) did not specifically address the validity of this scale although the seven factor model it was a part of showed full metric invariance across four groups of shoppers.

**COMMENTS:**

Although developed as part of the *experiential value scale*, this subscale appears to be useful by itself if a researcher so desires to use it apart from the rest of the subscales.

**REFERENCES:**

## #132 Attitude Toward the Website (Entertaining)

A commercial research project sponsored by a consortium of catalog retailers led by Sears Shop At Home Services (1993), *Catalog Coalition Research Project*, Hoffman Estates, IL: Sears Shop At Home Services.

Mathwick, Charla, Naresh Malhotra, and Edward Rigdon (2001), "Experiential Value: Conceptualization, Measurement and Application in the Catalog and Internet Shopping Environment," *JR*, 77 (Spring), 39-56.

Mathwick, Charla, Naresh K. Malhorta and Edward Rigdon (2002), "The Effect of Dynamic Retail Experiences on Experiential Perceptions of Value: An Internet and Catalog Comparison," *JR*, 78 (Spring), 51-60.

Schlinger, Mary Jane (1979), "A Profile of Responses to Commercials," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 19 (2), 37-48.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. I think \_\_\_\_\_'s Internet site is very entertaining.
2. The enthusiasm of \_\_\_\_\_'s Internet site is catching; it picks me up.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ doesn't sell products – it entertains me.
- 4.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the company should be placed in the blanks. In items #1 and #2, Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) used the word "catalog" instead of "Internet site" when the scale was used with the catalog shopper sample.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Entertaining)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This scale uses four statements to measure the degree to which a consumer believes that the website for a particular store that he/she has just visited is fun and visually appealing. Even though the scale was developed for use with webstore, the items appear to be amenable for use with a brick-and-mortar store as well.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although sharing some key phrases with scales used by Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2001) as well as Schlinger (1979), this scale as a whole is distinct enough to be considered original to Vrechopoulos et al. (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

A Cronbach's alpha value of .9380 was reported for this scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Vrechopoulos et al. (2004) did not provide any information about the validity of the scale.

**REFERENCES:**

- Mathwick, Charla, Naresh Malhotra, and Edward Rigdon (2001), "Experiential Value: Conceptualization, Measurement and Application in the Catalog and Internet Shopping Environment," *JR*, 77 (Spring), 39-56.
- Schlinger, Mary Jane (1979a), "A Profile of Responses to Commercials," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 19 (2), 37-48.
- Vrechopoulos, Adam P., Robert M. O'Keefe, Georgios I. Doukidis, and George J. Siomkos (2004), "Virtual Store Layout: An Experimental Comparison in the Context of Grocery Retail," *JR*, 80 (1), 13-22.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The store I have just visited was lots of fun to browse,
2. I thought that the store I have just visited was clever and quite entertaining.
3. The store I have just visited was not just selling – it was entertaining me and I appreciated that.
4. I liked the look and feel of the store I just visited.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format of the scale was not specified by Vrechopoulos et al. (2004) but it appears to have been a seven-point Likert-type scale.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Escapism)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type statements and appears to measure the extent to which a person views shopping at a specific website as helping provide the sense of leaving his/her normal world for a while. Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) used the scale with reference to a catalog while Mathwick and Rigdon (2004) used it with reference to searching a website for information.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Several steps were followed by Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2001) in developing the scales used in their study. First, they drew upon previous scales of similar constructs along with qualitative research by the Catalog coalition (1993) to generate items. Then, various types of pretesting followed which helped reduced the set of items and provide a sense of content validity. Ultimately, the study produced an instrument that the authors referred to as the *experiential value scale* which has seven dimensions and 19 items.

With specific reference to this scale, the fundamental phrases in the items are extremely similar to some used by Unger (1981; Unger and Kernan 1983). (See V1, #136).

**RELIABILITY:**

An composite reliability of .79 was reported for the scale by Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2001). Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) apparently pooled the data from the website and catalog samples resulting in a composite reliability of .81 for the scale. The version of the scale used by Mathwick and Rigdon (2004) had an alpha of .76.

**VALIDITY:**

Confirmation factor analysis was used to provide evidence of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent validity (Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon 2001). Discriminant validity was difficult to test due to the multidimensional, hierarchically organized constructs that were hypothesized to compose the model. However, some limited evidence of discriminant validity was provided.

Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) did not specifically address the validity of this scale although the seven factor model it was a part of showed full metric invariance across four groups of shoppers. Although the details were not provided, results of confirmatory factor analysis and other tests were used to support a claim of convergent and discriminant validity for this scale by Mathwick and Rigdon (2004).

**COMMENTS:**

Although developed as part of the *experiential value scale*, this subscale appears to be useful by itself if a researcher so desires to use it apart from the rest of the subscales.

## #134 Attitude Toward the Website (Escapism)

### REFERENCES:

- A commercial research project sponsored by a consortium of catalog retailers led by Sears Shop At Home Services (1993), *Catalog Coalition Research Project*, Hoffman Estates, IL: Sears Shop At Home Services.
- Mathwick, Charla, Naresh Malhotra, and Edward Rigdon (2001), "Experiential Value: Conceptualization, Measurement and Application in the Catalog and Internet Shopping Environment," *JR*, 77 (Spring), 39-56.
- Mathwick, Charla, Naresh K. Malhorta and Edward Rigdon (2002), "The Effect of Dynamic Retail Experiences on Experiential Perceptions of Value: An Internet and Catalog Comparison," *JR*, 78 (Spring), 51-60.
- Mathwick, Charla and Edward Rigdon (2004), "Play, Flow, and the Online Search Experience," *JCR*, 31 (September), 324-332.
- Unger, Lynette S. (1981), "Measure Validation in the Leisure Domain," doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati.
- Unger, Lynette S. and Jerome B. Kernan (1983), "On the Meaning of Leisure: An Investigation of Some Determinants of the Subjective Experience," *JCR*, 9 (March), 381-391.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. Shopping from \_\_\_\_\_'s Internet site "gets me away from it all."
2. Shopping from \_\_\_\_\_ makes me feel like I am in another world.
3. I get so involved when I shop from \_\_\_\_\_ that I forget everything else.
- 4.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the company should be placed in the blanks. In item #1, Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) used the word "catalog" instead of "Internet site" when the scale was used with the catalog shopper sample. In the study by Mathwick and Rigdon (2004), the items were phrased with regard to searching a website for information about a particular product.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Fulfillment Reliability)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point Likert-type statements that are supposed to measure an aspect of a person's attitude about a website having to do with the degree to which a product was described accurately and then delivered as expected.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is one of four developed by Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) referred to in total as eTailQ. As a group they are intended to help measure the primary dimensions of one's "etail" experience which, in turn, predict etail quality. The scales were constructed using three studies.

**RELIABILITY:**

Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) reported an alpha of .79 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Evidence was provided by Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) in support of the scale's unidimensionality and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Wolfinbarger, Mary and Mary C. Gilly (2003), "eTailQ: Dimensionalizing, Measuring and Predicting eTail Quality," *JR*, 79 (3), 183-198.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The product that came was represented accurately by the website.
2. You get what you ordered from this site.
3. The product is delivered by the time promised by the company.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six items intended to measure a person's overall evaluation of a website. The scale was called *attitude toward the site* by Chen and Wells (1999).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to the study by Chen and Wells (1999). They asked a sample of people experienced using the web to describe "good" and "bad" websites. Based on that feedback, the scale items were developed.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .92 and .81 have been reported for the scale by Chen and Wells (1999) and Shamdasani, Stanaland, and Tan (2001), respectively. An alpha of .71 was calculated for the version of the scale used by McMillan and Hwang (2002). Moore, Stammerjohan, and Coulter (2005) reported alphas of .86 (experiment 1) and .89 (experiment 2). In the study by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005), the scale has an alpha of .85.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported in any of the studies. However, some evidence bearing on validity has been provided in a couple of studies. Chen and Wells (1999) noted that a factor analysis indicated the scale items were unidimensional. The scale was one of many in a confirmatory factor analysis conducted by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005) that was considered to have fit well.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Wolfenbarger and Gilly (2003). An evaluation of this scale compared to two other measures of the same construct was made by Bruner and Kumar (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

- Bruner II, Gordon C. and Anand Kumar (2002), "Similarity Analysis Of Three Attitude-Toward-The-Website Scales," *Quarterly Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 3 (2), 163-172.
- Chen, Qimei and William D. Wells (1999), "Attitude toward the Site," *JAR*, (September/ October), 27-37.
- Ko, Hanjun, Chang-Hoan Cho, and Marilyn S. Roberts (2005), "Internet Uses and Gratifications: A Structural Equation Model of Interactive Advertising," *JA*, 34 (2), 57-70.
- McMillan, Sally J. and Jang-Sun Hwang (2002), "Measures of Perceived Interactivity: An Explosion of the Role of Direction of Communication, User Control, and Time in Shaping Perceptions of Interactivity," *JA*, 29 (3), 29-42.

## #136 Attitude Toward the Website (General)

Moore, Robert S., Claire Allison Stammerjohan, and Robin A. Coulter (2005), "Banner Advertiser-Web Site Context Congruity and Color Effects on Attention and Attitudes," *JA*, 34 (2), 71-84.

Shamdasani, Prem N., Andrea J. S. Stanaland, and Juliana Tan (2001), "Location, Location, Location: Insights for Advertising Placement on the Web," *JAR*, 41 (July-August), 7-21.

Wolfenbarger, Mary and Mary C. Gilly (2003), "eTailQ: Dimensionalizing, Measuring and Predicting eTail Quality," *JR*, 79 (3), 183-198.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

Directions: The following items assess your general favorability toward the website you just visited. Circle the number that best indicates your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

1. This website makes it easy for me to build a relationship with this company.
2. I would like to visit this website again in the future.
3. I'm satisfied with the service provided by this website.
4. I feel comfortable in surfing the website.
5. I feel surfing this website is a good way for me to spend my time.
6. Compared with other websites, I would rate this one as ...

---

<sup>1</sup> As used by Chen and Well (1999), the first five items were answered with a five-point response scale anchored by *definitely disagree/definitely agree* whereas the anchors for the sixth item was *one of the worst/one of the best*. The response format used by Shamdasani, Stanaland, and Tan (2001) was similar except that they used seven-point scales. McMillan and Hwang (2002) used items #2, #3, and #6. A nine-point response format was used by Moore, Stammerjohan, and Coulter (2005).

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure a person's general attitude toward some specified website.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Neither Coyle and Thorson (2001) nor Becker-Olson (2003) cited any previous study as the source of their scales, thus, they could be considered original. Mathwick and Rigdon (2004) implied that they developed their scale themselves. Despite these seemingly independent origins, the scales are strikingly similar to each other. This is possibly due to the use of items that have commonly been employed over the years in the most popular attitude-toward-the-brand and attitude-toward-the-ad scales.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .92 (n = 270), .84 (n = 68), and .80 (n = 110) were reported for the versions of the scale used by Becker-Olson (2003), Coyle and Thorson (2001), and Mathwick and Rigdon (2004), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Becker-Olson (2003) or Coyle and Thorson (2001). Although the details were not provided, results of confirmatory factor analysis and other tests were used to support a claim of convergent and discriminant validity for this scale by Mathwick and Rigdon (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Becker-Olson, Karen L. (2003), "And Now, A Word From Our Sponsor: A look at the Effects of Sponsored Content and Banner Advertising," *JA*, 32 (2), 17-32.
- Coyle, James R. and Esther Thorson (2001), "The Effects of Progressive Levels of Interactivity and Vividness in Web Marketing Sites," *JA*, 30 (Fall), 65-77.
- Mathwick, Charla and Edward Rigdon (2004), "Play, Flow, and the Online Search Experience," *JCR*, 31 (September), 324-332.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. bad / good
2. unfavorable / favorable
3. dislike / like
4. negative / positive
5. low quality / high quality

---

<sup>1</sup> Becker-Olson (2003) used #1, #2, and #4, Coyle and Thorson (2001) used #1-#3, and Mathwick and Rigdon (2004) used #1, #5, and an item similar to #3.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Order Fulfillment)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three items and is intended to measure a person's attitude about the way a particular website manages orders with the emphasis on issues relevant to customers, e.g., providing confirmation of orders, delivery options, and clear return policies.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's origin was provided by Bart et al. (2005). It appears to be original to their work.

**RELIABILITY:**

The authors reported the scale to have an alpha of .92 (Bart et al. 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

The authors provided evidence that the measurement model was acceptable. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of this scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for this construct was .79.

**REFERENCES:**

Bart, Yakov, Venkatesh Shankar, Fareena Sultan, and Glen L. Urban (2005), "Are the Drivers and Role of Online Trust the Same for All Web Sites and Consumers? A Large-Scale Exploratory Study," *JM*, 69 (October), 133-152.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Delivery options are available.
2. Return policies or other measures of accountability are present.
3. Order confirmation is given via e-mail.

---

<sup>1</sup> The nature of the response format was not described by Bart et al. (2005).

#139 *Attitude Toward the Website (Pleasantness)*

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Pleasantness)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four item, nine-point scale measures the degree to which a person considers a website to be enjoyable to look at.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Subsets of the items have been used in a variety of scales (e.g., #20, #57, #59) but applying this set of items as a whole to a website appears to be original to Menon and Kahn (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .92 was reported for the scale (Menon and Kahn 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Menon and Kahn (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Menon, Satya (2005), Personal Correspondence.

Menon, Satya and Barbara Kahn (2002), "Cross-category Effects of Induced Arousal and Pleasure on the Internet Shopping Experience," *JR*, 78 (1), 31-40.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Please rate the website on the following adjectives. The more appropriate you feel each adjective is, pick a box closer to 9. The less appropriate you believe it is, pick a box closer to 1.<sup>1</sup>

1. enjoyable
2. fun
3. attractive
4. makes one feel happy

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem was provided by Menon (2005). The anchors appear to be of the *strongly disagree / strongly agree* variety.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Product Assortment)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has four, seven-point Likert type statements that are used to assess the degree to which a person thinks that an e-retail website has a broad and deep product assortment so the consumer has access to a great variety of products at one place. The scale was referred to as *choice* by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) as part of a larger set of scales that the authors ultimately called the 8Cs since all of the scales began with the letter S. The in-depth interviews helped to identify eight factors that seemed to influence e-loyalty. Following that, more in-depth interviews were conducted to help generate scale items. They were evaluated by a group of academics and then pretested with a small sample.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .81 was reported for the scale by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond what was stated (above) regarding the Origin of the scale, Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) divided the main study's sample into three parts. One part was for an exploratory factor analysis (n=180) and one was for a confirmatory factor analysis (n=180). These analyses led to the scales being purified for model estimation using the largest portion of the main study's sample (n=851). Having said that, specific evidence in support of this scale's validity was not provided.

**REFERENCES:**

Srinivasan, Srini S., Rolph Anderson, and Kishore Ponnnavolu (2002), "Customer Loyalty in E-commerce: An Exploration of its Antecedents and Consequences," *JR*, 78 (1), 41-50.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. This website provides a "one-stop shop" for my shopping.
2. This website does not satisfy a majority of my online shopping needs. (r)
3. The choice of products at this website is limited. (r)
4. This website does not carry a wide selection of products to choose from. (r)

## #141 Attitude Toward the Website (Quality Image)

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Quality Image)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale uses three statements to assess a person's attitude about a website, with the emphasis being on familiarity with the company that owns the site and the quality level of what it does. The scale was called *brand strength* by Bart et al. (2005).

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's origin was provided by Bart et al. (2005). It appears to be original to their work.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

The authors reported the scale to have an alpha of .84 (Bart et al. 2005).

#### **VALIDITY:**

The authors provided evidence that the measurement model was acceptable. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of this scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for this construct was .66.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Bart, Yakov, Venkatesh Shankar, Fareena Sultan, and Glen L. Urban (2005), "Are the Drivers and Role of Online Trust the Same for All Web Sites and Consumers? A Large-Scale Exploratory Study," *JM*, 69 (October), 133-152.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am familiar with the company whose site this is.
2. The site represents a quality company or organization.
3. The quality of the brands being advertised on this site is consistent with the quality of the site's sponsoring company.

---

<sup>1</sup> The nature of the response format was not described by Bart et al. (2005).

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Safety)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type statements that are used to measure the degree to which a person believes that privacy and financial transactions are adequately protected by a website.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is one of four developed by Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) referred to in total as eTailQ. As a group they are intended to help measure the primary dimensions of one's "etail" experience which, in turn, predict etail quality. The scales were constructed using three studies.

**RELIABILITY:**

Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) reported an alpha of .88 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Evidence was provided by Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) in support of the scale's unidimensionality and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Wolfinbarger, Mary and Mary C. Gilly (2003), "eTailQ: Dimensionalizing, Measuring and Predicting eTail Quality," *JR*, 79 (3), 183-198.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I feel like my privacy is protected at this site.
2. I feel safe in my transactions with this website.
3. The website has adequate security features.

## #143 Attitude Toward the Website (Security)

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Security)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three statements that measure the degree to which a person believes a particular website has visual cues that indicate it is secure and meets certain business standards.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's origin was provided by Bart et al. (2005). It appears to be original to their work.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

The authors reported the scale to have an alpha of .91 (Bart et al. 2005).

#### **VALIDITY:**

The authors provided evidence that the measurement model was acceptable. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of this scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for this construct was .77.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Bart, Yakov, Venkatesh Shankar, Fareena Sultan, and Glen L. Urban (2005), "Are the Drivers and Role of Online Trust the Same for All Web Sites and Consumers? A Large-Scale Exploratory Study," *JM*, 69 (October), 133-152.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. There were signs or symbols on the site placed there by third-party companies indicating that the site had been reviewed or audited for sound business practices.
2. There were trust seals present (e.g., TRUSTe).
3. There were seals of companies stating that my information on this site is secure (e.g., Verisign).

---

<sup>1</sup> The nature of the response format was not described by Bart et al. (2005).

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Service)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the extent to which a person believes that the customer service provided by a website is responsive.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is one of four developed by Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) referred to in total as eTailQ. As a group they are intended to help measure the primary dimensions of one's "etail" experience which, in turn, predict etail quality. The scales were constructed using three studies.

**RELIABILITY:**

Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) reported an alpha of .84 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Evidence was provided by Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) in support of the scale's unidimensionality and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Wolfinbarger, Mary and Mary C. Gilly (2003), "eTailQ: Dimensionalizing, Measuring and Predicting eTail Quality," *JR*, 79 (3), 183-198.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The company is willing and ready to respond to customer needs.
2. When you have a problem, the website shows a sincere interest in solving it.
3. Inquiries are answered promptly.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Shopping Assistance)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three items are used in this scale to measure the degree to which a person believes a particular website provides interactive functions that help in comparing brands and making a choice among them. The scale was called *advice* by Bart et al. (2005).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's origin was provided by Bart et al. (2005). It appears to be original to their work.

**RELIABILITY:**

The authors reported the scale to have an alpha of .86 (Bart et al. 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

The authors provided evidence that the measurement model was acceptable. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of this scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for this construct was .69.

**REFERENCES:**

Bart, Yakov, Venkatesh Shankar, Fareena Sultan, and Glen L. Urban (2005), "Are the Drivers and Role of Online Trust the Same for All Web Sites and Consumers? A Large-Scale Exploratory Study," *JM*, 69 (October), 133-152.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Comparisons of all competing brands are presented.
2. To recommend products, easy-to-answer questions are asked about my preferences.
3. Useful shopping recommendations are made based on my personal information and preferences.

---

<sup>1</sup> The nature of the response format was not described by Bart et al. (2005).

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Shopping Efficiency)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three-item, seven-point Likert-type scale is intended to measure the extent to which a consumer believes that shopping at a particular website is an efficient use of his/her time. Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) also used the scale with reference to a catalog.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Several steps were followed by Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2001) in developing this scale as well as the others used in their study. First, they drew upon previous scales of similar constructs along with qualitative research by the Catalog Coalition (1993) to generate items. Then, various types of pretesting followed which helped reduce the set of items and provide a sense of content validity. Ultimately, the study produced an instrument that the authors referred to as the *experiential value scale* which has seven dimensions and 19 items.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .74 was reported for the scale by Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2001). The composite reliability was .75. Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) apparently pooled the data from the website and catalog samples and reported the composite reliability for the scale to be .77.

**VALIDITY:**

Confirmation factor analysis was used to provide evidence of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent validity (Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon 2001). Discriminant validity was difficult to test due to the multidimensional, hierarchically organized constructs that were hypothesized to compose the model. However, some limited evidence of discriminant validity was provided.

Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) did not specifically address the validity of this scale although the seven factor model it was a part of showed full metric invariance across four groups of shoppers.

**COMMENTS:**

Although developed as part of the *experiential value scale*, this subscale appears to be useful by itself if a researcher does not want to use the other subscales.

**REFERENCES:**

- A commercial research project sponsored by a consortium of catalog retailers led by Sears Shop At Home Services (1993), *Catalog Coalition Research Project*, Hoffman Estates, IL: Sears Shop At Home Services.
- Mathwick, Charla, Naresh Malhotra, and Edward Rigdon (2001), "Experiential Value: Conceptualization, Measurement and Application in the Catalog and Internet Shopping Environment," *JR*, 77 (Spring), 39-56.

### #146 Attitude Toward the Website (Shopping Efficiency)

Mathwick, Charla, Naresh K. Malhorta and Edward Rigdon (2002), "The Effect of Dynamic Retail Experiences on Experiential Perceptions of Value: An Internet and Catalog Comparison," *JR*, 78 (Spring), 51-60.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. Shopping from \_\_\_\_\_ is an efficient way to manage my time.
2. Shopping from \_\_\_\_\_'s Internet site is makes my life easier.
3. Shopping from \_\_\_\_\_'s Internet site fits with my schedule.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the company should be placed in the blanks. In items #1 and #2, Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) used the word "catalog" instead of "Internet site" when the scale was used with the catalog shopper sample.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Trust)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three items that measure the level of trust a customer expresses having with a certain website, with emphasis on the information it provides.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's origin was provided by Bart et al. (2005). It appears to be original to their work.

**RELIABILITY:**

The authors reported that the scale to had an alpha of .91 (Bart et al. 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

The authors provided evidence that the measurement model was acceptable. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of this scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for this construct was .78.

**REFERENCES:**

Bart, Yakov, Venkatesh Shankar, Fareena Sultan, and Glen L. Urban (2005), "Are the Drivers and Role of Online Trust the Same for All Web Sites and Consumers? A Large-Scale Exploratory Study," *JM*, 69 (October), 133-152.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. My overall trust in this site is . . . .
2. My overall believability of the information on this site is . . . .
3. My overall confidence in the recommendations on this site is . . . .

---

<sup>1</sup> The nature of the response format was not described by Bart et al. (2005). The verbal anchors for the scale were probably something like *high/low*.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Visual Appeal)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three-item, seven-point Likert-type scale is intended to measure how visually attractive a person believes a website to be. Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) also used the scale with reference to a catalog.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Several steps were followed by Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2001) in developing this scale as well as the others used in their study. First, they drew upon previous scales of similar constructs along with qualitative research by the Catalog Coalition (1993) to generate items. Then, various types of pretesting followed which helped reduced the set of items and provide a sense of content validity. Ultimately, the study produced an instrument that the authors referred to as the *experiential value scale* which has seven dimensions and 19 items.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .92 was reported for the scale by Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2001). The composite reliability was .93. Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) apparently pooled the data from the website and catalog samples and reported the composite reliability for the scale to be .94.

**VALIDITY:**

Confirmation factor analysis was used to provide evidence of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent validity (Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon 2001). Discriminant validity was difficult to test due to the multidimensional, hierarchically organized constructs that were hypothesized to compose the model. However, some limited evidence of discriminant validity was provided.

Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) did not specifically address the validity of this scale although the seven factor model it was a part of showed full metric invariance across four groups of shoppers.

**COMMENTS:**

Although developed as part of the *experiential value scale*, this subscale appears to be useful by itself if a researcher so desires to use it apart from the rest of the subscales.

**REFERENCES:**

- A commercial research project sponsored by a consortium of catalog retailers led by Sears Shop At Home Services (1993), *Catalog Coalition Research Project*, Hoffman Estates, IL: Sears Shop At Home Services.
- Mathwick, Charla, Naresh Malhotra, and Edward Rigdon (2001), "Experiential Value: Conceptualization, Measurement and Application in the Catalog and Internet Shopping Environment," *JR*, 77 (Spring), 39-56.

#148 *Attitude Toward the Website (Visual Appeal)*

Mathwick, Charla, Naresh K. Malhorta and Edward Rigdon (2002), "The Effect of Dynamic Retail Experiences on Experiential Perceptions of Value: An Internet and Catalog Comparison," *JR*, 78 (Spring), 51-60.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. The way \_\_\_\_\_ displays its products is attractive.
2. \_\_\_\_\_'s Internet site is aesthetically appealing.
3. I like the way \_\_\_\_\_'s Internet site looks.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the company should be placed in the blanks. In items #2 and #3, Mathwick, Malhotra, and Rigdon (2002) used the word "catalog" instead of "Internet site" when the scale was used with the catalog shopper sample.

## #149 Attitude Toward the Website (Visual Appeal)

### **SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Website (Visual Appeal)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three statements that are used to measure the degree to which a person enjoys the way things look at a website. The scale was called *graphic style perceptions* by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003).

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003) implied that the scale was based on work by Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994). While there are conceptual similarities with a few of the latter's scale items, it is probably best to consider this new scale to be original to Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003).

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Construct reliabilities of .89 (Study 1) and .87 (Study 2) were reported for the scale by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003).

#### **VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not explicitly addressed by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003). However, from the information provided it appears that the scale had acceptable levels of convergent and discriminant validity.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Baker, Julie, Dhruv Grewal, and A. Parasuraman (1994), "The Influence of Store Environment on Quality Inferences and Store Image," *JAMS*, 22 (4), 328-339.
- Montoya-Weiss, Mitzi M., Glenn B. Voss and Dhruv Grewal (2003), "Determinants of Online Channel Use and Overall Satisfaction With a Relational, Multichannel Service Provider," *JAMS*, 31 (4), 448-458.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I like the look and feel of the \_\_\_\_\_ site.
2. The \_\_\_\_\_ site is an attractive web site.
3. I like the graphics on the \_\_\_\_\_ site.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the website should fill the blanks. Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003) did not specify the response format but it appears the typical *agree/disagree* verbal anchors along with a five or seven-point scale would be appropriate. These are the statements used in Study 1; Study 2 involved a university's registration process (telephone or online) and required some modification to the items.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward Voting**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the personal importance of engaging in voting activity. The construct being tapped into is more akin to attitude-toward-the-act than behavioral intention.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale used by Pinkleton, Um, and Austin (2002) is not clear though they may have drawn to some extent on work by Johnson-Cartee and Copeland (1991). It should be noted that although the scale items are stated in the positive, Pinkleton, Um, and Austin (2002) reversed scored them all in an attempt to make a measure of apathy.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .93 and .94 were reported for the scale as used by Pinkleton, Um, and Austin (2002) in a pretest and posttest, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Pinkleton, Um, and Austin (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

- Johnson-Cartee, Karen S. and Gary A. Copeland (1991), *Negative Political Advertising: Coming of Age*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pinkleton, Bruce E., Nam-Hyun Um, and Erica Weintraub Austin (2002), "An Exploration of the Effects of Negative Political Advertising on Political Decision Making," *JA*, 31 (Spring), 13-25.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Voting in each election is a high priority for me.
2. Voting in elections is important to me.
3. I would feel guilty if I didn't vote.
4. I like to vote.

**SCALE NAME: Attitude Towards the Spokesperson**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The five-point, four item scale seems to measure a person's evaluation of the "spokesperson" in an advertisement to which the person has been exposed to. It may be best to view the scale as a general evaluation of a spokesperson since several somewhat different facets are referred to rather than a single facet such as likeability, persuasiveness, or trustworthiness.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Whipple and McManamon (2002) drew a couple of the items from the work of Wells, Leavitt, and McConville (1971) but the scale as a whole appears to be original to their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .68 was reported for the scale (Whipple and McManamon 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

While Whipple and McManamon (2002) stated that the items composing this scale loaded together in an exploratory factor analysis they did not address the scale's validity.

**COMMENTS:**

Although all of the items apparently refer to the spokesperson in the ad, they also seem to be referring to different *aspects* of the spokesperson. If so, that may account for the scale's low internal consistency, e.g., a spokesperson may be viewed as having a "pleasant voice" and yet that does not mean that the consumer will "want to buy" the featured product.

**REFERENCES:**

- Wells, William D., Clark Leavitt and Maureen McConville (1971), "A Reaction Profile for TV Commercials," *JAR*, 11 (December), 11-17.
- Whipple, Thomas W. and Mary K. McManamon (2002), "Implications of Using Male and Female Voices in Commercials: An Exploratory Study," *JA*, 31 (2), 79-91.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Pleasant voice

---

<sup>1</sup> A five-point response format was used by Whipple and McManamon (2002) with *not at all* and *extremely* as the anchors.

*#151 Attitude Towards the Spokesperson*

2. Makes me want to buy
3. Credible spokesperson
4. Irritating

**SCALE NAME: Attractiveness of Competitors**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a customer believes that competitors could do a better job than one's current service supplier.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) is a slight modification of the attractiveness scale developed by Ping (1993). (See V3, #506). Whereas Ping's scale was made for use in business-to-business contexts, the phrasing used by Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) was for ultimate consumers. Further, the latter version was adapted into a Likert-type format.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale's alpha coefficient was reported to be .94 and .9226 by Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) and Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

Based on the EFA and CFA tests, Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) implied that there was evidence in support of this scale's validity but specific tests of convergent and discriminant validity were not reported.

Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) used both exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis to refine the many scales in their study. Once some poorly loading items for other scales were eliminated, the model fit the data. They also provided further evidence of the scale's convergent validity based on factor loadings and squared multiple correlations.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bansal, Harvir S., P. Gregory Irving, and Shirley F. Taylor (2004), "A Three-Component Model of Customer Commitment to Service Providers," *JAMS*, 32 (3), 234-250.
- Bansal, Harvir S., Shirley F. Taylor, and Yannik St. James (2005), "Migrating' to New Service Providers: Toward a Unifying Framework of Consumers' Switching Behaviors," *JAMS*, 33 (1), 96-115.
- Ping, Robert A., Jr. (1993), "The Effects of Satisfaction and Structural Constraints on Retailer Exiting, Voice, Loyalty, Opportunism, and Neglect," *JR*, 69 (3), 320-352.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. All in all, competitors would be much more fair than my \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The generic name of the service provider should be placed in the blank. Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) used "hair stylist" and "auto service company."

#152 *Attractiveness of Competitors*

2. Overall, competitors' policies would benefit me much more than my \_\_\_\_\_'s policies.
3. I would be much more satisfied with the service available from competitors than the service provided by my \_\_\_\_\_.
4. In general, I would be much more satisfied with competitors than I am with my \_\_\_\_\_.
5. Overall, competitors would be better to do business with than my \_\_\_\_\_.

**SCALE NAME: Authenticity Evidence**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the extent to which a person believes an object or set of objects are evidence of the existence of some specified character or event.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Grayson and Martinec (2004). Several stages were used to develop and purify the scales.

**RELIABILITY:**

Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported an alpha of .93 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Although the exact details were not provided, Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported that this scale along with all others used in their study were tested using CFA and showed acceptable discriminant and convergent validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Grayson, Kent and Radan Martinec (2004), "Consumer Perceptions of Iconicity and Indexicality and Their Influence on Assessments of Authentic Market Offerings," *JCR*, 31 (September), 296-312.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. It is almost like proof that \_\_\_\_\_ really existed.
2. It helped me to believe some facts about \_\_\_\_\_.
3. It is almost like verification that \_\_\_\_\_ really existed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the character or event should be placed in the blank, e.g., Sherlock Holmes.

**SCALE NAME: Behavioral Control****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Using three, seven-point Likert-type statements, the scale measures one's subjective degree of control over performance of a particular behavior. As currently viewed by Ajzen (2002), perceived behavioral control is an overarching construct that includes self-efficacy as well as controllability. Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) used the scale with mobile services but it appears to be amenable for use with goods as well.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) received ideas for their statements from scales used by Bhattacharjee (2004) and Taylor and Todd (1995), it is probably best to view the scale as a whole being original. Four mobile services were examined in their study using the scale: text messaging, contact, payment, and gaming.

**RELIABILITY:**

The construct reliability for the scale across four mobile services studied was .77 (Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) supported the scale's validity by testing their measurement model. The model had 26 items measuring eight factors. The results indicated that each construct shared more variance with its indicators than with the other constructs in the study. Further, the fit indices indicated that the measurement model was acceptable for each of the four applications.

**REFERENCES:**

- Ajzen, Icek (2002), "Perceived Behavioral Control, Self-Efficacy, Locus of Control, and the Theory of Planned Behavior," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32 (4), 665-683.
- Bhattacharjee, Anol (2000), "Acceptance of E-Commerce Services: The Case of Electronic Brokerages," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 30 (4), 411-420.
- Nysveen, Herbjørn, Per E. Pederson and Helge Thorbjørnsen (2005), "Intentions to Use Mobile Services: Antecedents and Cross-Service Comparisons," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 330-346.
- Taylor, Shirley and Peter A. Todd (1995), "Understanding Information Technology Usage: A Test of Competing Models," *Information Systems Research*, 6 (June), 144-176.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**


---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the object should be placed in the blanks.

*#154 Behavioral Control*

1. I feel free to use the kind of \_\_\_\_\_ I like to.
2. Using \_\_\_\_\_ is entirely within my control.
3. I have the necessary means and resources to use \_\_\_\_\_.

**SCALE NAME: Behavioral Intention (Brand)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five statements are used to measure the extent to which a consumer has “positive” inclinations with regard to a specific brand. Unlike some of the other more popular measures of intention, it is not general enough to be amenable with a wide variety of activities nor is it so focused as to be a purchase intention scale.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although drawing upon ideas in previous intentions scales, this scale appears to have been developed by Krishnamurthy and Sivaraman (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .88 was reported for the scale (Krishnamurthy and Sivaraman 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale’s validity was reported by Krishnamurthy and Sivaraman (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Krishnamurthy, Parthasarathy and Anuradha Sivaraman (2002), “Counterfactual Thinking and Advertising Responses,” *JCR*, 28 (March), 650-658.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am likely to ask the salesperson about \_\_\_\_\_ the next time I visit the \_\_\_\_\_ store.<sup>2</sup>
2. I am likely to consider the \_\_\_\_\_ the next time I think about buying a \_\_\_\_\_.<sup>3</sup>
3. I am likely to check reviews regarding \_\_\_\_\_.
4. I am likely to suggest \_\_\_\_\_ to a friend.

---

<sup>1</sup>

The blank in each statement (the first blank in first two items) is to be filled with the name of the focal brand.

<sup>2</sup> The second blank should be filled with the name of the type of store that carries the product, e.g., electronics, grocery, shoe.

<sup>3</sup> The second blank should be filled with the generic name of the product category the focal brand is a member of, is a component of, or is complementary with.

**SCALE NAME: Behavioral Intention (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The semantic differential scale measures the stated inclination of a person to engage in a specified behavior. In most of the studies described below the behavior was a purchase but the items are general enough to refer to non-purchase behaviors as well (e.g., likelihood of shopping at a store, paying attention to an ad, using a coupon). An early use of the scale was for measuring a consumer's intention to deal with the same sales person as used previously (Oliver and Swan 1989). A version of the scale used by Machleit, Allen, and Madden (1993) (referred to as *contact intention*) measured the motivation to try the brand if in the market for the product. Some have used the scale to measure *patronage intention* (Day and Stafford 1997; Kukar-Kinney and Walters 2003; Stafford 1996; Wakefield and Baker 1998) while Urbany et al. (1997) modified it to measure *willingness to rent an apartment*. As used by Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) as well as Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005), the scale measured *service provider switching intentions*. The various versions of the scale differ in the number and set of items employed as well as the scale stem. However, the uses are similar in that they have multiple items in common.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Little information was provided in most of the studies about the origin of the particular sets of items they used. Since it is unlikely that they would have independently arrived at such similar sets of items, they must have, instead, built upon some unspecified source and from each other. The books by Fishbein (Fishbein and Ajzen 1975; Ajzen and Fishbein 1980) are possible sources although only item #1 (below) figures prominently in those books as a way to measure behavioral intention.

Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) cited Oliver and Swan (1989) as the source of their version of the scale. Indeed, they used the three items that had been used previously by the other authors and just changed the scale stem.

Taylor, Miracle, and Wilson (1997) developed a Korean version of the scale using the back-translation method. The set of items used by Choi and Miracle (2004) with Koreans was parallel with the translations used with Americans.

**RELIABILITY:**

Reported internal consistencies have tended to be very good and have ranged from .80 (Zhang and Buddha 1999) to .99 (Jones, Mothersbaugh, and Beatty 2000).

**VALIDITY:**

In none of the studies was the scale's validity fully addressed. Although not specifically examining the validity of behavioral intention, Machleit, Allen, and Madden (1993) used confirmatory factor analysis to provide evidence that another measure (brand interest) and two measures of behavioral intention (purchase and contact) were not measures of

the same construct (discriminant validity). Similarly, a couple of tests generally described by Urbany et al. (1997) provided support for a claim of discriminant validity for the scale but the details relative to this particular scale were not given.

Using the results of their EFA and CFA tests, Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) implied that there was evidence in support of this scale's validity but specific tests of convergent and discriminant validity were not reported.

Based on the CFA and other tests that were conducted on this and other scales, both Jones, Mothersbaugh, and Beatty (2000) as well as Madrigal (2000) concluded that their versions of the scale were unidimensional and showed evidence of discriminant validity.

A correlation matrix was provided by MacKensie and Spreng (1992) between the items in the behavioral intention scale as well as several others that sheds some limited light on the issue of validity. For example, the inter-correlations of the intention scale items ranged between .47 and .88 which provides some evidence that the items are measuring the same thing. In contrast, the correlations between the intention items and items measuring related but theoretically distinct constructs were much lower.

#### **COMMENTS:**

See also Dabholkar (1994), Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002), Dabholkar, Thorpe, and Rentz (1996), Lim, Darley, and Summers (1994), Prakash (1992), Schuhwerk & Lefkoff-Hagius (1995), and Tripp, Jensen, and Carlson (1994).

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Ajzen, Icek and Martin Fishbein (1980), *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Bansal, Harvir S., P. Gregory Irving, and Shirley F. Taylor (2004), "A Three-Component Model of Customer Commitment to Service Providers," *JAMS*, 32 (3), 234-250.
- Bansal, Harvir S., Shirley F. Taylor, and Yannik St. James (2005), "Migrating' to New Service Providers: Toward a Unifying Framework of Consumers' Switching Behaviors," *JAMS*, 33 (1), 96-115.
- Bruner II, Gordon C. and Anand Kumar (2000), "Web Commercials and Advertising Hierarchy-of-Effects," *JAR*, 40 (Jan-Apr), 35-42.
- Chang, Chingching (2004), "The Interplay of Product Class Knowledge and Trial Experience in Attitude Formation," *JA*, 33 (1), 83-92.
- Chattopadhyay, Amitava and Kunal Basu (1990), "Humor in Advertising: The Moderating Role of Prior Brand Evaluation," *JMR*, 27 (November), 466-476.
- Choi, Yung Kyun and Gordon E. Miracle (2004), "The Effectiveness of Comparative Advertising in Korea and the United States," *JA*, 33 (4), 75-87.
- Dabholkar, Pratibha (1994), "Incorporating Choice into an Attitudinal Framework: Analyzing Models of Mental Comparison Processes," *JCR*, 21 (June), 100-118.
- Dabholkar, Pratibha A. and Richard P. Bagozzi (2002), "An Attitudinal Model of Technology-Based Self-Service: Moderating Effects of Consumer Traits and Situational Factors," *JAMS*, 30 (3), 184-201.

## #156 Behavioral Intention (General)

- Dabholkar, Pratibha, Dayle I. Thorpe, and Joseph O. Rentz (1996), "A Measure of Service Quality for Retail Stores: Scale Development and Validation," *JAMS*, 24 (Winter), 3-16.
- Day, Ellen and Marla Royne Stafford (1997), "Age-Related Cues in Retail Services Advertising: Their Effects on Younger Consumers," *JR*, 73 (2), 211-233.
- Fishbein, Martin and Icek Ajzen (1975), *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Gill, James D., Sanford Grossbart, and Russell N. Laczniak (1988), "Influence of Involvement, Commitment and Familiarity on Brand Beliefs and Attitudes of Viewers Exposed to Alternative Claim Strategies," *JA*, 17 (2), 33-43.
- Goldsmith, Ronald E., Barbara A. Lafferty, and Stephen J. Newell (2001), "The Impact of Corporate Credibility and Celebrity Credibility on Consumer Reaction to Advertisements and Brands," *JA*, 29 (3), 30-54.
- Gotlieb, Jerry B. and Dan Sarel (1991), "Comparative Advertising Effectiveness: The Role of Involvement and Source Credibility," *JA*, 20 (1), 38-45.
- Gotlieb, Jerry B. and Dan Sarel (1992), "The Influence of Type of Advertisement, Price, and Source Credibility on Perceived Quality," *JAMS*, 20 (Summer), 253-260.
- Grossbart, Sanford, Darrel D. Muehling, and Norman Kangun (1986), "Verbal and Visual References to Competition in Comparative Advertising," *JA*, 15 (1), 10-23.
- Homer, Pamela M. (1995), "Ad Size as an Indicator of Perceived Advertising Costs and Effort: The Effects on Memory and Perceptions," *JA*, 24 (Winter), 1-12.
- Jones, Michael A., David L. Mothersbaugh, and Sharon E. Beatty (2000), "Switching Barriers and Repurchase Intentions in Services," *JR*, 79 (2), 259-274.
- Ko, Hanjun, Chang-Hoan Cho, and Marilyn S. Roberts (2005), "Internet Uses and Gratifications: A Structural Equation Model of Interactive Advertising," *JA*, 34 (2), 57-70..
- Kukar-Kinney, Monika and Rockney G. Walters (2003), "Consumer Perceptions of Refund Depth and Competitive Scope in Price-matching Guarantees: Effects on Store Patronage," *JR*, 79 (3), 153-160.
- Lacher, Kathleen T. and Richard Mizerski (1994), "An Exploratory Study of the Responses and Relationships Involved in the Evaluation of, and in the Intention to Purchase New Rock Music," *JCR*, 21 (September), 366-380.
- Li, Hairong, Terry Daugherty, and Frank Biocca (2002), "Impact of 3-D Advertising on Product Knowledge, Brand Attitude, and Purchase Intention," *JA*, 29 (3), 43-57.
- Lim, Jeen-Su, William K. Darley, and John O. Summers (1994), "An Assessment of Country of Origin Effects Under Alternative Presentation Formats," *JAMS*, 22 (3), 272-282.
- Machleit, Karen A., Chris T. Allen, and Thomas J. Madden (1993), "The Mature Brand and Brand Interest: An Alternative Consequence of Ad-Evoked Affect," *JM*, 57 (October), 72-82.
- 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," *JMR*, 23 (May), 130-143.
- MacKenzie, Scott B. and Richard A. Spreng (1992), "How Does Motivation Moderate the Impact of Central and Peripheral Processing on Brand Attitudes and Intentions," *JCR*, 18 (March), 519-529.

- Madrigal, Robert (2000), "The Influence of Social Alliances with Sports Teams on Intentions to Purchase Corporate Sponsors' Products," *JA*, 29 (Winter), 13-24.
- Martin, Brett A. S., Christina Kwai-Choi Lee, and Feng Yang (2004), "The Influence of Ad Model Ethnicity and Self-Referencing on Attitudes," *JA*, 33 (4), 27-37.
- Netemeyer, Richard G. and William O. Bearden (1992), "A Comparative Analysis of Two Models of Behavioral Intention," *JAMS*, 20 (Winter), 49-59.
- Oliver, Richard L. and William O. Bearden (1985), "Crossover Effects in the Theory of Reasoned Action: A Moderating Influence Attempt," *JCR*, 12 (December), 324-340.
- Oliver, Richard L. and John E. Swan (1989), "Consumer Perceptions of Interpersonal Equity and Satisfaction in Transactions: A Field Survey Approach," *JM*, 53 (April), 21-35.
- Prakash, Ved (1992), "Sex Roles and Advertising Preferences," *JAR*, 32 (May/June), 43-52.
- Putrevu, Sanjay (2004), "Communicating with the Sexes," *JA*, 33 (Fall), 51-62.
- Schuhwerk, Melody E. and Roxanne Lefkoff-Hagius (1995), "Green or Non-Green? Does Type of Appeal Matter When Advertising a Green Product?" *JA*, 24 (Summer), 45-54.
- Shimp, Terence A. and Subhash Sharma (1987), "Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of The CETSCALE," *JMR*, 24 (August), 280-289.
- Simpson, Penny M., Steve Horton, and Gene Brown (1996), "Male Nudity in Advertisements: A Modified Replication and Extension of Gender and Product Effects," *JAMS*, 24 (Summer), 257-262.
- Sinclair, Janas and Tracy Irani (2005), "Advocacy Advertising for Biotechnology," *JA*, 34 (3), 59-73.
- Singh, Mandeep, Siva K. Balasubramanian, and Goutam Chakraborty (2000), "A Comparative Analysis of Three Communication Formats: Advertising, Infomercial, and Direct Experience," *JA*, 29 (Winter), 59-75.
- Singh, Surendra N. and Catherine Cole (1993), "The Effects of Length, Content, and Repetition on Television Commercial Effectiveness," *JMR*, 30 (February), 91-104.
- Singh, Surendra N., V. Parker Lessig, Dongwook Kim, Reetika Gupta, and Mary Ann Hocutt (2000), "Does Your Ad Have Too Many Pictures?" *JAR*, 40 (Jan-Apr), 11-27.
- Stafford, Marla Royne (1996), "Tangibility in Services Advertising: An Investigation of Verbal versus Visual Cues," *JA*, 25 (Fall), 13-28.
- Stafford, Marla Royne and Ellen Day (1995), "Retail Services Advertising: The Effects of Appeal, Medium, and Service," *JA*, 24 (Spring), 57-71.
- Stevenson, Julie, Gordon C. Bruner II, and Anand Kumar (2000), "Webpage Background and Viewer Attitudes," *JAR*, 40 (January/April), 29-34.
- Szymanski, David M (2001), "Modality and Offering Effects in Sales Presentations for a Good Versus a Service," *JAMS*, 29 (2), 179-189.
- Taylor, Charles R., Gordon E. Miracle, and R. Dale Wilson (1997), "The Impact of Information Level on the Effectiveness of U.S. and Korean Television Commercials," *JA*, 26 (Spring), 1-18.
- Till, Brian D. and Daniel W. Baack (2005), "Recall and Persuasion," *JA*, 34 (3), 47-57.
- Till, Brian D. and Michael Busler (2001), "The Match-Up Hypothesis: Physical Attractiveness, Expertise, and the Role of Fit on Brand Attitude, Purchase Intent and Brand Beliefs," *JA*, 29 (3), 1-14.

## #156 Behavioral Intention (General)

- Tripp, Carolyn, Thomas D. Jensen, and Les Carlson (1994), "The Effects of Multiple Product Endorsements by Celebrities on Consumers' Attitudes and Intentions," *JCR*, 20 (March), 535-547.
- Urbany, Joel E., William O. Bearden, Ajit Kaicker, and Melinda Smith-de Borrero (1997), "Transaction Utility Effects When Quality is Uncertain," *JAMS*, 25 (Winter), 45-55.
- Voss, Kevin E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Voss, Kevin E., Eric R. Spangenberg, and Bianca Grohmann (2003), "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Dimensions of Consumer Attitude," *JMR*, 40 (August), 310-320.
- Wakefield, Kirk L. and Julie Baker (1998), "Excitement at the Mall: Determinants and Effects on Shopping Response," *JR*, 74 (4), 515-539.
- Yi, Youjae (1990a), "Cognitive and Affective Priming Effects of the Context for Print Advertisements," *JA*, 19 (2), 40-48.
- Yi, Youjae (1990b), "The Effects of Contextual Priming in Print Advertisements," *JCR*, 17 (September), 215-222.
- Zhang, Yong (1996), "Responses to Humorous Advertising: The Moderating Effect of Need for Cognition," *JA*, 25 (Spring), 15-32.
- Zhang, Yong and Richard Buda (1999), "Moderating Effects of Need for Cognition on Responses to Positively versus Negatively Framed Advertising Messages," *JA*, 28 (2), 1-15.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. unlikely / likely
2. non-existent / existent
3. improbable / probable
4. impossible / possible
5. uncertain / certain
6. definitely would not use / definitely would use
7. not at all / very frequent
8. no chance / certain
9. probably not / probably

Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004): 1, 3, 8 7-point [.94]

Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005): 1, 3, 8 7-point [.9342]

Bruner and Kumar (2000): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.91]

Chang (2004): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.93]

Chattopadhyay and Basu (1990): 1, 3, 4 [.93]

Choi and Miracle (2004): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.91-.93]

Dabholkar (1994): 1, 4, 6 mixed points [.87 & .90]

Day and Stafford (1997): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.93 & .95]

---

<sup>1</sup> An asterisk (\*) indicates that the actual item used in the indicated study varied somewhat from that shown in the list. Scale stems have varied depending upon the object of the intention.

- Gill, Grossbart, and Laczniak (1988) 1, 2, 3, 4 [.861]  
Goldsmith, Lafferty and Newell (2001): 1\*, 3, 4 7-point [.92]  
Gotlieb and Sarel (1991, 1992): 1, 3, 4 [.89 & .93]  
Grossbart, Muehling, and Kangun (1986): 1, 3, 5 [.92]  
Homer (1995): 1\*, 3\*, 4\* 9-point [.97]  
Jones, Mothersbaugh, and Beatty (2000): 1, 3\*, 4, 8 10-point [.99]  
Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.89]  
Kukar-Kinney and Walters (2003): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.91]  
Lacher and Mizerski (1994): 1, 3, 4 6-point [.92 & .94]  
Li, Daugherty, and Biocca (2002): 1, 3, 5, 6\* 7-point [.90 & .79]  
Lim, Darley, and Summers (1994): 1, 3, 4 [.90-.94]  
Machleit, Allen, and Madden (1993): 1, 3, 4 [>.95]  
MacKenzie, Lutz, and Belch (1986): 1, 3, 4 [.88 & .90]  
MacKensie and Spreng (1992): 1, 3, 4 [.88]  
Madrigal (2000): 1, 3, 8 7-point [.81]  
Martin, Lee, and Yang (2004): 1, 3, 4 5-point [.87]  
Netemeyer and Bearden (1992): 1, 3, 4 [.91 & .90]  
Oliver and Bearden (1985): 1, 3, 4, 5 [.87]  
Oliver and Swan (1989): 1, 3\*, 4, 8 7-point [.964]  
Putrevu (2004): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.90-.96]  
Shimp and Sharma (1987): 1, 3, 5 [.84]  
Simpson, Horton, and Brown (1996): 1, 3, 4 9-point [.96]  
Sinclair and Irani (2005): 1\*, 3, 4 [.94]  
Singh, Balasubramanian, and Chakraborty (2000): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.95 & .93]  
Singh and Cole (1993): 1, 3, 4 [.93]  
Singh et al. (2000): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.95]  
Stafford (1996): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.94]  
Stafford and Day (1995): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.94]  
Stevenson, Bruner, and Kumar (2000): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.95]  
Szymanski (2001): 1\*, 6\*, 9 7-point [.94]  
Taylor, Miracle, and Wilson (1997): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.98 & .97]  
Till and Baack (2005): 1, 3, 6\* 7-point [>.97]  
Till and Busler (2000): 1, 3, 6\* 9-point [.95 & .96]  
Tripp, Jensen, and Carlson (1994): 1, 2, 3, 4 7-point [.93]  
Urbany et al. (1997): 1, 3, 5, 6\* mixed points [.91]  
Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003; Voss 2005): 1-4 7-point [.96]  
Wakefield and Baker (1998): 1, 3, 4, 7 7-point [.96]  
Yi (1990a, 1990b): 1, 3, 4 [.89 & .92]  
Zhang (1996): 1, 3, 4 9-point [.80]  
Zhang and Budda (1999): 1, 3, 4 7-point [.80]

**SCALE NAME: Behavioral Intention Toward the Product in the Ad**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point statements are used to measure a person's stated likelihood of trying and buying a product featured in an advertisement.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's source was stated by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004). Given that, the authors probably developed the scale for use in this study.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .86 was reported by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was discussed by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004) but they did report the results of an exploratory factor analysis in which these three items loaded together.

**REFERENCES:**

Sundar, Shyam S. and Sriram Kalyanaraman (2004), "Arousal, Memory and Impression-Formation Effects of Animation Speed in Web Advertising," *JA*, 33 (1), 7-17.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How likely are you to buy the good/service in the advertisement?
2. How likely are you to try the product in the advertisement?
3. How likely are you to visit the associated website of the advertisement?

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale anchors used by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004) were *not at all likely* (1) and *very likely* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Behavioral Intention Toward the Product in the Ad**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four items are used to measure the probability that a person who has seen a product in an advertisement will engage in certain positive behaviors with respect to the product. As shown, the items are stated in terms of an ad for a vacation destination. Although the items could be rephrased for use with other products, it is unknown how well they would perform.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Petrova and Cialdini (2005) did not state the source of the scale but it clearly appears to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .94 was reported for the scale by Petrova and Cialdini (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Petrova and Cialdini (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Petrova, Petia K. and Robert B. Cialdini (2005), "Fluency of Consumption Imagery and the Backfire Effects of Imagery Appeals," *JCR*, 32 (December), 442-452.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

What is the likelihood that you will:

1. consider the vacation in the future?
2. request a brochure with further product information?
3. visit the web site shown on the ad?
4. visit the advertised destination given you were to plan such a vacation and had the necessary time and money?

---

<sup>1</sup> The phrasing of these items is recreated based on paraphrasing provided in the article by Petrova and Cialdini (2005). Also, the nature of the response scale was not identified but could have been something like *very unlikely / very likely*.

**SCALE NAME: Believability of the Information**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure the extent to which some specific information to which a consumer has been exposed is viewed as being true and acceptable. If using instructions similar to Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000), the respondent's attention can be focused on something specific in the information, e.g., a claim made about the product.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000). A slight variation in the scale was used later by Sen, Gurhan-Canli, and Morwitz (2001).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale by Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000) was reported to have alphas of .87 (Study 1) and .77 (Study 2). Alphas of .87 (Study 1) and .86 (Study 2) were reported for the version of the scale used by Sen, Gurhan-Canli, and Morwitz (2001). Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004) reported an alpha of .89 for the scale in their study.

**VALIDITY:**

No evidence of the scale's validity was reported in the studies.

**REFERENCES:**

- Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep and Rajeev Batra (2004), "When Corporate Image Affects Product Evaluations: The Moderating Role of Perceived Risk," *JMR*, 41 (2), 197-205.
- Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep and Durairaj Maheswaran (2000), "Determinants of Country-of-Origin Evaluations," *JCR*, 27 (1), 96-108.
- Sen, Sankar, Zeynep Gurhan-Canli, and Vicki Morwitz (2001), "Withholding Consumption: A Social Dilemma Perspective on Consumer Boycotts," *JCR*, 28 (December), 399-417.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: Please describe your perceptions of the information provided to you by answering each of the following questions. For each question please circle one number on each scale that best describes your perceptions. *In your opinion the claim made was:*

---

<sup>1</sup> These are the directions used by Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000). By changing the final phrase in the scale directions (shown in italics) the scale can be made to focus on some other aspect of the information. By deleting it altogether the scale would evaluate the information in general. In the study by Sen, Gurhan-Canli, and Morwitz (2001) the scale was used with regard to a mock newspaper article that subjects were asked to read. Items #1-#3 are those by Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000) whereas Sen, Gurhan-Canli, and Morwitz (2001) used #1, #2, and #4. Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004) used #1, #3, and #5 with a nine-point response format.

*#159 Believability of the Information*

1. Not at all believable / highly believable
2. Not at all true / absolutely true
3. Not at all acceptable / totally acceptable
4. Not at all credible / very credible
5. Not at all trustworthy / completely trustworthy

**SCALE NAME: Benevolence Importance**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of nine, nine-point statements measuring the value placed by a person on the welfare of those people with whom one is in frequent personal contact.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005) was derived from Schwartz (1992). It is part of the Schwartz Value Survey which has been tested in many different countries and is intended to capture ten important human values. Due to the unconventional psychometric techniques used to develop the instrument, many issues regarding each scale's dimensionality and validity are worthy of further testing.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) was .81 (Burroughs 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Although the scale's validity was not directly assessed by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002), the results of multidimensional scaling analysis showed that benevolence was located along an axis with other self-transcendent values such as community and religiosity and was in opposition to self-enhancement values such as hedonism and materialism. This provides at least some modicum of evidence of the scale's nomological validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Richins (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.
- Richins, Marsha L. (2004), "The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form," *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.
- Schwartz, Shalom H. (1992), "Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, V. 25, Mark P. Zanna, ed., San Diego: Academic Press, Inc, 1-65.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

Directions: Rate each value listed below as a guiding principle in your life using the following nine-point scale: *opposed to my values* (-1), *not important* (0), (1 and 2, unlabeled), *important* (3), (4 and 5, unlabeled), *very important* (6), and *of supreme importance* (7).

1. HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)
2. HONEST (genuine, sincere)
3. FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)
4. LOYAL (faithful to my friends, group)
5. RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)
6. A SPIRITUAL LIFE (emphasis on spiritual not material matters)
7. TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close, supportive friends)
8. MATURE LOVE (deep emotional and spiritual intimacy)
9. MEANING IN LIFE (a purpose in life)

7

---

<sup>1</sup> The same nine-point response scale and anchors were used by Schwartz (1992) and Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005). The directions shown here were recreated based on a description by Schwartz (1992, p. 17).

**SCALE NAME: Benevolence of the Business**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, five-point Likert-type statement assessing the degree to which a customer believes a store or company has policies which indicate their customers' best interests are in mind.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) along with several other scales based on focus groups and in-depth interviews. In total the scales were intended to assess dimensions of trustworthiness related to front-line employees or management policies and practices. This scale measures one of the latter dimensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .90 (retail) and .86 (airline) were reported for the scale by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was assessed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) as part of a three-factor measurement model. In that context, the authors concluded the fit was good and there was acceptable evidence of convergent and discriminant validity. This was true for the separate retail and airline data as well as the combined set.

**REFERENCES:**

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

**SCALE ITEMS:**

The \_\_\_\_\_:<sup>1</sup>

1. has policies that indicate respect for the customer.
2. has policies that favor the customer's best interest.
3. acts as if the customer is always right.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the type of business can be placed in the blank. Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) used "store" and "airline."

**SCALE NAME: Benevolence of the Employees**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the extent that a customer believes the employees of a store or company have the customers' best interests in mind.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) along with several other scales based on focus groups and in-depth interviews. In total the scales were intended to assess dimensions of trustworthiness related to front-line employees or management policies and practices. This scale measures one of the former dimensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .84 (retail) and .81 (airline) were reported for the scale by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was assessed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) as part of a three-factor measurement model. In that context, the authors concluded the fit was good and there was acceptable evidence of convergent and discriminant validity. This was true for the separate retail and airline data as well as the combined set.

**REFERENCES:**

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

**SCALE ITEMS:**

The \_\_\_\_\_ employees:<sup>1</sup>

1. act as if they value you as a customer.
2. can be relied upon to give \_\_\_\_\_.<sup>2</sup>
3. treat you with respect.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the type of employees can be placed in the blank. Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) used "store" and "airline."

<sup>2</sup> Depending on the type of business, a different phrase is placed in the blank. Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) used "honest advice even if they won't make a sale" for a retail context and "accurate information in the event of flight delays or cancellations" for an airline.

**SCALE NAME: Biotech Companies' Compliance with Regulation**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, five-point Likert-type statements that measure a person's belief that companies producing biotech crops are concerned about and committed to following U.S. government regulations. Sinclair and Irani (2005) referred to the scale as *intent*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Sinclair and Irani (2005) appear to be the source of this scale though they drew upon their own previous work (Irani, Sinclair, and O'Malley 2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale's alpha was calculated to be .66 (Sinclair 2008).

**VALIDITY:**

The only evidence bearing on the scale's validity was that a three factor solution was found as expected by Sinclair and Irani (2005) in the exploratory factor analysis of these items and those of two other related scales (#164 and #165).

**REFERENCES:**

Irani, Tracy, Janas Sinclair, and Michelle O'Malley (2002), "The Importance of Being Accountable: the Relationship between Perceptions of Accountability, Knowledge, and Attitude toward Plant Genetic Engineering," *Science Communication*, 23 (3), 225-242.

Sinclair, Janas (2008), Personal Correspondence.

Sinclair, Janas and Tracy Irani (2005), "Advocacy Advertising for Biotechnology," *JA*, 34 (3), 59-73.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Companies that produce biotech crops are concerned about following U.S. government regulations.
2. Companies that produce biotech crops are committed to protecting the public from possible risks of biotech crops.
3. Companies that produce biotech crops do not care about complying with U.S. government regulations. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Biotech Companies' Efficacy**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, five-point Likert-type statements that are intended to measure a person's belief that companies producing biotech crops have the ability to control whether or not their products are a safety hazard to the public. Sinclair and Irani (2005) referred to the scale as *transparency*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Sinclair and Irani (2005) appear to be the source of this scale though they drew upon their own previous work (Irani, Sinclair, and O'Malley 2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale's alpha was calculated to be .59 (Sinclair 2008).

**VALIDITY:**

The only evidence bearing on the scale's validity was that a three factor solution was found as expected by Sinclair and Irani (2005) in the exploratory factor analysis of these items and those of two other related scales (#163 and #165).

**COMMENTS:**

The alpha of the scale is so low that it brings the scale's reliability into doubt. This low reliability may be due to the items are tapping into multiple, complex, hypothetical issues.

**REFERENCES:**

Irani, Tracy, Janas Sinclair, and Michelle O'Malley (2002), "The Importance of Being Accountable: the Relationship between Perceptions of Accountability, Knowledge, and Attitude toward Plant Genetic Engineering," *Science Communication*, 23 (3), 225-242.

Sinclair, Janas (2008), Personal Correspondence.

Sinclair, Janas and Tracy Irani (2005), "Advocacy Advertising for Biotechnology," *JA*, 34 (3), 59-73.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Companies that produce biotech crops have control over whether or not a biotech crop is introduced that has a negative impact on public safety.
2. If a biotech crop had a negative impact on public safety, a specific company would be at fault.
3. A company that produces biotech crops could avoid introducing a biotech crop that has a negative impact on public safety.

**SCALE NAME: Biotech Regulation**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's belief that government agencies in the U.S. have clear policies regarding the production of biotech crops. Sinclair and Irani (2005) referred to the scale as *rule-based trust*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Sinclair and Irani (2005) appear to be the source of this scale though they drew upon their own previous work (Irani, Sinclair, and O'Malley 2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale's alpha was calculated to be .77 (Sinclair 2008).

**VALIDITY:**

Sinclair and Irani (2005) conducted exploratory factor analysis on these items and those of two other related scales (#163 and #164). A three factor solution was found and provides some minimal level of evidence regarding the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Irani, Tracy, Janas Sinclair, and Michelle O'Malley (2002), "The Importance of Being Accountable: the Relationship between Perceptions of Accountability, Knowledge, and Attitude toward Plant Genetic Engineering," *Science Communication*, 23 (3), 225-242.

Sinclair, Janas (2008), Personal Correspondence.

Sinclair, Janas and Tracy Irani (2005), "Advocacy Advertising for Biotechnology," *JA*, 34 (3), 59-73.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. U.S. government agencies have regulations that specifically apply to the production of biotech crops.
2. U.S. government agencies have clear rules for the production of biotech crops.
3. U.S. government agencies do not have policies related to the production of biotech crops. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Boycotting Counterarguments**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, ten-point Likert-type items that assess a consumer's reasoning for a lack of motivation to boycott a company.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated explicitly by Klein, Smith, and John (2004), the scale appears to be original to their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

Klein, Smith, and John (2004) reported an alpha of .61 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Klein, Smith, and John (2004). However, the factor analysis they conducted of the items in this scale and three others provided evidence that each set of items was unidimensional.

**COMMENTS:**

The authors acknowledged that the scale's reliability was low. One possible explanation for this low internal consistency is that the items are tapping into different reasons for not boycotting. Thus, it could be that this is more like a formative scale than a reflective one. Before the scale is used again, some consideration should be given to what sort of measure it is. If it is to be a reflective scale then work is called for to increase its psychometric quality. If it is a formative scale then alpha is not a proper assessment and other techniques are called for (e.g., Jarvis, MacKenzie, and Podsakoff 2003).

**REFERENCES:**

- Jarvis, Cheryl Burke, Scott B. MacKenzie, and Philip M. Podsakoff (2003), "A Critical Review of Construct Indicators and Measurement Model Misspecification in Marketing and Consumer Research," *JCR*, 30 (September), 199-218.
- Klein, Jill Gabrielle, Craig N. Smith, and Andrew John (2004), "Why We Boycott: Consumer Motivations for Boycott Participation," *JM*, 68 (July), 92-109.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I do not need to boycott \_\_\_\_\_; enough other people are doing so.
2. I do not buy enough \_\_\_\_\_ products for it to be worthwhile boycotting; it would not even be noticed.
3. One shouldn't boycott because it will put other \_\_\_\_\_ jobs in danger.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the company should be placed in the blank.

## #166 *Boycotting Counterarguments*

4. I don't boycott \_\_\_\_\_ because it is a company and boycotting would lead me to buy foreign products.

**SCALE NAME: Boycotting Effectiveness**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three statements with a ten-point Likert-type response format are used to measure the extent to which a consumer believes that a boycott is an appropriate and useful consumer activity in order to affect a company's decisions. The scale was called *make a difference* by Klein, Smith, and John (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated explicitly by Klein, Smith, and John (2004), the scale appears to be original to their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

Klein, Smith, and John (2004) reported an alpha of .78 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Klein, Smith, and John (2004). However, the factor analysis they conducted of the items in this scale and three others provided evidence that each set of items was unidimensional.

**REFERENCES:**

Klein, Jill Gabrielle, Craig N. Smith, and Andrew John (2004), "Why We Boycott: Consumer Motivations for Boycott Participation," *JM*, 68 (July), 92-109.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Boycotts are an effective means to make a company change its actions.
2. Everyone should take part in the boycott because every contribution, no matter how small, is important.
3. By boycotting, I can help change \_\_\_\_\_'s decision.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the company should be placed in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Brand Community Engagement**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This scale has four, ten-point Likert-type statements that are intended to measure the degree to which a person is involved with a community of brand users due to intrinsic benefits of the activity.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005). An initial set of items were developed for several scales using qualitative research followed by a quantitative pretest. As used to gather the data, the items were apparently in German.

**RELIABILITY:**

The composite reliability reported for the scale by Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005) was .88.

**VALIDITY:**

Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005) used CFA with twelve latent constructs and twenty measures. The measurement model fit the data well and two tests were used to provide evidence of each scale's discriminant validity. The average variance extracted for this scale was .64.

**REFERENCES:**

Algesheimer, René, Utpal M. Dholakia, and Andreas Herrmann (2005), "The Social Influence of Brand Community: Evidence from European Car Clubs," *JM*, 69 (July), 19-34.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I benefit from following the brand community's rules.
2. I am motivated to participate in the brand community's activities because I feel better afterwards.
3. I am motivated to participate in the brand community's activities because I am able to support other members.
4. I am motivated to participate in the brand community's activities because I am able to reach personal goals.

**SCALE NAME: Brand Community Identification**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, ten-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a person views him/herself as a member of a community of brand users.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005) based on inspiration from the identification scale by Mael and Ashforth (1992). An initial set of items were developed for several scales using qualitative research followed by a quantitative pretest. As used to gather the data, the items were apparently in German.

**RELIABILITY:**

The composite reliability reported for the scale by Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005) was .92.

**VALIDITY:**

Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005) used CFA with twelve latent constructs and twenty measures. The measurement model fit the data well and two tests were used to provide evidence of each scale's discriminant validity. The average variance extracted for this scale was .70.

**REFERENCES:**

- Algesheimer, René, Utpal M. Dholakia, and Andreas Herrmann (2005), "The Social Influence of Brand Community: Evidence from European Car Clubs," *JM*, 69 (July), 19-34.
- Mael, Fred and Blake E. Ashforth (1992), "Alumni and Their Alma Mater: A Partial Test of the Reformulated Model of Organizational Identification," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 103-23.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I am very attached to the community.
2. Other brand community members and I share the same objectives.
3. The friendships I have with other brand community members mean a lot to me.
4. If brand community members planned something, I'd think of it as something "we" would do rather than something "they" would do.
5. I see myself as a part of the brand community.

**SCALE NAME: Brand Community Interest**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a consumer's interest in other consumers due to their mutual ownership of a certain branded product. The scale was referred to as *owner-owners relationship* by McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig (2002).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig (2002). Creation of the items was based upon a literature review of brand communities as well as the authors' own ethnographic work and pretests.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .70 (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002) and .71 (Russell 2007; Russell, Norman, and Heckler 2004) have been reported for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

This scale was one of four that were used by McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig (2002) to capture customer-centered relationships. Acceptable fit was found for a four-factor confirmatory model. In addition, the results of a second-order model showed the four dimensions were an adequate reflection of a single higher-order construct (integrated brand community). The average variance extracted for this dimension was .61.

**REFERENCES:**

- McAlexander, James H., John W. Schouten, and Harold F. Koenig (2002), "Building Brand Community," *JM*, 66 (January), 38-54.
- Russell, Cristel Antonia, Andrew T. Norman and Susan E. Heckler (2004), "The Consumption of Television Programming and Validation of the Connectedness Scale," *JCR*, 31 (June), 150-161.
- Russell, Cristel Antonia (2007), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I have met wonderful people because of my \_\_\_\_\_.
2. I feel a sense of kinship with other \_\_\_\_\_ owners.
3. I have an interest in a club for \_\_\_\_\_ owners.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the brand should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Brand Community Loyalty**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, ten-point Likert-type statements to measure the commitment a person has to being a member of a community of brand users and his/her intention to continue being a member.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of the scale was not explicitly stated by Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005). They appear to have adapted items from previous scales especially for their study. As used to gather the data, the items were apparently in German.

**RELIABILITY:**

The composite reliability reported for the scale by Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005) was .84.

**VALIDITY:**

Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005) used CFA with twelve latent constructs and twenty measures. The measurement model fit the data well and two tests were used to provide evidence of each scale's discriminant validity. The average variance extracted for this scale was .64.

**REFERENCES:**

Algesheimer, René, Utpal M. Dholakia, and Andreas Herrmann (2005), "The Social Influence of Brand Community: Evidence from European Car Clubs," *JM*, 69 (July), 19-34.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. It would be very difficult for me to leave this brand community.
2. I am willing to pay more money to be a member of this brand community than I would for membership in other brand communities.
3. I intend to stay on as a brand community member.

**SCALE NAME: Brand Equity**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, five-point Likert-type statements measuring the relative value of a specified brand to a consumer compared to similar competing brands due to its name (above and beyond its features and quality).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Yoo, Donthu, and Lee (2000) generated 18 items based upon their definition of the construct. They attempted to emphasize in the items that all product characteristics except the name were the same. Ultimately, 14 of the items were not retained for the final version of the scale since they did not significantly contribute to the scale's reliability.

**RELIABILITY:**

Yoo, Donthu, and Lee (2000) reported the scale to have a composite reliability of .93.

**VALIDITY:**

Factor analyses (EFA and CFA) were used to check the dimensionality of this scale along with eight others used in the study. Based on the results, the authors concluded that all items loaded on their respective factors as expected providing some sense of the scales' convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for this scale was .77.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Arnett et al. (2003) where the authors slightly modified the phrasing of three of this scale's items to construct a measure of retailer equity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Arnett, Dennis B., Debra A. Laverie and Amanda Meiers (2003), "Developing Parsimonious Retailer Equity Indexes Using Partial Least Squares Analysis: A Method and Applications," *JR*, 79 (3), 161-170.
- Yoo, Boonghee, Naveen Donthu, and Sungho Lee (2000), "An Examination of Selected Marketing Mix Elements and Brand Equity," *JAMS*, 28 (2), 195-211.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. It makes sense to buy \_\_\_\_\_ instead of any other brand, even if they are the same.
2. Even if another brand has the same features as \_\_\_\_\_, I would prefer to buy \_\_\_\_\_.
3. If there is another brand as good as \_\_\_\_\_, I prefer to buy \_\_\_\_\_.

<sup>1</sup> The brand name of a product was placed in the blanks by Yoo, Donthu, and Lee (2000).

4. If another brand is not different from \_\_\_\_\_ in any way, it seems smarter to purchase \_\_\_\_\_.

**SCALE NAME: Brand Expansion Plausibility**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, nine-point semantic differentials. It attempts to assess a consumer's attitude toward the suitability of a certain established brand coming out in a new version that prominently features a particular ingredient.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Desai and Keller (2002) apparently created the scale for use in Pretest 1 of their series of studies in order to make sure that the scenarios presented in the main study were more likely to be viewed as plausible by subjects. The authors appear to have used the scale for both co-branded ingredients (e.g., *Tide* laundry detergent with *Irish Spring* scented bath soap) as well as self-branded ingredients (e.g., *Tide* laundry detergent with its own *EverFresh* scented bath soap).

**RELIABILITY:**

Desai and Keller (2002) reported an alpha of .95 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Desai and Keller (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Desai, Kalpesh Kaushik (2005), Personal Correspondence.

Desai, Kalpesh Kaushik and Kevin Lane Keller (2002), "The Effects of Ingredient Branding Strategies on Host Brand Extendibility," *JM*, 66 (January), 73-93.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: Using the scale items below please evaluate the strategy of expansion brand name incorporating ingredient brand name as an ingredient.

1. less believable / more believable
2. does not make any sense / makes a lot of sense
3. very unreasonable / very reasonable
4. very inappropriate / very appropriate

---

<sup>1</sup> These directions have been generalized to make them amenable for use in a variety of contexts. The exact phrasing as used by Desai and Keller (2002) was "Using the below given scale items please evaluate the strategy of *Tide* laundry detergent incorporating the scent of *Irish Spring* bath soap as an ingredient."

**SCALE NAME: Brand Extension Fit (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale measures a person's opinion of the similarity or match between a certain company and a proposed product to be marketed by that company. The scale seems to be amenable for use in a variety of situations in which the fit between the product and the marketer (manufacturer, retailer, or other channel member) is of interest.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information was provided by Keller and Aaker (1992) regarding the scale's origin but it is assumed to have been developed for use in their study. Despite the fact that Taylor and Bearden (2002) drew inspiration for their items from a variety of sources, as a whole it ended up being very similar to the version by Keller and Aaker (1992).

**RELIABILITY:**

All that was said by Keller and Aaker (1992) about the reliability of the multi-item scales used in their study is that they were all in excess of .70. The version used by Taylor and Bearden (2002) had an alpha of .70 (Taylor 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Neither study specifically examined the scale's validity. However, given that Taylor and Bearden (2002) successfully used the scale as a manipulation check, some sense of the scale's predictive validity is provided.

**REFERENCES:**

Keller, Kevin Lane and David A. Aaker (1992), "The Effects of Sequential Introduction of Brand Extensions," *JMR*, 29 (February), 35-50.

Taylor, Valerie A. (2004), Personal Correspondence.

\_\_\_\_\_ and William O. Bearden (2002), "The Effects of Price on Brand Extension Evaluations: The Moderating Role of Extension Similarity," *JAMS*, 30 (2), 131-140.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Bad fit between company and product / Good fit between company and product
2. Not at all logical for company / Very logical for company
3. Not at all appropriate for company / Very appropriate for company
4. Dissimilar / Similar

---

<sup>1</sup> Keller and Aaker (1992) used items #1-#3 and a seven-point response format. Taylor and Bearden (2002) used all four items and a nine-point response format.

**SCALE NAME: Brand Extension Fit (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has seven, seven-point Likert-type statements that are used to measure the degree of fit a person perceives there to be between a certain company's current products and a potential new product.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

While it is clear that DelVecchio and Smith (2005) drew phrases and inspiration from scales by Smith and Park (1992) and Keller and Aaker (1992), enough changes were made that the result should be considered a new scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .911 was reported for the scale by DelVecchio and Smith (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond the implication that the items for this scale loaded together in a factor analysis of the study's many items, no information regarding the scale's validity was reported by DelVecchio and Smith (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- DelVecchio, Devon and Daniel C. Smith (2005), "Brand-Extension Price Premiums: The Effects of Perceived Fit and Extension Product Category Risk," *JAMS*, 33 (2), 184-196.
- Keller, Kevin Lane and David A. Aaker (1992), "The Effects of Sequential Introduction of Brand Extensions," *JMR*, 29 (February), 35-50.
- Smith, Daniel C. and C. Whan Park (1992), "The Effects of Brand Extensions on Market Share and Advertising Efficiency," *JMR*, 29 (August), 296-313.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ are similar to other \_\_\_\_\_ products in terms of the needs they satisfy.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ are similar to other \_\_\_\_\_ products in terms of the needs situations in which they are used.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ are similar to other \_\_\_\_\_ products in terms of the skills needed to manufacture them.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ are similar to other \_\_\_\_\_ products in terms of their physical features.
5. There is a good fit between \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_.
6. It is logical for \_\_\_\_\_ to make \_\_\_\_\_.
7. It is appropriate for \_\_\_\_\_ to make \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> Each statement refers to a new product and to the marketer. The longer blank in the sentences indicates where the product name/description should go and the shorter blank is where the name of the company should go.

**SCALE NAME: Brand Extension Fit (Usage-Based)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three statements attempting to assess a consumer's perception of the similarity of two products based on when/how they are used, such as a well-known core brand and a proposed extension.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Martin and Stewart (2001; Martin, Stewart, and Matta 2005) stated that their scale was based on measures used by Chakravarti, MacInnis, and Nakamoto (1989) as well as Ratneshwar and Shocker (1991). Those previous studies used one item measures of product similarity thus, this multi-item scale appears to be original to Martin and Stewart (2001).

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .82 (Martin and Stewart 2001; Martin, Stewart, and Matta 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

The typical aspects of scale validity were not provided by Martin and Stewart (2001; Martin, Stewart, and Matta 2005) although some information bearing on the scale's nomological validity was discussed.

**REFERENCES:**

- Chakravarti, Dipankar, Deborah J. MacInnis, and Kent Nakamoto (1989), "Product Category Perceptions, Elaborative Processing and Brand Name Extension Strategies," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 17, Thomas Srull, ed., Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 910-916.
- Martin, Ingrid M. and David W. Stewart (2001), "The Differential Impact of Goal Congruency on Attitudes, Intentions, and the Transfer of Brand Equity," *JMR*, 38 (November), 471-484.
- Martin, Ingrid M., David W. Stewart and Sashi Matta (2005), "Branding Strategies, Marketing Communication, and Perceived Brand Meaning: The Transfer of Purposive, Goal-Oriented Brand Meaning to Brand Extensions," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 275-294.
- Ratneshwar, Srinivsan and Allan D. Shocker (1991), "Substitution in Use and the Role of Usage Context in Product Category Structures," *JMR*, 28 (August), 281-95.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> The blanks in the first two items are filled with the names for (or descriptions of) the core brand and the extension. As used by Martin and Stewart (2001; Martin, Stewart, and Matta 2005), the first blank in item #3 refers to the brand while the second blank refers to a usage context, e.g., *how appropriate is it to use Reebok athletic wear to exercise?*

#176 *Brand Extension Fit (Usage-Based)*

1. How similar are \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ in terms of how/when they are used?  
*not at all similar / very similar*
2. How likely are you to use \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ together?"  
*Not at all likely / very likely*
3. How appropriate is it to use \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_?  
*not at all appropriate / very appropriate*

**SCALE NAME: Brand Personality (Excitement)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale attempts to assess the degree to which a consumer views a brand as having personality-like characteristics typified by the following facets: daring, spirited, imaginative, and up-to-date.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Aaker (1997) as part of a larger set of 42 items which were proposed for the measurement of five brand-personality dimensions. She viewed these measures as being distinct from those of product-related attributes which are more utilitarian in function. In contrast, brand personality is supposed to serve a symbolic or self-expressive function. Before conducting the two initial studies, two pretests were used to reduce an initial list of items (309) to something more manageable (114).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .95 was reported for the scale by Aaker (1997) based upon data from the first study. With data from a subsample of the first study's respondents ( $n = 81$ ), the scale's stability (two month test-retest reliability) was estimated to be .74. In a later set of studies, .90 (Study 1) and something between .92 and .98 (Study 2) were the levels of alpha reported (Aaker 1999). The alpha for the abbreviated version of the scale used by Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) was .90. The four item version used by Johar, Sengupta, and Aaker (2005) was reported to have an alpha of .70.

**VALIDITY:**

Aaker (1997) reported a variety of steps and analyses were taken with data from both Study 1 and 2 that provided support for the stability of the five-factor structure represented in the full set of 42 items.

**COMMENTS:**

Using the combined results of Studies 1 and 2, Aaker (1997) indicated that the mean and standard deviation for this scale were 2.79 and 1.05, respectively.

**REFERENCES:**

- Aaker, Jennifer L. (1997), "Dimensions of Brand Personality," *JMR*, 34 (August), 347-356.
- Aaker, Jennifer L. (1999), "The Malleable Self: The Role of Self-Expression in Persuasion," *JMR*, 36 (February), 45-57.
- Aaker, Jennifer, Susan Fournier, and S. Adam Brasel (2004), "When Good Brands Do Bad," *JCR*, 31 (June), 1-16.
- Johar, Gita Venkataramani, Jaideep Sengupta, and Jennifer L. Aaker (2005), "Two Roads to Updating Brand Personality Impressions: Trait Versus Evaluative Inferencing," *JMR*, 42 (November), 458-469.

## #177 Brand Personality (Excitement)

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. daring
2. trendy
3. exciting
4. spirited
5. cool
6. young
7. imaginative
8. unique
9. up-to-date
10. independent
11. contemporary

---

<sup>1</sup> Aaker (1997, 1999) used all 11 items and a five-point response format with *not at all descriptive* and *extremely descriptive* as the extreme verbal anchors. A seven-point Likert-type response format and items #2, #3, #6, and #8 composed the scale used by Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004). The four, five-point items used by Johar, Sengupta, and Aaker (2005) were #3, #5, #8, and #9.

**SCALE NAME: Brand Personality (Integrity)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, five-point unipolar items are used to measure the degree to which a person describes a brand as being responsible and trustworthy.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Venable et al. (2005) set out to apply Aaker's (1997) five-dimensional brand personality paradigm to non-profit "brands." In their fourth and fifth studies, Venable et al. (2005) used all 54 of the original items Aaker (1997) had tested. They also included some new items that had been identified in their qualitative studies. The outcome was that five dimensions were produced and, while some of Aaker's dimensions were almost exactly the same, several were different in some significant way. The integrity dimension has some conceptual similarity to Aaker's (1997) competence and sincerity dimensions but is mostly composed of items she did not use.

**RELIABILITY:**

Venable et al. (2005) reported alphas of .86 (Study 4, convenience sample of university faculty and staff), .91 (Study 5, convenience sample of college students), and .922 (Study 6, a nationally representative sample of American adults).

**VALIDITY:**

Venable et al. (2005) used the results of three different tests to provide evidence in support of their scale's discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Aaker, Jennifer L. (1997), "Dimensions of Brand Personality," *JMR*, 34 (August), 347-356.
- Venable, Beverly T., Gregory M. Rose, Victoria D. Bush and Faye W. Gilbert (2005), "The Role of Brand Personality in Charitable Giving: An Assessment and Validation," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 295-312.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Honest
2. Reputable
3. Reliable
4. Positive influence
5. Committed

---

<sup>1</sup> A five-point response format was used with *not at all descriptive* and *very descriptive* as the verbal anchors in the studies by Venable et al. (2005).

**SCALE NAME: Brand Personality (Nurturance)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This scale has three, five-point unipolar items that are used to measure the degree to which a person describes a brand as having humanitarian qualities.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Venable et al. (2005) set out to apply Aaker's (1997) five-dimensional brand personality paradigm to non-profit "brands." In their fourth and fifth studies, Venable et al. (2005) used all 54 of the original items Aaker (1997) had tested. They also included some new items that had been identified in their qualitative studies. The outcome was that five dimensions were produced and, while some of Aaker's dimensions were almost exactly the same, several were different in some significant way. The nurturance dimension has a little bit of conceptual similarity to Aaker's (1997) sincerity dimension but is totally composed of items she did not use.

**RELIABILITY:**

Venable et al. (2005) reported alphas of .82 (Study 4, convenience sample of university faculty and staff), .81 (Study 5, convenience sample of college students), and .876 (Study 6, a nationally representative sample of American adults).

**VALIDITY:**

Venable et al. (2005) used the results of three different tests to provide evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Aaker, Jennifer L. (1997), "Dimensions of Brand Personality," *JMR*, 34 (August), 347-356.
- Venable, Beverly T., Gregory M. Rose, Victoria D. Bush and Faye W. Gilbert (2005), "The Role of Brand Personality in Charitable Giving: An Assessment and Validation," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 295-312.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Compassionate
2. Loving
3. Caring

---

<sup>1</sup> A five-point response format was used with *not at all descriptive* and *very descriptive* as the verbal anchors in the studies by Venable et al. (2005).

**SCALE NAME: Brand Personality (Ruggedness)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The original scale is composed of five items and a five-point response format indicating the degree to which a consumer views a brand as having personality-like characteristics typified by toughness and masculinity. A four item version was used by Venable et al. (2005) with regard to brand personality for the nonprofit context.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Aaker (1997) as part of a larger set of 42 items which were proposed for the measurement of five brand-personality dimensions. She viewed these measures as being distinct from those of product-related attributes which are more utilitarian in function. In contrast, brand personality is supposed to serve a symbolic or self-expressive function. Before conducting the two initial studies, two pretests were used to reduce an initial list of items (309) to something more manageable (114).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .90 was reported for the scale by Aaker (1997) based upon data from the first study. With data from a subsample of the first study's respondents (n = 81), the scale's stability (two month test-retest reliability) was estimated to be .77. In a later set of studies, .96 (Study 1) and something between .92 and .98 (Study 2) were the levels of alpha reported (Aaker 1999).

For their version of the scale, Venable et al. (2005) reported alphas of .86 (Study 4, convenience sample of university faculty and staff), .91 (Study 5, convenience sample of college students), and .922 (Study 6, a nationally representative sample of American adults).

**VALIDITY:**

Aaker (1997) indicated that a variety of steps and analyses were taken with data from both Study 1 and 2 that provided support for the stability of the five-factor structure represented in the full set of 42 items. Venable et al. (2005) used the results of three different tests to provide evidence in support of their scale's discriminant validity.

**COMMENTS:**

Using the combined results of Studies 1 and 2, the mean and standard deviation for this scale was reported to be 2.49 and 1.08, respectively (Aaker 1997).

**REFERENCES:**

- Aaker, Jennifer L. (1997), "Dimensions of Brand Personality," *JMR*, 34 (August), 347-356.
- Aaker, Jennifer L. (1999), "The Malleable Self: The Role of Self-Expression in Persuasion," *JMR*, 36 (February), 45-57.

## #180 Brand Personality (*Ruggedness*)

Venable, Beverly T., Gregory M. Rose, Victoria D. Bush and Faye W. Gilbert (2005), "The Role of Brand Personality in Charitable Giving: An Assessment and Validation," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 295-312.

### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. outdoorsy
2. masculine
3. Western
4. tough
5. rugged

---

<sup>1</sup> A five-point response format was used with *not at all descriptive* and *extremely descriptive* as the verbal anchors in the studies by Aaker (1997, 1999) and Venable et al. (2005). While Aaker (1997, 1999) used all five items listed here, Venable et al. (2005) just used #1-#4.

**SCALE NAME: Brand Personality (Sincerity)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale attempts to assess the degree to which a consumer views a brand as having personality-like characteristics typified by the following facets: down-to-earth, honest, wholesome, and cheerful.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Aaker (1997) as part of a larger set of 42 items which were proposed for the measurement of five brand-personality dimensions. She viewed these measures as being distinct from those of product-related attributes which are more utilitarian in function. In contrast, brand personality is supposed to serve a symbolic or self-expressive function. Before conducting the two initial studies, two pretests were used to reduce an initial list of items (309) to something more manageable (114).

Johar, Sengupta, and Aaker (2005) cited Aaker (1997) as the source of their scale and, indeed, two of the three items are from that original set of eleven. It is not clear why they choose to add another item not in that original list.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .93 was reported for the scale by Aaker (1997) based upon data from the first study. With data from a subsample of the first study's respondents ( $n = 81$ ), the scale's stability (two month test-retest reliability) was estimated to be .75. Aaker (1999) reported an alpha level between .92 and .98 (Study 2). The alpha for the abbreviated version of the scale used by Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) was .87. The three item version used by Johar, Sengupta, and Aaker (2005) was reported to have an alpha of .67.

**VALIDITY:**

Aaker (1997) reported a variety of steps and analyses were taken with data from both Study 1 and 2 that provided support for the stability of the five-factor structure represented in the full set of 42 items.

**COMMENTS:**

Using the combined results of Studies 1 and 2, Aaker (1997) indicated that the mean and standard deviation for this scale were 2.72 and .99, respectively.

**REFERENCES:**

- Aaker, Jennifer L. (1997), "Dimensions of Brand Personality," *JMR*, 34 (August), 347-356.
- Aaker, Jennifer L. (1999), "The Malleable Self: The Role of Self-Expression in Persuasion," *JMR*, 36 (February), 45-57.
- Aaker, Jennifer, Susan Fournier, and S. Adam Brasel (2004), "When Good Brands Do Bad," *JCR*, 31 (June), 1-16.

## #181 Brand Personality (Sincerity)

Johar, Gita Venkataramani, Jaideep Sengupta, and Jennifer L. Aaker (2005), "Two Roads to Updating Brand Personality Impressions: Trait Versus Evaluative Inferencing," *JMR*, 42 (November), 458-469.

### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. down-to-earth
2. family-oriented
3. small-town
4. honest
5. sincere
6. real
7. wholesome
8. original
9. cheerful
10. sentimental
11. friendly
12. genuine

---

<sup>1</sup> Aaker (1997, 1999) used the first 11 items and a five-point response format with *not at all descriptive* and *extremely descriptive* as the extreme verbal anchors. A seven-point Likert-type response format and items #2, #5, #7, and #10 composed the scale used by Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004). The three, five-point items used by Johar, Sengupta, and Aaker (2005) were #5, #11, and #12.

**SCALE NAME: Brand Personality (Sophistication)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The original version of the scale is composed of six items and a five-point response format indicating the degree to which a consumer views a brand as having personality-like characteristics typified by good looks and charm. A three item version was used by Venable et al. (2005) with regard to brand personality for the nonprofit context.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Aaker (1997) as part of a larger set of 42 items which were proposed for the measurement of five brand-personality dimensions. She viewed these measures as being distinct from those of product-related attributes which are more utilitarian in function. In contrast, brand personality is supposed to serve a symbolic or self-expressive function. Before conducting the two initial studies, two pretests were used to reduce an initial list of items (309) to something more manageable (114).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .91 was reported for the scale by Aaker (1997) based upon data from the first study. With data from a subsample of the first study's respondents (n = 81), the scale's stability (two month test-retest reliability) was estimated to be .75. Aaker (1999) reported an alpha level between .92 and .98 (Study 2).

For their version of the scale, Venable et al. (2005) reported alphas of .84 (Study 4, convenience sample of university faculty and staff), .84 (Study 5, convenience sample of college students), and .749 (Study 6, a nationally representative sample of American adults).

**VALIDITY:**

Aaker (1997) indicated that a variety of steps and analyses were taken with data from both Study 1 and 2 that provided support for the stability of the five-factor structure represented in the full set of 42 items. Venable et al. (2005) used the results of three different tests to provide evidence in support of their scale's discriminant validity.

**COMMENTS:**

Using the combined results of Studies 1 and 2, Aaker (1997) reported the mean and standard deviation for this scale to be 2.66 and 1.02, respectively.

**REFERENCES:**

- Aaker, Jennifer L. (1997), "Dimensions of Brand Personality," *JMR*, 34 (August), 347-356.
- Aaker, Jennifer L. (1999), "The Malleable Self: The Role of Self-Expression in Persuasion," *JMR*, 36 (February), 45-57.

## #182 *Brand Personality (Sophistication)*

Venable, Beverly T., Gregory M. Rose, Victoria D. Bush and Faye W. Gilbert (2005),  
“The Role of Brand Personality in Charitable Giving: An Assessment and  
Validation,” *JAMS*, 33 (3), 295-312.

### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. upper class
2. glamorous
3. good looking
4. charming
5. feminine
6. smooth

---

<sup>1</sup> A five-point response format was used with *not at all descriptive* and *extremely descriptive* as the verbal anchors in the studies by Aaker (1997, 1999) and Venable et al. (2005). While Aaker (1997, 1999) used all six items listed here, Venable et al. (2005) just used #1-#3.

**SCALE NAME: Brand Prominence**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the degree to which a person believes that for a certain product, different brands are easy to distinguish, primarily due to the conspicuousness of their brand names. DelVecchio and Smith (2005) referred to the scale as *social risk – brand prominence*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to DelVecchio and Smith (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .752 was reported for the scale by DelVecchio and Smith (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond the implication that the items for this scale loaded together in a factor analysis of the study's many items, no information regarding the scale's validity was reported by DelVecchio and Smith (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

DelVecchio, Devon and Daniel C. Smith (2005), "Brand-Extension Price Premiums: The Effects of Perceived Fit and Extension Product Category Risk," *JAMS*, 33 (2), 184-196.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. When you look at a \_\_\_\_\_, it is easy to identify the brand name of the manufacturer.
2. It is easy to tell one brand of \_\_\_\_\_ from another by looking at it.
3. Brand names are likely to be prominently displayed on \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The blank in each sentence indicates where the focal product name/description should go.

**SCALE NAME: Brand Similarity**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five, nine-point statements measuring the degree of similarity a consumer believes there to be between two brands based on image and features.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Desai and Keller (2002) apparently created the scale for use in Pretest 2 of their series of studies in order to make sure that the scenarios presented in the main study were more likely to be viewed as plausible by subjects. Specifically, the authors used the scale to ensure that a fictitious brand (e.g., *EverFresh* bath soap) would be viewed as similar to a well-known brand (e.g., *Irish Spring* bath soap).

**RELIABILITY:**

Desai and Keller (2002) reported an alpha of .92 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Desai and Keller (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Desai, Kalpesh Kaushik and Kevin Lane Keller (2002), "The Effects of Ingredient Branding Strategies on Host Brand Extendibility," *JM*, 66 (January), 73-93.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: A leading marketing company in the country is considering using the brand name \_\_\_\_\_ for its new \_\_\_\_\_. Even though you may not be aware of the specific properties of the new brand, you might be able to imagine what type of product it is from the name. Using the scale items below please indicate your opinion about how similar the new brand is to \_\_\_\_\_.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ are likely to be . . .
2. the brand images of \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ are likely to be . . .
3. the attributes characterizing these two brands are likely to be . . .
4. the consumers of \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ are likely to be . . .
5. if you were to describe these two brands to someone, your descriptions of these two brands are likely to be . . .

---

<sup>1</sup> These directions are based on the description provided by Desai and Keller (2002, p. 80) but have been generalized to make them amenable for use in a greater variety of contexts. The brand name being tested should be placed in the first blank of the directions while the generic product name goes in the second blank. The third blank in the directions is for the well-known brand to which the new brand is being compared. The brand names are also placed in the scale items. The scale anchors are *very dissimilar* / *very similar*.

**SCALE NAME: Brand Switcher**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three statements utilizing a five-point Likert-type response format that measure the degree to which a consumer tries different brands in a product category rather than always using the same brand.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The first two items of the three shown below are similar to items used by Moore-Shay and Lutz (1989). The third item is similar to one originally used by Raju (1980).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .81 was reported for the scale by Coulter, Price, and Feick (2003). Although the sample was 340 Hungarian women, their English was considered good enough that the survey was in English and was not translated.

**VALIDITY:**

No information of the scale's validity was reported by Coulter, Price, and Feick (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Coulter, Robin A., Linda L. Price and Lawrence Feick (2003), "Rethinking the Origins of Involvement and Brand Commitment: Insights from Postsocialist Central Europe," *JCR*, 30 (September), 151-169.

Moore-Shay, Elizabeth and Richard J. Lutz (1988), "Intergenerational Influences in the Formation of Consumer Attitudes and Beliefs about the Marketplace: Mothers and Daughters," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 15, Michael J. Houston, ed., Provo, Utah: Association for Consumer Research, 461-467.

Raju, P. S. (1980), "Optimum Stimulation Level: Its Relationship to Personality, Demographics, and Exploratory Behavior," *JCR*, 7 (December), 272-282.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I switch among brands of \_\_\_\_\_ just to try something new once in a while.
2. When I am shopping for \_\_\_\_\_, I am likely to buy new brands just for the fun of it.
3. I get bored with buying the same brands of \_\_\_\_\_, and so I often try different brands.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal product category should be placed in the blanks. The category examined by Coulter, Price, and Feick (2003) was cosmetics.

**SCALE NAME: Calmness**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six, nine point uni-polar items are used to measure how much a person reports feeling a low level of arousal. The scale was referred to as *feelings-of-relaxation* and *felt relaxation* by Gorn et al. (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Gorn et al. (2004) did not specify the source of the scale used in their four experiments but it seems to have been developed by them for these studies.

**RELIABILITY:**

Cronbach alphas for the scale ranged from .79 to .91 in the four experiments in which it was used by Gorn et al. (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No test on the scale's validity was performed by Gorn et al. (2004)

**REFERENCES:**

Gorn, Gerald J., Amitava Chattopadhyay, Jaideep Sengupta, and Sashank Tripathi (2004), "Waiting for the Web: How Screen Color Affects Time Perception," *JMR*, 41 (2), 215-225.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. relaxed
2. calm
3. peaceful
4. uneasy (r)
5. tense (r)
6. anxious (r)

**SCALE NAME: Change Seeking****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of seven statements measuring the degree to which a person expresses a desire for variation or stimulation in his/her life. The scale can be viewed as a measure of *optimum stimulation level* (e.g., Campbell and Goodstein 2001) or *inherent novelty seeking* (Dabholkar and Bagozzi 2002).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Campbell and Goodstein (2001) came from Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1995). The latter developed it to be a short form of the CSI (Change Seeker Index), the 95 item instrument created by Garlington and Shimota (1964). (See V. II, #52.) The studies conducted by Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1995) first reduced the scale from 95 items to seven and then cross-validated those seven in three countries and with two types of subjects.

Interestingly, six of the items in this short form are also a subset of the well-known 40 item arousal seeking scale by Mehrabian and Russell (1974). (See V. II, #14.) That is the source cited for the version of the scale used by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

Baumgartner and Steenkamp (2001) reported an overall alpha of .75 in their pan-European survey with alphas for individual countries ranging from .60 to .81. As used in study 2 by Campbell and Goodstein (2001); the alpha of the scale was .82. An alpha of .72 was reported for the version of the scale used by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The purpose of the study by Baumgartner and Steenkamp (2001) was to examine response styles as a source of contamination in questionnaire measures and the effect that might have on validity of conclusions drawn from such data. Although most of the results were reported at an overall level one finding pertinent to this scale was that the mean level of contamination in scale scores was estimated to be 2% (ranging from 1%-4% for eleven European countries), among the lowest average amounts of contamination found for the 14 scales that were examined.

Evidence was provided by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002) in support of the convergent and discriminant validity for the version of the scale they used. No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Campbell and Goodstein (2001).

**REFERENCES:**

Baumgartner, Hans and Jan-Benedict E.M. Steenkamp (2001), "Response Styles in Marketing Research: A Cross-National Investigation," *JMR*, 38 (May), 143-156.

## #187 Change Seeking

- Campbell, Margaret C. and Ronald C. Goodstein (2001), "The Moderating Effect of Perceived Risk on Consumers' Evaluations of Product Incongruity: Preference for the Norm," *JCR*, 28 (December), 439-449.
- Dabholkar, Pratibha and Richard P. Bagozzi (2002), "An Attitudinal Model of Technology-Based Self-Service: Moderating Effects of Consumer Traits and Situational Factors," *JAMS*, 30 (3), 184-201.
- Garlington, Warren K. and Helen E. Shimota (1964), "The Change Seeker Index: A Measure of the Need for Variable Stimulus Input," *Psychological Reports*, 14, 919-924.
- Mehrabian, Albert and James A. Russell (1974), *An Approach to Environmental Psychology*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Steenkamp, Jan-Benedict E.M. and Hans Baumgartner (1995), "Development and Cross-Cultural Validation of a Short form of CSI as a Measure of Optimum Stimulation Level," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 12, 97-104.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. I like to continue doing the same old things rather than trying new and different things.(r)
2. I like to experience novelty and change in my daily routine.
3. I like a job that offers change, variety, and travel, even if it involves some danger.
4. I am continually seeking new ideas and experiences.
5. I like continually changing activities.
6. When things get boring, I like to find some new and unfamiliar experience.
7. I prefer a routine way of life to an unpredictable one full of change.(r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format used by Campbell and Goodstein (2001) was not described. Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1995) used a five-point scale ranging from completely false to completely true. The final version of the scale used by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002) was composed of items the same or very similar to #2, #4-#6 and a seven-point Likert-type response format.

**SCALE NAME: Charity Donation Requests (Corporate)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's attitude regarding the propriety of companies asking their customers to give money to charities. The scale was called *Corporate Boundary* by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .65 (Study 3) and .70 (Study 4) were reported for the scale by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Although some aspects of the scale's validity were probably assessed by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004), none were reported in the article.

**REFERENCES:**

Lichtenstein, Donald R., Minette E. Drumwright, and Bridgette M. Braig (2004), "The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Customer Donations to Corporate-Supported Nonprofits," *JM*, 68 (October), 16-32.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Corporations are asking too much of consumers if they ask them to donate to charities.
2. It is not a corporation's role to give to charities: They should pass the savings on to consumers instead and let consumers donate to whatever charities they want.
3. If I purchase products from corporations that support charities, I'm doing my part: I shouldn't be asked to donate directly to the charities in addition.

**SCALE NAME: Charity Support Importance**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This scale has four, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the importance of giving time and money to nonprofit organizations that are attempting to remedy a certain (specified) problem. The scale was called *Nonprofit Domain Importance* by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .92 (labor practice version) and .86 (reading skills version) were reported for the scale by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Although some aspects of the scale's validity were probably assessed by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004), none were reported in the article.

**REFERENCES:**

Lichtenstein, Donald R., Minette E. Drumwright, and Bridgette M. Braig (2004), "The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Customer Donations to Corporate-Supported Nonprofits," *JM*, 68 (October), 16-32.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Supporting nonprofits that \_\_\_\_\_ is important to me.
2. I could see myself donating some of my time to supporting nonprofits that help \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Nonprofits that have the goal of \_\_\_\_\_ make this world a better place to live.
4. I can identify with nonprofits that have the goal of \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004) had two versions of the scale. One completed the blanks with phrases like *fight manufacturing sweatshops* whereas the other used phrases similar to *help increase the reading skills of our youths*.

**SCALE NAME: Choice Difficulty**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, nine-point semantic differentials intended to measure the degree to which a person describes a choice between brands as being challenging and requiring great mental effort.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Laroche et al. (2005) was adapted from a scale by Breivik et al. (1999).

**RELIABILITY:**

In Experiment 1, Laroche et al. (2005) reported the scale's alpha to be .782. In Experiment 2, the alphas were .945 (off-line subsample) and .952 (online subsample).

**VALIDITY:**

No information was provided by Laroche et al. (2005) regarding the scale's validity. However, it did appear that in both experiments the measurement model fit the data well.

**REFERENCES:**

- Breivik, Einar, Sigurd V. Troye, Ulf H. Olsson (1999), "Dimensions of Intangibility and Their Impact on Product Evaluation," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 26, 264.
- Laroche, Michel, Zhiyong Yang, Gordon H.G. McDougall, and Jasmin Bergeron (2005), "Internet Versus Bricks-and-Mortar Retailers: An Investigation into Intangibility and Its Consequences," *JR*, 81 (4), 251-267.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Given that I have to buy \_\_\_\_\_ in a store, choosing among the available brands will be:<sup>1</sup>

1. very difficult / very easy
2. very problematic / not problematic at all
3. very complex / very simple
4. very complicated / not complicated at all

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the generic product should be placed in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Closure Concern**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five, six-point Likert-type statements that are intended to assess the degree to which a person is concerned about answers he/she provided as part of a recently completed task.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was apparently developed by Kardes et al. (2004) to be a manipulation check for Experiment 3 in their series of studies.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .80 was reported for the scale by Kardes et al. (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information about the scale's validity was provided by the authors except indirectly, by noting that it showed the experimental manipulation to be successful (Kardes et al. 2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Kardes, Frank R., Maria L. Cronley, James J. Kellaris, and Steven S. Posavic (2004), "The Role of Selective Information Processing in Price-Quality Inference," *JCR*, 31 (September), 368-374.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I was worried about making mistakes on the \_\_\_\_\_.
2. I continued to think about the \_\_\_\_\_, even after I provided my answers.
3. I struggled with the \_\_\_\_\_.
4. The answers to the \_\_\_\_\_ came to me quickly. (r)
5. I disliked the \_\_\_\_\_ because it was confusing.

---

<sup>1</sup> Some sort of name for the task should be placed in the blanks. Kardes et al. (2004) used the phrase *prediction task*.

**SCALE NAME: Commitment to the Brand**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The purpose of the scale is to assess the degree to which a consumer expresses devotion to a specified brand versus a willingness to accept alternative brands even if they are cheaper or more convenient. The scale is composed of three, nine-point Likert-type statements. The scale was called *commitment to the target brand* by Ahluwalia (2000; Ahluwalia, Burnkrant, and Unnava 2000; Ahluwalia, Unnava, and Burnkrant 2001).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Ahluwalia (2000; Ahluwalia, Burnkrant, and Unnava 2000; Ahluwalia, Unnava, and Burnkrant 2001) is original to Beatty, Kahle, and Homer (1988). They called it *brand commitment* rather than *brand loyalty* since the latter suggests a behavioral dimension which the former does not. Their work provided evidence that commitment is distinct from purchase involvement and ego involvement but is influenced by them. The construct reliability was .75 and variance extracted as .51.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale used by Ahluwalia (2000) was .62 (Ahluwalia 2002). (The “lab study” in Ahluwalia [2000] seems to be the same as what is referred to as Experiment One in Ahluwalia, Burnkrant, and Unnava [2000] and Experiment Two in Ahluwalia, Unnava, and Burnkrant [2001].)

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale’s validity was reported by Ahluwalia (2000; Ahluwalia, Burnkrant, and Unnava 2000; Ahluwalia, Unnava, and Burnkrant 2001).

**COMMENTS:**

See also Agrawal and Maheswaran (2005b) as they appear to have used this scale or something based on it.

**REFERENCES:**

- Agrawal, Nidhi and Durairaj Maheswaran (2005), “The Effects of Self-Construal and Commitment on Persuasion,” *JCR*, 31 (March), 841-849.
- Ahluwalia, Rohini (2000), “Examination of Psychological Processes Underlying Resistance to Persuasion,” *JCR*, 27 (2), 217-232.
- Ahluwalia, Rohini (2002), Personal Correspondence.
- Ahluwalia, Rohini, Robert E. Burnkrant, and H. Rao Unnava (2000), “Consumer Response to Negative Publicity: The Moderating Role of Commitment,” *JMR*, 37 (May), 203-214.
- Ahluwalia, Rohini, H. Rao Unnava, and Robert E. Burnkrant (2001), “The Moderating Role of Commitment on the Spillover Effect of Marketing Communications,” *JMR*, 38 (Nov.), 458-470.

## #192 *Commitment to the Brand*

Beatty, Sharon E., Lynn R. Kahle, and Pamela Homer (1988), "The Involvement-Commitment Model: Theory and Implications," *Journal of Business Research*, 16 (2), 149-167.

### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. If \_\_\_\_\_ was not available at the store, it would make little difference to me if I had to choose another brand. (r)
2. I consider myself to be highly loyal to \_\_\_\_\_.
3. When another brand is on sale, I will generally purchase it rather than \_\_\_\_\_. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> Responses to these items were measured by Ahluwalia (2000; Ahluwalia, Burnkrant, and Unnava 2000; Ahluwalia, Unnava, and Burnkrant 2001) on a nine-point Likert-type scale with *disagree/agree* anchors.

**SCALE NAME: Commitment to the Brand**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three statements utilizing a five-point Likert-type response format that measure the degree to which a consumer expresses commitment to a brand or set of brands in a product category.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

While inspiration for the scale items may have come from previous work by others, the scale as a whole seems to be original to Coulter, Price, and Feick (2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .92 was reported for the scale by Coulter, Price, and Feick (2003). Although the sample was 340 Hungarian women, their English was considered good enough that the survey was in English and was not translated.

**VALIDITY:**

No information of the scale's validity was reported by Coulter, Price, and Feick (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Coulter, Robin A., Linda L. Price and Lawrence Feick (2003), "Rethinking the Origins of Involvement and Brand Commitment: Insights from Postsocialist Central Europe," *JCR*, 30 (September), 151-169.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am really attached to the brand(s) of \_\_\_\_\_ I use.
2. I stick with my usual brand(s) of \_\_\_\_\_ because I know it is (they are) best for me.
3. I am committed to my brand(s) of \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The product category examined by Coulter, Price, and Feick (2003) was cosmetics.

**SCALE NAME: Commitment to the Company (Affective)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the degree to which a customer expresses a desire-based attachment to a particular service provider.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) and Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) is a subset of items from a scale by Meyer and Allen (1997). The latter viewed commitment as having three components (normative, affective, and continuance) and constructed scales to measure each one. Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) apparently began with four of the original six items from Meyer and Allen (1997) and then dropped one based on test results. Similarly, Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) started with five items but their analysis led to dropping two items before finalizing the scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .80 and .8180 were reported by Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) and Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) performed several tests on this scale and the other two measuring commitment but the typical evidence for supporting claims of convergent and discriminant validity was not provided. The authors did say, however, that they compared three models of commitment and the three-component model fit the data best. As noted above, they also stated that testing led to dropping an item from the measure of affective commitment.

Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) used both exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis to refine the many scales in their study. Two of the items used to measure commitment loaded poorly but once they were dropped, the model fit the data.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bansal, Harvir S., P. Gregory Irving, and Shirley F. Taylor (2004), "A Three-Component Model of Customer Commitment to Service Providers," *JAMS*, 32 (3), 234-250.
- Bansal, Harvir S., Shirley F. Taylor, and Yannik St. James (2005), "'Migrating' to New Service Providers: Toward a Unifying Framework of Consumers' Switching Behaviors," *JAMS*, 33 (1), 96-115.
- Meyer, John P. and Natalie J. Allen (1997), *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to my \_\_\_\_\_. (r)
2. I do not feel like “part of the family” with my \_\_\_\_\_. (r)
3. I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my \_\_\_\_\_. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the service provider should be placed in the blanks.

## #195 Commitment to the Company (Affective)

### **SCALE NAME: Commitment to the Company (Affective)**

### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, five-point Likert-type statements that attempt to assess a person's motivation to continue being a customer of a particular business due to feelings of attachment, identification, and loyalty.

### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

In their early scale development, Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002) drew items from several previous studies. The final version of the scale is unique but bears the most resemblance to a commitment scale by Garbarino and Johnson (1999).

### **RELIABILITY:**

The scale had a composite reliability of .78 in the main study conducted by Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002) as well as Verhoef (2003).

### **VALIDITY:**

Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002) as well as Verhoef (2003) followed a multi-step process in the development and testing of the scales they used in their study. They provide a variety of evidence in support of the scale's content, convergent, and discriminant validity.

### **REFERENCES:**

- Garbarino, Ellen and Mark S. Johnson (1999), "The Different Roles of Satisfaction, Trust, and Commitment in Customer Relationships," *JM*, 63 (April), 70-87.
- Verhoef, Peter C. (2003), "Understanding the Effect of Customer Relationship Management Efforts on Customer Retention and Customer Retention and Customer Share Development," *JM*, 67 (October), 30-45.
- Verhoef, Peter C., Philip Hans Franses, and Janny C. Hoekstra (2002), "The Effects of Relational Constructs on Customer Referrals and Number of Services Purchased From a Multiservice Provider: Does Age of Relationship Matter?" *JAMS*, 30 (3), 202-216.

### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am a loyal customer of \_\_\_\_\_.
2. Because I feel a strong attachment to \_\_\_\_\_, I remain a customer of \_\_\_\_\_.

<sup>1</sup> The name of the business/organization should be placed in the blanks. These statements are the translations provided in the article by Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002); the actual items used in their study were phrased in Dutch.

#195 *Commitment to the Company (Affective)*

3. Because I feel a strong sense of belonging with \_\_\_\_\_, I want to remain a customer of \_\_\_\_\_.

**SCALE NAME: Commitment to the Company (Affective)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, ten-point items are used to measure the level of emotional attachment a customer has with a certain company.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Gustafsson, Johnson, and Roos (2005) drew upon past measures to develop their scale, principally Johnson et al. (2001).

**RELIABILITY:**

No direct measure of reliability was provided for the scale but its AVE (average variance extracted) was .692, suggesting acceptable reliability.

**VALIDITY:**

Gustafsson, Johnson, and Roos (2005) provided information in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Gustafsson, Anders, Michael D. Johnson, and Inger Roos (2005), "The Effects of Customer Satisfaction, Relationship Commitment Dimensions, and Triggers on Customer Retention," *JM*, 69 (October), 210-218.
- Johnson, Michael D., Anders Gustafsson, Tor Wallin Andreassenc, Line Lervikc, and Jaesung Cha (2001), "The Evolution and Future of National Customer Satisfaction Index Models," *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 22 (April), 217-245.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I take pleasure in being a customer of the company.
2. The company is the operator that takes the best care of their customers.
3. There is a presence of reciprocity in my relationship with the company.
4. I have feelings of trust toward the company.

**SCALE NAME: Commitment to the Company (Calculative)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's desire to continue being a customer of a particular business due to the financial costs that are assumed to be incurred if a switch is made.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was development by Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002) who adapted items from Geyskens et al. (1996) and Kumar, Hibbard, and Stern (1994).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had a composite reliability of .75 in the main study conducted by Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002) followed a multi-step process in the development and testing of the scales they used in their study. They provide a variety of evidence in support of the scale's content, convergent, and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Geyskens, Inge, Jan-Benedict E. M. Steenkamp, Lisa K. Sheer, and Nirmayala Kumar (1996), "The Effects of Trust and Independence on Relationship Commitment: A Trans-Atlantic Study," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 13 (4), 303-317.
- Kumar, Nirmayala, Jonathan D. Hibbard, and Louis W. Stern (1994), "The Nature and Consequences of Marketing Channel Intermediary Commitment," Report #94-115, Marketing Science Institute Working Paper.
- Verhoef, Peter C., Philip Hans Franses, and Janny C. Hoekstra (2002), "The Effects of Relational Constructs on Customer Referrals and Number of Services Purchased From a Multiservice Provider: Does Age of Relationship Matter?" *JAMS*, 30 (3), 202-216.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Because it is difficult to stop my business at \_\_\_\_\_, I remain a customer of \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the business/organization should be placed in the blanks. These statements are the translations provided in the article by Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002); the actual items used in their study were phrased in Dutch.

*#197 Commitment to the Company (Calculative)*

2. I remain a customer of \_\_\_\_\_ because it is difficult to take my business to another company.
3. I remain a customer of \_\_\_\_\_ because it costs much time and energy to switch my business to another company.

**SCALE NAME: Commitment to the Company (Calculative)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three statements with a ten-point response format that measures a customer's attitude regarding the financial consequences of continuing/ending the relationship with a certain company.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Gustafsson, Johnson, and Roos (2005) drew upon past measures to develop their scale, principally Johnson et al. (2001).

**RELIABILITY:**

No direct measure of reliability was provided for the scale but its AVE (average variance extracted) was .630, suggesting acceptable reliability.

**VALIDITY:**

Gustafsson, Johnson, and Roos (2005) provided information in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Gustafsson, Anders, Michael D. Johnson, and Inger Roos (2005), "The Effects of Customer Satisfaction, Relationship Commitment Dimensions, and Triggers on Customer Retention," *JM*, 69 (October), 210-218.
- Johnson, Michael D., Anders Gustafsson, Tor Wallin Andreassenc, Line Lervikc, and Jaesung Cha (2001), "The Evolution and Future of National Customer Satisfaction Index Models," *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 22 (April), 217-245.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. It pays off economically to be a customer of the company.
2. I would suffer economically if the relationship were broken.
3. The company has location advantages versus other companies.

## #199 Commitment to the Company (Continuance)

### **SCALE NAME: Commitment to the Company (Continuance)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point Likert-type statements that are intended to measure the extent that a customer expresses a constraint-based attachment to a particular service provider such that the customer feels “locked-in” to the relationship.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) is a subset of items from a scale by Meyer and Allen (1997). The latter viewed commitment as having three components (normative, affective, and continuance) and constructed scales to measure each one. Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) apparently began with five of the original seven items from Meyer and Allen (1997) and then dropped two based on test results.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

The scale’s alpha coefficient was reported by Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) to be .77.

#### **VALIDITY:**

Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) performed several tests on this scale and the other two measuring commitment but the typical evidence for supporting claims of convergent and discriminant validity was not provided. The authors did say, however, that they compared three models of commitment and the three-component model fit the data best. As noted above, they also stated that testing led to dropping two items from the measure of continuance commitment.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Bansal, Harvir S., P. Gregory Irving, and Shirley F. Taylor (2004), “A Three-Component Model of Customer Commitment to Service Providers,” *JAMS*, 32 (3), 234-250.  
Meyer, John P. and Natalie J. Allen (1997), *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. It would be very hard for me to leave my \_\_\_\_\_ right now, even if I wanted to.
2. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my \_\_\_\_\_ now.
3. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving my \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the service provider should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Commitment to the Company (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of Likert-type items measuring a customer's identification with, loyalty to, and concern for a certain business.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Garbarino and Johnson (1999) indicated that they drew upon a variety of sources to develop the items. The focal business in their study was a theater. Hsieh, Chiu, and Chiang (2005) used three of those items, added an item from Morgan and Hunt (1994), and slightly adapted them all for use with a online store.

**RELIABILITY:**

Garbarino and Johnson (1999) reported the following alphas for the scales as used with three different subsets of theatergoers: .87 (individual ticket buyers), .87 (occasional subscribers), and .82 (consistent subscribers). The alpha for the version of the scale used by Hsieh, Chiu, and Chiang (2005) was .92.

**VALIDITY:**

Based on the indicators they examined, Garbarino and Johnson (1999) made a general claim of good fit for their measurement model as well as evidence of good convergent validity. This scale performed adequately on a couple of tests of discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Garbarino, Ellen and Mark S. Johnson (1999), "The Different Roles of Satisfaction, Trust, and Commitment in Customer Relationships," *JM*, 63 (April), 70-87.
- Hsieh, Yi-Ching, Hung-Chang Chiu, and Mei-Yi Chiang (2005), "Maintaining and Committed Online Customer: A Study Across Search-Experience-Credence Products," *JR*, 81 (1), 75-82.
- Morgan, Robert M. and Shelby D. Hunt (1994), "The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing," *JM*, 58 (July), 20-38.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am proud to belong to \_\_\_\_\_.
2. I feel a sense of belonging to \_\_\_\_\_.
3. I care about the long-term success of \_\_\_\_\_.
4. I am a loyal patron of \_\_\_\_\_.
5. I plan to maintain a long-term relationship with \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> A one or two word description of the business should be placed in the blank, e.g., this theater, the e-tailer, the store, the company. Garbarino and Johnson (1999) used the first four items and a five-point response scale. Hsieh, Chiu, and Chiang (2005) used items #1, #3, #4, and #5 with a seven-point scale. For item #1, the phrase was changed to "proud to be a member of."

## #201 Commitment to the Company (General)

### **SCALE NAME: Commitment to the Company (General)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five, seven-point statements measuring the degree of commitment a consumer expresses having with a company and the likelihood of doing business with it again.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not expressly stated, the scale appears to have been developed by Lemon, White, and Winer (2002) for use in a pretest before their Study 2.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .91 was reported for the scale.

#### **VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported.

#### **COMMENTS:**

The scale items are stated hypothetically because respondents read scenarios and were asked to describe their likely reactions. Since the items were developed for use with hypothetical grocery delivery services, that affected the phrasing. If used with very different businesses and/or methodology, some modification in the items may be necessary. Finally, even though the scale's internal consistency appears to be good, it is based on a very small sample. If/when the scale is used in another context with a larger sample more rigorous examination of its psychometric quality is called for.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Lemon, Katherine N. (2005), Personal Correspondence.

Lemon, Katherine N., Tiffany Barnett White, and Russell S. Winer (2002), "Dynamic Customer Relationship Management: Incorporating Future Considerations into the Service Retention Decision," *JM*, 66 (January), 1-14.

White, Tiffany Barnett (2005), Personal Correspondence.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. To what extent is the relationship you read about likely to be long term?  
*not at all / to a great extent*
2. How likely is it that the next time you need to \_\_\_\_\_, you would use  
\_\_\_\_\_?  
*not at all likely / very likely<sup>2</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> The scale anchors were provided by Lemon (2005) and White (2005).

<sup>2</sup> The first blank should describe the product generically while the second blank names a particular brand or company.

#201 *Commitment to the Company (General)*

3. How committed would you be to this company?  
*not at all committed / very committed*
4. How likely are you to frequent this company on a regular basis?  
*not at all likely / very likely*
5. How much of an obligation would you feel to do business with this company (relative to its competitors)?  
*not at all obligated / very obligated*

## #202 Commitment to the Company (General)

### **SCALE NAME: Commitment to the Company (General)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The six item, seven-point Likert-type scale assesses the degree to which a person expresses a willingness to continue a relationship with a company and make some effort to do it if need be.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale appears to be original to Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) although they received inspiration from previous work by others.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) reported alphas ranging from .91 to .93 over three time periods.

#### **VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004).

#### **COMMENTS:**

The company with which the scale was used in the experiment by Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) was a fictitious website. If the scale is used with other entities then adjustment in some of the items might be necessary, such as #3 (below).

#### **REFERENCES:**

Aaker, Jennifer, Susan Fournier, and S. Adam Brasel (2004), "When Good Brands Do Bad," *JCR*, 31 (June), 1-16.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am very loyal to \_\_\_\_\_.
2. I am willing to make small sacrifices in order to keep using \_\_\_\_\_.
3. I would be willing to postpone my purchases if the \_\_\_\_\_ site was temporarily unavailable.
4. I would stick with \_\_\_\_\_ even if it let me down once or twice.
5. I am so happy with \_\_\_\_\_ that I no longer feel the need to watch out for other alternatives.
6. I am likely to be using \_\_\_\_\_ one year from now.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal company should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Commitment to the Company (Normative)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a customer believes he/she should remain with a particular service provider because it is the “right” thing to do.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) is an adaptation of one developed by Meyer and Allen (1997). The latter viewed commitment as having three components (normative, affective, and continuance) and constructed scales to measure each one. One of the differences in the measure of normative commitment by Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) is that it is a rephrasing of four of the six items in the version by Meyer and Allen (1997).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale’s alpha coefficient was reported by Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) to be .85.

**VALIDITY:**

Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) performed several tests on this scale and the other two measuring commitment but the typical evidence for supporting claims of convergent and discriminant validity was not provided. The authors did, however, compare three models of commitment and the three-component model fit the data best.

**REFERENCES:**

Bansal, Harvir S., P. Gregory Irving, and Shirley F. Taylor (2004), “A Three-Component Model of Customer Commitment to Service Providers,” *JAMS*, 32 (3), 234-250.  
Meyer, John P. and Natalie J. Allen (1997), *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my \_\_\_\_\_.
2. My \_\_\_\_\_ deserves my loyalty.
3. I would feel guilty if I left my \_\_\_\_\_ now.
4. I would not leave my \_\_\_\_\_ right now because I have a sense of obligation to them.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the service provider should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Commitment to the Dealership**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure a customer's expressed level of dedication to continuing a relationship with a particular dealer. A car dealer was examined by Brown et al. (2005), in fact, the statements appear to be general enough to use with a wide variety of companies, retailers, and organizations.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale seems to have been developed by Brown et al. (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

Brown et al. (2005) reported an alpha of .94 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Using confirmatory factor analysis, Brown et al. (2005) provided evidence in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Brown, Tom J., Thomas E. Barry, Peter A. Dacin, and Richard F. Gunst (2005), "Spreading the Word: Investigating Antecedents of Consumers' Positive Word-of-Mouth Intentions and Behaviors in a Retailing Context," *JAMS*, 33 (2), 123-138.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

1. I am committed to my relationship with \_\_\_\_\_.
2. I really care about my relationship with \_\_\_\_\_.
3. The relationship that I have with \_\_\_\_\_ is something I am very committed to.
4. The relationship that I have with \_\_\_\_\_ deserves my maximum effort to maintain.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the brand of car should be placed in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Commitment to the Service Provider**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three item scale measures a person's desire to continue receiving service from the current provider with which a relationship has already been developed. Patterson and Smith (2003) referred to the scale as both *propensity to stay with service providers* and *behavioral intention to continue with present service provider*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Patterson and Smith (2003) drew inspiration from some past scales, the scale they used is original to them. A two-country (two language), multi-stage process was used to develop and refine their measures.

**RELIABILITY:**

Patterson and Smith (2003) reported alphas for three different types of service providers that ranged from .87 to .91 in Australia and from .83 to .87 in Thailand.

**VALIDITY:**

With the results of confirmatory factor analysis and other tests, Patterson and Smith (2003) provided support for the unidimensionality as well as the convergent and discriminant validities of their scales. Average variances extracted ranged from .52 to .74 in Australia and from .56 to .64 in Thailand.

**REFERENCES:**

Patterson, Paul G. and Tasman Smith (2003), "A Cross-Cultural Study of Switching Barriers and Propensity to Stay with Service Providers," *JR*, 79 (2), 107-120.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am not looking for another \_\_\_\_\_ to replace the present one.
2. The relationship is important to me.
3. I wish to retain my relationship with \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> Details regarding the response format were not provided by Patterson and Smith (2003). It was likely to have been a five- or seven-point Likert-type response scale.

**SCALE NAME: Commitment to the Store (Affective)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This scale uses three, seven-point Likert-type statements to measure the level of emotional attachment a consumer has to a certain store or a chain of stores.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004) was apparently developed in dissertation research by Hess (1998).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .85 was reported for the scale by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Although some aspects of the scale's validity were probably assessed by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004), none were reported in the article. Likewise, information regarding the validity of the scale is likely to be in Hess's (1998) dissertation.

**REFERENCES:**

Hess, Jeffrey Scott (1998), "A Multidimensional Conceptualization of Consumer Brand Relationships: The Differential Impact of Relationship Dimensions on Evaluative Relationship Outcomes," doctoral dissertation, Leeds School of Business, University of Colorado, Boulder.

Lichtenstein, Donald R., Minette E. Drumwright, and Bridgette M. Braig (2004), "The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Customer Donations to Corporate-Supported Nonprofits," *JM*, 68 (October), 16-32.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The emotional reward I get from shopping at \_\_\_\_\_ makes it worth it for me.
2. Shopping at \_\_\_\_\_ gives me a sense of warmth and comfort.
3. Shopping at \_\_\_\_\_ makes me happy.
4. I would experience an emotional loss if I could no longer shop at \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal retail store/chain should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Communication Openness (Patient/Physician)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The seven item, five-point Likert-type scale assesses the degree to which a person describes his/her style of interaction with a physician as being characterized by a two-way flow of information.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Hausman (2004) modified a scale originally presented by Kitchell (1995). (See V3, #556.) The modification amounted to adding two items as well as rephrasing the original five items to better fit the physician/patient dyad.

**RELIABILITY:**

A Cronbach's alpha of 0.78 was reported based upon data from the combined sample. For the subsamples, the alphas were .83 (Midwest city), .81 (Hispanics), and .80 (Elderly).

**VALIDITY:**

Several tests provided evidence of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Hausman, Angela (2004), "Modeling the Patient-Physician Service Encounter: Improving Patient Outcomes," *JAMS*, 32 (4), 403-417.
- Kitchell, Susan (1995), "Corporate Culture, Environmental Adaptation, and Innovation Adoption: A Qualitative/Quantitative Approach," *JAMS*, 23 (3), 195-205.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Communication between my doctor and myself is excellent.
2. My doctor is willing to share all relevant information with me.
3. There is little communication between my doctor and myself. (r)
4. My doctor was willing to answer all of my questions.
5. My doctor talked to me in terms I could understand.
6. The direction of information is usually from me to my doctor, rather than from my doctor to me.
7. There are few opportunities to have informal conversations with my doctor. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Community Value**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The nine-item, seven-point Likert-type scale measures the importance a person places on serving his/her community by showing concern and playing an active role in the donation of time and money.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .91 (Burroughs and Rindfleisch 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Besides some general validation evidence for all of their scales using LISREL, Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) specifically examined the predictive validity of the Community Value scale with another sample (n = 120). They found that those who scored higher than average on the scale were more likely to have recently volunteered in their community and given more time to community activities.

**REFERENCES:**

Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I feel an obligation to donate money to local charities.
2. I feel that it is important to serve as a volunteer in my community.
3. It is important to me to form close ties with others in my community.
4. I am very concerned about the welfare of my community.
5. I believe it is important to take an active role in the civic affairs of the community in which I live.
6. I believe it is important to attend town hall or city council meetings and voice one's concerns about issues affecting the community.
7. I would readily give money to help out a neighbor who fell on hard times.
8. I believe that it is important to give of one's time to community activities.
9. I frequently donate foodstuffs to local food drives.

**SCALE NAME: Comparison Shopping Necessity**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point statements are used to measure the degree of importance a person places on going to several stores before making a final decision about where to buy some certain product.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated explicitly by Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005), the scale seems to have been developed by them.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .79 was reported by Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005). They did, however, factor analyze these items along with those for another scale (#636) and found a two-dimensional solution.

**REFERENCES:**

Louro, Maria J., Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2005), "Negative Returns on Positive Emotions: The Influence of Pride and Self-Regulatory Goals on Repurchase Decisions," *JCR*, 31 (March), 833-840.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. To what extent is visiting many \_\_\_\_\_ stores necessary for making a good decision?
2. Do you think that you must look in several different stores before choosing where to buy \_\_\_\_\_?
3. How important is it to obtain information on other \_\_\_\_\_ stores to make a good purchase decision in the future?
4. Before deciding where to buy \_\_\_\_\_, do you feel that it is required to check multiple stores?

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors for this scale were *not at all* / *very much*.

**SCALE NAME: Comparison Valence of the Ad**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure the degree to which a person believes that an ad has disparaged a competitor.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Jain and Posavac (2004) is a modified version of a scale used by Jain (1993). The scale used in the two studies reported by Jain (1993) had four items and their alphas were .93 (study 1) and .89 (study 2).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas ranging from .81 to .94 were reported for the scale used in the three studies by Jain and Posavac (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Jain and Posavac (2004) did not report any validity testing of this scale.

**REFERENCES:**

- Jain, Shailendra Pratap (1993), "Positive Versus Negative Comparative Advertising," *Marketing Letters*, 4 (4), 309-320.
- Jain, Shailendra Pratap and Steven S. Posavac (2004), "Valenced Comparisons," *JMR*, 41 (1), 46-58.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The ad was hostile / gentle to one or more competitors.
2. The ad derogated / did not derogate one or more competitors.
3. The ad criticized / complimented one or more competitors.
4. The ad tried to damage / did not try to damage the reputation of one or more competitors.
5. The ad put down / praised one or more competitors.

---

<sup>1</sup> The version used by Jain (1993) was composed of items #2-#5.

**SCALE NAME: Compatibility of the Product**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a consumer believes that a good or service is well-suited to his/her needs and lifestyle. Because this is one of the five key characteristics that are thought to influence adoption of innovations (Rogers 2003), this construct is most typically examined with respect to new products rather than mature ones.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was adapted by Meuter et al. (2005) from key phrases and concepts in a scale by Moore and Benbasat (1991).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .95 and .97 were reported by Meuter et al. (2005) for use of the scale in Studies 1 and 2, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

At a general level, Meuter et al. (2005) tested a measurement model containing all of their constructs and indicators. Its fit was acceptable. The factor loadings were reported to be significant and evidence of discriminant validity was provided for each construct using two different tests (confidence interval, variance extracted).

**REFERENCES:**

- Meuter, Matthew L., Mary Jo Bitner, Amy L. Ostrom, and Stephen W. Brown (2005), "Choosing Among Alternative Service Delivery Modes: An Investigation of Customer Trial of Self-Service Technologies," *JM*, 69 (April), 61-83.
- Moore, Gary C. and Izak Benbasat (1991), "Development of an Instrument to Measure the Perceptions of Adopting an Information Technology Innovation," *Information Systems Research*, 2 (3), 192-223.
- Rogers, Everett M. (2003), *Diffusion of Innovations*, New York: The Free Press.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Using the \_\_\_\_\_ is compatible with my lifestyle.
2. Using the \_\_\_\_\_ is completely compatible with my needs.
3. The \_\_\_\_\_ fits well with the way I like to get things done.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the good or service should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Competence of the Airline**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A customer's attitude regarding some aspects of an airline's operations is assessed using three, five-point Likert-type statements. The emphasis seems to be on some visible indicators that the airline is being managed competently such as with the efficiency of pre- and post-flight service.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) along with several other scales based on focus groups and in-depth interviews. In total the scales were intended to assess dimensions of trustworthiness related to front-line employees or management policies and practices. This scale measures one of the latter dimensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .73 was reported for the scale by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was assessed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) as part of a three-factor measurement model. In that context, the authors concluded the fit was good and there was acceptable evidence of convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

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

**SCALE ITEMS:**

The airline:

1. has fast, efficient check-in procedures.
2. keeps its airlines clean and free of clutter.
3. has fast, efficient baggage claim service.

**SCALE NAME: Competence of the Employee (Social)**

The scale is composed of nine, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the extent to which a customer reports being treated special by an employee and relating to each other on a personal level. The context examined by Dolen et al. (2002) involved a shopper and a salesperson in a retail store.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The items used by Dolen et al. (2002) were previously used by Price and Arnould (Price, Arnould, and Tierney 1995; Price, Arnould, and Deibler 1995). In those studies the items were not part of the same scale but rather three different ones, with support for that structure coming from the factor analyses that were conducted. (See V3, #277 and #389.)

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .92 was reported by Dolen et al. (2002) for use of the scale with customers.

**VALIDITY:**

Dolen et al. (2002) used CFA to examine the psychometric quality of this scale's items along with those for three other scales. Evidence was provided in support of the model's fit as well as the convergent and discriminant validities of the scales. Despite this, the analyses performed by Price and Arnould (referred to above) suggest that at least under some circumstances the items in this scale are not unidimensional.

**REFERENCES:**

- Price, Linda L., Eric J. Arnould, and Patrick Tierney (1995), "Going to Extremes: Managing Service Encounters and Assessing Provider Performance," *JM*, 59 (April), 83-97.
- Price, Linda L., Eric J. Arnould, and Sheila L. Deibler (1995), "Consumers' Emotional Responses to Service Encounters: The Influence of the Service Provider," *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 6 (3), 34-63.
- Dolen, Willemijn van, Jos Lemmink, Ko de Ruyter, and Ad de Jong (2002), "Customer-Sales Employee Encounters: A Dyadic Perspective," *JR*, 78 (4), 265-279.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The employee connected to my life/experiences.
2. The employee revealed personal information.
3. The employee invited me to reveal personal information.
4. The employee paid special attention to me.
5. The employee went out of his/her way.
6. The employee gave me a break (something special).
7. The employee was truly out of the ordinary.
8. The employee was his/her own person.
9. The employee was genuine.

*#213 Competence of the Employee (Social)*

8. The employee was his/her own person.
9. The employee was genuine.

**SCALE NAME: Competence of the Employee (Task)**

Six, seven-point Likert-type items are used to assess the degree to which a customer believes that an employee performed efficiently and effectively. The context examined by Dolen et al. (2002) involved a shopper and a salesperson in a retail store.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The items used by Dolen et al. (2002) came from scales apparently developed by Price, Arnould, and Deibler (1995). Interestingly, in that study the items in this scale were not used together but were in two different scales, with support for that structure coming from the CFA that was conducted.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .87 was reported by Dolen et al. (2002) for use of the scale with customers.

**VALIDITY:**

Dolen et al. (2002) used CFA to examine the psychometric quality of this scale's items along with those for three other scales. Evidence was provided in support of the model's fit as well as the convergent and discriminant validities of the scales. Despite this, the analysis performed by Price, Arnould, and Deibler (1995) suggests that at least under some circumstances the items in this scale are not unidimensional.

**REFERENCES:**

- Price, Linda L., Eric J. Arnould, and Sheila L. Deibler (1995), "Consumers' Emotional Responses to Service Encounters: The Influence of the Service Provider," *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 6 (3), 34-63.
- Dolen, Willemijn van, Jos Lemmink, Ko de Ruyter, and Ad de Jong (2002), "Customer-Sales Employee Encounters: A Dyadic Perspective," *JR*, 78 (4), 265-279.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The employee was capable.
2. The employee was efficient.
3. The employee was organized.
4. The employee was thorough.
5. The employee met my needs.
6. The employee performed as I expected.

**SCALE NAME: Competence of the Employees**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point Likert-type items are used to measure a customer's attitude toward a store's employees with an emphasis on some visible indicators that they are efficient and reliable.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) along with several other scales based on focus groups and in-depth interviews. In total the scales were intended to assess dimensions of trustworthiness related to front-line employees or management policies and practices. This scale measures one of the former dimensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .91 (retail) and .87 (airline) were reported for the scales (Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was assessed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) as part of a three-factor measurement model. In that context, the authors concluded the fit was good and there was acceptable evidence of convergent and discriminant validity. This was true for the separate retail and airline data as well as the combined set.

**REFERENCES:**

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

**SCALE ITEMS:**

The \_\_\_\_\_ employees:<sup>1</sup>

1. work quickly and efficiently.
2. can competently handle most customer requests.
3. can be relied upon to know what they are doing.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the type of employees can be placed in the blank. Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) used "store" and "airline."

**SCALE NAME: Competence of the Store**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, five-point Likert-type statement assessing a customer's attitude of a store with an emphasis on some visible indicators that it is being managed competently.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) along with several other scales based on focus groups and in-depth interviews. In total the scales were intended to assess dimensions of trustworthiness related to front-line employees or management policies and practices. This scale measures one of the latter dimensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .77 was reported for the scale by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was assessed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) as part of a three-factor measurement model. In that context, the authors concluded the fit was good and there was acceptable evidence of convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

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

**SCALE ITEMS:**

The store:

1. is organized so as to make it easy to \_\_\_\_\_.<sup>1</sup>
2. is generally clean and free of clutter.
3. keeps checkouts staffed and moving so you don't have to wait.

---

<sup>1</sup> The phrase used in the blank by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) was "pick your clothing selection." That phrase can be modified for other types of stores or generalized to "shop."

**SCALE NAME: Complaint Behavior**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, seven-point statements that are used to assess the degree to which a person reports having complained to a provider regarding some recent problem with the quality (or lack thereof) of service received. Whereas most scales have measured the likelihood of complaining in the future, this scale measures the degree to which it occurred in the past.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) implied that they had used a scale by Swan and Oliver (1989). However, the latter only had a one-item measure of the construct so it is more accurate to say that Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) developed their scale after receiving some inspiration from the work of Swan and Oliver (1989).

**RELIABILITY:**

Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) reported an alpha of .903 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

- Bougie, Roger, Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2003), "Angry Customers Don't Come Back, They Get Back: The Experience and Behavioral Implications of Anger and Dissatisfaction in Services," *JAMS*, 31 (4), 377-393.
- Swan, John E. and Richard L. Oliver (1989), "Postpurchase Communications by Consumers," *JR*, 65 (4), 516-533.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I complained to the service provider about the service quality.
2. I asked the service provider to take care of the problem.
3. I complained to the service provider about the way I was treated.
4. I discussed the problem with the service provider.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale anchors used by Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) were *not at all* to *very much*.

**SCALE NAME: Complaint Intentions (Third Party)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A four-item, six-point scale is used to assess the likelihood that a consumer would express his or her dissatisfaction after a purchase to parties who were not involved in the exchange but who could bring some pressure to bear on the offending marketer. Such third parties could be consumer organizations, the media, or lawyers. Although it would be most natural to use the scale to measure future intentions, Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) seem to have used it to measure past behavior.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Singh (1988, 1990) drew on work by Day (1984), the scale was original. Along with other scales developed in the study, the items were modified on the basis of data collected in a pretest of faculty and staff.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .805 and .84 have been reported by Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) and Singh (1990), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

Using data from the car repair sample, the items in this scale, along with those for two other related complaint intentions scales (voice and private), were analyzed by Singh (1988, 1990) using exploratory factor analysis. A three-factor structure was obtained and examined using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for the other three data sets. Results of the CFA provided further support for the three-factor structure and discriminant validity. See Singh (1988) for more validation information. No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003).

**COMMENTS:**

As noted, four transactions were examined in the study by Singh (1988, 1990). However, only the items relating to the car repair were reported. To the extent that a researcher wished to use the scale to study complaints in a nonrepair context, one of the other three versions of the scale might be more appropriate.

See also Singh and Wilkes (1996) for further analysis of a portion of the same database used by Singh (1988, 1990).

**REFERENCES:**

- Bougie, Roger, Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2003), "Angry Customers Don't Come Back, They Get Back: The Experience and Behavioral Implications of Anger and Dissatisfaction in Services," *JAMS*, 31 (4), 377-393.
- Day, Ralph L. (1984), "Modeling Choices Among Alternative Responses to Dissatisfaction," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 11, Tom Kinnear, ed. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 496-499.

## #218 Complaint Intentions (Third Party)

Singh, Jagdip (1988), "Consumer Complaint Intentions and Behaviors: Definitional and Taxonomical Issues," *JM*, 52 (January), 93-107.

Singh, Jagdip (1990), "Typology of Consumer Dissatisfaction Response Styles," *JR*, 66 (Spring), 57-97.

Singh, Jagdip and Robert E. Wilkes (1996), "When Consumers Complain: A Path Analysis of the Key Antecedents of Consumer Compliant Response Estimates," *JAMS*, 24 (Fall), 350-365.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

How likely is it that you would:

1. Complain to a consumer agency and ask them to make the repair shop take care of your problem?
2. Write a letter to a local newspaper about your bad experience?
3. Report to a consumer agency so that they can warn other consumers?
4. Take some legal action against the repair shop/manufacturer.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the form of the scale used by Singh (1990). The verbal anchors for his scale were *very unlikely* and *very likely*. The anchors used by Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) were *not at all* to *very much*. The focal business was a service provider and the items and the directions were apparently phrased in the past tense.

**SCALE NAME: Complaint Success Likelihood****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three-item, six-point Likert-like scale measures a consumer's degree of expectation that a complaint would be responded to in a positive way by a marketer. The construct measured by the scale was referred to as *expectancy (voice)* in Singh (1990a) and *probability of a successful complaint* in Singh (1990b). Three slightly different versions of the scale were used depending on the service category being studied.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Singh (1990a, 1990b) drew on similar studies by Day (1984) and Richins (1983), the scale was original. Along with other scales developed in the study, the items were modified on the basis of data collected in a pretest of faculty and staff.

**RELIABILITY:**

Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) reported an alpha of .733 for the scale. Singh (1990b) reported composite reliabilities of .84, .89, and .93 for the grocery, car repair, and medical care versions of the scale, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003). Using results from a LISREL analysis, Singh (1990b) concluded that the scale provided acceptable evidence of discriminant validity in each of the three service categories examined.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bougie, Roger, Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2003), "Angry Customers Don't Come Back, They Get Back: The Experience and Behavioral Implications of Anger and Dissatisfaction in Services," *JAMS*, 31 (4), 377-393.
- Day, Ralph L. (1984), "Modeling Choices Among Alternative Responses to Dissatisfaction," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 11, Tom Kinnear, ed. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 496-499.
- Richins, Marsha L. (1983), "An Analysis of Consumer Interaction Styles in the Marketplace," *JCR*, 10 (June), 73-82.
- Singh, Jagdip (1988), "Consumer Complaint Intentions and Behaviors: Definitional and Taxonomical Issues," *JM*, 52 (January), 93-107.
- Singh, Jagdip (1990a), "Typology of Consumer Dissatisfaction Response Styles," *JR*, 66 (Spring), 57-97.
- Singh, Jagdip (1990b), "Voice, Exit, and Negative Word-of-Mouth Behaviors: An Investigation Across Three Service Categories," *JAMS*, 18 (Winter), 1-15.

## #219 Complaint Success Likelihood

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

Assume you reported the incident to the \_\_\_\_\_, how likely is it that the \_\_\_\_\_ would:

1. take appropriate action to take care of your problem (refund, etc.)?
2. solve your problem and give service to you in the future?
3. be more careful in the future and everyone would benefit?.

---

<sup>1</sup> The blanks can be filled with appropriate terms or phrases describing the marketer being studied. The anchors Singh (1990a, 1990b) used with the response scale were *very unlikely* and *very likely*. The anchors used by Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) were *not at all* and *very much*. The scale stem they used was “At the moment of the service failure, how likely was it that the service provider would . . . .” Also, each item had the phrase “if you would report the incident” at the end.

**SCALE NAME: Complementarity of Products**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point semantic differentials are used to assess how well two products are viewed as going together, particularly in their usage.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although the scale appears to be original to Ruth and Simonin (2003), they apparently drew inspiration for the items from Varadarajan (1986).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was used by Ruth and Simonin (2003) with four products in order to determine their degree of complementarity with soda. The alphas were .96 (ice cream), .91 (whiskey), .85 (banks), and .95 (cigarettes). Since these alphas were based on data from a pretest sample of just 35 people at a university, they should be interpreted cautiously.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Ruth and Simonin (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Ruth, Julie A. and Bernard L. Simonin (2003), "Brought to You by Brand A and Brand B: Investigating Multiple Sponsors' Influence on Consumers' Attitudes Towards Sponsored Events," *JA*, 32 (3), 19-30.

Varadarajan, R. Rajan (1986), "Horizontal Cooperative Sales Promotion: A Framework for Classification and Additional Perspectives," *JM*, 50 (April), 61-73.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. noncomplementary product combination / complementary product combination
2. bad-fitting product combination / good-fitting product combination
3. noncomplementary in use / complementary in use

**SCALE NAME: Complexity of the Service**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four, five-point Likert-type statements measure the degree to which a person views a service as being complicated and difficult to understand.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated explicitly, the scale appears to have been developed by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003). A pretest and the main study helped develop and refine the many scales they used to measure switching costs as well as its antecedents and consequences. Complexity was viewed as an antecedent of switching costs.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .70 and .82 were reported by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) for long-distance and credit card applications, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale as well as those for five other scales used to measure the antecedents of switching costs were examined using CFA. The results provided support for this scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Burnham, Thomas A., Judy K. Frels, and Vijay Mahajan (2003), "Consumer Switching Costs: A Topology, Antecedents and Consequences," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 109-126.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I would have to know a lot to take full advantage of the options/programs offered by service providers.
2. The offerings in this industry are difficult to understand.
3. A salesperson selling this kind of service needs to know a lot to do a good job.
4. This service is complicated in nature.

**SCALE NAME: Compliance with Physician's Instructions**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, five point Likert-type items are used to measure the extent to which a patient says he/she tends to follow the instructions given by his/her physician.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Hausman (2004) was developed in a previous study of hers (Hausman 2001).

**RELIABILITY:**

A Cronbach's alpha of 0.86 was reported by Hausman (2004) based upon data from the combined sample. For the subsamples, the alphas were .87 (Midwest city), .85 (Hispanics), and .64 (Elderly).

**VALIDITY:**

The results of several tests were provided by Hausman (2004) as evidence of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Hausman, Angela (2004), "Modeling the Patient-Physician Service Encounter: Improving Patient Outcomes," *JAMS*, 32 (4), 403-417.
- Hausman, Angela (2001), "Taking Your Medicine: Relational Steps Toward Improving Patient Compliance," *Health Marketing Quarterly*, 19 (2), 24-31.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. When I'm ill, I always take all the medication prescribed by my doctor.
2. For chronic conditions, such as high blood pressure, I always take all of the medication prescribed by my doctor.
3. I follow my doctor's orders, such as to stay in bed.
4. I return to the doctor on the schedule he suggests.
5. I always have follow-up tests recommended by my doctor.

**SCALE NAME: Compliance with Weight Loss Program**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This nine item, seven-point Likert-type scale is intended to measure the degree to which a person follows the instructions given to him/her as part of a weight loss program.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Dellande, Gilly, and Graham (2004) in consultation with the director of research at a weight loss clinic.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .80 was reported for the scale by Dellande, Gilly, and Graham (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Information bearing on the scale's validity was not reported by Dellande, Gilly, and Graham (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Dellande, Stephanie, Mary C. Gilly, and John L. Graham (2004), "Gaining Compliance and Losing Weight: The Role of the Service Provider in Health Care Services," *JM*, 68 (3), 78-91.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I follow the weight loss directions that my nurse suggests.
2. I visit the \_\_\_\_\_ as I have been instructed to do.<sup>1</sup>
3. I use my pedometer as I have been instructed to do.
4. I apply the skills taught to me by my nurse to help control my environment.
5. I do not follow the weight loss directions that my nurse suggests.
6. I take the prepackaged food supplements as I have been instructed to do.
7. I calculate my daily intake of carbohydrates as I have been instructed to do.
8. I keep a daily journal of my weight loss program activities.
9. I do not determine my daily level of physical activity as I have been instructed to do.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the service provider should be placed in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Compulsive Buying**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of eleven statements measuring a consumer's uncontrollable urge to buy. This motivation in the extreme could be considered a form of addiction.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) was borrowed from d'Astous, Maltais, and Roberge (1990) who in turn were building on a scale used previously by their lead author. That version used by d'Astous, Maltais, and Roberge (1990) was adapted for use with adolescents and had an alpha of .78.

**RELIABILITY:**

Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) reported an alpha of .84 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Without providing many details, Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) implied that the scale showed evidence of unidimensionality as well as convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- d'Astous, Alain, Julie Maltais, and Caroline Roberge (1990), "Compulsive Buying Tendencies of Adolescent Consumers," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 17, 306-312.
- Manolis, Chris (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Roberts, James A., Chris Manolis, and John F. Tanner, Jr. (2003), "Family Structure, Materialism, and Compulsive Buying: A Reinquiry and Extension," *JAMS*, 31 (3), 300-311.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. When I have money, I cannot help but spend part or all of it.
2. I often buy something I see in a store without planning, just because I've got to have it.
3. Shopping is a way of relaxing and forgetting my problems.
4. I sometimes feel that something inside pushes me to go shopping.
5. There are times when I have a strong urge to buy (clothing, music, jewelry).
6. At times, I have felt somewhat guilty after buying because it seemed unreasonable.

---

<sup>1</sup> Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) did not provide the exact items they used but merely said that they used the scale by d'Astous, Maltais, and Roberge (1990), slightly modifying three of the items (unspecified). Indeed, the listing provided by the latter has several cases of awkward wording, probably due to translation from the original French. That awkward phrasing has been corrected in the items shown here. As for the response format, Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003; Manolis 2005) used a five-point response scale with *agree/disagree* anchors.

*#224 Compulsive Buying*

7. There are some things I buy that I do not show to anybody because I fear people will think I did a foolish thing or I wasted my money.
8. I often have a real desire to go shopping and buy something.
9. As soon as I enter a shopping center, I wish to go in a store and buy something.
10. I have often bought a product that I did not need when I knew I had very little money left.
11. I like to spend money.

**SCALE NAME: Computer Importance in the Home**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five, five-point Likert-type statements that measure how essential a consumer believes a computer to be in his/her home.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Shih and Venkatesh (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .79 was reported for the scale by Shih and Venkatesh (2004)

**VALIDITY:**

Although Shih and Venkatesh (2004) did not directly address the validity of the scale they did state that a factor analysis showed the items in this scale and those in a related scale (Computer Importance in Daily Life) loaded on separate factors.

**REFERENCES:**

Shih, Chuan-Fong and Alladi Venkatesh (2004), "Beyond Adoption: Development and Application of a Use-Diffusion Model," *JM*, 68 (January), 59-72.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The computer is as essential in my home as is any other household appliance.
2. It would be difficult to imagine life without a computer in my home.
3. Households with a computer are run more efficiently than those without a computer.
4. The computer has saved me time at home.
5. The computer has become part of the daily routine in my home.

**SCALE NAME: Computer's Effect on Home Activities**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, five-point Likert-type statements are used to assess the degree to which a consumer believes that a computer has changed key aspects of his/her life, particularly in the home.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Shih and Venkatesh (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .66 was reported for the scale by Shih and Venkatesh (2004)

**VALIDITY:**

Although Shih and Venkatesh (2004) did not directly address the validity of the scale they did state that a factor analysis showed the items in this scale and those in a related scale (Computer Importance in the Home) loaded on separate factors.

**REFERENCES:**

Shih, Chuan-Fong and Alladi Venkatesh (2004), "Beyond Adoption: Development and Application of a Use-Diffusion Model," *JM*, 68 (January), 59-72.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The computer has changed the way I do things in the home.
2. The computer has replaced the telephone as the major communication device in my home.
3. I have more contact with friends as relatives now that I have e-mail.
4. My family watches less television as a result of using the computer or the Internet.
5. The computer has increased the amount of job-related work I do at home.

**SCALE NAME: Confidence (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point unipolar items that are intended to assess the extent of conviction and certainty a person has about something. It appears to be amenable for use in a variety of contexts. For example, as used by Petty, Briñol, and Tormala (2002), it measured participants' confidence in the validity of the thoughts they provided to researchers in a task. In contrast, Argo, Dahl, and Manchanda (2005) viewed their scale as measuring an emotion, something they "felt" while shopping.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Briñol, Petty, and Tormala (2004) was used previously by Petty, Briñol, and Tormala (2002). In two of the four studies the latter conducted, a four-item version of the scale was used. The three items used by Briñol, Petty, and Tormala (2004) are a subset of the four item version.

The source of the scale used by Argo, Dahl, and Manchanda (2005) was not stated but is remarkably similar to the one by Briñol, Petty, and Tormala (2004). Another possibility is that the version used by Argo, Dahl, and Manchanda (2005) is a variation of the scale used by Urbany et al. (1997) and others. (See #560.)

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .80 (Study 1) and .70 (Study 2) were reported by Briñol, Petty, and Tormala (2004). An alpha of .81 was reported for the version of the scale used by Argo, Dahl, and Manchanda (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No information was provided about the scale's validity by either Briñol, Petty, and Tormala (2004) or Argo, Dahl, and Manchanda (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- Argo, Jennifer J., Darren W. Dahl, and Rajesh V. Manchanda (2005), "The Influence of a Mere Social Presence in a Retail Context," *JCR*, 32 (September), 207-212.
- Briñol, Pablo, Richard E. Petty, and Zakary L. Tormala (2004), "Self-Validation of Cognitive Responses to Advertisements," *JCR*, 30 (March), 559-573.
- Petty, Richard E. Petty, Pablo Briñol, and Zakary L. Tormala (2002), "Thought Confidence as a Determinant of Persuasion: The Self-Validation Hypothesis," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82 (5), 722-741.
- Urbany, Joel E., William O. Bearden, Ajit Kaicker, and Melinda Smith-de Borrero (1997), "Transaction Utility Effects When Quality is Uncertain," *JAMS*, 25 (Winter), 45-55.

#227 Confidence (General)

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. confident
2. certain
3. valid
4. sure

---

<sup>1</sup> Items #1-#3 composed the scale used by Briñol, Petty, and Tormala (2004) and *not at all* and *extremely* were the verbal anchors. Argo, Dahl, and Manchanda (2005) used items #1, #2, and #4 with *not at all* and *very* as extreme verbal anchors.

**SCALE NAME: Confidence (Voter)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three item, seven-point Likert-type scale measures a voter's confidence in his/her ability to make a "good" choice in an upcoming election.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by O'Cass (2002) was adapted from a scale used in previous product-related research by the author (O'Cass 1999).

**RELIABILITY:**

The internal consistency of the scale was .89 (O'Cass 2002, 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

O'Cass (2002) claimed evidence for the scale's discriminant validity using a simple but less popular technique (Gaski 1984) whereby the internal consistency of a scale is compared to its correlations with every other scale in a study. To the extent that the internal consistency is higher than the correlations then some evidence for discriminant validity is shown. O'Cass implied that the confidence scale successfully met this criterion.

**REFERENCES:**

- O'Cass, Aron (1999), "Exploring Purchase Decision Involvement's Influence on Product Knowledge and Confidence," in *Proceedings of the Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy*. Proceedings of the Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy: University of New South Wales, 1-8.
- O'Cass, Aron (2002), "Political Advertising Believability and Information Source Value During Elections," *JA*, 31 (Spring), 63-73.
- O'Cass, Aron (2004), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am confident I will choose the right party/politician in the \_\_\_\_\_ election.
2. I have confidence in my ability to make a good decision on who to vote for in the \_\_\_\_\_ election.
3. I have confidence in my ability in deciding who to vote for in the \_\_\_\_\_ election.

---

<sup>1</sup> While the statements could be used as is, the measure would benefit from having descriptors in the blanks that could give some focus for the beliefs such as helping the respondent to think about *local*, *state*, or *national* elections.

**SCALE NAME: Conflict (Decision)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of nine opposing phrases with a six-point response format that attempt to measure the degree of difficulty a person believes he/she would experience in making a particular choice. Since the items are stated hypothetically, the scale is not exactly a measure of post-purchase dissonance. The scale was called *value conflict* by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) but the items seem to be general enough for use in a variety of situations where the researcher is concerned about how much conflict consumers imagine there would be in making a particular decision.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002). They said that a large pool of items were generated after a review of conflict theory then pared down through standard scale development procedures.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .93 (Burroughs and Rindfleisch 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

As a new scale, Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) separately examined the dimensionality of the items using EFA and determined that they all loaded strongly on one factor. Subsequently, the scale was analyzed along with all of the study's scales using CFA and LISREL leading to a general claim of discriminant validity for them all.

**REFERENCES:**

Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. This would be a clear decision for me / This decision would require a lot of self-searching.
2. I would be conflicted between what I feel I should do and what I would like to do / There would be no conflict between my feelings about the decision I would make. (r)
3. This would be a difficult decision for me / This would not be a difficult decision for me. (r)
4. I would feel a sense of conflict between my values in trying to make a decision / There would be no conflict as to what my values were in reaching a decision. (r)
5. There would be no wavering on which direction I would go / I would feel pulled in two different directions.
6. I would not feel any internal conflict about my decision / I would have a great deal of internal conflict over my decision.

#229 *Conflict (Decision)*

7. I would probably look back and wonder if I made the right decision / I would not look back on this decision. (r)
8. I feel somewhat guilty about the thoughts I had while working through my decision / I do not feel any guilt about thinking the way I did as I worked through my decision. (r)
9. This is a situation for which I would need more information before reaching a decision / I would not need any more information to make a decision. I know what my choice would be. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Conformity Importance**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, nine-point statements are used to measure the value placed by a person on self-restraint and self-transcendence in order to minimize social disruption.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005) was derived from Schwartz (1992). It is part of the Schwartz Value Survey which has been tested in many different countries and is intended to capture ten important human values. Due to the unconventional psychometric techniques used to develop the instrument, many issues regarding each scale's dimensionality and validity are worthy of further testing.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) was .701 (Burroughs 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Although the scale's validity was not directly assessed by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002), the results of multidimensional scaling analysis showed that conformity was located along an axis with other self-transcendent values such as tradition and religiosity and was in opposition to self-enhancement values such as hedonism and materialism. This provides at least some modicum of evidence of the scale's nomological validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Richins (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.  
Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.  
Schwartz, Shalom H. (1992), "Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, V. 25, Mark P. Zanna, ed., San Diego: Academic Press, Inc, 1-65.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> The same nine-point response scale and anchors were used by Schwartz (1992) and Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005). The directions shown here were recreated based on a description by Schwartz (1992, p. 17).

## #230 Conformity Importance

Directions: Rate each value listed below as a guiding principle in your life using the following nine-point scale: *opposed to my values* (-1), *not important* (0), (1 and 2, unlabeled), *important* (3), (4 and 5, unlabeled), *very important* (6), and *of supreme importance* (7).

1. OBEDIENT (dutiful, meeting obligations)
2. HONORING OF PARENTS AND ELDERS (showing respect)
3. POLITENESS (courtesy, good manners)
4. SELF-DISCIPLINE (self-restraint, resistance to temptation)

**SCALE NAME: Congruence (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point semantic-differentials intended to assess the degree of fit a person believes there to be between two objects.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was created by Rifon et al. (2004) as a manipulation check. The two objects were a website and a sponsor of the site.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale's alpha was .896 (Rifon 2006).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Rifon et al. (2004) though it was used to show that two congruence conditions created by the authors were indeed perceived to be significantly different.

**REFERENCES:**

Rifon, Nora J. (2006), Personal Correspondence.

Rifon, Nora J., Sejung Marina Choi, Carrie S. Trimble and Hairong Li (2004), "Congruence Effects In Sponsorship," *JA*, 33 (1), 29-42.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. not compatible / compatible
2. not a good fit / good fit
3. not congruent / congruent

**SCALE NAME: Congruence (Self with Brand)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of seven Likert-type statements that are intended to measure the degree to which a consumer views a similarity and connection between him/her self-image and that of a particular brand.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was apparently developed and reported first by Escalas and Bettman (2003). The version used by Escalas and Bettman (2005) was very similar to the previous version but not exactly the same, e.g., different scale anchors and slightly different phrasing of items.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was used in the two studies reported by Escalas and Bettman (2005) and in both cases had alphas of .96.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Escalas and Bettman (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Escalas, Jennifer Edson and James R. Bettman (2003), "You Are What They Eat: The Influence of Reference Groups on Consumers' Connections to Brands," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 13 (3), 339–348.

Escalas, Jennifer Edson and James R. Bettman (2005), "Self-Construal, Reference Groups, and Brand Meaning," *JCR*, 32 (December), 378-389.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. This brand reflects who I am.
2. I can identify with this brand.
3. I feel a personal connection to this brand.
4. I use this brand to communicate who I am to other people.
5. I think this brand help me become the type of person I want to be.
6. I consider this brand to be "me" (it reflects who I consider myself to be or the way that I want to present myself to others).
7. This brand suits me well.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format used by Escalas and Bettman (2005) had 101 points and ranged from *strongly disagree* (0) to *strongly agree* (100).

**SCALE NAME: Congruence of the Ad**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point statements are used to measure the degree to which a person believes that an ad (or more specifically, its message) fits with variables either within the ad or external to it. Examples of internal elements could be the product, music, and the actors within the ad. Key external variables are the audience and the place where the ad is encountered (at home, in the car, at the supermarket).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Mantel and Kellaris (2003) said that they based their scale on a measure previously used by Kellaris, Cox, and Cox (1993). While there is some conceptual similarity between the two sets of items there are enough differences that it is best to consider this scale to be original to Mantel and Kellaris (2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .95 was reported for the scale by Mantel and Kellaris (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Mantel and Kellaris (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Kellaris, James J., Anthony D. Cox, and Dena Cox (1993), "The Effect of Background Music on Ad Processing: A Contingency Explanation," *JM*, 57 (October), 114-124.  
Mantel, Susan Powell and James J. Kellaris (2003), "Cognitive Determinants of Consumers' Time Perceptions: The Impact of Resources Required and Available," *JCR*, 29 (March), 531-538.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The \_\_\_\_\_ was appropriate for the \_\_\_\_\_.<sup>2</sup>
2. The \_\_\_\_\_ did not seem to fit with the message. (r)
3. The \_\_\_\_\_ was relevant to the subject of the ad.
4. The \_\_\_\_\_ did not match the product in the ad. (r)
5. The \_\_\_\_\_ was congruent with the message of the ad.

---

<sup>1</sup> The blank should be filled with an element other than message and product which the audience is likely to be processing concurrently with the ad message. The element of interest to Mantel and Kellaris (2003) was "music."

<sup>2</sup> The second blank in this item should be filled with another element besides what is placed in the first blank. The term used by Mantel and Kellaris (2003) was "restaurant" since the ad was for a restaurant.

**SCALE NAME: Congruence of the Ad (External)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point items are used to measure the degree to which a person believes that a particular ad is consistent with the type usually run by a company.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information was provided about the source of the scale by Martin, Stewart, and Matta (2005). It would appear to have been developed by them.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .69 was reported for the scale (Martin, Stewart, and Matta 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Martin, Stewart, and Matta (2005) did not address the scale's validity. However, to the extent that the scale was successfully used as a manipulation check, that provides some evidence of its predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Martin, Ingrid M., David W. Stewart and Sashi Matta (2005), "Branding Strategies, Marketing Communication, and Perceived Brand Meaning: The Transfer of Purposive, Goal-Oriented Brand Meaning to Brand Extensions," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 275-294.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How similar is the type of advertising that you associate with \_\_\_\_\_ and the type of message that you see here for \_\_\_\_\_?  
*not at all similar / very similar*
2. How well does this message exemplify the type of advertising that \_\_\_\_\_ uses for its other products?  
*extremely poor example / extremely good example*
3. How consistent is this message with the type of advertising that \_\_\_\_\_ uses for its other products?  
*not at all consistent / very consistent*

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the company should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Connectedness with Television Program**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The sixteen-item, five-point Likert-type scale measures the intensity of the relationship that viewer has with the characters and setting of a para-social TV program and the extent to which it affects the viewer's self-identity.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Russell, Norman, and Heckler (2004). Using three focus groups, 85 items were generated. After removal of redundant and ambiguous statements, 45 items remained and were tested in an initial study (Phase 1) using 175 undergraduate students. Exploratory factor analysis was used to remove items with low or split loadings. Sixteen items representing six factors remained. As a combined set, the 16 items had an alpha of .84.

**RELIABILITY:**

In the main study (n = 11,000), the scale had an alpha of .87 (Russell, Norman, and Heckler 2004; Russell 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Russell, Norman, and Heckler (2004) described three phases that were used to develop the scale. Each phase provided further evidence of the scale's validity. In particular, Phase 2 re-examined the factor structure that emerged from Phase 1. Indeed, there were six factors but it was also shown that a model of those factors loading on a higher order factor (connectedness) fit the data better than two competing models. In Phase 3, some evidence was provided in support of predictive and discriminant validity. However, the authors acknowledged the need for more testing to more fully distinguish between connectedness and related constructs (involvement and attitude).

**REFERENCES:**

- Russell, Cristel Antonia, Andrew T. Norman and Susan E. Heckler (2004), "The Consumption of Television Programming and Validation of the Connectedness Scale," *JCR*, 31 (June), 150-161.
- Russell, Cristel Antonia (2005), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Watching \_\_\_\_\_ is an escape for me.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ helps me forget about the day's problems.
3. If I am in a bad mood, watching \_\_\_\_\_ puts me in a better mood.
4. I like the clothes they wear on \_\_\_\_\_.
5. I like the hairstyles on \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the TV program should be placed in the blanks.

*#235 Connectedness with Television Program*

6. I often buy clothing styles that I've seen in \_\_\_\_\_.
7. I imitate the gestures and facial expressions from the characters in \_\_\_\_\_.
8. I find myself saying phrases from \_\_\_\_\_ when I interact with other people.
9. I try to speak like the characters in \_\_\_\_\_.
10. I learn how to handle real life situations by watching \_\_\_\_\_.
11. I get ideas from \_\_\_\_\_ about how to interact in my own life.
12. I relate what happens in \_\_\_\_\_ to my own life.
13. I would love to be an actor in \_\_\_\_\_.
14. I would love to meet the characters of \_\_\_\_\_.
15. I have objects that relate to \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., badge, book, picture, etc.).
16. I read books if they are related to \_\_\_\_\_.

**SCALE NAME: Consistency Motivation (Internal)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five statements that measure the degree to which a person expresses the importance of his/her beliefs and behavior being in agreement and not contradictory.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Moorman et al. (2004) is the internal consistency dimension of the Preference for Consistency instrument by Cialdini, Trost, and Newsom (1995).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .73 was reported for the scale by Moorman et al. (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Moorman et al. (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Moorman, Christine, Kristin Diehl, David Brinberg, and Blair Kidwell (2004), "Subjective Knowledge, Search Locations and Consumer Choice," *JCR*, 31 (December), 673-680.
- Cialdini, Robert B., Melanie R. Trost, and Jason T. Newsom (1995), "Preference for Consistency: The Development of a Valid Measure and Discovery of Surprising Behavioral Implications," *JCR*, 69 (2), 318-328.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. It is important to me that my actions are consistent with my beliefs.
2. I get uncomfortable when I find my behavior contradicts my beliefs.
3. I typically prefer to do things the same way.
4. I'm uncomfortable holding two beliefs that are inconsistent.
5. It doesn't bother me much if my actions are inconsistent. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> Although not explicitly stated by Moorman et al. (2004), the response scale seems to have used a seven-point Likert-type format.

**SCALE NAME: Consumption Affect**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, nine-point, Likert-type items are used to measure the degree of pleasure one experienced upon eating a specific food, e.g., jelly beans.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not identified by Kahn and Wansink (2004) but it clearly appears to have been developed for use in Study 5 of six studies described in their article.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .84 was reported for the scale by Kahn and Wansink (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information about the scale's validity was reported by Kahn and Wansink (2004). They did state, however, that all of their scales "yielded one factor solutions."

**REFERENCES:**

Kahn, Barbara E. and Brian Wansink (2004), "The Influence of Assortment Structure on Perceived Variety and Consumption Quantities," *JCR*, 30 (March), 519-533.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Aesthetically pleasurable to consume.
2. Enjoyable to eat.
3. Exciting to eat.

---

<sup>1</sup> A variety of scale stems are possible with these items. The phrase used by Kahn and Wansink (2004) was "the assortment of jelly beans I took was . . . ."

**SCALE NAME: Consumption Affect (Anticipated)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The nine-point, seven item Likert-type scale is intended to measure the degree of pleasure one expects would be experienced if able to pick items to eat from an assortment of a specific food, e.g., jelly beans.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not identified by Kahn and Wansink (2004) but it clearly appears to have been developed for use in Study 5 of six studies described in their article.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .92 was reported for the scale by Kahn and Wansink (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information about the scale's validity was reported by Kahn and Wansink (2004). They did state, however, that all of their scales "yielded one factor solutions."

**REFERENCES:**

Kahn, Barbara E. and Brian Wansink (2004), "The Influence of Assortment Structure on Perceived Variety and Consumption Quantities," *JCR*, 30 (March), 519-533.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Eating from this assortment would make me . . .

1. Feel happy after eating from it.
2. Feel enjoyable because of the wide variety.
3. Feel fun as I ate it.
4. Feel excited as I ate it.
5. Feel positive as I ate it.
6. Feel enjoyable as I ate it.
7. Feel satisfied as I ate it.

**SCALE NAME: Consumption Assortment Aesthetic Evaluation**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, nine-point, Likert-type statements that are intended to measure the extent to which one believes an assortment of a given product one was exposed to was aesthetically pleasing.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not identified by Kahn and Wansink (2004) but it clearly appears to have been developed for use in Study 5 of six studies described in their article.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .93 was reported for the scale by Kahn and Wansink (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information about the scale's validity was reported by Kahn and Wansink (2004). They did state, however, that all of their scales "yielded one factor solutions."

**REFERENCES:**

Kahn, Barbara E. and Brian Wansink (2004), "The Influence of Assortment Structure on Perceived Variety and Consumption Quantities," *JCR*, 30 (March), 519-533.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. This assortment of \_\_\_\_\_ will be aesthetically pleasurable to consume.
2. This assortment of \_\_\_\_\_ looks really colorful.
3. This assortment of \_\_\_\_\_ looks aesthetically pleasing.

---

<sup>1</sup> A generic name for the food should be placed in the blanks, e.g., jelly beans.

#240 Consumption Occasion (Hedonic/Utilitarian)

**SCALE NAME: Consumption Occasion (Hedonic/Utilitarian)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure the extent to which a person views the situation in which a product is normally used to be more pleasure-related (hedonic) or more functional (utilitarian) in nature.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Wakefield and Inman (2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .80 (Study 1) and .90 (Study 3) were reported for the scale by Wakefield and Inman (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided in the article by Wakefield and Inman (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Wakefield, Kirk L., and J. Jeffrey Inman (2003), "Situational Price Sensitivity: The Role of Consumption Occasion, Social Context and Income," *JR*, 79 (4), 199-212.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Think of the situation in which each product below is typically used:<sup>1</sup>

1. practical purposes / just for fun
2. purely functional / pure enjoyment
3. for a routine need / for pleasure

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the scale stem used by Wakefield and Inman (2003) in Study 1 when they had respondents use the scale with several product categories. Obviously, the stem could be adapted for those situations where just one product category or one product is of concern.

**SCALE NAME: Control of Shopping Process**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven point Likert-type statements are used to measure a consumer's belief that he/she has the ability and opportunity to significantly affect the shopping process, particularly in terms of the value received for the money spent.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Chandran and Morwitz (2005) stated that the scale was based on a domain specific scale by Paulhus (1983).

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .80 (Chandran and Morwitz 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Chandran and Morwitz (2005) did not report any examination of the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Chandran, Sucharita and Vicki G. Morwitz (2005), "Effects of Participative Pricing on Consumers' Cognitions and Actions: A Goal Theoretic Perspective," *JCR*, 32 (September), 249-259.

Paulhus, Delroy (1983), "Sphere-Specific Measures of Control," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44 (June), 1253-1265.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. There is a lot that I, as a consumer, can do to get the best value for my dollar.
2. With enough effort I can get very good value for money spent.
3. By taking an active part in the shopping process, I can have considerable influence as a consumer.
4. In the long run, I as a consumer am responsible for getting the best value for my money.

**SCALE NAME: Coping Strategy (Action)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This seven item with a seven-point response format is intended to measure a person's expressed intention to deal with a stressful situation by taking direct action to solve the problem in an objective manner.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Duhachek (2005) constructed this measure along with seven others in an effort to efficiently capture the breadth of strategies people apparently use to cope with stress. After examining the literature and gathering items from ten previous instruments, some 250 items were collected. Once conceptually redundant items were deleted, 53 items remained. After an initial exploratory factor analysis, no single solution could easily be deemed "best." However, using the data available and in an effort to be consistent with the literature, an eight-factor solution was settled upon. The results of two confirmatory factor analyses were then used to support that solution.

**RELIABILITY:**

Duhachek (2005) reported an alpha of .87 for the scale based on Study 1 data.

**VALIDITY:**

Only one of the other subscales was deemed to have a high enough correlation with this scale to be concerned about: rational thinking (#249). Duhachek (2005) collapsed the pair and then retested the model. Indeed, the fit was significantly worse, suggesting that despite their correlation ( $r = .43$ ), those two scales were distinct.

**REFERENCES:**

- Duhachek, Adam (2005), "Coping: A Multidimensional, Hierarchical Framework of Responses to Stressful Consumption Episodes," *JCR*, 32 (June), 41-53.  
Duhachek, Adam (2008), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Concentrate on ways the problem could be solved
2. Try to make a plan of action
3. Generate potential solutions
4. Think about the best way to handle things
5. Concentrate my efforts on doing something about it
6. Do what has to be done
7. Follow a plan to make things better—more satisfying

---

<sup>1</sup> Duhachek (2005) asked respondents to imagine a time when they had a stressful incident with a service organization and to indicate how they would cope with their stress via the ways described in the items. The verbal anchors were *not at all like me* (1) and *very much like me* (7) (Duhachek 2008).

**SCALE NAME: Coping Strategy (Avoidance)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, seven-point items that are meant to capture a person's motivation to react to a stressful situation by trying not to think about it.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Duhachek (2005) constructed this measure along with seven others in an effort to efficiently capture the breadth of strategies people apparently use to cope with stress. After examining the literature and gathering items from ten previous instruments, some 250 items were collected. Once conceptually redundant items were deleted, 53 items remained. After an initial exploratory factor analysis, no single solution could easily be deemed "best." However, using the data available and in an effort to be consistent with the literature, an eight-factor solution was settled upon. The results of two confirmatory factor analyses were then used to support that solution.

**RELIABILITY:**

Duhachek (2005) reported an alpha of .83 for the scale based on Study 1 data.

**VALIDITY:**

Since this scale had "low" correlations ( $r \leq .20$ ) with the other subscales, Duhachek (2005) did not believe any special tests of discriminant validity were needed.

**REFERENCES:**

Duhachek, Adam (2005), "Coping: A Multidimensional, Hierarchical Framework of Responses to Stressful Consumption Episodes," *JCR*, 32 (June), 41-53.  
Duhachek, Adam (2008), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Try to take my mind off of it by doing other things
2. Distract myself to avoid thinking about it
3. Avoid thinking about it
4. Find satisfaction in other thing

---

<sup>1</sup> Duhachek (2005) asked respondents to imagine a time when they had a stressful incident with a service organization and then to indicate to what extent they would cope with their stress via each of the ways described in the items. The verbal anchors used with these items were *not at all like me* (1) and *very much like me* (7) (Duhachek 2008).

## #244 Coping Strategy (Denial)

### **SCALE NAME: Coping Strategy (Denial)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three items with a seven-point response format are used to measure a person's motivation to react to a stressful situation by mentally separating oneself from the event in an effort to reduce the negative effects.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Duhachek (2005) constructed this measure along with seven others in an effort to efficiently capture the breadth of strategies people apparently use to cope with stress. After examining the literature and gathering items from ten previous instruments, some 250 items were collected. Once conceptually redundant items were deleted, 53 items remained. After an initial exploratory factor analysis, no single solution could easily be deemed "best." However, using the data available and in an effort to be consistent with the literature, an eight-factor solution was settled upon. The results of two confirmatory factor analyses were then used to support that solution.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Duhachek (2005) reported an alpha of .67 for the scale based on Study 1 data.

#### **VALIDITY:**

Since this scale had "low" correlations ( $r \leq .25$ ) with the other subscales, Duhachek (2005) did not believe any special tests of discriminant validity were needed.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Duhachek, Adam (2005), "Coping: A Multidimensional, Hierarchical Framework of Responses to Stressful Consumption Episodes," *JCR*, 32 (June), 41-53.  
Duhachek, Adam (2008), Personal Correspondence.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Deny that the event happened
2. Refuse to believe that the problem had occurred
3. Pretend that this never happened

---

<sup>1</sup> Duhachek (2005) asked respondents to imagine a time when they had a stressful incident with a service organization and then to indicate to what extent they would cope with their stress via each of the ways described in the items. The verbal anchors used with these items were *not at all like me* (1) and *very much like me* (7) (Duhachek 2008).

**SCALE NAME: Coping Strategy (Emotional Support)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point items are used to measure a person's motivation to seek comfort after a stressful situation by interacting with others who are trusted and respected.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Duhachek (2005) constructed this measure along with seven others in an effort to efficiently capture the breadth of strategies people apparently use to cope with stress. After examining the literature and gathering items from ten previous instruments, some 250 items were collected. Once conceptually redundant items were deleted, 53 items remained. After an initial exploratory factor analysis, no single solution could easily be deemed "best." However, using the data available and in an effort to be consistent with the literature, an eight-factor solution was settled upon. The results of two confirmatory factor analyses were then used to support that solution.

**RELIABILITY:**

Duhachek (2005) reported an alpha of .83 for the scale based on Study 1 data.

**VALIDITY:**

Only two of the other subscales were deemed to have high enough correlations with this scale to be concerned about: instrumental support (#247) and emotional venting (#246). In successive analyses, Duhachek (2005) collapsed emotional support with one of the other scales and retested the model. Indeed, the fit in each case was significantly worse, suggesting that despite their correlations, the scales were distinct.

**REFERENCES:**

Duhachek, Adam (2005), "Coping: A Multidimensional, Hierarchical Framework of Responses to Stressful Consumption Episodes," *JCR*, 32 (June), 41-53.  
Duhachek, Adam (2008), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Seek out others for comfort
2. Tell others how I feel
3. Rely on others to make me feel better
4. Share my feelings with others I trusted and respected

---

<sup>1</sup> Duhachek (2005) asked respondents to imagine a time when they had a stressful incident with a service organization and then to indicate to what extent they would cope with their stress via each of the ways described in the items. The verbal anchors used with these items were *not at all like me* (1) and *very much like me* (7) (Duhachek 2008).

**SCALE NAME: Coping Strategy (Emotional Venting)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six, seven-point items intended to measure a person's motivation to deal with a stressful situation by a release of feelings and trying to understand them.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Duhachek (2005) constructed this measure along with seven others in an effort to efficiently capture the breadth of strategies people apparently use to cope with stress. After examining the literature and gathering items from ten previous instruments, some 250 items were collected. Once conceptually redundant items were deleted, 53 items remained. After an initial exploratory factor analysis, no single solution could easily be deemed "best." However, using the data available and in an effort to be consistent with the literature, an eight-factor solution was settled upon. The results of two confirmatory factor analyses were then used to support that solution.

**RELIABILITY:**

Duhachek (2005) reported an alpha of .78 for the scale based on Study 1 data.

**VALIDITY:**

Only one of the other subscales was deemed to have a high enough correlation with this scale to be concerned about: emotional support (#245). Duhachek (2005) collapsed the pair and then retested the model. Indeed, the fit was significantly worse, suggesting that despite their correlation ( $r = .50$ ), the two scales were distinct.

**REFERENCES:**

- Duhachek, Adam (2005), "Coping: A Multidimensional, Hierarchical Framework of Responses to Stressful Consumption Episodes," *JCR*, 32 (June), 41-53.  
Duhachek, Adam (2008), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Take time to express my emotions
2. Let my feelings out somehow
3. Delve into my feelings to understand of them
4. Would take time to figure out what I am feeling
5. Would realize that my feelings are valid and justified
6. Would acknowledge my emotions

---

<sup>1</sup> Duhachek (2005) asked respondents to imagine a time when they had a stressful incident with a service organization and then to indicate to what extent they would cope with their stress via each of the ways described in the items. The verbal anchors used with these items were *not at all like me* (1) and *very much like me* (7) (Duhachek 2008).

**SCALE NAME: Coping Strategy (Instrumental Support)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point items that are intended to measure a person's motivation to deal with a stressful situation by seeking advice from others about the kind of action that should be taken.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Duhachek (2005) constructed this measure along with seven others in an effort to efficiently capture the breadth of strategies people apparently use to cope with stress. After examining the literature and gathering items from ten previous instruments, some 250 items were collected. Once conceptually redundant items were deleted, 53 items remained. After an initial exploratory factor analysis, no single solution could easily be deemed "best." However, using the data available and in an effort to be consistent with the literature, an eight-factor solution was settled upon. The results of two confirmatory factor analyses were then used to support that solution.

**RELIABILITY:**

Duhachek (2005) reported an alpha of .84 for the scale based on Study 1 data.

**VALIDITY:**

Only one of the other subscales was deemed to have a high enough correlation with this scale to be concerned about: emotional support (#245). Duhachek (2005) collapsed the pair and then retested the model. Indeed, the fit was significantly worse, suggesting that despite their correlation ( $r = .50$ ), the two scales were distinct.

**REFERENCES:**

Duhachek, Adam (2005), "Coping: A Multidimensional, Hierarchical Framework of Responses to Stressful Consumption Episodes," *JCR*, 32 (June), 41-53.  
Duhachek, Adam (2008), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Ask friends with similar experiences what they did
2. Try to get advice from someone about what to do
3. Have a friend assist me in fixing the problem

---

<sup>1</sup> Duhachek (2005) asked respondents to imagine a time when they had a stressful incident with a service organization and then to indicate to what extent they would cope with their stress via each of the ways described in the items. The verbal anchors used with these items were *not at all like me* (1) and *very much like me* (7) (Duhachek 2008).

## #248 Coping Strategy (Positive Thinking)

### **SCALE NAME: Coping Strategy (Positive Thinking)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has four, seven-point items that are intended to measure a person's motivation to react to a stressful situation by mentally restructuring the event in order for it to be more tolerable.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Duhachek (2005) constructed this measure along with seven others in an effort to efficiently capture the breadth of strategies people apparently use to cope with stress. After examining the literature and gathering items from ten previous instruments, some 250 items were collected. Once conceptually redundant items were deleted, 53 items remained. After an initial exploratory factor analysis, no single solution could easily be deemed "best." However, using the data available and in an effort to be consistent with the literature, an eight-factor solution was settled upon. The results of two confirmatory factor analyses were then used to support that solution.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Duhachek (2005) reported an alpha of .85 for the scale based on Study 1 data.

#### **VALIDITY:**

Since this scale had "low" correlations ( $r \leq .33$ ) with the other subscales, Duhachek (2005) did not believe any special tests of discriminant validity were needed.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Duhachek, Adam (2005), "Coping: A Multidimensional, Hierarchical Framework of Responses to Stressful Consumption Episodes," *JCR*, 32 (June), 41-53.  
Duhachek, Adam (2008), Personal Correspondence.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Try to look at the bright side of things
2. Focus on the positive aspects of the problem
3. Look for the good in what happened
4. Try to make the best of the situation

---

<sup>1</sup> Duhachek (2005) asked respondents to imagine a time when they had a stressful incident with a service organization and then to indicate to what extent they would cope with their stress via each of the ways described in the items. The verbal anchors used with these items were not at all like me (1) and very much like me (7) (Duhachek 2008).

**SCALE NAME: Coping Strategy (Rational Thinking)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five items with a seven-point response format are used to measure a person's intention to deal with a stressful situation by making a deliberate effort to think before taking action and not to respond emotionally.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Duhachek (2005) constructed this measure along with seven others in an effort to efficiently capture the breadth of strategies people apparently use to cope with stress. After examining the literature and gathering items from ten previous instruments, some 250 items were collected. Once conceptually redundant items were deleted, 53 items remained. After an initial exploratory factor analysis, no single solution could easily be deemed "best." However, using the data available and in an effort to be consistent with the literature, an eight-factor solution was settled upon. The results of two confirmatory factor analyses were then used to support that solution.

**RELIABILITY:**

Duhachek (2005) reported an alpha of .81 for the scale based on Study 1 data.

**VALIDITY:**

Only one of the other subscales was deemed to have a high enough correlation with this scale to be concerned about: action (#242). Duhachek (2005) collapsed the pair and then retested the model. Indeed, the fit was significantly worse, suggesting that despite their correlation ( $r = .43$ ), those two scales were distinct.

**REFERENCES:**

Duhachek, Adam (2005), "Coping: A Multidimensional, Hierarchical Framework of Responses to Stressful Consumption Episodes," *JCR*, 32 (June), 41-53.  
Duhachek, Adam (2008), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Analyze the problem before reacting
2. Try to step back from the situation and be objective
3. Try to control my emotions
4. Try to keep my feelings from controlling my actions
5. Would use restraint to avoid acting rashly

---

<sup>1</sup> Duhachek (2005) asked respondents to imagine a time when they had a stressful incident with a service organization and then to indicate to what extent they would cope with their stress via each of the ways described in the items. The verbal anchors used with these items were *not at all like me* (1) and *very much like me* (7) (Duhachek 2008).

**SCALE NAME: Corporate Community Relations**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four item, seven-point Likert-type scale measures the degree to which a person believes that a local business (probably part of a larger corporation) is a “good” corporate citizen of the community due to its involvement in socially responsible activities. The activities were described in the instructions provided by Dean (2002) but were not specified in the items themselves.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not explicitly stated, the source of the scale appears to be Dean (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

As explained below, two subsets of items were used by Dean (2002), the alphas of which were .86 in both cases.

**VALIDITY:**

Each subscale (explained below) was said to have shown evidence of convergent and discriminant validity (Dean 2002).

**COMMENTS:**

The scale was used as a pre- and post-measure of attitude. The post-measure was administered after respondents were informed that the business had decided to support a local charitable event. The model being tested included CCR twice because it was expected that pre-CCR would have an effect on post-CCR. However, having two scales with the same items led to the measurement model having only marginal fit. Given that, one item from the set was deleted from the set of four to produce different subscales and then the model was respecified for testing the study’s hypotheses.

**REFERENCES:**

- Dean, Dwane Hal (2004), Personal Correspondence.  
Dean, Dwane Hal (2002), “Associating the Corporation with a Charitable Event Through Sponsorship: Measuring the Effects on Corporate Community Relations,” *JA*, 31 (4), 77-87.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ is a good corporate citizen of the communities in which it does business.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the business should be placed in the blank. The pre-CCR measure used items #1-#3 while the post-CCR measure had items #1, #2, and #4 (Dean 2004).

*#250 Corporate Community Relations*

2. \_\_\_\_\_ works to satisfy its social responsibilities to the communities it serves.
3. As a business, the \_\_\_\_\_ corporation fulfills its social obligations to the community.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ tries to “give back” something to those communities in which it operates.

**SCALE NAME: Corporate Social Responsibility (Treatment of Workers)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the importance of companies treating its foreign workers as well as its domestic employees. The scale was called *Nonprofit Domain Perceived Importance* by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .93 (Study 2) and .91 (Study 3) were reported for the scale by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Although some aspects of the scale's validity were probably assessed by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004), none were reported in the article.

**REFERENCES:**

Lichtenstein, Donald R., Minette E. Drumwright, and Bridgette M. Braig (2004), "The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Customer Donations to Corporate-Supported Nonprofits," *JM*, 68 (October), 16-32.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I strongly believe that companies should treat workers in their foreign manufacturing plants as well as they treat workers in their U.S. manufacturing plants.
2. I am committed to the corporate practice of treating workers in foreign and U.S. manufacturing plants equally well.
3. I believe that corporations should monitor their overseas manufacturing operations to make sure their business practices are fair to their workers.
4. I believe that corporations have a responsibility to make sure that the working conditions in their overseas manufacturing plants are as good as the working conditions in their U.S. plants.
5. Standing up for fair manufacturing practices in overseas plants is important.
6. Corporations will have a better foreign workforce if workers are treated the same as workers in their U.S. plants.

**SCALE NAME: Credibility (Attractiveness)****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of various semantic differentials measuring an aspect of source credibility related to beauty and classiness. The scale has been used to test the attractiveness of print ad models (Bower and Landreth 2001) and celebrity endorsers (Ohanian 1990, 1991; Till and Busler 2000). While the focus in Ohanian (1990) was on the development of a semantic differential version of the scale, Likert and Staple versions were developed as well though the exact phrasing of the items was not given in the article.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Ohanian (1990, 1991) as part of her construction of a multidimensional measure of credibility. Subscales were created for measuring the three proposed dimensions: attractiveness, expertise, and trustworthiness. While she conducted several exploratory and confirmatory analyses to refine the scales, she cites Bowers and Phillips (1967) and Whitehead (1968) as sources for the items she began with.

As for the scale's internal consistency, Ohanian (1990) reported construct reliabilities for the subscale for each of two celebrity endorsers. The reliabilities were .893 and .904 for attractiveness. Specific alpha coefficients were not reported by Ohanian (1991) but she did calculate them for both males and females and for four different celebrity endorser test ads. The alphas were described as being .82 or higher in each case. In terms of validity, Ohanian (1990) tested nomological validity by relating scores on the subscales to several self-reported behaviors. The hypothesized pattern was basically confirmed. Convergent and discriminant validity were examined using the multitrait-multimethod matrix and the analyses supported a claim of acceptable convergent and discriminant validity for the subscales. Average variance extracted was between .61 and .65 for each subscale.

**RELIABILITY:**

Bower and Landreth (2001) conducted two studies of models in advertisements in which the subscale of attractiveness was used and had the following alphas: .85 and .86. Likewise, Till and Busler (2000) provided an alpha of .94 for attractiveness. In the study by Stafford, Stafford, and Day (2002; Stafford 2004) the alpha was .8873 for attractiveness.

**VALIDITY:**

Little examination of the scale's validity has been reported by the various users. However, Stafford, Stafford, and Day (2002) presented the results of a CFA of the items they used to measure the three components of credibility as well as three  $A_{ad}$  constructs. All items loaded significantly on the appropriate factors.

## #252 Credibility (Attractiveness)

### COMMENTS:

The evidence indicates that credibility is a multidimensional construct, thus, users should not expect to accurately capture the full construct in just one, unidimensional scale. They should either use one subscale to measure the focal dimension of interest, such as attractiveness, or use three scales to measure the three dimensions.

### REFERENCES:

- Bower, Amanda B. and Stacy Landreth (2001), "Is Beauty Best? Highly Versus Normally Attractive Models in Advertising," *JA*, 30 (1), 1-12.
- Bowers, John W. and William A. Phillips (1967), "A Note on the Generality of Source Credibility Scales," *Speech Monographs*, 34 (August), 185-186.
- Ohanian, Roobina (1990), "Construction and Validation of a Scale to Measure Celebrity Endorsers' Perceived Expertise, Trustworthiness, and Attractiveness," *JA*, 19 (3), 39-52.
- Ohanian, Roobina (1991), "The Impact of Celebrity Spokes Persons' Perceived Image on Consumer's Intention to Purchase," *JAR*, 31 (1), 46-54.
- Stafford, Marla Royne (2004), Personal Correspondence.
- Stafford, Marla Royne, Thomas F. Stafford and Ellen Day (2002), "A Contingency Approach: The Effects of Spokesperson Type and Service Type on Service Advertising Perceptions," *JA*, 31 (2), 17-34.
- Till, Brian D. and Michael Busler (2001), "The Match-Up Hypothesis: Physical Attractiveness, Expertise, and the Role of Fit on Brand Attitude, Purchase Intent and Brand Beliefs," *JA*, 29 (3), 1-14.
- Whitehead, Jack L. (1968), "Factors of Source Credibility," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 54 (1), 59-63.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. unattractive / attractive
2. not classy / classy
3. ugly / beautiful
4. plain / elegant
5. not sexy / sexy

---

<sup>1</sup> A seven-point response scale was used by Bower and Landreth (2001) as well as Stafford, Stafford, and Day (2002) whereas Till and Busler (2000) used a nine-point format.

**SCALE NAME: Credibility (Expertise)****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of multiple bi-polar adjectives measuring a dimension of credibility related to a source's perceived skill and knowledge. The following applications of the scale (or parts of it) have been made: the expertise of a company (Goldsmith, Lafferty and Newell 2001); a website's reputation (Shamdasani, Stanaland, and Tan 2001); expertise of print ad models (Bower and Landreth 2001); and, credibility of celebrity endorsers (Ohanian 1990, 1991; Till and Busler 2000). While the focus in Ohanian (1990) was on the development of a semantic differential version of the scale, Likert and Staple versions were developed as well though the exact phrasing of the items was not given in the article.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Ohanian (1990, 1991) who engaged in considerable developmental work in construction of a multidimensional measure of credibility. Subscales were created for measuring the three proposed dimensions: expertise, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. While she conducted several exploratory and confirmatory analyses to refine the scales, she cites Bowers and Phillips (1967) and Whitehead (1968) as sources for the items she began with.

As for the scale's internal consistency, Ohanian (1990) reported construct reliabilities for the subscale for each of two celebrity endorsers. The reliabilities were .885 and .892 for expertise. Specific alpha coefficients were not reported by Ohanian (1991) but she did calculate them for both males and females and for four different celebrity endorser test ads. The alphas were described as being .82 or higher in each case.

In terms of validity, Ohanian (1990) tested nomological validity by relating scores on the subscales to several self-reported behaviors. The hypothesized pattern was basically confirmed. Convergent and discriminant validity were examined using the multitrait-multimethod matrix and the analyses supported a claim of acceptable convergent and discriminant validity for the subscales. Average variance extracted was between .61 and .65 for each subscale.

**RELIABILITY:**

Internal consistencies for each study are provided below and have been uniformly high, ranging from .8653 to .94.

**VALIDITY:**

Most of the studies have not reported any assessment of the scale's validity. Although no rigorous evaluation of the scale's validity was discussed in the article by Goldsmith, Lafferty and Newell (2001), it was stated that all of the scale items in their study were examined via principle axis factor analysis with oblique rotation. All of the items were described as loading as expected and those intended to measure "corporate credibility"

## #253 Credibility (Expertise)

loaded on two factors (trustworthiness and expertise). This provides some rudimentary evidence of the scales' convergent and discriminant validity.

Stafford, Stafford, and Day (2002) presented the results of a CFA of the items they used to measure the three components of credibility as well as three  $A_{ad}$  constructs. All items loaded significantly on the appropriate factors.

### COMMENTS:

The evidence indicates that credibility is a multidimensional construct, thus, users should not expect to accurately capture the full construct in just one, unidimensional scale. They should either use one subscale to measure the focal dimension of interest, such as expertise, or use three scales to measure the three dimensions.

See also an apparent use of the scale (or a form of it) by Senecal and Nantel (2004).

### REFERENCES:

- Bower, Amanda B. (2001), "Highly Attractive Models in Advertising and the Women Who Loathe Them: The Implementations of Negative Affect for Spokesperson Effectiveness," *JA*, 30 (3), 51-63.
- Bower, Amanda B. and Stacy Landreth (2001), "Is Beauty Best? Highly Versus Normally Attractive Models in Advertising," *JA*, 30 (1), 1-12.
- Bowers, John W. and William A. Phillips (1967), "A Note on the Generality of Source Credibility Scales," *Speech Monographs*, 34 (August), 185-186.
- Goldsmith, Ronald E., Barbara A. Lafferty and Stephen J. Newell (2001), "The Impact of Corporate Credibility and Celebrity Credibility on Consumer Reaction to Advertisements and Brands," *JA*, 29 (3), 30-54.
- Ohanian, Roobina (1990), "Construction and Validation of a Scale to Measure Celebrity Endorsers' Perceived Expertise, Trustworthiness, and Attractiveness," *JA*, 19 (3), 39-52.
- Ohanian, Roobina (1991), "The Impact of Celebrity Spokes Persons' Perceived Image on Consumer's Intention to Purchase," *JAR*, 31 (1), 46-54.
- Senecal, Sylvain and Jacques Nantel (2004), "The Influence of Online Product Recommendations on Consumers' Online Choices," *JR*, 80 (2), 159-169.
- Shamdasani, Prem N., Andrea J. S. Stanaland, and Juliana Tan (2001), "Location, Location, Location: Insights for Advertising Placement on the Web," *JAR*, 41 (July-August), 7-21.
- Stafford, Marla Royne (2004), Personal Correspondence.
- Stafford, Marla Royne, Thomas F. Stafford and Ellen Day (2002), "A Contingency Approach: The Effects of Spokesperson Type and Service Type on Service Advertising Perceptions," *JA*, 31 (2), 17-34.
- Till, Brian D. and Michael Busler (2001), "The Match-Up Hypothesis: Physical Attractiveness, Expertise, and the Role of Fit on Brand Attitude, Purchase Intent and Brand Beliefs," *JA*, 29 (3), 1-14.
- Whitehead, Jack L. (1968), "Factors of Source Credibility," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 54 (1), 59-63.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. not an expert / expert
2. inexperienced / experienced
3. unknowledgeable / knowledgeable
4. unqualified / qualified
5. unskilled / skilled

Bower (2001): 1, 2, 3 7-point (?) [.89]

Bower and Landreth (2001): 1-5 7-point [.91, .94]

Goldsmith, Lafferty and Newell (2001): 1, 2, 5 7-point [.88]

Ohanian (1990): 1-5 7-point [.885, .892]

Shamdasani, Stanaland, and Tan (2001): 1-5 7-point [.94]

Stafford, Stafford, and Day (2002): 1-5 7-point [.8653]

Till and Busler (2000): 1-5 9-point [.94]

## #254 Credibility (Expertise)

### **SCALE NAME: Credibility (Expertise)**

### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, Likert-type statements are used to measure the credibility of an advertiser/company with an emphasis on its experience and skill.

### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Sinclair and Irani (2005) was developed by Newell and Goldsmith (2001). They conducted five studies to purify and validate two scales, one to capture the trustworthiness facet of credibility and another to capture the expertise facet.

### **RELIABILITY:**

Sinclair and Irani (2005) reported an alpha of .85.

### **VALIDITY:**

Sinclair and Irani (2005) did not report any evidence regarding the scale's validity.

### **REFERENCES:**

Newell, Stephen J. and Ronald E. Goldsmith (2001), "The Development of a Scale to Measure Perceived Corporate Credibility," *Journal of Business Research*, 52 (3), 235-247.

Sinclair, Janas and Tracy Irani (2005), "Advocacy Advertising for Biotechnology," *JA*, 34 (3), 59-73.

### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ has a great amount of experience.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ is skilled in what they do.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ has great expertise.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ does not have much experience. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the firm or advertiser should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Credibility (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point statements are used to measure the degree to which a person views an advertisement to be believable and realistic.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although these items have been used in various measures previously, the majority of scales measuring this construct have employed semantic differentials and do not have realism as an item. So, using these items together and in this format appears to be original to Williams and Drolet (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .92 (Experiment 1) and .86 (Experiment 2) were reported for the scale by Williams and Drolet (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Williams and Drolet (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Williams, Patti and Aimee Drolet (2005), "Age-Related Differences in Response to Emotional Advertisements," *JCR*, 32 (December), 343-354.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. This advertisement is believable.
2. This advertisement is credible.
3. This advertisement is realistic.

---

<sup>1</sup> The extreme verbal anchors for the response scale used by Williams and Drolet (2005) were *not at all* and *very much*.

**SCALE NAME: Credibility (Trustworthiness)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of various semantic differentials measuring a component of source credibility relating primarily to honesty and sincerity. The following applications of the scale (or parts of it) have been made: credibility of a nutrition claim in an ad (Andrews, Netemeyer, and Burton 1998; Andrews 2001; Andrews, Burton and Netemeyer 2001; Kozup, Creyer, and Burton 2003); credibility of merchant supplied price information (Lichtenstein and Bearden 1989); credibility of a store's ad (Bobinski, Cox, and Cox 1996); the trustworthiness of a company (Goldsmith, Lafferty and Newell 2001; MacKenzie and Lutz 1989); a website's reputation (Shamdasani, Stanaland, and Tan 2001); the credibility of a website's sponsor (Rifon et al. 2004); the trustworthiness of print ad models (Bower and Landreth 2001); trustworthiness of noncelebrity product endorsers (Moore, Mowen, and Reardon 1994); and, credibility of celebrity endorsers (Ohanian 1990, 1991; Till and Busler 2000; Tripp, Jensen, and Carlson 1994). While the focus in Ohanian (1990) was on the development of a semantic differential version of the scale, Likert and Staple versions were developed as well though the exact phrasing of the items was not given in the article.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Lohse and Rosen (2001) as well as Rifon et al. (2004) cited Mackenzie and Lutz (1989) as the source of the items they used and Tripp, Jensen, and Carlson (1994) cited McCroskey (1966) as their source. The scale used by Putrevu (2004) is a semantic-differential version of a scale he had used earlier in Likert form (Putrevu and Lord 1994).

Despite these other sources, Ohanian (1990, 1991) is probably the primary source for most of the studies. She engaged in considerable developmental work in construction of a multidimensional measure of credibility. Subscales were created for measuring the three proposed dimensions: expertise, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. While she conducted several exploratory and confirmatory analyses to refine the scales, she cites Bowers and Phillips (1967) and Whitehead (1968) as sources for the items she began with

Regarding scale internal consistency, Ohanian (1990) reported construct reliabilities for each subscale for each of two celebrity endorsers. The reliabilities were .895 and .896 for trustworthiness. Specific alpha coefficients were not reported by Ohanian (1991) but she did calculate them for both males and females and for four different celebrity endorser test ads. The alphas were described as being .82 or higher in each case.

As for validity, Ohanian (1990) tested nomological validity by relating scores on the subscales to several self-reported behaviors. The hypothesized pattern was basically confirmed. Convergent and discriminant validity were examined using the multitrait-multimethod matrix and the analyses supported a claim of acceptable convergent and discriminant validity for the subscales. Average variance extracted was between .61 and .65 for each subscale.

**RELIABILITY:**

Although varying somewhat in their item composition, the various versions of the scales have had acceptable if not high internal consistency ranging from .71 (Lohse and Rosen 2001) to .95 (Till and Busler 2000). (Specific reliabilities for each usage are provided below.)

**VALIDITY:**

Most of the studies have not reported any assessment of the scale's validity. Although no rigorous evaluation of the scale's validity was discussed in the article by Goldsmith, Lafferty and Newell (2001) it was stated that all of the scale items in their study were examined via principle axis factor analysis with oblique rotation. All of the items were described as loading as expected and those intended to measure "corporate credibility" loaded on two factors (trustworthiness and expertise). This provides some rudimentary evidence of the scales' convergent and discriminant validity.

Stafford, Stafford, and Day (2002) presented the results of a CFA of the items they used to measure the three components of credibility as well as three Aad constructs. All items loaded significantly on the appropriate factors.

**COMMENTS:**

See also a use of a form of this scale by Senecal and Nantel (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Andrews, J. Craig (2001), Personal Correspondence.
- Andrews, J. Craig, Scot Burton, and Richard G. Netemeyer (2001), "Are Some Comparative Nutrition Claims Misleading? The Role of Nutrition Knowledge, Ad Claim Type and Disclosure Conditions," *JA*, 29 (3), 29-42.
- Andrews, J. Craig, Richard G. Netemeyer, and Scot Burton (1998), "Consumer Generalization of Nutrient Content Claims in Advertising," *JM*, 62 (October), 62-75.
- Bobinski, George S. Jr., Dena Cox, and Anthony Cox (1996), "Retail 'Sale' Advertising, Perceived Retailer Credibility, and Price Rationale," *JR*, 72 (3), 291-306.
- Bower, Amanda B. (2001), "Highly Attractive Models in Advertising and the Women Who Loathe Them: The Implementations of Negative Affect for Spokesperson Effectiveness," *JA*, 30 (3), 51-63.
- Bower, Amanda B. and Stacy Landreth (2001), "Is Beauty Best? Highly Versus Normally Attractive Models in Advertising," *JA*, 30 (1), 1-12.
- Bowers, John W. and William A. Phillips (1967), "A Note on the Generality of Source Credibility Scales," *Speech Monographs*, 34 (August), 185-186.
- Dahlén, Miceal (2005), "The Medium as a Contextual Cue," *JA*, 34 (3), 89-98.
- Goldsmith, Ronald E., Barbara A. Lafferty, and Stephen J. Newell (2001), "The Impact of Corporate Credibility and Celebrity Credibility on Consumer Reaction to Advertisements and Brands," *JA*, 29 (3), 30-54.
- Kozup, John C., Elizabeth H. Creyer, and Scot Burton (2003), "Making Heathful Food Choices: The Influence of Health Claims and Nutrition Information on Consumers'

## #256 Credibility (Trustworthiness)

- Evaluations of Packaged Food Products and Restaurant Menu Items,” *JM*, 67 (April), 19-34.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R. and William O. Bearden (1989), “Contextual Influences on Perceptions of Merchant-Supplied Reference Prices,” *JCR*, 16 (June), 55-66.
- Lohse, Gerald L. and Dennis L. Rosen (2001), “Signaling Quality and Credibility in Yellow Pages Advertising: The Influence of Color and Graphics on Choice,” *JA*, 30 (2), 73-85.
- Mackenzie, Scott B. and Richard J. Lutz (1989), “An Empirical Examination of the Structural Antecedents of Attitude Toward the Ad in an Advertising Pretesting Context,” *JM*, 53 (April), 48-65.
- McCroskey, James C. (1966), “Scales for the Measurement of Ethos,” *Speech Monographs*, 33 (March), 65-72.
- Moore, David J., John C. Mowen, and Richard Reardon (1994), “Multiple Sources in Advertising Appeals: When product Endorsers Are Paid by the Advertising Sponsor,” *JAMS*, 22 (Summer), 234-243.
- Ohanian, Roobina (1990), “Construction and Validation of a Scale to Measure Celebrity Endorsers' Perceived Expertise, Trustworthiness, and Attractiveness,” *JA*, 19 (3), 39-52.
- Ohanian, Roobina (1991), “The Impact of Celebrity Spokes Persons' Perceived Image on Consumer's Intention to Purchase,” *JAR*, 31 (1), 46-54.
- Putrevu, Sanjay (2004), “Communicating with the Sexes,” *JA*, 33 (Fall), 51-62.
- Putrevu, Sanjay and Kenneth R. Lord (1994), “Comparative and Noncomparative Advertising: Attitudinal Effects Under Cognitive and Affective Involvement Conditions,” *JA*, 23 (June), 77-90.
- Rifon, Nora J., Sejung Marina Choi, Carrie S. Trimble and Hairong Li (2004), “Congruence Effects In Sponsorship,” *JA*, 33 (1), 29-42.
- Senecal, Sylvain and Jacques Nantel (2004), “The Influence of Online Product Recommendations on Consumers' Online Choices,” *JR*, 80 (2), 159-169.
- Sengupta, Jaideep and Gita Venkataramani Johar (2002), “Effects of Inconsistent Attribute Information on the Predictive Value of Product Attitudes: Toward a Resolution of Opposing Perspectives,” *JCR*, 29 (June), 39-56.
- Shamdasani, Prem N., Andrea J. S. Stanaland, and Juliana Tan (2001), “Location, Location, Location: Insights for Advertising Placement on the Web,” *JAR*, 41 (July-August), 7-21.
- Till, Brian D. and Michael Busler (2001), “The Match-Up Hypothesis: Physical Attractiveness, Expertise, and the Role of Fit on Brand Attitude, Purchase Intent and Brand Beliefs,” *JA*, 29 (3), 1-14.
- Tripp, Carolyn, Thomas D. Jensen, and Les Carlson (1994), “The Effects of Multiple Product Endorsements by Celebrities on Consumers' Attitudes and Intentions,” *JCR*, 20 (March), 535-547.
- Whitehead, Jack L. (1968), “Factors of Source Credibility,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 54 (1), 59-63.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> These items with an asterisk (\*) were used in slightly different form than shown here.

1. insincere / sincere
2. dishonest / honest
3. not dependable / dependable
4. not trustworthy / trustworthy
5. not credible / credible
6. biased / not biased
7. not believable / believable
8. disreputable / reputable
9. unreliable / reliable
10. untruthful / truthful
11. unconvincing / convincing
12. not at all expert / expert
13. not true / true

Andrews, Burton and Netemeyer (2001): 4\*, 5, 7\* 7-point [.89]

Andrews, Netemeyer, and Burton (1998; Andrews 2001): 4\*, 5, 7\* 7-point [.89]

Bobinski, Cox, and Cox (1996): 1\*, 2\*, 3\*, 4\*, 5\* 7-point [.91]

Bower and Landreth (2001): 1-4, 9, 7-point [.92 and .93]

Dahlén (2005): 6\*, 7\*, 11 7-point [.78]

Goldsmith, Lafferty and Newell (2001): 2, 4\*, 10\* 7-point [.85]

Kozup, Creyer, and Burton (2003): 2, 3, 4\* 7-point [.84-.93]

Lichtenstein and Bearden (1989): 1-5 9-point [.78]

Lohse and Rosen (2001): 6, 7, 11 7-point [.71]

MacKenzie and Lutz (1989): 6\*, 7\*, 11 7-point [.82]

Moore, Mowen, and Reardon (1994): 1, 6, 7, 10 7-point [.80]

Ohanian (1990): 1-4, 9 ?-point [.895 and .896]

Putrevu (2004): 1, 2, 7, 13 7-point [.88-.93]

Rifon et al. (2004): 6, 7, 11 7-point [.73]

Sengupta and Johar (2002): 4\*, 5\*, 7\*, 12\* 7-point [.86]

Shamdasani, Stanaland, and Tan (2001): 1-4, 9, 7-point [.94]

Stafford, Stafford, and Day (2002): 1, 2, 3\*, 4\*, 9 7-point [.9131]

Till and Busler (2000): 1-4, 9, 9-point [.95]

Tripp, Jensen, and Carlson (1994): 1, 2, 4, 5-8 7-point [.88]

**SCALE NAME: Credibility (Trustworthiness)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four item, Likert-type scale measures the credibility of a company or advertiser with an emphasis on the degree to which its claims are believed to be true.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Sinclair and Irani (2005) was developed by Newell and Goldsmith (2001). They conducted five studies to purify and validate two scales, one to capture the trustworthiness facet of credibility and another to capture the expertise facet.

**RELIABILITY:**

Sinclair and Irani (2005) reported an alpha of .80.

**VALIDITY:**

Sinclair and Irani (2005) did not report any evidence regarding the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Newell, Stephen J. and Ronald E. Goldsmith (2001), "The Development of a Scale to Measure Perceived Corporate Credibility," *Journal of Business Research*, 52 (3), 235-247.

Sinclair, Janas and Tracy Irani (2005), "Advocacy Advertising for Biotechnology," *JA*, 34 (3), 59-73.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I trust \_\_\_\_\_.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ makes truthful claims.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ is honest.
4. I do not believe what \_\_\_\_\_ tells me. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the firm or advertiser should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Credibility of the Company**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale measures a person's attitude about the trustworthiness and expertise of a company. The versions of the scale by Keller and Aaker (1992) and Niedrich and Swain (2003) were composed of six semantic differentials while a different configuration was used by Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004) and just focused on trustworthiness.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No detailed information is provided by Keller and Aaker (1992) regarding the scale's origin, but it appears to have been developed for use in their study. As noted below, the final form of the scale was a combination of items from two other scales, *trustworthiness* and *expertise*.

**RELIABILITY:**

All that is said by Keller and Aaker (1992) about the reliability of their multi-item scales is that they were all in excess of .70. Niedrich and Swain (2003) used the scale two times a piece in two studies (a total of four times) and the alphas ranged from .900 to .927. An alpha of .85 was reported by Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004) for their variation of the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Keller and Aaker (1992) reported no specific examination of the scale's validity. They did report that the correlation of scores on their *trustworthiness* and *expertise* scales was .82, which led them to treat the items as one measure of company credibility. More sophisticated testing is needed to determine if the items are truly unidimensional.

While Niedrich, Ronald W. and Scott D. Swain (2003) said that the scale showed evidence of discriminant validity in both of their studies, no specifics were provided. No evidence of scale validity was provided by Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep and Rajeev Batra (2004), "When Corporate Image Affects Product Evaluations: The Moderating Role of Perceived Risk," *JMR*, 41 (2), 197-205.
- Keller, Kevin Lane and David A. Aaker (1992), "The Effects of Sequential Introduction of Brand Extensions," *JMR*, 29 (February), 35-50.
- Niedrich, Ronald W. and Scott D. Swain (2003), "The Influence of Pioneer Status and Experience Order on Consumer Brand Preference: A Mediated-Effects Model," *JAMS*, 31 (4), 468-480.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> Both Keller and Aaker (1992) and Niedrich, Ronald W. and Scott D. Swain (2003) used items #1-#6, the former with a seven-point response scale and the latter with a nine-point format. The first three items

## #258 *Credibility of the Company*

1. Overall low quality products / Overall high quality products
2. Not at all good at manufacturing / Very good at manufacturing
3. Overall inferior products / Overall superior products
4. Not at all trustworthy / Very trustworthy
5. Not at all dependable / Very dependable
6. Not at all concerned about customers / Very concerned about customers
7. \_\_\_\_\_ is a trustworthy company.<sup>2</sup>

---

compose the *expertise* subscale and #4-#6 are the *trustworthiness* subscale. The version of the scale by Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004) used items #4, #5, and #7 with a nine-point response format.

<sup>2</sup> The name of the focal company should be placed in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Crowding****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The seven-point semantic differential scale measures the perceived density of people in an area of space. The construct also carries with it the sense that perceived crowding is linked with stress and is an unpleasant subjective experience.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

It appears that the scale was first used by Bateson and Hui (1987). With a convenience sample of 30 business school students, the alpha was reported to be .91. The measure was found to have high negative correlations with dominance and pleasure but no significant relationship with arousal.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .86 and .90 were reported for the scale by Bateson and Hui (1992) and Hui and Bateson (1991), respectively. Grewal et al. (2003) reported that the version of the scale they used had a construct reliability of .92.

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not specifically addressed by either Bateson and Hui (1992) or Hui and Bateson (1991). However, some idea of the scale's convergent validity can be taken from correlations between it and another scale used to measure the same construct (Bateson and Hui 1992, p. 278). In three different situations the correlations were .65 or higher, providing evidence that the two measures were tapping into the same construct.

Grewal et al. (2003) provided evidence in support of their scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bateson, John E. G. and Michael K. Hui (1987), "A Model for Crowding in the Service Experience: Empirical Findings," in *The Service Challenge: Integrating for Competitive Advantage*, John A. Czepiel et al., eds. Chicago: American Marketing Association, 85-90.
- Bateson, John E. G. and Michael K. Hui (1992), "The Ecological Validity of Photographic Slides and Videotapes in Simulating the Service Setting," *JCR*, 19 (September), 271-281.
- 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," *JR*, 79 (4), 259-268.
- Hui, Michael K. and John E. G. Bateson (1991), "Perceived Control and the Effects of Crowding and Consumer Choice on the Service Experience," *JCR*, 18 (September), 174-184.

## #259 *Crowding*

### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. Not stuffy / Stuffy
2. Uncrowded / Crowded
3. Uncramped / Cramped
4. Restricted / Free to move
5. Confined / Spacious

---

<sup>1</sup> Bateson and Hui (1992) and Hui and Bateson (1991) used all of these items whereas Grewal et al. (2003) only used #3-#5.

**SCALE NAME: Cultural Orientation (Horizontal Collectivism)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of eight items measuring the degree to which self is viewed in terms of its interdependence on the group, where similarity and equality of members is stressed.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Singelis et al. (1995). A considerable amount of research was conducted to develop an instrument that would reflect the distinctions between two dimensions of cultural orientation: horizontal/vertical and collectivism/individualism. Given this, four scales were developed and tested. Confirmatory factor analysis showed that the four-factor model provided better fit than the two- and one-factor models. The reliability (alpha) for the horizontal collectivism scale was .74.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .70 was reported for the scale by Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000b).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000b).

**COMMENTS:**

See also Agrawal and Maheswaran (2005), Mattila and Patterson (2004), as well as Polyorat and Alden (2005). In these cases, this scale or something very much like it appears to be what they referred to as the interdependence subscale of the self-construal scale.

**REFERENCES:**

- Agrawal, Nidhi and Durairaj Maheswaran (2005), "The Effects of Self-Construal and Commitment on Persuasion," *JCR*, 31 (March), 841-849.
- Gürhan-Canli, Zeynep and Durairaj Maheswaran (2000b), "Cultural Variations in Country of Origin Effects," *JMR*, 37 (3), 309-317.
- Matilla, Anna S. and Paul G. Patterson (2004), "The Impact of Culture on Consumers' Perceptions of Service Recovery Efforts," *JR*, 80 (3), 196-206.
- Polyorat, Kawpong and Dana L. Alden (2005), "Self-Construal and Need-For-Cognition Effects on Brand Attitudes and Purchase Intentions in Response to Comparative Advertising in Thailand and the United States," *JA*, 34 (1), 37-48.
- Singelis, Theodore M., Harry C. Triandis, Dharm P.S. Bhawuk, and Michele J. Gelfand (1995), "Horizontal and Vertical Dimensions of Individualism and Collectivism: A Theoretical and Measurement Refinement," *Cross-Cultural Research*, 29 (August), 341-375.

#260 *Cultural Orientation (Horizontal Collectivism)*

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. The well-being of my coworkers is important to me.
2. If a coworker gets a prize, I would feel proud.
3. If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would help within my means.
4. It is important to maintain harmony within my group.
5. I like sharing little things with my neighbors.
6. I feel good when I cooperate with others.
7. My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me.
8. To me, pleasure is spending time with others.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000b) used a seven-point response format but did not describe the exact nature of the verbal anchors. The original format by Singelis et al. (1995) appears to have been a nine-point scale with anchors ranging from *never or definitely no* to *always or definitely yes*.

**SCALE NAME: Cultural Orientation (Horizontal Individualism)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The purpose of the eight-item scale is to measure the degree to which a person expresses a tendency towards self-reliance. Self is viewed in terms of its autonomy from the group though not in terms of relative status.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Singelis et al. (1995). A considerable amount of research was conducted to develop an instrument that would reflect the distinctions between two dimensions of cultural orientation: horizontal/vertical and collectivism/individualism. Given this, four scales were developed and tested. Confirmatory factor analysis showed that the four-factor model provided better fit than the two- and one-factor models. The reliability (alpha) for the horizontal individualism scale was .67.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .74 was reported for the scale by Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000b).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000b).

**COMMENTS:**

See also Agrawal and Maheswaran (2005), Mattila and Patterson (2004), as well as Polyorat and Alden (2005). In these cases, this scale or something very much like it appears to be what they referred to as the independent subscale of the self-construal scale.

**REFERENCES:**

- Agrawal, Nidhi and Durairaj Maheswaran (2005), "The Effects of Self-Construal and Commitment on Persuasion," *JCR*, 31 (March), 841-849.
- Gürhan-Canli, Zeynep and Durairaj Maheswaran (2000b), "Cultural Variations in Country of Origin Effects," *JMR*, 37 (3), 309-317.
- Matilla, Anna S. and Paul G. Patterson (2004), "The Impact of Culture on Consumers' Perceptions of Service Recovery Efforts," *JR*, 80 (3), 196-206.
- Polyorat, Kawpong and Dana L. Alden (2005), "Self-Construal and Need-For-Cognition Effects on Brand Attitudes and Purchase Intentions in Response to Comparative Advertising in Thailand and the United States," *JA*, 34 (1), 37-48.
- Singelis, Theodore M., Harry C. Triandis, Dharm P.S. Bhawuk, and Michele J. Gelfand (1995), "Horizontal and Vertical Dimensions of Individualism and Collectivism: A Theoretical and Measurement Refinement," *Cross-Cultural Research*, 29 (August), 341-375.

#261 *Cultural Orientation (Horizontal Individualism)*

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. I often do “my own thing.”
2. One should live one’s life independently of others.
3. I like my privacy.
4. I prefer to be direct and forthright when discussing with people.
5. I am a unique individual.
6. What happens to me is my own doing.
7. When I succeed, it is usually because of my abilities.
8. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000b) used a seven-point response format but did not describe the exact nature of the verbal anchors. The original format by Singelis et al. (1995) appears to have been a nine-point scale with anchors ranging from *never or definitely no* to *always or definitely yes*.

**SCALE NAME: Curiosity about the Product**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four item scale measures the degree to which a consumer is motivated to seek out more information regarding a certain product.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The details of the scale's development were not described by Menon and Soman (2002) but it seems that the scale is original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .80 was reported for the scale as used in Experiment 1 by Menon and Soman (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No analysis of the scale's validity was reported by Menon and Soman (2002).

**COMMENTS:**

As written, the scale assumes that respondents are familiar with the product and have also been recently exposed to a print ad for it. If this is not a correct assumption then the scale will have to be modified somewhat, particularly item #3.

**REFERENCES:**

Menon, Satya and Dilip Soman (2002), "Managing the Power of Curiosity for Effective Web Advertising Strategies," *JA*, 29 (3), 1-14.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How curious do you feel about this product?
2. How interested would you be in reading more about this product?
3. How involved did you feel in reading the advertisement about the product?
4. How interested would you be in checking out this product at a store?

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors for the response scale were not specified by Menon and Soman (2002) but would appear to have been something like *little/a lot*.

**SCALE NAME: Cynicism (Political)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to assess a person's attitude about a political system with an emphasis on statements reflecting distrust and lack of confidence in the system.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Pinkleton, Um, and Austin (2002) cited several previous studies that examined this construct, they drew items for their scale most directly from a previous study by two of the authors (Pinkleton, Austin, and Fortman 1998). The later scale appears to be a subset of the earlier scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .84 and .88 were reported for the scale as used by Pinkleton, Um, and Austin (2002) in a pretest and posttest, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Pinkleton, Um, and Austin (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

- Pinkleton, Bruce E., Erica Weintraub Austin, and Kristine K.J. Fortman (1998), "Relationships of Media Use and Political Disaffection to Political Efficacy and Voting Behavior," *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 42 (Winter), 34-49.
- Pinkleton, Bruce E., Nam-Hyun Um, and Erica Weintraub Austin (2002), "An Exploration of the Effects of Negative Political Advertising on Political Decision Making," *JA*, 31 (Spring), 13-25.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Politicians lose touch with people quickly.
2. Political candidates are only interested in people's votes, not their opinions.
3. Too many politicians only serve themselves or special interests.
4. It seems our government is run by a few big interests just out for themselves.
5. Politicians lie to the media and the public.

**SCALE NAME: Cynicism (Political)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The eight item, seven-point Likert-type scale measures the degree of confidence and trust a person has in politicians and the government.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Kaid (2002) stated that she adapted items from scales she had used with colleagues in previous research (Kaid, McKinney, and Tedesco 2000; Tedesco and Kaid 2000).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas for the scale were reported to be .75 and .77 in the pre- and post-tests, respectively (Kaid 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Kaid (2002).

**COMMENTS:**

See also Tedesco (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

- Kaid, Lynda Lee (2002), "Political Advertising and Information Seeking: Comparing Exposure via Traditional and Internet Channels," *JA*, 31 (Spring), 27-35.
- Kaid, Lynda Lee, M.S. McKinney, and J. C. Tedesco (2000), *Civic Dialogue in the 1996 Presidential Campaign: Candidate, Media, and Public Voices*, Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Tedesco, John C. (2002), "Televised Political Advertising Effects: Evaluating Responses During the 2000 Robb-Allen Senatorial Election," *JA*, 31 (Spring), 37-48.
- Tedesco, John C. and L.L. Kaid (2000), "Candidate Web Sites and Voter Effects: Investigating Uses and Gratifications," paper presented at the National Communication Association Convention, (November), Seattle.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Whether I vote or not has no influence on what politicians do.
2. One never really knows what politicians think.
3. People like me don't have any say about that the government does.
4. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.
5. One can be confident that politicians will always do the right thing (r).

*#264 Cynicism (Political)*

6. Politicians often quickly forget their election promises after a political campaign is over.
7. Politicians are more interested in power than in what the people think.
8. One cannot always trust what politicians say.

**SCALE NAME: Depression****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of twenty, four point statements assessing the extent to which a person makes statements symptomatic of depression in adults. The formal name for the measure is Center for Epidemiology Depression scale (CES-D).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed for the National Institute of Mental Health by Radloff (1977) and has been considered the best measure for detecting symptoms of depression in adults (Myers and Weissman 1980). Evidence of the scale's reliability and validity comes from a wide variety of populations (Radloff 1977; Roberts and Vernon 1983). Although the scale allows depression to be measured as a continuous variable, scores have typically been treated dichotomously such that respondents are categorized as either depressive or nondepressive based on a cut-off score. Evidence supporting a score of 16 as the appropriate cut-off can be found in Boyd et al. (1982) and Eaton and Kessler (1981).

**RELIABILITY:**

The alphas for the scale were .81 in Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002; Keller 2005) and .75 in Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported in the studies by Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002, 2003).

**REFERENCES:**

- Boyd, Jeffrey H., Myrna M. Weissman, Douglas W. Thompson, and Jerome K. Myers (1982), "Screening for Depression in a Community Sample: Understanding the Discrepancies Between Depression Symptoms and Diagnostic Scales," *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 39 (October), 1195-1200.
- Eaton, William W. and Ronald G. Kessler (1981), "Rates of Symptoms of Depression in a National Sample," *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 114 (October), 528-538.
- Keller, Punan Anand, (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Keller, Punan Anand, Issac M. Lipkus, and Barbara K. Rimer (2002), "Depressive Realism and Health Risk Accuracy: The Negative Consequences of Positive Mood," *JCR*, 29 (June), 57-69.
- Keller, Punan Anand, Issac M. Lipkus, and Barbara K. Rimer (2003), "Affect, Framing, and Persuasion," *JMR*, 40 (February), 54-65.
- Myers, Jerome K. and Myrna M. Weissman (1980), "Use of Self-Report Symptom Scale to Detect Depression in a Community Sample," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 137 (September), 1081-1084.

## #265 Depression

Radloff, Lenore S. (1977), "The CES-D Scale: A Self-Report Depression Scale for Research in the General Population," *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1 (3), 385-401.

Roberts, Robert E. and Sally W. Vernon (1983), "The Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale: Its Use in a Community Sample," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 140 (January), 41-46.

### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me.
2. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor.
3. I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with help from my family or friends.
4. I felt that I was just as good as other people.
5. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.
6. I felt depressed.
7. I felt that everything I did was an effort.
8. I felt hopeful about the future.
9. I thought my life had been a failure.
10. I felt fearful.
11. My sleep was restless.
12. I was happy.
13. I talked less than usual.
14. I felt lonely.
15. People were unfriendly.
16. I enjoyed life.
17. I had crying spells.
18. I felt sad.
19. I felt that people disliked me.
20. I could not get "going."

---

<sup>1</sup> Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002, 2003) reported using the following verbal anchors with these items: *none of the time* (0), *a little of the time* (1), *a moderate amount of the time* (2), and *most of the time* (3).

**SCALE NAME: Depression****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The seven-item, seven-point Likert-type scale attempts to assess the degree to which a person has an affective disorder characterized by feelings of hopelessness, loneliness, and poor self-esteem.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Burroughs (Burroughs 2005; Burroughs and Rindfleisch 2002) is a slight adaptation of a scale developed by Lovibond and Lovibond (1995). The former phrased the items in the present tense while the latter phrased them in the past tense. Also, the former used a seven-point *agree/ disagree* response scale while the latter used a four-point response format ranging from *did not apply to me at all* to *applied to me very much or most of the time*. The seven-item scale is a short version of a fourteen-item depression subscale of an instrument called DASS (depression, anxiety, stress scales).

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale as used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) was .93 ( $n \approx 373$ ).

**VALIDITY:**

Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) reported that the scale had a high negative correlations with measures of happiness and life satisfaction as well as having strong positive correlations with measures of neuroticism, stress, and anxiety. These correlations along with general evidence from the LISREL analysis of all their measures provided evidence in support of the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.
- Lovibond, P. F. and S. H. Lovibond (1995), "The Structure of Negative Emotional States: Comparison of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) with the Beck Depression and Anxiety Inventories," *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 33 (3), 335-343.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I often feel downhearted and blue.
2. I regularly feel like I have nothing to look forward to.
3. I often feel that life is meaningless.
4. I often feel like I am not worth much as a person.
5. I have difficulty becoming enthusiastic about almost anything.
6. I can't seem to experience any positive feeling at all.

#266 *Depression*

7. I find it difficult to work up the initiative to do things.

**SCALE NAME: Desirable Responding**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is intended to measure both the tendency to give self-reports that are honest but positively biased (*self-deceptive positivity*) as well as deliberate self-presentation to others (*impression management*). Scores are based upon the extent to which respondents consider forty statements about their behavior to be true. The full instrument is called the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

This version of the BIDR scale was developed by Paulhus (1984) but is based upon an earlier instrument by Sackeim and Gur (1978). Alphas have been reported to range from .75 to .86 for the impression management component, .68 to .80 for the self-deceptive positivity component, and .83 for the scale as a whole (Paulhus 1988). The stability (5-week test-retest) was reported to be .65 for impression management and .69 for self-deceptive positivity (Paulhus 1988). A variety of data have been presented in support of the scale's validity among which is a correlation of .71 between the complete BIDR and the Marlowe-Crowne scale (Paulhus 1988). (See Robinson, Shaver, and Wrightsman 1991 for more details.)

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .75 was reported for the scale by Lastovicka et al.(1999). Just the impression management portion of the scale was used in the studies by Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose (2001) and Tian, Bearden, and Hunter (2001) with alphas of .81 and .77 being reported for it, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of BIDR's validity was reported by Lastovicka et al. (1999), Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose (2001), or Tian, Bearden, and Hunter (2001) although it was used in each case in the process of validating other scales.

**COMMENTS:**

With the forty items of the BIDR intentionally tapping into two constructs, it is highly unlikely that the BIDR is unidimensional, a characteristic that is now viewed as essential for proper measurement of any construct (Gerbing and Anderson 1988). If the sets of items composing the two components are shown to be unidimensional and those two factors are shown to load appropriately on a higher order factor (desirable responding) then a composite score of all forty items might be acceptable.

See also Mick (1996) and Bloch, Brunel, and Arnold (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

## #267 Desirable Responding

- Bearden, William O., David M. Hardesty, and Randall L. Rose (2001), "Consumer Self Confidence: Refinements in Conceptualization and Measurement," *JCR*, 28 (June), 121-134.
- Bloch, Peter H., Frédéric F. Brunel, and Todd J. Arnold (2003), "Individual Differences in the Centrality of Visual Product Aesthetics: Concept and Measurement," *JCR*, 29 (March), 551-565.
- Gerbing, David W. and James C. Anderson (1988), "An Updated Paradigm for Scale Development Incorporating Unidimensionality and Its Assessment," *JMR*, 52 (May), 186-192.
- Lastovicka, John L., Lance A. Bettencourt, Renee Shaw Hughner, and Ronald J. Kuntze (1999), "Lifestyle of the Tight and Frugal: Theory and Measurement," *JCR*, 26 (June), 85-98.
- Mick, David Glen (1996), "Are Studies of Dark Side Variables Confounded by Socially Desirable Responding? The Case of Materialism," *JCR*, 23 (September), 106-119.
- Paulhus, Delroy L. (1984), "Two-Component Models of Socially Desirable Responding," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46 (3), 598-609.
- Paulhus, Delroy L. (1988), *Assessing Self-Deception and Impression Management in Self-Reports: the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding*. Manual available from the author at the Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1Y7.
- Robinson, John P., Phillip R. Shaver, and Lawrence S. Wrightsman (1991), *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes*, San Diego: Academic Press.
- Sackeim, H. A. and R. C. Gur (1978), "Self-deception, Self-confrontation and Consciousness," in *Consciousness and Self-Regulation: Advances in Research*, G. E. Schwartz and D. Shapiro. New York: Plenum, V. 2, pp.139-197.
- Tian, Kelly T., William O. Bearden and Gary L. Hunter (2001), "Consumers' Need for Uniqueness: Scale Development and Validation," *JCR*, 28 (June), 50-66.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. My first impressions of people usually turn out to be right.(r)
2. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.
3. I don't care to know what other people really think of me.
4. I have not always been honest with myself.(r)
5. I always know why I like things.
6. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.(r)
7. Once I've made up my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.
8. I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.(r)
9. I am fully in control of my own fate.
10. It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.(r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The first twenty items are intended to measure self-deceptive positivity and the last twenty items measure impression management. The response format used by Paulhus (1984, 1988) ranged from 1 (*not true*) to 7 (*very true*). A dichotomous scoring procedure was used such that only items receiving a 6 or 7 were counted and added one point a piece. Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose (2001) as well as Tian, Bearden, and Hunter (2001) only used the 20 items composing the impression management subscale.

11. I never regret my decisions.
12. I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.(r)
13. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.
14. My parents were not always fair when they punished me.(r)
15. I am a completely rational person.
16. I rarely appreciate criticism.(r)
17. I am very confident of my judgments.
18. I have sometimes doubted my ability as a lover.(r)
19. It's all right with me if some people happen to dislike me.
20. I don't always know the reasons why I do the things I do.(r)
21. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.(r)
22. I never cover up my mistakes.
23. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.(r)
24. I never swear.
25. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.(r)
26. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
27. I have said something bad about a friend behind his or her back.(r)
28. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.
29. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.(r)
30. I always declare everything at customs.
31. When I was young I sometimes stole things.(r)
32. I have never dropped litter on the street.
33. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.(r)
34. I never read sexy books or magazines.
35. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.(r)
36. I never take things that don't belong to me.
37. I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.(r)
38. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.
39. I have some pretty awful habits.(r)
40. I don't gossip about other's people's business.

**SCALE NAME: Discomfort (Psychological)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point uni-polar items are used to measure the extent to which a person is experiencing a state of psychological tension and is troubled by it. Depending upon the scale stem and context in which it used, one could argue that the scale is a measure of cognitive dissonance.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Spangenberg et al. (2003) was borrowed from Elliot and Devine (1994). In a series of studies, the latter provided evidence in support of the scale's validity. The alphas were above .80.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was used by Spangenberg et al. (2003) in Studies 3A, 3B, and 4. The scale was also used in a "separate study" (footnote 2, p. 54) apparently conducted to provide further evidence of the scale's psychometric quality. The alphas in these studies ranged from .85 to .94.

**VALIDITY:**

For each of the four studies referred to above, Spangenberg et al. (2003) described the results of confirmatory factor analyses that provided evidence of the scale's psychometric quality. For example, the average variance extracted ranged from .72 to .84. Only in the "separate study," however, was the CFA conducted with more than one construct. In that study the scale was shown to have discriminant validity with respect to two other scales with which it bore some resemblance (positive and negative affect).

**REFERENCES:**

- Elliot, Andrew J. and Patricia G. Devine (1994), "On the Motivational Nature of Cognitive Dissonance: Dissonance as Psychological Discomfort," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67 (September), 382-394.
- Spangenberg, Eric R., David E. Sprott, Bianca Grohmann, and Ronn J. Smith (2003), "Mass-Communicated Prediction Requests: Practical Application and Cognitive Dissonance Explanation for Self-Prophecy," *JM*, 67 (July), 47-62.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. uncomfortable
2. uneasy
3. bothered

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format used by Spangenberg et al. (2003) had the following anchors: *does not apply at all* (1) and *applies very much* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Discomfort (Psychological)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point, one word descriptors are used to assess the strength of emotional and/or mental uneasiness reported by a person as a result of exposure to some stimulus. Using the same items but slightly different instructions, another version of the scale measured emotions depicted by someone else or in something else. The stimuli examined by Williams and Aaker (2002) were print ads but the scale appears to be amenable for use with a variety of stimuli.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Though the items or similar terms can be found among the many items offered by Holbrook and Batra (1988) as well as Izard (1977), the use of these three items as a summated scale appears to be original to Williams and Aaker (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was used in several studies reported by Williams and Aaker (2002) with alphas ranging from .68 to .87.

**VALIDITY:**

No specific examination of the scale's validity was reported by Williams and Aaker (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Holbrook, Morris B. and Rajeev Batra (1988), "Toward a Standardized Emotional Profile (SEP) Useful in Measuring Responses to the Nonverbal Components of Advertising," in *Nonverbal Communication in Advertising*, Sidney Hecker and David W. Stewart. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 101.

Izard, Carroll E. (1977), *Human Emotions*, New York: Plenum Press.

Williams, Patti and Jennifer L. Aaker (2002), "Can Mixed Emotions Peacefully Coexist?" *JCR*, 28 (March), 636-649.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. uncomfortable
2. conflicted
3. confuse

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors used for the seven-point response scale by Williams and Aaker (2002) were *not at all* and *very strongly*. See Experiment 2 by Williams and Aaker (2002) for two versions of the directions (*felt* vs. *depicted*).

**SCALE NAME: Disconfirmation**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has been used to measure the degree to which a consumer's expectations regarding a decision are not met. The three-item version has been used most (Oliver 1993; Oliver and Swan 1989a, 1989b; Wallace, Giese, and Johnson 2004, Westbrook 1987), but a two-item, seven-point version has been used as well (Oliver 1980).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The three-item version of the scale was based on the two-item version developed and used originally by Oliver (1980).

**RELIABILITY:**

The version of the scale used by Westbrook (1987) was reported to have an alpha of .84. Three LISREL estimates of the scale's reliability were made in Oliver and Swan (1989b). The consumers' disconfirmation perceptions regarding the dealer, the salesperson, and the car produced alphas of .86, .87, and .84, respectively. With regard to disconfirmation with a salesperson in Oliver and Swan (1989a), a LISREL estimate of .856 was reported. No reliability information was reported by Oliver (1980). Oliver (1993) reported alphas of .89 (n = 125) and .65 (n = 178). Wallace, Giese, and Johnson (2004) reported the reliability of their version of the scale to be .81.

**VALIDITY:**

No specific examination of scale validity has been reported in any of the studies except for Wallace, Giese, and Johnson (2004). In particular, they showed that satisfaction and disconfirmation were distinct constructs. The AVE of their scale was .59.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Niedrich, Kiryanova, and Black (2005) who adapted five disconfirmation items for use in two contexts and with four different "standards" inserted into the items: *wanted*, *needed*, *predicted*, and *should be*. Their conclusion was that "the choice of a specific standard should be based on conceptual considerations rather than selecting a 'best' standard" (p. 55).

**REFERENCES:**

- Niedrich, Ronald W., Elena Kiryanova, and William C. Black (2005) (2005), "The Dimensional Stability of the Standards Used in the Disconfirmation Paradigm," *JR*, 81 (1), 49-57.
- Oliver, Richard L. (1980), "A Cognitive Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Satisfaction Decisions," *JMR*, 17 (November), 460-69.

- Oliver, Richard L. (1993), "Cognitive, Affective, and Attribute Bases of the Satisfaction Response," *JCR*, 20 (December), 418-30.
- Oliver, Richard L. and John E. Swan (1989a), "Consumer Perceptions of Interpersonal Equity and Satisfaction in Transactions: A Field Survey Approach," *JM*, 53 (April), 21-35.
- Oliver, Richard L. and John E. Swan (1989b), "Equity and Disconfirmation Perceptions as Influences on Merchant and Product Satisfaction," *JCR*, 16 (December), 372-83.
- Wallace, David W., Joan L. Giese, and Jean L. Johnson (2004), "Customer Retailer Loyalty in the Context of Multiple Channel Strategies," *JR*, 80 (4), 249-263.
- Westbrook, Robert A. (1987), "Product/Consumption-Based Affective Responses and Postpurchase Processes," *JMR*, 24 (August), 258-70.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

The form used by Oliver (1980)

1. The problems you have encountered have been:
2. The benefits you have experienced have been:

\* \* \* \* \*

The form used by Oliver and Swan (1989a and 1989b)

Compared to what I expected the salesperson to be like:

3. The problems I had with him were . . .
4. His good points were . . .
5. Overall, my salesman was . . .

\* \* \* \* \*

The forms used by Oliver and Swan (1989b)

Compared to what I expected the dealership to be like:

1. The problems I had were . . .
2. The benefits I expected were . . .
3. Overall, the dealer was . . .

Compared to what I expected:

1. The car's strengths were . . .
2. The car's weaknesses were . . .
3. All things about the car were . . .

---

<sup>1</sup> Except for Wallace, Giese, and Johnson (2004), the actual items were not provided in the articles but are reconstructed here based upon the descriptions that were provided. The verbal anchors for the response scales used in the studies by Oliver seem to have been similar to those used by Wallace, Giese, and Johnson (2004).

## #270 *Disconfirmation*

\* \* \* \* \*

The form used by Wallace, Giese, and Johnson (2004)

1. Thinking about the problems you encountered during your purchase experience, were they:  
*much more serious than expected / much less serious than expected*
2. Overall, the benefits you received in your purchase were:  
*much worse than expected / much better than expected*
3. Overall, was your purchase experience:  
*much worse than expected / much better than expected*

**SCALE NAME: Dissatisfaction**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point uni-polar descriptors that are used to assess the degree to which a person reports being dissatisfied with some stimulus. As used by Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) the stimulus was a service experience.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) indicated that they had adapted a scale used by Crosby and Stephens (1987). Indeed, the latter had three semantic differentials and Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) took two of the anchors and them with an additional one as three item, uni-polar scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) reported an alpha of .692 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) used CFA to examine the items in the dissatisfaction scale along with some items supposed to measure anger (#31). A two-factor structure fit the data better than did the one factor model providing some evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bougie, Roger, Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2003), "Angry Customers Don't Come Back, They Get Back: The Experience and Behavioral Implications of Anger and Dissatisfaction in Services," *JAMS*, 31 (4), 377-393.
- Crosby, Lawrence A. and Nancy Stephens (1987), "Effects of Relationship Marketing on Satisfaction, Retention, and Prices in the Life Insurance Industry," *JMR*, 24 (November), 404-411.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

How did you feel about your experience on this occasion?

1. dissatisfied
2. displeased
3. discontented

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale anchors were not stated by Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) were probably something like *not at all* to *very much*.

**SCALE NAME: Donation Likelihood**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, five-point items measuring a person's expressed probability of contributing time, money, or other resources to a nonprofit organization.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not explicitly stated by Venable et al. (2005), the scale appears to have been developed by them.

**RELIABILITY:**

Venable et al. (2005) reported the following alphas for the scale: .74 (PBS), .86 (Greenpeace), and .78 (March of Dimes).

**VALIDITY:**

Venable et al. (2005) did not directly address the validity of this scale. However, the scale was used to provide support for the predictive validity of some brand personality scales. See the article for details, particularly the organization/brand personality dimensions for which significant correlations were not found with donation likelihood.

**REFERENCES:**

Venable, Beverly T., Gregory M. Rose, Victoria D. Bush and Faye W. Gilbert (2005), "The Role of Brand Personality in Charitable Giving: An Assessment and Validation," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 295-312.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

How likely is it that you will:

1. contribute any personal time?
2. contribute any money?
3. contribute something other than money or time?

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale anchors were *not very likely* (1) and *very likely* (5).

**SCALE NAME: Ease of Generating Reasons**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point statements are used to measure how easily a person completed a task in which he/she was supposed to provide reasons for doing something. In Tybout et al. (2005), subjects were asked to give potential reasons for driving a particular car.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale seems to have been created by Tybout et al. (2005). Apparently, the scale was used in Experiment 1 with American consumers whereas in Experiment 2 the items were translated into Korean and used with Korean consumers.

**RELIABILITY:**

Two alphas were reported for the scale by Tybout et al. (2005): .82 (Experiment 1) and .76 (Experiment 2).

**VALIDITY:**

Although the validity of the scale was not explicitly addressed by Tybout et al. (2005), its successful use as a manipulation check gives a sense of its predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Tybout, Alice M., Brian Sternthal, Prashant Malaviya, Georgios A. Bakamitsos, and Sebum Park (2005), "Information Accessibility as a Moderator of Judgments: The Role of Content versus Retrieval Ease," *JCR*, 32 (June), 76-85.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How difficult was it to generate reasons?
2. How annoying was it to generate reasons?
3. How confident were you about generating reasons?<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The extreme verbal anchors used with the scale by Tybout et al. (2005) were *not at all* and *very much*.

<sup>2</sup> Reverse-coding of the items was not indicated by Tybout et al. (2005) but it seems possible that this item would need to be coded in reverse of the other two items.

**SCALE NAME: Ease of Use**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The seven point semantic differential scale measures a person's beliefs concerning the time and effort involved in a specified activity. The activity examined by Dabholkar (1994) was ordering in a fast-food restaurant and two options were compared: touch screen ordering versus verbally placing the order with an employee. Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002) just examined the touch screen option.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of the scale appears to be Dabholkar (1994). Refinement of the scale occurred with a pretest sample that consisted of 141 undergraduate students. The scale produced alphas of .88 (touch screen ordering) and .80 (verbal ordering).

**RELIABILITY:**

Dabholkar (1994) reported construct reliabilities of .92 and .86 for the touch screen and verbal versions of the scale, respectively. An alpha of .90 was reported for the version of the scale used by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Results of confirmatory and exploratory factor analyses provided by Dabholkar (1994) indicated that both versions of the scale were unidimensional. Evidence was provided by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002) in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Dabholkar, Pratibha (1994), "Incorporating Choice into an Attitudinal Framework: Analyzing Models of Mental Comparison Processes," *JCR*, 21 (June), 100-118.
- Dabholkar, Pratibha and Richard P. Bagozzi (2002), "An Attitudinal Model of Technology-Based Self-Service: Moderating Effects of Consumer Traits and Situational Factors," *JAMS*, 30 (3), 184-201.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. will be complicated / will be simple
2. will take a lot of effort / will take a little effort

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem used by Dabholkar (1994; Dabholkar and Bagozzi 2002) was "Using a \_\_\_\_\_ to order fast food . . ." and *touch screen* or *verbal* were placed in the blank. Only one anchor for each pair was explicitly stated in the articles; the others are hypothetical reconstructions. Dabholkar (1994) used all six items while the final version of the scale used by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002) was composed of items #2, #4-#6.

3. will be confusing / will be clear
4. will take a long time / will take a short time
5. will require a lot of work / will require little work
6. will be slow / will be fast

**SCALE NAME: Ease of Use**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the degree to which a consumer believes that a good or service is free from effort when being used. Meuter et al. (2005) referred to this scale as *complexity* because they were studying the five key characteristics thought to influence adoption of innovations (Rogers 2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Meuter et al. (2005) drew from a scale by Moore and Benbasat (1991), the key phrases are quite common among the variety of ease-of-use scales that have been created at least since Davis (1989).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .83 and .88 were reported by Meuter et al. (2005) for use of the scale in Studies 1 and 2, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

At a general level, Meuter et al. (2005) tested a measurement model containing all of their constructs and indicators. Its fit was acceptable. The factor loadings were reported to be significant and evidence of discriminant validity was provided for each construct using two different tests (confidence interval, variance extracted).

**REFERENCES:**

- Davis Fred D. (1989), "Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use and user acceptance of information technology," *MIS Quarterly*, 13 (2), 319-339.
- Meuter, Matthew L., Mary Jo Bitner, Amy L. Ostrom, and Stephen W. Brown (2005), "Choosing Among Alternative Service Delivery Modes: An Investigation of Customer Trial of Self-Service Technologies," *JM*, 69 (April), 61-83.
- Moore, Gary C. and Izak Benbasat (1991), "Development of an Instrument to Measure the Perceptions of Adopting an Information Technology Innovation," *Information Systems Research*, 2 (3), 192-223.
- Rogers, Everett M. (2003), *Diffusion of Innovations*, New York: The Free Press.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I believe that the \_\_\_\_\_ is cumbersome to use. (r)
2. It is difficult to use the \_\_\_\_\_. (r)
3. I believe that the \_\_\_\_\_ is easy to use.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the good or service should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Ease of Use****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Eight, seven-point statements are used to assess how easily a person believes that a certain product can be used or learn to be used. Thompson et al. (2005) referred to the scale as *product usability*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Thompson et al. (2005) appear to have combined items from two primary sources to create their scale: Chin, Diehl, and Norman (1988) and Davis, Bagozzi, and Warshaw (1989).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was used several times in the studies reported by Thompson et al. (2005). The alphas ranged from .93 to .95 (Thompson 2008, Thompson et al. 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No explicit information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Thompson et al. (2005). They did, however, imply that in each study where the scale was used confirmatory factor analysis supported the validity of the scales in the models via acceptable goodness of fit and the items loading strongly on their respective factors.

**REFERENCES:**

- Chin, John P. , Virginia A. Diehl, Kent L. Norman (1988), "Development of an Instrument Measuring User Satisfaction of the Human-Computer Interface," in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 213-218.
- Davis, Fred D., Richard P. Bagozzi, and Paul R. Warshaw (1989), "User Acceptance of Computer Technology: A Comparison of Two Theoretical Models," *Management Science*, 35 (8), 982-1003.
- Thompson, Debora Viana (2008), Personal Correspondence.
- Thompson, Debora Viana, Rebecca W. Hamilton, and Roland T. Rust (2005), "Feature Fatigue: When Product Capabilities Become Too Much of a Good Thing," *JMR*, 42 (November), 431-442.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Considering this \_\_\_\_\_, rate how difficult you expect each of the following actions to be:

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors for the response scale used with the first two items were *difficult* and *easy*. For the other items, the anchors were *disagree* and *agree*. A generic name for the product category should be placed in the blanks of the scale stems, e.g., digital video player.

## #276 *Ease of Use*

1. Exploring new features by trial and error
2. Remembering use of commands

Considering this \_\_\_\_\_, rate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

3. Learning to use the product will be easy for me
4. Tasks can be performed in a straightforward manner
5. Interacting with the product will not require a lot of my mental effort
6. My interaction with the product will be clear and understandable
7. I think the product will be easy to use
8. I think it will be easy to get the product to do what I want it to do

**SCALE NAME: Ease of Use****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, seven-point Likert-type statements that are intended to measure a person's attitude regarding the effort required to learn and use something. Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) used the scale with mobile services but it appears to be amenable for use with goods as well.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) is built upon concepts and phrases in the ease-of-use scale described by Davis, Bagozzi, and Warshaw (1989). Four mobile services were examined in their study using the scale: text messaging, contact, payment, and gaming.

**RELIABILITY:**

The construct reliability for the scale across four mobile services studied was .95 (Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) supported the scale's validity by testing their measurement model. The model had 26 items measuring eight factors. The results indicated that each construct shared more variance with its indicators than with the other constructs in the study. Further, the fit indices indicated that the measurement model was acceptable for each of the four applications.

**REFERENCES:**

- Davis, Fred D., Richard P. Bagozzi, and Paul R. Warshaw (1989), "User Acceptance of Computer Technology: A Comparison of Two Theoretical Models," *Management Science*, 35 (8), 982-1003.
- Nysveen, Herbjørn, Per E. Pederson and Helge Thorbjørnsen (2005), "Intentions to Use Mobile Services: Antecedents and Cross-Service Comparisons," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 330-346.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Learning to use \_\_\_\_\_ is easy to me.
2. It is easy to make \_\_\_\_\_ do what I want it to.
3. My interaction with \_\_\_\_\_ is clear and understandable.
4. It is easy to use \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the object should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Easiness**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has four semantic-differentials and is intended to measure how easy a person views something to be or to have been. In Tybout et al. (2005), subjects were asked about the ease of giving reasons to drive a particular car.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale appears to have been created by Tybout et al. (2005). There seem to have been four conditions where it was used in Experiment 4: 1) think of one good reason to drive a certain car, 2) think of 10 good reasons to drive a certain car, 3) imagine one good reason to drive a certain car, and 4) imagine 10 goods reasons to drive a certain car.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alphas for the four conditions in which the scale were used were described as being greater than .90.

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Tybout et al. (2005).

**COMMENTS:**

See also Dellaert and Stremersch (2005) for a variation on the scale.

**REFERENCES:**

- Dellaert, Benedict G.C. and Stefan Stremersch (2005), "Marketing Mass-Customized Products: Striking a Balance Between Utility and Complexity," *JMR*, 42 (May), 219-227.
- Tybout, Alice M., Brian Sternthal, Prashant Malaviya, Georgios A. Bakamitsos, and Sebum Park (2005), "Information Accessibility as a Moderator of Judgments: The Role of Content versus Retrieval Ease," *JCR*, 32 (June), 76-85.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. very easy / difficult
2. not effortful / effortful
3. simple / complicated
4. breeze / hard work

**SCALE NAME: Efficacy (Political)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to assess a person's belief in his/her ability to participate effectively in the political system.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Pinkleton, Um, and Austin (2002) drew two items for their scale most directly from a previous study by two of the authors (Pinkleton, Austin, and Fortman 1998) and a third item from a study by Craig, Niemi, and Silver (1990). The scale is meant to tap into *internal* efficacy as opposed to external efficacy or cynicism.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .77 and .86 were reported for the scale as used by Pinkleton, Um, and Austin (2002) in a pretest and posttest, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Pinkleton, Um, and Austin (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

- Craig, Stephen C., Richard G. Niemi, and Glenn E. Silver (1990), "Political Efficacy and Trust: A Report on the NES Pilot Study Items," *Political Behavior*, 12 (Sept.), 289-314.
- Pinkleton, Bruce E., Erica Weintraub Austin, and Kristine K.J. Fortman (1998), "Relationships of Media Use and Political Disaffection to Political Efficacy and Voting Behavior," *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 42 (Winter), 34-49.
- Pinkleton, Bruce E., Nam-Hyun Um, and Erica Weintraub Austin (2002), "An Exploration of the Effects of Negative Political Advertising on Political Decision Making," *JA*, 31 (Spring), 13-25.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Voting is an effective way to influence what the government does.
2. I have a real say in what the government does.
3. My vote makes a difference.

#280 *Efficacy (Website Quality Judgment)*

**SCALE NAME: Efficacy (Website Quality Judgment)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three items compose the scale and measure a person's confidence in his/her ability to assess the quality of websites.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's origin was provided by Bart et al. (2005). It appears to be original to their work.

**RELIABILITY:**

The authors reported the scale to have an alpha of .87 (Bart et al. 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

The authors provided evidence that the measurement model was acceptable. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of this scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for this construct was .70.

**REFERENCES:**

Bart, Yakov, Venkatesh Shankar, Fareena Sultan, and Glen L. Urban (2005), "Are the Drivers and Role of Online Trust the Same for All Web Sites and Consumers? A Large-Scale Exploratory Study," *JM*, 69 (October), 133-152.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I consider myself to be quite knowledgeable about Internet sites in general.
2. I am confident in my ability to assess trustworthiness of web sites.
3. I am confident in my ability to assess the quality of a site.

---

<sup>1</sup> The nature of the response format was not described by Bart et al. (2005).

**SCALE NAME: Employee Effort**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure a person's perceptions of the amount of effort an employee has put into a particular service encounter.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is slightly modified version of a scale used by Mohr and Bitner (1995). The original scale had five items and was used to measure employee effort in the context of satisfaction with service transactions.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of 0.71 was reported by Mattila and Patterson (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Mattila and Patterson (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Mattila, Anna S. and Paul G. Patterson (2004), "The Impact of Culture on Consumers' Perceptions of Service Recovery Efforts," *JR*, 80 (3), 196-206.
- Mohr, Lois and Mary Jo Bitner (1995), "The Role of Employee Effort in Satisfaction with Service Transactions," *Journal of Business Research*, 32 (3), 239-252.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The employee exerted a lot of energy.
2. The employee did not spend much time in taking care of our needs.
3. The employee did not try very hard. (r)
4. The employee put a lot of effort into serving us.

**SCALE NAME: Envy**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

An eight-item, five-point Likert-type scale is used to measure the degree to which a person desires another person's possessions and resents others with the desired possessions. A shorter version of the scale was used by O'Guinn and Faber (1989; Faber and O'Guinn 1992). See also Richins (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of the scale is reported in Belk (1984). The measure of envy was one of three scales constructed for examining aspects of materialism. Initial pools of 30 or more items were tested for each of the three measures with 237 business school students. Using factor analysis, item-total correlations, and measures of internal consistency, seven or more items were chosen from each pool to measure the three materialism-related constructs. The eight items retained for measuring envy were reported to have an alpha of .80.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .64 was reported for one of the Belk (1984) samples (n = 338). A two-week, test-retest correlation of .70 (n=48) was reported for another Belk (1984, 1985) sample. O'Guinn and Faber (1989; Faber and O'Guinn) and Richins and Dawson (1992) reported alphas of .72 and .52, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

Belk (1984) compared scale scores with other measures in a multi-trait, multi-method matrix. As evidence of convergent validity, scores on the envy scale were correlated significantly with two other measures used to assess the same construct. Only partial support for discriminant validity was found. Evidence of criterion validity was found by noting that two known groups had significantly different mean scores on the scale and the differences were in the hypothesized directions.

No examination of scale validity was made by O'Guinn and Faber (1989) beyond factor analysis. Items regarding envy and two other materialism-related constructs were factor analyzed, and three factors clearly emerged. The authors did indicate that the scales were slightly modified on the basis of the factor analysis, however.

The validity of the envy scale was not addressed by Richins and Dawson (1992) except in the sense that it was used to assess the nomological validity of the materialism scale being developed.

**REFERENCES:**

Belk, Russell W. (1984), "Three Scales to Measure Constructs Related to Materialism: Reliability, Validity, and Relationships to Measures of Happiness," in *Advances in*

- Consumer Research, Vol. 11*, Thomas Kinnear, ed. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 291-97.
- Belk, Russell W. (1985), "Materialism: Trait Aspects of Living in the Material World," *JCR*, 12 (December), 265-80.
- Faber, Ronald J. and Thomas C. O'Guinn (1992), "A Clinical Screener for Compulsive Buying," *JCR*, 19 (December), 459-69.
- O'Guinn, Thomas C. and Ronald J. Faber (1989), "Compulsive Buying: A Phenomenological Exploration," *JCR*, 16 (September), 147-57.
- Richins, Marsha L. (2004), "The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form," *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.
- Richins, Marsha L. and Scott Dawson (1992), "A Consumer Values Orientation for Materialism and Its Measurement: Scale Development and Validation," *JCR*, 19 (December), 303-16.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am bothered when I see people who buy anything they want.
2. I don't know anyone whose spouse or steady date I would like to have as my own. (r)
3. When friends do better than me in competition it usually makes me feel happy for them. (r)
4. People who are very wealthy often feel they are too good to talk to average people.
5. There are certain people I would like to trade places with.
6. When friends have things I cannot afford it bothers me.
7. I don't seem to get what is coming to me.
8. When Hollywood stars or prominent politicians have things stolen I really feel sorry for them. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The short version of the scale used by O'Guinn and Faber (1989; Faber and O'Guinn 1992) employed only items 1, 5, 6, and 7.

**SCALE NAME: Ethicality**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The seven point semantic differential scale measures the degree to which a person's evaluation of the propriety of some stimulus is based upon beliefs shaped early in life by sources such as the family.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The items in this scale were developed and tested by Reidenbach and Robin (1988, 1990). Along with two more items they constructed the Multidimensional Ethics Scale (MES). The items shown below were thought to represent two of the MES' three dimensions: *moral equity* and *relativism*. Sometimes these two dimensions are measured together in one simple summated scale (LaTour and Henthorne 1994; LaTour, Snipes, and Bliss 1996) while in others they are measured separately (Reidenbach and Robin 1990; Smith and Cooper-Martin 1997; Thomas, Vitell, Gilbert, and Rose 2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .92 and .90 were found for the scale as used by LaTour and Henthorne (1994) and LaTour, Snipes, and Bliss (1996; LaTour 1997), respectively. Smith and Cooper-Martin (1997) measured the subscales of the MES separately in the two studies they conducted and reported the following alpha estimates of reliability: *moral equity* (.93, .91) and *relativism* (.70, .69). Alphas of .942 (pretest) and .965 (main study) were reported for the moral equity subscale by Thomas, Vitell, Gilbert, and Rose (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Some evidence of the unidimensionality of the six items comes from the exploratory factor analysis where they loaded high ( $\geq .78$ ) on one factor and low ( $.38 \geq$ ) on another factor that represented the *contractualism* dimension of ethicality (LaTour and Henthorne 1994). It should be noted that items #1 to #4 (below) were expected to represent the *moral equity* dimension of ethicality whereas items #5 and #6 were thought to measure *relativism*. The factor analyses have tended to show, however, that the items load together (LaTour, Snipes, and Bliss 1996).

Smith and Cooper-Martin (1997) provided some evidence they claim supports the construct validity of the MES but no evidence was reported that supported the discriminant validity of the subscales. While Thomas, Vitell, Gilbert, and Rose (2002) did not explicitly address the validity of the scale they did note that two videos designed to manipulate reactions to ethical cues (ethical vs. unethical) did indeed have significantly different scores on the scale. This provides some support for the scale's concurrent validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also LaFleur, Reidenbach, and Forrest (1996) for usage of the scale with advertising professionals.

## REFERENCES:

- LaFleur, Elizabeth K., R. Eric Reidenbach, Donald P. Robin, and P. J. Forrest (1996), "An Exploration of Rule Configuration Effects on the Ethical Decision Processes of Advertising Professionals," *JAMS*, 24 (1), 66-76.
- LaTour, Michael S. (1997), Personal Correspondence.
- LaTour, Michael S. and Tony L. Henthorne (1994), "Ethical Judgments of Sexual Appeals in Print Advertising," *JA*, 23 (September), 81-90.
- LaTour, Michael S., Robin L. Snipes, and Sara J. Bliss (1996), "Don't Be Afraid to Use Fear Appeals: An Experimental Study," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 36 (March/April), 59-67.
- Reidenbach, R. Eric and Donald P. Robin (1988), "Some Initial Steps Toward Improving the Measurement of Ethical Evaluations of Marketing Activities," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 7 (July), 871-879.
- Reidenbach, R. Eric and Donald P. Robin (1990), "Toward the Development of a Multidimensional Scale for Improving Evaluations of Business Ethics," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9 (August), 639-653.
- Smith, N. Craig and Elizabeth Cooper-Martin (1997), "Ethics and Target Marketing: The Role of Product Harm and Consumer Vulnerability," *JM*, 61 (July), 1-20.
- Thomas, James L., Scott J. Vitell, Faye W. Gilbert, and Gregory M. Rose (2002), "The Impact of Ethical Cues on Customer Satisfaction with Service," *JR*, 78 (3), 167-173.

## SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. unjust / just
2. unacceptable to my family / acceptable to my family
3. unfair / fair
4. not morally right / morally right
5. culturally unacceptable / culturally acceptable
6. traditionally unacceptable / traditionally acceptable

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas, Vitell, Gilbert, and Rose (2002) used the first four items. Smith and Cooper-Martin (1997) used items #1-#4 as one subscale and #5 and #6 as another subscale. LaTour and Henthorne (1994) and LaTour, Snipes, and Bliss (1996) used all of the items as one summated scale.

**SCALE NAME: Ethnocentrism**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

It is a seventeen-item, seven-point Likert-type summated ratings scale measuring a respondent's attitude toward the appropriateness of purchasing American-made products versus those manufactured in other countries. The scale was called CETSCALE (consumers' ethnocentric tendencies) by its originators (Shimp and Sharma 1987). The scale has been used in a variety of languages and countries. A ten-item version of the scale has been used in some studies and a revised version of the scale was used by Herche (1992).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to the studies reported by Shimp and Sharma (1987). Development of the scale passed through several stages and employed numerous different samples. The information provided below is primarily based upon the final seventeen-item version of the scale rather than larger preliminary sets.

Four separate samples were used to assess the psychometric properties of the CETSCALE. One sample used names and addresses obtained from a list broker. One thousand questionnaires were mailed to each of three deliberately chosen cities: Detroit, Denver, and Los Angeles. The response rate was just less than a third for each area. At the same time, 950 questionnaires were sent to former panel members in the Carolinas. The response rate was nearly 60%. The total sample size in this "four-areas study" was 1535. The "Carolinas study" was composed of a group of 417 people who were a part of the "four-areas study." Data for the former study was collected two years prior to the latter. A smaller, ten-item version of the scale was tested in national consumer good study. A total of more than 2000 completed responses were received. A fourth study examined data from 145 college students. Although having varying proportions, each of the samples except for the student group had respondents representing most age and income groups.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .94 (n = 465) and .70 (n = 168) have been reported for the ten-item version of the scale as used by Balabanis and Diamantopoulos (2004) and Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000b), respectively. The revised version of the scale used by Herche (1992) was reported to have an alpha of .93 (n = 520). Klein, Ettenson, and Morris (1998) reported a construct reliability of .83 (n = 244) for a six-item version of the scale modified for use in China. Netemeyer, Durvasula, and Lichtenstein (1991) reported alphas of .91, .92, .94, and .95 for the Japanese (n = 76), French (n = 70), German (n = 73), and American (n = 71) samples, respectively.

Alphas of between .94 and .96 were found for the scale in the four samples used by Shimp and Sharma (1987). Test-retest reliability was estimated with the student sample only. With a five-week interval between administrations, a correlation of .77 was reported.

Sharma, Shimp, and Shin (1995) reported a reliability coefficient of .91 for the CETSCALE based upon a holdout sample (n=333).

Composite reliabilities of .939 (n = 990), .952 (n = 1,153), and **.937** (n = 974) were reported for the short version of the scale used by Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1998) for Belgium, Great Britain, and Greece, respectively.

### **VALIDITY:**

Although bearing somewhat on the scale's predictive validity, the study by Herche (1992) did not directly assess the scale's construct validity. However, the revised version of the scale he used was discussed in an earlier paper (Herche 1990) as being a superior measure to the original CETSCALE. In that earlier paper Herche argued that the absence of negatively stated items in the scale made it vulnerable to response bias. He developed a version of the scale with seven of the original items stated in the opposite direction which were reverse coded during summation. The evidence indicated that the revised version of the scale explained substantially more variance than the original and had a better factor structure. He later recanted his recommendations (Herche and Engelland 1996) by providing evidence that there may be a significant threat to a scale's unidimensionality when both reversed- and standard-polarity items are included.

Klein, Ettenson, and Morris (1998) began with the ten- item version of the scale modified for the Chinese sample. However, fit statistics from a measurement model indicated that some adjustment was justified. The statistics improved when the scale was trimmed to six items. Further, some evidence of the scale's discriminant validity came from finding it was distinct from two types of animosity measures: #9 and #10. However, the variance extracted for the six-item scale was less than the minimum of .50 recommended by Fornell and Larcker (1981).

Using the original version of the scale and confirmatory factor analysis Netemeyer, Durvasula, and Lichtenstein (1991) found evidence that it was unidimensional and had adequate discriminant validity. Moderate support was also found for the scale's nomological validity. Convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity were addressed by Shimp and Sharma (1987) who provided evidence of the scale's quality.

Sharma, Shimp, and Shin (1995) made a general claim of discriminant and convergent validity for all of their scales based upon results of a CFA.

Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1998) examined the invariance of the scale in a cross-national study. Evidence was provided in support of partial metric and scalar invariance.

### **COMMENTS:**

See also Steenkamp, Hofstede, and Wedel (1999) as well as Baumgartner and Steenkamp (2001).

### **REFERENCES:**

- Balabanis, George and Adamantios Diamantopoulos (2004), "Domestic Country Bias, Country-of-Origin Effects and Consumer Ethnocentrism: A Multidimensional Unfolding Approach," *JAMS*, 32 (1), 80-95.
- Baumgartner, Hans and Jan-Benedict E.M. Steenkamp (2001), "Response Styles in Marketing Research: A Cross-National Investigation," *JMR*, 38 (May), 143-156.

## #284 Ethnocentrism

- Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *JMR*, 18 (February), 39-50.
- Gürhan-Canli, Zeynep and Durairaj Maheswaran (2000b), "Cultural Variations in Country of Origin Effects," *JMR*, 37 (3), 309-317.
- Herche, Joel (1990), "The Measurement of Consumer Ethnocentrism: Revisiting the CETSCALE," in *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Conference of the Academy of Marketing Science*, B. J. Dunlap, ed. Western Carolina University, 371-375.
- Herche, Joel (1992), "A Note on the Predictive Validity of the CETSCALE," *JAMS*, 20 (Summer), 261-264.
- Herche, Joel and Brian Engelland (1996), "Reversed-Polarity Items and Scale Unidimensionality," *JAMS*, 24 (Fall), 366-374.
- Herche, Joel, Klein, Jill Gabrielle, Richard Ettenson, and Marlene D. Morris (1998), "The Animosity Model of Foreign Product Purchase: An Empirical Test in the People's Republic of China," *JM*, 62 (January), 89-100.
- Klein, Jill Gabrielle, Richard Ettenson, and Marlene D. Morris (1998), "The Animosity Model of Foreign Product Purchase: An Empirical Test in the People's Republic of China," *JM*, 62 (January), 89-100.
- Netemeyer, Richard G. Srinvas Durvasula, and Donald R. Lichtenstein (1991), "A Cross-National Assessment of the Reliability and Validity of the CETSCALE," *JMR*, 28 (August), 320-327.
- Sharma, Subhash, Terence A. Shimp, and Jeongshin Shin (1995), "Consumer Ethnocentrism: A Test of Antecedents and Moderators," *JAMS*, 23 (Winter), 26-37.
- Shimp, Terence A. and Subhash Sharma (1987), "Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of the CETSCALE," *JMR*, 24 (August), 280-289.
- Steenkamp, Jan-Benedict E.M. and Hans Baumgartner (1998), "Assessing Measurement Invariance in Cross-National Consumer Research," *JCR*, 25 (June), 78-90.
- Steenkamp, Jan-Benedict E. M., Frenkel ter Hofstede, and Michel Wedel (1999), "A Cross-National Investigation into the Individual and National Cultural Antecedents of Consumer Innovativeness," *JM*, 63 (April), 55-69.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. American people should always buy American-made products instead of imports.
2. Only those products that are unavailable in the U.S. should be imported.
3. Buy American-made products. Keep America working.
4. American products first, last, and foremost.
5. Purchasing foreign-made products is un-American.
6. It is not right to purchase foreign products, because it puts Americans out of jobs.
7. A real American should always buy American-made products.
8. We should purchase products manufactured in America instead of letting other countries get rich off us.

---

<sup>1</sup> The seven items altered by Herche (1990, 1992) were 1, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, and 17. The alterations in each case essentially amounted to the addition of the word "not" in the sentence. The ten items used in the national consumer good study by Shimp and Sharma (1987) were 2, 4 to 8, 11, 13, 16, and 17. Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000b) as well as Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1998) apparently used that same ten-item version of the scale. The items composing the final version of the scale used by Klein, Ettenson, and Morris (1998) were 4-6, 8, 16, and 17. The items are modified to reflect the county and citizens of interest.

9. It is always best to purchase American products.
10. There should be very little trading or purchasing of goods from other countries unless out of necessity.
11. Americans should not buy foreign products, because this hurts American business and causes unemployment.
12. Curbs should be put on all imports.
13. It may cost me in the long-run but I prefer to support American products.
14. Foreigners should not be allowed to put their products on our markets.
15. Foreign products should be taxed heavily to reduce their entry into the U.S.
16. We should buy from foreign countries only those products that we cannot obtain within our own country.
17. American consumers who purchase products made in other countries are responsible for putting their fellow Americans out of work.

**SCALE NAME: Expertise (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A four-item, seven-point semantic differential scale is used to measure the degree of knowledge and experience a person reports having with regard to something. Although the scale has been used up to now as product expertise, three of the items are amenable for use with objects other than goods and services.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

There is nothing to indicate that the scale is anything other than original to the research reported by Mishra, Umesh, and Stem (1993).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas for all three product classes studied by Mishra, Umesh, and Stem (1993) were .90. As used by Griffith and Chen (2004), the scale had an alpha of .92.

**VALIDITY:**

None of the studies reported examination of the scale's validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Martin, Lang, and Wong (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Griffith, David A. and Qimei Chen (2004), "The Influence of Virtual Direct Experience (VDE) on On-Line Ad Message Effectiveness," *JA*, 33 (1), 55-68.
- Martin, Brett A.S., Bodo Lang, and Stephanie Wong (2004), "Conclusion Explicitness in Advertising," *JA*, 32 (4), 57-65.
- Mishra, Sanjay, U. N. Umesh, and Donald E. Stem, Jr. (1993), "Antecedents of the Attraction Effect: An Information-Processing Approach," *JMR*, 30 (August), 331-349.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Know very little about / Know very much about
2. Inexperienced / Experienced
3. Uninformed / Informed
4. Novice buyer / Expert buyer

**SCALE NAME: Expertise (Personal)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point statements are used to assess a person's expressed familiarity and experience with a certain category of products. The emphasis of the scale is on knowledge and, in that sense, it is conceptually similar to many other measures of product class knowledge. However, since one item (#5, below) has to do with usage of the product, it moves the scale more towards a measure of behavioral expertise and that is the way it was viewed by Thompson et al. (2005).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Thompson et al. (2005) adapted items that had been used by Mitchell and Dacin (1996).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was used several times in the studies reported by Thompson et al. (2005). The alphas ranged from .89 to .93 (Thompson 2008, Thompson et al. 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Thompson et al. (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- Mitchell, Andrew A. and Peter A. Dacin (1996), "The Assessment of Alternative Measures of Consumer Expertise," *JCR*, 23 (3), 219-239.
- Thompson, Debora Viana (2008), Personal Correspondence.
- Thompson, Debora Viana, Rebecca W. Hamilton, and Roland T. Rust (2005), "Feature Fatigue: When Product Capabilities Become Too Much of a Good Thing," *JMR*, 42 (November), 431-442.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How familiar are you with \_\_\_\_\_?  
*Not familiar at all / Very familiar*
2. How clear an idea do you have about which characteristics are important in providing you maximum usage satisfaction?  
*Not very clear / Very clear*
3. I know a lot about \_\_\_\_\_.  
*Disagree / Agree*
4. How would you rate your knowledge of \_\_\_\_\_ relative to other \_\_\_\_\_?  
*One of the least knowledgeable people / One of the most knowledgeable people*

---

<sup>1</sup> The blanks in each item should be filled with a brief description of the product category, e.g., digital video players. In the case of item #4, the product class is named in the first blank while a relevant peer group is named in the second blank, e.g., college students.

#286 *Expertise (Personal)*

5. How frequently do you use \_\_\_\_\_?  
*Never use / Use all the time*

**SCALE NAME: Expertise (Product Prices)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale measures the extent to which a person believes that others consider him/her to be a good source of information about product prices.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Kopalle and Lindsay-Mullikin (2003) cited Kopalle and Lehmann (1995), the scale itself appears to have been developed by the former.

**RELIABILITY:**

Kopalle and Lindsay-Mullikin (2003) reported an alpha of .90 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Kopalle and Lindsay-Mullikin (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

- Kopalle, Praveen K. and Joan Lindsey-Mullikin (2003), "The Impact of External Reference Price on Consumer Price Expectations," *JR*, 79 (4), 225-236.
- Kopalle, Praveen K. and Donald R. Lehmann (1995), "The Effects of Advertised and Observed Quality on Expectations about New Product Quality," *JMR*, 32 (3), 280-290.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am considered somewhat of an expert when it comes to knowing the price of products.
2. My friends think of me as a good source of price information.
3. I enjoy telling people how much they might expect to pay for different products.

---

<sup>1</sup> No information regarding the response scale was provided by Kopalle and Lindsay-Mullikin (2003). It probably had 5 or 7 points and *agree/disagree* anchors.

**SCALE NAME: Expertise (Source)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A multi-item, seven-point semantic differential is used to measure a consumer's assessment of a specified person's competency and training as a source of information about a particular product. Netemeyer and Bearden (1992) used a five-item scale to measure expertise of a personal source of information (retail employee), and Tripp, Jensen, and Carlson (1994) measured the expertise of celebrity endorsers using a six-item scale. Dellaert and Stremersch (2005) used their version of the scale to measure a person's evaluation his/her expertise in configuring a computer.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Netemeyer and Bearden (1992) did not indicate the origin of the scale, but Tripp, Jensen, and Carlson (1994) cited McCroskey (1966) as the source of their measure. However, only three items from McCroskey's scale (1966) were incorporated into the version used Tripp, Jensen, and Carlson (1994).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was reported by Netemeyer and Bearden (1992) to have alphas of .94 and .91 for the two models of behavioral intention that were tested. Alphas of .87 and .97 were reported for the versions of the scale used by Tripp, Jensen, and Carlson (1994) and Dellaert and Stremersch (2005), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of scale validity was reported by either Netemeyer and Bearden (1992) or Tripp, Jensen, and Carlson (1994). The latter indicated that the scale had a beta coefficient of .82, which suggests the scale is unidimensional. However, further testing using confirmatory factor analysis is necessary to better determine the scale's dimensionality. All that Dellaert and Stremersch (2005) said was that their use of confirmatory factor analysis with this scale and two others showed evidence of three distinct factors.

**REFERENCES:**

- Dellaert, Benedict G.C. and Stefan Stremersch (2005), "Marketing Mass-Customized Products: Striking a Balance Between Utility and Complexity," *JMR*, 42 (May), 219-227.
- McCroskey, James C. (1966), "Scales for the Measurement of Ethos," *Speech Monographs*, 33 (March), 65-72.
- Netemeyer, Richard G. and William O. Bearden (1992), "A Comparative Analysis of Two Models of Behavioral Intention," *JAMS*, 20 (Winter), 49-59.

Tripp, Carolyn, Thomas D. Jensen, and Les Carlson (1994), "The Effects of Multiple Product Endorsements by Celebrities on Consumers' Attitudes and Intentions," *JCR*, 20 (March), 535–47.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

The (message source) is:

1. Not knowledgeable / Knowledgeable
2. Incompetent / Competent
3. Inexpert / Expert
4. Not trained / Trained
5. Not experienced / Experienced
6. Unintelligent / Intelligent
7. Uninformed / Informed
8. Stupid / Bright

---

<sup>1</sup> Netemeyer and Bearden (1992) used items #1–#5. Tripp, Jensen, and Carlson (1994) used items #2–#4 and #6–#8. Dellaert and Stremerech (2005) used items the same or similar to #1–#5 except that they appear to have been phrased in Dutch.

**SCALE NAME: Exploratory Consumer Tendencies**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of multiple Likert-type items measuring the degree to which a person expresses preference for situations calling for greater exploratory consumer behavior and that produce stimulation from one's environment. The scale was referred to as *optimum stimulation level* (OSL) by Menon and Kahn (1995) although it would appear that OSL is a more general personality trait that is one determinant of (rather than being equivalent to) the consumer behaviors referred to in this scale. Following Baumgartner and Steenkamp (1996), Van Trijp, Hoyer, and Inman (1996) referred to their measure as *exploratory acquisition of products* and viewed it as measuring the consumer's need for variety. The eight-item subset used by Keaveney and Parthasarathy (2001) was referred to as *propensity for risk-taking behavior*. A three-item subset used by Ganesh, Arnold, and Reynolds (2000) was called *risk aversion*. A six-item version called *need for change* was used by Cotte and Wood (2004). Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) use a three item subset and reverse coded the items in order to measure one's attitude about staying with the same service provider rather than switching.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Menon and Kahn (1995) is a 30-item subset of 39 items developed by Raju (1980). An initial pool of ninety items related to exploratory behavior and lifestyle were compiled and then tested for low social desirability bias and high item-total correlations. Thirty-nine items were found to meet the criteria and were tested with two separate samples. Menon and Kahn (1995) used those items which Raju's (1980) findings indicated had the highest correlations with arousal-seeking tendency (Mehrabian and Russell 1974, pp.218, 219) and were not specific to any product category (Kahn 1997).

A variety of short versions have been used over time. Van Trijp, Hoyer, and Inman (1996) used a six-item version of a scale validated by Baumgartner and Steenkamp (1996) that in turn was mostly composed of items taken from Raju (1980). Van Trijp, Hoyer, and Inman (1996) indicated that using Baumgartner and Steenkamp's (1996) own data the six-item scale had a extremely high correlation ( $r = .96$ ) with the 10-item version. Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002), Ganesh, Arnold, and Reynolds (2000), as well as Keaveney and Parthasarathy (2001) stated that they borrowed the items from Raju (1980). Cotte and Wood (2004) drew all of their items from previous scales, mostly Raju (1980). See Wood and Swait (2002) for the background on the development of that scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .77, .88, and .79 were reported by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002), Menon and Kahn (1995), and Van Trijp, Hoyer, and Inman (1996), respectively, for their different versions of the scale. Keaveney and Parthasarathy (2001) reported alphas of .91 and .93 for the version of the scale they used in their Studies 1 and 2, respectively. An alpha of .74 was reported for the version of the scale used by Ganesh, Arnold, and

Reynolds (2000). The version used by Cotte and Wood (2004) had an alpha of .65. The small, three-item subset used by Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) had an alpha of .7243.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported in most of the studies. While Ganesh, Arnold, and Reynolds (2000) did not examine the scale's validity they did include its items in an EFA along with items intended to measure two other constructs. All items loaded strongly on the expected dimension with no significant cross-loadings. Some limited validation information is provided in Wood and Swait (2002) for the scale used by Cotte and Wood (2004).

Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) used both exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis to refine the many scales in their study. Once some poorly loading items for other scales were eliminated, the model fit the data. They also provided further evidence of the scale's convergent validity based on factor loadings and squared multiple correlations.

**COMMENTS:**

Although the full scale has high internal consistency it almost certainly does not have unidimensionality. This conclusion is based upon comments by Raju (1980) that his judgment and the results of a factor analysis led to the breaking up of the large set of items into seven different scales. Testing is called for to determine the dimensionality of this set of thirty items (a subset of Raju's 39 items). If it is not unidimensional then it would be inappropriate to use as a summated rating scale (Gerbing and Anderson 1988).

See also Baumgartner and Steenkamp (2001), Roehm and Roehm (2005), Steenkamp, Hofstede, and Wedel (1999), and Swaminathan and Bawa (2005) for uses of the scale or parts of it.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bansal, Harvir S., Shirley F. Taylor, and Yannik St. James (2005), "'Migrating' to New Service Providers: Toward a Unifying Framework of Consumers' Switching Behaviors," *JAMS*, 33 (1), 96-115.
- Baumgartner, Hans and Jan-Benedict E. M. Steenkamp (1996), "Exploratory Consumer Buying Behavior: Conceptualization and Measurement," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 13 (2), 121-137.
- Baumgartner, Hans and Jan-Benedict E. M. Steenkamp (2001), "Response Styles in Marketing Research: A Cross-National Investigation," *JMR*, 38 (May), 143-156.
- Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.
- Cotte, June and Stacy L. Wood (2004), "Families and Innovative Consumer Behavior: A Triadic Analysis of Sibling and Parental Influence," *JCR*, 31 (June), 78-86.
- Ganesh, Jaishanker, Mark J. Arnold, and Kristy E. Reynolds (2000), "Understanding the Customer Base of Service Providers: An Examination of the Differences Between Switchers and Stayers," *JM*, 64 (3), 65-87.

## #289 Exploratory Consumer Tendencies

- Gerbing, David W. and James C. Anderson (1988), "An Updated Paradigm for Scale Development Incorporating Uni-dimensionality and Its Assessment," *JMR*, 25 (May), 186-192.
- Kahn, Barbara E. (1997), Personal Correspondence.
- Keaveney, Susan M. and Madhavan Parthasarathy (2001), "Customer Switching Behavior in Online Services: An Exploratory Study of the Role of Selected Attitudinal, Behavioral, and Demographic Factors," *JAMS*, 29 (Fall), 374-390.
- Mehrabian, Albert and James A. Russell (1974), *An Approach to Environmental Psychology*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Menon, Satya and Barbara E. Kahn (1995), "The Impact of Context on Variety Seeking in Product Choices," *JCR*, 22 (December), 285-295.
- Raju, P. S. (1980), "Optimum Stimulation Level: Its Relationship to Personality, Demographics, and Exploratory Behavior," *JCR*, 7 (December), 272-282.
- Roehm, Harper A. Jr. and Michelle L. Roehm (2005), "Revisiting the Effect of Positive Mood on Variety Seeking," *JCR*, 32 (September), 330-336.
- Steenkamp, Jan-Benedict E.M., Frenkel ter Hofstede, and Michel Wedel (1999), "A Cross-National Investigation into the Individual and National Cultural Antecedents of Consumer Innovativeness," *JM*, 63 (April), 55-69.
- Swaminathan, Srinivasan and Kapil Bawa (2005), "Category-Specific Coupon Proneness: The Impact of Individual Characteristics and Category-Specific Variables," *JR*, 81 (3), 205-214.
- Van Trijp, Has C. M., Wayne D. Hoyer, and J. Jeffrey Inman (1996), "Why Switch? Product Category-Level Explanations for True Variety-Seeking Behavior," *JMR*, 33 (August), 281-292.
- Wood, Stacy L. and Joffre Swait (2002), "Psychological Indicators of Innovation Adoption: Cross-Classification Based on Need for Cognition and Need for Change," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 12 (1), 1-13.

### SCALE ITEMS:

1. Even though certain food products are available in a number of different flavors, I always tend to buy the same flavor. (r)
2. When I eat out, I like to try the most unusual items the restaurant serves, even if I am not sure I would like them.
3. I like to shop around and look at displays.
4. I like to browse through mail order catalogs even when I don't plan to buy anything.
5. When I see a new or different brand on the shelf, I pick it up just to see what it is like.
6. I often read the information on the packages of products just out of curiosity.
7. I am the kind of person who would try any new product once.
8. A new store or restaurant is not something I would be eager to find out about.(r)
9. When I go to a restaurant, I feel it is safer to order dishes I am familiar with.(r)
10. I am very cautious in trying new/different products.
11. Even for an important date or dinner, I wouldn't be wary of trying a new or unfamiliar restaurant.
12. I generally read even my junk mail just to know what it is about.
13. I enjoy sampling different brands of commonplace products for the sake of comparison.

#289 *Exploratory Consumer Tendencies*

14. I would rather stick with a brand I usually buy than try something I am not very sure of.(r)
15. I usually throw away mail advertisements without reading them.(r)
16. If I like a brand, I rarely switch from it just to try something different.(r)
17. I often read advertisements just out of curiosity.
18. I would prefer to keep using old appliances and gadgets even if it means having to get them fixed, rather than buy new ones every few years.(r)
19. I would rather wait for others to try a new store or restaurant than try it myself.(r)
20. I get bored with buying the same brands even if they are good.
21. When I see a new brand somewhat different from the usual, I investigate it.
22. I never buy something I don't know about at the risk of making a mistake.(r)
23. I would get tired of flying the same airline every time.
24. If I buy appliances, I will buy only well established brands.(r)
25. Investigating new brands of grocery and other similar products is generally a waste of time.(r)
26. I rarely read advertisements that just seem to contain a lot of information.(r)
27. A lot of times I feel the urge to buy something really different from the brands I usually buy.
28. I enjoy taking chances in buying unfamiliar brands just to get some variety in my purchases.
29. If I did a lot of flying, I would probably like to try all the different airlines, instead of flying just one most of the time.
30. I enjoy exploring several different alternatives or brands while shopping.
31. I like introducing new brands and products to my friends.
32. I shop around a lot for my clothes just to find out more about the latest styles.

Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005): 10, 14, 16 7-point

Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002): 1, 2, 7, 10, 14, 16, 19, 27 7-point

Cotte and Wood (2004): 5, 17, 20, 28, 31, 32

Ganesh, Arnold, and Reynolds (2000): 10, 14, 28 5-point

Keaveney and Parthasarathy (2001): 2, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 22 7-point

Menon and Kahn (1995): 1-30 9-point

Van Trijp, Hoyer, and Inman (1996): 1, 9, 10, 14, 16, 28 5-point

**SCALE NAME: Expressiveness of Product Usage**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a person views a product one uses as conveying meaning to others about his/her personality and, beyond that, impressing them. Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) used the scale with mobile services but the phrasing of the items appears to make them amenable for use with goods as well.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) though they drew ideas for items from the literature. Four mobile services were examined in their study: text messaging, contact, payment, and gaming.

**RELIABILITY:**

The construct reliability for the scale across four mobile services studied was .82 (Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Although one of the items in this scale had a moderate cross-loading on another scale used in the study by Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005), the authors supported the scale's validity by testing their measurement model. The model had 26 items measuring eight factors. The results indicated that each construct shared more variance with its indicators than with the other constructs in the study. Further, the fit indices indicated that the measurement model was acceptable for each of the four applications.

**REFERENCES:**

Nysveen, Herbjørn, Per E. Pederson and Helge Thorbjørnsen (2005), "Intentions to Use Mobile Services: Antecedents and Cross-Service Comparisons," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 330-346.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I often talk to others about \_\_\_\_\_.
2. Using \_\_\_\_\_ is part of how I express my personality.
3. Other people are often impressed by the way I use \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Extra-Role Behaviors (Service Rep)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has five, seven-point Likert-type statements which measure a customer's evaluation of the degree to which a specific service representative has gone out of his/her way, beyond what was expected to resolve a problem in the service recovery process.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although getting some inspiration from previous examination of this construct (e.g., Bettencourt and Brown 1997), the scale seems to have been developed by Maxham and Netemeyer (2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .86 was reported for the scale (Maxham and Netemeyer 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

Maxham and Netemeyer (2003) entered the items in this scale along with 24 others, representing eight constructs in total, into a confirmatory factor analysis. Several tests of convergent and discriminant validity were apparently conducted and provided support for each scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bettencourt, Lance A. and Stephen W. Brown (1997), "Contact Employees: Relationships Among Workplace Fairness, Job Satisfaction and Prosocial Service Behaviors," *JR*, 73 (1), 39-61.
- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2003), "Firms Reap What They Sow: the Effects of Shared Values and Perceived Organizational Justice on Customers' Evaluations of Complaint Handling," *JM*, 67 (January), 46-62.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. For this particular encounter, the service representative I dealt with willingly went out of his/her way to make me satisfied.
2. For this particular encounter, the service representative I dealt with voluntarily assisted me even if it meant going beyond his/her job requirements.
3. For this particular encounter, the service representative I dealt with helped me with problems beyond what I expected or required.
4. For this particular encounter, the service representative I dealt with frequently went out of his/her way to help me.
5. For this particular encounter, the service representative I dealt with went "above and beyond the call of duty" in servicing me.

**SCALE NAME: Factory Closing Egregiousness**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, four-point statements are used to assess the degree to which a consumer views the managers at a specified company as acting appropriately if/when factory closings are being considered. As used in the study by Klein, Smith, and John (2004), the items appear to be scored such that high scores suggest a person believes it would be flagrantly offensive to close factories unnecessarily.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated explicitly by Klein, Smith, and John (2004), the scale appears to be original to their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

Klein, Smith, and John (2004) reported an alpha of .73 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Klein, Smith, and John (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Klein, Jill Gabrielle, Craig N. Smith, and Andrew John (2004), "Why We Boycott: Consumer Motivations for Boycott Participation," *JM*, 68 (July), 92-109.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. What is your level of confidence in the managers at \_\_\_\_\_ to not close factories except when necessary.
2. What is your level of confidence in the managers at \_\_\_\_\_ to ensure that the factory closings take place in the best possible way for the workers.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ must close certain unprofitable factories to avoid putting its entire product line in danger.

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors for the first two items were *no confidence* and *complete confidence*. The anchors for the third item were not explicitly given by Klein, Smith, and John (2004) but appear to have been of the *disagree/agree* variety. The name of the company should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Fairness of the Offer**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four item, nine-point scale attempts to assess a consumer's perception of the justness or equitability of a certain price for a certain product.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Hardesty, Carlson, and Bearden (2002) stated that the items used in their scale were "similar" to those used by Martins (1995).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .90 was reported for the scale by Hardesty, Carlson, and Bearden (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

In a CFA of several measures used in their study, Hardesty, Carlson, and Bearden (2002) provided evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Hardesty, David M. (2004), Personal Correspondence.
- Hardesty, David M., Jay P. Carlson, and William O. Bearden (2002), "Brand Familiarity and Invoice Price Effects on Consumer Evaluations: The Moderating Role of Skepticism Toward Advertising," *JA*, 31 (2), 1-15.
- Martins, Marielza O.B. (1995), "An Experimental Investigation of the Effects of Perceived Price Fairness on Perceptions of Sacrifice and Value," unpublished dissertation, College of Business Administration, University of Illinois at Urbana-Campaign.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Overall, how fair is the sale price for the \_\_\_\_\_?
2. The sale price for the \_\_\_\_\_ represents a fair price.
3. The sale price does not seem fair to me. (r)
4. How fair/unfair do you think the price offered to consumers is?

---

<sup>1</sup> Items 2 and 3 used *strongly disagree/strongly agree* as anchors (Hardesty 2004). Item 1 used *very fair/very unfair* and 4 used *extremely fair/extremely unfair*. A product descriptor should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Fallibility**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three item scale assesses the degree to which a person views somebody or something as having made mistakes. The scale was called *transgression index* by Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) and used with reference to a fictitious company.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) as a manipulation check in an experiment they conducted.

**RELIABILITY:**

Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) reported an alpha of .84 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No explicit examination of the scale's validity was reported by Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004). However, to the extent that it served as a manipulation check and was successful provides some limited evidence of its predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Aaker, Jennifer, Susan Fournier, and S. Adam Brasel (2004), "When Good Brands Do Bad," *JCR*, 31 (June), 1-16.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ makes mistakes.
2. There are times when \_\_\_\_\_ lets me down.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ can let me down.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal stimulus should be placed in the blanks. The type of response format used by Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) was not specified but appears to have been a Likert-type (*agree/disagree*).

**SCALE NAME: Familiarity of the Object**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This three-item semantic differential scale measures a person's reported knowledge about an object. The object studied by Oliver and Bearden (1985) was a branded appetite suppressant while Moore, Stammerjohan, and Coulter (2005) used it with apartments and 35mm cameras.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The measure was developed for the Oliver and Bearden (1985) study.

**RELIABILITY:**

A reliability of .85 was reported by Oliver and Bearden (1985). Moore, Stammerjohan, and Coulter (2005) reported alphas of .90 (apartments) and .97 (35mm cameras).

**VALIDITY:**

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted by Oliver and Bearden (1985), weak items were deleted, and the analysis was run again, resulting in higher overall factor loadings. No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Moore, Stammerjohan, and Coulter (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- Moore, Robert S., Claire Allison Stammerjohan, and Robin A. Coulter (2005), "Banner Advertiser-Web Site Context Congruity and Color Effects on Attention and Attitudes," *JA*, 34 (2), 71-84.
- Oliver, Richard L. and William O. Bearden (1985), "Crossover Effects in the Theory of Reasoned Action: A Moderating Influence Attempt," *JCR*, 12 (December), 324-340.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. In general, would you consider yourself familiar or unfamiliar with \_\_\_\_\_?  
*Very familiar / very unfamiliar*
2. Would you consider yourself informed or uninformed about \_\_\_\_\_?  
*Not at all informed / highly informed*
3. Would you consider yourself knowledgeable about \_\_\_\_\_?  
*Know a great deal / know nothing at all*

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the object should be placed in the blanks, e.g., nutrition, apartments, cameras. Oliver and Bearden (1985) used a seven-point response format while Moore, Stammerjohan, and Coulter (2005) used a nine-point scale.

**SCALE NAME: Familiarity of the Object**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point semantic differentials intended to measure a person's familiarity with a specified object. The objects being assessed by Becker-Olson (2003) were company names whereas Simonin and Ruth (1998) used it with brand names.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Neither of the set of authors stated the source of the scale. Individually, the items had been used before but the set as a whole may be original to Simonin and Ruth (1998). Since it is unlikely that Becker-Olson (2003) would have coincidentally developed a nearly identical scale, she may have merely made minor modifications to the one used by Simonin and Ruth (1998).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .95 was reported for the scale by Becker-Olson (2003). Alphas of .80 and .94 were reported for the scale as used with a car brands and microprocessor brands, respectively (Simonin and Ruth 1998).

**VALIDITY:**

In general terms, Simonin and Ruth (1998) reported evidence of the scale's convergent and discriminant validity from analysis of their measurement model. Becker-Olson (2003) did not provide any support for the scale's validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Kumar (2005a and 2005b).

**REFERENCES:**

- Becker-Olson, Karen L. (2003), "And Now, A Word from our Sponsor: A look at the effects of Sponsored Content and Banner Advertising," *JA*, 32 (2), 17-32.
- Kumar, Piyush (2005a), "Brand Counterextensions: The Impact of Brand Extension Success Versus Failure," *JMR*, 42 (May), 183-194.
- Kumar, Piyush (2005b), "The Impact of Cobranding on Customer Evaluation of Brand Counterextensions," *JM*, 69 (July), 1-18.
- Simonin, Bernard L. and Julie A. Ruth (1998), "Is a Company Known by the Company It Keeps? Assessing the Spillover Effects of Brand Alliances on Consumer Brand Attitudes," *JMR*, 35 (February), 30-42.
- Ruth, Julie A. (2001), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

Please indicate how familiar you are with the \_\_\_\_\_ brand name.

1. not at all familiar / extremely familiar
2. definitely do not recognize / definitely recognize
3. definitely have not heard of it before / definitely have heard of it before

---

<sup>1</sup> The directions and items were provided by Ruth (2001). Responses to the items were made on a seven-point scale and the name of the brand was put in the blank of the directions. The same key bi-polar phrases were used by Becker-Olson (2003).

**SCALE NAME: Familiarity with the Product Category & Brand**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of seven statements attempting to assess a consumer's familiarity and experience with a brand and several other things related to the brand such as the products carrying the brand name, the advertising for the brand, the stores carrying the products, and the product category.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated explicitly, the scale appears to have been created by Martin and Stewart (2001). The scale was developed for use in studying brand extensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .91 was reported for the scale (Martin and Stewart 2001; Martin, Stewart, and Matta 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Martin and Stewart (2001; Martin, Stewart, and Matta 2005).

**COMMENTS:**

On the face of it, the items in this scale refer to several different though possibly related things. Despite its high internal consistency it is difficult to see how the scale could be unidimensional. Care should be taken in using the scale until its psychometric quality can be confirmed.

**REFERENCES:**

- Martin, Ingrid M. and David W. Stewart (2001), "The Differential Impact of Goal Congruency on Attitudes, Intentions, and the Transfer of Brand Equity," *JMR*, 38 (Nov), 471-484.
- Martin, Ingrid M., David W. Stewart and Sashi Matta (2005), "Branding Strategies, Marketing Communication, and Perceived Brand Meaning: The Transfer of Purposive, Goal-Oriented Brand Meaning to Brand Extensions," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 275-294.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> With items 1, 3, 4, and 7 the name of the brand should be placed in the blanks. With item 2, the name of the brand goes in the first blank and the name or description of the products the brand is currently known for should go in the second blank. In item 5, the blank should be filled with a name or description of the product category that the brand has been known for whereas in 6 the extension category is named. As for the scale anchors, items #1 to #6 used *not at all familiar* and *very familiar* whereas #7 used *no experience at all* and *much experience*.

*#297 Familiarity with the Product Category & Brand*

1. How familiar are you with \_\_\_\_\_?
2. How familiar are you with \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_?
3. How familiar are you with the types of retail stores that carry \_\_\_\_\_ products?
4. How familiar are you with the type of advertising that \_\_\_\_\_ currently uses?
5. How familiar are you with \_\_\_\_\_ in general?
6. How familiar are you with \_\_\_\_\_ in general?
7. How much experience do you have with \_\_\_\_\_ products?

#298 *Family Communication (Concept-Oriented, Child's View)*

**SCALE NAME: Family Communication (Concept-Oriented, Child's View)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six, five-point Likert-type statements that measure the extent to which a child indicates that his/her mother takes an active interest in his/her use of money and the purchase of products. The tone of the items is positive such that the child's role is respected rather than his/her opinion being ignored and/or his/her purchases being dictated.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Mangleburg and Bristol (1998; Bristol and Mangleburg 2005) stated that they drew their items from the scales by Moschis, Moore, and Smith (1984). The version of this scale stated from the point of view of the parent can be found in V4 (#172).

**RELIABILITY:**

Composite reliabilities of .74 and .66 were reported for the scale by Mangleburg and Bristol (1998) and Bristol and Mangleburg (2005), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

Although confirmatory factor analysis was conducted by Mangleburg and Bristol (1998), the exact details bearing on the validity of this scale were not reported. Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) used the results of their initial confirmatory factor analysis to drop two of the scale's six items. The reanalysis of the four items along with items from several other scales produced a satisfactory fit. Evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity was provided as well.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bristol, Terry and Tamara F. Mangleburg (2005), "Not Telling the Whole Story: Teen Deception in Purchasing," *JAMS*, 33 (1), 79-95.
- Mangleburg, Tamara F. and Terry Bristol (1998), "Socialization and Adolescents' Skepticism Toward Advertising," *JA*, 27 (3), 11-21.
- Moschis, George P., Roy. L. Moore, and Ruth B. Smith (1984), "The Impact of Family Communication on Adolescent Consumer Socialization," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 11, Thomas C. Kinnear, ed., Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 314-319.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. My (step)mother asks me to help in buying things for the family.

---

<sup>1</sup> The items used by Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) were #1, #3, #4, and #6 with the verbal anchors for the response scale being *never* and *very often*. Mangleburg and Bristol (1998) used all six items.

*#298 Family Communication (Concept-Oriented, Child's View)*

2. My (step)mother asks me what I think about the things I buy for myself.
3. My (step)mother says I should decide about things I should or should not buy.
4. My (step)mother says that buying things I like is important even if others do not like them.
5. My (step)mother lets me decide how to spend my own money.
6. My (step)mother asks me for advice about buying things.

**SCALE NAME: Family Communication (Socio-Oriented, Child's View)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six, five-point Likert-type statements that measure the extent to which a child indicates that his/her mother tells him/her what to buy or not buy. The tone of the items is that the child believes the parent is concerned about how the child's money is used and wants to have a lot of control over the decisions.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Mangleburg and Bristol (1998; Bristol and Mangleburg 2005) drew their items from the scales by Moschis, Moore, and Smith (1984). A version of this scale stated from the point-of-view of the parent can be found in V4 (#174) of this series.

**RELIABILITY:**

Composite reliabilities of .80 and .78 were reported for the scale by Mangleburg and Bristol (1998) and Bristol and Mangleburg (2005), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

Although confirmatory factor analysis was conducted by Mangleburg and Bristol (1998), the exact details bearing on the validity of this scale were not reported. Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) used the results of their initial confirmatory factor analysis to drop two of the scale's six items. The reanalysis of the four items along with items from several other scales produced a satisfactory fit. Evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity was provided as well.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bristol, Terry and Tamara F. Mangleburg (2005), "Not Telling the Whole Story: Teen Deception in Purchasing," *JAMS*, 33 (1), 79-95.
- Mangleburg, Tamara F. and Terry Bristol (1998), "Socialization and Adolescents' Skepticism Toward Advertising," *JA*, 27 (3), 11-21.
- Moschis, George P., Roy. L. Moore, and Ruth B. Smith (1984), "The Impact of Family Communication on Adolescent Consumer Socialization," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 11, Thomas C. Kinnear, ed., Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 314-319.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. My (step)mother tells me what types of things I can buy.
2. My (step)mother wants to know what I do with my money.

---

<sup>1</sup> The items used by Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) were #1, #3, #5, and #6 with the verbal anchors for the response scale being *never* and *very often*. Mangleburg and Bristol (1998) used all six items.

*#299 Family Communication (Socio-Oriented, Child's View)*

3. My (step)mother complains when I buy something that she does not like.
4. My (step)mother says that I should not ask questions about things that teenagers do not usually buy.
5. My (step)mother tells me that I can't buy certain things.
6. My (step)mother says that she knows what is best for me and that I should not question her.

**SCALE NAME: Family Importance**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The seven-item, seven-point Likert-type scale measures the value a person places on having a family and spending time with them.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) were originally going to use the full Traditional Family Values scale by Glezer (1984) but many of the items were judged to be out-of-date. They retained a few of the items and added a few more from the Family Values scale by Faver (1981).

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .73 (Burroughs and Rindfleisch 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Besides some general validation evidence for all of their scales from LISREL, Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) specifically examined the predictive validity of the Family Value scale with another sample (n = 471). They found that those with scores above average on the scale were much more likely to be married and to have more children than those who scored below the average.

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.
- Faver, Catherine A. (1981), "Women, Careers, and Family: Generational and Life-Cycle Effects on Achievement Orientation," *Journal of Family Issues*, 2 (1), 91-112.
- Glezer, Helen (1984), "Antecedents and Correlates of Marriage and Family Attitudes in Young Australian Men and Women," in *Proceedings of the Twentieth International CFR Seminar on Social Change and Family Policies, Key Papers, Part 1*, Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I can't imagine having a fully satisfying life without my family.
2. It is possible for me to be happy without being married. (r)
3. I would not work longer hours if it would interfere with family activities.
4. The rewards of raising a family are more important to me than anything else.
5. The needs of other family members are more important than my own needs.
6. My really important relationships are in the home.
7. The family evening meal is one of the most important activities of my day.

**SCALE NAME: Family Resources**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five-point statements are used to measure the amount of support a person receives (or recalls receiving) from his or her family while growing up. The items have been used as two subscales to separately measure intangible and tangible support but the items have also been used together to measure both forms of support simultaneously.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997) indicated that they were guided in selecting items for the scale by examining family sociology literature, particularly Cherlin (1992) and McLanahan and Booth (1989). Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) used the scale by Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997) except that they ultimately dropped two of the original items because they did not correlate well with the rest of the items and may have been confusing to the young respondents.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .90 and .69 have been reported for the full version of the scale by Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997) and Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003), respectively. The alphas for the two subscales reported by Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997) were .92 (intangible) and .81 (tangible), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

A factor analysis by Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997) showed that there were two dimensions among the eight items. However, in a subsequent factor analysis that included the items from the family stressor scale (#302), all of the resource items loaded together. This may be why the authors reported their findings with the eight resource items combined into one scale. The authors bolstered their claim of the combined scale's validity somewhat by showing that respondents from disrupted families scored significantly lower than those from intact families.

Without providing many details, Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) implied that the scale showed evidence of unidimensionality as well as convergent and discriminant validity. Despite that, the poor reliability of the scale may indicate the presence of more than one factor. Considering all of this together, the dimensionality of these items should be examined more thoroughly in future research before assuming the full set of items form a unidimensional scale.

**REFERENCES:**

- Cherlin, Andrew (1992), *Marriage, Divorce, Remarriage*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- McLanahan, Sara S. and Karen Booth (1989), "Mother-Only Families: Problems, Prospects and Politics," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51 (August), 557-580.

## #301 Family Resources

Rindfleisch, Aric, James E. Burroughs, and Frank Denton (1997), "Family Structure, Materialism, and Compulsive Consumption," *JCR*, 23 (March), 312-325.

Roberts, James A., Chris Manolis, and John F. Tanner, Jr. (2003), "Family Structure, Materialism, and Compulsive Buying: A Reinquiry and Extension," *JAMS*, 31 (3), 300-311.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

Directions: Please indicate the amount of total support provided by your family for each of the categories below. For example, if your family always gives you a lot of spending money, fill in "a lot of support." If they give you little or no spending money, fill in "little or no support." Please choose the one category that best describes their support in each area.<sup>2</sup>

1. Spending money
2. Food
3. Clothing
4. Time and attention
5. Discipline
6. Emotional support and love
7. Life skills and instruction
8. Role modeling and guidance

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors on the response scale used by both Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997) as well as Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) were *inadequate support* (1) and *exceptional support* (5). The first three items of those listed compose the tangible subscale while the other five items compose the intangible subscale. The first six items are those used by Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003).

<sup>2</sup> The directions shown are those employed by Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997) with adults. Those used by Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) with adolescents were: "Please indicate the amount of total support provided by your family for each of the categories below. For example, if your family always gives you a lot of spending money, fill in 'a lot of support.' If they give you little or no spending money, fill in 'little or no support.' Please choose the one category that best describes their support in each area."

**SCALE NAME: Family Stressors**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has ten, five-point statements that are used to measure how a person reports being affected by various stressful events within his or her pre-adult life, particularly involving the respondent's family.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) cited Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997) as the source of the scale they used. The latter indicated that they adapted their scale from the Life Experiences Survey by Sarason, Johnson, and Siegel (1978). However, an examination of the Life Experiences Survey indicates that none of its 57 items was used in the Family Stressors scale. Although there are some similarities between the two scales, it may be most precise to describe the Family Stressors scale as original to Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997), though they may have received considerable inspiration from the Life Experiences Survey.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .76 and .70 have been reported for the scale by Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997) and Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

Although factor analysis is not a strong test of validity, the results from one were used by Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997) as evidence of discriminant validity. Items from two Family Resources scales (V3, #161 and #162) were examined along with items from this scale. All of the resource items loaded together, and all but one (3) of the stressor items loaded together. The authors bolstered their claim of the scale's validity by showing that respondents from disrupted families reported significantly more stress than did those from intact families.

Without providing many details, Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) implied that the scale showed evidence of unidimensionality as well as convergent and discriminant validity.

**COMMENTS:**

The only differences between the versions used by Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997) and Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) were in the directions they used. This is because the former used adults who were asked to recall the stress they experienced as they grew up while in the latter study the respondents were adolescents still living at home and potentially experiencing the stress at that time.

**REFERENCES:**

Rindfleisch, Aric, James E. Burroughs, and Frank Denton (1997), "Family Structure, Materialism, and Compulsive Consumption," *JCR*, 23 (March), 312-325.

## #302 Family Stressors

Roberts, James A., Chris Manolis, and John F. Tanner, Jr. (2003), "Family Structure, Materialism, and Compulsive Buying: A Reinquiry and Extension," *JAMS*, 31 (3), 300-311.

Sarason, Irwin G., James H. Johnson, and Judith M. Siegel (1978), "Assessing the Impact of Life Changes: Development of the Life Experiences Survey," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46 (October), 932-946.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

Directions: Considering up through your 18th birthday, please circle the overall extent to which each of the following events impacted your life (positively or negatively) around the time(s) they occurred. Use "No Impact" if the event made no difference or never occurred.<sup>2</sup>

1. Move(s) to a different home or place of residence.
2. Difficulties with schoolwork.
3. A major, sudden change in your family's money situation.
4. Regular or long periods in which one or both parents were temporarily absent.
5. Difficulties establishing or maintaining relationships.
6. The loss (other than death) or separation from family members or loved ones.
7. Encounters with juvenile authorities or police.
8. Physical abuse by parents or other family members.
9. Arguments between parents or other family members (including self).
10. Changes in your family other than the divorce of your parents (like remarriage of your parents, birth of your own child, etc.).

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale anchors used by Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997) as well as Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) were *strongly negative* (1) and *strongly positive* (5).

<sup>2</sup> The directions used by Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) were: "Please indicate the overall extent to which each of the following events hurt or helped you at the time these things happened. Use 'no impact' if the event made no difference or never occurred."

**SCALE NAME: Fear of Disapproval**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six, true/false statements attempting to assess the extent to which a person is experiencing anxiety regarding what others might think about an action he/she has taken. The behavior examined by Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002) was a person's usage of information bearing on the risk of getting breast cancer.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002) is a major modification of the instrument developed by Watson and Friend (1969). (See V2, #10.) That scale had 30 items, was called *Fear of Negative Evaluation*, and was more general (less focused on what others thought about a particular behavior).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was reported to have an alpha of .79 (Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Keller, Punan Anand, Issac M. Lipkus, and Barbara K. Rimer (2002), "Depressive Realism and Health Risk Accuracy: The Negative Consequences of Positive Mood," *JCR*, 29 (June), 57-69.

Watson, David and Robert Friend (1969), "Measurement of Social Evaluation Anxiety," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 33 (4), 448-457.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I used the risk information because I worry what others may think of me.
2. What others thought of me did not influence the way I used the risk information. (r)
3. I was afraid people would find fault with me if I didn't use the risk information.
4. The disapproval of others would have little effect on whether I used the risk information. (r)
5. If someone is evaluating me, I tend to expect the worst.
6. I am usually confident that others will have a favorable impression of me even if I disagree with them. (r)

## #304 Fearfulness

### **SCALE NAME: Fearfulness**

### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four semantic differentials with a seven-point response format are used to measure a person's emotional reaction being characterized by feelings of worry and anxiety.

### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Duhachek (2005) did not specify the source of the scale. Although these items can be found in other scales, they are not known to have been used as a set previously to measure this construct.

### **RELIABILITY:**

Duhachek (2005) reported an alpha of .70 for the scale based on Study 1 data.

### **VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Duhachek (2005).

### **REFERENCES:**

Duhachek, Adam (2005), "Coping: A Multidimensional, Hierarchical Framework of Responses to Stressful Consumption Episodes," *JCR*, 32 (June), 41-53.  
Duhachek, Adam (2008), Personal Correspondence.

### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. not at all threatened / extremely threatened
2. not at all worried / extremely worried
3. not at all fearful / extremely fearful
4. not at all anxious / extremely anxious

---

<sup>1</sup> Duhachek (2005) asked respondents to imagine a time when they had a stressful incident with a service organization and then to indicate to what extent they experienced these feelings. The items were supplied by Duhachek (2008).

**SCALE NAME: Financial Needs**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the degree to which a person believes that a particular university needs financial support from its alumni.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) for their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

The internal consistency of the scale was reported by Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) to be .86.

**VALIDITY:**

Based on their measurement model, Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) provided support for the scale's convergent and discriminant validity. Its average variance extracted was .67.

**COMMENTS:**

With some adjustment and retesting, the scale may be applied to other nonprofit organizations.

**REFERENCES:**

Arnett, Dennis B., Steve D. German, and Shelby D. Hunt (2003), "The Identity Salience Model of Relationship Marketing Success: The Case of Nonprofit Marketing," *JM*, 67 (April), 89-105.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_'s need for financial support from its alumni will be even greater in the future.
2. State universities need the financial support of their alumni just as much as private universities.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ presently needs strong financial support from its alumni.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the university should be placed in the blanks.

## #306 *Fit (Company with Industry)*

### **SCALE NAME: Fit (Company with Industry)**

### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven, seven-point semantic-differentials are used to measure the degree to which a person views a company as being representative of a certain industry.

### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not described by Becker-Olson (2003). However, it is striking to notice that most of the items can be found in two previous scales measuring brand extension fit (Ahluwalia and Gurhan-Canli 2000; Bridges, Keller, and Sood 2000; John, Loken, and Joiner 1998). (See V4, #101 and #102).

### **RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .98 was reported for the scale by Becker-Olson (2003).

### **VALIDITY:**

Becker-Olson (2003) did not provide any support for the scale's validity.

### **REFERENCES:**

Becker-Olson, Karen L. (2003), "And Now, A Word From Our Sponsor: A look at the Effects of Sponsored Content and Banner Advertising," *JA*, 32 (2), 17-32.

### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. similar / dissimilar
2. consistent / inconsistent
3. typical / atypical
4. representative / unrepresentative
5. complementary / not complementary
6. low fit / high fit
7. makes sense / does not make sense

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem was not provided by Becker-Olson (2003) but probably asked respondents to use the scale items to indicate how well the image they have of a company fits with the image they have of an industry, e.g., Sony with the entertainment industry and MasterCard with financial services.

**SCALE NAME: Flow (Shopping)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three item, Likert-type scale measures the extent to which a consumer expresses a tendency to become absorbed in shopping activity to such an extent that he/she loses track of time. The scale was called *time distortion* by Arnold and Reynolds (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Bloch, Ridgway, and Dawson (1994) developed the scale as part of a study of shopping mall behaviors. Two pretests and a main study were used to purify their scales.

**RELIABILITY:**

Arnold and Reynolds (2003) reported .92 as the alpha they calculated for the scale. No information regarding the scale's reliability was reported by Bloch, Ridgway, and Dawson (1994).

**VALIDITY:**

Although Arnold and Reynolds (2003) did not directly examine the validity of this scale, they used it in the process of testing the nomological validity of some other scales. The factor analysis reported by Bloch, Ridgway, and Dawson (1994) shows that the three items loaded strongest on the same factor with no split-loadings, providing evidence in support of the scale's unidimensionality.

**COMMENTS:**

The first two items appear to very amenable for use in a variety of contexts. However, the phrasing of item #3 is very constraining. Thought should be given to replacing that item so the scale can be used in a greater variety of situations.

**REFERENCES:**

- Arnold, Mark J. and Kristy E. Reynolds (2003), "Hedonic Shopping Motivations," *JR*, 79 (2), 77-95.
- Bloch, Peter, Nancy Ridgway, and Scott Dawson (1994), "The Shopping Mall as Consumer Habitat," *JR*, 70 (1), 23-42.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I lose track of time when I'm in a \_\_\_\_\_.
2. Time seems to fly by when I am at a \_\_\_\_\_.
3. When I leave a \_\_\_\_\_, I am sometimes surprised to find it's dark outside.

---

<sup>1</sup> The type of place should be specified in the blanks, e.g., shopping mall. Bloch, Ridgway, and Dawson (1994) used a five-point Likert-type response format whereas Arnold and Reynolds (2003) used a seven-point format.

#308 *Food Fat Knowledge (Subjective)*

**SCALE NAME: Food Fat Knowledge (Subjective)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six statements with seven-point response scales are used to measure a person's self-expressed level of knowledge regarding the nutrition- and health-related aspects of fat in food.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not explicitly stated by Moorman et al. (2004), the scale appears to be original to their research.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .88 was reported for the scale by Moorman et al. (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Moorman et al. (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Moorman, Christine, Kristin Diehl, David Brinberg, and Blair Kidwell (2004), "Subjective Knowledge, Search Locations and Consumer Choice," *JCR*, 31 (December), 673-680.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How knowledgeable do you feel about dietary guidelines for fat and food groups?
2. How knowledgeable do you feel about the link between fat and health consequences?
3. How knowledgeable do you feel about fat contained in foods?
4. How knowledgeable do you feel about fat in general?
5. How confident do you feel about your ability to make low-fat choices?
6. How confident do you feel about your ability to use your knowledge of fat in making food choices?

---

<sup>1</sup> The response scale for the items was anchored by *not at all* (1) and *extremely* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Fun****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of seven point, semantic differential items measuring a person's beliefs concerning the perceived enjoyment that would be experienced with regard to a specified stimulus. As described below, the stimuli compared by Dabholkar (1994) were two methods of ordering at a fast-food restaurant: touch screen versus verbally placing the order with an employee.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of the scale appears to be Dabholkar (1994). Refinement of the scale occurred with a pretest sample that consisted of 141 undergraduate students. The scale produced alphas of .89 (touch screen ordering) and .81 (verbal ordering).

**RELIABILITY:**

Dabholkar (1994) reported construct reliabilities of .90 and .87 for the touch screen and verbal versions of the scale, respectively. An alpha of .84 was reported for the version of the scale used by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Results of confirmatory and exploratory factor analyses provided by Dabholkar (1994) indicated that both versions of the scale were unidimensional. Evidence was provided by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002) in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Dabholkar, Pratibha (1994), "Incorporating Choice into an Attitudinal Framework: Analyzing Models of Mental Comparison Processes," *JCR*, 21 (June), 100-118.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ and Richard P. Bagozzi (2002), "An Attitudinal Model of Technology-Based Self-Service: Moderating Effects of Consumer Traits and Situational Factors," *JAMS*, 30 (3), 184-201.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. will not be interesting / will be interesting

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem used by Dabholkar (1994; Dabholkar and Bagozzi 2002) was "Using a \_\_\_\_\_ to order fast food ..." and *touch screen* or *verbal* was placed in the blank. Only one anchor for each pair was explicitly stated in the articles; the others are hypothetical reconstructions. Dabholkar (1994) used all four items while the final version of the scale used by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002) was composed of items #2-#4.

#309 *Fun*

2. will not be entertaining / will be entertaining
3. will not be fun / will be fun
4. will not be enjoyable / will be enjoyable

**SCALE NAME: Generality of Product Image**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale uses three, nine-point Likert-type items to measure the degree to which a person views a product in general terms because of difficulty in understanding or knowing its specific characteristics.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Laroche et al. (2005) developed this scale for the second of their two experiments after using another measure of the construct in their first experiment. The second measure was said to “more adequately reflect the conceptual definition” (p. 258).

**RELIABILITY:**

In Experiment 2, Laroche et al. (2005) reported the scale’s alphas to be .907 (off-line subsample) and .925 (online subsample).

**VALIDITY:**

No information was provided by Laroche et al. (2005) regarding the scale’s validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Laroche, Michel, Zhiyong Yang, Gordon H.G. McDougall, and Jasmin Bergeron (2005), “Internet Versus Bricks-and-Mortar Retailers: An Investigation into Intangibility and Its Consequences,” *JR*, 81 (4), 251-267.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. It is easy to describe many features related to \_\_\_\_\_. (r)
2. I could easily explain many features associated with \_\_\_\_\_. (r)
3. It is not difficult to give a precise description of \_\_\_\_\_. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the good, service, or other object should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Generosity**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A seven-item, five-point Likert-type summated ratings scale is used to measure the degree to which a person likes to share his/her possessions. The scoring of the items was done in such a way in several of the studies so as to measure “nongenerosity.” Five-item versions of the scale were used by O’Guinn and Faber (1989) as well as Arnold and Reynolds (2003). See also Richins (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of the scale is reported in Belk (1984). The measure of generosity was one of three scales constructed for examining aspects of materialism. Initial pools of 30 or more items were tested for each of the three measures with 237 business school students. Using factor analysis, item-total correlations, and measures of internal consistency, seven or more items were chosen from each pool to measure the three materialism-related constructs. The eight items retained for measuring generosity were reported to have an alpha of .72.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .58 was reported for one of the Belk (1984) samples ( $n = 338$ ). A two-week interval, test-retest correlation of .64 ( $n = 48$ ) was reported for another Belk (1984, 1985) sample. Alphas of .69, .63, and .63 were reported for the scale by Arnold and Reynolds (2003), O’Guinn and Faber (1989), and Richins and Dawson (1992).

**VALIDITY:**

Belk (1984) compared scale scores with other measures in a multi-trait/multi-method matrix. As evidence of convergent validity, scores on the generosity scale were correlated significantly with two other measures used to assess the same construct. Only partial support for discriminant validity was found. Evidence of criterion validity was found by noting that two known groups had significantly different mean scores on the scale, and the differences were in the hypothesized directions.

No examination of scale validity was made by O’Guinn and Faber (1989) beyond factor analysis. Items regarding generosity and two other materialism-related constructs were factor analyzed, and three factors clearly emerged. The authors did indicate that the scales were slightly modified on the basis of the factor analysis, however.

The validity of the generosity scale was not addressed by Richins and Dawson (1992) except in the sense that it was used to assess the nomological validity of the materialism scale being developed.

**REFERENCES:**

- Arnold, Mark J. and Kristy E. Reynolds (2003), "Hedonic Shopping Motivations," *JR*, 79 (2), 77-95.
- Belk, Russell W. (1984), "Three Scales to Measure Constructs Related to Materialism: Reliability, Validity, and Relationships to Measures of Happiness," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 11, Thomas Kinnear, ed. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 291-97.
- Belk, Russell W. (1985), "Materialism: Trait Aspects of Living in the Material World," *JCR*, 12 (December), 265-80.
- Faber, Ronald J. and Thomas C. O'Guinn (1992), "A Clinical Screener for Compulsive Buying," *JCR*, 19 (December), 459-69.
- O'Guinn, Thomas C. and Ronald J. Faber (1989), "Compulsive Buying: A Phenomenological Exploration," *JCR*, 16 (September), 147-57.
- Richins, Marsha L. (2004), "The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form," *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.
- Richins, Marsha L. and Scott Dawson (1992), "A Consumer Values Orientation for Materialism and Its Measurement: Scale Development and Validation," *JCR*, 19 (December), 303-16.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I enjoy having guests stay at my home. (r)
2. I enjoy sharing what I have. (r)
3. I don't like to lend things, even to good friends.
4. It makes sense to buy a lawnmower with a neighbor and share it. (r)
5. I don't mind giving rides to those who don't have a car. (r)
6. I don't like to have anyone in my home when I'm not there.
7. I enjoy donating things to charities. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> Items similar to or exactly the same as the following were used by O'Guinn and Faber (1989): 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7. Arnold and Reynolds (2003) used a seven-point response scale and five of these items but, apart from #3, the identity of those items is unknown.

**SCALE NAME: Goal Attainment**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This four item, seven-point Likert-type scale is intended to measure the degree to which a person believes that he/she is making progress towards accomplishment of a particular goal and is likely to reach it.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Dellande, Gilly, and Graham (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .86 was reported for the scale by Dellande, Gilly, and Graham (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Little information bearing on the scale's validity was reported by Dellande, Gilly, and Graham (2004). One piece of evidence bearing on concurrent validity was that the correlation between scale scores and a related behavioral measure was .349.

**REFERENCES:**

Dellande, Stephanie, Mary C. Gilly, and John L. Graham (2004), "Gaining Compliance and Losing Weight: The Role of the Service Provider in Health Care Services," *JM*, 68 (3), 78-91.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am attaining my \_\_\_\_\_ goal.
2. I think that I will achieve my \_\_\_\_\_ goal.
3. I am making progress towards my \_\_\_\_\_ goal.
4. I am not attaining my \_\_\_\_\_ goal. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name/description of focal goal should be placed in the blanks. The goal examined in the study by Dellande, Gilly, and Graham (2004) was weight loss.

**SCALE NAME: Goal Similarity (Fit)****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three statements attempting to assess a consumer's belief of how well a brand can achieve a certain goal. The scale was called *goodness-of-fit* by Martin and Stewart (2001; Martin, Stewart, and Matta 2005).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Martin and Stewart (2001) stated that their scale was based on the goals-based approach to measuring product similarity and their scale was apparently inspired by the work of Barsalou (e.g., 1985). As used by Martin and Stewart (2001; Martin, Stewart, and Matta 2005), the scale was applied to the study of brand extensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .69 (Martin and Stewart 2001; Martin, Stewart, and Matta 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

The typical aspects of scale validity were not provided by Martin and Stewart (2001; Martin, Stewart, and Matta 2005) although some information bearing on the scale's nomological validity was discussed.

**REFERENCES:**

- Barsalou, Lawrence W. (1985), "Ideals, Central Tendency, and Frequency of Instantiation as Determinants of Graded Structure in Categories," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 11 (4), 629-654.
- Martin, Ingrid M. and David W. Stewart (2001), "The Differential Impact of Goal Congruency on Attitudes, Intentions, and the Transfer of Brand Equity," *JMR*, 38 (Nov), 471-484.
- Martin, Ingrid M., David W. Stewart and Sashi Matta (2005), "Branding Strategies, Marketing Communication, and Perceived Brand Meaning: The Transfer of Purposive, Goal-Oriented Brand Meaning to Brand Extensions," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 275-294.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How well do \_\_\_\_\_ fit with the goal of wanting high quality, colorful clothing?  
*not at all well / very well*
2. How consistent are \_\_\_\_\_ with the goal of wanting high quality, colorful clothing?

<sup>1</sup> The first blank in each item should have the brand name (e.g., *Benetton's*) while the second blank is the product category name (e.g., *dress leather shoes*). To adapt the items for other product categories the ending phrases of each item can be rephrased so as to apply to other goals.

#313 Goal Similarity (Fit)

*not at all consistent / very consistent*

3. How well do \_\_\_\_\_ exemplify the goal of wanting high quality, colorful clothing?

*extremely poor example / extremely good example*

**SCALE NAME: Goal Similarity (Ideal Attributes)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point items are used to measure a consumer's belief of how well a brand or product category is thought to achieve certain goals. The scale was called *ideals at the category level* by Martin and Stewart (2001) and *ideal attributes* by Martin, Stewart, and Matta (2005).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Martin and Stewart (2001) stated that their scale was based on the goals-based approach to measuring product similarity and their scale was apparently inspired by the work of Barsalou (e.g., 1985). As used by Martin and Stewart (2001) as well as Martin, Stewart, and Matta (2005), the scale was applied to the study of brand extensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the category version of the scale used by Martin and Stewart (2001) was .81 while the alpha for the brand version used by Martin, Stewart, and Matta (2005) was .79.

**VALIDITY:**

The typical aspects of scale validity were not provided by Martin and Stewart (2001; Martin, Stewart, and Matta 2005) although some information bearing on the scale's nomological validity was discussed.

**REFERENCES:**

- Barsalou, Lawrence W. (1985), "Ideals, Central Tendency, and Frequency of Instantiation as Determinants of Graded Structure in Categories," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 11 (4), 629-654.
- Martin, Ingrid M., David W. Stewart and Sashi Matta (2005), "Branding Strategies, Marketing Communication, and Perceived Brand Meaning: The Transfer of Purposive, Goal-Oriented Brand Meaning to Brand Extensions," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 275-294.
- Martin, Ingrid M., and David W. Stewart (2001), "The Differential Impact of Goal Congruency on Attitudes, Intentions, and the Transfer of Brand Equity," *JMR*, 38 (Nov), 471-484.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How likely is it that \_\_\_\_\_ would be made of high quality, soft, pliable leather?

---

<sup>1</sup> The blank in each item should have the brand or product category name. To adapt the items for other product categories, the ending phrases of each item can be stated so as to apply to other attributes. The anchors of the response scale were *not at all likely* to *very likely*. Martin and Stewart (2001) used the first three items while Martin, Stewart, and Matta (2005) used items similar to #1, #3, and #4.

**#314 Goal Similarity (Ideal Attributes)**

2. How likely is it that \_\_\_\_\_ would come in bright, stylish colors to complete that fashionable, yet casual image?
3. How likely is it that \_\_\_\_\_ would come in many bright colors to mix and match with your wardrobe?
4. To what degree would \_\_\_\_\_ have bright colors that you can mix and match with your wardrobe?

**SCALE NAME: Headline Meaning Openness**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, nine-point statements indicating a person's agreement that a print advertisement's headline was open to interpretation and noticeable effort was expended to give meaning to it.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale appears to be original to Mothersbaugh, Huhmann, and Franke (2002) though Eco (1979) is cited, apparently as one source of inspiration for the construct's importance.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .71 was reported for the scale by Mothersbaugh, Huhmann, and Franke (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Mothersbaugh, Huhmann, and Franke (2002). However, given that the results of the study showed that, as expected, the more rhetorical headlines positively affected openness perceptions, it provides some rudimentary support for the scale's predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Eco, Umberto (1979), *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Mothersbaugh, David L., Bruce A. Huhmann, and George R. Franke (2002), "Combinatory and Separative Effects of Rhetorical Figures on Consumers' Effort and Focus in Ad Processing," *JCR*, 28 (March), 589-602.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I had to use my imagination to interpret this headline.
2. The headline invited me to participate in generating a meaning.
3. I had to work to interpret this headline.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the anchors for the response scale were not described by Mothersbaugh, Huhmann, and Franke (2002), it would appear they were of the typical *agree/disagree* format.

**SCALE NAME: Help Provision Likelihood (Customer to Business)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point statements are used to measure a customer's willingness and interest to assist a business that has asked for his/her help to accomplish some task that is above and beyond the normal activity of the business. The scale was referred to as *reactions to marketing actions* by Aggarwal (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is apparently original to Aggarwal (2004) and was used in the second of three experiments described in his article.

**RELIABILITY:**

Aggarwal (2004) reported that the scale's alpha was .85.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Aggarwal (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Aggarwal, Pankaj (2004), "The Effects of Brand Relationship Norms on Consumer Attitudes and Behavior," *JCR*, 31 (June), 87-101.  
Aggarwal, Pankaj (2007), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How likely are you to agree to their request to help them?
2. How enthusiastic do you feel about helping them?
3. Are you likely to support similar programs at the \_\_\_\_\_ in the future?<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The phrasing of the scale was provided by Aggarwal (2007). The response format was a seven point scale with *not at all likely* (1) and *very likely* (7) as anchors.

<sup>2</sup> A generic name for the business should be placed in the blank, e.g., club, bank, store.

**SCALE NAME: Honesty****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Thirteen, seven point Likert-type statements are used to measure the extent to which a person expresses beliefs that are consistent with honest behavior. The scale as a whole is not specific to any particular object or time but appears to describe one's general behavior. Wirtz and Kum (2004) referred to the scale as *morality*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

These items compose the honesty-dishonesty subscale of the Revised Morally Debatable Behaviors Scale from Katz, Santman and Lonero (1994). Wirtz and Kum (2004) chose this factor as it was most relevant in measuring the personality construct that may affect cheating on service guarantees.

**RELIABILITY:**

A Cronbach's alpha of 0.90 was reported for this scale by Wirtz and Kum (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Wirtz and Kum (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Wirtz, Jochen and Doreen Kum (2004), "Consumers Cheating on Service Guarantees," *JAMS*, 32 (2), 159-175.
- Katz, Roger C., Jennifer Santman, and Pamerla Lonero (1994), "Findings on the Revised Morally Debatable Behaviors Scale," *Journal of Psychology*, 128 (1), 15-21.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Taking and driving away a car belonging to someone else (joyriding).
2. Someone accepting a bribe in the course of their duties.
3. Buying something you knew was stolen.
4. Cheating on an exam.
5. Avoiding a fare on a public transport.
6. Claiming welfare benefits you're not entitled to.
7. Married men or women having an affair.
8. Failing to report damage you've done accidentally to a parked vehicle.
9. Threatening workers who refuse to join a strike.
10. Political assassination.
11. Lying in your own interest.
12. Cheating on your taxes if you have a chance.
13. Keeping money found.

---

<sup>1</sup> Item #6 was altered to better suit the Singapore context. Specifically the phrase "Claiming welfare benefits . . ." was changed to "Claiming social benefits . . ."

**SCALE NAME: Iconicity with Fiction**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three statements are used to measure a person's attitude regarding the degree to which something real looks like what it was imagined it would be based upon its depiction in a fictional narrative.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Grayson and Martinec (2004). Several stages were used to develop and purify the scales.

**RELIABILITY:**

Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported an alpha of .90 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Although the exact details were not provided, Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported that this scale along with all others used in their study were tested using CFA and showed acceptable discriminant and convergent validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Grayson, Kent and Radan Martinec (2004), "Consumer Perceptions of Iconicity and Indexicality and Their Influence on Assessments of Authentic Market Offerings," *JCR*, 31 (September), 296-312.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Stories or films about \_\_\_\_\_ depict this sort of thing.
2. This sort of thing is depicted in stories or films about \_\_\_\_\_.
3. How likely is it that a story or film about \_\_\_\_\_ depicts something like this?

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the fictional subject should be placed in the blank, e.g., Sherlock Holmes. A Likert-type response format was used for items #1 and #2 while item #3 used an unspecified semantic differential, probably something similar to *extremely unlikely* / *extremely likely*.

**SCALE NAME: Iconicity With History**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three item scale is intended to measure the degree to which a person believes an object or set of objects to which one has been exposed are historically accurate.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Grayson and Martinec (2004). Several stages were used to develop and purify the scales.

**RELIABILITY:**

Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported an alpha of .87 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Although the exact details were not provided, Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported that this scale along with all others used in their study were tested using CFA and showed acceptable discriminant and convergent validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Grayson, Kent and Radan Martinec (2004), "Consumer Perceptions of Iconicity and Indexicality and Their Influence on Assessments of Authentic Market Offerings," *JCR*, 31 (September), 296-312.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Historical documents about \_\_\_\_\_ describe this sort of thing.
2. Historians agree that this sort of thing existed in \_\_\_\_\_.
3. How likely is it that historical documents about \_\_\_\_\_ mention something like this?

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the object and/or historical setting should be placed in the blank, e.g., home life in the late 1800s. A Likert-type response format was used for items #1 and #2 while item #3 used an unspecified semantic differential, probably something similar to *extremely unlikely* / *extremely likely*.

**SCALE NAME: Iconicity with Old Things**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three statements that are intended to assess a person's attitude about the degree to which something looks old.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Grayson and Martinec (2004). Several stages were used to develop and purify the scales.

**RELIABILITY:**

Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported an alpha of .93 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Although the exact details were not provided, Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported that this scale along with all others used in their study were tested using CFA and showed acceptable discriminant and convergent validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Grayson, Kent and Radan Martinec (2004), "Consumer Perceptions of Iconicity and Indexicality and Their Influence on Assessments of Authentic Market Offerings," *JCR*, 31 (September), 296-312.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. It looked very old.
2. It looked as if it was made a long time ago.
3. How old did it look to you?

---

<sup>1</sup> A Likert-type response format was used for items #1 and #2 while item #3 used an unspecified semantic differential, possibly something similar to *extremely new / extremely old*.

**SCALE NAME: Identification with Brand**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The five item, seven-point Likert-type scale assesses the degree to which a customer relates with a brand/company and believes its image fits well with his/her own self-concept. Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) referred to the scale as *self-connection*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not explicitly stated by Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004), they appear to have developed the scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) reported alphas ranging from .88 to .91 over three time periods.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Aaker, Jennifer, Susan Fournier, and S. Adam Brasel (2004), "When Good Brands Do Bad," *JCR*, 31 (June), 1-16.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The \_\_\_\_\_ brand connects with the part of me that really makes me tick.
2. The \_\_\_\_\_ brand fits well with my current stage of life.
3. The \_\_\_\_\_ brand says a lot about the kind of person I would like to be.
4. Using \_\_\_\_\_ lets me be a part of a shared community of like-minded consumers.
5. I have become very knowledgeable about \_\_\_\_\_.
6. The \_\_\_\_\_ brand makes a statement about what is important to me in my life.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal company/brand should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Identification with Brand**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, ten-point Likert-type statements that are intended to measure the strength of the relationship a consumer has with a brand.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of the scale was not explicitly stated by Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005). They appear to have adapted items from previous scales especially for their study. As used to gather the data, the items were apparently in German.

**RELIABILITY:**

The composite reliability reported for the scale by Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005) was .81.

**VALIDITY:**

Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005) used CFA with twelve latent constructs and twenty measures. The measurement model fit the data well and two tests were used to provide evidence of each scale's discriminant validity. The average variance extracted for this scale was .66.

**REFERENCES:**

Algesheimer, René, Utpal M. Dholakia, and Andreas Herrmann (2005), "The Social Influence of Brand Community: Evidence from European Car Clubs," *JM*, 69 (July), 19-34.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. This brand says a lot about the kind of person I am.
2. This brand's image and my self-image are similar in many respects.
3. This brand plays an important role in my life.

**SCALE NAME: Identification with Role**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three Likert-type statements that measure the strength with which a person identifies with a certain role they either play or might play.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's source was provided by Bolton and Reed (2004). It is assumed that they developed it for their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

Bolton and Reed (2004) reported alphas of .71 and .73 for the scale when used with parent and teen role identities, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Bolton and Reed (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Bolton, Lisa E. and Americus Reed II (2004), "Sticky Priors: The Perseverance of Identity Effects on Judgment," *JMR*, 41 (November), 397-410.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I identify strongly with being a \_\_\_\_\_.
2. Being a \_\_\_\_\_ is an important part of who I am.
3. I found it difficult to play the role of a \_\_\_\_\_.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the role being examined should be placed in the blanks, e.g., parent. The number of points and the verbal anchors for the response scale were not described by Bolton and Reed (2004).

<sup>2</sup> If it is rather certain that all respondents' play the role being examined then this statement might be rephrased to be something like "I find it difficult . . . ."

**SCALE NAME: Identity Appraisal (Reflected)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three semantic differentials are used to measure a person's opinion of how well the people with whom the person interacts view him/her with regard to a certain identity. The opinion can be based on real or imagined feedback. One version of the scale has to do with *possessions*, what people are thought to say about the products used in the performance of a role. The other version has to do with *performance* itself, what people are thought to say about how well a role is played.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scales were developed in a series of pretests by Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

The reliabilities of the two versions of the scale were not reported by Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002) but the average variance extracted was .87 (possessions) and .82 (performance).

**VALIDITY:**

Although Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002) imply that the scales had been "validated" in a series of pretests, those details were not provided in the article. They did say, however, that there were "acceptable levels of discriminant validity among all construct pairs."

**REFERENCES:**

Laverie, Debra A., Robert E. Kleine III and Susan Schultz Kleine (2002), "Reexamination and Extension of Kleine, Kleine, and Kernan's Social Identity Model of Mundane Consumption: the Mediating Role of the Appraisal Process," *JCR*, 28 (March), 659-669.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Directions: Think about the comments that other people make about your \_\_\_\_\_. Use the adjective pairs below to describe what other people \_\_\_\_\_ say about your \_\_\_\_\_.<sup>1</sup>

1. notable / ordinary
2. excellent / poor
3. spectacular / terrible

---

<sup>1</sup> The first blank should be filled with the name of the possession (e.g., tennis equipment) or performance (e.g., tennis playing) being evaluated. The second blank can be used to specify the people being referred to, e.g., that you play tennis with. The third blank should match what is placed in the first blank.

**SCALE NAME: Identity Appraisal (Self)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three semantic differentials are used to measure a person's evaluation of his/her identity-related actions. One version of the scale has to do with *possessions*, what a person thinks about the products used in the performance of a role. The other version has to do with *performance* itself, what a person thinks about how well a role is played.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scales were developed in a series of pretests by Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

The reliabilities of the two versions of the scale were not reported by Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002) but the average variance extracted was .79 (possessions) and .88 (performance).

**VALIDITY:**

Although Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002) imply that the scales had been "validated" in a series of pretests, those details were not provided in the article. They did say, however, that there were "acceptable levels of discriminant validity among all construct pairs."

**REFERENCES:**

Laverie, Debra A., Robert E. Kleine III and Susan Schultz Kleine (2002), "Reexamination and Extension of Kleine, Kleine, and Kernan's Social Identity Model of Mundane Consumption: the Mediating Role of the Appraisal Process," *JCR*, 28 (March), 659-669.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Directions: Think of the standards you personally use to evaluate your \_\_\_\_\_. Keeping those standards in mind, use the adjective pairs below to rate your \_\_\_\_\_.<sup>1</sup>

1. notable / ordinary
2. excellent / poor
3. spectacular / terrible

---

<sup>1</sup> The first blank should be filled with the name of the possession (e.g., tennis equipment) or performance (e.g., tennis playing) being evaluated. The second blank should match what is placed in the first blank.

**SCALE NAME: Image of the Political Candidate**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Twelve bi-polar adjectives are used to measure a person's attitude toward a political candidate. The scale might also be useful for measuring the image of others for whom these qualities are relevant, e.g., spokesperson, manager, salesperson.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Tedesco (2002) indicated that the scale was developed by Sanders and Pace (1977).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was used as a pre- and post-test measure with two candidates. The alphas ranged from .82 to .89.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Tedesco (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Sanders, Keith and T. Pace (1977), "The Influence of Speech Communication on the Image of a Political Candidate: 'Limited Effects' Revisited," in *Communication Yearbook 1*, Brent D. Ruben, ed. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 465-474.  
Tedesco, John C. (2002), "Televised Political Advertising Effects: Evaluating Responses During the 2000 Robb-Allen Senatorial Election," *JA*, 31 (Spring), 37-48.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. qualified / unqualified
2. sophisticated / unsophisticated
3. honest / dishonest
4. sincere / insincere
5. successful / unsuccessful
6. believable / unbelievable
7. attractive / unattractive
8. calm / excitable
9. aggressive / unaggressive
10. strong / weak
11. passive / active
12. friendly / unfriendly

**SCALE NAME: Imagery Vividness (Multiple Senses)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A 35-item, seven-point, Likert-like summated ratings scale measuring the clarity of mental images a person is able to evoke. This measures a person's general ability to imagine several types of sensations and is not limited to a particular sense or stimulus. It has been referred to by various names, but most of them include the original creator's name (Betts).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The items were constructed originally by Betts (1909). The 35-item condensed version was developed by Sheehan (1967a). He has reported correlations between the short and long versions as being more than .90 and the short version as having a test-retest reliability of .78 using an interval of seven months (Richardson 1969; Sheehan 1967b).

**RELIABILITY:**

Miller and Marks (1992; Marks 1994) calculated an alpha of **.92** for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Miller and Marks (1992) reported no examination of the scale's validity.

**COMMENTS:**

The 35-item test has separate sections devoted to the five senses. Given that, it seems highly unlikely that the instrument as a whole is unidimensional. However, it may be possible that subdimensions load significantly on a second-order factor. Validity testing is sorely needed to investigate these issues and to indicate whether scoring would be more appropriate on the subscales rather than on the overall instrument.

See also Bone and Ellen (1992; Ellen and Bone 1991) as well as Schlosser (2003) for other apparent uses of this scale.

**REFERENCES:**

- Betts, G. H. (1909), "The Distributions and Functions of Mental Imagery," *Columbia University Contributions to Education*, 26, 1-99.
- Bone, Paula Fitzgerald and Pam Scholder Ellen (1992), "The Generation and Consequences of Communication-Evoked Imagery," *JCR*, 19 (June), 93-104.
- Ellen, Pam Scholder and Paula Fitzgerald Bone (1991), "Measuring Communication-Evoked Imagery Processing," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 18, Rebecca H. Holman and Michael R. Soloman, eds.. Provo, UT: Association of Consumer Research, 806-812.
- Marks, Lawrence J. (1994), Personal Correspondence.
- Miller, Darryl W. and Lawrence J. Marks (1992), "Mental Imagery and Sound Effects in Radio Commercials," *JA*, 21 (4), 83-93.
- Richardson, Alan (1969), *Mental Imagery*, New York: Publishing Co..

### #327 Imagery Vividness (Multiple Senses)

- Sheehan, Peter Winston (1967a), "A Shortened Form of Betts Questionnaire Upon Mental Imagery," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 23 (3), 386-389.
- Sheehan, Peter Winston (1967b), "Reliability of a Short Test of Imagery," *Perceptual & Motor Skills*, 25 (3), 744.
- Schlosser, Ann E. (2003), "Experiencing Products in the Virtual World: The Role of Goal and Imagery in Influencing Attitudes versus Purchase Intentions," *JCR*, 30 (September), 184-198.

#### SCALE ITEMS:

Directions: The aim of this test is to determine the vividness of your imagery. The items of the test will bring certain images to your mind. You are to rate the vividness of each image by reference to the accompanying rating scale, which is shown below. For example, if your image is 'vague and dim' you give it a rating of 5. Refer to the rating scale when judging the vividness of each image. Try to do each item separately, independent of how you may have done other items.

An image aroused by an item of this test may be:

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Description</i>
1	Perfectly clear and as vivid as the actual experience
2	Very clear and as vivid as the actual experience
3	Moderately clear and vivid
4	Not clear or vivid, but recognizable
5	Vague and dim
6	So vague and dim as to be hardly discernible
7	No image present at all, you only "know" that you are thinking of the object

For items 1-4, think of some relative or friend whom you frequently **see**, considering carefully the picture that comes before your mind's eye. Classify the images suggested by each of the following questions as indicated by the degrees of clearness and vividness specified on the rating scale.

1. the exact contour of face, head, shoulders, and body.
2. characteristic poses of head, attitudes of body, etc.
3. the precise carriage, length of step, etc., in walking.
4. the different colors worn in some familiar clothes.

Think of **seeing** the following, considering carefully the picture which comes before your mind's eye; and classify the image suggested by the following question as indicated by the degree of clearness and vividness specified on the rating scale.

5. the sun as it is sinking below the horizon

Think of each of the following **sounds** and classify the images on the rating scale.

#327 Imagery Vividness (Multiple Senses)

6. the whistle of a locomotive
7. the honk of an automobile
8. the mewing of a cat
9. the sound of escaping steam
10. the clapping of hands in applause

Think of “feeling” or **touching** each of the following and classify the images on the rating scale.

11. sand
12. linen
13. fur
14. the prick of a pin
15. the warmth of a tepid bath

Think of **performing** each of the following acts, considering carefully the image which comes to your mind’s arms, legs, lips, etc., and classify the images on the rating scale.

16. running upstairs
17. springing across a gutter
18. drawing a circle on paper
19. reaching up to a high shelf
20. kicking something out of your way

Think of **tasting** each of the following and classify the images on the rating scale.

21. salt
22. granulated (white) sugar
23. oranges
24. jelly
25. your favorite soup

Think of **smelling** each of the following and classify the images on the rating scale.

26. an ill-ventilated room
27. cooking cabbage
28. roast beef
29. fresh paint
30. new leather

Think of each of the following **sensations** and classify the images on the rating scale.

31. fatigue
32. hunger
33. a sore throat

#327 *Imagery Vividness (Multiple Senses)*

34. drowsiness

35. repletion as from a very full meal

**SCALE NAME: Imagery Vividness (Visual)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A sixteen-item, five-point Likert-type scale is used to measure the clarity of mental images a person evokes. It measures a person's general visual imagery ability rather than the clarity of a particular stimulus under investigation. The scale has been referred to by several users as the *Vividness of Visual Imagery Questionnaire* (e.g., Childers 1985; Marks 1973).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of this particular scale is Marks (1973). Eleven of the items in the scale are original, but five items were taken from a 35-item measure reported by Sheehan (1967), which was itself a shortened form of the 150-item measure of mental imagery developed by Betts (1909). Marks (1973) reported that his scale had a test-retest correlation of .74 ( $n = 68$ ) and a split-half reliability coefficient of .85 ( $n = 150$ ). The results of three experiments indicated that visual image vividness was an accurate predictor of the recall of information contained in pictures. Unexpectedly, it was also found in two of the three experiments that females were more accurate in their recall

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .85 was reported by Childers et al. (1985) for the scale in their first study, and alphas of .84 and .85 were found in their second study. With respect to item-total correlations, the authors reported that "each item was relatively equivalent in tapping the domain of interest" (p. 127).

**VALIDITY:**

A factor analysis in the first study by Childers and colleagues (1985) indicated that the items all loaded together. All of the loadings were more than .30 but six were less than .50. Evidence of the scale's discriminant validity came from its insignificant correlation with a measure of social desirability.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Hirschman (1986) as well as Petrova and Cialdini (2005) for another apparent use of this or a similar scale.

**REFERENCES:**

- Betts, G. H. (1909), "The Distributions and Functions of Mental Imagery," *Columbia University Contributions to Education*, 26, 1-99.
- Childers, Terry L. and Michael J. Houston, and Susan E. Heckler (1985), "Measurement of Individual Differences in Visual Versus Verbal Information Processing," *JCR*, 12 (September), 125-34.

### #328 Imagery Vividness (Visual)

Hirschman, Elizabeth C. (1986), "The Effect of Verbal and Pictorial Advertising Stimuli on Aesthetic, Utilitarian and Familiarity Perceptions," *JA*, 15 (2), 27-34.

Marks, David F. (1973), "Visual Imagery Differences in the Recall of Pictures," *British Journal of Psychology*, 64 (1), 17-24.

Petrova, Petia K. and Robert B. Cialdini (2005), "Fluency of Consumption Imagery and the Backfire Effects of Imagery Appeals," *JCR*, 32 (December), 442-452.

Sheehan, Peter Winston (1967), "A Shortened Form of Betts Questionnaire Upon Mental Imagery," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 23 (3), 386-89.

#### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

Directions: For items 1-4, think of some relative or friend whom you frequently see (but who is not with you at present) and consider carefully the picture that comes before your mind's eye.

1. The exact contour of face, head, shoulders, and body.
2. Characteristic poses of head, attitudes of body, etc.
3. The precise carriage, length of step, etc., in walking.
4. The different colors worn in some familiar clothes. Visualize a rising sun.

Visualize a rising sun. Consider carefully the picture that comes before your mind's eye.

5. The sun is rising above the horizon into a hazy sky.
6. The sky clears and surrounds the sun with blueness.
7. Clouds. A storm blows up, with flashes of lightning.
8. A rainbow appears.

Think of the front of a shop which you often go to. Consider the picture that comes before your mind's eye.

9. The overall appearance of the shop from the opposite side of the road.
10. A window display, including colors, shapes and details of individual items for sale.
11. You are near the entrance. The color, shape and details of the door.
12. You enter the shop and go to the counter. The counter assistant serves you. Money changes hands.

Finally, think of a country scene which involves trees, mountains, and a lake. Consider the picture that comes before your mind's eye.

13. The contours of the landscape.
14. The color and shape of the trees.
15. The color and shape of the lake.
16. A strong wind blows on the trees and on the lake causing waves.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scales anchors used were (1) *Perfectly clear and as vivid as normal vision*, (2) *Clear and reasonably vivid*, (3) *Moderately clear and vivid*, (4) *Vague and dim*, and (5) *No image at all, you only "know" that you are thinking of the object*.

**SCALE NAME: Importance (Product Attribute)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three-item semantic differential scale measures the degree of importance a specified product characteristic has to a consumer. Sujan and Bettman (1989) used it for attributes of 35mm SLR cameras while Desai and Keller (2002) applied it to the scent attribute of laundry detergents.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information about the scale's origin was provided by Sujan and Bettman (1989). Desai and Keller (2002) cited them as the source of their scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was used with two different camera features by Sujan and Bettman (1989). An alpha of .93 was reported for use of the scale with reference to the focal attribute ("sturdiness of construction") and .92 was reported for the control attribute ("compactness of design"). As used by Desai and Keller (2002) the scale had an alpha of .93.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of scale's validity was reported in either study.

**REFERENCES:**

- Desai, Kalpesh Kaushik and Kevin Lane Keller (2002), "The Effects of Ingredient Branding Strategies on Host Brand Extendibility," *JM*, 66 (January), 73-93.
- Sujan, Mita and James R. Bettman (1989), "The Effects of Brand Positioning Strategies on Consumers' Brand and Category Perceptions: Some Insights From Schema Research," *JMR*, 26 (November), 454-467.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. not at all important / very important
2. irrelevant to my choice / very relevant to my choice
3. a feature I would not consider / a feature I definitely consider

---

<sup>1</sup> Sujan and Bettman (1989) used a seven-point response format while Desai and Keller (2002) used a nine-point scale.

**SCALE NAME:           Impulse Buying**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Nine, five-point Likert-type items are used to measure “a consumer’s tendency to buy spontaneously, unreflectively, immediately, and kinetically” (Rook and Fisher 1995, p. 306). The construct is viewed as a consumer trait that may produce frequent motivations to buy, even though they are not always acted on.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although previous work had been done on the scale (Rook and Gardner 1993; Rook and Hoch 1985), the most extensive testing was conducted by Rook and Fisher (1995). In that study, 35 items were generated on the basis of a review of literature and pretested on 281 undergraduate business students. The purification process across the pretest and Study 1 samples resulted in a final nine-item scale. As described further below, evidence in support of the measure’s convergent and discriminant validity was found (Rook 1997).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .88 and .82 were reported by Rook and Fisher (1995) for the scale in Studies 1 and 2, respectively. Peck and Childers (2003) reported alphas of .90 (Study 3) and .88 (Study 4).

**VALIDITY:**

Confirmatory factor analysis was used in both Studies 1 and 2 to provide evidence that the nine-item measure was an acceptable model (Rook and Fisher 1995). The statistics in both studies supported a unidimensional scale. From information not reported in the article (Rook 1997), it is clear that the scale showed evidence of its validity. Specifically, strong positive correlations were found between it and overall impulsiveness, as well as with projections of impulsive purchase decisions on hypothetical consumers. Relatively weak correlations were found between the scale and other measures (sensation seeking, disinhibition seeking, boredom proneness, and future time orientation).

**REFERENCES:**

- Peck, Joann and Terry L. Childers (2003), “Individual Differences in Haptic Information Processing: The 'Need for Touch' Scale,” *JCR*, 30 (December), 430-442.
- Rook, Dennis W. (1997), Personal Correspondence.
- Rook, Dennis W. and Robert J. Fisher (1995), “Normative Influences on Impulsive Buying Behavior,” *JCR*, 22 (December), 305–13.
- Rook, Dennis W. and Meryl Paula Gardner (1993), “In the Mood: Impulse Buying’s Affective Antecedents,” in *Research in Consumer Behavior, Vol. 6*, Janeen Arnold Costa and Russell W. Belk, eds. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1–28.

Rook, Dennis W. and Stephen J. Hoch (1985), "Consuming Impulses," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 12, Morris B. Holbrook and Elizabeth J. Hirschman, eds. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 23–27.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I often buy things spontaneously.
2. "Just do it" describes the way I buy things.
3. I often buy things without thinking.
4. "I see it, I buy it" describes me.
5. "Buy now, think about it later" describes me.
6. Sometimes I feel like buying things on the spur of the moment.
7. I buy things according to how I feel at the moment.
8. I carefully plan most of my purchases. (r)
9. Sometimes I am a bit reckless about what I buy.

**SCALE NAME: Independence**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of eleven, five-point Likert-type statements. As a set they are intended to measure an aspect of self-concept involving how one relates to others. In particular, this scale attempts to capture a self-construal where the emphasis is on a person's own identity as opposed to one's connection to others.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Choi and Miracle (2004) drew upon several previous measures of independence/interdependence (e.g., Singelis 1994) when developing their scales but they also tested items they believed tapped into facets of the construct that had not been measured before. A CFA of 29 items showed the items loaded on two dimensions but several were dropped from each set due to poor loadings or other problems.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alphas reported for different types of ads ranged from .82 to .86 (Choi and Miracle 2004). Separate alphas for the American and Korean samples were not provided.

**VALIDITY:**

Choi and Miracle (2004) used the scale with American and Korean samples. Beyond what was stated about the scale's origin (above), the final set of items for this scale was described as being unidimensional and parallel.

**REFERENCES:**

- Choi, Yung Kyun and Gordon E. Miracle (2004), "The Effectiveness of Comparative Advertising in Korea and the United States," *JA*, 33 (4), 75-87.
- Singelis, Theodore M. (1994), "The Measurement of Independent and Interdependent Self-Construals," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20 (October), 580-591.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I should be judged on my own merit.
2. I voice my opinions in group discussions.
3. My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me.
4. I prefer to be self-reliant rather than dependent on others.
5. I act as a unique person, separate from others.
6. It is important to me to act as an independent person.
7. I have an opinion about most things: I know what I like and I know what I don't like.
8. I enjoy being unique and different from others.
9. I don't change my opinions in conformity with those of the majority.
10. Understanding myself is a major goal in my life.
11. I enjoy being admired for my unique qualities.

**SCALE NAME: Independence/Interdependence**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale measures the degree to which a person expresses preference for individualism and separation from others (independence) or connectedness and relations with others (interdependence).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The original 24-item version of the scale was constructed by Singelis (1994). He proposed that there are two images of self: one reflects independence of others while the other emphasizes interdependence on others. Further, these two self images can coexist in a person. Singelis developed and tested two 12-item subscales, one for each dimension. Results from several studies provided evidence in support of the two factor model as well as for the reliability and validity of each subscale. Alphas for the interdependence subscale were reported as .73 (n = 360) and .74 (n = 160); likewise, alphas for the independence subscale were .69 (n = 360) and .70 (n = 160).

Escalas and Bettman (2005) used the published version of the scale by Singelis (1994) and calculated the scores separately for the two subscales.

Aaker (2000b; and Williams 1998) reported using a 31-item version of the scale. This is based upon a 30-item unpublished version by Singelis (Aaker 2000b). The 31<sup>st</sup> item was being tested for the Japanese version of the scale but Aaker does not recommend its use (2000a).

**RELIABILITY:**

Aaker and Williams (1998) reported that the scale had an alpha of .90 (n = 151). Aaker (2000b) reported alphas of .90 (experiment 1), .87 (experiment 2), and .91 (experiment 3) for her use of the scale. As used by Aaker and Lee (2001), the independent subscale had an alpha of .77 while the interdependent subscale had an alpha of .74. In Study 2 by Escalas and Bettman (2005), the alphas for the subscales were .64 (independent) and .62 (interdependent).

**VALIDITY:**

No evidence of the scale's validity was presented in any of the articles. Aaker and Williams (1998) did, however, indicate that a factor analysis was conducted which yielded just one factor. They speculated that their sample size or insufficient situational variability in the items may have been the reason for not finding the expected two dimensional structure.

**COMMENTS:**

Given that the set of items were developed and tested by Singelis (1984) as a pair of subscales the implications of treating them as one scale are not clear. However, it is probably safest to separately calculate scores for the two subscales. Aaker concurs (2000a).

### #332 Independence/Interdependence

Further, several items in the scale were deliberately written by Singelis (1994) to be suitable for students. If the scale is to be used with a non-student sample, adjustment in those items will be necessary which in turn will call for retesting the scale's dimensionality and validity.

See also Hamilton and Biehal (2005).

#### REFERENCES:

- Aaker, Jennifer L. (2000a), Personal Correspondence.
- Aaker, Jennifer L. (2000b), "Accessibility or Diagnosticity? Disentangling the Influence of Culture on Persuasion Processes and Attitudes," *JCR*, 26 (March), 340-357.
- Aaker, Jennifer L. and Angela Y. Lee (2001), "I Seek Pleasures and We Avoid Pains: The Role of Self-Regulatory Goals in Information Processing and Persuasion," *JCR*, 28 (June), 33-49.
- Aaker, Jennifer L. and Patti Williams (1998), "Empathy versus Pride: The Influence of Emotional Appeals Across Cultures," *JCR*, 25 (December), 241-261.
- Escalas, Jennifer Edson and James R. Bettman (2005), "Self-Construal, Reference Groups, and Brand Meaning," *JCR*, 32 (December), 378-389.
- Hamilton, Rebecca W. and Gabriel J. Biehal (2005), "Achieving Your Goals or Protecting Their Future? The Effects of Self-View on Goals and Choices," *JCR*, 32 (September), 277-283.
- Singelis, Theodore M. (1994), "The Measurement of Independent and Interdependent Self-Construals," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20 (October), 580-591.

#### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact.
2. It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group.
3. My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.
4. I would offer my seat in a bus to my professor (boss).
5. I respect people who are modest about themselves.
6. I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group I am in.
7. I often have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments.
8. I should take into consideration my parents' advice when making education (career) plans.
9. It is important to me to respect decisions made by the group.
10. I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I'm not happy with the group.
11. If my brother or sister fails, I feel responsible.
12. Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument.
13. I feel my fate is intertwined with the fate of those around me.

---

<sup>1</sup> The first twelve items represent the interdependence subscale whereas items #16-#27 are the independence subscale as published by Singelis (1994). The other items were used by Aaker (2000b; and Williams 1998) are assumed to be from the unpublished version of the scale. (#13-#15 go with the interdependence subscale and #28-#30 are part of the independence subscale.) A seven-point, Likert-type response format was used by Singelis (1994).

14. I feel good when I cooperate with others.
15. I usually go along with what others do, even when I would rather do something different.
16. I'd rather say "No" directly, than risk being misunderstood.
17. Speaking up during a class (or a meeting) is not a problem for me.
18. Having a lively imagination is important to me.
19. I am comfortable with being singled out for praise or rewards.
20. I am the same person at home that I am at school.
21. Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.
22. I act the same way no matter whom I am with.
23. I feel comfortable using someone's first name soon after I meet them, even when they are much older than I am.
24. I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people I've just met.
25. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects.
26. My personal identity independent of others is very important to me.
27. I value being in good health above everything.
28. I do my own thing, regardless of what others think.
29. I feel it is important for me to act as an independent person.
30. I try to do what is best for me, regardless of how that might affect others.

### #333 Indexicality (Actual Contact)

#### **SCALE NAME: Indexicality (Actual Contact)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three item scale is intended to measure the degree to which a person believes there is a spatio-temporal association between a specified person and object.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Grayson and Martinec (2004). Several stages were used to develop and purify the scales.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported an alpha of .96 for the scale.

#### **VALIDITY:**

Although the exact details were not provided, Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported that this scale along with all others used in their study were tested using CFA and showed acceptable discriminant and convergent validity.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Grayson, Kent and Radan Martinec (2004), "Consumer Perceptions of Iconicity and Indexicality and Their Influence on Assessments of Authentic Market Offerings," *JCR*, 31 (September), 296-312.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ touched this or was physically near it.
2. This was touched by \_\_\_\_\_, or he was physically near it.
3. How much do you believe that \_\_\_\_\_ actually touched this or was physically near it?

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal person/character should be placed in the blank, e.g., Sherlock Holmes. A Likert-type response format was used for items #1 and #2 while item #3 used an unspecified semantic differential, possibly something similar to *I believe it is false / I believe it is true*.

**SCALE NAME: Indexicality (Hypothetical Contact)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This three item scale is supposed to measure the extent to which a person imagines there to be a spatio-temporal connection between an object and a fictional or historical character.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Grayson and Martinec (2004). Several stages were used to develop and purify the scales.

**RELIABILITY:**

Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported an alpha of .91 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Although the exact details were not provided, Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported that this scale along with all others used in their study were tested using CFA and showed acceptable discriminant and convergent validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Grayson, Kent and Radan Martinec (2004), "Consumer Perceptions of Iconicity and Indexicality and Their Influence on Assessments of Authentic Market Offerings," *JCR*, 31 (September), 296-312.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. While I was looking at it, I felt as if \_\_\_\_\_ could have been physically near it.
2. While I was in the museum, it made me feel as if \_\_\_\_\_ could have touched this.
3. While you were looking at it, how much did you feel as if \_\_\_\_\_ could have been physically near it?

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal person/character should be placed in the blank, e.g., Sherlock Holmes. A Likert-type response format was used for items #1 and #2 while item #3 used an unspecified semantic differential, possibly something similar to *not at all* / *very much*.

## #335 Indexicality (Telepresence)

### **SCALE NAME: Indexicality (Telepresence)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This three item scale is intended to measure the extent to which a person imagines that an object connects him/her to another time/place.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Grayson and Martinec (2004). Several stages were used to develop and purify the scales.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported an alpha of .93 for the scale.

#### **VALIDITY:**

Although the exact details were not provided, Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported that this scale along with all others used in their study were tested using CFA and showed acceptable discriminant and convergent validity.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Grayson, Kent and Radan Martinec (2004), "Consumer Perceptions of Iconicity and Indexicality and Their Influence on Assessments of Authentic Market Offerings," *JCR*, 31 (September), 296-312.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. When I looked at it, I felt a connection with \_\_\_\_\_.
2. It helped to transport me to \_\_\_\_\_.
3. How much of a connection with \_\_\_\_\_ did this make you feel?

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the time/place should be placed in the blank, e.g., the past. A Likert-type response format was used for items #1 and #2 while item #3 used an unspecified semantic differential, possibly something similar to *not at all / very much*.

**SCALE NAME: Indexicality with Era**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three statements are used to assess the degree to which a person believes an object is linked to (made or built in) a specified time period.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Grayson and Martinec (2004). Several stages were used to develop and purify the scales.

**RELIABILITY:**

Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported an alpha of .93 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Although the exact details were not provided, Grayson and Martinec (2004) reported that this scale along with all others used in their study were tested using CFA and showed acceptable discriminant and convergent validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Grayson, Kent and Radan Martinec (2004), "Consumer Perceptions of Iconicity and Indexicality and Their Influence on Assessments of Authentic Market Offerings," *JCR*, 31 (September), 296-312.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. It was made or built in the \_\_\_\_\_ .
2. This is old enough to be from \_\_\_\_\_ .
3. How much do you believe this was made or built during the \_\_\_\_\_ .

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal person/character should be placed in the blank, e.g., Sherlock Holmes. A Likert-type response format was used for items #1 and #2 while item #3 used an unspecified semantic differential, possibly something similar to *not at all* / *very much*.

**SCALE NAME: Innovativeness (Product Trial)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Eight, five-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a consumer's belief that he/she is among the first to try and/or buy new products when they become available. This is in contrast to wanting to stick with previous choices and being reluctant to change. The scale was called *dispositional innovativeness* by Steenkamp and Gielens (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Steenkamp and Gielens (2003) described the scale as being a revision of the scale used by Steenkamp et al. (1999). That scale was five unspecified items from the *exploratory acquisition of products* scale (Baumgartner and Steenkamp 1996). In turn, that scale was heavily based on content from the *exploratory consumer tendencies* (#289) scale by Raju (1980).

**RELIABILITY:**

Steenkamp and Gielens (2003) reported an alpha of .87 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

The analyses conducted by Steenkamp and Gielens (2003) of this scale and two others provided evidence in support of each scales' unidimensionality as well as their convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Baumgartner, Hans and Jan-Benedict E. M. Steenkamp (1996), "Exploratory Consumer Buying Behavior: Conceptualization and Measurement," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 13 (2), 121-137.
- Steenkamp, Jan-Benedict E.M. and Katrijn Gielens (2003), "Consumer and Market Drivers of the Trial Probability of New Consumer Packaged Goods," *JCR*, 30 (December), 368-384.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. When I see a new product on the shelf, I'm reluctant to give it a try. (r)
2. In general, I am among the first to buy new products when they appear on the market.
3. If I like a brand, I rarely switch from it just to try something new. (r)
4. I am very cautious in trying new and different products. (r)
5. I am usually among the first to try new brands.
6. I rarely buy brands about which I am uncertain how they will perform. (r)
7. I enjoy taking chances in buying new products.
8. I do not like to buy a new product before other people do. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Innovativeness (Use)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five, five-point statements that attempt to capture a consumer's motivation to explore different ways of using a product. Although the product examined by Shih and Venkatesh (2004) was a computer, the statements might be usable with other product categories as well.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Shih and Venkatesh (2004) was heavily based on the Use Innovativeness Index by Price and Ridgway (1983). There are two key differences. First, the full Index had 44 items measuring five factors whereas this scale is sort of general factor. Shih and Venkatesh (2004) say that they took items from four factors. Second, the Index was not specific to any product whereas the items in the scale refer to a specific product (e.g., computers).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .81 was reported for the scale by Shih and Venkatesh (2004)

**VALIDITY:**

Shih and Venkatesh (2004) did not provide any information regarding the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Price, Linda L. and Nancy M. Ridgway (1983), "Development of a Scale to Measure Use Innovativeness," in *Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 10*, Richard P. Bagozzi and Alice M. Tybout, eds. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Association for Consumer Research, 679-684.
- Shih, Chuan-Fong and Alladi Venkatesh (2004), "Beyond Adoption: Development and Application of a Use-Diffusion Model," *JM*, 68 (January), 59-72.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am creative with \_\_\_\_\_.
2. I am very curious about how \_\_\_\_\_ work.
3. I am comfortable working on \_\_\_\_\_ projects that are different from what I am used to.
4. I often try to do projects on my \_\_\_\_\_ without exact directions.
5. I use a \_\_\_\_\_ in more ways than most people do.

---

<sup>1</sup> The extreme verbal anchors for the response scale used by Shih and Venkatesh (2004) were *not at all* (1) and *very much* (5). The name of a product category should be placed in the blanks, e.g., computer(s).

**SCALE NAME: Intangibility (Mental)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, nine-point Likert-type items intended to measure the degree to which a person describes a product as difficult to picture in the mind.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Laroche et al. (2005) was adapted from previous work by a couple of the authors (Laroche, Bergeron, and Goutland 2001). In that earlier article, the scale had five items. A close reading of the two articles indicates that Experiment 1 in the second article (Laroche et al. 2005) was based on the same dataset as the one used in the earlier article (Laroche, Bergeron, and Goutland 2001).

**RELIABILITY:**

In Experiment 1, Laroche et al. (2005) reported the scale's alpha to be .712. In Experiment 2, the alphas were .789 (off-line subsample) and .800 (online subsample).

**VALIDITY:**

No information was provided by Laroche et al. (2005) regarding the scale's validity. However, it did appear that in both experiments the measurement model fit the data well.

**REFERENCES:**

- Laroche, Michel, Jasmin Bergeron, and Christine Goutaland (2001), "A Three-Dimensional Scale of Intangibility," *Journal of Service Research*, 4 (1), 26-38.
- Laroche, Michel, Zhiyong Yang, Gordon H.G. McDougall, and Jasmin Bergeron (2005), "Internet Versus Bricks-and-Mortar Retailers: An Investigation into Intangibility and Its Consequences," *JR*, 81 (4), 251-267.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I need more information about \_\_\_\_\_ to get a clear idea (image) of what it is.
2. This is a difficult product to think about.
3. This is not the sort of product that is easy to picture.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the good, service, or other object should be placed in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Intention to Get a Mammogram**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point semantic-differentials are used to measure a woman's attitude about the effectiveness of mammograms and her intention to get the examination.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of the scale was not stated by Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2003). Although some phrases in the items are typical of previous intention measures, this set of items is probably original to Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was reported to have an alpha of .86 (Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Keller, Punan Anand, Issac M. Lipkus, and Barbara K. Rimer (2003), "Affect, Framing, and Persuasion," *JMR*, 40 (February), 54-65.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. do not intend to get a mammogram / intend to get a mammogram
2. do not to plan on getting a mammogram / plan on getting a mammogram
3. mammograms are not at all effective at finding breast cancer for women my age / mammograms are very effective at finding breast cancer for women my age

**SCALE NAME: Intention to Recommend**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type statements that are used to measure a customer's expressed likelihood of suggesting to others that they buy from a particular business (company or retailer) in the future. In the studies by Maxham and Netemeyer (2002a, 2002b, 2003) the scale was called *word-of-mouth*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The items are similar to some that have been used in a variety of past measures, especially those related to shopping intention and store loyalty. (See #403 and #600 for examples.) However, in total, this is a different measure and should probably be viewed as original to Maxham and Netemeyer (2002a, 2002b, 2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .92 and .90 were reported for the version of the scale used by Maxham and Netemeyer (2002a) with bank customers (Study 1) and new home buyers (Study 2), respectively. An alpha of .93 was found for the version used with customers of an electronics dealer in the study by Maxham and Netemeyer (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

For both of their studies, Maxham and Netemeyer (2002a) tested a measurement model including the items in this scale as well as those intended to measure six other constructs. The model fit very well. In addition, the scale met a stringent test of discriminant validity. Likewise, Maxham and Netemeyer (2003) entered the items in this scale along with 25 others, representing eight constructs in total, into a confirmatory factor analysis. Several tests of convergent and discriminant validity were apparently conducted and provided support for the each scale's validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Maxham and Netemeyer (2002b).

**REFERENCES:**

- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2002a), "Modeling Customer Perceptions of Complaint Handling Over Time: The Effect of Perceived Justice on Satisfaction and Intent," *JR*, 78 (4), 239-252.
- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2002b), "A Longitudinal Study of Complaining Customers' Evaluations of Multiple Service Failures and Recovery Efforts," *JM*, 66 (October), 57-71.
- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2003), "Firms Reap What They Sow: the Effects of Shared Values and Perceived Organizational Justice on Customers' Evaluations of Complaint Handling," *JM*, 67 (January), 46-62.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. How likely are you to spread positive word of mouth about \_\_\_\_\_?
2. I would recommend \_\_\_\_\_ for \_\_\_\_\_ to my friends.
3. If my friends were looking to purchase \_\_\_\_\_, I would tell them to try \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the business should be placed in the short blanks while the name of the product category should go in the longer spaces. Although not stated by the authors, the scale anchors for item #1 were probably something similar to *highly unlikely/highly likely* whereas those used with the other two items were probably *strongly disagree/strongly agree*.

**SCALE NAME: Interdependence**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, five-point Likert-type statements are used to measure an aspect of self-concept involving how one relates to others. In particular, this scale attempts to capture a self-construal where a person's identity is intertwined with those of others.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Choi and Miracle (2004) drew upon several previous measures of independence/interdependence (e.g., Singelis 1994) when developing their scales but they also tested items they believed tapped into facets of the construct that had not been measured before. A CFA of 29 items showed the items loaded on two dimensions but several were dropped from each set due to poor loadings or other problems.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alphas reported for different types of ads ranged from .47 to .63 (Choi and Miracle 2004). Since separate alphas for the American and Korean samples were not provided, it is unclear if one of the translations was more reliable than the other. Given the low reliability, improvement is needed before the scale is used further.

**VALIDITY:**

Choi and Miracle (2004) used the scale with American and Korean samples. Beyond what was stated about the scale's origin (above), the final set of items for this scale was described as being unidimensional and parallel.

**REFERENCES:**

- Choi, Yung Kyun and Gordon E. Miracle (2004), "The Effectiveness of Comparative Advertising in Korea and the United States," *JA*, 33 (4), 75-87.
- Singelis, Theodore M. (1994), "The Measurement of Independent and Interdependent Self-Construals," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20 (October), 580-591.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. My happiness depends on the happiness of those in my group.
2. When with my group, I watch my words so I won't offend anyone.
3. I try to meet the demands of my group, even if it means controlling my own desires.
4. It is important to consult close friends and get their ideas before making decisions.
5. I act as fellow group members prefer I act.

**SCALE NAME: Interest (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four item, seven-point Likert-type scale measures the extent to which a person expresses interest in and attention to some specific stimulus. As used by Moorman, Neijens, and Smit (2002), the object was a magazine that respondents had been asked to look it.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Moorman, Neijens, and Smit (2002) although the items were drawn from various previous studies. The items shown below are abbreviated English translations; the actual items were statements in Dutch.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .79 was reported for the scale (Moorman, Neijens, and Smit 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not explicitly addressed by Moorman, Neijens, and Smit (2002). They did describe, however, how the items intended for this scale were factor analyzed (Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation) along with items intended to measure one's positive and negative affective responses to the stimulus. The items shown below loaded on the same dimension although one of them (*fascinating*) cross-loaded on the positive affective reaction.

**COMMENTS:**

The items in the scale are more similar to those used to measure how interesting an ad is than items assessing involvement with products. Given this, the scale is probably most suited for situations where subjects are presented with some media object (e.g., program, website, ad) and are then asked to indicate their level of interest in it.

**REFERENCES:**

Moorman, Marjolein, Peter C. Neijens and Edith G. Smit (2002), "The Effects of Magazine-Induced Psychological Responses and Thematic Congruence on Memory and Attitude Toward the Ad in a Real-Life Setting," *JA*, 31 (4), 27-39.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement that these items described how they felt about the object using a seven-point scale anchored by *no agreement at all* (1) and *total agreement* (7).

#343 *Interest (General)*

1. dull (r)
2. fascinating
3. uninteresting (r)
4. attentive

**SCALE NAME: Interest in Advertisements**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point statements that are intended to measure the degree to which a person wants to see a set of ads. Unlike some other measures of ad interest and involvement, this scale focuses on the ads associated with a specific ad vehicle rather than a person's interest in one particular ad or all ads in general.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale seems to be original to Jin (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

Jin (2004) reported an alpha of .94 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Some limited evidence was mentioned by Jin (2004) in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validity.

**COMMENTS:**

The scale items were developed with the Super Bowl in mind and have the most relevance when used in that context. However, with a little bit of rephrasing, the items appear to be amenable for use with other ad vehicles and media.

**REFERENCES:**

Jin, Hyun Seung (2004), "Compounding Consumer Interest," *JA*, 32 (4), 29-41.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How much interest do you have in commercials that will appear during the \_\_\_\_\_.
2. How much do you want to see the \_\_\_\_\_ ads?
3. I'm very curious about what the \_\_\_\_\_ advertisements will be this year.

---

<sup>1</sup> A Likert-type response format (*strongly agree/strongly disagree*) was used with the third item while the anchors for the first two items were *not very much/very much*. The name of the program should be placed in the blanks, e.g., Super Bowl.

**SCALE NAME: Interest in the Ad Vehicle**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three item, seven-point Likert-type scale seems to measure a person's interest in a vehicle which carries advertising. It does not measure interest in any specific ad nor in the medium itself, such as interest in watching TV, but focuses on a particular TV program or content of a magazine to which the respondent has been exposed.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

De Pelsmacker, Geuens, and Anckaert (2002) did not identify the source of the scale so it is assumed that it is original to their work.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .9186 (TV) and .8980 (magazine) were reported for the scale by De Pelsmacker, Geuens, and Anckaert (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity or unidimensionality was provided by De Pelsmacker, Geuens, and Anckaert (2002).

**COMMENTS:**

The scale was originally phrased in Dutch but was translated into English for purposes of publication (De Pelsmacker 2004).

**REFERENCES:**

De Pelsmacker, Patrick, Maggie Geuens, and Pascal Anckaert (2002), "Media Context and Advertising Effectiveness: The Role of Context Appreciation and Context/Ad Similarity," *JA*, 31 (2), 49-61.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I found the television program (magazine articles) to be interesting.
2. I would like to watch (read) this program (these magazine articles).
3. I found this program (these magazine articles) to be boring. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The items were provided by De Pelsmacker (2004). Depending upon the vehicle the subjects saw (TV vs. magazine), the phrasing of the items must change slightly.

**SCALE NAME: Internet Search Skill**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's belief about his/her knowledge and ability to find information on the web.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Mathwick and Rigdon (2004) is composed of a subset of items from a scale created by Novak et al. (2000).

**RELIABILITY:**

Mathwick and Rigdon (2004) reported an alpha of .93 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Mathwick and Rigdon (2004) appear to have gathered data with four items but, after using CFA to examine their measurement model, one weak item was dropped from the final version of the scale. Although the details were not provided, they implied that there was evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Mathwick, Charla and Edward Rigdon (2004), "Play, Flow, and the Online Search Experience," *JCR*, 31 (September), 324-332.
- Novak, Thomas P., Donna L. Hoffman, and Yiu-Fai Yung (2000), "Measuring the Customer Experience in Online Environments: A Structural Modeling Approach," *Marketing Science*, 19 (1), 22-42.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I am extremely skilled at using the Web.
2. I consider myself knowledgeable about good search techniques on the Web.
3. I know how to find what I am looking for on the Web.

## #347 Internet Shopping (Convenience)

### **SCALE NAME: Internet Shopping (Convenience)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three-item, seven-point scale measures the extent to which a person thinks that Internet stores are easier to shop at and save more time compared to shopping at traditional retail stores. The scale is attempting to tap into a very general attitude, not specific to any particular website or store.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Szymanski and Hise (2000). They said that the items for the scale were inspired by statements made by focus group members during the qualitative phase of their research.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .69 was reported for the scale by Szymanski and Hise (2000). The scale was translated into German by Evanschitzky et al. (2004) and used with two websites. The alphas were .61 (e-shopping) and .67 (e-finance).

#### **VALIDITY:**

Apart from evidence that the scale is unidimensional, no examination of the scale's validity was reported by Szymanski and Hise (2000). In contrast, more information was provided by Evanschitzky et al. (2004). With items from Szymanski and Hise (2000) that were suppose to measure five factors of e-satisfaction, the structure was confirmed in a German setting. (The convenience scale represented just one of the factors.) However, the authors admitted that the model fit was only "mediocre" (p. 242). Later, they re-analyzed the data with two items eliminated and the fit was much better. One of the deleted items is #3 (below).

#### **COMMENTS:**

If the phrase *store fronts* in the scale stem is viewed as awkward or confusing then a term such as *websites* could be used instead without having to make any other changes to the scale.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Evanschitzky, Heiner, Iyer R. Gopalkrishnan, Josef Hesse, and Dieter Ahlert (2004), "E-Satisfaction: A Re-Examination," *JA*, 80 (3), 239-247.
- Szymanski, David M. and Richard T. Hise (2000), "e-Satisfaction: An Initial Examination," *JR*, 76 (3), 309-322.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors used by Szymanski and Hise (2000) for the response scale were *much worse than traditional stores* (1) and *much better than traditional stores* (7).

### #347 *Internet Shopping (Convenience)*

Directions: Evaluate Internet store fronts relative to traditional retail stores on each of the following dimensions:

1. Total shopping time
2. Convenience
3. Ease of browsing

**SCALE NAME: Internet shopping (Site Design)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point items are used to assess the degree to which a person thinks websites of retailers are doing a good job of helping customers to navigate easily and find desired information quickly. The scale is attempting to tap into a very general attitude, not specific to any particular vendor's website.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Szymanski and Hise (2000). They said that the items for the scale were inspired by statements made by focus group members during the qualitative phase of their research.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .72 was reported for the scale by Szymanski and Hise (2000). The scale was translated into German by Evanschitzky et al. (2004) and used with two websites. The alphas were .76 (e-shopping) and .81 (e-finance).

**VALIDITY:**

Apart from evidence that the scale is unidimensional, no examination of the scale's validity was reported by Szymanski and Hise (2000). In contrast, more information was provided by Evanschitzky et al. (2004). With items from Szymanski and Hise (2000) that were suppose to measure five factors of e-satisfaction, the structure was confirmed in a German setting. (The site design scale represented just one of the factors.) However, the authors admitted that the model fit was only "mediocre" (p. 242). Later, they re-analyzed the data with two items eliminated and the fit was much better. One of the deleted items is #3 (below).

**COMMENTS:**

If the phrase *store fronts* in the scale stem is viewed as awkward or confusing then a term such as *websites* could be used instead without having to make any other changes to the scale.

**REFERENCES:**

- Evanschitzky, Heiner, Iyer R. Gopalkrishnan, Josef Hesse, and Dieter Ahlert (2004), "E-Satisfaction: A Re-Examination," *JA*, 80 (3), 239-247.
- Szymanski, David M. and Richard T. Hise (2000), "e-Satisfaction: An Initial Examination," *JR*, 76 (3), 309-322.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: In general, how good of a job are Internet store fronts doing on the following

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors used by Szymanski and Hise (2000) for the response scale were *poor job* (1) and *excellent job* (7).

dimensions:

1. presenting uncluttered screens
2. providing easy-to-follow search paths
3. presenting information fast

## #349 Internet Usage (Convenience Motivation)

### **SCALE NAME: Internet Usage (Convenience Motivation)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point Likert-type statements and measures a person's reasons for using the Internet with an emphasis on the ease with which it can be used.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed along with three other motivation scales by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005). While they drew upon dimensions and measures developed by Papacharissi and Rubin (2000), the outcome was different enough to be considered unique. Both Korean and English versions of the scale were developed.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .65 (Ko, Cho, and Roberts 2005).

#### **VALIDITY:**

Some purification in the scale items and wording appears to have been done by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005) in a pretest but the details were not provided. In the main study, all that the authors said with bearing on validity was that the scale was one of many measures in a confirmatory factor analysis that was considered to have fit the data well.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Ko, Hanjun, Chang-Hoan Cho, and Marilyn S. Roberts (2005), "Internet Uses and Gratifications: A Structural Equation Model of Interactive Advertising," *JA*, 34 (2), 57-70.
- Papacharissi, Zizi and Alan M. Rubin (2000), "Predictors of Internet Use," *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 44 (2), 175-196.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. It's convenient to use
2. I can get what I want for less effort
3. I can use it anytime, anywhere

---

<sup>1</sup> The directions were not reported in the article by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005) but seem to have asked respondents to indicate why they used the Internet.

**SCALE NAME: Internet Usage (Entertainment Motivation)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the degree to which a person uses the Internet because of the enjoyment received from it and its usefulness in having a good time.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed along with three other motivation scales by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005). While they drew upon dimensions and measures developed by Papacharissi and Rubin (2000), the outcome was different enough to be considered unique. Both Korean and English versions of the scale were developed.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .78 (Ko, Cho, and Roberts 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Some purification in the scale items and wording appears to have been done by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005) in a pretest but the details were not provided. In the main study, all that the authors said with bearing on validity was that the scale was one of many measures in a confirmatory factor analysis that was considered to have fit the data well.

**REFERENCES:**

- Ko, Hanjun, Chang-Hoan Cho, and Marilyn S. Roberts (2005), "Internet Uses and Gratifications: A Structural Equation Model of Interactive Advertising," *JA*, 34 (2), 57-70.
- Papacharissi, Zizi and Alan M. Rubin (2000), "Predictors of Internet Use," *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 44 (2), 175-196.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. To pass time
2. I just like to surf the Internet
3. It's enjoyable
4. It's entertaining

---

<sup>1</sup> The directions were not reported in the article by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005) but seem to have asked respondents to indicate why they used the Internet.

**SCALE NAME: Internet Usage (Information Motivation)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's reasons for using the Internet with an emphasis on its usefulness in learning information.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed along with three other motivation scales by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005). While they drew upon dimensions and measures developed by Papacharissi and Rubin (2000), the outcome was different enough to be considered unique. Both Korean and English versions of the scale were developed.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .67 (Ko, Cho, and Roberts 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Some purification in the scale items and wording appears to have been done by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005) in a pretest but the details were not provided. In the main study, all that the authors said with bearing on validity was that the scale was one of many measures in a confirmatory factor analysis that was considered to have fit the data well.

**REFERENCES:**

- Ko, Hanjun, Chang-Hoan Cho, and Marilyn S. Roberts (2005), "Internet Uses and Gratifications: A Structural Equation Model of Interactive Advertising," *JA*, 34 (2), 57-70.
- Papacharissi, Zizi and Alan M. Rubin (2000), "Predictors of Internet Use," *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 44 (2), 175-196.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. to learn about unknown things
2. it's a good way to do research
3. to learn about useful things

---

<sup>1</sup> The directions were not reported in the article by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005) but seem to have asked respondents to indicate why they used the Internet.

**SCALE NAME: Internet Usage (Social Motivation)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the extent that a person uses the Internet because of its ability to facilitate communication with others.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed along with three other motivation scales by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005). While they drew upon dimensions and measures developed by Papacharissi and Rubin (2000), the outcome was different enough to be considered unique. Both Korean and English versions of the scale were developed.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .76 (Ko, Cho, and Roberts 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Some purification in the scale items and wording appears to have been done by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005) in a pretest but the details were not provided. In the main study, all that the authors said with bearing on validity was that the scale was one of many measures in a confirmatory factor analysis that was considered to have fit the data well.

**REFERENCES:**

- Ko, Hanjun, Chang-Hoan Cho, and Marilyn S. Roberts (2005), "Internet Uses and Gratifications: A Structural Equation Model of Interactive Advertising," *JA*, 34 (2), 57-70.
- Papacharissi, Zizi and Alan M. Rubin (2000), "Predictors of Internet Use," *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 44 (2), 175-196.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I wonder what other people said
2. To express myself freely
3. To meet people with my interests

---

<sup>1</sup> The directions were not reported in the article by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005) but seem to have asked respondents to indicate why they used the Internet.

## #353 Internet Usage (Time)

### **SCALE NAME: Internet Usage (Time)**

### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the amount of time a person spends on the Web relative to other people.

### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Mathwick and Rigdon (2004).

### **RELIABILITY:**

Mathwick and Rigdon (2004) reported an alpha of .93 for the scale.

### **VALIDITY:**

Explicit details regarding validation efforts were not provided by Mathwick and Rigdon (2004), but they did use CFA to examine their measurement model and no changes were apparently made as a result. They also implied that there was evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity.

### **REFERENCES:**

Mathwick, Charla and Edward Rigdon (2004), "Play, Flow, and the Online Search Experience," *JCR*, 31 (September), 324-332.

### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I spend several hours a week on the Web.
2. Compared with most Americans, I think I spend a lot of time on the Web.
3. Outside of the time I spend with e-mail, I consider myself to be a "heavy user" of the Web.
4. In a typical week, I visit dozens of sites.

**SCALE NAME: Internet Usage Control**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's attitude regarding the extent of control he/she had over a particular Internet-related task. The scale was called *decisional control* by Mathwick and Rigdon (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The items for the scale used by Mathwick and Rigdon (2004) were adapted from a "job control" scale by de Rijk et al. (1998) who, in turn, adapted items from a "job decision latitude" scale by Karasek (1985).

**RELIABILITY:**

Mathwick and Rigdon (2004) reported an alpha of .73 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Explicit details regarding validation efforts were not provided by Mathwick and Rigdon (2004), but they did use CFA to examine their measurement model and no changes were apparently made in the scale as a result. They also implied that there was evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- de Rijk, Angelique E., Pascale M. Le Blanc, Wilmar B. Schaufeli, and Jan de Jonge (1998), "Active Coping and Need for Control as Moderators of the Job Demand-Control Model: Effects on Burnout," *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 71 (March), 1-18.
- Karasek, R. A. (1985), *Job Content Instrument: Questionnaire and Users Guide*, Los Angeles: Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, University of Southern California.
- Mathwick, Charla and Edward Rigdon (2004), "Play, Flow, and the Online Search Experience," *JCR*, 31 (September), 324-332.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Navigating the Internet in this way allowed me to make a lot of decisions on my own.
2. I had a lot to say about what happened in these online information searches.
3. I had flexibility in my interactions with the Internet, while searching for information in this way.

**SCALE NAME: Internet Usage Skill**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's attitude regarding the extent to which an Internet-usage task has challenged his/her abilities. The scale was called *navigational challenge* by Mathwick and Rigdon (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Mathwick and Rigdon (2004) is composed slightly modified versions of items that were created by Novak et al. (2000). Interestingly, it appears as if the very items used by the former to compose the scale were dropped from the final version of the scale used by the latter.

**RELIABILITY:**

Mathwick and Rigdon (2004) reported an alpha of .85 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Explicit details regarding validation efforts were not provided by Mathwick and Rigdon (2004), but they did use CFA to examine their measurement model and no changes were apparently made as a result. They also implied that there was evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Mathwick, Charla and Edward Rigdon (2004), "Play, Flow, and the Online Search Experience," *JCR*, 31 (September), 324-332.
- Novak, Thomas P., Donna L. Hoffman, and Yiu-Fai Yung (2000), "Measuring the Customer Experience in Online Environments: A Structural Modeling Approach," *Marketing Science*, 19 (1), 22-42.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Using the Web in this way challenges me.
2. Using the Web in this way pushed me to perform to the best of my ability.
3. Using the Web in this way provides a good test of my skills.
4. I found that using the Web in this way stretched my capabilities to my limits.

**SCALE NAME: Intimacy with Company**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The five item, seven-point Likert-type scale assesses the degree to which a customer expresses a familiarity with a company's products, a sense that the company understands his/her needs, and the person's willingness to share personal information with the business.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not explicitly stated by Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004), they appear to have developed the scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) reported alphas ranging from .83 to .87 over three time periods.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Aaker, Jennifer, Susan Fournier, and S. Adam Brasel (2004), "When Good Brands Do Bad," *JCR*, 31 (June), 1-16.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I would feel comfortable sharing detailed information about myself with \_\_\_\_\_.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ really understands my needs in the \_\_\_\_\_ category.
3. I'd feel comfortable describing \_\_\_\_\_ to someone who was not familiar with it.
4. I am familiar with the range of goods and services \_\_\_\_\_ offers.
5. I have become very knowledgeable about \_\_\_\_\_.
6. I am likely to be using \_\_\_\_\_ one year from now.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal company should be placed in the blanks. The second blank in #2 should have a term describing the category of products offered by the company; photographic services.

**SCALE NAME: Investment Strategy (Prevention Benefits)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

These eight, seven-point Likert-type items are intended to measure a person's motivation to focus on minimizing risks and potential losses when selecting investment funds.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Hamilton and Biehal (2005) did not cite a source for the scale and it appears to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .90 (Study 1) and .85 (Study 2) were reported for the scale by Hamilton and Biehal (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Hamilton and Biehal (2005) did not address the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Hamilton, Rebecca W (2008), Personal Correspondence.  
Hamilton, Rebecca W. and Gabriel J. Biehal (2005), "Achieving Your Goals or Protecting Their Future? The Effects of Self-View on Goals and Choices," *JCR*, 32 (September), 277-283.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I was motivated to prevent possible losses.
2. I focused on each fund's (the investment's) potential to lose money.
3. I was willing to accept lower average returns in order to decrease the risk of losses.
4. When considering the four funds' performance profiles (the investment's past performance), I focused on the negative returns.
5. I wanted to create a combination of funds (select an investment) that would protect against large declines in value.
6. My primary goal was to preserve my assets.
7. I focused on what I have now.
8. I wanted to select a set of funds (an investment) that would minimize my expected losses.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hamilton (2008) provided the items. The statements used in Study 1 are listed with their changes for Study 2 shown in parentheses.

**SCALE NAME: Investment Strategy (Promotion Benefits)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Eight, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's motivation to focus on potential gains rather than potential losses in selecting investment funds.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Hamilton and Biehal (2005) did not cite a source for the scale and it appears to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .73 (Study 1) and .79 (Study 2) was reported for the scale by Hamilton and Biehal (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Hamilton and Biehal (2005) did not address the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Hamilton, Rebecca W (2008), Personal Correspondence.  
Hamilton, Rebecca W. and Gabriel J. Biehal (2005), "Achieving Your Goals or Protecting Their Future? The Effects of Self-View on Goals and Choices," *JCR*, 32 (September), 277-283.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I was motivated to seize opportunities for gains.
2. I focused on each fund's (the investment's) potential to make money.
3. I was willing to accept greater risk in order to achieve higher average returns.
4. When considering the four funds' performance profiles (the investment's past performance), I focused on the positive returns.
5. I wanted to create a combination of funds (select an investment) that offered opportunities for growth in value.
6. My primary goal was to grow my assets.
7. I focused on what I want to have in the future.
8. I wanted to select a set of funds (an investment) that would maximize my expected gains.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hamilton (2008) provided the items. The statements used in Study 1 are listed with their changes for Study 2 shown in parentheses.

**SCALE NAME: Involvement (Enduring)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The original version of the scale has twenty, seven point semantic differential items and measures the enduring and intrinsic (rather than situational) relevance of an object to a person. The scale is easily customized to measure involvement with a product category, a particular brand, an ad, merchant, et cetera. The scale was referred to as Personal Involvement Inventory (PII) by the originator (Zaichkowsky 1985).

Abbreviated versions of the scale have been used in several studies. Even Zaichkowsky (1994) herself introduced a version with just ten items and distinguished between affective and cognitive involvement subscales.

For a greatly modified version of the scale see Steenkamp and Wedel (1991) where store involvement was measured in Holland. Also see McQuarrie and Munson (1987) for another modified version of the scale (RPII). Finally, Neese and Taylor (1994) used only positive anchors to make two Likert-type scales for the study of luxury sedans.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

While previous research was reviewed and may have provided ideas for scale items, the scale as a unit was generated and tested first by Zaichkowsky (1985). Construction of the scale used four data sets of 286 undergraduate psychology students; two data sets with 49 MBA students; and two data sets with 57 clerical and administrative staff members. The stability of the measure was checked over two subject groups for four products producing test-retest correlations from .88 to .93. Internal consistency was calculated with the same data as ranging from .95 to .97 (Cronbach's alpha). Content validity was demonstrated for the scale through use of expert judges at two points: first, by reducing the list of word pairs to those most appropriate for measuring the construct; second, by successful classification of open-ended statements from subjects. Criterion validity was examined by demonstrating the similarity between subjects' average involvement levels with four products and the expected degree of involvement based upon previous studies. Construct validity was checked for three products by noting the association between subjects' scale scores and their statements of behavior expected to reflect involvement. For each of the three products there was a positive relationship between scale scores and responses to statements.

Later, Zaichkowsky (1994) produced an abbreviated version of the scale but reported that it might not be unidimensional. Based on this, she produced a five item cognitive involvement subscale and a five item affective involvement subscale.

The scale used by Maheswaran and Meyers-Levy (1990) may not have been directly derived from the Zaichkowsky measure and is very short but is similar enough to be viewed here as measuring the same thing.

**RELIABILITY:**

Reported internal consistencies have ranged from .80 (Lord, Lee, and Sauer 1994) to .98 (Houston and Walker 1996). Zaichkowsky (1994) reported that the abbreviated version of

the scale she tested had stability scores (3 week test-retest) ranging between .73 and .84 depending upon the ad.

Alphas for the subscales were reported by Zaichkowsky (1994) to range from .39 to .96 for the cognitive component and .75 to .95 for the affective component. In their Study 2B, Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003; Voss 2005) found alphas of .89 and .92 for the cognitive and affective components, respectively. In their Study 6, the cognitive and affective subscales had alphas of .96 and .93, respectively (Voss 2005). The eight-item subscale used by Ofir (2004) in two studies with two income groups and two products had a wide range of alphas (.79-.99).

### **VALIDITY:**

Few, if any, tests of validity were reported by most of the studies. A factor analysis of the twenty-item scale performed by Mick (1992) produced a two-factor solution. Only the sixteen items loading strongly on the first factor were retained for calculating scale scores.

Houston and Walker (1996) were concerned about the dimensionality of the scale and tested it further using CFA. While evidence was found for two factors, the test for discriminant validity they applied was not met which led them to treat the two dimensions as one for purposes of the scale. After eliminating some items (details not provided), Mathwick and Rigdon (2004) provided results of confirmatory factor analysis and other tests to support a claim of convergent and discriminant validity for the final version of the scale they used.

After examining an abundance of information on the construct, Zaichkowsky (1994) was not certain of the best way to measure it. On the one hand she admitted that using latent structure analysis indicated that a correlated two-factor solution fit the data better than a one factor solution yet she concluded that the validity using two distinct subscales “cannot be confirmed by these studies” and that it “is not clear that affective and cognitive types of involvement can be separated” (p. 68).

### **COMMENTS:**

See also Dean (1999), Celsi and Olson (1998), Gotlieb and Sarel (1991), Gotlieb and Swan (1990), Haugtvedt and Wegener (1994), Machleit, Allen, and Madden (1993), Mano and Oliver (1993), Martin, Lang, and Wong (2004), Mishra, Umesh, and Stem (1993), Mittal (1990), Murry, Lastovicka, and Singh (1992), Samu, Krishnan, and Smith (1999), Schlosser (2003), Singh and Cole (1993), Spreng, MacKenzie, and Olshavsky (1996), Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003), and Yi and Jeon (2003) for other uses of the scale. Kukar-Kinney and Walters (2003) used five of this scale’s items to measure the value of a price-matching guarantee. Garretson and Burton (2005) used three of the items to measure the importance of brand selection.

### **REFERENCES:**

Bower, Amanda B. and Stacy Landreth (2001), “Is Beauty Best? Highly Versus Normally Attractive Models in Advertising,” *JA*, 30 (1), 1-12.

### #359 Involvement (Enduring)

- Celsi, Richard L. and Jerry C. Olson (1988), "The Role of Involvement in Attention and Comprehension Processes," *JCR*, 15 (September), 210-224.
- Coyle, James R. and Esther Thorson (2001), "The Effects of Progressive Levels of Interactivity and Vividness in Web Marketing Sites," *JA*, 30 (Fall), 65-77.
- Dean, Dwane Hal (1999), "Brand Endorsement, Popularity, and Event Sponsorship as Advertising Cues Affecting Consumer Pre-Purchase Attitudes," *JA*, 28 (3), 1-12.
- Garretson, Judith A. and Scot Burton (2005), "The Role of Spokescharacters as Advertisement and Package Cues in Integrated Marketing Communications," *JM*, 69 (October), 118-132.
- Gotlieb, Jerry B. and John E. Swan (1990), "An Application of the Elaboration Likelihood Model," *JAMS*, 18 (Summer), 221-228.
- Gotlieb, Jerry B. and Dan Sarel (1991), "Comparative Advertising Effectiveness: The Role of Involvement and Source Credibility," *JA*, 20 (1), 38-45.
- Haugtvedt, Curtis P. and Duane T. Wegener (1994), "Message Order Effects in Persuasion: An Attitude Strength Perspective," *JCR*, 21 (June), 205-218.
- Houston, Mark B. and Beth A. Walker (1996), "Self-Relevance and Purchase Goals: Mapping a Consumer Decision," *JAMS*, 24 (Summer), 232-245.
- Kukar-Kinney, Monika and Rockney G. Walters (2003), "Consumer Perceptions of Refund Depth and Competitive Scope in Price-matching Guarantees: Effects on Store Patronage," *JR*, 79 (3), 153-160.
- Laczniak, Russell N. and Darrel D. Muehling (1993), "The Relationship Between Experimental Manipulations and Tests of Theory in an Advertising Message Involvement Context," *JA*, 22 (September), 59-74.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R., Peter H. Bloch, and William C. Black (1988), "Correlates of Price Acceptability," *JCR*, 15 (Sept.), 243-252.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R., Richard D. Netemeyer, and Scot Burton (1990), "Distinguishing Coupon Proneness From Value Consciousness: An Acquisition-Transaction Utility Theory Perspective," *JM*, 54 (July), 54-67.
- Lord, Kenneth R., Myung-Soo Lee, and Paul L. Sauer (1994), "Program Context Antecedents of Attitude toward Radio Commercials," *JAMS*, 22 (1), 3-15.
- Maheswaran, Durairaja and Joan Meyers-Levy (1990), "The Influence of Message Framing and Issue Involvement," *JMR*, 27 (August), 361-367.
- Machleit, Karen A., Chris T. Allen, and Thomas J. Madden (1993), "The Mature Brand and Brand Interest: An Alternative Consequence of Ad-Evoked Affect," *JM*, 57 (October), 72-82.
- Mano, Haim and Richard L. Oliver (1993), "Assessing the Dimensionality and Structure of the Consumption Experience: Evaluation, Feeling, and Satisfaction," *JCR*, 20 (December), 451-466.
- Marks, Lawrence J. (1994), Personal Correspondence.
- Martin, Brett A.S., Bodo Lang, and Stephanie Wong (2004), "Conclusion Explicitness in Advertising," *JA*, 32 (4), 57-65.
- Mathwick, Charla and Edward Rigdon (2004), "Play, Flow, and the Online Search Experience," *JCR*, 31 (September), 324-332.
- McQuarrie, Edward F. and J. Michael Munson (1987), "The Zaichkowsky Personal Inventory: Modification and Extension," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 14 (?), 36-40.

- Mick, David Glen (1992), "Levels of Subjective Comprehension in Advertising Processing and Their Relations to Ad Perceptions, Attitudes, and Memory," *JCR*, 18 (March), 411-424.
- Miller, Darryl W. and Lawrence J. Marks (1992), "Mental Imagery and Sound Effects in Radio Commercials," *JA*, 21 (4), 83-93.
- Mishra, Sanjay, U. N. Umesh, and Donald E. Stem, Jr. (1993), "Antecedents of the Attraction Effect: An Information-Processing Approach," *JMR*, 30 (August), 331-349.
- Mittal, Banwari (1990), "The Relative Roles of Brand Beliefs and Attitude Toward the Ad as Mediators of Brand Attitude: A Second Look," *JMR*, 27 (May), 209-219.
- Moore, Robert S., Claire Allison Stammerjohan, and Robin A. Coulter (2005), "Banner Advertiser-Web Site Context Congruity and Color Effects on Attention and Attitudes," *JA*, 34 (2), 71-84.
- Mothersbaugh, David L., Bruce A. Huhmann, and George R. Franke (2002), "Combinatory and Separative Effects of Rhetorical Figures on Consumers' Effort and Focus in Ad Processing," *JCR*, 28 (March), 589-602.
- Muehling, Darrel D. (1994), Personal Correspondence.
- Murry, John P. Jr., John L. Lastovicka, Surendra N. Singh (1992), "Feeling and Liking Responses to Television Programs: An Examination of Two Explanations for Media-Context Effects," *JCR*, 18 (March), 441-451.
- Neese, William T. and Ronald D. Taylor (1994), "Verbal Strategies for Indirect Comparative Advertising," *JAR*, 34 (March/April), 56-69.
- Ofir, Chezy (2004), "Reexamining Latitude of Price Acceptability and Price Thresholds: Predicting Basic Consumer Reaction to Price," *JCR*, 30 (March), 612-621.
- Russell, Cristel Antonia, Andrew T. Norman and Susan E. Heckler (2004), "The Consumption of Television Programming and Validation of the Connectedness Scale," *JCR*, 31 (June), 150-161.
- Samu, Sridhar, H. Shanker Krishnan, and Robert E. Smith (1999), "Using Advertising Alliances for New Product Introduction: Interactions Between Product Complementarity and Promotional Strategies," *JM*, 63 (January), 57-74.
- Schlosser, Ann E. (2003), "Experiencing Products in the Virtual World: The Role of Goal and Imagery in Influencing Attitudes versus Purchase Intentions," *JCR*, 30 (September), 184-198.
- Singh, Surendra N. and Catherine Cole (1993), "The Effects of Length, Content, and Repetition on Television Commercial Effectiveness," *JMR*, 30 (February), 91-104.
- Spreng, Richard A., Scott B. MacKenzie, and Richard W. Olshavsky (1996), "A Reexamination of the Determinants of Consumer Satisfaction," *JM*, 60 (July), 15-32.
- Stafford, Marla Royne (1996), "Tangibility in Services Advertising: An Investigation of Verbal versus Visual Cues," *JA*, 25 (Fall), 13-28.
- Stafford, Marla Royne (1998), "Advertising Sex-Typed Services: The Effects of Sex, Service Type, and Employee Type on Consumer Attitudes," *JA*, 27 (2), 65-82.
- Steenkamp, Jan-Benedict E. M. and Michel Wedel (1991), "Segmenting Retail Markets on Store Image Using a Consumer-Based Methodology," *JR*, 67 (Fall), 300-320.
- Voss, Kevin E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.

### #359 Involvement (Enduring)

- Voss, Kevin E., Eric R. Spangenberg, and Bianca Grohmann (2003), "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Dimensions of Consumer Attitude," *JMR*, 40 (August), 310-320.
- Wakefield, Kirk L. and Julie Baker (1998), "Excitement at the Mall: Determinants and Effects on Shopping Response," *JR*, 74 (4), 515-539.
- Yi, Youjae and Hoseong Jeon (2003), "Effects of Loyalty Programs on Value Perception, Program Loyalty, and Brand Loyalty," *JAMS*, 31 (3), 229-240.
- Zaichkowsky, Judith L. (1985), "Measuring the Involvement Construct," *JCR*, 12 (December), 341-352.
- Zaichkowsky, Judith L. (1994), "The Personal Involvement Inventory: Reduction, Revision, and Application to Advertising," *JA*, 23 (December), 59-70.

#### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. unimportant / important
2. of no concern / of concern to me
3. irrelevant / relevant
4. means nothing to me / means a lot to me
5. useless / useful
6. worthless / valuable
7. trivial / fundamental
8. not beneficial / beneficial
9. doesn't matter / matters to me
10. uninterested / interested
11. insignificant / significant
12. superfluous / vital
13. boring / interesting
14. unexciting / exciting
15. unappealing / appealing
16. mundane / fascinating
17. nonessential / essential
18. undesirable / desirable
19. unwanted / wanted
20. not needed / needed
21. not involved / highly involved
22. uninvolving / involving

Bower and Landreth (2001): 1, 2, 3, 9 [.90]

Coyle and Thorson (2001): 13, 14, 15, 22 [.82, .92]

Houston and Walker (1996): 1-20 [.98]

Lichtenstein et al. (1988): 1 to 6, 8, 17, 20 [.93]

Lichtenstein et al. (1990): 1 to 4, 6, 8, 9, 13 to 15, 17 [.90]

Lord, Lee, and Sauer (1994): 1 to 3, 8, 12 [.80]

---

<sup>1</sup> Seven-point response formats have been typically used. According to Zaichkowsky (1994), the items composing the cognitive subscale were 1, 3, 4, 6, and 20 while 5, 14, 15, 16, and 22 composed the affective subscale.

#359 *Involvement (Enduring)*

- Maheswaran and Joan Meyers-Levy (1990): short phrases based on 3, 10, 21 [.89]  
Mathwick and Rigdon (2004): 4, 6, 13, 14, 16, 22 [.88]  
Mick (1992): 1-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18, 19 [.96]  
Miller and Marks (1992; Marks 1994): 1-20 [.94]  
Moore, Stammerjohan, and Coulter (2005): 1 to 6, 8, 17, 20 [.94, .93]  
Mothersbaugh, Huhmann, and Franke (2002): 1, 3, 4, 6, 13-16, 20, 22 [.94]  
Ofir (2004): 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 17, 20 [.70-.99]  
Russell, Norman, and Heckler (2004): 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 14-16, 20, 22 [.90]  
Stafford (1996): 1-20 [.97]  
Stafford (1998): 1, 3, 4, 6, 13-16, 20, 22 [.92]  
Wakefield and Baker (1998): 1, 4, 9, 13-15 [.96 ]  
Zaichkowsky (1985): 1-20 [.95-.97]  
Zaichkowsky (1994): 1, 3, 4, 6, 13-16, 20, 22 [.91-.96]

**SCALE NAME: Involvement (Situational)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

It is a multi-item, seven point semantic differential scale measuring the temporary (rather than enduring and/or intrinsic) relevance of an object to a person. Whereas enduring involvement is ongoing and is probably related to a product class, situational involvement is a passing motivation. The scale can be easily customized for measuring involvement with such things a particular ad one has been exposed to or the amount of involvement in a certain purchase decision.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The items for the scale come from the Personal Involvement Inventory (PII) by Zaichkowsky (1985). However, that scale was constructed to assess enduring involvement. In contrast, the studies listed here used a subset of the PII items and specifically modified instructions to measure a distinct though related construct: situational involvement.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .99 and .80 were reported for the slightly different versions of the scale by Houston and Walker (1996) and Krishnamurthy and Sivaraman (2002), respectively. Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1990) reported the reliability (LISREL estimate) of their version of the scale to be .96. Alphas of .89 and .93 were reported for the version of the scale used by Mantel and Kardes (1999) for low- and high-involvement manipulation checks, respectively. Wallace, Giese, and Johnson (2004) reported the reliability for their nine-item version of the scale to be .81.

**VALIDITY:**

Houston and Walker (1996) examined the discriminant validity of the scale with the larger version of the scale. They concluded that the two were related but distinct constructs. They also stated that the items composing the situational involvement scale loaded on a single factor in principle components analysis.

Although the scale may have been used to help validate another scale or two developed in the study, no explicit test of the situational involvement scale's validity was reported by Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1990).

Similarly, the validity of the scale was not specifically tested by Mantel and Kardes (1999) but, as a manipulation check, some sense of the scale's concurrent validity comes from confirmation that the manipulation of subjects occurred as expected.

Wallace, Giese, and Johnson (2004) used confirmatory factor analysis to provide evidence in support of the validity of their version of the involvement scale. In particular, their analysis showed that involvement and experience were separate constructs.

**REFERENCES:**

- Houston, Mark B. and Beth A. Walker (1996), "Self-Relevance and Purchase Goals: Mapping a Consumer Decision," *JAMS*, 24 (Summer), 232-245.
- Krishnamurthy, Parthasarathy and Anuradha Sivaraman (2002), "Counterfactual Thinking and Advertising Responses," *JCR*, 28 (March), 650-658.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R., Richard D. Netemeyer, and Scot Burton (1990), "Distinguishing Coupon Proneness From Value Consciousness: An Acquisition-Transaction Utility Theory Perspective," *JM*, 54 (July), 54-67.
- Mantel, Susan Powell and Frank R. Kardes (1999), "The Role of Direction of Comparison, Attribute-Based Processing, and Attitude-Based Processing in Consumer Preference," *JCR*, 25 (March), 335-352.
- Wallace, David W., Joan L. Giese, and Jean L. Johnson (2004), "Customer Retailer Loyalty in the Context of Multiple Channel Strategies," *JR*, 80 (4), 249-263.
- Zaichkowsky, Judith L. (1985), "Measuring the Involvement Construct," *JCR*, 12 (December), 341-352.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. unimportant / important
2. of no concern / of concern to me
3. irrelevant / relevant
4. means nothing to me / means a lot to me
5. worthless / valuable
6. not beneficial / beneficial
7. doesn't matter / matters to me
8. boring / interesting
9. unexciting / exciting
10. unappealing / appealing
11. nonessential / essential
12. insignificant / significant to me
13. undesirable / desirable
14. mundane / fascinating
15. uninvolving / involving
16. not needed / needed
17. useless / useful

---

<sup>1</sup> Directions should be provided for respondents that focus attention on the object/action towards which situational involvement is being measured. Houston and Walker (1996) used items 1-4, 7, and 12 whereas Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1990) used items 1-11. Items 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 13 were used by Mantel and Kardes (1999) while Krishnamurthy and Sivaraman (2002) used 1, 3, 4, 5, 8-10, 14-16. The version of the scale used by Wallace, Giese, and Johnson (2004) was composed of #1-#6, #11, #16, and #17.

**SCALE NAME: Involvement in the Experimental Task**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to assess the earnestness with which a subject engaged in an experimental task that involved reading an ad and making a purchase decision.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although similar in concept to a scale the lead author used years earlier (Pham 1996), the items in this scale are different enough to be considered original to Pham and Avnet (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .84 was reported for the scale by Pham and Avnet (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Pham and Avnet (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Pham, Michel Tuan (1996), "Cue Representation and Selection Effects of Arousal on Persuasion," *JCR*, 22 (March), 373-387.

Pham, Michel Tuan and Tamar Avnet (2004), "Ideals and Oughts and the Reliance on Affect versus Substance in Persuasion," *JCR*, 30 (March), 503-518.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I did not take the task of evaluating the \_\_\_\_\_ seriously. (r)
2. I really read the ad as if I actually needed to by a \_\_\_\_\_.
3. I took extra care in making a sound evaluation of the \_\_\_\_\_.

**SCALE NAME: Involvement in the Message (Motivation)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure the interest and relevance a person expresses having in a message.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Shiv, Britton, and Payne (2004) did not identify the source of the scale. The terms have been used in many previous measures of involvement but it does not appear that this set of items has been used previously. The scale was described as a measure of their “processing motivation manipulation” (p. 202).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .88 (persuasive message) and .92 (additional information) were reported for the scale by Shiv, Britton, and Payne (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Shiv, Britton, and Payne (2004) did not report any examination of the scale’s validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Shiv, Baba, Julie A. Edell Britton and John W. Payne (2004), “Does Elaboration Increase or Decrease the Effectiveness of Negatively versus Positively Framed Messages?” *JCR*, 31 (June), 199-208.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. interesting
2. involving
3. personally relevant

---

<sup>1</sup> These were the items as described in the article by Shiv, Britton, and Payne (2004). It is unknown if the actual items they used were more elaborate phrases than this.

**SCALE NAME: Involvement in the Message (Processing Effort)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four statements are used in this scale to measure the self-expressed amount of cognitive effort a person has put into reading a message and thinking about it. The message in the experiment by Wheeler, Petty, and Bizer (2005) was an ad for a product but the scale items appear to be amenable for use with a wide variety of messages that could have nothing to do with products, e.g., politics, social issues, the economy.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although it bears some similarity to various other measures of involvement, attention, and cognitive effort, the scale used by Wheeler, Petty, and Bizer (2005) seems to have been developed by them for their study (experiment 1).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .81 was reported for the scale by Wheeler, Petty, and Bizer (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Wheeler, Petty, and Bizer (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Wheeler, S. Christian, Richard E. Petty, and George Y. Bizer (2005), "Self-Schema Matching and Attitude Change: Situational and Dispositional Determinants of Message Elaboration," *JCR*, 31 (March), 787-797.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. To what degree did you pay attention to the message you read about the \_\_\_\_\_<sup>2</sup>.
2. Did you think deeply about the information contained in this message?
3. How much effort did you put into reading the message?
4. How personally involved did you feel with the issue you read about?

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors and number of points for the response scale were not stated by Wheeler, Petty, and Bizer (2005) but were likely to have been of the seven-point *very little / a lot* variety.

<sup>2</sup> The name of the topic, object, product, et cetera should be stated in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Involvement in the Task (Distraction)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure the degree of focus a person has on a particular activity, as in an experiment, with the emphasis being on how much the person's attention was diverted from the task to something else.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale seems to be original to Nowlis and Shiv (2005) and was used in their Experiments 3 and 4.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alphas reported by Nowlis and Shiv (2005) were .89 (n = 197) and .86 (n = 305).

**VALIDITY:**

No evidence of the scale's validity was reported by Nowlis and Shiv (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Nowlis, Stephen M. and Baba Shiv (2005), "The Influence of Consumer Distractions on the Effectiveness of Food-Sampling Programs," *JMR*, 42 (May), 157-168.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

While \_\_\_\_\_:<sup>1</sup>

1. I was not at all busy / I was very busy<sup>2</sup>
2. I was not at all distracted / I was very distracted
3. I was not at all preoccupied / I was very preoccupied

---

<sup>1</sup> A brief description of the focal task could be added here, e.g., *tasting the chocolate* (Nowlis and Shiv 2005).

<sup>2</sup> A brief description of a specific distraction could be added here, e.g., *memorizing the list* (Nowlis and Shiv 2005)

**SCALE NAME: Involvement in the Task (Processing Effort)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of seven-point statements that measure the cognitive effort a person expresses was expended in processing a message or a decision.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Shiv, Britton, and Payne (2004) did not identify the source of the scale. The key phrases have been used in previous measures of involvement but it does not appear that this set of items has been used previously. Actually, two slightly different versions of the scale were used in their first and second experiments. The first one was called “processing opportunity” (p. 203) and the second one was referred to as “cognitive elaboration” (p. 205). Ferraro, Shiv and Bettman (2005) used the three item version of the scale and merely described it as the extent to which participants deliberated on a choice.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .91 (Experiment 1) and .87 (Experiment 2) were reported for the scale by Shiv, Britton, and Payne (2004). Ferraro, Shiv and Bettman (2005) reported an alpha of .79 for the version of the scale they used.

**VALIDITY:**

Neither Shiv, Britton, and Payne (2004) nor Ferraro, Shiv and Bettman (2005) reported any examination of the scale’s validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Ferraro, Rosellina, Baba Shiv and James R. Bettman (2005), “Let Us Eat and Drink, for Tomorrow We Shall Die: Effects of Morality Salience and Self-Esteem on Self-Regulation in Consumer Choice,” *JCR*, 32 (June), 65-75.
- Shiv, Baba, Julie A. Edell Britton and John W. Payne (2004), “Does Elaboration Increase or Decrease the Effectiveness of Negatively versus Positively Framed Messages?” *JCR*, 31 (June), 199-208.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. the extent to which you deliberated
2. the time you spent thinking
3. the amount of attention you paid
4. the extent to which you thought about

---

<sup>1</sup> These were the items as described in the article by Shiv, Britton, and Payne (2004). The first three items composed the scale in Experiment 1 while the last three were used in Experiment 2. Ferraro, Shiv and Bettman (2005) appear to have used items #1-#3. The authors of both studies said the extreme verbal anchors of the response scale were *very low* (1) and *very high* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Involvement with Coupons****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This is a multi-item, seven-point Likert-type scale measuring the degree to which a consumer reports using coupons and enjoying it. A five-item version was used by Lichtenstein, Ridgway, and Netemeyer (1993), Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1995), Lichtenstein, Burton, and Netemeyer (1997), and Burton et al. (1998, 1999). In these studies the scale was referred to as *coupon proneness*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1990). Five marketing academicians judged the appropriateness of 33 items generated to represent the construct. Twenty-five items remained after this procedure. Based upon a second round of five additional judges assessing the face validity of the items, all items were retained. The items were then interspersed throughout a questionnaire given to 263 undergraduate and graduate business students. The eight items composing the final version of the scale were those that had corrected item-total correlations equal to or greater than .40. Confirmatory factor analysis provided evidence that the items were unidimensional and had discriminant validity. The construct reliability was calculated to be .88.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .84 was calculated for the scale as used by Biwa, Srinivasan, and Srivastava (1997; Biwa 1998). Burton et al. (1998) reported an alpha of .86. In Study 1 by Burton, Lichtenstein, and Netemeyer (1999) an alpha of .88 was reported; in Study 2 it was merely reported to be greater than .85. Lastovicka et al. (1999) reported an alpha of .88.

The internal consistency of the scale was calculated by Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1990) to be .88 and item-total correlations were above .40. Alphas of .88 and .86 were reported for the scale by Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1995) for Study 1 (Lichtenstein, Burton, and Netemeyer 1997) and 2, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

In the process of validating another scale (#26), Burton et al. (1998) conducted multiple tests of the scale's discriminant validity. The evidence provided support for a claim of discriminant validity for the Involvement (Coupons) scale as well.

Lastovicka et al. (1999) used this scale in the process of validating another scale (V4, #177). Based upon that, their data indicated that scores on the coupon involvement scale were not significantly related to either frugality or a measure of response bias (#267).

Confirmatory factor analyses were used in each of the studies by Lichtenstein et al. (1990, 1993, 1995, 1997) and the evidence indicated that the scale was unidimensional and showed evidence of discriminant validity. Lichtenstein, Ridgway, and Netemeyer (1993) stated that after using CFA, items with low standardized factor loadings were

### #366 *Involvement with Coupons*

dropped. This is likely to be the reason that fewer items composed the scale in the later studies compared to the first.

#### **COMMENTS:**

Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1995) reported means on the scale of 19.26 and 19.18 for Study 1 and 2, respectively. See also Swaminathan and Bawa (2005).

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Biwa, Kapil (1998), Personal Correspondence.
- Biwa, Kapil, Srini S. Srinivasan, and Rajendra K. Srivastava (1997), "Coupon Attractiveness and Coupon Proneness: A Framework for Modeling Coupon Redemption," *JMR*, 34 (November), 517-525.
- Burton, Scot (2000), Personal Correspondence.
- Burton, Scot, Donald R. Lichtenstein, and Richard G. Netemeyer (1999), "Exposure to Sales Flyers and Increased Purchases in Retail Supermarkets," *JAR*, 39 (September/October), 7-14.
- Burton, Scot, Donald R. Lichtenstein, Richard G. Netemeyer, and Judith A. Garretson (1998), "A Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward Private Label Products and an Examination of Its Psychological and Behavioral Correlates," *JAMS*, 26 (4), 293-306.
- Lastovicka, John L., Lance A. Bettencourt, Renee Shaw Hughner, and Ronald J. Kuntze (1999), "Lifestyle of the Tight and Frugal: Theory and Measurement," *JCR*, 26 (June), 85-98.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R., Scot Burton, and Richard G. Netemeyer (1997), "An Examination of Deal Proneness Across Sales Promotion Types: A Consumer Segmentation Perspective," *JR*, 73 (2), 283-297.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R., Richard D. Netemeyer, and Scot Burton (1990), "Distinguishing Coupon Proneness From Value Consciousness: An Acquisition-Transaction Utility Theory Perspective," *JM*, 54 (July), 54-67.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R., Richard D. Netemeyer, and Scot Burton (1995), "Assessing the Domain Specificity of Deal Proneness: A Field Study," *JCR*, 22 (December), 314-326.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R., Nancy M. Ridgway, and Richard G. Netemeyer (1993), "Price Perceptions and Consumer Shopping Behavior: A Field Study," *JMR*, 30 (May), 234-245.
- Swaminathan, Srinivasan and Kapil Bawa (2005), "Category-Specific Coupon Proneness: The Impact of Individual Characteristics and Category-Specific Variables," *JR*, 81 (3), 205-214.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> All of the above items were used by Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1990) but only items 1 to 4, and 8 were used by Burton et al. (1998, 1999, 2000), Lichtenstein, Burton, and Netemeyer (1997), Lichtenstein, Ridgway, and Netemeyer (1993) as well as Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1995). Biwa, Srinivasan, and Srivastava (1997) as well as Lastovicka et al. (1999) were not explicit about which items they used but it would appear they used the original version of the scale.

1. Redeeming coupons makes me feel good.
2. I enjoy clipping coupons out of the newspapers.
3. When I use coupons, I feel that I am getting a good deal.
4. I enjoy using coupons, regardless of the amount I save by doing so.
5. I have favorite brands, but most of the time I buy the brand I have a coupon for.
6. I am more likely to buy brands for which I have a coupon.
7. Coupons have caused me to buy products I normally would not buy.
8. Beyond the money I save, redeeming coupons gives me a sense of joy.

**SCALE NAME: Involvement with Politics**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The six item, seven-point Likert-type scale is intended to measure the importance of politics to the respondent and its centrality in his/her life.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

O’Cass (2002) did not state the source of the scale but comparing it to the widely used enduring involvement scale by Zaichkowsky (1985) shows that the key word in each statement of the former is part of the latter. The difference is that this scale focuses on politics and uses Likert-type phrasing and response formats rather than bi-polar adjectives.

**RELIABILITY:**

The internal consistency of the scale was .92 (O’Cass 2002, 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

O’Cass claimed evidence for the scale’s discriminant validity using a simple but less popular technique (Gaski 1984) whereby the internal consistency of a scale is compared to its correlations with every other scale in a study. To the extent that the internal consistency is higher than the correlations then some evidence for discriminant validity is shown. O’Cass implied that the involvement scale successfully met this criterion.

**REFERENCES:**

- O’Cass, Aron (2002), “Political Advertising Believability and Information Source Value During Elections,” *JA*, 31 (1 Spring), 63-73.  
\_\_\_\_\_(2004), Personal Correspondence.  
Zaichkowsky, Judith L. (1985), “Measuring the Involvement Construct,” *JCR*, 12 (December), 341-352.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Politics means a lot to me.
2. Politics is significant to me.
3. Politics is relevant to me.
4. For me personally, politics is important.
5. I am interested in politics.
6. Some individuals are completely involved with politics, absorbed by it. For others politics is simply not that involving. How involved are you with politics?  
*not at all / extremely*

**SCALE NAME: Involvement With Reading Task**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure the level at which a person reports being motivated to process some specific information. In the study by Suri and Monroe (2003), the scale was used with subjects who had been asked to evaluate some product-related information.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information about the scale's origin was provided by Suri and Monroe (2003). It seems to be original to their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

Suri and Monroe (2003) reported the alpha for the scale to be .90 in the pretest and .79 in the main study (n = 306 undergraduate business students).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Suri and Monroe (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Suri, Rajineesh and Kent B. Monroe (2003), "The Effects of Time Constraints on Consumers' Judgments of Prices and Products," *JCR*, 30 (June), 92-104.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. very interested to read / not interested to read
2. very involved / not involved
3. very interested to understand / not interested to understand

**SCALE NAME: Involvement with Sales Promotion Deals**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

It is a eight-item, seven-point Likert-type scale measuring a consumer's enjoyment of sales promotion deals and tendency to buy products associated with such offers. This measures a general tendency rather than the likelihood that the behavior occurs for any particular product category. Burton et al. (1998) and Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1995) referred the scale as *general deal proneness* while Garretson, Fisher, and Burton (2002) called it *national brand promotion attitude*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to the studies by Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1995) though some of the items are similar to ones developed previously by the same authors for other measures (e.g., Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton 1990). In an effort to develop a deal proneness measure not specific to any particular type of deal 43 items were generated and purified to a final set of eight using a pretest sample.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .90 was reported for the scale by both Burton et al. (1998) and Garretson, Fisher, and Burton (2002). Alphas of .90 and .91 were reported for the scale by Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1995) for a pretest and Study 2, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

Confirmatory factor analysis was used by Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1995) to conclude that the scale was unidimensional and showed evidence of discriminant validity. Some evidence of the scale's predictive validity was also indicated since the scale had significant positive associations with most of the marketplace behaviors examined in the study. Garretson, Fisher, and Burton (2002) examined the items in this scale along with the items for several other scales using confirmatory factor analysis. The acceptable fit of the model along with some other typical tests provided support for the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**COMMENTS:**

Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1995) reported means on the scale of 32.66 and 36.06 for the pretest and Study 2, respectively. See also Baumgartner and Steenkamp (2001).

**REFERENCES:**

- Baumgartner, Hans and Jan-Benedict E.M. Steenkamp (2001), "Response Styles in Marketing Research: A Cross-National Investigation," *JMR*, 38 (May), 143-156.
- Burton, Scot, Donald R. Lichtenstein, Richard G. Netemeyer, and Judith A. Garretson (1998), "A Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward Private Label Products and an Examination of Its Psychological and Behavioral Correlates," *JAMS*, 26 (4), 293-306.

Garretson, Judith A., Dan Fisher, and Scot Burton (2002), "Antecedents of Private Label Attitude and National Brand Promotion Attitude: Similarities and Differences," *JR*, 78 (2), 91-99.

Lichtenstein, Donald R., Richard D. Netemeyer, and Scot Burton (1990), "Distinguishing Coupon Proneness From Value Consciousness: An Acquisition-Transaction Utility Theory Perspective," *JM*, 54 (July), 54-67.

Lichtenstein, Donald R., Richard D. Netemeyer, and Scot Burton (1995), "Assessing the Domain Specificity of Deal Proneness: A Field Study," *JCR*, 22 (December), 314-326.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I enjoy buying a brand that is "on deal."
2. Beyond the money I save, buying brands on deal makes me happy.
3. Compared to other people, I am very likely to purchase brands that come with promotional offers.
4. Receiving a promotional deal with a product purchase makes me feel like I am a good shopper.
5. I'm usually not motivated to respond to promotional deals on products. (r)
6. When I purchase a brand that is offering a special promotion, I feel that it is a good buy.
7. I feel like a successful shopper when I purchase products that offer special promotions.
8. I love special promotional offer for products.

**SCALE NAME: Involvement with Store Type**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three Likert-type statements that measure a consumer's level of interest in a product category and the stores that carry it, particularly the stores specializing in that product category.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Seiders et al. (2005) drew upon previous measures for inspiration, the scale as a whole appears to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

Seiders et al. (2005) reported the construct reliability for the scale to be .89 (n = 945).

**VALIDITY:**

Seiders et al. (2005) did not explicitly address the validity of their scales. However, the strength of the item loadings on the construct and the average variance extracted (.73) offer some evidence of convergent validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Seiders, Kathleen, Glenn B. Voss, Dhruv Grewal, and Andrea L. Godfrey (2005), "Do Satisfied Customers Buy More? Examining Moderating Influences in a Retailing Context," *JM*, 69 (October), 26-43.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I have a strong personal interest in stores like \_\_\_\_\_.
2. Stores like \_\_\_\_\_ are very important to me.
3. The kinds of products \_\_\_\_\_ sells are important to me.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the retailer should be placed in the blanks. Seiders et al. (2005) did not state the number of points on the response scale. The verbal anchors were not described either but would appear to be of the *agree/disagree* type.

**SCALE NAME: Involvement with the Brand (Interest)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three Likert-type statements that are used to assess the extent to which a consumer expresses interest in a certain brand.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) is a slight modification in the wording of items from Rodgers and Schneider (1993) who had in turn adapted the five subscales composing the Consumer Involvement Profile (Laurent and Kapferer 1985; Kapferer and Laurent 1993). Since the original scales were in French, various English translations have been offered. The version by Rodgers and Schneider (1993) was developed out of a lack of satisfaction with the translation by others. They modified each item to be in more conversational English. The items were tested with three samples and seven product categories. The original five factor structure was confirmed with the exception that the items composing the Interest and Pleasure scales tended to load together. Since this indicated that there were four dimensions rather than the five that had been found in the Kapferer and Laurent research the authors speculated that this might have to do with differences between American and French culture.

**RELIABILITY:**

As used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) in their Study 2B, the scale had an alpha of .60 (Voss 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) although it was used to provide evidence of discriminant validity for two other scales (hedonic and utilitarian dimensions of attitude).

**REFERENCES:**

- Kapferer, Jean-Noël and Gilles Laurent (1993), "Further Evidence on the Consumer Involvement Profile: Five Antecedents of Involvement," *Psychology & Marketing*, 10 (4), 347-355.
- Laurent, Gilles and Jean-Noël Kapferer (1985), "Measuring Consumer Involvement Profiles," *JMR*, 22 (February), 41-53.
- Rodgers, William C. and Kenneth C. Schneider (1993), "An Empirical Evaluation of the Kapferer-Laurent Consumer Involvement Profile Scale," *Psychology & Marketing*, 10 (4), 333-345.
- Voss, Kevin E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Voss, Kevin E., Eric R. Spangenberg, and Bianca Grohmann (2003), "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Dimensions of Consumer Attitude," *JMR*, 40 (August), 310-320.

#371 *Involvement with the Brand (Interest)*

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. I attach great importance to this brand.
2. One can say that this brand interests me a lot.
3. This brand is a topic which leaves me totally indifferent. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The numbers of points used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) was not stated. A five-point response format was used by Rodgers and Schneider (1993).

**SCALE NAME: Involvement with the Brand (Pleasure)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three Likert-type statements are used to measure the extent that a consumer expresses pleasure in buying and owning a brand. The scale was labeled as the Hedonic dimension of the CIP (see Origin below) by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) is a slight modification in the wording of items from Rodgers and Schneider (1993) who had in turn adapted the five subscales composing the Consumer Involvement Profile (Laurent and Kapferer 1985; Kapferer and Laurent 1993). Since the original scales were in French, various English translations have been offered. The version by Rodgers and Schneider (1993) was developed out of a lack of satisfaction with the translation by others. They modified each item to be in more conversational English. The items were tested with three samples and seven product categories. The original five factor structure was confirmed with the exception that the items composing the Interest and Pleasure scales tended to load together. Since this indicated that there were four dimensions rather than the five that had been found in the Kapferer and Laurent research the authors speculated that this might have to do with differences between American and French culture.

**RELIABILITY:**

As used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) in their Study 2B, the scale had an alpha of .92 (Voss 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) although it was used to provide evidence of discriminant validity for two other scales (hedonic and utilitarian dimensions of attitude).

**REFERENCES:**

- Kapferer, Jean-Noël and Gilles Laurent (1993), "Further Evidence on the Consumer Involvement Profile: Five Antecedents of Involvement," *Psychology & Marketing*, 10 (4), 347-355.
- Laurent, Gilles and Jean-Noël Kapferer (1985), "Measuring Consumer Involvement Profiles," *JMR*, 22 (February), 41-53.
- Rodgers, William C. and Kenneth C. Schneider (1993), "An Empirical Evaluation of the Kapferer-Laurent Consumer Involvement Profile Scale," *Psychology & Marketing*, 10 (4), 333-345.
- Voss, Kevin E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Voss, Kevin E., Eric R. Spangenberg, and Bianca Grohmann (2003), "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Dimensions of Consumer Attitude," *JMR*, 40 (August), 310-320.

*#372 Involvement with the Brand (Pleasure)*

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. It gives great pleasure to purchase this brand.
2. Buying this is like buying a present for myself.
3. This brand is somewhat of a pleasure to me.

---

<sup>1</sup> The numbers of points used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) was not stated. A five-point response format was used by Rodgers and Schneider (1993).

**SCALE NAME: Involvement with the Brand (Risk Importance)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three Likert-type statements assessing how upset a consumer says he/she would be if it turned out that a poor brand decision was made. This scale appears to relate to the consequences component of risk and, in particular, to the type of consequence called *psychological* (e.g., Cox 1967).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) is a slight modification in the wording of items from Rodgers and Schneider (1993) who had in turn adapted the five subscales composing the Consumer Involvement Profile (Laurent and Kapferer 1985; Kapferer and Laurent 1993). Since the original scales were in French, various English translations have been offered. The version by Rodgers and Schneider (1993) was developed out of a lack of satisfaction with the translation by others. They modified each item to be in more conversational English.

**RELIABILITY:**

As used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) in their Study 2B, the scale had an alpha of .71 (Voss 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) although it was used to provide evidence of discriminant validity for two other scales (hedonic and utilitarian dimensions of attitude).

**REFERENCES:**

- Cox, Donald F. ed. (1967), *Risk Taking and Information Handling in Consumer Behavior*, Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kapferer, Jean-Noël and Gilles Laurent (1993), "Further Evidence on the Consumer Involvement Profile: Five Antecedents of Involvement," *Psychology & Marketing*, 10 (4), 347-355.
- Laurent, Gilles and Jean-Noël Kapferer (1985), "Measuring Consumer Involvement Profiles," *JMR*, 22 (February), 41-53.
- Rodgers, William C. and Kenneth C. Schneider (1993), "An Empirical Evaluation of the Kapferer-Laurent Consumer Involvement Profile Scale," *Psychology & Marketing*, 10 (4), 333-345.
- Voss, Kevin E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Voss, Kevin E., Eric R. Spangenberg, and Bianca Grohmann (2003), "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Dimensions of Consumer Attitude," *JMR*, 40 (August), 310-320.

#373 *Involvement with the Brand (Risk Importance)*

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. When you choose a brand, it is not a big deal if you make a mistake. (r)
2. It is really annoying to purchase a brand that is not suitable.
3. If, after I bought the brand, my choice proves poor, I would be really upset.

---

<sup>1</sup> The numbers of points used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) was not stated. A five-point response format was used by Rodgers and Schneider (1993).

**SCALE NAME: Involvement with the Brand (Risk Probability)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four Likert-type statements assessing the degree of difficulty a consumer has in selecting a brand from among the alternative brands in a certain product category. This scale appears to relate to the uncertainty component of risk (e.g., Bauer 1960). Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) referred to this scale as the *mispurchase* dimension of the CIP (see Origin below).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) is a slight modification in the wording of items from Rodgers and Schneider (1993) who had in turn adapted the five subscales composing the Consumer Involvement Profile (Laurent and Kapferer 1985; Kapferer and Laurent 1993). Since the original scales were in French, various English translations have been offered. The version by Rodgers and Schneider (1993) was developed out of a lack of satisfaction with the translation by others. They modified each item to be in more conversational English.

**RELIABILITY:**

As used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) in their Study 2B, the scale had an alpha of .71 (Voss 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) although it was used to provide evidence of discriminant validity for two other scales (hedonic and utilitarian dimensions of attitude).

**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.
- Kapferer, Jean-Noël and Gilles Laurent (1993), "Further Evidence on the Consumer Involvement Profile: Five Antecedents of Involvement," *Psychology & Marketing*, 10 (4), 347-355.
- Laurent, Gilles and Jean-Noël Kapferer (1985), "Measuring Consumer Involvement Profiles," *JMR*, 22 (February), 41-53.
- Rodgers, William C. and Kenneth C. Schneider (1993), "An Empirical Evaluation of the Kapferer-Laurent Consumer Involvement Profile Scale," *Psychology & Marketing*, 10 (4), 333-345.
- Voss, Kevin E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Voss, Kevin E., Eric R. Spangenberg, and Bianca Grohmann (2003), "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Dimensions of Consumer Attitude," *JMR*, 40 (August), 310-320.

#374 *Involvement with the Brand (Risk Probability)*

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. Whenever one buys the brand, one really never knows whether it is the one that should have been bought.
2. When I face a shelf of this product, I am never really sure which should be bought.
3. Choosing this brand is rather complicated.
4. When one purchases this brand, one is never certain of one's choice.

---

<sup>1</sup> The numbers of points used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) was not stated. A five-point response format was used by Rodgers and Schneider (1993).

**SCALE NAME: Involvement with the Brand (Signal)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a consumer views a brand as communicating something important about who he/she is. Likewise, brands that others own are viewed as signaling something about them too. The scale was labeled as the *symbolic* dimension of the CIP (see Origin below) by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) is a slight modification in the wording of items from Rodgers and Schneider (1993) who had in turn adapted the five subscales composing the Consumer Involvement Profile (Laurent and Kapferer 1985; Kapferer and Laurent 1993). Since the original scales were in French, various English translations have been offered. The version by Rodgers and Schneider (1993) was developed out of a lack of satisfaction with the translation by others. They modified each item to be in more conversational English.

**RELIABILITY:**

As used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) in their Study 2B, the scale had an alpha of .86 (Voss 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) although it was used to provide evidence of discriminant validity for two other scales (hedonic and utilitarian dimensions of attitude).

**REFERENCES:**

- Kapferer, Jean-Noël and Gilles Laurent (1993), "Further Evidence on the Consumer Involvement Profile: Five Antecedents of Involvement," *Psychology & Marketing*, 10 (4), 347-355.
- Laurent, Gilles and Jean-Noël Kapferer (1985), "Measuring Consumer Involvement Profiles," *JMR*, 22 (February), 41-53.
- Rodgers, William C. and Kenneth C. Schneider (1993), "An Empirical Evaluation of the Kapferer-Laurent Consumer Involvement Profile Scale," *Psychology & Marketing*, 10 (4), 333-345.
- Voss, Kevin E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Voss, Kevin E., Eric R. Spangenberg, and Bianca Grohmann (2003), "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Dimensions of Consumer Attitude," *JMR*, 40 (August), 310-320.

*#375 Involvement with the Brand (Signal)*

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. You can tell a lot about a person by the brand they use.
2. The brand I buy gives a glimpse of the type of person I am.
3. The brand you buy tells a little bit about you.

---

<sup>1</sup> The numbers of points used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) was not stated. A five-point response format was used by Rodgers and Schneider (1993).

**SCALE NAME: Involvement with the Product**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six Likert-type statements assessing the extent to which a consumer views a particular product as affecting his/her sense of identity and how one is viewed by others.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Traylor and Joseph (1984). Forty-eight items were generated after a literature review, personal interviews, and focus groups. That set was reduced to 22 and then administered to 200 consumers. Factor analysis of those results led to 10 items being tested in another study (n = 280 students). Six of the items were found to load together and high on the same factor for 12 different product categories. That set of six items had an alpha of .92.

**RELIABILITY:**

As used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) in their Study 2B, the scale had an alpha of .91 (Voss 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) although it was used to provide evidence of discriminant validity for two other scales (hedonic and utilitarian dimensions of attitude).

**REFERENCES:**

- Traylor, Mark B. and W. Benoy Joseph (1984), "Measuring Consumer Involvement in Products: Developing a General Scale," *Psychology & Marketing*, 1 (2), 65-77.
- Voss, Kevin E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Voss, Kevin E., Eric R. Spangenberg, and Bianca Grohmann (2003), "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Dimensions of Consumer Attitude," *JMR*, 40 (August), 310-320.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. When other people see me using this product, they form an opinion of me.
2. You can tell a lot about a person by seeing what brand of this product he/she uses.
3. This product helps me express who I am.
4. This product is "me."
5. Seeing somebody else use this product tells me a lot about that person.
6. When I use this product, others see me the way I want them to see me.

---

<sup>1</sup> The numbers of points used by Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003) was not stated. Traylor and Joseph (1984) appear to have used a seven-point response format.

**SCALE NAME: Involvement with the Product**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three statements with a five-point Likert-type response format that measure a consumer's interest in and the personal relevance of a product.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Chandrasekaran (2004) for use in his second study 2 after a reviewer expressed concern about the version of the scale used in study 1. The second one (shown here) was supposed to better represent the construct.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .91 was reported for the scale by Chandrasekaran (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Chandrasekaran (2004) provided evidence in support of the scale's unidimensionality. Further, he said the scale had a correlation of .92 with the most popular measure of involvement in scholarly consumer research, the 20-item measure of enduring involvement by Zaichkowsky (1985).

**REFERENCES:**

- Chandrasekaran, Rajesh (2004), "The Influence of Redundant Comparison Prices and Other Price Presentation Formats on Consumers' Evaluations and Purchase Intentions," *JR*, 80 (1), 53-66.
- Zaichkowsky, Judith L. (1985), "Measuring the Involvement Construct," *JCR*, 12 (December), 341-352.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am particularly interested in the advertised product.
2. Given my personal interests, this product is not very relevant to me. (r)
3. Overall, I am quite involved when I am purchasing \_\_\_\_\_ for personal use.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal product should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Involvement with the Product Category**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of nine statements utilizing a five-point Likert-type response format that attempts to measure a consumer's interest in a product category. It also seems to measure a facet of self-concept in that the consumer believes decisions regarding the product category express something about one's self and others.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The terms in this scale used by Coulter, Price, and Feick (2003) are similar to those in many other involvement scales but ultimately it appears to be an amalgam of items from Zaichkowsky (1994) as well as Higie and Feick (1989) set in a Likert-type format.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .92 was reported for the scale by Coulter, Price, and Feick (2003). Although the sample was 340 Hungarian women, their English was considered good enough that the survey was in English and was not translated.

**VALIDITY:**

No information of the scale's validity was reported by Coulter, Price, and Feick (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

- Coulter, Robin A., Linda L. Price and Lawrence Feick (2003), "Rethinking the Origins of Involvement and Brand Commitment: Insights from Postsocialist Central Europe," *JCR*, 30 (September), 151-169.
- Higie, Robin A. and Lawrence F. Feick (1989), "Enduring Involvement: Conceptual and Measurement Issues," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 16, Thomas K. Srull, ed., Provo, Utah: Association for Consumer Research, 690-696.
- Zaichkowsky, Judith L. (1994), "The Personal Involvement Inventory: Reduction, Revision, and Application to Advertising," *JA*, 23 (December), 59-70.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. are part of my self-image
2. are boring to me
3. portray an image of me to others
4. are fun to me
5. are fascinating to me
6. are important to me
7. are exciting to me

---

<sup>1</sup> Although not described by Coulter, Price, and Feick (2003), some sort of instructions would need to be provided to respondents before these items are presented so as to focus their attention on some object, such as a product category. The class of products examined by Coulter, Price, and Feick (2003) was cosmetics.

*#378 Involvement with the Product Category*

8. tell others about me
9. tell me about other people

**SCALE NAME: Involvement with the Product's Description**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Eight, nine-point semantic differential items are employed to measure the level of interest a person had while reading a product description. In the study by Johar (1995), the product description was in an advertisement. In the study by Chakravarti and Janiszewski (2003) subjects read several product descriptions provided by the authors which were received in text form after clicking on brand names as part of a computer-aided task.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although the source of the scale was not explicitly stated by Johar (1995), it would appear to be original to her study. She drew heavily upon the items used by Zaichkowsky (1985, 1994) but the set is distinctive enough to be treated separately here.

Chakravarti and Janiszewski (2003) cited Zhang and Markman (2001) as the source who in turn cited Johar (1995).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .80 and .88 were reported for the scale as used in Experiments 1 and 2, respectively (Johar 1995). The scale was used only in Study 4 by Chakravarti and Janiszewski (2003) and had an alpha of .87.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by either Johar (1995) or Chakravarti and Janiszewski (2003). However, to the extent that the scale performed successfully as a manipulation check for Chakravarti and Janiszewski (2003) it provides some evidence of its predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Chakravarti, Amitav and Chris Janiszewski (2003), "The Influence of Macro-Level Motives on Consideration Set Composition in Novel Purchase Situations," *JCR*, 30 (September), 244-258.
- Zaichkowsky, Judith L. (1985), "Measuring the Involvement Construct," *JCR*, 12 (December), 341-352.
- Zaichkowsky, Judith L. (1994), "The Personal Involvement Inventory: Reduction, Revision, and Application to Advertising," *JA*, 23 (December), 59-70.
- Zhang, Shi and Arthur B. Markman (2001), "Processing Product Unique Features: Alignability and Involvement in Preference Construction," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 11 (1), 13-27.

*#379 Involvement with the Product's Description*

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Would you say that while reading the product description you:

1. were not interested / were very interested
2. were not absorbed / were very absorbed
3. skimmed the description quickly / read the description thoroughly

Would you say that you found the product description:

4. unimportant / important
5. irrelevant / of concern to you
6. worthless / valuable
7. boring / interesting
8. uninvolving / involving

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the form of the scale used by Johar (1995). The items used by Chakravarti and Janiszewski (2003) were exactly the same as those listed but the scale stems may have been a little different.

**SCALE NAME: Involvement with the Voting Decision**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point statements are used to measure the importance of a particular voting decision to a person and the degree to which he/she is concerned about the decision.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

O’Cass (2002) said that he had adapted a scale by Mittal (1989) but it may be more accurate to say that a one item measure of *product decision involvement* used by the latter inspired the former in development of his multi-item scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

The internal consistency of the scale was .90 (O’Cass 2002, 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

O’Cass claimed evidence for the scale’s discriminant validity using a simple but less popular technique (Gaski 1984) whereby the internal consistency of a scale is compared to its correlations with every other scale in a study. To the extent that the internal consistency is higher than the correlations then some evidence for discriminant validity is shown. O’Cass implied that the vote involvement scale successfully met this criterion.

**REFERENCES:**

- Mittal, Banwari (1989), “Must Consumer Involvement Always Imply More Information Search?” *Advances in Consumer Research*, 16, 167-172.  
O’Cass, Aron (2002), “Political Advertising Believability and Information Source Value During Elections,” *JA*, 31 (Spring), 63-73.  
O’Cass, Aron (2004), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. In selecting from candidates and parties available in the election, would you say that:  
*I would not care at all who I vote for / I would care a great deal who I vote for*
2. Do you think that the various candidates and parties available in the election are all very alike or are all very different?  
*They are alike / They are all different*
3. How important would it be to you to make a right choice of candidates and parties?  
*Not at all important / Extremely important*
4. In making your selection of candidates and parties, how concerned would you be about the outcome of your choice?  
*Not at all concerned / Very much Concerned*

**SCALE NAME: Joy**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three items are used to assess a person's experience of a joy-related emotion. The directions and response scale can be worded so as to measure the *intensity* of the emotional state at the present time or they can be adjusted to measure the *frequency* with which a person has experienced the emotional trait during some specified time period. One-word items were used in the studies by Westbrook and Oliver (1991) and later by Williams and Aaker (2002); phrases based on those same items were used by Allen, Machleit, and Kleine (1992).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The measure was developed by Izard (1977) and is part of the Differential Emotions Scale (DES II). The instrument originally was designed as a measure of a person's emotional "state" at a particular point in time, but adjustments in the instrument's instructions enable the same items to be used in the assessment of emotional experiences as perceived over a longer time period. The latter was viewed by Izard as a measure of one's emotional "trait" (1977, p.125). Test-retest reliability for the joy subscale of DES II was reported to be .87 (n = 63). Beyond this evidence, several other studies have provided support for the validity of the scale, including consumption settings (e.g., Westbrook 1987).

The items in DES II were composed of only one word. In contrast, the items in DES III are phrases describing the target emotion. They were developed by Izard, although the first published validity testing was conducted by Kotsch, Gerbing, and Schwartz (1982). A study by Allen, Machleit, and Marine (1988) provides some insight to the factor structure of both DES II and III. The results indicate that when presented with the other DES items, the joy items typically load together and not with items purported to measure other emotions.

**RELIABILITY:**

Allen, Machleit, and Kleine (1992; Allen 1994) calculated an alpha of .90 for DES III. Westbrook and Oliver (1991) calculated an alpha of .73 for the frequency version of DES II while the intensity version was reported by Oliver (1993) to have alphas of .70 and .84. The intensity version of DES II was also used in several studies reported by Williams and Aaker (2002) with alphas ranging from .88 to .92.

**VALIDITY:**

No specific examination of the scale's validity was reported in any of the studies. However, some sense of the scale's predictive validity comes from noting in the research by Williams and Aaker (2002) that an ad intended to evoke happiness did indeed produce significantly greater happiness than sadness and an ad intended to evoke sadness produced significantly greater sadness than happiness.

**REFERENCES:**

- Allen, Chris T. (1994), Personal Correspondence.
- Allen, Chris T., Karen A. Machleit, and Susan Schultz Kleine (1992), "A Comparison of Attitudes and Emotions as Predictors of Behavior at Diverse Levels of Behavioral Experience," *JCR*, 18 (March), 493-504.
- Allen, Chris T., Karen A. Machleit, and Susan S. Marine (1988), "On Assessing the Emotionality of Advertising Via Izard's Differential Emotions Scale," in *Advances in Consumer Research Vol.14*, Michael J. Houston. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 226-31.
- Izard, Carroll E. (1977), *Human Emotions*, New York: Plenum Press.
- Kotsch, William E., Davis W. Gerbing, and Lynne E. Schwartz (1982), "The Construct Validity of the Differential Emotions Scale as Adapted for Children and Adolescents," in *Measuring Emotions in Infants and Children*, Carroll E. Izard, ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 251-78.
- Oliver, Richard L. (1993), "Cognitive, Affective, and Attribute Bases of the Satisfaction Response," *JCR*, 20 (December), 418-30.
- Westbrook, Robert A. (1987), "Product/Consumption-Based Affective Responses and Postpurchase Processes," *JMR*, 24 (August), 258-70.
- Westbrook, Robert A. and Richard L. Oliver (1991), "The Dimensionality of Consumption Emotion Patterns and Consumer Satisfaction," *JCR*, 18 (June), 84-91.
- Williams, Patti and Jennifer L. Aaker (2002), "Can Mixed Emotions Peacefully Coexist?" *JCR*, 28 (March), 636-649.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Possible directions for the frequency version of the scale: Below is a list of words that you can use to show how you feel. We want you to tell us how often you felt each of these feelings \_\_\_\_\_.

Possible directions for the frequency version of the scale: Below is a list of words that you can use to show how you feel. We want you to tell us how strongly you feel.

**DES II**

1. delighted
2. happy
3. joyful

**DES III**


---

<sup>1</sup> The blank in the directions for the frequency version should be used to specify the time period of interest, such as "during the last week." Potential anchors for the response scale of the frequency version could be *almost never* and *very often*. The anchors for the intensity version could be *very weak* (or *not at all*) and *very strong*. Several of the studies used a five-point response format but Williams and Aaker (2002) used seven with DES II. See experiment 2 by Williams and Aaker (2002) for two versions of the directions (*felt* vs. *depicted*).

#381 *Joy*

1. feel glad about something
2. feel happy
3. feel joyful, like everything is going your way, everything is rosy

**SCALE NAME: Justice (Distributive)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is used to measure the degree to which a customer who lodged a complaint thinks that the resolution of the problem was appropriate. In the study by Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekar (1998) the respondents were given this scale after being told to remember a recent service experience that led to their lodging a complaint. Similarly, in Smith, Bolton, and Wagner (1999; Smith and Bolton 2002) subjects were asked to imagine a visit to a service provider they had been to before and what they would do if a service failure occurred.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekar (1998) as well as Smith, Bolton, and Wagner (1999; Smith and Bolton 2002) appear to have drawn upon dissertation work by Tax (1993).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .97 was reported for the scale by Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekar (1998). The version of the scale used by Smith, Bolton, and Wagner (1999; Smith 2002; Smith and Bolton 2002) had alphas of .88 and .91 as used with restaurants and hotels, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

Although specific details of the validation were not presented by Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekar (1998), they did state that evidence was found “for discriminant validity among all the variables in the study” (p.67). Smith, Bolton, and Wagner (1999; Smith 2002) indicated that there was evidence of their scale’s convergent and discriminant validity but it appears to be based upon the pattern of loadings in an exploratory factor analysis.

**COMMENTS:**

The article by Smith and Bolton (2002) uses the same database as used in Smith, Bolton, and Wagner (1999).

**REFERENCES:**

- Smith, Amy K. (2002), Personal Correspondence.  
Smith, Amy K. and Ruth N. Bolton (2002), “The Effect of Customers’ Emotional Responses to Service Failures on Their Recovery Effort Evaluations and Satisfaction Judgments,” *JAMS*, 30 (1), 5-23.

### #382 *Justice (Distributive)*

Smith, Amy K., Ruth N. Bolton, and Janet Wagner (1999), "A Model of Customer Satisfaction with Service Encounters Involving Failure and Recovery," *JMR*, 36 (August), 356-372.

Tax, Stephen S. (1993), "The Role of Perceived Justice in Complaint Resolutions: Implications for Services and Relationship Marketing," doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University.

Tax, Stephen S. Stephen W. Brown, and Murali Chandrashekar (1998), "Customer Evaluations of Service Complaint Experiences: Implications for Relationship Marketing," *JM*, 62 (April), 60-76.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. The result of the complaint was not right. (r)
2. In resolving the complaint the firm gave me what I needed.
3. I did not receive what I required. (r)
4. I got what I deserved.
5. My outcome was probably not as good as others who have complained to this firm. (r)
6. The result I received from the complaint was fair.

---

<sup>1</sup> Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekar (1998) used a five-point response scale with their items whereas Smith, Bolton, and Wagner (1999; Smith and Bolton 2002) used a seven-point format. Also, the items used by the latter were similar to #1, #2, #4, and #6 and were phrased with respect to a restaurant (Study 1) and a hotel (Study 2).

**SCALE NAME: Justice (Distributive)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, seven-point Likert-type items that assess a customer's beliefs regarding the fairness of the outcome provided by a business as a result of its service recovery process given the inconvenience experienced by the consumer.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although inspiration was derived from previous examination of this construct (e.g., Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekar 1998), the scale is different enough to be considered original to Maxham and Netemeyer (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .90 was reported for the scale as used by Maxham and Netemeyer (2002) with bank customers (Study 1) and new home buyers (Study 2). The same alpha was also found for customers of an electronics dealer in the study by Maxham and Netemeyer (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

For both of their studies, Maxham and Netemeyer (2002) tested a measurement model including the items in this scale as well as those intended to measure six other constructs. The model fit very well. In addition, the scale met a stringent test of discriminant validity. Likewise, Maxham and Netemeyer (2003) entered the items in this scale along with 25 others, representing eight constructs in total, into a confirmatory factor analysis. Several tests of convergent and discriminant validity were apparently conducted and provided support for the each scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- 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," *JR*, 78 (4), 239-252.
- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2003), "Firms Reap What They Sow: the Effects of Shared Values and Perceived Organizational Justice on Customers' Evaluations of Complaint Handling," *JM*, 67 (January), 46-62.
- Tax, Stephen S., Stephen W. Brown, and Murali Chandrashekar (1998), "Customer Evaluations of Service Complaint Experiences: Implications for Relationship Marketing," *JM*, 62 (April), 60-76.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Although the event caused me problems, \_\_\_\_\_'s effort to fix it resulted in a very positive outcome for me.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the business should be placed in each blank.

#383 *Justice (Distributive)*

2. The final outcome I received from \_\_\_\_\_ was fair, given the time and hassle.
3. Given the inconvenience caused by the problem, the outcome I received from \_\_\_\_\_ was fair.
4. The service recovery outcome that I received in response to the problem was more than fair.

**SCALE NAME: Justice (Distributive)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, five-point Likert-type statements that measure how fair a customer believes a company has been in its compensation provided in response to his/her complaint.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Homburg and Fürst (2005) received inspiration from previous work by others, particularly Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekar (1998), this scale is unique and was developed by them for their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for this scale was .89 (Homburg and Fürst 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Homburg and Fürst (2005) used confirmatory factor analysis and examined the discriminant validity of their scales with two different tests. No problems were found with any of them.

**REFERENCES:**

- Homburg, Christian and Andreas Fürst (2005), "How Organizational Complaint Handling Drives Customer Loyalty: An Analysis of the Mechanistic and the Organic Approach," *JM*, 69 (July), 95-114.
- Tax, Stephen S. Stephen W. Brown, and Murali Chandrashekar (1998), "Customer Evaluations of Service Complaint Experiences: Implications for Relationship Marketing," *JM*, 62 (April), 60-76.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I received an adequate compensation from the company.
2. I received about as much compensation from the company as in the context of previous complaints.
3. In solving my problem, the company gave me exactly what I needed.
4. Overall, the compensation I received from the company was fair.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem used with the items was "To what extent do you agree with the following statements?"

## #385 Justice (*Interactional*)

**SCALE NAME:** Justice (**Interactional**)

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four item, seven-point Likert-type scale is intended to measure the degree to which a customer who lodged a complaint with a service provider thinks that the concern and effort put forth by employees to solve the problem was appropriate. In Smith, Bolton, and Wagner (1999; Smith and Bolton 2002), subjects were asked to imagine a visit to a service provider they had been to before and what they would do if a service failure occurred.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Smith and colleagues (Smith, Bolton, and Wagner 1999; Smith and Bolton 2002) drew upon dissertation work by Tax (1993).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had alphas of .88 and .91 as used with restaurants and hotels, respectively (Smith, Bolton, and Wagner 1999; Smith 2002; Smith and Bolton 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Smith, Bolton, and Wagner (1999; Smith 2002) indicated that there was evidence of their scale's convergent and discriminant validity but it appears to be based upon the pattern of loadings in an exploratory factor analysis.

**COMMENTS:**

The article by Smith and Bolton (2002) uses the same database as used in Smith, Bolton, and Wagner (1999).

**REFERENCES:**

- Smith, Amy K. (2002), Personal Correspondence.
- Smith, Amy K. and Ruth N. Bolton (2002), "The Effect of Customers' Emotional Responses to Service Failures on Their Recovery Effort Evaluations and Satisfaction Judgments," *JAMS*, 30 (1), 5-23.
- Smith, Amy K., Ruth N. Bolton, and Janet Wagner (1999), "A Model of Customer Satisfaction with Service Encounters Involving Failure and Recovery," *JMR*, 36 (August), 356-372.
- Tax, Stephen S. (1993), "The Role of Perceived Justice in Complaint Resolutions: Implications for Services and Relationship Marketing," doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

*#385 Justice (Interactional)*

1. The employees were appropriately concerned about my problem.
2. The employees did not put the proper effort into resolving my problem. (r)
3. The employees' communications with me were appropriate.
4. The employees did not give me the courtesy I was due. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Justice (Interactional)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure a customer's beliefs regarding the fairness with which he/she was treated by a particular firm's personnel in its efforts to deal with a problem.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although considerable inspiration was derived from previous examination of this construct (e.g., Folger and Konovsky 1989; Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekar 1998), the scale is distinct enough to be considered original to Maxham and Netemeyer (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .93 and .94 were reported for the version of the scale used by Maxham and Netemeyer (2002) with bank customers (Study 1) and new home buyers (Study 2), respectively. An alpha of .83 was found for the version used with customers of an electronics dealer in the study by Maxham and Netemeyer (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

For both of their studies, Maxham and Netemeyer (2002) tested a measurement model including the items in this scale as well as those intended to measure six other constructs. The model fit very well. In addition, the scale met a stringent test of discriminant validity. Likewise, Maxham and Netemeyer (2003) entered the items in this scale along with 25 others, representing eight constructs in total, into a confirmatory factor analysis. Several tests of convergent and discriminant validity were apparently conducted and provided support for the each scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Folger, Robert and Mary.A. Konovsky (1989), "Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reactions to Pay Raise Decisions," *Academy of Management Journal*, 32 (1), 115-130.
- 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," *JR*, 78 (4), 239-252.
- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2003), "Firms Reap What They Sow: the Effects of Shared Values and Perceived Organizational Justice on Customers' Evaluations of Complaint Handling," *JM*, 67 (January), 46-62.
- Tax, Stephen S., Stephen W. Brown, and Murali Chandrashekar (1998), "Customer Evaluations of Service Complaint Experiences: Implications for Relationship Marketing," *JM*, 62 (April), 60-76.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. In dealing with my problem, \_\_\_\_\_'s personnel treated me in a courteous manner.
2. During their effort to fix my problem, \_\_\_\_\_'s employee(s) showed a real interest in trying to be fair.
3. \_\_\_\_\_'s employee(s) worked as hard as possible for me during the recovery effort.
4. \_\_\_\_\_'s employee(s) were honest and ethical in dealing with me during their fixing of my problem.
5. \_\_\_\_\_'s employee(s) got input from me before handling the problem.
6. While attempting to fix my problem, \_\_\_\_\_'s personnel considered my views.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the business should be placed in each blank. Maxham and Netemeyer (2002) used items #1, #2, #5, and #6 while Maxham and Netemeyer (2003) used items #1-#4.

**SCALE NAME: Justice (Interactional)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has five, five-point Likert-type statements that are intended to measure the degree to which a customer believes that interaction with a company's employees led to them understanding his/her complaint and responding fairly.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Homburg and Fürst (2005) received inspiration from previous work by others, this scale was developed by them for their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha as well as the composite reliability for this scale was .93 (Homburg and Fürst 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Homburg and Fürst (2005) used confirmatory factor analysis and examined the discriminant validity of their scales with two different tests. No problems were found with any of them.

**REFERENCES:**

Homburg, Christian and Andreas Fürst (2005), "How Organizational Complaint Handling Drives Customer Loyalty: An Analysis of the Mechanistic and the Organic Approach," *JM*, 69 (July), 95-114.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The employees seemed to be very interested in my problem.
2. The employees understood exactly my problem.
3. I felt treated rudely by the employees. (r)
4. The employees were very keen to solve my problem.
5. Overall, the employees' behavior during complaint handling was fair.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem used with the items was "To what extent do you agree with the following statements?"

**SCALE NAME: Justice (Procedural)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has four, seven-point Likert-type statements which measure a customer's evaluation of the fairness of the policies and procedures used in handling a problem that has occurred.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although some inspiration was derived from previous examination of this construct (e.g., Folger and Konovsky 1989), the scale seems to have been developed by Maxham and Netemeyer (2002, 2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .91 was reported for the scale as used by Maxham and Netemeyer (2002) with bank customers (Study 1) and new home buyers (Study 2). The same alpha was also found for customers of an electronics dealer in the study by Maxham and Netemeyer (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

For both of their studies, Maxham and Netemeyer (2002) tested a measurement model including the items in this scale as well as those intended to measure six other constructs. The model fit very well. In addition, the scale met a stringent test of discriminant validity. Likewise, Maxham and Netemeyer (2003) entered the items in this scale along with 25 others, representing eight constructs in total, into a confirmatory factor analysis. Several tests of convergent and discriminant validity were apparently conducted and provided support for the each scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Folger, Robert and Mary.A. Konovsky (1989), "Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reactions to Pay Raise Decisions," *Academy of Management Journal*, 32 (1), 115-130.
- 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," *JR*, 78 (4), 239-252.
- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2003), "Firms Reap What They Sow: the Effects of Shared Values and Perceived Organizational Justice on Customers' Evaluations of Complaint Handling," *JM*, 67 (January), 46-62.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Despite the hassle caused by the problem, \_\_\_\_\_ responded fairly and quickly.
2. I feel \_\_\_\_\_ responded in a timely fashion to the problem.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the business should be placed in each blank.

*#388 Justice (Procedural)*

3. I believe \_\_\_\_\_ has fair policies and practices to handle problems.
4. With respect to its policies and procedures, \_\_\_\_\_ handled the problem in a fair manner.

**SCALE NAME: Justice (Procedural)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point Likert-type statements are employed to measure the extent to which a customer believes that a company responded to his/her complaint quickly and fairly.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Homburg and Fürst (2005) received inspiration from previous work by others, this scale was developed by them for their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha as well as the composite reliability for this scale was .90 (Homburg and Fürst 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Homburg and Fürst (2005) used confirmatory factor analysis and examined the discriminant validity of their scales with two different tests. No problems were found with any of them.

**REFERENCES:**

Homburg, Christian and Andreas Fürst (2005), "How Organizational Complaint Handling Drives Customer Loyalty: An Analysis of the Mechanistic and the Organic Approach," *JM*, 69 (July), 95-114.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The company reacted quickly to my complaint.
2. The company gave me the opportunity to explain my point of view of the problem.
3. Overall, the company's complaint handling procedure was fair.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem used with the items was "To what extent do you agree with the following statements?"

**SCALE NAME: Justifiability of the Decision**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three statements measuring the extent to which a person believes a decision that has been made makes sense and is easy to support.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not described by Inman and Zeelenberg (2002) but it appears to be origin to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas for the scale as used in Study 4 by Inman and Zeelenberg (2002) were .91, .95, .94, and .92 for airline, backpack, deodorant, and jeans decision scenarios, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Inman and Zeelenberg (2002).

**COMMENTS:**

As used by Inman and Zeelenberg (2002), subjects were responding to scenarios describing a choice made by a person rather than reacting to their own real experiences.

**REFERENCES:**

Inman, Jeffrey J. and Marcel Zeelenberg (2002), "Regret in Repeat Purchase versus Switching Decisions: The Attenuating Role of Decision Justifiability," *JCR*, 29 (June), 116-128.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How justifiable is the decision to \_\_\_\_\_?  
*Weakly justifiable/Strongly justifiable*
2. How easy to defend is the decision to \_\_\_\_\_?  
*Not easy to defend/easy to defend*
3. How logical is the decision to \_\_\_\_\_?  
*Very illogical/very logical*

---

<sup>1</sup> A phrase should be added here that indicates either switching to a different brand or making a repeat purchase of the same brand.

**SCALE NAME: Knowledge (Subjective)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three items that attempt to measure the extent to which a person expresses having knowledge about some object. As used by Gurhan-Canli (2003), the scale measures subjective knowledge for a specified product class. However, the items seem to be flexible for use with a wide variety of applications that might not even directly refer to products, e.g., nutrition, consumer-related legislation, a company's position on an issue, familiarity with a TV series or celebrity, etc.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No source for the scale was specified by Gurhan-Canli (2003) but it seems to be original to her study.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .92 and .96 were reported for the scale by Gurhan-Canli (2003) for TV sets and electronic products, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Gurhan-Canli (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep (2003), "The Effect of Expected Variability of Product Quality and Attribute Uniqueness on Family Brand Evaluations," *JCR*, 30 (June), 105-114.  
Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep (2006), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I know a lot about \_\_\_\_\_.  
*strongly disagree / strongly agree*
2. My knowledge of \_\_\_\_\_ is . . .  
*inferior / superior*
3. My knowledge of \_\_\_\_\_ is . . .  
*very poor / very good*

---

<sup>1</sup> Only one item was provided in the article by Gurhan-Canli (2003); the other two were provided by her (Gurhan-Canli 2006). The blank should be filled with the topic of interest, e.g., TV sets.

**SCALE NAME: Knowledge of the Brand**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This scale has three, ten-point Likert-type statements that measure the degree to which a consumer believes him/herself to be familiar and experienced with a certain brand relative to friends and others. By changing the term “brand” to “product” the scale is amenable for use with reference to a product category.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of the scale was not explicitly stated by Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005). They appear to have adapted items from previous knowledge and expertise scales. As used to gather the data, the items were apparently phrased in German.

**RELIABILITY:**

The composite reliability reported for the scale by Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005) was .89.

**VALIDITY:**

Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005) used CFA with twelve latent constructs and twenty measures. The measurement model fit the data well and two tests were used to provide evidence of each scale’s discriminant validity. The average variance extracted for this scale was .75.

**REFERENCES:**

Algesheimer, René, Utpal M. Dholakia, and Andreas Herrmann (2005), “The Social Influence of Brand Community: Evidence from European Car Clubs,” *JM*, 69 (July), 19-34.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. When compared to other people, I know a lot about this brand.
2. My friends consider me an expert regarding this brand.
3. I consider myself very experienced with this brand.

**SCALE NAME: Knowledge of the Product Class**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four statements and a seven-point Likert-type response format. It is intended to assess a consumer's perceived knowledge of the various brands in a specified product category as well as the confidence to make a selection from among the brands.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not specified by Smith and Park (1992) and they may have been the ones who created it.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .80 was reported for the scale by Smith and Park (1992). Li, Daugherty, and Biocca (2002) reported alphas of .78 (Study 1) and .90 (Study 2).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not addressed by neither Smith and Park (1992) nor Li, Daugherty, and Biocca (2002). However, the latter performed a CFA on these items and those of several other scales in both of their studies concluding that the items composing this scale were unidimensional.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Sicilia, Ruiz, and Munuera (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Li, Hairong, Terry Daugherty, and Frank Biocca (2002), "Impact of 3-D Advertising on Product Knowledge, Brand Attitude, and Purchase Intention: The Mediating Role of Presence," *JA*, 29 (3), 43-57.

Sicilia, Maria, Salvador Ruiz, and Jose L. Munuera (2005), "Effects of Interactivity in a Web Site," *JA*, 34 (3), 31-45.

Smith, Daniel C. and C. Whan Park (1992), "The Effects of Brand Extensions on Market Share and Advertising Efficiency," *JMR*, 29 (August), 296-313.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I feel very knowledgeable about this product.

---

<sup>1</sup> Li, Daugherty, and Biocca (2002) used just three items (apparently #1, #2, and #3), indicating that the fourth item had performed poorly in previous research they had conducted.

*#393 Knowledge of the Product Class*

2. If I had to purchase this product today, I would need to gather very little information in order to make a wise decision.
3. I feel very confident about my ability to tell the difference in quality among different brands of this product.
4. If a friend asked me about this product, I could give them advice about different brands.

**SCALE NAME: Knowledge of the Product Class**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A seven-point Likert-type rating scale is used to measure a person's self-reported familiarity and expertise with a particular product category. This is a subjective measure of product knowledge and is considered to be distinct from, though related to, objective knowledge and experience.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The three-item scale used by Flynn, Goldsmith, and Eastman (1996) in Study 1 was a preliminary version of a measure of product knowledge made for use with rock music. A six-item version was used in Study 3 by Flynn, Goldsmith, and Eastman (1996). (See also Study 1 by Flynn and Goldsmith 1999.) Eventually, much effort was invested in validating the measure, which led to further changes, and the authors strongly recommended the use of the final version of the scale, as reported in Flynn and Goldsmith (1999).

**RELIABILITY:**

The three-item preliminary version of scale used by Flynn, Goldsmith, and Eastman (1996) in Study 1 had an alpha of .82 (Goldsmith 1997). The alpha for the six-item knowledge scale used by Flynn, Goldsmith, and Eastman (1996) in Study 3 was approximately .93 (Flynn and Goldsmith 1999).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not directly assessed by Flynn, Goldsmith, and Eastman (1996). However, because it was part of an effort to examine the nomological validity of two other scales (V3, #243 and #245), some sense of its own nomological validity can be gained. For example, high positive correlations were found between knowledge and opinion leadership, innovativeness, and product involvement. No relationship was found between knowledge and opinion seeking.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Senecal and Nantel (2004) as well as Mägi and Julander (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- Flynn, Leisa R. and Ronald E. Goldsmith (1999), "A Short, Reliable Measure of Subjective Knowledge," *Journal of Business Research*, 46 (1), 57-66.
- Flynn, Leisa R., Ronald E. Goldsmith and Jacqueline K. Eastman (1996), "Opinion Leaders and Opinion Seekers: Two New Measurement Scales," *JAMS*, 24 (Spring), 137-47.

### #394 Knowledge of the Product Class

Goldsmith, Ronald E. (1997), Personal Correspondence.

Mägi, Anne W. and Claes-Robert Julander (2005), "Consumers' Store-Level Price Knowledge: Why Are Some Consumers More Knowledgeable Than Others?," *JR*, 81 (4), 319-329.

Senecal, Sylvain and Jacques Nantel (2004), "The Influence of Online Product Recommendations on Consumers' Online Choices," *JR*, 80 (2), 159-169.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I feel quite knowledgeable about \_\_\_\_\_.
2. Among my circle of friends, I'm one of the "experts" on \_\_\_\_\_.
3. I rarely come across a \_\_\_\_\_ that I haven't heard of.
4. I know pretty much about \_\_\_\_\_.
5. I do not feel very knowledgeable about \_\_\_\_\_. (r)
6. Compared to most other people, I know less about \_\_\_\_\_. (r)
7. When it comes to \_\_\_\_\_, I really don't know a lot. (r)
8. I have heard of most of the new \_\_\_\_\_ that are around.

---

<sup>1</sup> Items 1–3 were used by Flynn, Goldsmith, and Eastman (1996) with rock music in Study 1. The items used in their Study 3, with fashion, were apparently 2 and 4–8. The final five-item version of the scale reported by Flynn and Goldsmith (1999) was composed of 2 and 4–7.

**SCALE NAME: Knowledge of the Product Class**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point statements are used to measure a consumer's opinion of his/her level of familiarity with a product. The items seem to be amenable for use with respect to a category of products or a specific brand.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although drawing inspiration from previous research, particularly Srinivasan and Ratchford (1991), the scale seems to be original to Roehm, Pullins, and Roehm (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

Roehm, Pullins, and Roehm (2002) reported that the scale had an alpha of .86 in Study 1.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Roehm, Pullins, and Roehm (2002). They did, however, indicate that the items loaded on a single factor.

**REFERENCES:**

Roehm, Michelle L., Ellen Bolman Pullins, and Harper A. Roehm, Jr. (2002), "Designing Loyalty-Building Programs for Packaged Goods Brands," *JMR*, 39 (May), 202-213.  
Srinivasan, Narasimhan and Brian T. Ratchford (1991), "An Empirical Test of a External Search for Automobiles," *JCR*, 18 (September), 233-242.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Please rate your knowledge of \_\_\_\_\_ as compared to the average person's knowledge of \_\_\_\_\_.  
*one of the least knowledgeable / one of the most knowledgeable*
2. Please circle the number that described your familiarity with \_\_\_\_\_.  
*not at all familiar / extremely familiar*
3. In general, I know a lot about \_\_\_\_\_.  
*strongly disagree / strongly agree*
4. Please rate your level of knowledge about \_\_\_\_\_.  
*not knowledgeable / very knowledgeable*
5. I feel very knowledgeable about \_\_\_\_\_.  
*strongly disagree / strongly agree*

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the brand or the product category should be placed in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Knowledge of the Product Class**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a person's believes that he/she is knowledgeable about a product or category of products, in fact, is an expert compared to friends.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although the items in the scale are similar to items found in various other measures of knowledge and expertise, this set of items appears to be original to Chang (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

Chang (2004) reported an alpha of .88 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No evidence regarding the scale's validity was provided by Chang (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Chang, Chingching (2004), "The Interplay of Product Class Knowledge and Trial Experience in Attitude Formation," *JA*, 33 (1), 83-92.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I know a lot about \_\_\_\_\_.
2. I would consider myself an expert in terms of my knowledge of \_\_\_\_\_.
3. I know more about \_\_\_\_\_ than my friends do.
4. I usually pay a lot of attention to information about \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product should be placed in the blank, e.g., computers, fashion, nutrition.

**SCALE NAME: Knowledge of the Product Class**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of seven statements with nine-point response formats that measure a person's opinion regarding his/her familiarity and experience with regard to some product category relative to others.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although it is clear that Laroche et al. (2005) drew upon measures by both Park, Mothersbaugh, and Feick (1994) and Oliver and Bearden (1985), the combination of items and their adaptation are considered here to have produced a unique scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

In Experiment 2, Laroche et al. (2005) reported the scale's alphas to be .874 (offline sample) and .886 (online sample).

**VALIDITY:**

No information was provided by Laroche et al. (2005) regarding the scale's validity. However, it did appear that the measurement model fit the data well.

**REFERENCES:**

- Laroche, Michel, Zhiyong Yang, Gordon H.G. McDougall, and Jasmin Bergeron (2005), "Internet versus Bricks-and-Mortar Retailers: An Investigation into Intangibility and Its Consequences," *JR*, 81 (4), 251-267.
- Oliver, Richard L. and William O. Bearden (1985), "Crossover Effects in the Theory of Reasoned Action: A Moderating Influence Attempt," *JCR*, 12 (December), 324-340.
- Park, C. Whan, David L. Mothersbaugh, and Lawrence Feick (1994), "Consumer Knowledge Assessment," *JCR*, 21 (June), 71-82.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Compared with my friends and acquaintances, my knowledge of \_\_\_\_\_ is:  
*weaker / stronger*
2. In general, my knowledge of \_\_\_\_\_ is:  
*very weak / very strong*
3. Would you consider yourself informed or uninformed about \_\_\_\_\_?  
*very uninformed / very informed*
4. Compared with experts in that area, my knowledge of \_\_\_\_\_ is:  
*weaker / stronger*
5. The information search I have performed on \_\_\_\_\_ is:  
*very weak / very thorough*

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the generic product should be placed in the blank.

#397 *Knowledge of the Product Class*

6. I “use” \_\_\_\_\_:  
*never / very often*
7. I don’t have much experience making this kind of decision:  
*strongly agree / strongly disagree*

**SCALE NAME: Knowledge of the Product Class**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a consumer expresses having knowledge about a product category compared to his/her friends.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Coulter et al. (2005) is a modification of one developed by Park, Mothersbaugh, and Feick (1994). Coulter et al. (2005) adapted the items for use in surveys administered to Hungarian women regarding cosmetics knowledge. The scale items were translated from English into Hungarian, back-translated, and then pretested with Hungarian women before use in the main studies.

**RELIABILITY:**

Coulter et al. (2005) used the scale at least two different times, in a 1992 survey and then in a 1998 survey, with the alphas for the scale being .86 and .88, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

Confirmatory factor analysis was employed by Coulter et al. (2005) to assess the configural invariance of the scale. Their conclusion was that the measure was equivalent between the two time periods.

**REFERENCES:**

- Coulter, Robin A., Linda L. Price, Lawrence Feick, and Camelia Micu (2005), "The Evolution of Consumer Knowledge and Sources of Information: Hungary in Transition," *JAMS*, 33 (4), 604-619.
- Park, C. Whan, David L. Mothersbaugh, and Lawrence Feick (1994), "Consumer Knowledge Assessment," *JCR*, 21 (June), 71-82.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How much do you know about \_\_\_\_\_.<sup>2</sup>
2. How much do you know compared to your friends?
3. How much do you know about the important things to consider when buying these products?

---

<sup>1</sup> Coulter et al. (2005) stated that the verbal anchors for the response scale were *strongly disagree/strongly agree*. However, that type of response format would not make sense, at least not in English. Instead, anchors such as *a little/a lot* would be more appropriate.

<sup>2</sup> The name of the product category being examined should be placed in the blank, e.g., cosmetics.

**SCALE NAME: Knowledge of the Product Class**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three statements are used to measure the degree to which a person believes he/she is well informed about a certain product category and able to give advice about it. The scale was referred to as a measure of expertise by Lambert-Pandraud, Laurent, and Lapersonne (2005).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Lambert-Pandraud, Laurent, and Lapersonne (2005) appear to have developed the scale for their study and, as used by them, the items seem to have been phrased in French.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .74 was reported for the scale (Lambert-Pandraud, Laurent, and Lapersonne 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Lambert-Pandraud, Laurent, and Lapersonne (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Lambert-Pandraud, Raphaëlle, Gilles Laurent, and Eric Lapersonne (2005), "Repeat Purchasing of New Automobiles by Older Consumers: Empirical Evidence and Interpretations," *JM*, 69 (April), 97-113.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I keep informed about news of the \_\_\_\_\_ market.
2. I could give good advice on \_\_\_\_\_ if I was asked to.
3. I know a lot about \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal product class should be placed in the blanks. The verbal anchors and number of points on the response scale were not stated by Lambert-Pandraud, Laurent, and Lapersonne (2005).

**SCALE NAME: Locus of Control (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of ten forced-choice items that measure the degree to which a person attributes success to his/her own efforts versus fate or other forces. The Valecha (1972) version of the scale asks respondents not only to choose between items in each pair but also to indicate how close the choice is to their own true opinions.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is from the work of Valecha (1972) who developed a measure based on a subset of items from the original Rotter (1966) scale. The scale was tested only on men and no reliability data were reported, but some evidence of the scale's convergent validity was presented. Rotter's scale consisted of 23 pairs of opposing statements in a forced-choice format.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .70 was reported by Teas (1981) for the scale when used with 171 sales people. Burroughs and Mick (2004) reported an alpha of .71 for the scale as used with 172 adult consumers.

**VALIDITY:**

No explicit examination of the scale's validity was reported in the studies by Teas (1981) and Burroughs and Mick (2004). However, the latter did point out that a CFA indicated the scale was unidimensional.

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. and David Glen Mick (2004), "Exploring Antecedents and Consequences of Consumer Creativity in a Problem-Solving Context," *JCR*, 31 (September), 402-411.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966), "Generalized Expectancies for Internal and External Control of Reinforcement," *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80 (1), Whole No. 609.
- Teas, R. Kenneth (1981), "An Empirical Test of Models of Salespersons' Job Expectancy and Instrumentality Perceptions," *JMR*, 18 (May), 209-226.
- Valecha, G. K. . (1972), "Construct Validation of Internal-External Locus of Control as Measured by an Abbreviated 11-Item IE Scale," doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> The external response is alternative **b** for items #1 through #5, and 10, whereas the external response is alternative **a** for items #6 through #9.

### #400 Locus of Control (General)

Directions: For each pair below, indicate which item is closer to your opinion and then indicate whether it is “much closer” or only “slightly closer” to your actual opinion.

1. a) In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.  
b) Unfortunately, an individual’s worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
2. a) The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.  
b) Most students don’t realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
3. a) Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.  
b) Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
4. a) The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.  
b) This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
5. a) In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.  
b) Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
6. a) Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.  
b) Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability; luck has little or nothing to do with it.
7. a) Most people don’t realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.  
b) There really is no such thing as “luck.”
8. a) In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good things.  
b) Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
9. a) Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.  
b) It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
10. a) What happens to me is my own doing.  
b) Sometimes I feel that I don’t have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

**SCALE NAME: Locus of Control (Health)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of eleven statements attempting to measure a person's reason for using/not using some information bearing on health risks. To the extent that the person used the information then it indicated external locus of control whereas expressing non-usage of the information suggests internal control. The response format used by Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002) was simply *yes/no*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002) stated that their scale was a modification of the Adult Internal-External Control Scale developed by Nowicki and Strickland (1974). However, a close comparison of the two shows that, although they relate to similar constructs, they differ in so many ways that it is best to think of the Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002) scale as being original though the authors were inspired in its development by what Nowicki and Strickland (1974) had produced.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was reported to have an alpha of .71 (Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

- Keller, Punan Anand, Issac M. Lipkus, and Barbara K. Rimer (2002), "Depressive Realism and Health Risk Accuracy: The Negative Consequences of Positive Mood," *JCR*, 29 (June), 57-69.
- Nowicki, Stephen, Jr. and Marshall P. Duke (1974), "The Nowicki-Strickland Life Span Locus of Control Scales: Construct Validation," in *Research with the Locus of Control Construct*, Vol. 2, Herbert M. Lefcourt New York: Academic Press, 9-43.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I did not use the risk information because it was not relevant to me.
2. I would think of myself as having failed if I did not revise my risk on breast cancer.  
(r)
3. I don't think anyone knows breast cancer risk estimates.
4. I didn't use the risk information because most public health information is not very credible.
5. I believe most health problems will solve themselves if you just don't fool with them.
6. I only have myself to blame if I do not do what was expected of me.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although stated here in terms of breast cancer, the statements appear to be amenable to slight rephrasing so as to relate to other types of health risks.

*#401 Locus of Control (Health)*

7. I did not find the risk information believable.
8. I was given the risk information so that I would know my risk for getting breast cancer better. (r)
9. I am willing to take a chance and not believe the risk information.
10. I would blame myself if I did not get the right answer.
11. I believe I know my risk better than the experimenter.

**SCALE NAME: Loyalty (Action)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four statements that use a seven-point Likert-type response format and are intended to measure the degree to which a person states an intention to continue using a particular company in the future as opposed to its competitors. The scale was called *action loyalty* by Harris and Goode (2004) and was used with respect to online stores but it appears to be amenable for use with a variety of vendors.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Harris and Goode (2004) are the source of this scale and three other loyalty measures. They were inspired to develop them based on the four stage loyalty sequence proposed by Oliver (1997). Additionally, Harris and Goode (2004) combined the four scales and provided evidence that they represented a second order factor of loyalty.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .74 (study 1) and .78 (study 2) were found for the scale by Harris and Goode (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Harris and Goode (2004) provided evidence in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Harris, Lloyd C and Mark M.H. Goode (2004), "The Four Levels of Loyalty and the Pivotal Role of Trust: A Study of Online Service Dynamics," *JR*, 80 (2), 139-158.  
Oliver, Richard L. (1997), *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I would always continue to choose \_\_\_\_\_ before others.
2. I will always continue to choose the features of \_\_\_\_\_ before others.
3. I would always continue to favor the offerings of \_\_\_\_\_ before others.
4. I will always choose to use \_\_\_\_\_ in preference to competitor firms.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal company should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Loyalty (Active)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Varying somewhat on the version used, the scale measures the degree to which a customer of a business expects to continue buying from the business in the future and/or to engage in positive word-of-mouth communications about it. Due to the particular subsets of items used by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnayolu (2002) and Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002), they referred to their scales as *word-of-mouth* and *customer referrals*, respectively.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The majority of items come from a scale by Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1996) and most of the subsequent users say they built upon them. The items composing the Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1996) scale were part of a 13-item set proposed for measuring a wide range of behavioral intentions appropriate for a service-quality context. Factor analysis of the 13 items across four companies showed that there was a considerable amount of similarity in factor structure, particularly as it related to this “loyalty” dimension.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .75, .95, and .85 were reported for the versions of the scale used by Bettencourt (1997), Price and Arnould (1999), and Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnayolu (2002), respectively. The version used by Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002) had a composite reliability of .73 in their main study. Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) reported an alpha of .69 for the negative version of the scale they used. Alphas of .93, .94, .94, and .93 were reported by Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1996) for the scale with computer manufacturer, retail chain, automobile insurer, and life insurer samples, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

Bettencourt (1997) performed a CFA with items from his scale and two others which provided support for the three factor conceptualization. Likewise, Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1996) performed oblique factor analyses on data from four companies for the 13 items. The five items composing this scale tended to load together for each data set.

Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002) followed a multi-step process in the development and testing of the scales they used in their study. They provided a variety of evidence in support of the scale’s content, convergent, and discriminant validity. The AVE of the final scale was .48, slightly lower than the .50 minimum expected for a scale (Fornell and Larcker 1981) for which convergent validity is claimed.

No information about the scale's validity was provided by Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003), Price and Arnould (1999), or Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

### COMMENTS:

See Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) where the scale is used to measure loyalty toward a website. Also, Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005) adapted four of Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman's (1996) items to measure intention to shop at a particular retailer again in the future.

### REFERENCES:

- Bettencourt, Lance A. (1997), "Customer Voluntary Performance: Customers As Partners in Service Delivery," *JR*, 73 (3), 383-406.
- Bougie, Roger, Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2003), "Angry Customers Don't Come Back, They Get Back: The Experience and Behavioral Implications of Anger and Dissatisfaction in Services," *JAMS*, 31 (4), 377-393.
- Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *JMR*, 18 (February), 39-50.
- Louro, Maria J., Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2005), "Negative Returns on Positive Emotions: The Influence of Pride and Self-Regulatory Goals on Repurchase Decisions," *JCR*, 31 (March), 833-840.
- Price, Linda L. and Eric J. Arnould (1999), "Commercial Friendships: Service Provider-Client Relationships in Context," *JM*, 63 (October), 38-56.
- Srinivasan, Srini S., Rolph Anderson, and Kishore Ponnnavolu (2002), "Customer Loyalty in E-commerce: An Exploration of its Antecedents and Consequences," *JR*, 78 (1), 41-50.
- Verhoef, Peter C., Philip Hans Franses, and Janny C. Hoekstra (2002), "The Effects of Relational Constructs on Customer Referrals and Number of Services Purchased From a Multiservice Provider: Does Age of Relationship Matter?" *JAMS*, 30 (3), 202-216.
- Wolfinbarger, Mary and Mary C. Gilly (2003), "eTailQ: Dimensionalizing, Measuring and Predicting eTail Quality," *JR*, 79 (3), 183-198.
- Zeithaml, Valerie A., Leonard L. Berry, and A. Parasuraman (1996), "The Behavioral Consequences of Service Quality," *JM*, 60 (April), 31-46.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Depending upon the statement, some of the blanks are filled with the name of the business, some are filled with the type of business, and some are filled with the general "need" the business caters to. The first five items shown above are most similar to the version used by Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1996) which used a seven-point response scale anchored by *not at all likely/extremely likely*. The version used by Bettencourt (1997) had seven-point Likert-type responses (*agree/disagree*) and used #6 as well as items similar to #1 and #3 stated with respect to a store. The items used by Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002) were similar to #1-#3, used five-point Likert-type responses (*agree/disagree*), and were stated in Dutch. Price and Arnould (1999) used items similar to #1, #2, and #7 with respect to a hairstylist. The format used by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) with regard to a website was a seven-point

### #403 Loyalty (Active)

1. I say positive things about \_\_\_\_\_ to other people.
2. I recommend \_\_\_\_\_ to someone who seeks my advice.
3. I encourage friends and relatives to do business with \_\_\_\_\_.
4. I consider \_\_\_\_\_ my first choice to buy \_\_\_\_\_ services.
5. I will do more business with \_\_\_\_\_ in the next few years.
6. I make an effort to use this store for all of my \_\_\_\_\_ needs.
7. I would recommend this \_\_\_\_\_ to others.
8. I do not encourage friends to do business with this \_\_\_\_\_. (r)

---

*agree/disagree* scale with item #8, ones very similar to #1 and #2, and one like #3 stated in the negative. To measure negative word-of-mouth, Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) used a reverse coded version of item #2 and reversed phrasings of items #1 and #3 along with a seven-point response format anchored by *not at all* and *very much*.

**SCALE NAME: Loyalty (Active)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, nine-point Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a customer engages in, or plans to engage in, positive behaviors with respect to a particular business that indicate he/she is committed to it. The scale was referred to as *behavioral intentions* by Brady et al. (2005).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Brady et al. (2005) received inspiration for their items from a scale by Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1996). However, the former's items ended up being different enough to produce a distinct scale. They used at least a couple of rounds of pretesting to refine the items for use in multiple countries. They gave great care to ensure that the non-English versions were functionally and semantically similar to the English one.

**RELIABILITY:**

The composite reliabilities in Study 1 by Brady et al. (2005) ranged from .84 (Netherlands) to .95 (USA). Study 2 was just in the U.S. and the reliability was .93.

**VALIDITY:**

Evidence was provided by Brady et al. (2005) in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities. Its average variance extracted ranged in Study 1 from .63 (Netherlands) to .86 (USA). In Study 2, it was .82. Evidence was also provided in support of the configural and metric invariance of the items composing their scales.

**REFERENCES:**

- Brady, Michael K., Gary A. Knight, J. Joseph Cronin Jr., G. Tomas, M. Hult, and Bruce D. Keillor (2005), "Removing the Contextual Lens: A Multinational, Multi-Setting Comparison of Service Evaluation Methods," *JA*, 81 (3), 215-230.
- Zeithaml, Valerie A., Leonard L. Berry, and A. Parasuraman (1996), "The Behavioral Consequences of Service Quality," *JM*, 60 (April), 31-46.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I would classify myself as a loyal customer of this \_\_\_\_\_.
2. If asked, I would say good things about the \_\_\_\_\_.
3. I would recommend the \_\_\_\_\_ to a friend.

---

<sup>1</sup> An appropriate term such as *business, store, website*, et cetera should be placed in the blanks.

## #405 Loyalty (Affective)

### **SCALE NAME: Loyalty (Affective)**

### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has four, seven-point Likert-type statements that are intended to measure the extent to which a person likes a certain company along with its features, services, and offerings. The scale was called *affective loyalty* by Harris and Goode (2004) and was used with respect to online stores but it appears to be amenable for use with a variety of vendors.

### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Harris and Goode (2004) are the source of this scale and three other loyalty measures. They were inspired to develop them based on the four stage loyalty sequence proposed by Oliver (1997). Additionally, Harris and Goode (2004) combined the four scales and provided evidence that they represented a second order factor of loyalty.

### **RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .75 (study 1) and .73 (study 2) were found for the scale by Harris and Goode (2004).

### **VALIDITY:**

Harris and Goode (2004) provided evidence in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

### **REFERENCES:**

Harris, Lloyd C and Mark M.H. Goode (2004), "The Four Levels of Loyalty and the Pivotal Role of Trust: A Study of Online Service Dynamics," *JR*, 80 (2), 139-158.  
Oliver, Richard L. (1997), *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I have a negative attitude to \_\_\_\_\_ . (r)
2. I dislike the \_\_\_\_\_ offering. (r)
3. I like the features of \_\_\_\_\_ services and offers.
4. I like the performance and services of the \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal company should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Loyalty (Brand)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This scale has three, ten-point Likert-type statements that measure a consumer's stated intention to search for and purchase a particular brand of product(s) in the future.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of the scale was not explicitly stated by Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005). They appear to have adapted items from previous scales especially for their study. As used to gather the data, the items were apparently phrased in German.

**RELIABILITY:**

The composite reliability reported for the scale by Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005) was .90.

**VALIDITY:**

Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann (2005) used CFA with twelve latent constructs and twenty measures. The measurement model fit the data well and two tests were used to provide evidence of each scale's discriminant validity. The average variance extracted for this scale was .75.

**REFERENCES:**

Algesheimer, René, Utpal M. Dholakia, and Andreas Herrmann (2005), "The Social Influence of Brand Community: Evidence from European Car Clubs," *JM*, 69 (July), 19-34.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I intend to buy this brand in the near future.
2. I would actively search for this brand in order to buy it.
3. I intend to buy other products of this brand.

**SCALE NAME: Loyalty (Cognitive)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's belief that buying from a certain company is preferable than buying from others at that point in time. The scale was called *cognitive loyalty* by Harris and Goode (2004) and was used with respect to online stores but it appears to be amenable for use with a variety of vendors.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Harris and Goode (2004) are the source of this scale and three other loyalty measures. They were inspired to develop them based on the four stage loyalty sequence proposed by Oliver (1997). Additionally, Harris and Goode (2004) combined the four scales and provided evidence that they represented a second order factor of loyalty.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .83 (study 1) and .69 (study 2) were found for the scale by Harris and Goode (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Harris and Goode (2004) provided evidence in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Harris, Lloyd C and Mark M.H. Goode (2004), "The Four Levels of Loyalty and the Pivotal Role of Trust: A Study of Online Service Dynamics," *JR*, 80 (2), 139-158.  
Oliver, Richard L. (1997), *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I believe that using \_\_\_\_\_ is preferable to other companies.
2. I believe that \_\_\_\_\_ has the best offers at the moment.
3. I believe that the features of \_\_\_\_\_ are badly suited to what I like. (r)
4. I prefer the service of \_\_\_\_\_ to the service of competitors.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal company should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Loyalty (Conative)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale uses four items with a seven-point Likert-type response format to measure a person's belief that his/her repeated experience has shown that buying from a certain company is better than buying from others. The scale was called *conative loyalty* by Harris and Goode (2004) and was used with respect to online stores but it appears to be amenable for use with a variety of vendors.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Harris and Goode (2004) are the source of this scale and three other loyalty measures. They were inspired to develop them based on the four stage loyalty sequence proposed by Oliver (1997). Additionally, Harris and Goode (2004) combined the four scales and provided evidence that they represented a second order factor of loyalty.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .72 (study 1) and .69 (study 2) were found for the scale by Harris and Goode (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Harris and Goode (2004) provided evidence in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Harris, Lloyd C and Mark M.H. Goode (2004), "The Four Levels of Loyalty and the Pivotal Role of Trust: A Study of Online Service Dynamics," *JR*, 80 (2), 139-158.  
Oliver, Richard L. (1997), *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I have repeatedly found \_\_\_\_\_ is better than others.
2. I nearly always find the offer of \_\_\_\_\_ inferior. (r)
3. I have repeatedly found the features of \_\_\_\_\_ inferior. (r)
4. Repeatedly, the performance of \_\_\_\_\_ is superior to that of competing firms.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal company should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Loyalty (Passive)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point statements compose the scale. Together they measure the likelihood that a consumer is willing to continue doing business with a firm even if its prices increase somewhat. The scale was referred to as *willingness to pay more* by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) with inspiration coming from work by Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1996).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .77 was reported for the scale by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Evidence in support of this scale's validity was not provided by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Srinivasan, Srini S., Rolph Anderson, and Kishore Ponnnavolu (2002), "Customer Loyalty in E-commerce: An Exploration of its Antecedents and Consequences," *JR*, 78 (1), 41-50.

Zeithaml, Valerie A., Leonard L. Berry, and A. Parasuraman (1996), "The Behavioral Consequences of Service Quality," *JM*, 60 (April), 31-46.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Will you take some of your business to a competitor that offers better prices? (r)
2. Will you continue to do business with this \_\_\_\_\_ if its prices increase somewhat'?
3. Will you pay a higher price at this \_\_\_\_\_ relative to the competition for the same benefit?
4. Will you stop doing business with this \_\_\_\_\_ if its competitors' prices decrease somewhat? (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The type of business should be stated in the blanks. Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) used the word "website." Their response format was a seven-point scale with *not at all likely* and *very likely* as anchors.

**SCALE NAME: Loyalty Proneness (Product)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is a five-item, seven-point Likert-type measure assessing a consumer's general tendency to buy the same brands over time rather than switching around to try other brands. The measure is not as specific as normally considered of "brand loyalty" where the tendency to purchase a particular brand is assessed rather than the propensity to be loyal in all sorts of purchases.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale appears to be original to Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1990) although they drew upon Raju (1980) for a couple of items.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .92 and .91 were reported by Burton et al. (1998) and Garretson, Fisher, and Burton (2002), respectively. Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1990) reported the reliability of the scale to be .88.

**VALIDITY:**

No test of validity was reported by either Burton et al. (1998) or Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1990). Garretson, Fisher, and Burton (2002) examined the items in this scale along with the items for several other scales using confirmatory factor analysis. The acceptable fit of the model along with some other typical tests provided support for the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Burton, Scot, Donald R. Lichtenstein, Richard G. Netemeyer, and Judith A. Garretson (1998), "A Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward Private Label Products and an Examination of Its Psychological and Behavioral Correlates," *JAMS*, 26 (4), 293-306.
- Garretson, Judith A., Dan Fisher, and Scot Burton (2002), "Antecedents of Private Label Attitude and National Brand Promotion Attitude: Similarities and Differences," *JR*, 78 (2), 91-99.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R., Richard D. Netemeyer, and Scot Burton (1990), "Distinguishing Coupon Proneness From Value Consciousness: An Acquisition Transaction Utility Theory Perspective," *JM*, 54 (July), 54-67.
- Raju, P. S. (1980), "Optimum Stimulation Level: Its Relationship to Personality, Demographics, and Exploratory Behavior," *JCR*, 7 (December), 272-282.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I generally buy the same brands I have always bought.
2. Once I have made a choice on which brand to purchase, I am likely to continue to buy it without considering other brands.
3. Once I get used to a brand, I hate to switch.

*#410 Loyalty Proneness (Product)*

4. If I like a brand, I rarely switch from it just to try something different.
5. Even though certain products are available in a number of different brands, I always tend to buy the same brand.

**SCALE NAME: Loyalty to Company (Post-Complaint)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point Likert-type statements are used to measure whether or not a consumer purchased from a company to which he/she had previously complained and the likelihood of purchasing again from the company in the future.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Homburg and Fürst (2005) received inspiration from previous work by others, this scale is unique and was developed by them for their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha and composite reliability for this scale were both .92 (Homburg and Fürst 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Homburg and Fürst (2005) used confirmatory factor analysis and examined the discriminant validity of their scales with two different tests. No problems were found with any of them.

**REFERENCES:**

Homburg, Christian and Andreas Fürst (2005), "How Organizational Complaint Handling Drives Customer Loyalty: An Analysis of the Mechanistic and the Organic Approach," *JM*, 69 (July), 95-114.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. After the complaint, I purchased the product of this company again.
2. It is very likely that I will purchase the product of this company again.
3. I intend to remain loyal to this company in the future.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem used with the items was "To what extent do you agree with the following statements?"

**SCALE NAME: Loyalty to the Airline**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, ten-point items assessing a customer's probability of using a particular airline in the future.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) implied that the scale they used was adapted from one by Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1996) [#403]. Although there is some conceptual similarity in the items it is more accurate to describe the scale as original to Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) with inspiration coming from the previous measure.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .94 was reported for the scale by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Evidence regarding the scale's validity scale was not reported by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**COMMENTS:**

See also Agustin and Singh (2005) who used a three-item version of the scale, possibly drawn from the same database as by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

- Agustin, Clara and Jagdip Singh (2005), "Curvilinear Effects of Consumer Loyalty Determinants in Relational Exchanges," *JMR*, 42 (February), 96-108.
- Sirdeshmukh, Deepak, Jagdip Singh, and Barry Sabol (2002), "Consumer Trust, Value, and Loyalty in Relational Exchanges," *JM*, 66 (January), 15-37.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

How likely are you to:

1. do most of your future travel on this airline?
2. recommend this airline to friends, neighbors, and relatives?
3. use this airline the very next time you need to travel?
4. take more than 50% of your flights on this airline?

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) used for the response scale were *very unlikely* / *very likely*.

**SCALE NAME: Loyalty to the e-Retailer**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven, seven-point Likert-type statements are used in the scale. Together they measure the degree to which a person expresses commitment to buying from a certain e-retail website in the future and not switching to another website. The scale was referred to as *e-loyalty* by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) with inspiration coming from work by Gremler (1995) as well as Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1996).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .92 was reported for the scale by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Evidence in support of this scale's validity was not provided by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

- Gremler, David D. (1995), "The Effect of Satisfaction, Switching Costs, and Interpersonal Bonds on Service Loyalty," doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University.
- Srinivasan, Srini S., Rolph Anderson, and Kishore Ponnnavolu (2002), "Customer Loyalty in E-commerce: An Exploration of its Antecedents and Consequences," *JR*, 78 (1), 41-50.
- Zeithaml, Valerie A., Leonard L. Berry, and A. Parasuraman (1996), "The Behavioral Consequences of Service Quality," *JM*, 60 (April), 31-46.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I seldom consider switching to another website.
2. As long as the present service continues, I doubt that I would switch websites.
3. I try to use the website whenever I need to make a purchase.
4. When I need to make a purchase, this website is my first choice.
5. I like using this website.
6. To me this website is the best retail website to do business with.
7. I believe that this is my favorite retail website.

**SCALE NAME: Loyalty to the Financial Adviser**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure a customer's intentions to continue doing business with a particular investment advisory service.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Bell, Seigyoung, and Smalley (2005) drew inspiration from some previous measures, this scale is original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

Bell, Seigyoung, and Smalley (2005) reported an alpha of .88.

**VALIDITY:**

A series of exploratory and confirmatory analyses were conducted by Bell, Seigyoung, and Smalley (2005) that purified the scale and provided evidence of its unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities. The scale was calculated to have an AVE of .71.

**REFERENCES:**

Bell, Simon J., Seigyoung Auh, and Karen Smalley (2005), "Customer Relationship Dynamics: Service Quality and Customer Loyalty in the Context of Varying Levels of Customer Expertise and Switching Costs," *JAMS*, 33 (2), 169-183.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I will invest more funds through \_\_\_\_\_.
2. The chances of me staying in this relationship are very good.
3. The likelihood of me trying other \_\_\_\_\_ services is very good.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the financial adviser should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Loyalty to the Store**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This scale uses three, seven-point Likert-type statements to measure the level of psychological commitment a consumer has to shopping at a certain store or a chain of stores.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004) was apparently developed in dissertation research by Hess (1998).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .87 was reported for the scale by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Although some aspects of the scale's validity were probably assessed by Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004), none were reported in the article. Likewise, information regarding the validity of the scale is likely to be in Hess's (1998) dissertation.

**REFERENCES:**

- Hess, Jeffrey Scott (1998), "A Multidimensional Conceptualization of Consumer Brand Relationships: The Differential Impact of Relationship Dimensions on Evaluative Relationship Outcomes," doctoral dissertation, Leeds School of Business, University of Colorado, Boulder.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R., Minette E. Drumwright, and Bridgette M. Braig (2004), "The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Customer Donations to Corporate-Supported Nonprofits," *JM*, 68 (October), 16-32.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I could easily switch from \_\_\_\_\_ to another store. (r)
2. I am a committed shopper at \_\_\_\_\_.
3. I feel a sense of loyalty to \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal retail store/chain should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Loyalty to the Store**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, ten-point statements are used to measure a customer's expressed likelihood of shopping at a specified store in the future.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Both Nijssen et al. (2003) and Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) implied that the scales they used were adapted from a scale by Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1996). (See #403). Indeed, there is some similarity in the items but the later users modified the items enough to consider the results to be distinct scales.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .92 and .90 were reported for the scales used by Nijssen et al. (2003) and Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

The confirmatory factor analysis by Nijssen et al. (2003) showed a good fit and evidence was provided in support of their scales' convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for this scale was .72. The validity of the scale was not addressed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**COMMENTS:**

Based on the material provided in the respective articles, there were very slight wording differences between the items used by Nijssen et al. (2003) and Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002). It is not clear if these were true differences or if they have more to do with the way the phrases were abbreviated for the articles, especially since the studies seem to have used the same database. In addition, the items were apparently a little different depending upon the context being examined. (Both articles report on use of the scales in a retail clothing context as well as an airline context. See also Agustin and Singh [2005] who used a three item version of the scale, possibly drawn from the same database.)

**REFERENCES:**

- Agustin, Clara and Jagdip Singh (2005), "Curvilinear Effects of Consumer Loyalty Determinants in Relational Exchanges," *JMR*, 42 (February), 96-108.
- Nijssen, Edwin, Jagdip Singh, Deepak Sirdeshmukh, and Hartmut Holzmüller (2003), "Investigating Industry Context Effects in Consumer-Firm Relationships: Preliminary Results from a Dispositional Approach," *JAMS*, 31 (1), 46-60.
- Sirdeshmukh, Deepak, Jagdip Singh, and Barry Sabol (2002), "Consumer Trust, Value, and Loyalty in Relational Exchanges," *JM*, 66 (January), 15-37.
- Zeithaml, Valerie A., Leonard L. Berry, and A. Parasuraman (1996), "The Behavioral Consequences of Service Quality," *JM*, 60 (April), 31-46.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

How likely are you to:

1. do most of your future shopping at this store?
2. recommend this store to friends, neighbors, and relatives?
3. use this store the very next time you need to shop for a \_\_\_\_\_ item?<sup>2</sup>
4. spend more than 50% of your \_\_\_\_\_ budget at this store?<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors used by both Nijssen et al. (2003) and Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) for the response scale were *very unlikely* / *very likely*.

<sup>2</sup> The name of a prominent product category carried by the store should be placed in the blank.

<sup>3</sup> The name of a product category should be placed in the blank, e.g., clothing, grocery, books.

**SCALE NAME: Machiavellianism**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Twenty, seven-point Likert-type statements measure the degree to which a person expresses tendencies to control others through aggressive, manipulative, and even devious means in order to achieve personal or organizational objectives. In marketing research, the scale has mostly been used with marketing professionals in the U.S. (e.g., Ho et al. 1997; Hunt and Chonko 1984). See Wirtz and Kum (2004) for a use of the scale with a mixture of Singaporean workers, professionals, and ultimate consumers.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Christie and Geis (1970). Initially, they drew 71 items from the writings of Machiavelli (*The Prince* and *The Discourses*). They ultimately selected the 20 items with the highest item-to-total correlations (10 stated positively and 10 stated negatively). They reported that the split-half reliability of the scale averaged approximately .79 across several samples and the average item-to-total correlation was .38. A forced choice version of the scale (MACH V) was developed when MACH IV was found to have significant social desirability bias.

A version appropriate for use with children (Kiddie Mach) was also developed. See Robinson, Shaver, and Wrightsman (1991, pp. 380–85) for these other two versions of the scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .71 and .76 were reported for the scale by Ho and colleagues (1997) and Hunt and Chonko (1984; Sparks 1994), respectively. Wirtz and Kum (2004) reported that the alpha for the scale was .74 with their Singaporean sample. They ended up dropping one of the scale items (#18, below) when it was found to be greatly depressing internal reliability.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity has been reported in any of these marketing studies.

**COMMENTS:**

See also a use of the scale by Saxe and Weitz (1982).

**REFERENCES:**

- Christie, Richard and Florence L. Geis (1970), *Studies in Machiavellianism*, New York: Academic Press.
- Ho, Foo Nin, Scott J. Vitell, James H. Barnes, and Rene Desborde (1997), "Ethical Correlates of Role Conflict and Ambiguity in Marketing: The Mediating Role of Cognitive Moral Development," *JAMS*, 25 (2), 117-126.

- Hunt, Shelby D. and Lawrence B. Chonko (1984), "Marketing and Machiavellianism," *JM*, 48 (Summer), 30-42.
- Robinson, John P., Phillip R. Shaver, and Lawrence S. Wrightsman (1991), *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes*, San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Saxe, Robert and Barton A. Weitz (1982), "The SOCO Scale: A Measure of the Customer Orientation of Salespeople," *JMR*, 19 (August), 343-351.
- Sparks, John R. (1994), "Machiavellianism and Personal Success in Marketing: The Moderating Role of Latitude for Improvisation," *JAMS*, 22 (4), 393-400.
- Wirtz, Jochen and Doreen Kum (2004), "Consumers Cheating on Service Guarantees," *JAMS*, 32 (2), 159-175.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.
2. When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reasons for wanting it, rather than giving reasons which might carry more weight. (r)
3. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.
4. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.
5. Honesty is the best policy in all cases. (r)
6. It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak, and it will come out when they are given a chance.
7. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.
8. One should take action only when sure it is morally right. (r)
9. It is wise to flatter important people.
10. All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than important and dishonest. (r)
11. Barnum was very wrong when he said there's a sucker born every minute. (r)
12. People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death.
13. It is possible to be good in all respects. (r)
14. Most people are basically good and kind. (r)
15. There is no excuse for lying to someone else. (r)
16. Most men forget more easily the death of their father than the loss of their property.
17. Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives. (r)
18. Generally speaking, men won't work hard unless they're forced to do so.
19. The biggest difference between criminals and other people is that criminals are stupid enough to get caught.
20. Most men are brave. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Mammogram Costs**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of seven, five-point Likert-type statements measuring the perceived “costs,” mostly non-monetary, of getting a mammogram.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of the scale was not stated by Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2003) but it is assumed to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was reported to have an alpha of .74 (Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale’s validity was reported by Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Keller, Punan Anand, Issac M. Lipkus, and Barbara K. Rimer (2003), “Affect, Framing, and Persuasion,” *JMR*, 40 (February), 54-65.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Mammograms often lead to surgery that is not needed.
2. Mammograms are not needed unless you have some breast problems or pain.
3. Having a mammogram is looking for trouble.
4. You have so many problems that you can not be bothered with having mammograms.
5. The cost of getting a mammogram would cause me to hesitate about getting one.
6. It is hard to get to a place where they do mammograms.
7. The pain caused by getting a mammogram is bad enough to make you put off getting one.

**SCALE NAME: Market Mavenism**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, five-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a consumer's belief that other consumers come to him/her for product-related advice and are positively influenced by it. Since two of the items include the word "new" it also suggests that this scale taps into a facet of innovativeness as well as the person's general ability to influence product-related opinions and behaviors.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Steenkamp and Gielens (2003) described the scale as being adapted from the scale by Feick and Price (1987). However, only one of the four items below come from Feick and Price's six item scale, thus, it may be better to describe this scale as original to Steenkamp and Gielens (2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

Steenkamp and Gielens (2003) reported an alpha of .68 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

The analyses conducted by Steenkamp and Gielens (2003) of this scale and two others provided evidence in support of each scales' unidimensionality as well as their convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Feick, Lawrence F. and Linda L. Price (1987), "The Market Maven: A Diffuser of Marketplace Information," *JM*, 51 (January), 83-97.
- Steenkamp, Jan-Benedict E.M. and Katrijn Gielens (2003), "Consumer and Market Drivers of the Trial Probability of New Consumer Packaged Goods," *JCR*, 30 (December), 368-384.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I like introducing new brands and products to my friends.
2. I don't talk to friends about the products that I buy. (r)
3. My friends and neighbors often come to me for advice.
4. People seldom ask me for my opinion about new products. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Materialism (Centrality)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The original scale had seven, five point Likert-type items and was intended to measure the extent to which a person believes that buying and owning things are important in his/her life. Alternative versions of the scale, varying in their length, have been developed and tested.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Richins and Dawson (1990, 1992a). The earlier paper describes the preliminary work in constructing the materialism instrument. Items were generated through open-ended discussions with consumers, noting how materialistic people were described in the literature, and by adapting a few items used in past studies. Using three studies with student samples the 100+ original items were condensed to 29 items representing about four factors. The items relating to the centrality factor either loaded on different factors or had low communalities. At least two of the items shown below, however, were part of that an asceticism scale tested in the earlier studies.

More recently, Richins (2004) provided a thorough examination of the original seven-item scale and then tested various short forms. Five-, three-, two-, and one-item versions were tested. While all of them may have contexts where they are useful, only the five-item version was suggested for replacing the original six-item version when the centrality facet is being studied rather than materialism at a general level (Richins 2004, p. 217).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas ranging between .71 to .75 were reported for the scale by Richins and Dawson (1992a). The stability of the scale was estimated using 58 students at an urban university. The test-retest correlation (three week interval) was .82. An alpha of .81 was found for the scale as used with the fashion model sample by Netemeyer, Burton, and Lichtenstein (1995; Netemeyer 1997). In Study 4 by Bloch, Brunel, and Arnold (2003) the scale had an alpha of .76. Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) reported an alpha of .60 for the version of the scale they used.

Richins (2004) reported that across 15 data sets, alphas for the seven-item version of the scale ranged from .64 - .82 and were .54 - .77 for the five-item set.

**VALIDITY:**

Although the validity of the scale was not directly examined by Bloch, Brunel, and Arnold (2003), it was used to help show the discriminant validity of a visual product aesthetics scale.

Likewise, Netemeyer, Burton, and Lichtenstein (1995) used the scale to help establish the construct validity of four vanity-related scales. The materialism scale had

significant positive correlations with two of the vanity scales involving concern for appearance and achievement.

The validity of the scale was addressed a variety of ways by Richins and Dawson (1992a). For example, the results of an exploratory factor analysis of the seven centrality items as well as eleven items composing two other components of materialism (#422 and #423) showed that the centrality items had their highest loadings on the same factor. Some evidence of discriminant validity came from the fact that the scale had a very low correlation with a measure of social desirability bias. The rest of the evidence provided generally positive support for nomological validity but was reported just for the overall scale, with items for the three components combined.

Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) conducted a CFA of the items in this scale and those measuring the other two components of materialism. Several items did not perform well, with the authors guessing that it was due to confusion on the part of their adolescent sample with certain items. After eliminating those items, a subsequent analysis showed that all items loaded significantly on the expected factors.

A great deal of information regarding the validity of the various versions of this scale was provided by Richins (2004). Ultimately, the five-item version was superior to all others, including the seven-item version.

#### **COMMENTS:**

Although reported separately here, Richins and Dawson (1992a) argued for combining scores of the three components of materialism. Much of the article's information is about the overall instrument's psychometric quality. For example, in the same studies as described above it was reported to have alphas between .80 to .88 and a test-retest reliability of .87. Consult Wong, Rindfleisch, and Burroughs (2003) regarding the cross-cultural issues with the combined scale, particularly as it has to do with the mixture of positively- and negatively-worded items.

In contrast, Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) decided to conduct structural analyses with the three separate components rather than with them combined. This was based on a second-order factor model they conducted that fit the data better than a single-order model.

According to Richins (2004), all of the various versions of the combined materialism items produce a three factor solution except for the shortest version which only has one item representing each facet. While she views the nine- and six-item versions as acceptable measures of general materialism, she still recommends the 15-item version be used when studying materialism at the domain level.

See also Mick (1996), Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997), Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002), and Shrum, Burroughs, and Rindfleisch (2005).

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Bloch, Peter H., Frédéric F. Brunel, and Todd J. Arnold (2003), "Individual Differences in the Centrality of Visual Product Aesthetics: Concept and Measurement," *JCR*, 29 (March), 551-565.
- Burroughs, James E., and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.

## #420 Materialism (Centrality)

- Manolis, Chris (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Mick, David Glen (1996), "Are Studies of Dark Side Variables Confounded by Socially Desirable Responding? The Case of Materialism," *JCR*, 23 (September), 106–19.
- Netemeyer, Richard G. (1997), Personal Correspondence.
- Netemeyer, Richard G., Scot Burton, and Donald R. Lichtenstein (1995), "Trait Aspects of Vanity: Measurement and Relevance to Consumer Behavior," *JCR*, 21 (March), 612-626.
- Richins, Marsha L. (1994), "Special Possessions and the Expression of Material Values," *JCR*, 21 (December), 522–33.
- Richins, Marsha L. and Scott Dawson (1990), "A Preliminary Report of Scale Development," in *Advances in Consumer Research Vol.17*, Marvin E. Goldberg, Gerald Gorn, and Richard W. Pollay. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 169–75.
- Richins, Marsha L. and Scott Dawson (1992a), "A Consumer Values Orientation for Materialism and Its Measurement: Scale Development and Validation," *JCR*, 19 (December), 303–16.
- Richins, Marsha L. and Scott Dawson (1992b), "A Consumer Values Orientation for Materialism and Its Measurement: Scale Development and Validation," unpublished results of hypothesis tests by subscale, available from the authors.
- Richins, Marsha L. (2004), "The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form," *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.
- Rindfleisch, Aric, James E. Burroughs, and Frank Denton (1997), "Family Structure, Materialism, and Compulsive Consumption," *JCR*, 23 (March), 312–25.
- Roberts, James A., Chris Manolis, and John F. Tanner, Jr. (2003), "Family Structure, Materialism, and Compulsive Buying: A Reinquiry and Extension," *JAMS*, 31 (3), 300-311.
- Shrum, L. J., James E. Burroughs, and Aric Rindfleisch (2005), "Television's Cultivation of Material Values," *JCR*, 32 (December), 473-479.
- Wong, Nancy, Aric Rindfleisch, and James E. Burroughs (2003), "Do Reverse-Worded Items Confound Measures in Cross-Cultural Consumer Research? The Case of the Material Values Scale," *JCR*, 30 (June), 72-91.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. I usually buy only the things I need. (r)
2. I try to keep my life simple, as far as possessions are concerned. (r)
3. The things I own aren't all that important to me. (r)
4. I enjoy spending money on things that aren't that practical.
5. Buying things gives me a lot of pleasure.
6. I like a lot of luxury in my life.
7. I put less emphasis on material things than most people I know. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale used by Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) used a seven-point response format and was composed of item #6 and items very similar to #4, #5, and #7 (minor word changes). Richins (2004) used all items but #1 and #4 in the five item version of the scale. The three item subscale was composed of #2, #5, and #6. The two item version had #5 and #6. The single item version used #6.

**SCALE NAME: Materialism (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of Likert-type statements intended to capture the emphasis a person places on material things and the belief that those things bring happiness.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Sirgy et al. (1998) is original to Richins (1987). The items used by Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) are from that same set.

Interestingly, her analysis of the items showed that they were not unidimensional. She dropped item #7 (below) and used the other six to compose two scales. Ultimately, she developed stronger measures of three materialism subconstructs (Richins and Dawson 1992; Richins 2004). (See #420, #422, and #423.)

**RELIABILITY:**

Sirgy et al. (1998) used the scale with six different samples in five different countries. Alphas ranged from .303 for the Chinese sample (n = 191) to .686 for the Canadian sample (n = 180). A construct reliability of .74 was reported by Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) for the four-item version of the scale they used with 281 American teenagers.

**VALIDITY:**

Because of the scale's moderate and significant correlations with another measure of materialism, Sirgy et al. (1998) claimed support for the scale's convergent validity. Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) used the results of their initial confirmatory factor analysis to drop two of the six items they used to measure the construct. The reanalysis of the four items along with items from several other scales produced a satisfactory fit. Evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity was provided as well.

**COMMENTS:**

Despite the support for the scale's validity mentioned above, there is reason for concern given that so much of the in-depth work on materialism (Belk 1985; Richins and Dawson 1992) indicates that it is a multifaceted construct, not captured in any one scale.

**REFERENCES:**

- Belk, Russell W. (1985), "Materialism: Trait Aspects of Living in the Material World," *JCR*, 12 (December), 265-280.
- Bristol, Terry and Tamara F. Mangleburg (2005), "Not Telling the Whole Story: Teen Deception in Purchasing," *JAMS*, 33 (1), 79-95.
- Richins, Marsha L. (1987), "Media, Materialism, and Human Happiness," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 14, Melanie Wallendorf and Paul Anderson, eds. Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 352-356.

## #421 Materialism (General)

Richins, Marsha L. and Scott Dawson (1992), "A Consumer Values Orientation for Materialism and its Measurement: Scale Development and Validation," *JCR*, 19 (December), 303-316.

Richins, Marsha L. (2004), "The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form," *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.

Sirgy M. Joseph, Dong-Jin Lee, Rustan Kosenko, H. Lee Meadow, Don Rahtz, Murriss Cicic, Guang Xi-Jin, Duygun Yarsuvat, David L. Blenkhorn, and Newell Wright (1998), "Does Television Viewership Play a Role in the Perception of Quality of Life?" *Journal of Advertising*, 27 (Spring), 125-142.

### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. It is important to me to have really nice things.
2. I would like to be rich enough to buy anything I want.
3. I'd be happier if I could afford to buy more things.
4. It sometimes bothers me quite a bit that I can't afford to buy all of the things I would like.
5. People place too much emphasis on material things. (r)
6. It's really true that money can buy happiness.
7. The things I own give me a great deal of pleasure.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sirgy et al. (1998) used a five-point response format and, depending upon the country, some items were ultimately dropped from this set when calculating scores. Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) used items #1-#3 and #6 with a seven-point response scale.

**SCALE NAME: Materialism (Happiness)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The original scale was composed of five, five-point Likert-type statements assessing the degree to which a person believes that the number and quality of a person's possessions are necessary to achieve happiness in life. Alternative versions of the scale, varying in their length, were subsequently developed and tested by Richins (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Richins and Dawson (1990, 1992a). The earlier paper describes the preliminary work in constructing the materialism instrument. Items were generated through open-ended discussions with consumers, noting how materialistic people were described in the literature, and by adapting a few items used in past studies. Using three studies with student samples, the 100+ original items were condensed to 29 items representing about four factors. The factor related to the final scale shown had reliabilities ranging from .75 to .80.

More recently, Richins (2004) provided a thorough examination of the original five-item scale and then tested various short forms. Three-, two-, and one-item versions were tested. While all of them may have contexts where they are useful, only the five-item version was suggested for use when the centrality facet is being studied rather than materialism at a general level (Richins 2004, p. 217).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas ranging between .73 and .83 were reported for the scale by Richins and Dawson (1992a). The stability of the scale was estimated using 58 students at an urban university. The test-retest correlation (three week interval) was .86. In Study 4 by Bloch, Brunel, and Arnold (2003) the scale had an alpha of .79. The version of the scale used by Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) had an alpha of .70 (Manolis 2005).

Richins (2004) reported that across 15 data sets, alphas for the five-item version of the scale ranged from .70 - .83.

**VALIDITY:**

Although the validity of the scale was not directly examined by Bloch, Brunel, and Arnold (2003), it was used to help show the discriminant validity of a visual product aesthetics scale.

The validity of the scale was addressed a variety of ways by Richins and Dawson (1992a). For example, the results of an exploratory factor analysis of the five happiness items as well as thirteen items composing two other components of materialism (centrality and success) showed that the happiness items had their highest loadings on the same factor. Some evidence of discriminant validity came from the fact that the scale had practically no correlation with a measure of social desirability. The rest of the evidence

## #422 Materialism (Happiness)

provided generally positive support for nomological validity but was reported just for the overall scale, with items for the three components combined.

Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) conducted a CFA of the items in this scale and those measuring the other two components of materialism (#420 and #423). Several items did not perform well, with the authors guessing that it was due to confusion on the part of their adolescent sample with certain items. After eliminating those items, a subsequent analysis showed that all items loaded significantly on the expected factors.

A great deal of information regarding the validity of the various versions of this scale was provided by Richins (2004). Ultimately, the five-item version was superior to all others.

### COMMENTS:

Although reported separately here, Richins and Dawson (1992a) argued for combining scores of the three components of materialism. Much of the article's information is about the overall instrument's psychometric quality. For example, in the same studies as described above it was reported to have alphas between .80 to .88 and a test-retest reliability of .87. Consult Wong, Rindfleisch, and Burroughs (2003) regarding the cross-cultural issues with the combined scale, particularly as it has to do with the mixture of positively- and negatively-worded items.

In contrast, Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) decided to conduct structural analyses with the three separate components rather than with them combined. This was based on a second-order factor model they conducted that fit the data better than a single-order model.

According to Richins (2004), all of the various versions of the combined materialism items produce a three factor solution except for the shortest version which only has one item representing each facet. While she views the nine- and six-item versions as acceptable measures of general materialism, she still recommends the 15-item version be used when studying materialism at the domain level.

See also Mick (1996), Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997), Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002), and Shrum, Burroughs, and Rindfleisch (2005).

### REFERENCES:

- Bloch, Peter H., Frédéric F. Brunel, and Todd J. Arnold (2003), "Individual Differences in the Centrality of Visual Product Aesthetics: Concept and Measurement," *JCR*, 29 (March), 551-565.
- Burroughs, James E., and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.
- Manolis, Chris (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Mick, David Glen (1996), "Are Studies of Dark Side Variables Confounded by Socially Desirable Responding? The Case of Materialism," *JCR*, 23 (September), 106-19.
- Richins, Marsha L. (1994), "Special Possessions and the Expression of Material Values," *JCR*, 21 (December), 522-33.
- Richins, Marsha L. and Scott Dawson (1990), "A Preliminary Report of Scale Development," in *Advances in Consumer Research Vol.17*, Marvin E. Goldberg,

- Gerald Gorn, and Richard W. Pollay. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 169–75.
- Richins, Marsha L. and Scott Dawson (1992a), “A Consumer Values Orientation for Materialism and Its Measurement: Scale Development and Validation,” *JCR*, 19 (December), 303–16.
- Richins, Marsha L. and Scott Dawson (1992b), "A Consumer Values Orientation for Materialism and Its Measurement: Scale Development and Validation," unpublished results of hypothesis tests by subscale, available from the authors.
- Richins, Marsha L. (2004), “The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form,” *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.
- Rindfleisch, Aric, James E. Burroughs, and Frank Denton (1997), “Family Structure, Materialism, and Compulsive Consumption,” *JCR*, 23 (March), 312–25.
- Roberts, James A., Chris Manolis, and John F. Tanner, Jr. (2003), “Family Structure, Materialism, and Compulsive Buying: A Reinquiry and Extension,” *JAMS*, 31 (3), 300-311.
- Shrum, L. J., James E. Burroughs, and Aric Rindfleisch (2005), “Television’s Cultivation of Material Values,” *JCR*, 32 (December), 473-479.
- Wong, Nancy, Aric Rindfleisch, and James E. Burroughs (2003), “Do Reverse-Worded Items Confound Measures in Cross-Cultural Consumer Research? The Case of the Material Values Scale,” *JCR*, 30 (June), 72-91.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I have all the things I really need to enjoy life. (r)
2. My life would be better if I owned certain things I don't have.
3. I wouldn't be any happier if I owned nicer things. (r)
4. I'd be happier if I could afford to buy more things.
5. It sometimes bothers me quite a bit that I can't afford to buy all the things I'd like.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale used by Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) used a seven-point response format and was composed of item #5 and items very similar to #2 and #3 (minor word changes). Richins (2004) used all items for the five item version of the scale. The three item subscale was composed of #2, #4, and #5. The two item version had #2 and #4. The single item version used #4.

**SCALE NAME: Materialism (Success)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a person believes that the number and quality of a person's possessions are indicators of success in life. Alternative versions of the scale, varying in their length, have been developed and tested.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Richins and Dawson (1990, 1992a). The earlier paper describes the preliminary work in constructing the materialism instrument. Items were generated through open-ended discussions with consumers, noting how materialistic people were described in the literature, and by adapting a few items used in past studies. Using three studies with student samples the 100+ original items were condensed to 29 items representing about four factors. The factor related to the final scale shown below had reliabilities ranging from .80 to .85.

More recently, Richins (2004) provided a thorough examination of the original six-item scale and then tested various short forms. Five-, three-, two-, and one-item versions were tested. While all of them may have contexts where they are useful, only the five-item version was suggested for replacing the original six-item version when the success facet is being studied rather than materialism at a general level (Richins 2004, p. 217).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas ranging between .74 and .78 were reported for the scale by Richins and Dawson (1992a). The stability of the scale was estimated using 58 students at an urban university. The test-retest correlation (three week interval) was .82. Among the alphas for the scale found by Netemeyer, Burton, and Lichtenstein (1995; Netemeyer 1997) were .90 (students), .85 (nonstudents adults), and .76 (fashion models). In study 4 by Bloch, Brunel, and Arnold (2003) the scale had an alpha of .80. The version of the scale used by Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) had an alpha of .64 (Manolis 2005).

Richins (2004) reported that across 15 data sets, alphas for the six-item version of the scale ranged from .72-.85 and were .72-.84 for the five-item set.

**VALIDITY:**

Although the validity of the scale was not directly examined by Bloch, Brunel, and Arnold (2003), it was used to help show the discriminant validity of a visual product aesthetics scale.

Likewise, Netemeyer, Burton, and Lichtenstein (1995) used the scale to help establish the construct validity of four vanity-related scales. Materialism had significant positive correlations with each of the vanity scales.

The validity of the scale was addressed a variety of ways by Richins and Dawson (1992a). For example, the results of an exploratory factor analysis of the six success items as well as twelve items composing two other components of materialism (#420 and #422) showed that the success items had their highest loadings on the same factor. Some evidence of discriminant validity came from the fact that the scale had practically no correlation with a measure of social desirability bias. The rest of the evidence provided generally positive support for nomological validity but was reported just for the overall scale, with items for the three components combined.

Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) conducted a CFA of the items in this scale and those measuring the other two components of materialism. Several items did not perform well, with the authors guessing that it was due to confusion on the part of their adolescent sample with certain items. After eliminating those items, a subsequent analysis showed that all items loaded significantly on the expected factors.

A great deal of information regarding the validity of the various versions of this scale was provided by Richins (2004). Ultimately, the five-item version was superior to all others, including the six-item version.

#### **COMMENTS:**

Although reported separately here, Richins and Dawson (1992a) argued for combining scores of the three components of materialism. Much of the article's information is about the overall instrument's psychometric quality. For example, in the same studies as described above it was reported to have alphas between .80 to .88 and a test-retest reliability of .87. Consult Wong, Rindfleisch, and Burroughs (2003) regarding the cross-cultural issues with the combined scale, particularly as it has to do with the mixture of positively- and negatively-worded items.

In contrast, Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) decided to conduct structural analyses with the three separate components rather than with them combined. This was based on a second-order factor model they conducted that fit the data better than a single-order model.

According to Richins (2004), all of the various versions of the combined materialism items produce a three factor solution except for the shortest version which only has one item representing each facet. While she views the nine- and six-item versions as acceptable measures of general materialism, she still recommends the 15-item version be used when studying materialism at the domain level.

See also Mick (1996), Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton (1997), Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002), and Shrum, Burroughs, and Rindfleisch (2005).

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Bloch, Peter H., Frédéric F. Brunel, and Todd J. Arnold (2003), "Individual Differences in the Centrality of Visual Product Aesthetics: Concept and Measurement," *JCR*, 29 (March), 551-565.
- Burroughs, James E., and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.
- Manolis, Chris (2005), Personal Correspondence.

## #423 Materialism (Success)

- Mick, David Glen (1996), "Are Studies of Dark Side Variables Confounded by Socially Desirable Responding? The Case of Materialism," *JCR*, 23 (September), 106–19.
- Netemeyer, Richard G. (1997), Personal Correspondence.
- Netemeyer, Richard G., Scot Burton, and Donald R. Lichtenstein (1995), "Trait Aspects of Vanity: Measurement and Relevance to Consumer Behavior," *JCR*, 21 (March), 612-626.
- Richins, Marsha L. (1994), "Special Possessions and the Expression of Material Values," *JCR*, 21 (December), 522–33.
- Richins, Marsha L. and Scott Dawson (1990), "A Preliminary Report of Scale Development," in *Advances in Consumer Research Vol.17*, Marvin E. Goldberg, Gerald Gorn, and Richard W. Pollay. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 169–75.
- Richins, Marsha L. and Scott Dawson (1992a), "A Consumer Values Orientation for Materialism and Its Measurement: Scale Development and Validation," *JCR*, 19 (December), 303–16.
- Richins, Marsha L. and Scott Dawson (1992b), "A Consumer Values Orientation for Materialism and Its Measurement: Scale Development and Validation," unpublished results of hypothesis tests by subscale, available from the authors.
- Richins, Marsha L. (2004), "The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form," *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.
- Rindfleisch, Aric, James E. Burroughs, and Frank Denton (1997), "Family Structure, Materialism, and Compulsive Consumption," *JCR*, 23 (March), 312–25.
- Roberts, James A., Chris Manolis, and John F. Tanner, Jr. (2003), "Family Structure, Materialism, and Compulsive Buying: A Reinquiry and Extension," *JAMS*, 31 (3), 300-311.
- Shrum, L. J., James E. Burroughs, and Aric Rindfleisch (2005), "Television's Cultivation of Material Values," *JCR*, 32 (December), 473-479.
- Wong, Nancy, Aric Rindfleisch, and James E. Burroughs (2003), "Do Reverse-Worded Items Confound Measures in Cross-Cultural Consumer Research? The Case of the Material Values Scale," *JCR*, 30 (June), 72-91.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. I admire people who own expensive homes, cars, and clothes.
2. Some of the most important achievements in life include acquiring material possessions.
3. I don't place much emphasis on the amount of material objects people own as a sign of success. (r)
4. The things I own say a lot about how well I'm doing in life.
5. I like to own things that impress people.
6. I don't pay much attention to the material objects other people own. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale used by Roberts, Manolis, and Tanner (2003) used a seven-point response format and was composed of items #4 and #5, an item very similar to #1, and a major rephrasing of #2. Richins (2004) used all items but #6 in the five item version of the scale. The three item subscale was composed of #1, #4, and #5. The two item version had #1 and #4. The single item version used #1.

**SCALE NAME:     Meaningfulness (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of seven-point bi-polar adjectives intended to measure the extent to which a person perceives a stimulus to be relevant and important.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although all of the items have been used previously, Mano and Oliver (1993) appear to have been the first to use them as a summated scale. They drew upon Zaichkowsky (1985) as well as Batra and Ahtola (1991) for items. The source of the version used by Cox and Cox (2002) was not stated.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .89 and .79 were reported for the versions of the scale used by Mano and Oliver (1993) and Cox and Cox (2002), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Cox and Cox (2002). Mano and Oliver (1993) did not specifically address the scale's validity but a factor analysis of 25 items used in their study indicated that the seven items composing their scale had high loadings on the same factor although one item (important) also had a high loading on another factor (need).

**REFERENCES:**

- Batra, Rajeev and Olli T. Ahtola (1991), "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Sources of Consumer Attitudes," *Marketing Letters*, 2 (April), 159-170.
- Cox, Dena S. and Anthony D. Cox (2002), "Beyond First Impressions: The Effects of Repeated Exposure on Consumer Liking of Visually Complex and Simple Product Designs," *JAMS*, 30 (2), 119-130.
- Mano, Haim and Richard L. Oliver (1993), "Assessing the Dimensionality and Structure of the Consumption Experience: Evaluation, Feeling, and Satisfaction," *JCR*, 20 (December), 451-466.
- Zaichkowsky, Judith L. (1985), "Measuring the Involvement Construct," *JCR*, 12 (December), 341-352.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. unimportant / important

---

<sup>1</sup> Mano and Oliver (1993) used the first seven items. Cox and Cox (2002) used item #8 and ones similar to #1 and #7.

*#424 Meaningfulness (General)*

2. of no concern / of concern to me
3. irrelevant / relevant
4. means nothing to me / means a lot to me
5. worthless / valuable
6. doesn't matter / matters to me
7. insignificant / significant
8. not meaningful / meaningful

**SCALE NAME: Mood****DESCRIPTION:**

This is a seven-point semantic differential purported to measure a subject's affective mood state at a particular point in time.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale seems to be original to Allen and Janiszewski (1989). It is unknown if the version used by Roehm and Roehm (2005) was deliberately adapted from the one by Allen and Janiszewski (1989) or if it is merely very similar to it by coincidence.

**RELIABILITY:**

Allen and Janiszewski (1989) reported an alpha of .72 for their scale. Roehm and Roehm (2005) used their scale after each time 57 participants in a pilot test viewed a commercial. For the 30 commercials that were viewed, the alphas ranged from .80-.91.

**VALIDITY:**

No validity assessment was reported by Allen and Janiszewski (1989) or Roehm and Roehm (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- Allen, Chris T. and Chris A. Janiszewski (1989), "Assessing the Role of Contingency Awareness in Attitudinal Conditioning with Implications for Advertising Research," *JMR*, 26 (February), 30-43.
- Roehm, Harper A. Jr. and Michelle L. Roehm (2005), "Revisiting the Effect of Positive Mood on Variety Seeking," *JCR*, 32 (September), 330-336.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

At this moment I am feeling:

1. good / bad
2. unpleasant / pleasant (r)
3. happy / sad<sup>2</sup>
4. negative / positive

<sup>1</sup> Allen and Janiszewski (1989) used all four items while Roehm and Roehm (2005) used the first three items.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of this particular anchor, Roehm and Roehm (2005) used *unhappy*.

**SCALE NAME: Need for Cognition**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of eighteen Likert-type items that are supposed to measure a person's tendency to engage in and enjoy effortful information processing. Abbreviated versions of the scale have been used by Ailawadi, Neslin, and Gedenk (2001), Kopalle and Lindsay-Mullikin (2003), and Cotte and Wood (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Cacioppo, Petty, and Kao (1984) and was a short form of a thirty-four item version (Cacioppo and Petty 1982). The short version was reported to have a theta coefficient (maximized Cronbach's alpha) of .90 compared to the long version's .91. Also, the two versions of the scale had a correlation of .95. Finally, factor analysis indicated that all items except one had substantial and higher loadings on the first factor than subsequent factors. It is unclear why the weak item was not suggested for elimination in future use. Since factor loadings were not presented in the article, it is unknown which particular item it was.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .88 (Batra and Stayman 1990), .88 (Darley and Smith 1993, 1995), .86 (Inman, Peter, and Raghurir 1997), .80 (Manning, Sprott, and Miyazaki 1998), .89 (Mantel and Kardes 1999), .87 (Peck and Childers 2003), and .86 (Zhang and Buddha 1999) have been reported for the scale. Roehm and Sternthal (2001) used the scale in four experiments with the alphas from two of them being .90 ( $n = 29$ ) and .87 ( $n = 39$ ). A composite reliability of .882 was reported for the scale used by Ailawadi, Neslin, and Gedenk (2001). The scale was used in two studies reported by Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003) with the alphas being .87 ( $n = 104$ ) to .89 ( $n = 273$ ). The four item version used by Kopalle and Lindsay-Mullikin (2003) had an alpha of .62 and the five item version by Cotte and Wood (2004) had an alpha of .73. Shrum, Burroughs, and Rindfleisch (2005) calculated a composite reliability of .97 for the full scale (Study 2) and .70 for a five-item short form (Study 1).

A Spanish version of the eighteen-item scale was used by Briñol, Petty, and Tormala (2004) with alphas of .84 (pretest) and .86 (Experiment 1). They also used the English version (Experiment 2) and it had an alpha of .89. Thai ( $\alpha = .75$ ) and English ( $\alpha = .87$ ) versions were used in the study by Polyorat and Alden (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the full scale's validity was reported in any of the marketing studies. The items in the short version of the scale used by Ailawadi, Neslin, and Gedenk (2001) were examined along with those belonging to 14 other scales in a confirmatory factor analysis. The fit of the measurement model was acceptable and general evidence was cited in support of the scale's discriminant validity.

Briñol, Petty, and Tormala (2004) used a variety of steps, both exploratory and confirmatory, to validate the Spanish language version of the scale.

**COMMENTS:**

Also see Garbarino and Edell (1997), Inman, McAlister, and Hoyer (1990), MacKenzie (1986), Mantel and Kellaris (2003), Martin, Lang, and Wong (2004), Meyers-Levy and Tybout (1989; 1997), Nowlis, Kahn, and Dhar (2002), O'Guinn and Shrum (1997), Peracchio and Meyers-Levy (2005), Peracchio and Tybout (1996), Pham and Avnet (2004), Priluck and Till (2004), Samu, Krishnan, and Smith (1999), Schlosser (2003), Sengupta and Johar (2002), Sicilia, Ruiz, and Munuera (2005), Wheeler, Petty, and Bizer (2005), Wong, Rindfleisch, and Burroughs (2003), Zhang (1996), and Zhu and Meyers-Levy (2005) for other uses of the scale.

**REFERENCES:**

- Ailawadi, Kusum L., Scott A. Neslin, and Karen Gedenk (2001), "Pursuing the Value-Conscious Consumer: Store Brands Versus National Brand Promotions," *JM*, 65 (1), 71-89.
- Batra, Rajeev and Stayman (1990), "The Role of Mood in Advertising Effectiveness," *JCR*, 17 (September), 203-214.
- Briñol, Pablo, Richard E. Petty and Zakary L. Tormala (2004), "Self-Validation of Cognitive Responses to Advertisements," *JCR*, 30 (March), 559-573.
- Cacioppo, John T. and Richard E. Petty (1982), "The Need for Cognition," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42 (1), 116-131.
- Cacioppo, John T., Richard E. Petty, and Chuan Feng Kao (1984), "The Efficient Assessment of Need for Cognition," *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48 (3), 306, 307.
- Cline, Thomas W., Moses B. Altsech and James J. Kellaris (2003), "When Does Humor Enhance or Inhibit As Responses: The Moderating Role of the Need for Humor," *JA*, 32 (3), 31-45.
- Cotte, June and Stacy L. Wood (2004), "Families and Innovative Consumer Behavior: A Triadic Analysis of Sibling and Parental Influence," *JCR*, 31 (June), 78-86.
- Darley, William K. and Robert E. Smith (1993), "Advertising Claim Objectivity: Antecedents and Effects," *JM*, 57 (October), 100-113.
- Darley, William K. and Robert E. Smith (1995), "Gender Differences in Information Processing Strategies: An Empirical Test of the Selectivity Model in Advertising Response," *JA*, 24 (Spring), 41-56.
- Garbarino, Ellen C. and Julie A. Edell (1997), "Cognitive Effort, Affect, and Choice," *JCR*, 24 (September), 147-158.
- Inman, J. Jeffrey, Leigh McAlister, and Wayne D. Hoyer (1990), "Promotion Signal: Proxy for a Price Cut?" *JCR*, 17 (June), 74-81.
- Inman, J. Jeffrey, Anil C. Peter, Priya Raghbir (1997), "Framing the Deal: The Role of Restrictions in Accentuating Deal Value," *JCR*, 24 (June), 68-79.
- Kopalle, Praveen K. and Joan Lindsey-Mullikin (2003), "The Impact of External Reference Price on Consumer Price Expectations," *JR*, 79 (4), 225-236.
- MacKenzie, Scott B. (1986), "The Role of Attention in Mediating the Effect of Advertising on Attribute Importance," *JCR*, 13 (September), 174-195.

## #426 Need for Cognition

- Manning, Kenneth C., David E. Sprott, and Anthony D. Miyazaki (1998), "Consumer Response to Quantity Surcharges: Implications for Retail Price Setters," *JR*, 74 (3), 373-399.
- Mantel, Susan Powell and Frank R. Kardes (1999), "The Role of Direction of Comparison, Attribute-Based Processing, and Attitude-Based Processing in Consumer Preference," *JCR*, 25 (March), 335-352.
- Mantel, Susan Powell and James J. Kellaris (2003), "Cognitive Determinants of Consumers' Time Perceptions: The Impact of Resources Required and Available," *JCR*, 29 (March), 531-538.
- Martin, Brett A.S., Bodo Lang, and Stephanie Wong (2004), "Conclusion Explicitness in Advertising," *JA*, 32 (4), 57-65.
- Meyers-Levy, Joan and Alice M. Tybout (1989), "Schema Congruity as a Basis for Product Evaluation," *JCR*, 16 (June), 39-54.
- Meyers-Levy, Joan and Alice M. Tybout (1997), "Context Effects at Encoding and Judgment in Consumption Settings: The Role of Cognitive Resources," *JCR*, 24 (June), 1-14.
- Nowlis, Stephen M., Barbara E. Kahn and Ravi Dhar (2002), "Coping with Ambivalence: The Effect of Removing a Neutral Option on Consumer Attitude and Preference Judgments," *JCR*, 29 (December), 319-334.
- O'Guinn, Thomas C. and L. J. Shrum (1997), "The Role of Television in the Construction of Consumer Reality," *JCR*, 23 (March), 278-294.
- Peck, Joann and Terry L. Childers (2003), "Individual Differences in Haptic Information Processing: The 'Need for Touch' Scale," *JCR*, 30 (December), 430-442.
- Peracchio, Laura A., and Joan Meyers-Levy (2005), "Using Stylistic Properties of Ad Pictures to Communicate with Consumers," *JCR*, 32 (June), 29-40.
- Peracchio, Laura A. and Alice M. Tybout (1996), "The Moderating Role of Prior Knowledge in Schema-Based Product Evaluation," *JCR*, 23 (December), 177-192.
- Pham, Michel Tuan and Tamar Avnet (2004), "Ideals and Oughts and the Reliance on Affect versus Substance in Persuasion," *JCR*, 30 (March), 503-518.
- Polyorat, Kawpong and Dana L. Alden (2005), "Self-Construal and Need-For-Cognition Effects on Brand Attitudes and Purchase Intentions in Response to Comparative Advertising in Thailand and the United States," *JA*, 34 (1), 37-48.
- Priluck, Randi and Brian D. Till (2004), "The Role of Contingency Awareness, Involvement, and Need for Cognition in Attitude formation," *JAMS*, 32 (3), 329-344.
- Roehm, Michelle L. and Brian Sternthal (2001), "The Moderating Effect of Knowledge and Resources on the Persuasive Impact of Analogies," *JCR*, 28 (September), 257-272.
- Samu, Sridhar, H. Shanker Krishnan, and Robert E. Smith (1999), "Using Advertising Alliances for New Product Introduction: Interactions Between Product Complementarity and Promotional Strategies," *JM*, 63 (January), 57-74.
- Schlosser, Ann E. (2003), "Experiencing Products in the Virtual World: The Role of Goal and Imagery in Influencing Attitudes versus Purchase Intentions," *JCR*, 30 (September), 184-198.
- Sengupta, Jaideep and Gita Venkataramani Johar (2002), "Effects of Inconsistent Attribute Information on the Predictive Value of Product Attitudes: Toward a Resolution of Opposing Perspectives," *JCR*, 29 (June), 39-56.

- Shrum, L. J., James E. Burroughs, and Aric Rindfleisch (2005), "Television's Cultivation of Material Values," *JCR*, 32 (December), 473-479.
- Sicilia, Maria, Salvador Ruiz, and Jose L. Munuera (2005), "Effects of Interactivity in a Web Site," *JA*, 34 (3), 31-45.
- Wheeler, S. Christian, Richard E. Petty, and George Y. Bizer (2005), "Self-Schema Matching and Attitude Change: Situational and Dispositional Determinants of Message Elaboration," *JCR*, 31 (March), 787-797.
- Wong, Nancy, Aric Rindfleisch, and James E. Burroughs (2003), "Do Reverse-Worded Items Confound Measures in Cross-Cultural Consumer Research? The Case of the Material Values Scale," *JCR*, 30 (June), 72-91.
- Zhang, Yong (1996), "Responses to Humorous Advertising: The Moderating Effect of Need for Cognition," *JA*, 25 (Spring), 15-32.
- Zhang, Yong and Richard Buda (1999), "Moderating Effects of Need for Cognition on Responses to Positively versus Negatively Framed Advertising Messages," *JA*, 28 (2), 1-15.
- Zhu, Rui (Juliet) and Joan Meyers-Levy (2005), "Distinguishing Between the Meanings of Music: When Background Music Affects Product Perceptions," *JMR*, 42 (August), 333-345.

### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I would prefer complex to simple problems.
2. I like to have the responsibility of handling a situation that requires a lot of thinking.
3. Thinking is not my idea of fun. (r)
4. I would rather do something that requires little thought than something that is sure to challenge my thinking abilities. (r)
5. I try to anticipate and avoid situations where there is a likely chance I will have to think in depth about something. (r)
6. I find satisfaction in deliberating hard and for long hours.
7. I only think as hard as I have to. (r)
8. I prefer to think about small, daily projects to long-term ones. (r)
9. I like tasks that require little thought once I have learned them. (r)
10. The idea of relying on thought to make my way to the top appeals to me.
11. I really enjoy a task that involves coming up with new solutions to problems.
12. Learning new ways to think doesn't excite me very much. (r)
13. I prefer my life to be filled with puzzles that I must solve.
14. The notion of thinking abstractly is appealing to me.
15. I would prefer a task that is intellectual, difficult, and important to one that is somewhat important but does not require much thought.
16. I feel relief rather than satisfaction after completing a task that required a lot of mental effort. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format used in the reported articles is rarely described but a five- or seven-point *agree / disagree* style would be appropriate. The short version of the scale used by Ailawadi, Neslin, and Gedenk (2001) was composed of item 3, 7, and a slightly different phrasing of 9. The short version by Cotte and Wood (2004) used items #4, #5, #7, and phrasings of #10 and #14 that added the word "not."

*#426 Need for Cognition*

17. It's enough for me that something gets the job done: I don't care how or why it works.  
(r)
18. I usually end up deliberating about issues even when they do not affect me personally.

**SCALE NAME: Need for Cognitive Closure**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of forty-two, six-point Likert-type statements that assess the extent to which a person expresses a need for definite answers rather than ambiguity.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Kruglanski, Webster, and Klem (1993). Over a series of studies, the authors have provided evidence in support of the scale's reliability and validity. For instance, the scale's internal consistency (alpha) was reported to be .86 and its stability (12 week test-retest) was .86.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .82 (experiment 2) and .86 (experiment 4) were reported for the scale by Kardes et al. (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Kardes et al. (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Kardes, Frank R., Maria L. Cronley, James J. Kellaris, and Steven S. Posavic (2004), "The Role of Selective Information Processing in Price-Quality Inference," *JCR*, 31 (September), 368-374.
- Kruglanski, Arie W., Donna M. Webster, and Adena Klem (1993), "Motivated Resistance and Openness to Persuasion in the Presence or Absence of Prior Information," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65 (5), 861-876.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I think that having clear rules and order at work is essential for success.
2. Even after I've made up my mind about something, I am always eager to consider a different opinion. (r)
3. I don't like situations that are uncertain.
4. I dislike questions which could be answered in many different ways.
5. I like to have friends who are unpredictable. (r)
6. I find that a well ordered life with regular hours suits my temperament.
7. When dining out, I like to go to places where I have been before so that I know what to expect.
8. I feel uncomfortable when I don't understand the reason why an event occurred in my life.
9. I feel irritated when one person disagrees with what everyone else in a group believes.
10. I hate to change my plans at the last minute.
11. I don't like to go into a situation without knowing what I can expect from it.

#### #427 *Need for Cognitive Closure*

12. When I go shopping, I have difficulty deciding exactly what it is that I want. (r)
13. When faced with a problem, I usually see the one best solution very quickly.
14. When I am confused about an important issue, I feel very upset.
15. I tend to put off making important decisions until the last possible moment.
16. I usually make important decisions quickly and confidently.
17. I would describe myself as indecisive. (r)
18. I think it is fun to change my plans at the last moment. (r)
19. I enjoy the uncertainty of going into a new situation without knowing what might happen. (r)
20. My personal space is usually messy and disorganized. (r)
21. In most social conflicts, I can easily see which side is right and which is wrong.
22. I tend to struggle with most decisions. (r)
23. I believe that orderliness and organization are among the most important characteristics of a good student.
24. When considering most conflict situations, I can usually see how both sides could be right. (r)
25. I don't like to be with people who are capable of unexpected actions.
26. I prefer to socialize with familiar friends because I know what to expect from them.
27. I think that I would learn best in a class that lacks clearly stated objectives and requirements. (r)
28. When thinking about a problem, I consider as many different opinions on the issue as possible. (r)
29. I like to know what people are thinking all the time.
30. I dislike it when a person's statement could mean many different things.
31. It's annoying to listen to someone who cannot seem to make up his or her mind.
32. I find that establishing a consistent routine enables me to enjoy life more.
33. I enjoy having a clear and structured mode of life.
34. I prefer interacting with people whose opinions are very different from my own. (r)
35. I like to have a place for everything and everything in its place.
36. I feel uncomfortable when someone's meaning or intention is unclear to me.
37. When trying to solve a problem, I often see so many possible options that it's confusing. (r)
38. I always see many possible solutions to problems I face. (r)
39. I'd rather know bad news than stay in a state of uncertainty.
40. I do not usually consult many different opinions before forming my own view.
41. I dislike unpredictable situations.
42. I dislike the routine aspects of my work (studies). (r)

**SCALE NAME: Need for Evaluation****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of sixteen statements intended to measure the extent to which a person chronically engages in evaluative responding across situations and objects, i.e., people are differentially motivated to engage in evaluation. No biological basis for this “need” is presumed although it is possible. Instead, it is viewed as a “self-attributed motive,” a component of the self-concept. A Dutch translation of the scale was used by Fennis and Bakker (2001).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to an unpublished masters thesis by Jarvis that was ultimately reported in Jarvis and Petty (1996). That article provides information about five studies attesting to the scale’s reliability and validity. A collapsed data set of the three samples showed an internal consistency (alpha) of .85. A test of scale stability (10-week test-retest) showed a correlation of .84. As for the scale’s dimensionality, the data were mixed about the existence of one or two factors. Surprisingly, the factor loadings for many of the items were consistently much lower than would be acceptable in scholarly marketing research (< .50). Finally, the scale did not have a significant correlation with either the Social Desirability Scale (#619, Crowne and Marlowe 1964) or the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (#267, Paulhus 1988).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .84 and .79 have been reported for the scale by Fennis and Bakker (2001) and Peck and Childers (2003), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale’s validity was reported in these consumer studies but Fennis and Bakker (2001) did state that a factor analysis of the items showed they were unidimensional.

**REFERENCES:**

- Crowne, Douglas P. and David Marlowe (1960), “A New Scale of Social Desirability Independent of Psychopathology,” *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24 (August), 349-354.
- Fennis, Bob M. and Arnold B. Bakker (2001), “Stay Tuned-We Will Be Back Right After These Messages: Need to Evaluate Moderates the Transfer of Irritation in Advertising,” *JA*, 30 (3), 15-25.
- Jarvis, W. Blair and Richard E. Petty (1996), “The Need to Evaluate,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70 (1), 172-194.
- Paulhus, Delroy L. (1988), *Assessing Self-Deception and Impression Management in Self-Reports: the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding*, Vancouver, B.C., Canada: Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia.

## #428 *Need for Evaluation*

Peck, Joann and Terry L. Childers (2003), "Individual Differences in Haptic Information Processing: The 'Need for Touch' Scale," *JCR*, 30 (December), 430-442.

### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. I form opinions about everything.
2. I prefer to avoid taking extreme positions. (r)
3. It is very important to me to hold strong opinions.
4. I want to know exactly what is good and bad about everything.
5. I often prefer to remain neutral about complex issues. (r)
6. If something does not affect me, I do not usually determine if it is good or bad. (r)
7. I enjoy strongly liking and disliking new things.
8. There are things for which I do not have a preference. (r)
9. It bothers me to remain neutral.
10. I like to have strong opinions even when I am not personally involved.
11. I have many more opinions than the average person.
12. I would rather have a strong opinion than no opinion at all.
13. I pay a lot of attention to whether things are good or bad.
14. I only form strong opinions when I have to. (r)
15. I like to decide that new things are really good or really bad.
16. I am pretty much indifferent to many important issues. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> No information about the response format was provided by Fennis and Bakker (2001). However, Jarvis and Petty (1996) used a five-point scale that ranged from *extremely uncharacteristic* (1) to *extremely characteristic* (5).

**SCALE NAME: Need for Humor****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The seven-point Likert-type scale measures the degree to which a person views him/herself as funny, thinks that others view him/her as funny, and desires to be interact with sources that are funny (people, stories).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003) built on a stream of research by Cline begun in his dissertation (1997) and reported in Cline, Machleit, and Kellaris (1999). The view is that people have a trait referred to as “the need for levity.” Levity was defined as a more extensive construct than just humor and having four dimensions. The scales for measuring two of those dimensions were combined to form the need for humor scale described here.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .83 (Study 1), .83 (Study 2), and .85 (Study 3) were reported for the scale by Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

Three studies are reported by Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003) and in each they apparently performed a confirmatory factor analysis on the scale items. Each time the results indicated that there were two dimensions but because the factors were correlated, the authors used the items from each to form one scale. To more fully support the combination of these items in one scale when the tests show there are two dimensions, it should be shown that both dimensions have high loadings on a higher order factor.

**REFERENCES:**

- Cline, Thomas W. (1997), “The Role of Expectancy and Relevancy in Humorous Ad Executions: An Individual Difference Perspective,” doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati.
- Cline, Thomas W. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Cline, Thomas W., Karen Machleit, and James J. Kellaris (1999), “Is There a Need for Levity,” in *Proceedings of the Society for Consumer Psychology 1998 Winter Conference*, K.A. Machleit and M. Campbell. Austin: American Psychological Association, 155-157.
- Cline, Thomas W., Moses B. Altsech and James J. Kellaris (2003), “When Does Humor Enhance or Inhibit As Responses: The Moderating Role of the Need for Humor,” *JA*, 32 (3), 31-45.

#429 *Need for Humor*

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. People expect me to say amusing things.
2. I can crack people up with the things I say.
3. I often come-up with witty comments.
4. I am good at thinking-up jokes or funny stories.
5. People tell me that I am quick-witted.
6. I often feel the need to make other people laugh.
7. I am a connoisseur of humor.
8. I prefer situations where people are free to express their senses of humor.
9. I enjoy being with people who tell jokes or funny stories.
10. I often read jokes and funny stories.
11. I enjoy being around quick-witted people.
12. I need to be with people who have a sense of humor.

---

<sup>1</sup> All 12 items were used by Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003) in Studies 2 and 3 but only 10 items were used in Study 1 (#6 and #12 were omitted).

**SCALE NAME: Need for Interaction (Service Encounters)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the importance a consumer places on interacting with a real employee (as opposed to a machine) when receiving service.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Dabholkar (1996). In that study four items were used and its construct reliability was .83. The final version of the scale used by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002) had just three of the items since one was dropped due to its poor performance in the CFA.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .83 was reported for the scale by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Based on the results of a CFA, evidence was provided by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002) in support of the convergent and discriminant validity of the scale after one of the original items was dropped.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Meuter et al. (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- Dabholkar, Pratibha (1996), "Consumer Evaluations of New Technology-Based Self-Service Options: An Investigation of Alternative Models of Service Quality," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 13 (1), 29-51.
- Dabholkar, Pratibha and Richard P. Bagozzi (2002), "An Attitudinal Model of Technology-Based Self-Service: Moderating Effects of Consumer Traits and Situational Factors," *JAMS*, 30 (3), 184-201.
- Meuter, Matthew L., Mary Jo Bitner, Amy L. Ostrom, and Stephen W. Brown (2005), "Choosing Among Alternative Service Delivery Modes: An Investigation of Customer Trial of Self-Service Technologies," *JM*, 69 (April), 61-83.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Human contact in providing services makes the process enjoyable for the consumer.
2. I like interacting with the person who provides the service.
3. It bothers me to use a machine when I could talk to a person instead.

**SCALE NAME: Need for Touch (Autotelic)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

These six, seven-point Likert-type statements compose one of two parts of the *Need for Touch* (NFT) scale, defined as one's "preference for the extraction and utilization of information obtained through the haptic system" (Peck and Childers 2003b, p. 431). This subscale is intended to capture the terminal dimension of NFT such that touch during the pre-purchase search process is an inherently hedonic experience regardless of the purchase goal.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed and tested by Peck and Childers (2003b) in a thorough series of seven studies. The process began by examining the content validity of a pool of 50 items expected to tap into at least one of the scale's two dimensions. Studies #1 to #4 purified the scale and examined its psychometric qualities (reliability, dimensionality, and construct validity). The nomological validity of the final 12 item version of the scale (six items per dimension) was explored in the remaining studies.

**RELIABILITY:**

The final six item version of this subscale had alphas ranging from .89 (Study 4) to .95 (Study 5).

**VALIDITY:**

As implied above, support for the scale's validity was provided in a series of tests conducted by Peck and Childers (2003b). In addition, the average variance extracted for this dimension was good (.74, Study 4) and did not exhibit a sensitivity to social desirability response bias.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Peck and Childers (2003a) where both if NFT subscales are used together as one scale.

**REFERENCES:**

Peck, Joann and Terry L. Childers (2003a), "To Have to Hold: The Influence of Haptic Information on Product Judgments," *JM*, 67 (April), 35-48.

Peck, Joann and Terry L. Childers (2003b), "Individual Differences in Haptic Information Processing: The 'Need for Touch' Scale," *JCR*, 30 (December), 430-442.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. When walking through stores, I can't help touching all kinds of products.

---

<sup>1</sup> The copyright for the scale belongs to Joanne Peck and Terry Childers. Please request permission from them before using the scale.

*#431 Need for Touch (Autotelic)*

2. Touching products can be fun.
3. When browsing in stores, it is important for me to handle all kinds of products.
4. I like to touch products even if I have no intention of buying them.
5. When browsing in stores, I like to touch lots of products.
6. I find myself touching all kinds of products in stores.

**SCALE NAME: Need for Touch (Instrumental)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure one of two parts of the *Need for Touch* (NFT) scale, defined as one's "preference for the extraction and utilization of information obtained through the haptic system" (Peck and Childers 2003b, p. 431). This subscale is intended to capture the more goal-driven dimension of NFT such that, during the pre-purchase process, touch provides information relevant to the purchase decision.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed and tested by Peck and Childers (2003b) in a thorough series of seven studies. The process began with the examination of the content validity of a pool of 50 items expected to tap into at least one of the scale's two dimensions. Studies #1 to #4 purified the scale and examined its psychometric qualities (reliability, dimensionality, and construct validity). The nomological validity of the final 12 item version of the scale (six items per dimension) was explored in the remaining studies.

**RELIABILITY:**

The final six item version of this subscale had alphas ranging from .87 (Study 4) to .90 (Studies 5 and 6).

**VALIDITY:**

As implied above, support for the scale's validity was provided in a series of tests conducted by Peck and Childers (2003b). In addition, the average variance extracted for this dimension was good (.71, Study 4) and did not exhibit a sensitivity to social desirability response bias.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Peck and Childers (2003a) where both if NFT subscales are used together as one scale.

**REFERENCES:**

Peck, Joann and Terry L. Childers (2003a), "To Have to Hold: The Influence of Haptic Information on Product Judgments," *JM*, 67 (April), 35-48.

Peck, Joann and Terry L. Childers (2003b), "Individual Differences in Haptic Information Processing: The 'Need for Touch' Scale," *JCR*, 30 (December), 430-442.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I place more trust in products that can be touched before purchase.

---

<sup>1</sup> The copyright for the scale belongs to Joanne Peck and Terry Childers. Interested users should contact them for permission before using the scale.

*#432 Need for Touch (Instrumental)*

2. I feel more comfortable purchasing a product after physically examining it.
3. If I can't touch a product in the store, I am reluctant to purchase the product.
4. I feel more confident making a purchase after touching a product.
5. The only way to make sure a product is worth buying is to actually touch it.
6. There are many products that I would only buy if I could handle them before purchase.

## #433 *Need for Touch (Instrumental)*

### **SCALE NAME: Need for Touch (Instrumental)**

### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has six, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the degree to which a person has a “need” for tactile input. The scale was called *need for tactile input* by Citrin et al. (2003).

### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Citrin et al. (2003). After a two-stage content validation process, the scale was used in a survey of 272 students. It was found to be unidimensional, have an alpha of .94, and average variance extracted of .61.

### **RELIABILITY:**

The alpha reported for the scale by Peck and Childers (2003) was .96.

### **VALIDITY:**

Peck and Childers (2003) used the scale to provide evidence of convergent validity for their own measure of the same (or very similar) construct. Indeed, the two had a very high positive relationship. Although this scale had a moderate relationship with the companion scale by Peck and Childers (2003) that measures the autotelic dimension of the need for touch, it was significantly lower than for the instrumental dimension.

### **REFERENCES:**

- Citrin, Alka Varma, Donald E. Stem, Eric R. Spangenberg, and Michael J. Clark (2003), “Consumer Need for Tactile Input: An Internet Retailing Challenge,” *Journal of Business Research*, 56 (11), 915-922.
- Peck, Joann and Terry L. Childers (2003), “Individual Differences in Haptic Information Processing: The 'Need for Touch' Scale,” *JCR*, 30 (December), 430-442.

### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I need to touch a product in order to evaluate its quality.
2. I need to touch a product in order to evaluate how much I will like the product.
3. I feel it necessary to touch a product in order to evaluate its physical characteristics.
4. I feel it is necessary to touch a product in order to evaluate its quality.
5. I need to touch a product in order to evaluate its physical characteristics.
6. I need to touch a product in order to create a general evaluation of it.

**SCALE NAME: Need for Unique Products**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of eight Likert-type statements measuring the degree to which a person expresses the motivation to have unique consumer products that few others possess. The scale was called *desire for unique consumer products* (DUCP) by Lynn and Harris (1997).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Lynn and Harris (1997). Their article provides a variety of evidence from multiple studies attesting to the reliability and validity of the scale. Briefly, multiple estimates of internal consistency were above .78 and its stability (two week test-retest) was .85. The unidimensional factor structure was generalizable across multiple samples. The pattern of correlations with measures of several personality traits was as expected. Evidence of the scale's predictive validity was also provided.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .85 (n = 121 college students) and .74 (n = 108 college students) were reported for the scale as used by Tian, Bearden, and Hunter (2001) and Bloch, Brunel, and Arnold (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

Although it was not the purpose of Tian, Bearden, and Hunter (2001) to validate the scale, they used it in the process of validating their own scale: consumer's need for uniqueness (CNFU). Among the findings were that CNFU had a moderately strong positive correlation ( $r = .65$ ) with DUCP.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bloch, Peter H., Frédéric F. Brunel, and Todd J. Arnold (2003), "Individual Differences in the Centrality of Visual Product Aesthetics: Concept and Measurement," *JCR*, 29 (March), 551-565.
- Lynn, Michael and Judy Harris (1997), "The Desire for Unique Consumer Products: A New Individual Differences Scale," *Psychology & Marketing*, 14 (September), 601-616.
- Tian, Kelly T., William O. Bearden and Gary L. Hunter (2001), "Consumers' Need for Uniqueness: Scale Development and Validation," *JCR*, 28 (June), 50-66.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I am very attracted to rare objects.
2. I tend to be a fashion leader rather than a fashion follower.

*#434 Need for Unique Products*

3. I am more likely to buy a product if it is scarce.
4. I would prefer to have things custom-made than to have them ready-made.
5. I enjoy having things that others do not.
6. I rarely pass up the opportunity to order custom features on the products I buy.
7. I like to try new goods and services before others do.
8. I enjoy shopping at stores that carry merchandise which is different and unusual.

**SCALE NAME: Need for Uniqueness (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of 32 Likert-type statements measuring the extent to which a person expresses the motivation to be different from other people. The NFU scale approaches the motivation in a positive way rather than treating it negatively such as with mal-adaption or deviancy.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Tian, Bearden, and Hunter (2001) was developed by Snyder and Fromkin (1977, 1980). A considerable amount of testing was done to validate the scale. For example, the authors used expert judges to reduce a set of 300 items down to 117. That set was further reduced to the final 32 by noting which ones had a prescribed pattern of correlation (or lack thereof) with other scales. Its internal consistency reliability (KR-20) in multiple administrations ranged from .68 to .82. The scale's stability was estimated to be .91 (two month test-retest) and .68 (four month test-retest). Further, with multiple samples it was determined that the scale was not susceptible to social desirability bias. Factor analysis showed the set of items represented three dimensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .70 (n = 121 college students) and .85 (n = 235 college students) were reported for the scale as used by Tian, Bearden, and Hunter (2001).

**VALIDITY:**

Although it was not the purpose of Tian, Bearden, and Hunter (2001) to validate the scale, they did use it in the process of validating their own scale: consumer's need for uniqueness (V4, #286). Among the findings were that CNFU had a moderate positive correlation ( $r = .44$ ) with NFU. Interestingly, when examined at the subscale level, the CNFU correlated highest ( $r = .46$ ) with the dimension most related to counterconformity and much less with other two dimensions.

**COMMENTS:**

There is little doubt that the NFU scale is multidimensional. The question is whether or not it is appropriate to use one score to represent responses to the multiple dimensions. Further testing is needed to resolve this issue.

For other uses of the scale see Ariely and Levav (2000), Drolet (2002), as well as Simonson and Nowlis (2000).

**REFERENCES:**

- Ariely, Dan and Jonathon Levav (2000), "Sequential Choice in Group Settings: Taking the Road Less Traveled and Enjoyed," *JCR*, 27 (3), 279-290.
- Drolet, Aimee (2002), "Inherent Rule Variability in Consumer Choice: Changing Rules for Change's Sake," *JCR*, 29 (December), 293-305.

### #435 Need for Uniqueness (General)

Simonson, Itamar and Stephen M. Nowlis (2000), "The Role of Explanations and Need for Uniqueness in Consumer Decision Making: Unconventional Choices Based on Reasons," *JCR*, 27 (1), 49-68.

Snyder, C. R. and Howard L. Fromkin (1977), "Abnormality as a Positive Characteristic: The Development and Validation of a Scale Measuring Need for Uniqueness," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 86 (5), 518-527.

Snyder, C. R. (1980), *Uniqueness*, New York: Plenum Press.

Tian, Kelly T., William O. Bearden and Gary L. Hunter (2001), "Consumers' Need for Uniqueness: Scale Development and Validation," *JCR*, 28 (June), 50-66.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

Directions: The following statements concern your perceptions about yourself in a variety of situations. Your task is to indicate the strength of your agreement with each statement, utilizing a scale in which 1 denotes strong disagreement, 5 denotes strong agreement, and 2, 3, and 4 represent intermediate judgments. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers, so select the number that most closely reflects you on each statement. Take your time and consider each statement carefully.

1. When I am in a group of strangers, I am not reluctant to express my opinion publicly.
2. I find that criticism affects my self-esteem. (r)
3. I sometimes hesitate to use my own ideas for fear they might be impractical. (r)
4. I think society should let reason lead it to new customs and throw aside old habits or mere traditions.
5. People frequently succeed in changing my mind. (r)
6. I find it sometimes amusing to upset the dignity of teachers, judges, and "cultured" people.
7. I like wearing a uniform because it makes me proud to be a member of the organization it represents. (r)
8. People have sometimes called me "stuck-up."
9. Others' disagreements make me uncomfortable. (r)
10. I do not always need to live by the rules and standards of society.
11. I am unable to express my feelings if they result in undesirable consequences. (r)
12. Being a success in one's career means making a contribution that no one else has made.
13. It bothers me if people think I am being too unconventional. (r)
14. I always try to follow rules. (r)
15. If I disagree with a superior on his or her views, I usually do not keep it to myself.
16. I speak up in meetings in order to oppose those whom I feel are wrong.
17. Feeling "different" in a crowd of people makes me feel uncomfortable. (r)
18. If I must die, let it be an unusual death rather than an ordinary death in bed.

---

<sup>1</sup> These are the directions, response format, and items as described by Snyder and Fromkin (1980, pp. 79, 80). They used a five-point scale.

*#435 Need for Uniqueness (General)*

19. I would rather be just like everyone else than be called a "freak." (r)
20. I must admit I find it hard to work under strict rules and regulations.
21. I would rather be known for always trying new ideas than for employing well-trusted methods.
22. It is better always to agree with the opinions of others than to be considered a disagreeable person. (r)
23. I do not like to say unusual things to people. (r)
24. I tend to express my opinions publicly, regardless of what others say.
25. As a rule, I strongly defend my own opinions.
26. I do not like to go my own way. (r)
27. When I am with a group of people, I agree with their ideas so that no arguments will arise. (r)
28. I tend to keep quiet in the presence of persons of higher rank, experience, etc. (r)
29. I have been quite independent and free from family rule.
30. Whenever I take part in group activities, I am somewhat of a nonconformist.
31. In most things in life, I believe in playing it safe rather than taking a gamble. (r)
32. It is better to break rules than always to conform with an impersonal society.

**SCALE NAME: Neuroticism**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Twelve Likert-type statements are used to assess the extent to which a person expresses emotional instability with symptoms such as wide mood swings, irritability, and nervousness. Burroughs (Burroughs 2005; Burroughs and Rindfleisch 2002) used a yes/no response format.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Burroughs (Burroughs 2005; Burroughs and Rindfleisch 2002) was a portion of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire. More specifically, the items used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) compose one of the four subscales in the short version of the EPQ-R (Eysenck, Eysenck, and Barrett 1985). That subscale was shown to have alphas of .84 (n = 408) and .80 (n = 494) for men and women, respectively.

**RELIABILITY:**

The reliability (KR-20) for the scale as used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) was .76 (n ≈ 373).

**VALIDITY:**

Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) reported that the scale was negatively related to happiness and life satisfaction while being positively related to anxiety, depression, and stress. This pattern of correlations along with general evidence from the LISREL analysis of all their measures provided evidence in support of the scale's validity. However, one potential cause of concern is that the scale had a significant correlation ( $r = -.30, p < .01$ ) with a measure of socially desirable responding. Given the nature of neuroticism, the full meaning of this negative relationship should be considered.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Wheeler, Petty, and Bizer (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.
- Eysenck, Sybil B., Hans J. Eysenck, and Paul Barrett (1985), "A Revised Version of the Psychoticism Scale," *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6 (1), 21-29.
- Wheeler, S. Christian, Richard E. Petty, and George Y. Bizer (2005), "Self-Schema Matching and Attitude Change: Situational and Dispositional Determinants of Message Elaboration," *JCR*, 31 (March), 787-797.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Does your mood often go up and down?
2. Do you ever feel 'just miserable' for no reason?
3. Are you an irritable person?
4. Are your feelings easily hurt?
5. Do you often feel "fed-up"?
6. Would you call yourself a nervous person?
7. Are you a worrier?
8. Would you call yourself tense or 'highly-strung'?
9. Do you worry too long after an embarrassing experience?
10. Do you suffer from 'nerves'?
11. Do you often feel lonely?
12. Are you often troubled about feelings of guilt?

**SCALE NAME: New Product Attributes (Value Added)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, nine-point statements are used to measure the extent to which a consumer believes that the advertised new features of a product provide additional benefits and value to the product.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Mukherjee and Hoyer (2001) did not specify the source of the scale but it would appear to be original to their work.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had an alpha of .91 (Mukherjee 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Mukherjee and Hoyer (2001).

**COMMENTS:**

See also Thompson et al. (2005) as well as Zhu and Meyers-Levy (2005) for variations of this scale.

**REFERENCES:**

Mukherjee, Ashesh (2003), Personal Correspondence.

Mukherjee, Ashesh and Wayne D. Hoyer (2001), "The Effect of Novel Attributes on Product Evaluation," *JCR*, 28 (December), 462-472.

Thompson, Debora Viana, Rebecca W. Hamilton, and Roland T. Rust (2005), "Feature Fatigue: When Product Capabilities Become Too Much of a Good Thing," *JMR*, 42 (November), 431-442.

Zhu, Rui (Juliet) and Joan Meyers-Levy (2005), "Distinguishing Between the Meanings of Music: When Background Music Affects Product Perceptions," *JMR*, 42 (August), 333-345.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: The following questions relate to the new features offered by the advertised product (e.g., \_\_\_\_\_).

1. It is likely that the new features will offer advantages to the consumer.  
*strongly disagree / strongly agree*
2. How likely is it that the new features will add value to the advertised product?

---

<sup>1</sup> This phrasing of the items was provided by Mukherjee (2003). The new features can be listed in the blank at the end of the scale instructions.

#437 *New Product Attributes (Value Added)*

*not at all likely / very likely*

3. The new features are likely to perform well.

*strongly disagree / strongly agree*

**SCALE NAME: Normative Compliance (Usage of Product)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Using three, seven-point Likert-type statements, the scale measures the degree to which a person believes important referent people expect him/her to use a product. Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) used the scale with mobile services but it appears to be amenable for use with goods as well.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) received inspiration for development of the scale from work by Bhattacharjee (2004). Four mobile services were examined in their study using the scale: text messaging, contact, payment, and gaming.

**RELIABILITY:**

The construct reliability for the scale across four mobile services studied was .87 (Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) supported the scale's validity by testing their measurement model. The model had 26 items measuring eight factors. The results indicated that each construct shared more variance with its indicators than with the other constructs in the study. Further, the fit indices indicated that the measurement model was acceptable for each of the four applications.

**REFERENCES:**

Bhattacharjee, Anol (2000), "Acceptance of E-Commerce Services: The Case of Electronic Brokerages," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 30 (4), 411-420.

Nysveen, Herbjørn, Per E. Pederson and Helge Thorbjørnsen (2005), "Intentions to Use Mobile Services: Antecedents and Cross-Service Comparisons," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 330-346.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. People important to me think I should use \_\_\_\_\_.
2. It is expected that people like me use \_\_\_\_\_.
3. People I look up to expect me to use \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the object should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Novelty (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five, seven-point bi-polar adjectives intended to measure the extent to which a person perceives a certain object to be fresh and distinctive.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Cox and Cox (2002) imply that a previous article of theirs is the source of the scale (V1, #324) but an examination indicates it is more precise to describe the new one as a modification of the previous one. Also, if this scale is scored in the opposite direction then it bears strong resemblance to a measure of typicality (V4, #485, Campbell and Goodstein 2001).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .81 was reported for the scale (Cox and Cox 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Cox and Cox (2002).

**COMMENTS:**

See also Dimofte, Forehand, and Deshpandé (2004).

**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," *JCR*, 28 (December), 439-449.
- Cox, Dena S. and Anthony D. Cox (1988), "What Does Familiarity Breed? Complexity as a Moderator of Repetition Effects in Advertisement Evaluation," *JCR*, 15 (June), 111-16.
- Cox, Dena S. and Anthony D. Cox (2002), "Beyond First Impressions: The Effects of Repeated Exposure on Consumer Liking of Visually Complex and Simple Product Designs," *JAMS*, 30 (2), 119-130.
- Dimofte, Claudie V., Mark R. Forehand, and Rohit Deshpandé (2004), "Ad Schema Incongruity as Elicitor of Ethnic Self-Awareness and Differential Advertising Response," *JA*, 32 (4), 7-17.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. new / old
2. original / unoriginal
3. unusual / common

#439 *Novelty (General)*

4. familiar / novel
5. typical / atypical

**SCALE NAME: Nutrition Information Interest**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four item, seven-point Likert-type scale measures a consumer's attitude toward nutrition information on package food products. The scale appears to assess the cognitive (items #1 and #3) and behavioral (items #2 and #4) components of an attitude but not the affective component. The scale was referred to as *motivation to process nutrition information* by Balasubramanian and Cole (2002).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although conceptually similar to several scales previously used by others who studied consumer interest in nutritional information, this scale seems to be original to Balasubramanian and Cole (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

Balasubramanian and Cole (2002) reported an alpha of .82 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Balasubramanian and Cole (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Balasubramanian, Siva K. and Catherine Cole (2002) (2002), "Consumers' Search and Use of Nutrition Information: The Challenge and Promise of the Nutrition Labeling and Education Act," *JM*, 66 (July), 112-127.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Today, I was interested at looking at the nutritional information on the \_\_\_\_\_ package.
2. I look at nutritional information on \_\_\_\_\_ boxes regularly.
3. I think that the nutritional information panels on \_\_\_\_\_ packages provide very useful information.
4. I regularly use the nutritional information provided on \_\_\_\_\_ packages.

---

<sup>1</sup> The blanks could be filled with the type of food products being focused on, e.g., cereal (Balasubramanian and Cole 2002). On the other hand, if general interest in nutritional information is being studied then something like "food" could be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Nutrition Interest**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The five item, eleven-point scale measures a person's concern about the consumption of a specific type of food based on its nutritional value. One item (#5) is not nutrition-related.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not identified by Desai and Ratneshwar (2002). Individually, the items bare some similarity to others that have been used in previous health, nutrition, and food scales but as a whole the scale appears to be new and was probably developed by Desai and Ratneshwar (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had an alpha of .82 according to Desai and Ratneshwar (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Desai and Ratneshwar (2002). Due to one item (#5) being so different from the other four, the face validity and unidimensionality are in question and deserve further scrutiny.

**REFERENCES:**

Desai, Kalpesh Kaushik and S. Ratneshwar (2003), "Consumer Perceptions of Product Variants Positioned on Atypical Attributes," *JAMS*, 31 (1), 22-35.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Whenever I buy a *new* \_\_\_\_\_, I check its nutritional information.
2. In general, I prefer to eat low-fat \_\_\_\_\_.
3. I usually get upset with myself when I eat fattening \_\_\_\_\_.
4. I pay very close attention to the kind of \_\_\_\_\_ I eat.
5. I exercise.

---

<sup>1</sup> The first four items were of the Likert-type (*agree/disagree*) while the anchors for the last item (#5) were *never* and *regularly* (Desai and Ratneshwar 2002). The blanks are to be filled with the food of interest, e.g., snack food (Desai and Ratneshwar 2002).

**SCALE NAME: Nutrition Knowledge (Subjective)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three statements with seven-point response scales are used to measure a person's self-expressed level of nutrition knowledge compared to the average consumer and his/her confidence in using that knowledge.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Moorman et al. (2004) indicated that they adapted a scale by Brucks (1985), the two scales are different enough that they should both be considered original.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .80 was reported for the scale by Moorman et al. (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not discussed by Moorman et al. (2004). It is worthy of note, however, that the scale was not significantly associated with an objective measure of nutrition.

**REFERENCES:**

- Brucks, Merrie (1985), "The Effect of Product Class Knowledge on Information Search Behavior," *JCR*, 12 (June), 1-16.
- Moorman, Christine, Kristin Diehl, David Brinberg, and Blair Kidwell (2004), "Subjective Knowledge, Search Locations and Consumer Choice," *JCR*, 31 (December), 673-680.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Rate your knowledge of nutrition information compared to the average consumer.
2. Rate your confidence in using nutrition information compared to the average consumer.
3. I feel confident about my ability to comprehend nutrition information on product labels.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response scale for items #1 and #2 had *much less* and *much more* as verbal anchors whereas #3 used *disagree* and *agree*.

**SCALE NAME: Optimism**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six statements with seven-point Likert-type response scales are used to measure the degree to which a person expresses an optimistic view of the future. Given the phrasing of the scale stem, the respondent is describing his/her view at the time a particular purchase decision was made. With a change in that phrase, a more general measure of optimism is possible.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) reported a construct reliability of .99 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Using confirmatory factor analysis, Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) examined a measurement model of this scale and one measuring product replacement motivation. The analysis provided evidence in support of each scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Grewal, Rajdeep, Raj Mehta, Frank R. Kardes (2004), "The Timing of Repeat Purchases of Consumer Durable Goods: The Role of Functional Bases of Consumer Attitudes," *JMR*, 41 (February), 101-115.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

At the time you of your most recent \_\_\_\_\_ purchase, your overall sentiment about the future was:<sup>1</sup>

1. I was optimistic about the future.
2. I thought good times lay ahead.
3. The future seemed bright.
4. I was skeptical about the future.(r)
5. I was pessimistic about the future.(r)
6. I thought good times were passing by. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product should be placed in the blank, e.g., car.

**SCALE NAME: Ordering Option Beliefs (Ease of Use)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A six item, seven point semantic differential scale is used to measure a person's beliefs concerning the time and effort involved in a specified method of placing an order. As described below, the setting used by Dabholkar (1994) was ordering at a fast-food restaurant and two options were compared: touch screen ordering versus verbally placing the order with an employee.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of the scale appears to be Dabholkar (1994). Refinement of the scale occurred with a pretest sample that consisted of 141 undergraduate students. The scale produced alphas of .88 (touch screen ordering) and .80 (verbal ordering).

**RELIABILITY:**

Dabholkar (1994) reported construct reliabilities of .92 and .86 for the touch screen and verbal versions of the scale, respectively. An alpha of .90 was reported for the scale as used by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not explicitly addressed by Dabholkar (1994). However, results of confirmatory and exploratory factor analyses indicated that both versions of the scale were unidimensional.

**REFERENCES:**

- Dabholkar, Pratibha (1994), "Incorporating Choice into an Attitudinal Framework: Analyzing Models of Mental Comparison Processes," *JCR*, 21 (June), 100-118.
- Dabholkar, Pratibha A. and Richard P. Bagozzi (2002), "An Attitudinal Model of Technology-Based Self-Service: Moderating Effects of Consumer Traits and Situational Factors," *JAMS*, 30 (3), 184-201.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Using a \_\_\_\_\_ to order fast food . . .<sup>2</sup>

1. will be complicated / will be simple\*
2. will take a lot of effort / will take little effort\*
3. will be confusing / will be clear\*

---

<sup>1</sup> The phrases with an asterisk were not explicitly stated in the article by Dabholkar (1994) and are reconstructions based upon their respective semantic opposites that were given.

<sup>2</sup> Either *touch screen* or *verbal* were placed in the blank.

#### #444 *Ordering Option Beliefs (Ease of Use)*

4. will take a long time at the register / will take a short the register\*
5. will require a lot of work\* / will require a little work
6. will be slow once I'm at the counter / will be fast once I'm at the counter\*

**SCALE NAME: Organizational Prestige**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A Likert-type scale is used to measure the degree to which a person views an organization of which he or she is a member as having a positive reputation in the community. The organization studied by Bhattacharya, Rao, and Glynn (1995) was an art museum while Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) studied a university.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Bhattacharya, Rao, and Glynn (1995) is a subset of the measure developed by Mael (1988; Mael and Ashforth 1992). Of the eight items in the scale, Bhattacharya, Rao, and Glynn (1995) selected just those three they considered to fit the context of a museum. The other items had to do with students, alumni, or faculty of a school.

Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) also drew their items from the organizational prestige scale by Mael (1988; Mael and Ashforth 1992).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .81 and .69 were reported for the different versions of the scale used by Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) and Bhattacharya, Rao, and Glynn (1995), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

Based on their measurement model, Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) provided support for the scale's convergent and discriminant validity. Its average variance extracted was .59.

No evidence of the scale's validity was reported by Bhattacharya, Rao, and Glynn (1995).

**REFERENCES:**

- Arnett, Dennis B., Steve D. German, and Shelby D. Hunt (2003), "The Identity Salience Model of Relationship Marketing Success: The Case of Nonprofit Marketing," *JM*, 67 (April), 89-105.
- Bhattacharya, C.B., Hayagreeva Rao, and Mary Ann Glynn (1995), "Understanding the Bond of Identification: An Investigation of Its Correlates Among Art Museum Members," *JM*, 59 (October), 46-57.
- Mael, Fred. (1988), "Organizational Identification: Construct Redefinition and a Field Application with Organizational Alumni," doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University.
- Mael, Fred and Blake E. Ashforth (1992), "Alumni and Their Alma Mater: A Partial Test of the Reformulated Model of Organizational Identification," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 103-23.

## #445 *Organizational Prestige*

### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. People in my community think highly of membership in the \_\_\_\_\_.
2. It is considered prestigious in my community to be a member of the \_\_\_\_\_.
3. The \_\_\_\_\_ does not have an outstanding reputation in my community. (r)
4. People seeking to advance their careers should downplay their association with \_\_\_\_\_ . (r)
5. Most people are proud when their children attend \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal organization should be placed in the blanks. Bhattacharya, Rao, and Glynn (1995) used items #1-#3 with a five-point format. Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) used items #4 and #5 as well as items similar to #1 and #2 with a seven-point format.

**SCALE NAME: Originality****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has eleven, five-point items that measure the degree to which a person views his/herself as being characterized by behaviors that exhibit creativity, individuality, and spontaneity.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Im, Bayus, and Mason (2003) is the “originality” subdimension of the Kirton Adaption-Innovation Inventory (Kirton 1976). They used that scale as a measure of innate innovativeness because previous research had shown it to have higher convergent validity with other measures of innovativeness compared to the other two dimensions of the Inventory. A great deal of work has been conducted to validate the KAI over time, e.g., Bagozzi and Foxall (1996).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had an alpha of .87 (Im 2005; Im, Bayus, and Mason 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

Im, Bayus, and Mason (2003) use confirmatory factor analysis to examine the eleven items. The results showed that the model had a good fit and that all of the items had significant positive loadings on the construct. Evidence was provided in support of the scale’s unidimensionality and convergent validity.

**COMMENTS:**

Although these items as well as the rest of the ones composing the KAI have been used widely and reported in various academic journals, potential users are urged to contact Michael Kirton for permission to use the scale. Substantial payment for a “certification program” may also be necessary. Consult [www.kaicentre.com/](http://www.kaicentre.com/) for more information.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bagozzi, Richard P. and Gordon R. Foxall (1996), “Construct Validation of a Measure of Adaptive-Innovative Cognitive Styles in Consumption,” *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 13 (3), 201-213.
- Im, Subin (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Im, Subin, Barry L. Bayus, and Charlotte H. Mason (2003), “An Empirical Study of Innate Consumer Innovativeness, Personal Characteristics, and New-Product Adoption Behavior,” *JAMS*, 31 (1), 61-73.
- Kirton, Michael J. (1976), “Adaptors and Innovators: A Description and Measure,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61 (5), 622-629.

## #446 Originality

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. often risks doing things differently
2. has original ideas
3. copes with several ideas at the same time
4. proliferates ideas
5. has fresh perspectives on old problems
6. is stimulating
7. will always think of something when stuck
8. can stand out in disagreement against a group
9. would sooner create than improve
10. likes to vary set routines at a moment's notice
11. needs the stimulation of frequent change

---

<sup>1</sup> Apparently, respondents were asked how well they viewed these behaviors as fitting themselves. The five-point response scale used by Im, Bayus, and Mason (2003) was anchored by *very easy to project to my image* (1) and *very hard to project to my image* (5).

**SCALE NAME: Outcome Status**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, nine-point bi-polar adjectives are used to measure the extent to which a person believes a certain result has been achieved.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Agrawal and Maheswaran (2005) apparently developed the scale for use in their studies. As used by them, the scale measured recall because subjects had previously read an article that stated a product either passed a test or that it failed the test. When outcomes are more subjective, the scale could be used to measure the degree to which one believes a product passed a test. Further, the items seem amenable for use with some other types evaluations (non-product) such whether respondent's believe a message was effective in communicating a point or if an action taken by a company solved a problem.

**RELIABILITY:**

Agrawal and Maheswaran (2005) reported the scale to have alphas ranging from .75 to .86.

**VALIDITY:**

No explicit examination of the scale's validity was reported by Agrawal and Maheswaran (2005). However, since in three studies the scale was used successfully as a manipulation check, that provides some limited evidence of its predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Agrawal, Nidhi and Durairaj Maheswaran (2005), "Motivated Reasoning in Outcome-Bias Effects," *JCR*, 31 (March), 798-805.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

What was the result of the product test?

1. negative / positive
2. unfavorable / favorable
3. failure / success

**SCALE NAME: Participative Decision-Making (Patient-Physician Interaction)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, five point Likert-type statements are used to measure the level of decision-making involvement a patient believes him/herself to have had in a recent visit to a physician.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was adapted by Hausman (2004) from a scale by Mohr and Spekman (1994). The items were modified to suit the medical service context.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale by Hausman (2004) had alphas ranging from .88 to .90, with an alpha of .89 for the combined samples.

**VALIDITY:**

Using CFA, evidence was provided by Hausman (2004) in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Hausman, Angela (2004), "Modeling the Patient-Physician Service Encounter: Improving Patient Outcomes," *JAMS*, 32 (4), 403-417.
- Mohr, Jakki and Robert Spekman (1994), "Characteristics of Partnership Success: Partnership Attributes, Communication Behavior, and Conflict Resolution Techniques," *Strategic Management Journal*, 15 (February), 135-152.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. My doctor asks my advice and council regarding treatment options.
2. I helped the doctor in planning my treatment.
3. My doctor encourages suggestions about appropriate treatment of my illness.
4. Both the doctor and I participated extensively in planning treatment of my illness.
5. Together, my doctor and I set goals and discuss treatment options.

**SCALE NAME: Patronage Frequency**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to assess the relative number of times a person reports visiting a specified place. Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003) referred to the scale as *number of past encounters with the organization*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had an alpha of .95 (Hess, Ganesan, and Klein 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of this scale's validity was reported by Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003). However, the scale was used as a manipulation check and to the degree that the manipulation was successful that provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Hess, Jr., Ronald L, Shankar Ganesan, and Noreen M. Klein (2003), "Service Failure and Recovery: the Impact of Relationship Factors on Customer Satisfaction," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 127-145.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

How would you characterize your history with this \_\_\_\_\_?

1. I have visited this \_\_\_\_\_ many times in the past.
2. I am a frequent visitor of this \_\_\_\_\_.
3. I normally go to this \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> A category descriptor of the focal place should be inserted into each blank, e.g., restaurant (Hess, Ganesan, and Klein 2003).

**SCALE NAME: Performance Quality**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The seven point semantic differential scale measures a person's beliefs concerning the perceived degree of accuracy and reliability in a certain activity. The activity examined by Dabholkar (1994) was ordering in a fast-food restaurant and two options were compared: touch screen ordering versus verbally placing the order with an employee. Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002) just examined the touch screen option. Thus, in these contexts, the scale assessed the degree to which a method of ordering was thought to lead to the intended result (getting exactly what was wanted).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of the scale appears to be Dabholkar (1994). Refinement of the scale occurred with a pretest sample that consisted of 141 undergraduate students. The scale produced alphas of .81 (touch screen ordering) and .79 (verbal ordering).

**RELIABILITY:**

Dabholkar (1994) reported construct reliabilities of .87 and .85 for the touch screen and verbal versions of the scale, respectively. An alpha of .77 was reported for the version of the scale used by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Results of confirmatory and exploratory factor analyses provided by Dabholkar (1994) indicated that both versions of the scale were unidimensional. Evidence was provided by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002) in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validity.

**COMMENTS:**

The scale appears to be amenable for use with activities other than placing orders, however, some minor rephrasing of items #1 and #3 (below) will be necessary.

**REFERENCES:**

- Dabholkar, Pratibha (1994), "Incorporating Choice into an Attitudinal Framework: Analyzing Models of Mental Comparison Processes," *JCR*, 21 (June), 100-118.
- Dabholkar, Pratibha and Richard P. Bagozzi (2002), "An Attitudinal Model of Technology-Based Self-Service: Moderating Effects of Consumer Traits and Situational Factors," *JAMS*, 30 (3), 184-201.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. means I will not get what I ordered / means I will get just what I ordered
2. is something I don't expect to work very well / is something I expect to work very well
3. will result in errors in the order / will not result in errors in the order
4. will be unreliable / will be reliable

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem used by Dabholkar (1994; Dabholkar and Bagozzi 2002) was "Using a \_\_\_\_\_ to order fast food ..." and touch screen or verbal was placed in the blank. Only one anchor for each pair was explicitly stated in the articles; the others are hypothetical reconstructions.

**SCALE NAME: Persuasiveness of the Ad**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point bi-polar adjectives are used to measure the degree to which a person believes a particular advertisement is believable. Chang (2003) used the scale with regard to an ad for a political candidate.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's source was stated by Chang (2003) but it would seem to be original.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .88 was reported for the scale by Chang (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Chang (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Chang, Chingching (2003), "Party Bias In Political-Advertising Processing," *JA*, 32 (2), 55-67.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. persuasive / not persuasive
2. ethical / not ethical
3. accurate / inaccurate

**SCALE NAME: Persuasiveness of the Ad**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point semantic differentials that are used to measure the degree to which an advertisement is described as being likely to change attitudes and behaviors.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Pham and Avnet (2004) but it appears to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .80 was reported for the scale by Pham and Avnet (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Pham and Avnet (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Pham, Michel Tuan and Tamar Avnet (2004), "Ideals and Oughts and the Reliance on Affect versus Substance in Persuasion," *JCR*, 30 (March), 503-518.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. influences my opinion about \_\_\_\_\_ / doesn't influence my opinion about \_\_\_\_\_
2. changed my attitude toward \_\_\_\_\_ / didn't change my attitude toward \_\_\_\_\_
3. the ad will influence my \_\_\_\_\_ habits / the ad will influence other people's \_\_\_\_\_ habits

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the issue or product should be placed in the blanks of the items.

**SCALE NAME: Persuasiveness of the Information**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three semantic differentials are used to measure the extent to which some specific product information to which a consumer has been exposed is viewed as being convincing and powerful. If using instructions similar to Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000), the respondent's attention can be focused on something specific in the information, e.g., message arguments related to the product. In the study by Pham and Avnet (2004), the directions apparently asked respondents about the strength of the claim made in an ad.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

One version of the scale is original to Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000). A slight variation in that version was made later by Sen, Gurhan-Canli, and Morwitz (2001). The origins of the versions by Jain and Posavac (2004) and Pham and Avnet (2004) were not stated though they are very similar to these other ones.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale by Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000) was reported to have an alphas of .85 (Study 1) and .83 (Study 2). Alphas of .92 (Study 1) and .93 (Study 2) were reported for the version of the scale used by Sen, Gurhan-Canli, and Morwitz (2001). In the article by Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004), the alpha for manufacturer-related arguments was .95 while it was .92 for product attribute-related arguments. The alphas of .91 and .95 were reported for the versions of the scale by Jain and Posavac (2004) and Pham and Avnet (2004), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No evidence of the scale's validity was reported in the studies.

**REFERENCES:**

- Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep and Rajeev Batra (2004), "When Corporate Image Affects Product Evaluations: The Moderating Role of Perceived Risk," *JMR*, 41 (2), 197-205.
- Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep and Durairaj Maheswaran (2000), "Determinants of Country-of-Origin Evaluations," *JCR*, 27 (1), 96-108.
- Jain, Shailendra Pratap and Steven S. Posavac (2004), "Valenced Comparisons," *JMR*, 41 (February), 46-58.
- Pham, Michel Tuan and Tamar Avnet (2004), "Ideals and Oughts and the Reliance on Affect versus Substance in Persuasion," *JCR*, 30 (March), 503-518.
- Sen, Sankar, Zeynep Gurhan-Canli, and Vicki Morwitz (2001), "Withholding Consumption: A Social Dilemma Perspective on Consumer Boycotts," *JCR*, 28 (December), 399-417.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: Please describe your perceptions about the strength of the arguments presented in the message. In your opinion, the message arguments were:

1. very weak / very strong
2. not very convincing / very convincing
3. not very powerful / very powerful
4. not very persuasive / very persuasive
5. not compelling / compelling
6. not at all conclusive / very conclusive

---

<sup>1</sup> These are the directions used by Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000). By changing the directions, the scale can be made to focus on some other aspect of the information or on the information stimulus as a whole. In the study by Sen, Gurhan-Canli, and Morwitz (2001) the scale was used with regard to a mock boycott announcement that subjects were asked to read. Items #1-#3 are those by Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000) as well as Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004) whereas Sen, Gurhan-Canli, and Morwitz (2001) used #1, #2, and #4. Items #1, #2, and #6 composed the version used by Jain and Posavac (2004). Pham and Avnet (2004) used item #5 and two that were slight variations of #1 and #2. All of these authors appear to have used seven-point response formats except for Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004) and Jain and Posavac (2004) who used nine.

## #454 Planning (Product Usage)

### **SCALE NAME: Planning (Product Usage)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four statements that measure the extent to which a consumer has thought about how to get a product and use it.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the source of the scale was stated by Escalas and Luce (2004), thus, it seems likely that it was developed by them.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

The alpha reported for the scale by Escalas and Luce (2004) was .75.

#### **VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was discussed by Escalas and Luce (2004).

#### **REFERENCES:**

Escalas, Jennifer Edson and Mary Francis Luce (2004), "Understanding the Effects of Process-Focused versus Outcome-Focused Thought in Response to Advertising," *JCR*, 31 (September), 274-285.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. To what extent have you figured out exactly how you might buy \_\_\_\_\_?
2. To what extent do you have a plan for how you might buy the \_\_\_\_\_?
3. To what extent have you figured out exactly how you might use the \_\_\_\_\_?
4. To what extent do you have a plan for how you might use the \_\_\_\_\_?

---

<sup>1</sup> The extreme scale anchors were *not at all* and *very much*. The number of points on the response scale was not specified. The name of the product should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Pleasantness****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is supposed to measure the pleasantness-related dimension of a feeling a person is experiencing at some point in time or immediately after exposure to some stimulus. Three versions were used by Broach, Page, and Wilson (1995): one to measure how subjects felt before the experimental manipulation (*prior pleasantness*), one to measure the effect of the treatment (*program pleasantness*), and one to measure the feeling evoked by an ad (*commercial pleasantness*). The version used by Ellen and Bone (1998) had to do with the smell of an object. Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2003) used their version of the scale as a mood manipulation check after respondents had written a detailed description of a happy or sad event they had experienced. Mantel and Kellaris (2003) used the scale with regard to the background music in a mock radio commercial.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Broach, Page, and Wilson (1995) stated that the items for the scale were selected from Averill's (1975) semantic atlas of emotional words. However, use of the terms as a set in a summated format appears to be original to their own study. The scale was pretested with about 25 undergraduate students. The alphas for the version used with four different programs ranged from .85 to .96. Similarly, alphas for the *commercial pleasantness* version of the scale ranged from .90 to .96.

The studies by Ellen and Bone (1998), Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2003), and Mantel and Kellaris (2003) did not specify the source of their scales.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas ranging from .86 to .97 (*prior pleasantness*), .84 to .94 (*program pleasantness*), and .85 to .97 (*commercial pleasantness*) were reported for the scale (Broach, Page, and Wilson 1995). Alphas of .96, .86, and .84 were reported for the versions of the scale used by Ellen and Bone (1998), Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2003), and Mantel and Kellaris (2003), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported in any of the studies. However, Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2003) used the scale as a manipulation check and to the extent that it was successful it provides some evidence of its predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Averill, James R. (1975), "A Semantic Atlas of Emotional Concepts," *JSAS Catalogue of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 5, 330.
- Broach, V. Carter, Jr., Thomas J. Page, Jr., and R. Dale Wilson (1995), "Television Programming and Its Influence on Viewers' Perceptions of Commercials: The Role of Program Arousal and Pleasantness," *JA*, 24 (Winter), 45-54.

## #455 Pleasantness

Ellen, Pam Scholder and Paula Fitzgerald Bone (1998), "Does It Matter If It Smells? Olfactory Stimuli As Advertising Executional Cues," *JA*, 27 (4), 29-39.

Keller, Punan Anand, Issac M. Lipkus, and Barbara K. Rimer (2003), "Affect, Framing, and Persuasion," *JMR*, 40 (February), 54-65.

Mantel, Susan Powell and James J. Kellaris (2003), "Cognitive Determinants of Consumers' Time Perceptions: The Impact of Resources Required and Available," *JCR*, 29 (March), 531-538.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. negative / positive
2. bad / good
3. awful / nice
4. sad / happy
5. unpleasant / pleasant
6. agreeable / disagreeable
7. pleased / displeased

---

<sup>1</sup> Broach, Page, and Wilson (1995) used items 1-5 in a seven-point format with the following scale stems: for version measuring *prior pleasantness*: "At this time I feel . . .;" for version measuring *program pleasantness*: "Did the program as a whole make you feel . . .;" and, for version measuring *commercial pleasantness*: "Did the commercial as a whole make you feel . . ." Ellen and Bone (1998) used items 2, 5, and 6 in a seven-point format. Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2003) used items 2, 4, and 5 in an eleven-point format. Items #1, #2, and #7 were used by Mantel and Kellaris (2003).

**SCALE NAME: Pleasure****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is used to assess one's affective reaction to an environmental stimulus with an emphasis on its degree of pleasantness. As used by Raghunathan and Irwin (2001), the scale was considered a measure of mood.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Several of the items come from the work of Mehrabian and Russell (1974). Given previous work by others as well as their own research, they proposed that there are three dimensions that underlie all emotional reactions to environmental stimuli. They referred to the three factors as pleasure, arousal, and dominance. A series of studies were used to develop measures of each factor. A study of the "final" set of items used 214 University of California undergraduates, each of whom used the scales to evaluate a different subset of six situations. (The analysis was based, therefore, on 1284 observations.) A principal components factor analysis with oblique rotation was used and the expected three factors emerged. Pleasure, arousal, and dominance explained 27%, 23%, and 14% of the available variance, respectively. Scores on the pleasure scale had correlations of 0.07 and 0.03 with arousal and dominance, respectively.

**RELIABILITY:**

The internal consistency for this scale has tended to be good across studies with a variety of samples, typically having reliabilities well above .80. Specific reliabilities are reported below along with the items used by the various researchers in their respective studies.

**VALIDITY:**

Aylesworth and MacKenzie (1998) collected data on all six items shown below but dropped item #6 in calculating scale scores due to the item's unacceptably low factor loading as well as its low communality estimate compared to the other items.

Some idea of the scale's convergent validity can be taken from correlations between it and another scale used to measure the same construct (Bateson and Hui 1992, p. 278). In three different situations the correlations were .65 or higher providing evidence that the two measures were tapping into the same construct.

A principal components factor analysis performed by Donovan et al. (1994) indicated that all six of the pleasure-related items loaded highest on the same dimension and low on one related to arousal.

Wirtz, Matilla, and Tan (2000) performed a confirmatory factor analysis on this scale and a couple of others with the results providing some evidence of each scale's convergent and discriminant validity. Further evidence of the scale's discriminant validity came from noting that its average variance extracted was higher than it was for the squared correlation between it and any of the other two constructs (Fornell and Larcker 1981). Some evidence of nomological validity came from noting, as expected from previous research, that pleasure had a high correlation with satisfaction.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Havlena and Holbrook (1986), Hui and Bateson (1991), Menon and Kahn (1995), Mitchell, Kahn, and Knasko (1995), Morrin and Ratneshwar (2003), Nyer (1997), and Olney, Holbrook, and Batra (1991).

**REFERENCES:**

- Aylesworth, Andrew B. and Scott B. MacKenzie (1998), "Context Is Key: The Effect of Program-Induced Mood on Thoughts about the Ad," *JA*, 27 (Summer), 17-31.
- Bateson, John E. G. and Michael K. Hui (1992), "The Ecological Validity of Photographic Slides and Videotapes in Simulating the Service Setting," *JCR*, 19 (September), 271-281.
- Donovan, Robert J., John R. Rossiter, Gilian Marcolyn, and Andrew Nesdale (1994), "Store Atmosphere and Purchasing Behavior," *JR*, 70 (3), 283-294.
- Fisher, Robert J. and Laurette Dubé (2005), "Gender Differences in Responses to Emotional Advertising: A Social Desirability Perspective," *JCR*, 31 (March), 850-858.
- Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *JMR*, 18 (February), 39-50.
- Havlena, William J. and Morris B. Holbrook (1986), "The Varieties of Consumption Experience: Comparing Two Typologies of Emotion in Consumer Behavior," *JCR*, 13 (December), 394-404.
- Holbrook, Morris B., Robert W. Chestnut, Terence A. Oliva, and Eric A. Greenleaf (1984), "Play as a Consumption Experience: The Roles of Emotions, Performance, and Personality in the Enjoyment of Games," *JCR*, 11 (September), 728-739.
- Howard, Daniel J., and Charles Gengler (2001), "Emotional Contagion Effects on Product Attitudes," *JCR*, 28 (September), 189-201.
- Hui, Michael K. and John E. G. Bateson (1991), "Perceived Control and the Effects of Crowding and Consumer Choice on the Service Experience," *JCR*, 18 (September), 174-184.
- Hui, Michael K. and David K. Tse (1996), "What to Tell Consumers in Waits of Different Lengths: An Integrative Model of Service Evaluation," *JM*, 60 (April), 81-90.
- Hui, Michael K., Mrugank V. Thakor, and Ravi Gill (1998), "The Effect of Delay Type and Service Stage on Consumers' Reactions to Waiting," *JCR*, 24 (March), 469-479.
- Mattila, Anna S. and Jochen Wirtz (2001), "Congruency of Scent and Music as a Driver of In-store Evaluations and Behaviour," *JR*, 77 (2), 273-289.
- Mehrabian, Albert and James A. Russell (1974), *An Approach to Environmental Psychology*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Menon, Satya and Barbara E. Kahn (1995), "The Impact of Context on Variety Seeking in Product Choices," *JCR*, 22 (December), 285-295.
- Mitchell, Deborah, Barbara E. Kahn, and Susan C. Knasko (1995), "There's Something in the Air: Effects of Congruent or Incongruent Ambient Odor on Consumer Decision Making," *JCR*, 22 (September), 229-238.
- Morrin, Maureen and S. Ratneshwar (2003), "Does it Make Sense to Use Scents to Enhance Brand Memory?" *JMR*, 40 (February), 10-25.

- Neelamegham, Ramya and Dipak Jain (1999), "Consumer Choice Process for Experience Goods: An Econometric Model and Analysis," *JMR*, 36 (August), 373-386.
- Nyer, Prashanth U. (1997), "A Study of the Relationships Between Cognitive Appraisals and Consumption Emotions," *JAMS*, 25 (Fall), 296-304.
- Olney, Thomas J., Morris B. Holbrook, and Rajeev Batra (1991), "Consumer Responses to Advertising: The Effects of Ad Content, Emotions, and Attitude toward the Ad on Viewing Time," *JCR*, 17 (March), 440-453.
- Raghunathan, Rajagopal and Julie Irwin (2001), "Walking the Hedonic Product Treadmill: Default Contrast and Mood-Based Assimilation in Judgments of Predicted Happiness with a Target Product," *JCR*, 28 (December), 355-368.
- Simpson, Penny M., Steve Horton, and Gene Brown (1996), "Male Nudity in Advertisements: A Modified Replication and Extension of Gender and Product Effects," *JAMS*, 24 (Summer), 257-262.
- Wirtz, Jochen, Anna S. Matilla and Rachel L.P. Tan (2000), "The Moderating Role of Target-Arousal on the Impact of Affect on Satisfaction-An Examination in the Context of Service Experience," *JR*, 76 (3), 347-365.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

Rate your emotions according to the way the \_\_\_\_\_ made you feel.<sup>2</sup>

1. happy / unhappy
2. pleased / annoyed
3. satisfied / unsatisfied
4. contented / melancholic
5. hopeful / despairing
6. relaxed / bored
7. joyful / not joyful

- Aylesworth and MacKenzie (1998): 1-5 [.85]  
 Bateson and Hui (1992): item set unknown [.86]  
 Donovan et al. (1994): 1-6 [.88]  
 Fisher and Dubé (2005): 1, 2, 3\*, 4\* 7-point [.83]  
 Holbrook et al. (1984): 1-6 [.89]  
 Howard and Gengler (2001): 1\*, 2\*, 7 7-point [.80-.92]  
 Hui and Tse (1996): 1-3, 6 [.87]  
 Hui, Thakor, and Gill (1998): 1-3 [.89]  
 Mattila and Wirtz (2001): 1-6 7-point [.89]  
 Neelamegham and Jain (1999): 2-4, 7-point [.85]  
 Raghunathan and Irwin (2001): 1-3 11-point [.76, .83]  
 Simpson, Horton, and Brown (1996): 1-6 [.96]  
 Wirtz, Matilla and Tan (2000): 1-6 [.92]

<sup>1</sup> Some authors used items in which one anchor was not as shown here but was semantically similar. Those pairs are shown with an asterisk next them.

<sup>2</sup> This is a possible scale stem that can be used with the items.

**SCALE NAME: Popularity of the Object**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five, seven-point semantic differentials that are intended to measure the degree to which a person believes a particular person, place, or thing is socially acceptable and desirable.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Lam and Mukherjee (2005) was developed by Bell, Holbrook, and Solomon (1991). One of the latter's six items was dropped by the former, however, when it didn't load well with the other items.

**RELIABILITY:**

Lam and Mukherjee (2005) reported composite reliabilities for the scale ranging from .90 to .92 for three different conditions with the men's wear sample. For women's wear the reliabilities ranged from .92 to .94.

**VALIDITY:**

Evidence in support of the convergent and discriminant validities of the scale were provided by Lam and Mukherjee (2005). The average variance extracted ranged from .79 to .83 for the men's wear sample and .70 to .76 for the women's wear sample.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bell, Stephen S., Morris B. Holbrook, and Michael R. Solomon (1991), "Combining Esthetic and Social Value to Explain preferences for Product Styles with the Incorporation of Personality and Ensemble Effect," *Journal of Social behavior and Personality*, 6 (6), 243-273.
- Lam, Shun Yin and Avinandan Mukherjee (2005), "The Effects of Merchandise Coordination and Juxtaposition on Consumers' Product Evaluation and Purchase Intention in Store-Based Retailing," *JR*, 81 (3), 231-250.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. socially unacceptable / socially acceptable
2. unfashionable / fashionable
3. undesired impression / desired impression
4. disapproved by others / approved by others
5. unpopular / popular

**SCALE NAME: Possessiveness****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A nine-item, five-point, Likert-type summated ratings scale is used in measuring the degree to which a person desires to maintain control over one's possessions. A four-item version of the scale was used by O'Guinn and Faber (1989).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of the scale is reported in Belk (1984). The measure of possessiveness was one of three scales constructed for examining aspects of Materialism. Initial pools of 30 or more items were tested for each of the three measures with 237 business school students. Using factor analysis, item-total correlations, and measures of internal consistency, seven or more items were chosen from each pool to measure the three materialism-related constructs. The eight items retained for measuring possessiveness were reported to have an alpha of .68.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .57 was reported for one of the Belk (1984) samples ( $n = 338$ ). A two-week interval, test-retest correlation of .87 ( $n=48$ ) was reported for another Belk (1984, 1985) sample. O'Guinn and Faber (1989) calculated an alpha of .61.

**VALIDITY:**

Belk (1984) compared scale scores with other measures in a multitrait-multimethod matrix. As evidence of convergent validity, scores on the possessiveness scale were correlated significantly with two other measures used to assess the same construct. Only partial support for discriminant validity was found. Evidence of criterion validity was found by noting that two known groups had significantly different mean scores on the scale and the differences were in the hypothesized directions.

O'Guinn and Faber (1989) made no reference to examining the scale's validity beyond using factor analysis. Items regarding possessiveness and two other materialism-related constructs were factor analyzed and three factors clearly emerged. The authors did indicate that the scales were slightly modified on the basis of the factor analysis, however.

**COMMENTS:**

The three materialism-related measures mentioned here have been used not only separately but together as well. Two alphas for the combined scale were reported by Belk (1985): .66 ( $n = 338$ ) and .73 ( $n = 48$ ). Belk (1985) also reported a test-retest correlation of .68 ( $n = 48$ ). O'Guinn and Faber (1989; Faber and O'Guinn 1992) calculated an alpha of .71 for the combined scale.

See also Richins (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Belk, Russell W. (1984), "Three Scales to Measure Constructs Related to Materialism: Reliability, Validity, and Relationships to Measures of Happiness," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 11. Thomas Kinnear, ed. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 291-97.
- Belk, Russell W. (1985), "Materialism: Trait Aspects of Living in the Material World," *JCR*, 12 (December), 265-80.
- Faber, Ronald J. and Thomas C. O'Guinn (1992), "A Clinical Screener for Compulsive Buying," *JCR*, 19 (December), 459-69.
- O'Guinn, Thomas C. and Ronald J. Faber (1989), "Compulsive Buying: A Phenomenological Exploration," *JCR*, 16 (September), 147-57.
- Richins, Marsha L. (2004), "The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form," *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Renting or leasing a car is more appealing to me than owning one. (r)
2. I tend to hang on to things I should probably throw out.
3. I get very upset if something is stolen from me even if it has little monetary value.
4. I don't get particularly upset when I lose things. (r)
5. I am less likely than most people to lock things up. (r)
6. I would rather buy something I need than borrow it from someone else.
7. I worry about people taking my possessions.
8. When I travel I like to take a lot of photographs.
9. I never discard old pictures or snapshots.

---

<sup>1</sup> Items similar to or exactly the same as the following were used by O'Guinn and Faber (1989): items 2, 3, 7, and 9.

**SCALE NAME: Power (Expert)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This five-item, seven-point scale is intended to measure the degree to which a person describes another person as having skills and/or expertise on a topic. The person being described in the study by Comer (1984) was sales manager while in the study by Dellande, Gilly, and Graham (2004) the person was a weight loss counselor.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of the expert power scale can be found in the original taxonomy of social power as developed by French and Raven (1959). In the taxonomy, expert power was indicated to be one of five sources of social power, along with coercive, reward, referent, and legitimate power. The scale reported here is intended to measure the perceptions of the expert power of others (as opposed to measuring the actual expert power of others). The particular scale used by Comer (1984) and Dellande, Gilly, and Graham (2004) is from the work of Holzbach (1974), who developed a series of scales to measure the French and Raven power taxonomy on an interpersonal level in an organizational environment.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .89 (Comer 1984) and .99 (Dellande, Gilly, and Graham 2004) have been reported for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Comer (1984) provide evidence in support of the scale's convergent and nomological validities as well as its dimensionality. Information bearing on the scale's validity was not reported by Dellande, Gilly, and Graham (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Comer, James M. (1984), "A Psychometric Assessment of a Measure of Sales Representatives' Power Perceptions," *JMR*, 21 (May), 221-225.
- Dellande, Stephanie, Mary C. Gilly, and John L. Graham (2004), "Gaining Compliance and Losing Weight: The Role of the Service Provider in Health Care Services," *JM*, 68 (3), 78-91.
- French, John R. P. and Bertram Raven (1959), "The Bases of Social Power," in *Studies in Social Power*, Dorwin Cartwright, ed. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 150-167.
- Holzbach, Robert Lawrence, Jr. (1974), "An Investigation of a Model for Managerial Effectiveness: The Effects of Leadership Style and Leader Attributed Social Power on Subordinate Job Performance," doctoral dissertation, Carnegie-Mellon University.

#459 *Power (Expert)*

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. Skilled
2. Knowledgeable
3. Experienced
4. Proficient
5. Qualified

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors for the scale were *Extremely inaccurate* (1), *Very inaccurate* (2), *Inaccurate* (3), *Don't know or can't decide* (4), *Accurate* (5), *Very accurate* (6), and *Extremely accurate* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Power Importance**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, nine-point statements are used to assess the value placed by a person on an attainment of social status as well as control over other people and resources.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005) was derived from Schwartz (1992). It is part of the Schwartz Value Survey which has been tested in many different countries and is intended to capture ten important human values. Due to the unconventional psychometric techniques used to develop the instrument, many issues regarding each scale's dimensionality and validity are worthy of further testing.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) was .735 (Burroughs 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Although the scale's validity was not directly assessed by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002), the results of multidimensional scaling analysis showed that the power motivation leaned more towards self-enhancement values such as hedonism and materialism and was in opposition to self-transcendence values such as religiosity and benevolence. This provides at least some modicum of evidence of the scale's nomological validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Richins (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.  
Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.  
Richins, Marsha L. (2004), "The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form," *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.  
Schwartz, Shalom H. (1992), "Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, V. 25, Mark P. Zanna, ed., San Diego: Academic Press, Inc, 1-65.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> The same nine-point response scale and anchors were used by Schwartz (1992) and Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005). The directions shown here were recreated based on a description by Schwartz (1992, p. 17).

## #460 *Power Importance*

Directions: Rate each value listed below as a guiding principle in your life using the following nine-point scale: *opposed to my values* (-1), *not important* (0), (1 and 2, unlabeled), *important* (3), (4 and 5, unlabeled), *very important* (6), and *of supreme importance* (7).

1. SOCIAL POWER (control over others, dominance)
2. AUTHORITY (the right to lead or command)
3. WEALTH (material possessions, money)
4. PRESERVING MY PUBLIC IMAGE (protecting my “face”)
5. SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, approval by others)

**SCALE NAME: Powerlessness**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three unipolar items with a seven-point response format are used to measure the degree to which a person describes something as having a quality that indicates a lack of power and authority.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Fisher and Dubé (2005) did not state the source of the scale, thus, it may have been developed by them for their study. Given the context in which they used it, they referred to the measure as *agency appraisal*. Agency is a meta-construct having to do with the mode of relating to the world via a striving for mastery.

**RELIABILITY:**

Fisher and Dubé (2005) reported the alpha for the scale being .72.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Fisher and Dubé (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Fisher, Robert J. and Laurette Dubé (2005), "Gender Differences in Responses to Emotional Advertising: A Social Desirability Perspective," *JCR*, 31 (March), 850-858.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Please indicate to what extent \_\_\_\_\_ possess the following qualities:<sup>2</sup>

1. unauthoritative
2. powerless
3. unaggressive

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors for the response scale were *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7).

<sup>2</sup> The object to be described should be stated in the blank, e.g., you, the salesperson, the people in the ad, et cetera.

**SCALE NAME: Price as a Quality Indicator**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point items are used to assess the extent to which a consumer believes that the price of a particular product provides an accurate indication of its quality. The scale was called *cue reliability* by Darke and Chung (2005).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Darke and Chung (2005) but it appears to have been developed by them.

**RELIABILITY:**

Darke and Chung (2005) reported the alphas for the scale to be .89 and .91 for the higher and lower price conditions, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No discussion of the scale's validity was provided by Darke and Chung (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Darke, Peter R. and Cindy M.Y. Chung (2005), "Effects of Pricing and Promotion on Consumer Perceptions: It Depends on How You Frame It," *JR*, 81 (1), 35-47.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Is the price a good indication of the product's quality?
2. Is the price a reliable indication of the product's quality?
3. Does the price reflect the true quality of the product?

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors on the response scale were *not at all* and *very*. The questions are constructed here based upon phrases provided in the article and may not be the original phrasing.

**SCALE NAME: Price Comparison Likelihood**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three items with seven-point response formats that measure a person's attitude regarding the probability that consumers would go to the effort to compare a certain store's prices to other stores.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Srivastava and Lurie (2004) but it appears to have been developed by them.

**RELIABILITY:**

Cronbach's alphas of .79 (study 2) and .76 (study 3) were reported for this scale (Srivastava and Lurie 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Srivastava and Lurie (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Srivastava, Joydeep and Nicholas H. Lurie (2004), "Price-matching Guarantees as Signals of Low Store Prices: Survey and Experimental Evidence," *JR*, 80 (2), 117-128.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How likely is it that most consumers will compare \_\_\_\_\_'s prices to other stores?  
*very unlikely / very likely*
2. How difficult or easy is it to compare the prices at \_\_\_\_\_ with other stores?  
*very difficult / very easy*
3. Most consumers at \_\_\_\_\_ would be willing to shop around.  
*strongly disagree / strongly agree*

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal store should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Price Fairness**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, nine-point items are used to measure a consumer's belief regarding which of two stores has the "fairer" prices with regard to a particular product category they carry in common (though some individual items are different). Although a "fairness" judgment can be more complex than merely comparing perceived price points, they appear to be the same with this scale such that "unfair" means a store's prices are more expensive than another store's.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Gourville and Moon (2004) did not describe the source of the scale but it appears to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

A Cronbach's alpha value of .845 was reported by Gourville and Moon (2004) for this scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Examination of the scale's validity was not reported by Gourville and Moon (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Gourville, John T. and Youngme Moon (2004), "Managing Price Expectations Through Product Overlap," *JR*, 80 (1), 23-25.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Which of these two stores do you think is more fairly priced? (In other words, in which one is a customer least likely to be overcharged for the \_\_\_\_\_ bought?)
2. The two stores probably carry \_\_\_\_\_ that are the same. Which of the two stores do you think is more fairly priced on those \_\_\_\_\_ carried by both stores?
3. The two stores also carry many \_\_\_\_\_ which are different (carried by one store but not by the other). Which of the two stores do you think is more fairly priced on those unique \_\_\_\_\_?

---

<sup>1</sup> The questions were anchored by *Store A is more fairly priced* (1) and *Store B is more fairly priced* (9). The name of the focal product category should be placed in the blanks, e.g., wine(s).

**SCALE NAME: Price Perception (Internal Reference)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three items are used to estimate what a consumer believes the price of a product is.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Darke and Chung (2005) developed the scale based on previous measures by Urbany, Bearden, and Weilbaker (1988) as well as Darke and Freedman (1993). (See V4, #313.)

**RELIABILITY:**

Darke and Chung (2005) reported the alpha for the scale to be .74 (Experiment 3).

**VALIDITY:**

No discussion of the scale's validity was provided by Darke and Chung (2005).

**COMMENTS:**

The third item (below) appears like it would receive very different responses than the first two. This brings the unidimensionality and content validity of the scale into question.

**REFERENCES:**

- Darke, Peter R. and Cindy M.Y. Chung (2005), "Effects of Pricing and Promotion on Consumer Perceptions: It Depends on How You Frame It," *JR*, 81 (1), 35-47.
- Darke, Peter R. and Jonathan L. Freedman (1993), "Deciding Whether to Seek a Bargain: Effects of Both Amount and Percentage Off," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78 (6), 960-965.
- Urbany, Joel E., William O. Bearden, and Dan C. Weilbaker (1988), "The Effect of Plausible and Exaggerated Reference Prices on Consumer Perceptions and Price Search," *JCR*, 15 (June), 95-100.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. What is the average price you would pay for this product elsewhere?
2. What do you believe this store's usual price is for this product?
3. What would be this product's price if the retailer sold the item at cost?

---

<sup>1</sup> Although not stated in the article by Darke and Chung (2005), it appears these are open-ended items such that respondents were expected to write down specific prices and then scale scores were computed as an average of the three prices. The questions are constructed here based upon phrases provided in the article and may not be the original phrasing.

**SCALE NAME: Price Perception (Store Comparison)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point statements are used to measure a consumer's perceptions regarding the overall price level of a store relative to its competitors and disregarding the store's willingness to give refunds as part of its price matching guarantee. Although not part of the scale *per se*, the scenario that subjects read before completing the scales described a store with a disguised name as explicitly having a price matching guarantee.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Srivastava and Lurie (2004) but it appears to have been developed by them.

**RELIABILITY:**

A Cronbach's alpha of .88 was reported for this scale (Srivastava and Lurie 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Srivastava and Lurie (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Srivastava, Joydeep and Nicholas H. Lurie (2004), "Price-matching Guarantees as Signals of Low Store Prices: Survey and Experimental Evidence," *JR*, 80 (2), 117-128.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Before taking a refund, the overall prices at \_\_\_\_\_ are most likely to be:  
*lower than average / higher than average*
2. Relative to other \_\_\_\_\_ stores, the prices at \_\_\_\_\_ are most likely to be:  
*low / high*
3. Before taking a refund, my expectations about the overall prices at \_\_\_\_\_ are:  
*very low / very high*
4. \_\_\_\_\_'s prices are likely to be:  
*lower than other stores / higher than other stores*

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal store should be placed in the blanks. In item #2, the name of the store goes in the second blank while a descriptor of the type of store goes in the first blank, e.g., electronics.

**SCALE NAME: Price Perception (Store Comparison)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three items with seven-point response formats that measure a person's attitude regarding a store's prices, with some emphasis on how they compare to other stores.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Srivastava and Lurie (2004) but it appears to have been developed by them. The construct measured by this scale was measured in three studies (an initial survey and then in two experiments). The version of the scale shown here was only used in the experiments, not in the survey.

**RELIABILITY:**

Cronbach's alphas of .87 (study 2) and .92 (study 3) were reported for this scale (Srivastava and Lurie 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Srivastava and Lurie (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Srivastava, Joydeep and Nicholas H. Lurie (2004), "Price-matching Guarantees as Signals of Low Store Prices: Survey and Experimental Evidence," *JR*, 80 (2), 117-128.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Based on the description, the overall prices at \_\_\_\_\_ are most likely:  
*very low / very high*
2. Relative to other stores, the prices at \_\_\_\_\_ are most likely to be:  
*lower than average / higher than average*
3. Your general expectation about the overall price level at \_\_\_\_\_ is:  
*very low / very high*

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal store should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Price-Consciousness**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of various, Likert-type items measuring the degree to which a consumer focuses on sales and trying to get the “best price.”

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

These items below and/or inspiration for them came from an early classic study of psychographics by Wells and Tigert (1971). One thousand questionnaires were mailed to homemaker members of the Market Facts mail panel. In addition to gathering demographic, product use, and media data, the survey contained 300 statements which have served as the basis for the construction of many lifestyle-related scales ever since. While the four items for this scale are reported in the article, they were not analyzed as a multi-item scale.

One of the first known uses of the items as a multi-item scale was in Darden and Perreault (1976). Analysis was based on self-administered questionnaires completed by 278 suburban housewives randomly selected in Athens, Georgia. A split-half reliability of .70 was reported for the scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .67 was reported by Dickerson and Gentry (1983). Barak and Stern (1985/1986) say only that the scale's alpha was above .5. The version of the scale used by Donthu (and Garcia 1999; and Gilliland 1996) was reported to have alphas of .72 and .81, respectively. Kopalle and Lindsay-Mullikin (2003) reported an alpha of .86 for the version of the scale they used. The construct reliability (LISREL) for the version of the scale used by Mittal (1994) was reported to be .69.

An alpha of .65 was reported for the scale used by Tat and Bejou (1994). Alphas of .67 and .66 were reported for blacks and whites, respectively. The internal consistency of the scale is somewhat low and care should be exercised in its use.

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not specifically addressed by Mittal (1994) except to say the tests that were conducted provided support for discriminant validity. Tat and Bejou (1994) did not directly test the validity of the scale. However, they did perform a couple of factor analyses on a total set of 24 items to purify the scales they developed. Factor loadings for the overall sample were respectable but the loading of item #5 (below) was rather low for blacks (.40) compared to whites (.74).

**COMMENTS:**

It is noteworthy that this scale in some of its forms displays low reliability. A possible reason for this is that three slightly different subconstructs are being measured such as comparison shopping, inspection of prices on products at the store, and watching ads for sales. Some attention should be given to this issue along with some redevelopment effort if the scale is to be used again.

See also Arora (1985), Burnett and Bush (1986), Heslop, Moran, and Cousineau (1981), Korgaonkar (1984), Schnaars and Schiffman (1984), Swaminathan, Srinivasan and Kapil Bawa (2005), and Taylor and Neslin (2005) for other uses or variations on the measure.

## REFERENCES:

- Arora, Raj (1985), "Involvement: Its Measurement for Retail Store Research," *JAMS*, 13 (Spring), 229-241.
- Barak, Benny and Barbara Stern (1985/1986), "Women's Age in Advertising: An Examination of Two Consumer Age Profiles," *JAR*, 25 (Dec./Jan.), 38-47.
- Burnett, John J. and Alan J. Bush (1986), "Profiling the Yuppies," *JAR*, 26 (April/May), 27-35.
- Darden, William R. and William D. Perreault, Jr. (1976), "Identifying Interurban Shoppers: Multiproduct Purchase Patterns and Segmentation Profiles," *JMR*, 13 (Feb.), 51-60.
- Dickerson, Mary D. and James W. Gentry (1983), "Characteristics of Adopters and Non-Adopters of Home Computers," *JCR*, 10 (Sept.), 225-235.
- Donthu, Naveen and Adriana Garcia (1999), "The Internet Shopper," *JAR*, 39 (May/June), 52-58.
- Donthu, Naveen and David Gilliland (1996), "The Infomercial Shopper," *JAR*, 36 (March/April), 69-76.
- Heslop, Louise A., Lori Moran, and Amy Cousineau (1981), "Consciousness in Energy Conservation Behavior: An Exploratory Study," *JAMS*, 8 (Dec.), 299-305.
- Kopalle, Praveen K. and Joan Lindsey-Mullikin (2003), "The Impact of External Reference Price on Consumer Price Expectations," *JR*, 79 (4), 225-236.
- Korgaonkar, Pradeep K. (1984), "Consumer Shopping Orientations, Non-Store Retailers, and Consumers' Patronage Intentions: A Multivariate Investigation," *JAMS*, 12 (Winter), 11-22.
- Mittal, Banwari (1994), "An Integrated Framework for Relating Diverse Consumer Characteristics to Supermarket Coupon Redemption," *JMR*, 31 (November), 533-544.
- Schhaars, Steven P. and Leon G. Schiffman (1984), "An Application of a Segmentation Design Based on the Hybrid of Canonical Correlation and Simple Cross-Tabulation," *JAMS*, 12 (Fall), 177-189.
- Swaminathan, Srinivasan and Kapil Bawa (2005), "Category-Specific Coupon Proneness: The Impact of Individual Characteristics and Category-Specific Variables," *JR*, 81 (3), 205-214.
- Tat, Peter K. and David Bejou (1994), "Examining Black Consumer Motives For Coupon Usage," *JAR*, 34 (March/April), 29-35.
- Taylor, Gail Ayala and Scott A. Neslin (2005), "The Current and Future Sales Impact of a Retail Frequency Reward Program," *JR*, 81 (4), 293-305.
- Wells, William D. and Douglas Tigert (1971), "Activities, Interests, and Opinions," *JAR*, 11 (Aug.), 27-35.

## #468 Price-Consciousness

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. I shop a lot for "specials."
2. I find myself checking the prices in the grocery store even for small items.
3. I usually watch the advertisements for announcements of sales.
4. A person can save a lot of money by shopping around for bargains.
5. I check the prices even for inexpensive items.
6. I pay attention to sales and specials.
7. Clothing, furniture, appliances, . . . whatever I buy, I shop around to get the best prices.
8. I usually purchase the cheapest item.
9. I usually purchase items on sale only.
10. I will shop at more than one store to take advantage of low prices.

Barak and Stern (1985/1986): 1, 2, 3, 4 6-point

Dickerson and Gentry (1983): 1, 2, 3, 4 6-point

Donthu and Garcia (1999): 2\*, 4, 8, 9 5-point

Donthu and Gilliland (1996): 2\*, 4, 8, 9 5-point

Kopalle and Lindsay-Mullikin (2003): 1, 2, 9\*, 10 ?-point

Mittal (1994): 1, 2, 7 5-point

Tat and Bejou (1994): 1, 5, 6 5-point

---

<sup>1</sup> Asterisks indicate that a scale item used in a study was similar to one shown but varied somewhat in phrasing.

**SCALE NAME: Price-Consciousness****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A five-item, seven-point Likert-type scale measuring a consumer's willingness to expend the time and energy necessary to shop around if need be to purchase grocery products at the lowest prices. A four-item version was used by Manning, Sprott, and Miyazaki (1998) and a six-item version was used by Ofir (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Lichtenstein, Ridgway, and Netemeyer (1993). While a few items were found in previous research, many were generated specifically for this study. A total of 18 items were tested along with many others in a pretest. The sample was composed of 341 nonstudent adult consumers who had the grocery-shopping responsibility for their households. Factor analysis and coefficient alpha were used to eliminate weaker items. The thirteen items remaining were reported to have an alpha of .84. These items were used in the main study although the next round of analysis eliminated eight of them leaving the final version of the scale with five items.

**RELIABILITY:**

Burton et al. (1998) reported an alpha of .86. In Study 1 by Burton, Lichtenstein, and Netemeyer (1999) an alpha of .84 was reported; in Study 2 it was merely reported to be greater than .85. The main study by Lichtenstein, Ridgway, and Netemeyer (1993) showed an alpha for the scale of .85. Lastovicka et al. (1999) reported an alpha of .80. Alphas of .84 and .80 were reported for the versions of the scale used by Manning, Sprott, and Miyazaki (1998) and Miyazaki, Sprott, and Manning (2000), respectively. Ofir (2004) reported that the six-item version he used had alphas of .85 (cooking oil) and .87 (jam).

**VALIDITY:**

Lastovicka et al. (1999) used this scale in the process of validating another scale (V4, #177). Based upon that, their data indicated that scores on the price consciousness scale had a moderate positive correlation with frugality as well as with a measure of response bias (#267). The former supports, as might be expected, that those who are price conscious are also frugal. The latter correlation is more confusing; it appears to suggest that as price consciousness increases the tendency to give exaggeratedly desirable responses increases too. The implication of this finding as it relates to the scale's validity is worthy of further investigation.

Confirmatory factor analysis was used by Lichtenstein, Ridgway, and Netemeyer (1993) to conclude that the scale was unidimensional and showed evidence of discriminant validity. No examination of the scale's validity was reported in the articles by the other users of the scale.

**REFERENCES:**

## #469 Price-Consciousness

- Burton, Scot, Donald R. Lichtenstein, and Richard G. Netemeyer (1999), "Exposure to Sales Flyers and Increased Purchases in Retail Supermarkets," *JAR*, 39 (September/October), 7-14.
- Burton, Scot, Donald R. Lichtenstein, Richard G. Netemeyer, and Judith A. Garretson (1998), "A Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward Private Label Products and an Examination of Its Psychological and Behavioral Correlates," *JAMS*, 26 (4), 293-306.
- Lastovicka, John L., Lance A. Bettencourt, Renee Shaw Hughner, and Ronald J. Kuntze (1999), "Lifestyle of the Tight and Frugal: Theory and Measurement," *JCR*, 26 (June), 85-98.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R., Nancy M. Ridgway, and Richard G. Netemeyer (1993), "Price Perceptions and Consumer Shopping Behavior: A Field Study," *JMR*, 30 (May), 234-245.
- Manning, Kenneth C. (2001), Personal Correspondence.
- Manning, Kenneth C., David E. Sprott, and Anthony D. Miyazaki (1998), "Consumer Response to Quantity Surcharges: Implications for Retail Price Setters," *JR*, 74 (3), 373-399.
- Miyazaki, Anthony D., David E. Sprott, and Kenneth C. Manning (2000), "Unit Prices on Retail Shelf Labels: An Assessment of Information Prominence," *JR*, 76 (1), 93-112.
- Ofir, Chezy (2004), "Reexamining Latitude of Price Acceptability and Price Thresholds: Predicting Basic Consumer Reaction to Price," *JCR*, 30 (March), 612-621.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. I am not willing to go to extra effort to find lower prices. (r)
2. I will grocery shop at more than one store to take advantage of low prices.
3. The money saved by finding low prices is usually not worth the time and effort. (r)
4. I would never shop at more than one store to find low prices. (r)
5. The time it takes to find low prices is usually not worth the effort. (r)
6. I typically seek out cheap retail outlets to buy products for the house.

---

<sup>1</sup> Most of the reported studies appear to have used items #1-#5. Manning, Sprott, and Miyazaki (1998) used #1, #2, #4, and #5 (Manning 2001). Ofir (2004) used item #6 and five other items that were very similar to #1-#5.

**SCALE NAME: Price Consciousness**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a consumer expresses willingness to spend additional effort if necessary in order to find low prices for a specified product category. Wakefield and Inman (2003) referred to the scale as *price sensitivity*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Wakefield and Inman (2003) developed the scale based upon inspiration from previous measures of the construct.

**RELIABILITY:**

Wakefield and Inman (2003) reported that the alphas ranged from .86 to .89 for the six product categories (three primarily hedonic, three primarily utilitarian) with which the scale was used.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided in the article by Wakefield and Inman (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Wakefield, Kirk L., and J. Jeffrey Inman (2003), "Situational Price Sensitivity: The Role of Consumption Occasion, Social Context and Income," *JR*, 79 (4), 199-212.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I'm willing to make an extra effort to find a low price for \_\_\_\_\_.
2. I will change what I had planned to buy in order to take advantage of a lower price for \_\_\_\_\_.
3. I am sensitive to differences in prices of \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the brand or product category should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Price-Quality Relationship**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure a consumer's belief that there is a positive relationship between product price and quality.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

This multi-item summated scale is original to Lichtenstein, Ridgway, and Netemeyer (1993). Inspiration for the scale came from several previous studies of the topic. In particular, item #1 is very similar to the one item measure used by Peterson and Wilson (1985).

**RELIABILITY:**

The main study by Lichtenstein, Ridgway, and Netemeyer (1993) showed an alpha for the scale of .78. An alpha of .85 was reported by both Burton et al. (1998) and Garretson, Fisher, and Burton (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Confirmatory factor analysis was used by both Garretson, Fisher, and Burton (2002) and Lichtenstein, Ridgway, and Netemeyer (1993) to conclude that the scale was unidimensional and showed evidence of discriminant validity. No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Burton et al. (1998).

**REFERENCES:**

- Burton, Scot, Donald R. Lichtenstein, Richard G. Netemeyer, and Judith A. Garretson (1998), "A Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward Private Label Products and an Examination of Its Psychological and Behavioral Correlates," *JAMS*, 26 (4), 293-306.
- Garretson, Judith A., Dan Fisher, and Scot Burton (2002), "Antecedents of Private Label Attitude and National Brand Promotion Attitude: Similarities and Differences," *JR*, 78 (2), 91-99.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R., Nancy M. Ridgway, and Richard G. Netemeyer (1993), "Price Perceptions and Consumer Shopping Behavior: A Field Study," *JMR*, 30 (May), 234-245.
- Peterson, Robert A. and William R. Wilson (1985), "Perceived Risk and Price-Reliance Schema as Price-Perceived-Quality Mediators," in *Perceived Quality: How Consumers View Stores and Merchandise*, Jacob Jacoby and Jerry C. Olson, eds. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company, 247-267.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Generally speaking, the higher the price of a product, the higher the quality.
2. The old saying "you get what you pay for" is generally true.
3. The price of a product is a good indicator of its quality.
4. You always have to pay a bit more for the best.

**SCALE NAME: Price-Quality Relationship**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three Likert-type statements are used to assess a person's attitude about there being a positive relationship between price and quality.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information about the scale's source was provided by Ofir (2004) but it seems to be original to him.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha reported for the scale by Ofir (2004) was specific to one product category (jam) and was .79.

**VALIDITY:**

Ofir (2004) did not report any information relevant to the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Ofir, Chezy (2004), "Reexamining Latitude of Price Acceptability and Price Thresholds: Predicting Basic Consumer Reaction to Price," *JCR*, 30 (March), 612-621.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. As the price of \_\_\_\_\_ increases so does the quality.
2. It is worthwhile to pay more for \_\_\_\_\_ because you get better quality.
3. As the price of \_\_\_\_\_ increases from the price of \$\_\_\_\_\_ to the price of \$\_\_\_\_\_, the quality significantly increases.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the generic product should be placed in the long blanks shown in the items. The response was not described by Ofir (2004) but he did hint that the verbal anchors were of the agree/disagree type.

<sup>2</sup> The short blanks in this item should contain prices that range from very low to very high. Ofir (2004) examined 15 pairs of prices.

**SCALE NAME: Pride**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point terms are used to measure how much pride-related emotion a person feels with respect to a specified object.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Two versions of the scale were used by Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002) and appear to be original that study. One version had to do with possession-related pride while the other had to do with the pride related to performance of a particular activity.

**RELIABILITY:**

The reliabilities of the two versions of the scale were not reported by Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002) but the average variance extracted was .79 (possessions) and .88 (performance).

**VALIDITY:**

Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002) stated that the scale had been “validated in a consumption context” in a previous study (Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine 1993), however, examination of that source did not show that a pride-related scale had been used.

**REFERENCES:**

- Laverie, Debra A., Robert E. Kleine III and Susan Schultz Kleine (1993), “Linking Emotions and Values in Consumption Experiences: An Exploratory Study,” in *Advances in Consumer Research*, 70-75.
- Laverie, Debra A., Robert E. Kleine III and Susan Schultz Kleine (2002), “Reexamination and Extension of Kleine, Kleine, and Kernan’s Social Identity Model of Mundane Consumption: the Mediating Role of the Appraisal Process,” *JCR*, 28 (March), 659-669.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Directions: How do you feel about \_\_\_\_\_? <sup>1</sup>

1. pride
2. self-esteem
3. self-confidence

---

<sup>1</sup> The blank should be filled with the name of the object the person is reacting to. The instructions for the possession version used by Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002) said that “the products I use for tennis make me feel . . .” while the performance version said “When I think of myself as a tennis player I feel . . .” Anchors for the seven-point response scale were *not at all* (1) and *very much so* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Problem-Solving Orientation of the Airline**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, five-point Likert-type statements that measure the extent to which a customer believes an airline has policies for satisfactorily addressing problems that arise as part of providing its service.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) along with several other scales based on focus groups and in-depth interviews. In total the scales were intended to assess dimensions of trustworthiness related to front-line employees or management policies and practices. This scale measures one of the latter dimensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .74 was reported for the scale by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was assessed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) as part of a three-factor measurement model. In that context, the authors concluded the fit was good and there was acceptable evidence of convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

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

**SCALE ITEMS:**

The airline:

1. makes every effort to get you to your final destination as quickly as possible when there are delays or cancellations.
2. goes out of the way to solve customer problems.
3. shows as much concern for customers in economy class as it doe for customers in first/business class.

**SCALE NAME: Problem-Solving Orientation of the Employees**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the extent to which a customer believes the employees of a store or company satisfactorily solve problems that arise as part of a service exchange.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) along with several other scales based on focus groups and in-depth interviews. In total the scales were intended to assess dimensions of trustworthiness related to front-line employees or management policies and practices. This scale measures one of the former dimensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .72 (retail) and .82 (airline) were reported for the scale by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was assessed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) as part of a three-factor measurement model. In that context, the authors concluded the fit was good and there was acceptable evidence of convergent and discriminant validity. This was true for the separate retail and airline data as well as the combined set.

**REFERENCES:**

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

**SCALE ITEMS:**

The \_\_\_\_\_ employees:<sup>1</sup>

1. don't hesitate to take care of any problems \_\_\_\_\_.<sup>2</sup>
2. go out of their way to solve customer problems.
3. are willing to bend company policies to help address customer needs.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the type of employees can be placed in the blank. Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) used "store" and "airline."

<sup>2</sup> Depending on the type of business, a different phrase is placed in the blank. Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) used "you might have with items purchased at the store" for a retail context and "that might arise during flight" for an airline.

**SCALE NAME: Problem-Solving Orientation of the Store**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point Likert-type items are used to assess the degree to which a customer believes a store has policies for satisfactorily addressing problems that arise as part of service exchanges. The emphasis in the statements is on the ease of returning items.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) along with several other scales based on focus groups and in-depth interviews. In total the scales were intended to assess dimensions of trustworthiness related to front-line employees or management policies and practices. This scale measures one of the latter dimensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .87 was reported for the scale by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was assessed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) as part of a three-factor measurement model. In that context, the authors concluded the fit was good and there was acceptable evidence of convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

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

**SCALE ITEMS:**

The store:

1. has practices that make returning items quick and easy.
2. goes out of the way to solve customer problems.
3. shows as much concern for customers returning items as for those shopping for new ones.

**SCALE NAME: Processing Goals (Advertisement)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point statements are used to assess the degree to which a person focuses more on the style of an ad or the brand-related information. The phrasing of the items makes them more appropriate for print ads than for commercials.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The full scale is original to Garretson and Burton (2005) but they received inspiration from previous work, building in particular on a one item scale by Goodstein (1993).

**RELIABILITY:**

Garretson and Burton (2005) reported the alphas for the scale to be .86 (second pretest) and .82 (Experiment 1).

**VALIDITY:**

Although Garretson and Burton (2005) did not directly assess the validity of the scale, some sense of its concurrent validity comes from it being used successfully as a manipulation check.

**REFERENCES:**

Garretson, Judith A. and Scot Burton (2005), "The Role of Spokescharacters as Advertisement and Package Cues in Integrated Marketing Communications," *JM*, 69 (October), 118-132.

Goodstein, Ronald C. (1993), "Category based Applications and Extensions in Advertising: Motivating More Extensive Ad Processing," *JCR*, 20 (June), 87-99.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. As I viewed the advertisements, I was mainly thinking about the . . .
2. In the earlier advertisement task, I concentrated primarily on the . . .
3. When looking at the advertisements, I was mainly thinking about whether or not I liked the . . .
4. For the earlier task with the advertisements, I was primarily focusing on the quality of the . . .

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors for the response scale used with these items by Garretson and Burton (2005) were *layout and creative elements in the ad* and *attributes and benefits of the brand*.

**SCALE NAME: Product Innovativeness**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six, seven-point Likert-type items intended to measure the extent to which a person views the rate of technological change in a particular product category to be high.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) reported a construct reliability of .97 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Using confirmatory factor analysis, Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) examined a measurement model of this scale and two others (necessity-luxury product character and public-private product character). The analysis provided evidence in support of each scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Grewal, Rajdeep, Raj Mehta, Frank R. Kardes (2004), "The Timing of Repeat Purchases of Consumer Durable Goods: The Role of Functional Bases of Consumer Attitudes," *JMR*, 41 (February), 101-115.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

In your opinion, how would you rate the pace of technological innovation in \_\_\_\_\_ ?

1. \_\_\_\_\_ technology is changing at a very fast pace.
2. Compared to other consumer durable products, \_\_\_\_\_ technology is changing fast.
3. I have NOT seen significantly new technology in \_\_\_\_\_ for sometime.(r)
4. Innovations in \_\_\_\_\_ are very frequent.
5. Pace of technological innovations in \_\_\_\_\_ is high.
6. Technological innovations and \_\_\_\_\_ don't go hand in hand. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product should be placed in the blanks, e.g., car(s).

**SCALE NAME: Product Replacement Motivation**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six statements with seven-point Likert-type response scales are used to measure the degree to which a person has bought a product because what it replaces is viewed as being degraded to the point of unacceptability, probably due to poor performance. At the other extreme, a purchase is indicated to have occurred because something newer was available that was more desirable than what was replaced. The scale was called *nature of purchase decision* by Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004). It is similar to some developed by Bruner (e.g., 1987, 1989) except that the former's scale focuses on the reason for a particular purchase whereas the latter's scales focused on habitual "styles" that consumers develop over time as they repeatedly deal with similar needs/desires.

**RELIABILITY:**

Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) reported a construct reliability of .92 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Using confirmatory factor analysis, Grewal, Mehta, and Kardes (2004) examined a measurement model of this scale and one measuring an optimistic outlook of the future. The analysis provided evidence in support of each scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bruner, Gordon C. II (1987), "The Effect of Problem Recognition Style on Information Seeking," *JAMS*, 15 (Winter), 33-41.
- Bruner, Gordon C. II (1989), "Profiling Desired State Type Problem Recognizers," *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 4 (Winter), 167-182.
- Grewal, Rajdeep, Raj Mehta, Frank R. Kardes (2004), "The Timing of Repeat Purchases of Consumer Durable Goods: The Role of Functional Bases of Consumer Attitudes," *JMR*, 41 (February), 101-115.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The old \_\_\_\_\_ was NOT functioning well and needed to be replaced.
2. Poor performance of the old \_\_\_\_\_ was the main reason for the purchase.
3. The old \_\_\_\_\_ was obsolete in terms of technology.
4. The old \_\_\_\_\_ was obsolete in terms of style.
5. New style and fashion prompted me to buy the \_\_\_\_\_. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product should be placed in the blanks, e.g., car.

6. Newer technology was available in the market, which prompted me to repurchase the \_\_\_\_\_ . (r)

**SCALE NAME: Product/Story Connection**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point statements are used to measure the extent to which a viewer believes that the role played by a product in a show (TV, movie, play) was pertinent to the story line.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information was provided by Russell (2002) regarding the scale's origin. It appears to be original to her study.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas ranging from .70 to .91 for four different product/story combinations were calculated for the scale (Russell 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Russell (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

- Russell, Cristel Antonia (2002), "Investigating the Effectiveness of Product Placements in Television Shows: The Role of Modality and Plot Connection Congruence on Brand Memory and Attitude," *JCR*, 29 (December), 306-318.  
Russell, Cristel Antonia (2005), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ played an important role in the story.
2. Without the references to \_\_\_\_\_, the story would be different.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ was connected to the plot.

---

The name of the product category or brand name should be placed in the blanks. The anchors for the response scale were *not at all* (1) and *very much* (5) (Russell 2005).

**SCALE NAME: Proximity**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three semantic differentials that are intended to measure a person's sense of the distance from one object to another. In the study by Argo, Dahl, and Manchanda (2005) the scale was used to measure how participants viewed the distance of other shoppers to themselves.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale used by Argo, Dahl, and Manchanda (2005) was not identified and have been developed by them.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .95 was reported for the scale by Argo, Dahl, and Manchanda (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No information was provided about the scale's validity by Argo, Dahl, and Manchanda (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Argo, Jennifer J., Darren W. Dahl, and Rajesh V. Manchanda (2005), "The Influence of a Mere Social Presence in a Retail Context," *JCR*, 32 (September), 207-212.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. close / far
2. near / distant
3. next to me / away from me

---

<sup>1</sup> Argo, Dahl, and Manchanda (2005) did not specify the number of points on the response scale.

**SCALE NAME: Purchase Experience**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This four item, seven-point scale is intended to measure a consumer's perceived degree of experience in gathering information about a certain type of product and buying it.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale used by Wallace, Giese, and Johnson (2004) was not stated but it appears to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

Wallace, Giese, and Johnson (2004) reported the reliability of the scale to be .89.

**VALIDITY:**

Wallace, Giese, and Johnson (2004) provided evidence in support of the scale's validity. In particular, they showed that purchase experience was distinct from purchase involvement. The AVE of the scale was .66.

**REFERENCES:**

Wallace, David W., Joan L. Giese, and Jean L. Johnson (2004), "Customer Retailer Loyalty in the Context of Multiple Channel Strategies," *JR*, 80 (4), 249-263.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Compared to the general population, how would you rate your experience at researching and purchasing products of this sort?

1. researching
2. purchasing

Compared to others who buy this type of product, how would you rate your experience at researching and purchasing products of this sort?

3. researching
4. purchasing

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors for the items were *inexperienced* (1) and *experienced* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Purchase Intention****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is typically characterized by multiple Likert-like items used to measure the inclination of a consumer to buy a specified good or use a service. The various versions of the scale discussed here employed between two and four items. Most of the studies appear to have used seven-point response scales with the exception of Okechuku and Wang (1988) who used a nine point format. Stafford (1998) modified the statements for use with services and called the scale *conative attitude toward the ad*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of this scale is a study of the physical attractiveness of models in advertisements (Baker and Churchill 1977). Consistent with the tripartite theory of attitudes, scales were developed to measure the cognitive, affective, and conative components of one's evaluation of an ad. Item-total correlations indicated that the three items expected to capture the conative component (#1, #2, and #3 below) were homogeneous. It should be noted that while the scale was developed to measure the conative dimension of one's attitude toward an ad, the statements instead measure the conative dimension of attitude toward the brand. Technically, therefore, this scale does not measure behavioral intention towards an ad although it could be used with a product described in an ad.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .73, .91, .81, .81, .81, and .7338 have been reported by Kilbourne (1986), Kilbourne, Painton and Ridley (1985), Neese and Taylor (1994), Perrien, Dussart, and Paul (1985), Stafford (1998), and Stafford, Stafford, and Day (2002), respectively. Okechuku and Wang (1988) reported two alphas: .82 and .77 for clothing and shoe ads, respectively. Alphas of .73 (buying movies) and .69 (buying sunglasses) were reported by Griffith and Chen (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Neese and Taylor (1994) though they authors stated in general terms that they used item-total correlations and the results of a factor analyses to purify each of their scales.

The item-total correlations reported by Okechuku and Wang (1988) indicated that items composing this scale had much higher correlations with scores on this scale than with correlations with total scores on two other scales (cognitive and affective dimensions of attitude). This provides some evidence of convergent and discriminate validities although at the item level rather than the scale level.

As some evidence of content validity, Perrien, Dussart and Paul (1985) used items taken from the literature and tested with 15 marketing experts. All were unanimous in

## #483 Purchase Intention

connecting the expected items with the proper dimensions of attitude (affective, cognitive, and conative).

Stafford, Stafford, and Day (2002) presented the results of a CFA of the three items they used to measure purchase intention along with items for measuring five other constructs. All items loaded significantly on the appropriate factors.

### COMMENTS:

Several users of this scale referred to it as a semantic differential. However, it is described here as a Likert-type because it does not use a series of bi-polar adjectives but is instead composed of a series of statements responded to on a scale with the same verbal anchors.

### REFERENCES:

- Baker, Michael J. and Gilbert A. Churchill, Jr. (1977), "The Impact of Physically Attractive Models on Advertising Evaluations," *JMR*, 14 (November), 538-555.
- Griffith, David A. and Qimei Chen (2004), "The Influence of Virtual Direct Experience (VDE) on On-Line Ad Message Effectiveness," *JA*, 33 (1), 55-68.
- Kilbourne, William E. (1986), "An Exploratory Study of Sex Role Stereotyping on Attitudes Toward Magazine Advertisements," *JAMS*, 14 (4), 43-46.
- Kilbourne, William E., Scott Painton and Danny Ridley (1985), "The Effect of Sexual Embedding on Responses to Magazine Advertisements," *JA*, 14 (2), 48-56.
- Neese, William T. and Ronald D. Taylor (1994), "Verbal Strategies for Indirect Comparative Advertising," *JAR*, 34 (March/April), 56-69.
- Okechuku, Chike and Gongrong Wang (1988), "The Effectiveness of Chinese Print Advertisements in North America," *JAR*, 28 (October/November), 25-34.
- Perrien, Jean, Christian Dussart and Francoise Paul (1985), "Advertisers and the Factual Content of Advertising," *JA*, 14 (1), 30-35, 53.
- Stafford, Marla Royne (1998), "Advertising Sex-Typed Services: The Effects of Sex, Service Type, and Employee Type on Consumer Attitudes," *JA*, 27 (2), 65-82.
- Stafford, Marla Royne (2004), Personal Correspondence.
- Stafford, Marla Royne, Thomas F. Stafford and Ellen Day (2002), "A Contingency Approach: The Effects of Spokesperson Type and Service Type on Service Advertising Perceptions," *JA*, 31 (2), 17-34.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the version of the scale reported by Baker and Churchill (1977) and the anchors on the seven-point response scale were yes, *definitely* and no, *definitely not*. Kilbourne, Painton, and Ridley (1985), Kilbourne (1986), and Neese and Taylor (1994) used phrases based upon these items. Okechuku and Wang (1988) appear to have used short phrases based upon these items. Perrien, Dussart, and Paul (1985) used items that referred to an ad the respondents had been exposed to and then asked questions similar to these items. Their scale also incorporated one bi-polar adjective (*influential/not influential*) that was included to measure the perceived power of the ad to affect purchase behavior. Stafford (1998; 2004; Stafford, Stafford, and Day 2002) used #4 and items similar to #1 and #3 that were phrased as "I would ..." and used a seven-point *agree/disagree* response format. Griffith and Chen (2004) modified items #2 and #3 to produce two versions of the scale, one for buying movies and another for buying sunglasses. The anchors for their scales were *not likely* and *very likely*.

1. Would you like to try this \_\_\_\_\_?
2. Would you buy this \_\_\_\_\_ if you happened to see it in a store?
3. Would you actively seek out this \_\_\_\_\_ (in a store in order to purchase it)?
4. I would patronize this \_\_\_\_\_.

**SCALE NAME: Purchase Intention**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale measures the likelihood that a consumer will buy a product he/she is knowledgeable of. The measure was referred to as *willingness to buy* by Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991) as well as Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998). The version of the scale used by Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991) had five items whereas the ones used by Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998), Grewal et al.(1998), and Hardesty, Carlson, and Bearden (2002) had three.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991) stated that the items for this and two other scales were "developed from previous research" (p. 312) although the source of the items and the extent of the borrowing were not specified. Hardesty, Carlson, and Bearden (2002) cited Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998) as the source of the version of the scale they used.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was reported to have alphas of .97 and .96 for the two similar experiments in which they were used by Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991). Average inter-item correlations were .97 and .96.

Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998) reported construct reliabilities of .92 and .95 for use of the scale in their first and second studies, respectively. Grewal et al.(1998) reported that their version of the scale had a construct reliability of .92.

An alpha of .92 was reported for the version of the scale used by Hardesty, Carlson, and Bearden (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991) stated that the results of an exploratory factor analysis indicated a three factor solution was found using items from this scale and two others. The suggestion was that the items in this scale loaded on one factor.

Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998) provided considerable evidence from both of their studies in support of the scale's unidimensionality, convergent validity, and discriminant validity.

A variety of tests conducted by Grewal et al.(1998) indicated the scale was unidimensional and showed evidence of discriminant validity. The variance extracted was .92.

Similarly, in a CFA of several measures used in their study, Hardesty, Carlson, and Bearden (2002) provided evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity. The variance extracted was .80.

**REFERENCES:**

- Dodds, William B., Kent B. Monroe, and Dhruv Grewal (1991), "The Effects of Price, Brand, and Store Information on Buyers' Product Evaluations," *JMR*, 28 (August), 307-319.
- 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," *JM*, 62 (April), 46-59.
- Grewal, Dhruv, R. Krishnan, Julie Baker, and Norm Borin (1998), "The Effect of Store Name, Brand Name and Price Discounts on Consumers' Evaluations and Purchase Intentions," *JR*, 74 (3), 331-352.
- Hardesty, David M. (2004), Personal Correspondence.
- Hardesty, David M., Jay P. Carlson, and William O. Bearden (2002), "Brand Familiarity and Invoice Price Effects on Consumer Evaluations: The Moderating Role of Skepticism Toward Advertising," *JA*, 31 (2), 1-15.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The likelihood of purchasing this product is . . .
2. If I were going to buy this product, I would consider buying the model at the price shown.
3. At the price shown, I would consider buying the product.
4. The probability that I would consider buying the product is . . .
5. My willingness to buy the product is . . .
6. If I were going to buy a \_\_\_\_\_, the probability of buying this model is . . .
7. I would purchase this \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991) used items #1 to #5; Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998) used item #4 and #6 as well as one similar to #1. Grewal et al.(1998) used items #4 and #7 plus one similar to #3. Hardesty, Carlson, and Bearden (2002; Hardesty 2004) used items similar to #1, #2, and #4. Items #2, #3, and #7 had *strongly disagree/strongly agree* as anchors while the rest used *very low/very high*.

**SCALE NAME: Purchase Intention**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

It is a three-item, seven-point scale measuring the self-reported likelihood that a consumer will purchase a product based upon information he/she has read either on the product's package (in the case of something purchased in a supermarket) or on the menu (in the case of purchasing something a restaurant).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Burton, Garretson, and Velliquette (1999) have drawn inspiration from previous measures of intention, this scale appears to have been especially developed for use in their study. Kozup, Creyer, and Burton (2003) used the same scale with slight changes.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .89 was reported for the scale by Burton, Garretson, and Velliquette (1999). Kozup, Creyer, and Burton (2003) used the scale in three studies with the alphas ranging from .83 to .97.

**VALIDITY:**

No explicit analysis of the scale's validity was provided in the articles.

**REFERENCES:**

- Burton, Scot, Judith A. Garretson, and Anne M. Velliquette (1999), "Implications of Accurate Usage of Nutrition Facts Panel Information for Food Product Evaluations and Purchase Intentions," *JAMS*, 27 (4), 470-480.
- Kozup, John C., Elizabeth H. Creyer, and Scot Burton (2003), "Making Heathful Food Choices: The Influence of Health Claims and Nutrition Information on Consumers' Evaluations of Packaged Food Products and Restaurant Menu Items," *JM*, 67 (April), 19-34.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Would you be more likely or less likely to purchase the product, given the information shown?  
*more likely / less likely*
2. Given the information shown, how probable is it that you would consider the purchase of the product?  
*very probable / not probable*
3. How likely would you be to purchase the product, given the information shown?  
*very likely / very unlikely*

---

<sup>1</sup> Each of the items used by Burton, Garretson, and Velliquette (1999) included phrases such as "on the package" but were dropped at least for Study 2 and 3 by Kozup, Creyer, and Burton (2003) because the "information shown" referred to the featured item from a restaurant menu.

**SCALE NAME: Purchase Intention****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point Likert-type statements that are used to measure a customer's expressed likelihood of buying from a particular business (company or retailer) when the need for certain products arise again. Unlike most measures of purchase intention, this scale is focused on the probability of doing business with a specific marketer rather than the likelihood of buying a product.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although the items are similar to many that have been used previously to measure the same construct, the scale as a whole seems to be distinct enough that it is probably original to Maxham and Netemeyer (2002a, 2002b, 2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .91 was reported for the scale as used by Maxham and Netemeyer (2002a) with bank customers (Study 1) and new home buyers (Study 2). The same alpha was also found for customers of an electronics dealer in the study by Maxham and Netemeyer (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

For both of their studies, Maxham and Netemeyer (2002a) tested a measurement model including the items in this scale as well as those intended to measure six other constructs. The model fit very well. In addition, the scale met a stringent test of discriminant validity. Likewise, Maxham and Netemeyer (2003) entered the items in this scale along with 25 others, representing eight constructs in total, into a confirmatory factor analysis. Several tests of convergent and discriminant validity were apparently conducted and provided support for the each scale's validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Maxham and Netemeyer (2002b) as well as Netemeyer, Maxham, and Pullig (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2002a), "Modeling Customer Perceptions of Complaint Handling Over Time: The Effect of Perceived Justice on Satisfaction and Intent," *JR*, 78 (4), 239-252.
- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2002b), "A Longitudinal Study of Complaining Customers' Evaluations of Multiple Service Failures and Recovery Efforts," *JM*, 66 (October), 57-71.
- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2003), "Firms Reap What They Sow: the Effects of Shared Values and Perceived Organizational Justice on Customers' Evaluations of Complaint Handling," *JM*, 67 (January), 46-62.

## #486 *Purchase Intention*

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," *JM*, 69 (April), 130-143.

### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. In the future, I intend to use \_\_\_\_\_ for \_\_\_\_\_ purchases.
2. If you were in the market for \_\_\_\_\_, how likely would you be to use \_\_\_\_\_?
3. In the near future, I will not use \_\_\_\_\_ as my \_\_\_\_\_ provider. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the business should be placed in the short blank of each item while the name of the product category should go in the longer space. The phrasings used by Maxham and Netemeyer (2002a) with new home buyers were slightly different than those shown here. Also, according to Maxham and Netemeyer (2002a), the scale anchors for the items were: *strongly disagree/strongly agree* (#1), *very unlikely/very likely* (#2), and *improbably/probable* (#3).

**SCALE NAME: Purchase Intention**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point statements are used to measure a consumer's stated likelihood of buying a particular product/brand.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The origin of the scale used by Rodgers (2004) was not stated but she seems to have developed it herself. She used the scale to measure a consumer's intention to buy a product by the sponsor of a fabricated news website.

**RELIABILITY:**

Rodgers (2004) reported an alpha of .73 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No information was supplied by Rodgers (2004) regarding the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Rodgers, Shelly (2004), "The Effects of Sponsor Relevance on Consumer Reactions to Internet Sponsorships," *JA*, 32 (4), 67-76.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I'm likely to make a purchase / I'm unlikely to make a purchase
2. I would like to have more information / I would not like to have more information
3. I'm interested in \_\_\_\_\_ / I'm not interested in \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the company should be identified in the directions or scale stem. Likewise, the name of the product or brand of interest should be stated in the blanks of #3.

**SCALE NAME: Purchase Intention**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven point statements are used to measure a consumer's stated likelihood of buying a particular product that is being offered at a certain price.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Chandran and Morwitz (2005). Some of the key phrases can be found in other purchase intention scales but this set as a whole appears to be original to Chandran and Morwitz (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .89 (Chandran and Morwitz 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Chandran and Morwitz (2005) did not report any examination of the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Chandran, Sucharita and Vicki G. Morwitz (2005), "Effects of Participative Pricing on Consumers' Cognitions and Actions: A Goal Theoretic Perspective," *JCR*, 32 (September), 249-259.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. How likely are you to buy the product on offer?  
*highly unlikely / highly likely*
2. How probable is it that you will purchase the product on offer?  
*highly improbable / highly probable*
3. How certain is it that you will purchase this product?  
*highly uncertain / highly certain*
4. What chance is there that you will buy this product?  
*no chance at all / very good chance*

**SCALE NAME: Purchase Intention Toward the Product in the Ad**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point Likert-type statements are used to assess the likelihood of a person buying a brand featured in an advertisement if the person was in the market for such a product. Although Lepkowska-White, Brashear, and Weinberger (2003) called the scale *purchase intention* and that is used here as well, it is debatable if the name is appropriate when scale items are stated hypothetically.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's source was provided by Lepkowska-White, Brashear, and Weinberger (2003). However, it is clear that key phrases in these items can be found in more traditional purchase intention scales. (See #484.) Thus, it may be best to view this scale as being a modification of a previous scale.

The authors developed an English version of the scale for use with an American sample and a Polish version of the scale for use in Poland. The Polish version was apparently developed after the English version utilizing a double-back translation method.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .90 (English) and .89 (Polish) were reported for the scale by Lepkowska-White, Brashear, and Weinberger (2003; Lepkowska-White 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Little evidence was provided in support of the scale's validity though Lepkowska-White, Brashear, and Weinberger (2003) said that profile analysis indicated there was no response bias (Mullen 1995).

**COMMENTS:**

If a study's concern is with a brand rather than just a product category then it would be appropriate to change the phrase "product in the ad" in each item below to "brand in the ad."

**REFERENCES:**

- Lepkowska-White, Elzbieta (2005), Personal Correspondence.  
Lepkowska-White, Elzbieta, Thomas G. Brashear and Marc G. Weinberger (2003), "A Test of Ad Appeal Effectiveness in Poland and the United States: The Interplay of Appeal, Product and Culture," *JA*, 32 (3), 57-67.  
Mullen, Michael R. (1995), "Diagnosing Measurement Equivalence in Cross-National Research," *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26 (3), 573-596.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

*#489 Purchase Intention Toward the Product in the Ad*

1. If I were looking for this type of product my likelihood of purchasing the product in the ad would be high.
2. If I were to buy this type of product, the probability that I would consider buying the product in the ad would be high.
3. If had to buy this type of product, my willingness to buy the product in the ad would be high.

**SCALE NAME: Purchase Intention Toward the Product in the Ad**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point uni-polar items are used to measure a person's attitude about a certain website with a slight emphasis on the cognitive aspect of the attitude.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale's source was stated by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004). Given that, the authors probably developed the scale for use in this study.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .89 was reported by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was discussed by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004) but they did report the results of an exploratory factor analysis. Data were collected on twelve descriptors and the results indicated that the five composing this scale loaded together. Four of the other items loaded on another factor and were used to create another scale.

**REFERENCES:**

Sundar, Shyam S. and Sriram Kalyanaraman (2004), "Arousal, Memory and Impression-Formation Effects of Animation Speed in Web Advertising," *JA*, 33 (1), 7-17.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. informative
2. useful
3. positive
4. favorable
5. good

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale anchors used by Sundar and Kalyanaraman (2004) were *describes very poorly* and *describes very well*.

**SCALE NAME: Purchase Secrecy**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's experience with hiding from some particular person the fact that certain purchases have been made because that person would probably disagree with the purchases. The scale was called *deception* by Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) and was used with teens to determine if they hid purchases from their others.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) stated that they developed the scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

The construct reliability for the scale was reported by Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) to be .75.

**VALIDITY:**

The results of the initial confirmatory factor analysis conducted by Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) did not lead them to dropping any items from this scale. After dropping items from some other scales, a reanalysis showed that the measurement model produced a satisfactory fit. Evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity was provided as well.

**REFERENCES:**

Bristol, Terry and Tamara F. Mangleburg (2005), "Not Telling the Whole Story: Teen Deception in Purchasing," *JAMS*, 33 (1), 79-95.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I sometimes hide things I buy from my \_\_\_\_\_.
2. I sometimes buy things without telling \_\_\_\_\_ about it.
3. My \_\_\_\_\_ would be upset if he/she knew about some of the things I've bought.

---

<sup>1</sup> The role name of the person from whom the purchases are being hidden should be placed in the blank, e.g., husband, wife, mother, etc.

**SCALE NAME: Purchase-Related Communication (Parent's View)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven, five-point items are used to measure the degree to which a parent reports communicating with a child about products and purchases.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The use of these items as a multi-item measure appears to be original to Carlson and Grossbart (1988). However, ideas for some of the items came from the research of Moschis (1978, p. 45) as well as Ward, Wackman, and Wartella (1977).

**RELIABILITY:**

Carlson and Grossbart (1988) reported an alpha of .76 and a beta of .65 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of scale validity was reported by Carlson and Grossbart (1988).

**COMMENTS:**

See also Mangleburg, Doney, and Bristol (2004) where a subset of the items from this scale were modified for use with teens and their purchase-related discussions with friends.

**REFERENCES:**

- Carlson, Les and Sanford Grossbart (1988), "Parental Style and Consumer Socialization of Children," *JCR*, 15 (June), 77-94.
- Mangleburg, Tamara F., Patricia M. Doney, and Terry Bristol (2004), "Shopping with Friends and Teens' Susceptibility to Peer Influence," *JR*, 80 (2), 101-116.
- Moschis, George P. (1978), *Acquisition of the Consumer Role by Adolescents*, Research Monograph No. 82. Atlanta, Ga.: Publishing Services Division, College of Business Administration, Georgia State University.
- Ward, Scott, Daniel B. Wackman, and Ellen Wartella (1977), *How Children Learn to Buy*, Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, Inc.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. My children and I talk about buying things.
2. I ask my child his/her preference when I buy something for him/her.
3. I talk to him/her about how much products cost.

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors for the response scale are *very often* (1), *disagree* (2), *neither* (3), *agree* (4), and *never* (5).

*#492 Purchase-Related Communication (Parent's View)*

4. I talk to him/her about where different products can be bought.
5. To teach my child to become a consumer I lecture him/her on consumer activities.
6. To teach my child to become a consumer we discuss consumer decisions.
7. To teach my child to become a consumer I act as an example.

**SCALE NAME: Quality of the Brand****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale measures a person's evaluation of a brand with an emphasis on its quality relative to other brands. The scale was used in two slightly different ways by Keller and Aaker (1992). One version focused on the core brand while the other measured a person's evaluation of a proposed brand extension. (In the experimental scenario the company was only considering the introduction of the new product.) As used by Taylor and Bearden (2002), the object of the scale was a new product under development (brand extension). Kumar (2005a, 2005b) used the scale with respect to counterextensions.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information was provided by Keller and Aaker (1992) regarding the scale's origin but it is assumed to have been developed for use in their study. Taylor and Bearden (2002) stated that some of their items were similar to those used by Keller and Aaker (1992). Kumar (2005a, 2005b) did not state the source of his version of the scale. Admittedly, the items he used are among those that are in the long list of items that have been part of many brand attitude scales (#108). However, the scale's purpose makes it more similar to these measures.

**RELIABILITY:**

All that was said by Keller and Aaker (1992) about the reliability of the multi-item scales used in their study is that they were all in excess of .70. The version used by Taylor and Bearden (2002) had a construct reliability of .91. In each of the articles by Kumar (2005a, 2005b), he reported multiple uses his version, with the alphas ranging from .85 to .93 (2005a) and .90 to .93 (2005b). (These were separate studies with different samples.)

**VALIDITY:**

No specific examination of the scale's validity was reported by Keller and Aaker (1992). However, core brand quality was one of the experimental manipulations and, indeed, the high quality core brand was evaluated significantly higher than the average quality core brand.

Taylor and Bearden (2002) provided evidence of the scale's discriminant validity based on several different tests. No support for the scale's validity was provided by Kumar (2005a, 2005b).

**REFERENCES:**

- Keller, Kevin Lane and David A. Aaker (1992), "The Effects of Sequential Introduction of Brand Extensions," *JMR*, 29 (February), 35-50.
- Kumar, Piyush (2005a), "Brand Counterextensions: The Impact of Brand Extension Success Versus Failure," *JMR*, 42 (May), 183-194.

## #493 *Quality of the Brand*

Kumar, Piyush (2005b), "The Impact of Cobranding on Customer Evaluation of Brand Counterextensions," *JM*, 69 (July), 1-18.

Taylor, Valerie A. and William O. Bearden (2002), "The Effects of Price on Brand Extension Evaluations: The Moderating Role of Extension Similarity," *JAMS*, 30 (2), 131-140.

### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. low quality / high quality
2. not at all likely to try / very likely to try
3. inferior / superior
4. bad / good
5. worse than most brands / better than most brands
6. negative / positive
7. not likely to buy / very likely to buy

---

<sup>1</sup> Keller and Aaker (1992) used a seven-point response format and items #1 to #3. Taylor and Bearden (2002) used the phrase "*I believe that the \_\_\_\_\_ will be*" and items #1, #3, #4, and #5 with a nine-point response format. A seven-point format was used by Kumar (2005a, 2005b) along with items #1, #3, #6, and #7.

**SCALE NAME: Quality of the Clothing**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, five-point Likert-type items that measure a person's beliefs regarding the quality of a piece of clothing that the person has seen in an advertisement.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Chandrasekaran (2004). Even though key phrases in two of the items were also in a scale by Buchanan, Simmons, and Bickart (1999), the scale used by Chandrasekaran (2004) is different enough to be considered original.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .78 was reported for the scale by Chandrasekaran (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond showing the results of a factor analysis in which the items in this scale loaded together, Chandrasekaran (2004) did not provide any evidence in support of the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Buchanan, Lauranne, Carolyn J. Simmons, and Barbara A. Bickart (1999), "Brand Equity Dilution: Retailer Display and Context Brand Effects," *JMR*, 36 (August), 345-355.  
Chandrasekaran, Rajesh (2004), "The Influence of Redundant Comparison Prices and Other Price Presentation Formats on Consumers' Evaluations and Purchase Intentions," *JR*, 80 (1), 53-66.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The advertised product is likely to last for a reasonably long time.
2. It is unlikely that the advertised product will fit me comfortably. (r)
3. Overall, I think the advertised \_\_\_\_\_ are of good quality.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal product should be placed in the blank, e.g., jeans.

**SCALE NAME: Quality of the Food**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure a consumer's evaluation of a food product, with an emphasis on taste-related attributes.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Olsen (2002). Results of a pilot study along with ideas from the literature (Shepherd and Farleigh 1989) were used to identify a set of items for measuring food quality.

**RELIABILITY:**

The composite reliability of the scale was estimated for several different forms of fish in the study conducted by Olsen (2002) such as "fresh from a seafood store" and "frozen from the supermarket." Also, two ways of presenting the questions were tested. (See the article for description of these two structures.) The composite reliabilities were good in all cases ranging from .88 to .93 depending upon the form of the fish and the questionnaire structure.

**VALIDITY:**

Using CFA, Olsen (2002) provided evidence in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validity.

**COMMENTS:**

Because the scale was developed using Norwegian consumers and their thoughts about consuming fish, it may not perform as well with other food products nor in cultures where fish is less much less frequently consumed.

**REFERENCES:**

- Olsen, Svein Ottar (2002), "Comparative Evaluation and the Relationship Between Quality, Satisfaction, and Repurchase Loyalty," *JAMS*, 30 (3), 240-249.
- Shepherd, Richard and Cynthia A. Farleigh (1989), "Sensory Assessment of Foods and the Role of Sensory Attributes in Determining Food Choice," in *Handbook of the Psychophysiology of Human Eating*, Richard Shepherd, ed. New York: John Wiley, 25-36.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Taste: bad / good
2. Tenderness: dry / juicy
3. Texture: bad / good
4. Appearance: bad / delicate

**SCALE NAME: Quality of the Grocer's Products**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six, six-point items are used to measure a person's attitude regarding the variety and quality of products in a particular supermarket, with an emphasis on its fresh items such as produce and meat.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Gomez, McLaughlin, and Wittink (2004) said they got the data for their study from a publicly held supermarket chain operating in the eastern part of the United States. The chain included these items in the semi-annual survey that it conducted of its loyalty card customers. Additionally, several of these items are very similar to ones in a measure of quality used by two of the authors in an earlier study (Sirohi, McLaughlin, and Wittink 1998). (See V4, #352.)

**RELIABILITY:**

Gomez, McLaughlin, and Wittink (2004) reported an alpha of .91 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not apparently examined by Gomez, McLaughlin, and Wittink (2004). However, they did conduct an EFA of 21 items and the ones in this scale had high loadings ( $> .62$ ) on the same factor.

**REFERENCES:**

- Gomez, Miguel I., Edward W. McLaughlin, and Dick R. Wittink (2004), "Customer Satisfaction and Retail Sales Performance: An Empirical Investigation," *JR*, 80 (4), 265-278.
- Sirohi, Niren, Edward W. McLaughlin, and Dick R. Wittink (1998), "A Model of Consumer Perceptions and Store Loyalty Intentions for a Supermarket Retailer," *JR*, 74 (2), 223-245.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. variety of our produce department
2. quality of our produce department
3. overall store cleanliness inside
4. variety of fresh meat items
5. quality of our fresh meat items
6. availability of loyalty card specials

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors of the response scale were *poor* (1) and *excellent* (6).

**SCALE NAME: Quality of the Product**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of several Likert-type items used to measure the perceived quality of a product with an emphasis in several of the versions on the product's future performance (e.g., *durable, reliable, dependable*).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although similar to previous measures of product quality, the sets of items used by Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998) as well as Grewal et al. (1998) seem to be unique to their studies. The latter did have three items in common with the former as well as using three more items.

Both Sweeney, Soutar, and Johnson (1999) as well as Teas and Agarwal (2000) cited Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991) as the source of their versions of the scale. Suri and Monroe (2003) did not state the source of their scale but they seem to have drawn on one or more of the other studies cited here.

**RELIABILITY:**

Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998) reported construct reliabilities of .79 ( $n = 361$ ) and .77 ( $n = 328$ ) for use of the scale in their first and second studies, respectively. The composite reliability for the version of the scale used by Grewal et al. (1998) was .91 ( $n = 309$ ).

The alpha for the version used by Suri and Monroe (2003) was .70. An alpha of .93 was reported for the scale by Sweeney, Soutar, and Johnson (1999). Alphas of .94 (wristwatch) and .96 (calculator) were reported for the version of the scale used by Teas and Agarwal (2000).

**VALIDITY:**

A variety of evidence was provided by Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998) and Grewal et al. (1998) in support of the scale's unidimensionality, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. The variance extracted for the version of the scale used by Grewal et al. (1998) was .74.

Not much was said by Sweeney, Soutar, and Johnson (1999) about this scale's validity but it was stated in general that all their scales exhibited discriminant validity by having their variance extracted being higher than the relevant squared structural path coefficients (Fornell and Larcker 1981).

Results of the confirmatory factor analysis conducted by Suri and Monroe (2003) provided evidence for their scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The variance extracted was .50.

Teas and Agarwal (2000) showed for two sets of data that the items were unidimensional. Beyond this, no evidence bearing on the scale's validity was provided.

**REFERENCES:**

- Dodds, William B., Kent B. Monroe, and Dhruv Grewal (1991), "The Effects of Price, Brand, and Store Information on Buyers' Product Evaluations," *JMR*, 28 (August), 307-319.
- Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *JMR*, 18 (February), 39-50.
- Grewal, Dhruv, R. Krishnan, Julie Baker, and Norm Borin (1998), "The Effect of Store Name, Brand Name and Price Discounts on Consumers' Evaluations and Purchase Intentions," *JR*, 74 (3), 331-352.
- 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," *JM*, 62 (April), 46-59.
- Suri, Rajineesh and Kent B. Monroe (2003), "The Effects of Time Constraints on Consumers' Judgments of Prices and Products," *JCR*, 30 (June), 92-104.
- Sweeney, Jillian C., Geoffrey N. Soutar, and Lester W. Johnson (1999), "The Role of Perceived Risk in the Quality-Value Relationship: A Study in a Retail Environment," *JR*, 75 (1), 77-105.
- Teas, R. Kenneth and Sanjeev Agarwal (2000), "The Effects of Extrinsic Product Cues on Consumers' Perceptions of Quality, Sacrifice, and Value," *JAMS*, 28 (2), 278-290.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The \_\_\_\_\_ appears to be of good quality.
2. The \_\_\_\_\_ appears to be durable.
3. The \_\_\_\_\_ appears to be reliable.
4. The \_\_\_\_\_ appears to be dependable.
5. My image of the \_\_\_\_\_ is \_\_\_\_\_.
6. I view the \_\_\_\_\_ brand name positively.
7. The workmanship on this product would be good.
8. How certain are you that this \_\_\_\_\_ will perform satisfactorily?  
uncertain / certain

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product should be placed in the blanks. Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998) used items 1-3 and a seven-point response format. Grewal et al. (1998) used the first six items. The blank at the end of item 5 was not specified in the article but was likely to have been a positive descriptor such as *good*. Items #1, #3, and #8 with seven-point response formats composed the scale used by Suri and Monroe (2003). The version of the scale used by Sweeney, Soutar, and Johnson (1999) used #7 and items similar to #2-#4 with a seven-point Likert-type response format. Teas and Agarwal (2000) used items the same or similar to #1-#4 and #7.

**SCALE NAME: Quality of the Product**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point items are used in this scale to measure a person's attitude regarding the quality of a particular product/brand.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Sprott and Shimp (2004) drew inspiration from previous measures, the scale as a whole is distinct enough to be considered original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

Sprott and Shimp (2004) used the scale with two products in Study 1 and one product in Study 2. The alphas in Study 1 were described as being  $\geq 0.96$  and the alpha in Study 2 was .97.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Sprott and Shimp (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Sprott, David E. and Terence A. Shimp (2004), "Using Product Sampling to Augment the Perceived Quality of Store Brands," *JR*, 80 (4), 305-315.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. All things considered, I would say this \_\_\_\_\_ has:<sup>1</sup>  
*poor overall quality / excellent overall quality*
2. This product has:  
*very poor quality / very good quality*
3. Overall, this product is:  
*poor / excellent*

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the product/brand should be placed in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Quality of the Product**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, eleven-point semantic differentials are used to measure a consumer's attitude regarding the quality of a product with an emphasis on its perceived stability.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Adaval and Monroe (2002). It is striking, however, to note how the key terms in this scale's semantic differentials are the same as those in the Likert-type statements used by Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998).

**RELIABILITY:**

In Experiment 4 the scale had alphas of .5617 and .8579 for low- and high-priced products, respectively (Adaval and Monroe 2002; Adaval 2005). The low alpha for low-priced products is probably aberration since there is nothing about the items themselves that indicates a problem.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Adaval and Monroe (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Adaval, Rashmi (2005), Personal Correspondence.

Adaval, Rashmi and Kent B. Monroe (2002), "Automatic Construction and Use of Contextual Information for Product and Price Evaluations," *JCR*, 28 (March), 572-588.

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," *JM*, 62 (April), 46-59.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. extremely low quality / extremely high quality
2. very little durability / very high durability
3. very unreliable / very reliable

---

<sup>1</sup> The response scale used with these items ranged from -5 to 5 including a 0 (zero) point thus producing an eleven point scale.

**SCALE NAME: Quality of the Restaurant**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to assess a customer's attitude regarding the quality of food and service at a particular restaurant.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had an alpha of .88 (Hess, Ganesan, and Klein 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of this scale's validity was reported by Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003). However, the scale was used as a manipulation check and to the degree that the manipulation was successful that provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Hess, Jr., Ronald L, Shankar Ganesan, and Noreen M. Klein (2003), "Service Failure and Recovery: the Impact of Relationship Factors on Customer Satisfaction," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 127-145.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Based on the experiences we have described, please give your evaluations of the restaurant's performance.

1. The food and quality at this restaurant have been exceptional.
2. The quality of this restaurant's food and service has been poor. (r)
3. The quantity of the food and service provided by this restaurant in the past has been excellent.

**SCALE NAME: Reason Generation Difficulty**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three questions that are intended to measure the amount of difficulty a person has had in coming up with reasons for doing something.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source was not stated by Tybout et al. (2005) but it is likely to be original to them. In their study, subjects responded to the scale after being exposed to an ad for a car and then being asked to state some reasons for driving the car.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .82 (Experiment 1) and .76 (Experiment 2) were reported for the scale by Tybout et al. (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

While the validity of the scale was not directly discussed by Tybout et al. (2005), its successful use as a manipulation check provides some limited evidence of its predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Tybout, Alice M., Brian Sternthal, Prashant Malaviya, Georgios A. Bakamitsos, and Sebum Park (2005), "Information Accessibility as a Moderator of Judgments: The Role of Content versus Retrieval Ease," *JCR*, 32 (June), 76-85.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How difficult was it to generate reasons?
2. How annoying was it to generate reasons?
3. How confident were you about generating reasons?

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors for these items were *not at all* and *very much*.

**SCALE NAME: Reciprocity (Organization/Individual)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the degree to which a person believes that his/her support of a particular organization is truly appreciated.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale items were adapted by Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) from some of the items in a larger scale by Eisenberger et al. (1986) that was described as measuring organizational support.

**RELIABILITY:**

The internal consistency of the scale was reported by Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) to be .91.

**VALIDITY:**

Based on their measurement model, Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) provided support for the scale's convergent and discriminant validity. Its average variance extracted was .66.

**REFERENCES:**

- Arnett, Dennis B., Steve D. German, and Shelby D. Hunt (2003), "The Identity Salience Model of Relationship Marketing Success: The Case of Nonprofit Marketing," *JM*, 67 (April), 89-105.
- Eisenberger, Robert, Robin Huntington, Steven Hutchinson, and Deborah Sowa (1986), "Perceived Organizational Support," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71 (August), 500-507.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. values my contribution to its well-being.
2. appreciates any extra effort from me.
3. listens to any complaints I might have concerning \_\_\_\_\_.
4. would notice if I did something that benefited \_\_\_\_\_.
5. shows concern for me.
6. takes pride in my accomplishments.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem should provide the name of the focal organization to which each item is referring. The name of the organization should also be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Recycling (Social Norms)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, nine-point statements are used to measure a person's view of what other people he/she is familiar with think about recycling. The scale is amenable for specifying the type of people being described, e.g., students.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information was provided by Spangenberg et al. (2003) about the scale's origin. It would appear to have been developed by them for their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .77.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported.

**REFERENCES:**

Spangenberg, Eric R., David E. Sprott, Bianca Grohmann, and Ronn J. Smith (2003), "Mass-Communicated Prediction Requests: Practical Application and Cognitive Dissonance Explanation for Self-Prophecy," *JM*, 67 (July), 47-62.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ I know recycle.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ I know think it's important to recycle.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ I know should recycle those items that can be recycled.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ I know are concerned about issues related to recycling.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of a group of people can be placed in the blank to focus the respondent's attention on the social norms of a particular reference group rather than trying to describe some large, vague group.

**SCALE NAME: Refund Claim Likelihood**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point statements are used to measure a consumer's perceptions regarding the inclination of other customers to want a refund from a store if they find a product they bought there to be cheaper elsewhere. Although not part of the scale *per se*, the scenario that subjects read before completing the scales described a store with a disguised name as explicitly having a price matching guarantee.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Srivastava and Lurie (2004) but it appears to have been developed by them.

**RELIABILITY:**

A Cronbach's alpha of .82 was reported for this scale (Srivastava and Lurie 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Srivastava and Lurie (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Srivastava, Joydeep and Nicholas H. Lurie (2004), "Price-matching Guarantees as Signals of Low Store Prices: Survey and Experimental Evidence," *JR*, 80 (2), 117-128.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. It is very likely that most people will claim a refund from \_\_\_\_\_ if they find a product that they bought at \_\_\_\_\_ for a lower price elsewhere.
2. Most people will not claim a refund if they find a product that they bought at \_\_\_\_\_ for a lower price elsewhere. (r)
3. The likelihood of most consumers claiming a refund if they find a lower price at another store is:

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal store should be placed in the blanks. The verbal anchors for the response scale are *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (7) for items #1 and #2. For item #3, the anchors are *very low* (1) and *very high* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Regret (Decision)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, ten-point statements measuring the degree to which a person wishes a decision could be changed and how much happiness the change would bring.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not described by Inman and Zeelenberg (2002) but it appears to be origin to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas for the scale as used in Study 1 by Inman and Zeelenberg (2002) were .75, .73, and .76 for airline, backpack, and hotel decision scenarios, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Inman and Zeelenberg (2002).

**COMMENTS:**

As used by Inman and Zeelenberg (2002), the scale items were stated hypothetically since subjects were responding to scenarios rather than reacting to real experiences.

**REFERENCES:**

Inman, Jeffrey J. and Marcel Zeelenberg (2002), "Regret in Repeat Purchase versus Switching Decisions: The Attenuating Role of Decision Justifiability," *JCR*, 29 (June), 116-128.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How much would you regret your decision to \_\_\_\_\_?  
*Not regret at all/regret very much*
2. If you could do it over, would you change your decision?  
*Definitely would not change/definitely would change*
3. How much happier would you have been if you had made a different decision?  
*Not much happier/much happier*

---

<sup>1</sup> A phrase should be added here such as "switch to \_\_\_\_\_," "stay with \_\_\_\_\_," or "purchase \_\_\_\_\_" with the name of the brand put in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Relational Bonds (Financial)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, seven-point Likert-type statements intended to measure a person's belief that a certain business offers financial rewards to its customers in order to motivate repeat purchases.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

When developing their three measures of relational bonds, Hsieh, Chiu, and Chiang (2005) drew inspiration from several past studies but revised items for the context of their study. Given that, the final versions of the scales appear to be original to Hsieh, Chiu, and Chiang (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

Hsieh, Chiu, and Chiang (2005) reported an alpha of .90 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses supported the expected three dimensional structure of the data. Further, analyses provided evidence of convergent and discriminant validity for the three scales. The average variance extracted for the financial bond scale was .69.

**REFERENCES:**

Hsieh, Yi-Ching, Hung-Chang Chiu, and Mei-Yi Chiang (2005), "Maintaining and Committed Online Customer: A Study Across Search-Experience-Credence Products," *JR*, 81 (1), 75-82.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I can receive presents when I join the loyalty program.
2. The \_\_\_\_\_ offers discounts to encourage future purchasing.
3. The \_\_\_\_\_ provides discounts for loyal customers.
4. The \_\_\_\_\_ provides cumulative points programs.

---

<sup>1</sup> A one or two word description of the business should be placed in the blank, e.g., e-tailer, vendor, store.

**SCALE NAME: Relational Bonds (Social)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has nine, seven-point Likert-type statements that are intended to measure a person's belief that a certain business offers the opportunity for interpersonal interaction and friendship between the business and the customer as well as customer-to-customer. Although the scale was developed for use with an online store, it seems to be amenable for use with brick-and-mortar retailers as well if they have websites with social features.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

When developing their three measures of relational bonds, Hsieh, Chiu, and Chiang (2005) drew inspiration from several past studies but revised items for the context of their study. Given that, the final versions of the scales appear to be original to Hsieh, Chiu, and Chiang (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

Hsieh, Chiu, and Chiang (2005) reported the social bonds scale to have an alpha of .85.

**VALIDITY:**

Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses supported the expected three dimensional structure of the data. Further, analyses provided evidence of convergent and discriminant validity for the three scales. The average variance extracted for the social bond scale was .65.

**REFERENCES:**

Hsieh, Yi-Ching, Hung-Chang Chiu, and Mei-Yi Chiang (2005), "Maintaining and Committed Online Customer: A Study Across Search-Experience-Credence Products," *JR*, 81 (1), 75-82.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The \_\_\_\_\_ keeps in touch with me.
2. The \_\_\_\_\_ knows me.
3. I receive special treatment after I become a member.
4. The communities sponsored by the \_\_\_\_\_ provide me product information.
5. The \_\_\_\_\_ is concerned with my needs.
6. The \_\_\_\_\_ collects my opinions about services.
7. The \_\_\_\_\_ sends me greeting cards or gifts on special days.
8. The \_\_\_\_\_ sponsors communities for customers.
9. I can share my opinions on the Web site.

---

<sup>1</sup> A one or two word description of the business should be placed in the blank, e.g., e-tailer, vendor, store.

**SCALE NAME: Relational Bonds (Structural)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Eight, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's belief that a certain business offers goods, services, and helpful purchase information that are not readily available elsewhere. Although the scale was developed for use with an online store, it appears to be amenable for use with brick-and-mortar retailers as well if they have websites.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

When developing their three measures of relational bonds, Hsieh, Chiu, and Chiang (2005) drew inspiration from several past studies but revised items for the context of their study. Given that, the final versions of the scales appear to be original to Hsieh, Chiu, and Chiang (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .83 was reported for the scale (Hsieh, Chiu, and Chiang 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses conducted by Hsieh, Chiu, and Chiang (2005) supported the expected three dimensional structure of the data. Further, analyses provided evidence of the convergent and discriminant validity for the three scales. The average variance extracted for the structural bond scale was .70.

**REFERENCES:**

Hsieh, Yi-Ching, Hung-Chang Chiu, and Mei-Yi Chiang (2005), "Maintaining and Committed Online Customer: A Study Across Search-Experience-Credence Products," *JR*, 81 (1), 75-82.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I can order customized services or goods from the \_\_\_\_\_.
2. The \_\_\_\_\_ provides after-sales service for my requirements.
3. The \_\_\_\_\_ provides complete knowledge about the goods/services.
4. The \_\_\_\_\_ integrates goods or services from other sources to solve my problem.
5. The \_\_\_\_\_ provides professional knowledge about the industry.
6. I can retrieve full knowledge from the Web site.
7. The \_\_\_\_\_ resolves problems that I encounter.
8. The \_\_\_\_\_ provides clear instructions.

---

<sup>1</sup> A one or two word description of the business should be placed in the blank, e.g., e-tailer, vendor, store.

**SCALE NAME: Relative Advantage of the Product**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the degree to which a consumer believes that a good or service is better at some function than other products. Because this is one of the five key characteristics that are thought to influence adoption of innovations (Rogers 2003), the construct is most typically examined with respect to new products rather than mature ones.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Meuter et al. (2005) but they drew some key phrases and concepts from a scale by Moore and Benbasat (1991).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .95 was reported by Meuter et al. (2005) for use of the scale in both of their studies.

**VALIDITY:**

At a general level, Meuter et al. (2005) tested a measurement model containing all of their constructs and indicators. Its fit was acceptable. The factor loadings were reported to be significant and evidence of discriminant validity was provided for each construct using two different tests (confidence interval, variance extracted).

**REFERENCES:**

- Meuter, Matthew L., Mary Jo Bitner, Amy L. Ostrom, and Stephen W. Brown (2005), "Choosing Among Alternative Service Delivery Modes: An Investigation of Customer Trial of Self-Service Technologies," *JM*, 69 (April), 61-83.
- Moore, Gary C. and Izak Benbasat (1991), "Development of an Instrument to Measure the Perceptions of Adopting an Information Technology Innovation," *Information Systems Research*, 2 (3), 192-223.
- Rogers, Everett M. (2003), *Diffusion of Innovations*, New York: The Free Press.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Using the \_\_\_\_\_ improves the \_\_\_\_\_.
2. Overall, I believe using the \_\_\_\_\_ is advantageous.
3. I believe the \_\_\_\_\_, in general, is the best way to \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the good or service should be placed in the blank of #2 and the first blanks of #1 and #3. The second blank of #1 and #3 should be filled with a brief description of the product's function, e.g., order a prescription refill (Meuter et al. 2005).

**SCALE NAME: Relevance of the Information**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure the extent to which some product information to which a consumer has been exposed is viewed as being helpful in making a product evaluation. The emphasis appears to be on the content of the information versus the form/style in which it is presented. The scale was referred to as *diagnosticity* by Ahluwalia (Ahluwalia 2002; Ahluwalia, Unnava, and Burnkrant 2001) as well as Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale is not clear. Based on the information provided by Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000), the measure would appear to be original to their study. However, Ahluwalia, Unnava, and Burnkrant (2001) and Ahluwalia (2002) cited Klar (1990) as the source of the scale. While there are some differences between their two versions, the similarities between the items are so striking that it seems unlikely that they originated from totally different sources.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .90, .70, and .80 were reported for the versions of the scale used by Ahluwalia (2002), Ahluwalia, Unnava, and Burnkrant (2001), and Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000), respectively. Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004) used the scale twice, once with product-related arguments ( $\alpha = .93$ ) and once with regard to information about a company ( $\alpha = .97$ ).

**VALIDITY:**

No evidence of the scale's validity was reported in any of the studies.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Gurhan-Canli (2003) as Agrawal and Maheswaran (2005) where the same or a similar scale was used.

**REFERENCES:**

- Agrawal, Nidhi and Durairaj Maheswaran (2005), "Motivated Reasoning in Outcome-Bias Effects," *JCR*, 31 (March), 798-805.
- Ahluwalia, Rohini (2002), "How Prevalent Is the Negativity Effect in Consumer Environments?" *JCR*, 29 (September), 270-279.
- Ahluwalia, Rohini, H. Rao Unnava, and Robert E. Burnkrant (2001), "The Moderating Role of Commitment on the Spillover Effect of Marketing Communications," *JMR*, 38 (Nov), 458-470.
- Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep (2003), "The Effect of Expected Variability of Product Quality and Attribute Uniqueness on Family Brand Evaluations," *JCR*, 30 (June), 105-114.

Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep and Rajeev Batra (2004), "When Corporate Image Affects Product Evaluations: The Moderating Role of Perceived Risk," *JMR*, 41 (2), 197-205.

Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep and Durairaj Maheswaran (2000), "Determinants of Country-of-Origin Evaluations," *JCR*, 27 (1), 96-108.

Klar, Yecheil (1990), "Linking Structures and Sensitivity to Judgment-Relevant Information in Statistical and Logical Reasoning Tasks," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59 (5), 841-858.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Please indicate the degree to which the information provided was relevant or irrelevant for your evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_ products.  
*Irrelevant / relevant*
2. Please indicate the degree to which the information was useful in your evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_ products.  
*The information was of no use / the information was of great use*
3. Please indicate the degree to which the information provided was indicative of how good or bad \_\_\_\_\_ products are.  
*Not at all indicative / very indicative*

---

<sup>1</sup> The blanks were filled by Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000) with a phrase indicating a country-of-origin and a class of products, e.g., Taiwanese electronic products. By leaving that part of the statements out the scale can be used in a wider variety of situations where the interest is just in the relevance of some product information rather than anything related to where the product was made. The semantic differentials used by Ahluwalia (Ahluwalia 2002; Ahluwalia, Unnava, and Burnkrant 2001) were very similar to those shown above but it is not known if the stems shown with each item were used or if, instead, a general set of directions was provided. Likewise, all that is known about the items used by Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004) is that two of their semantic differentials were like those shown here (#1 and #2) but the stems were not described in the article. Also, the semantic-differential they used for #3 was *the information was not diagnostic at all / very diagnostic*.

**SCALE NAME: Relevance of the Product Attribute**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three semantic differentials are used to measure how important and useful something is to a consumer. As used by Miyazaki, Grewal, and Goodstein (2005), the scale was meant to measure a product attribute's salience to a consumer in an evaluation task. However, it appears the items are generic enough to be used in a variety of contexts.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not expressly stated by Miyazaki, Grewal, and Goodstein (2005), the scale appears to be original to them. It was used in Study 5 of their series of studies regarding the price-quality relationship.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas for the scale used by Miyazaki, Grewal, and Goodstein (2005) were .96 with respect to a product's price and .90 with respect to the product's warranty.

**VALIDITY:**

No information about the scale's validity was provided in the article by Miyazaki, Grewal, and Goodstein (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Miyazaki, Anthony D., Dhruv Grewal, and Ronald C. Goodstein (2005), "The Effect of Multiple Cues on Quality Perceptions: A Matter of Consistency," *JCR*, 32 (June), 146-153.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. not very relevant / very relevant
2. not very useful / very useful
3. not at all important / very important

**SCALE NAME: Religion Importance**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six, seven-point Likert-type statements assessing the centrality of religion in one's life. The items are not denomination specific nor do they stress any particular behaviors, e.g., attending church.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005) used a scale by Putney and Middleton (1961) with very slight word changes to the items. That scale was one of four scales Putney and Middleton (1961) offered for measuring the dimensions of religious ideology. Evidence of the scale's criterion validity was provided.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .91 (Burroughs and Rindfleisch 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Using LISREL, Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) provided general validation evidence for all of the scales they used.

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.  
Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.  
Putney, Snell and Russell Middleton (1961), "Dimensions and Correlates of Religious Ideologies," *Social Forces*, 39 (4), 285-290.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. My religion is one of the most important parts of my philosophy of life.
2. Religion is a subject in which I am not particularly interested. (r)
3. My ideas on religion have a big influence on my views in other areas.
4. My religion forms an important basis for the kind of person I want to be.
5. Were I to think about religion differently, my whole life would be very different.
6. I often think about religious matters.

**SCALE NAME: Repatronage Intention**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a customer expects to visit a particular business in the future and continue the relationship indefinitely.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003) said they had adapted a scale by Lusch and Brown (1996) and, indeed, the latter measured the same construct in a business-to-business context. (See V3, #825.) Ultimately, there are only a couple of phrases that are the same in the two scales, thus, it may be best to view this scale as original.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had an alpha of .78 (Hess, Ganesan, and Klein 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale and several others were examined by Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003) using confirmatory factor analysis. A strong fit was found for the measurement model and it provides some evidence of this scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Hess, Jr., Ronald L, Shankar Ganesan, and Noreen M. Klein (2003), "Service Failure and Recovery: the Impact of Relationship Factors on Customer Satisfaction," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 127-145.

Lusch, Robert F. and James R. Brown (1996), "Interdependency, Contracting, and Relational Behavior in Marketing Channels," *JM*, 60 (October), 19-38.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I expect to be coming to this \_\_\_\_\_ for a long time.
2. I do not expect to visit this \_\_\_\_\_ in the future. (r)
3. I expect my relationship with this \_\_\_\_\_ to be enduring.
4. It is likely that I will visit this \_\_\_\_\_ in the future.

---

<sup>1</sup> The type of business should be stated in the blanks, e.g., restaurant (Hess, Ganesan, and Klein 2003).

**SCALE NAME: Repatronage Intention**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point semantic differentials are used in the scale to measure the degree to which a customer expresses an intention to shop at a store/website or use a particular company's services again in the indefinite future.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Hui et al. (2004) did not indicate the origin of the scale but it appears to be original to their work.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .96 was reported for the scale (Hui et al. 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Hui et al. (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Hui, Michael K., Xiande Zhao, Xiucheng Fan, and Kevin Au (2004), "When Does the Service Process Matter? A Test of Two Competing Theories," *JCR*, 31 (September), 465-475.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. likely / unlikely
2. definitely yes / definitely no
3. inclined to / not inclined to

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem was not reported by Hui et al. (2004) but could have been something like this: *Using the items below, please indicate the likelihood that you would buy from this same company again.*

**SCALE NAME: Resource Demands**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point statements are used to assess the level of difficulty a person has with processing a specified stimulus. The object presented to subjects in the experiment by Zhu and Meyers-Levy (2005) was a radio commercial.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Zhu and Meyers-Levy (2005) did not state the source of the scale. Although some phrases in the scale can be found in previous measures of similar constructs, this set of items seems to be original to Zhu and Meyers-Levy (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .86 was reported for the scale (Zhu and Meyers-Levy 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Zhu and Meyers-Levy (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Zhu, Rui (Juliet) and Joan Meyers-Levy (2005), "Distinguishing Between the Meanings of Music: When Background Music Affects Product Perceptions," *JMR*, 42 (August), 333-345.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The \_\_\_\_\_ was difficult to understand.
2. I expended a lot of effort to understand the \_\_\_\_\_.
3. The \_\_\_\_\_ was hard to grasp.

---

<sup>1</sup> Abbreviated versions of the items were provided in the article by Zhu and Meyers-Levy (2005) and have been expanded here to what they were assumed to have been like in the questionnaire. The blanks should be filled with the name or brief description of the focal stimulus. The verbal anchors for the scale were *not at all* (1) and *extremely* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Response Difficulty****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This four item, seven point scale is intended to measure the perceived cognitive effort involved in answering a question. The scale was referred to by a variety of names: the *effort index* by Menon, Raghurir, and Schwarz (1995), the *accessibility manipulation* by Raghurir and Menon (1998), the *cognitive effort index* by Menon, Block, and Ramanathan (2002), and the *difficulty index* by Menon and Raghurir (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not perfectly clear, the scale appears to have been used first by Menon, Raghurir, and Schwarz (1995) and was apparently developed for use in that study.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was used in four studies reported by Menon and Raghurir (2003) with the alphas ranging from .87 (Study 2, n = 92) to .91 (Study 1, n = 143). Alphas of .80 and .83 (n = 177) were reported by Menon, Raghurir, and Schwarz (1995) for the scale as used with regard to a question about regular behaviors and irregular behaviors, respectively. The scale was used in Studies 2 and 3 by Raghurir and Menon (1998) and alphas of .84 (n = 76) and .90 (n = 109), respectively, were reported. In Study 3 by Menon, Block, and Ramanathan (2002) the scale had to do with coming up with risk estimates for behaviors and had an alpha of .83.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was discussed in any of the studies. However, to the extent that the scale performed successfully as a manipulation check in the four studies by Menon and Raghurir (2003), it provides some evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Menon, Geeta and Priya Raghurir (2003), "Ease-of-Retrieval as an Automatic Input in Judgements: A Mere-Accessibility Framework?" *JCR*, 30 (September), 230-243.
- Menon, Geeta, Lauren G. Block, and Suresh Ramanathan (2002), "We're At As Much Risk As We Are Led to Believe: Effects of Message Cues on Judgments of Health Risk," *JCR*, 28 (March), 533-549.
- Menon, Geeta, Priya Raghurir, and Norbert Schwarz (1995), "Behavioral Frequency Judgments: An Accessibility-Diagnosticity Framework," *JCR*, 22 (September), 212-228.
- Raghurir, Priya (2000), Personal Correspondence.

## #516 Response Difficulty

Raghubir, Priya and Geeta Menon (1998), "AIDS and Me, Never the Twain Shall Meet: The Effects of Information Accessibility on Judgments of Risk and Advertising Effectiveness," *JCR*, 25 (June), 52-63.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

Directions: The following questions pertain to how effortful you found the task. For each scale, please circle the number that best corresponds with your opinion.

1. How would you rate the LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY of responding to this question?  
*Not at all / Very difficult*
2. How would you rate the AMOUNT OF EFFORT it took you to respond to this question?  
*No effort / A lot of effort*
3. How would you rate the AMOUNT OF TIME it took you to respond to this question?  
*No time / A lot of time*
4. How would you rate the AMOUNT OF THOUGHT you had to put into responding to this question?  
*No thought / A lot of thought*

---

<sup>1</sup> Raghubir and Menon (1998; Raghubir 2000) used the items as shown and a seven-point response format. Menon, Block, and Ramanathan (2002) appear to have used the same or something very similar. The exact phrasing and structure of the scale was not described in the article by Menon, Raghubir, and Schwarz (1995) but is likely to have been very similar to this as well.

**SCALE NAME: Results of Store's High Prices**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point statements are used to measure a consumer's attitude regarding the monetary costs a company will incur if it has high prices. In the study by Srivastava and Lurie (2004), the "costs" referred to a price matching guarantee that was described in a scenario that subjects read before completing the scale.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Srivastava and Lurie (2004) but it appears to have been developed by them.

**RELIABILITY:**

A Cronbach's alpha of .80 was reported for this scale (Srivastava and Lurie 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Srivastava and Lurie (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Srivastava, Joydeep and Nicholas H. Lurie (2004), "Price-matching Guarantees as Signals of Low Store Prices: Survey and Experimental Evidence," *JR*, 80 (2), 117-128.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ is likely to incur substantial monetary costs if its prices are actually high.
2. If \_\_\_\_\_ has high prices, the monetary costs that it will have to bear are:
3. \_\_\_\_\_ will incur little or no costs if it has high prices. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal store should be placed in the blanks. The verbal anchors for the response scale are *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly disagree* (7) for items #1 and #3. For item #2, the anchors are *very low* (1) and *very high* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Risk (Financial)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has six, seven-point Likert-type statements that are used to measure the degree to which a person perceives there to be risk in buying a certain product due to the financial consequences involved.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although DelVecchio and Smith (2005) drew somewhat upon previous research, this scale is original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .827 was reported for the scale by DelVecchio and Smith (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond the implication that the items for this scale loaded together in a factor analysis of the study's many items, no information regarding the scale's validity was reported by DelVecchio and Smith (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

DelVecchio, Devon and Daniel C. Smith (2005), "Brand-Extension Price Premiums: The Effects of Perceived Fit and Extension Product Category Risk," *JAMS*, 33 (2), 184-196.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Considering the investment involved, purchasing a \_\_\_\_\_ would be risky.
2. Given the financial expenses associated with purchasing a \_\_\_\_\_, there is substantial financial risk.
3. I would worry about the cost of purchasing a \_\_\_\_\_.
4. Given the financial commitment, I may regret purchasing a \_\_\_\_\_.
5. I could lose a significant amount of money if I ended up with a \_\_\_\_\_ that didn't work.
6. Due to the financial commitment, I am unlikely to buy a \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The blank in each sentence indicates where the focal product name/description should go.

**SCALE NAME: Risk (Food Product Quality)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point statements are used to measure the probability that a specified perishable food item found in a grocery store will decrease in quality as it nears its printed expiration date. If one accepts the two component view of perceived risk (e.g., Bauer 1960; Cox 1967), then this scale most heavily taps into the uncertainty component as opposed to the consequences component.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale appears to have been developed by Tsiros and Heilman (2005). Initially, their desire was to measure the six theoretical types of risk (e.g., Jacoby and Kaplan 1972; Roselius 1971). However, exploratory factor analyses for six food categories indicated that items used to measure each of the types of risk reduced to two factors. The items originally intended to measure the functional, performance, and physical risks loaded together and were combined to produce a scale the authors called *product quality risk*. The items intended to measure the psychological, social, and financial risks loaded highest on another factor and were used to make a scale referred to as *personal risk*.

**RELIABILITY:**

Tsiros and Heilman (2005) used the scale with six food items and reported the alphas to range from .70 (lettuce and milk) to .81 (yogurt).

**VALIDITY:**

Apart from the exploratory factor analyses mentioned above, no evidence regarding the scale's validity was reported by Tsiros and Heilman (2005).

**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.
- Jacoby, Jacob and Leon B. Kaplan (1972), "The Components of Perceived Risk," in *Association for Consumer Research*, M. Venkatesan, ed. College Park, MD: Association for Consumer Research, 382-393.
- Roselius, Ted (1971), "Consumer Rankings of Risk Reduction Methods," *JM*, 35 (January), 56-61.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors were *very unlikely* (1) and *very likely* (5).

*#519 Risk (Food Product Quality)*

1. How likely is it that the following product will not meet your expectations as it approaches its expiration date?
2. How likely is it that the quality of the following product gets worse as the product approaches its expirations date?
3. How likely is it that consuming a spoiled product of the following grocery item may lead to a health risk?

**SCALE NAME: Risk (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, nine-point Likert-type statements that measure the degree to which a person views the purchase of a particular product in the next year to have negative consequences (unspecified).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Laroche et al. (2005) implied that the scale they used was the same as one used by Stone and Grønhaug (1993). A comparison of the two indicates that while a phrase or two are similar, no items are in common. Thus, it may be best to say the scale is original to Laroche et al. (2005) and they developed it based on inspiration received from the work of Stone and Grønhaug (1993).

**RELIABILITY:**

In Experiment 1, Laroche et al. (2005) reported the scale's alpha to be .813.

**VALIDITY:**

No information was provided by Laroche et al. (2005) regarding the scale's validity. However, it did appear that the measurement model fit the data well.

**REFERENCES:**

- Laroche, Michel, Zhiyong Yang, Gordon H.G. McDougall, and Jasmin Bergeron (2005), "Internet versus Bricks-and-Mortar Retailers: An Investigation into Intangibility and Its Consequences," *JR*, 81 (4), 251-267.
- Stone, Robert N. and Kjell Grønhaug (1993), "Perceived Risk: Further Considerations for the Marketing Discipline," *European Journal of Marketing*, 27 (3), 39-50.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. There is a good chance I will make a mistake if I purchase \_\_\_\_\_.
2. I have a feeling that purchasing \_\_\_\_\_ will really cause me lots of trouble.
3. I will incur some risk if I buy \_\_\_\_\_ in the next twelve months.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ is a very risky purchase.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the generic product should be placed in the blank.

## #521 Risk (Performance)

### **SCALE NAME: Risk (Performance)**

### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three statements with a nine-point Likert-type response format are used to measure the degree to which a person believes that the purchase of a specified product involves high performance risk. Given the phrasing of the items, the scale is appropriate when respondents are evaluating the risk of buying a new version of a product versus the “regular” or “standard” version.

### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although conceptually similar to several previous measures of the same construct, this scale appears to have a unique origin. It is assumed that Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004) developed it for their studies.

### **RELIABILITY:**

A Cronbach’s alpha of 0.82 was reported by Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004) for this scale.

### **VALIDITY:**

Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004) did not report any examination of the scale’s validity. However, since the scale was used successfully as a manipulation check, that provides some evidence of its concurrent validity.

### **REFERENCES:**

Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep and Rajeev Batra (2004), “When Corporate Image Affects Product Evaluations: The Moderating Role of Perceived Risk,” *JMR*, 41 (2), 197-205.

### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The decision to purchase a(n) \_\_\_\_\_ involves high risk.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ has the same chance as regular \_\_\_\_\_ of not performing as expected. (r)
3. The likelihood of \_\_\_\_\_ performing as expected is significantly lower than the likelihood of standard \_\_\_\_\_ performing as expected.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name for the product category should be placed in the blanks. The focal product in the studies by Gürhan-Canli and Batra (2004) was a HDTV.

**SCALE NAME: Risk (Performance)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the degree to which a person perceives there to be risk in buying a certain product due to doubt that it will satisfactorily perform the tasks for which it is intended.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although DelVecchio and Smith (2005) drew inspiration from previous research, this scale is original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .745 was reported for the scale by DelVecchio and Smith (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond the implication that the items for this scale loaded together in a factor analysis of the study's many items, no information regarding the scale's validity was reported by DelVecchio and Smith (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

DelVecchio, Devon and Daniel C. Smith (2005), "Brand-Extension Price Premiums: The Effects of Perceived Fit and Extension Product Category Risk," *JAMS*, 33 (2), 184-196.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am certain that a \_\_\_\_\_ would work satisfactorily. (r)
2. You are likely to have problems with the performance of your \_\_\_\_\_.
3. If a \_\_\_\_\_ malfunctions, the consequences can be fairly severe.
4. Buying the wrong \_\_\_\_\_ can lead to very negative outcomes.
5. You need to be careful when buying a \_\_\_\_\_ since a lot can go wrong when you use it.
6. There is little that can go wrong when using a \_\_\_\_\_. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The blank in each sentence indicates where the focal product name/description should go.

**SCALE NAME: Risk (Personal)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, five-point items that are supposed to measure the probability that a product will not perform as expected for reasons that could be viewed as “personal.” (See Origin below for more details.) If one accepts the two component model of perceived risk (e.g., Bauer 1960; Cox 1967), then this scale most heavily taps into the uncertainty component as opposed to the consequences component. Given the phrasing of the items, it is most suited for use with perishable foods.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale appears to have been developed by Tsiros and Heilman (2005). Initially, their desire was to individually measure six theoretically distinct types of risk (e.g., Jacoby and Kaplan 1972; Roselius 1971). However, exploratory factor analyses for six perishable food categories indicated that items used to measure each of the types of risk reduced to two factors. The items originally intended to measure functional, performance, and physical risks loaded together and were combined to produce a scale the authors called *product quality risk*. The items intended to measure psychological, social, and financial risks loaded highest on another factor and were used to make a scale referred to as *personal risk*.

**RELIABILITY:**

Tsiros and Heilman (2005) used the scale with six perishable food items and reported the alphas to range from .71 (milk and chicken) to .75 (carrots).

**VALIDITY:**

Apart from the exploratory factor analyses mentioned above, no evidence regarding the scale’s validity was reported by Tsiros and Heilman (2005).

**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.
- Jacoby, Jacob and Leon B. Kaplan (1972), “The Components of Perceived Risk,” in *Association for Consumer Research*, M. Venkatesan, ed. College Park, MD: Association for Consumer Research, 382-393.
- Roselius, Ted (1971), “Consumer Rankings of Risk Reduction Methods,” *JM*, 35 (January), 56-61.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. How likely are you to think less of yourself as an experienced shopper if you were to buy the following grocery item and then find that it did not meet your standards of quality?
2. How likely would guests in your home be to think less of you for serving them a poor quality product?
3. How likely would you be to feel financial angst from paying for the following product and then having it not perform up to its expectation?

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors were *very unlikely* (1) and *very likely* (5).

**SCALE NAME: Risk of Self-Service Technology**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the degree of uncertainty a consumer has about using self-service technology to perform a function and concern that unacceptable results could occur.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Meuter et al. (2005) for the studies they conducted.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .85 and .87 were reported by Meuter et al. (2005) for use of the scale in Studies 1 and 2, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

At a general level, Meuter et al. (2005) tested a measurement model containing all of their constructs and indicators. Its fit was acceptable. The factor loadings were reported to be significant and evidence of discriminant validity was provided for each construct using two different tests (confidence interval, variance extracted).

**REFERENCES:**

Meuter, Matthew L., Mary Jo Bitner, Amy L. Ostrom, and Stephen W. Brown (2005), "Choosing Among Alternative Service Delivery Modes: An Investigation of Customer Trial of Self-Service Technologies," *JM*, 69 (April), 61-83.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I fear using the self-service technology reduces the confidentiality of my \_\_\_\_\_ history.
2. I am unsure if the self-service technology performs satisfactorily.
3. Using the self-service technology infringes on my \_\_\_\_\_ privacy.
4. Overall, using the self-service technology is risky.

---

<sup>1</sup> The type of data being communicated should be named in the blanks, e.g., medical, financial, family.

**SCALE NAME: Sadness****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Eight, seven-point, one word descriptors are used to assess the strength of the sadness-related emotions reported by a person as a result of exposure to some stimulus. Using the same items but slightly different instructions, another version of the scale measured emotions depicted by someone else or in something else. The stimuli examined by Williams and Aaker (2002) were print ads but the scale appears to be amenable for use with a variety of stimuli.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Williams and Aaker (2002) developed the scale based upon items from several sources, particularly scales by Edell and Burke (1987) and Westbrook and Oliver (1991).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was used in several studies reported by Williams and Aaker (2002) with alphas ranging from .87 to .93.

**VALIDITY:**

No specific examination of the scale's validity was reported by Williams and Aaker (2002). However, some sense of the scale's predictive validity comes from noting that an ad intended to evoke sadness did indeed produce significantly greater sadness than happiness and an ad intended to evoke happiness produced significantly greater happiness than sadness.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Williams and Drolet (2005) where a subset of this scale's items are used to measure a person's emotional reaction to an ad's appeal.

**REFERENCES:**

- Edell, Julie E. and Marian C. Burke (1987), "The Power of Feelings in Understanding Advertising Effects," *JCR*, 14 (December), 421-33.
- Westbrook, Robert A. and Richard L. Oliver (1991), "The Dimensionality of Consumption Emotion Patterns and Consumer Satisfaction," *JCR*, 18 (June), 84-91.
- Williams, Patti and Jennifer L. Aaker (2002), "Can Mixed Emotions Peacefully Coexist?" *JCR*, 28 (March), 636-649.
- Williams, Patti and Aimee Drolet (2005), "Age-Related Differences in Response to Emotional Advertisements," *JCR*, 32 (December), 343-354.

## #525 Sadness

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. downhearted
2. sad
3. depressed
4. regretful
5. lonely
6. distressed
7. discouraged
8. sorrowful

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors used for the seven-point response scale by Williams and Aaker (2002) were *not at all* and *very strongly*. See experiment 2 by Williams and Aaker (2002) for two versions of the directions (*felt* vs. *depicted*).

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction (General)****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The seven-point semantic differential scale measures a consumer's degree of satisfaction with an object. The scale may be most suited for measuring a consumer's satisfaction with another party with whom a transaction has occurred or relationship has developed. The parties studied with this scale have been car salespeople (Oliver and Swan 1989a), hairstylists (Price and Arnould 1999; Bansal, Taylor, and James 2005), clothing/accessories salespeople (Reynolds and Beatty 1999a, 1999b), banks (Jones, Mothersbaugh, and Beatty 2000), and auto repair facility (Bansal, Irving, and Taylor 2004; Bansal, Taylor, and James 2005; Thomas, Vitell, Gilbert, and Rose 2002).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Oliver and Swan (1989a and 1989b) was adapted from a seven item version of the scale discussed in Westbrook and Oliver (1981). There it was generated and used in measuring consumer satisfaction with cars and with calculators. Four other satisfaction measures were used as well and their results compared in a multi-trait multi-method matrix. Convenience samples of students were used from two different universities. In terms of internal consistency, the alphas were .91 or greater as measured for the two products and the two samples. For both products and samples, the scale showed strong evidence of construct validity by converging with like constructs and discriminating between unlike constructs.

The version of the scale used by Price and Arnould (1999) is similar to that used by Oliver and Swan (1989a and 1989b) but may have drawn upon phrasings from other satisfaction scales.

Reynolds and Beatty (1999a, 1999b) stated that they modified a scale developed by Ganesan (1994). Indeed, it is very similar (see V. III, #865) but it is also remarkably similar to those listed here which have been used with ultimate consumers rather than with channel partners.

**RELIABILITY:**

The reliability of the version of the scale use by Jones, Mothersbaugh, and Beatty (2000) was .98 (both alpha and composite). The estimate of reliability provided by LISREL in Oliver and Swan (1989a) was .953 and had to do with a customer's expressed satisfaction with a car salesperson. LISREL estimates of .97 and .96 were reported for the scale when used to measure the consumer's satisfaction with the dealer and the salesperson, respectively (1989b).

Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) as well as Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) reported that their scales had alphas of .97. Alphas of .97 (Study 3) and .95 (Study 4) were reported for the scale by Price and Arnould (1999) with regard to clients' satisfaction with their hairstylists. Reynolds and Beatty (1999a) reported composite reliabilities of .94 and .97 for satisfaction with a salesperson and a company, respectively. In Reynolds and Beatty (1999b), the alphas were .86 (sales associate) and .89 (store).

## #526 Satisfaction (General)

Alphas of .962 (pretest) and .975 (main study) were reported by Thomas, Vitell, Gilbert, and Rose (2002).

### **VALIDITY:**

Based on the CFA and other tests that were conducted on this and other scales, Jones, Mothersbaugh, and Beatty (2000) concluded that their version of the scale was unidimensional and showed evidence of discriminant validity. In addition, the scale was reported to have a variance extracted of .91.

A claim of convergent validity was made by Reynolds and Beatty (1999a) based upon the significance of the scales'  $\lambda$  loadings. Evidence of the discriminant validity of their two satisfaction measures (salesperson and company) came from noting that the variance extracted for each was much higher than the correlation between them.

Although Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) reported that the items in their satisfaction scale were unidimensional, they also reported that the items and those used to measure another construct (trust) did not have discriminant validity since they loaded on a single factor in principal components analysis.

Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) used both exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis to refine the many scales in their study. Once some poorly loading items for other scales were eliminated, the model fit the data. They also provided further evidence of the scale's convergent validity based on factor loadings and squared multiple correlations.

### **COMMENTS:**

See Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003) for a modification of the scale for a restaurant context.

### **REFERENCES:**

- Bansal, Harvir S., P. Gregory Irving, and Shirley F. Taylor (2004), "A Three-Component Model of Customer Commitment to Service Providers," *JAMS*, 32 (3), 234-250.
- Bansal, Harvir S., Shirley F. Taylor, and Yannik St. James (2005), "Migrating' to New Service Providers: Toward a Unifying Framework of Consumers' Switching Behaviors," *JAMS*, 33 (1), 96-115.
- Ganesan, Shankar (1994), "Determinants of Long-Term Orientation in Buyer-Seller Relationships," *JM*, 58 (April), 1-19.
- Hess, Jr., Ronald L, Shankar Ganesan, and Noreen M. Klein (2003), "Service Failure and Recovery: the Impact of Relationship Factors on Customer Satisfaction," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 127-145.
- Jones, Michael A., David L. Mothersbaugh, and Sharon E. Beatty (2000), "Switching Barriers and Repurchase Intentions in Services," *JR*, 79 (2), 259-274.
- Oliver, Richard L. and John E. Swan (1989a), "Consumer Perceptions of Interpersonal Equity and Satisfaction in Transactions: A Field Survey Approach," *JM*, 53 (April), 21-35.
- Oliver, Richard L. and John E. Swan (1989b), "Equity and Disconfirmation Perceptions as Influences on Merchant and Product Satisfaction," *JCR*, 16 (December), 372-383.

- Price, Linda L. and Eric J. Arnould (1999), "Commercial Friendships: Service Provider-Client Relationships in Context," *JM*, 63 (October), 38-56.
- Reynolds, Kristy E. and Sharon E. Beatty (1999a), "Customer Benefits and Company Consequences of Customer-Salesperson Relationships in Retailing," *JR*, 75 (1), 11-32.
- Reynolds, Kristy E. and Sharon E. Beatty (1999b), "A Relationship Customer Typology," *JR*, 75 (4), 509-523.
- Thomas, James L., Scott J. Vitell, Faye W. Gilbert, and Gregory M. Rose (2002), "The Impact of Ethical Cues on Customer Satisfaction with Service," *JR*, 78 (3), 167-173.
- Westbrook, Robert A. and Richard L. Oliver (1981), "Developing Better Measures of Consumer Satisfaction: Some Preliminary Results," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 8, Kent B. Monroe, ed., Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 94-99.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

Directions: Please indicate how satisfied you were with your \_\_\_\_\_ by checking the space that best gives your answer.

1. displeased me / pleased me
2. disgusted with / contented with
3. very dissatisfied with / very satisfied with
4. did a poor job for me / did a good job for me
5. poor choice in buying from that \_\_\_\_\_ / wise choice in buying from that \_\_\_\_\_
6. unhappy with / happy with
7. bad value / good value
8. frustrating / enjoyable
9. very unfavorable / very favorable

---

<sup>1</sup> The studies tended to use seven-point response formats except for Jones, Mothersbaugh, and Beatty (2000) who used ten. The scale by Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) as well as Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) had items similar to #1-#4 and #6; Oliver and Swan (1989a and 1989b) used items 1 to 6; Price and Arnould (1999) used item 7 and some phrases similar to 1, 3 to 6; Reynolds and Beatty (1999a, 1999b) used item 8 and others similar to 1, 2, and 6; and Jones, Mothersbaugh, and Beatty (2000) used items 1, 2, 3, 6, and 9. Thomas, Vitell, Gilbert, and Rose (2002) used items that were slight variations of #1-#6.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

In its fullest form, the scale is composed of twelve Likert-type items and measures a consumer's degree of satisfaction with a product he/she has recently purchased. Most of its uses have been in reference to the purchase of cars but Mano and Oliver (1993) appear to have adapted it so as to be general enough to apply to whatever product a respondent was thinking about. Mattila and Wirtz (2001) adapted a short version of the scale to measure customers' satisfaction with a shopping experience. Seven of the items were modified by Hausman (2004) for use with the patient-physician encounter.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was originally generated and used by Westbrook and Oliver (1981) to measure consumer satisfaction with cars and with calculators. Four other satisfaction measures were used as well and their results compared in a multi-trait multi-method matrix. Convenience samples of students were used from two different universities ( $n = 68 + 107$ ). In terms of internal consistency, the alphas were .93 and .96 as measured for cars in the two samples. For both samples, the scale showed strong evidence of construct validity by converging with like constructs and discriminating between unlike constructs. Compared to the other measures of satisfaction, this Likert version produced the greatest dispersion of individual scores while maintaining a symmetrical distribution.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .95, .98, .94, and .94 were reported for the scale by Mano and Oliver (1993), Oliver (1993), Oliver and Swan (1989b), and Westbrook and Oliver (1991), respectively. Oliver, Rust, and Varki (1997) reported that the reliabilities were .89 and .87 in their first and second studies, respectively. The version of the scale used by Mattila and Wirtz (2001) had an alpha of .72. The seven-item adaptation of the scale by Hausman (2004) had alphas ranging from .79 to .94, with an alpha of .85 for the combined samples.

**VALIDITY:**

Examination of scale's validity was rarely reported in the studies. However, Mano and Oliver (1993) performed a factor analysis which provided evidence that the scale was unidimensional. Using CFA, evidence was provided by Hausman (2004) in support of her scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**COMMENTS:**

See Wolfinbarger and Gilly (2003) where the authors modified five of this scale's items in order to measure satisfaction with a consumer's most recent online purchase at a website.

**REFERENCES:**

- Hausman, Angela (2004), "Modeling the Patient-Physician Service Encounter: Improving Patient Outcomes," *JAMS*, 32 (4), 403-417.
- Mano, Haim and Richard L. Oliver (1993), "Assessing the Dimensionality and Structure of the Consumption Experience: Evaluation, Feeling, and Satisfaction," *JCR*, 20 (December), 451-466.
- Mattila, Anna S. and Jochen Wirtz (2001), "Congruency of Scent and Music as a Driver of In-store Evaluations and Behaviour," *JR*, 77 (2), 273-289.
- Oliver, Richard L. (1993), "Cognitive, Affective, and Attribute Bases of the Satisfaction Response," *JCR*, 20 (December), 418-430.
- Oliver, Richard L., Roland T. Rust, and Sajeev Varki (1997), "Customer Delight: Foundations, Findings, and Managerial Insight," *JR*, 73 (3), 311-336.
- Oliver, Richard L. and John E. Swan (1989b), "Equity and Disconfirmation Perceptions as Influences on Merchant and Product Satisfaction," *JCR*, 16 (December), 372-383.
- Westbrook, Robert A. and Richard L. Oliver (1981), "Developing Better Measures of Consumer Satisfaction: Some Preliminary Results," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 8, Kent B. Monroe, ed. Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 94-99.
- Westbrook, Robert A. and Richard L. Oliver (1991), "The Dimensionality of Consumption Emotion Patterns and Consumer Satisfaction," *JCR*, 18 (June), 84-91.
- Wolfinger, Mary and Mary C. Gilly (2003), "eTailQ: Dimensionalizing, Measuring and Predicting eTail Quality," *JR*, 79 (3), 183-198.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. This is one of the best \_\_\_\_\_ I could have bought.
2. This \_\_\_\_\_ is exactly what I need.
3. This \_\_\_\_\_ hasn't worked out as well as I thought it would. (r)
4. I am satisfied with my decision to buy this \_\_\_\_\_.
5. Sometimes I have mixed feelings about keeping it. (r)
6. My choice to buy this \_\_\_\_\_ was a wise one.
7. If I could do it over again, I'd buy a different make/model. (r)
8. I have truly enjoyed this \_\_\_\_\_.
9. I feel bad about my decision to buy this \_\_\_\_\_. (r)
10. I am not happy that I bought this \_\_\_\_\_. (r)
11. Owning this \_\_\_\_\_ has been a good experience.
12. I'm sure it was the right thing to buy this \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mano and Oliver (1993), Oliver (1993), and Westbrook and Oliver (1981) used five-point scales whereas Oliver and Swan (1989) used a seven-point format. Oliver, Rust, and Varki (1997) only used ten of these items (unspecified) and a five-point response scale. Mattila and Wirtz (2001) used seven-point items adapted from #4, #6, and #8. Hausman (2004) used a five-point response format with adjusted phrasings of items #1, #2, #4, #6-#8, and #10.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has multiple semantic differentials measuring a consumer's degree of satisfaction with some stimulus. The scale has been used with regard to: insurance agents, service policies, insurance agencies (Crosby and Stephens 1987); shopping (Eroglu and Machleit 1990); a retail store and an airline (Nijssen et al. 2003; Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol 2002); and, a camcorder (Spreng, MacKenzie, and Olshavsky 1996).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Based upon the statements (or lack thereof) made by the scale users the origin of the scale is unknown. Given that none of the uses described here is exactly the same it is quite possible they are all original to the studies in which they were used though they have enough in common to suggest there might have been some common origin and building upon proceeding studies.

**RELIABILITY:**

Crosby and Stephens (1987) reported the alphas for the scales in both waves to be over .96. The scale was completed for five different levels of retail density in the study by Eroglu and Machleit (1990). Alphas of .94, .91, .90, .93, .87 were reported for the least to most dense retail conditions, respectively. No alpha was reported by Spreng, MacKenzie, and Olshavsky (1996) but average variance extracted was indicated to be .85. Alphas of .94 (retail) and .96 (airline) were reported by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002); an alpha of .94 was reported by Nijssen et al. (2003) when those samples were merged. Niedrich, Kiryanova, and Black (2005) reported alphas of .96 (restaurant) and .97 (university instructor) for their version of the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Crosby and Stephens (1987) provided some evidence of their scale's predictive validity by comparing the satisfaction level of four known groups which varied on their policy status. The four groups were: those who paid the premium and stayed with the same company, those for whom the policy was still in force but had not paid the next year's premium yet, those who switched to a different company, and those whose policy lapsed and had not replaced it with another. The means for each of those groups in wave one on the overall satisfaction scale were 5.94, 5.29, 4.99, and 4.79, respectively. This shows that the scale gave an accurate indication of what the policy owners' actual behavior.

The confirmatory factor analysis by Nijssen et al. (2003) showed a good fit and evidence was provided in support of their scales' convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for this scale was .84.

Eroglu and Machleit (1990), Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002), and Spreng, MacKenzie, and Olshavsky (1996) did not address the validity of their scales. The latter

used confirmatory factor analysis to develop their measurement model which suggests that at the very least a test of the scale's unidimensionality was made though the results were unreported.

**COMMENTS:**

The version of the scale used by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) and Nijssen et al. (2003) seems to be the same one used by Agustin and Singh (2005). In fact, the latter may have used the same database as the former two. See also a two-item version used by Wallace, Giese, and Johnson (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Agustin, Clara and Jagdip Singh (2005), "Curvilinear Effects of Consumer Loyalty Determinants in Relational Exchanges," *JMR*, 42 (February), 96-108.

Crosby, Lawrence A. and Nancy Stephens (1987), "Effects of Relationship Marketing on Satisfaction, Retention, and Prices in the Life Insurance Industry," *JMR*, 24 (November), 404-411.

Eroglu, Segin A. and Karen A. Machleit (1990), "An Empirical Study of Retail Crowding: Antecedents and Consequences," *JR*, 66 (Summer), 201-221.

Niedrich, Ronald W., Elena Kiryanova, and William C. Black (2005) (2005), "The Dimensional Stability of the Standards Used in the Disconfirmation Paradigm," *JR*, 81 (1), 49-57.

Nijssen, Edwin, Jagdip Singh, Deepak Sirdeshmuk, and Hartmut Holzmüller (2003), "Investigating Industry Context Effects in Consumer-Firm Relationships: Preliminary Results from a Dispositional Approach," *JAMS*, 31 (1), 46-60.

Spreng, Richard A., Scott B. MacKenzie, and Richard W. Olshavsky (1996), "A Reexamination of the Determinants of Consumer Satisfaction," *JM*, 60 (July), 15-32.

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

Wallace, David W., Joan L. Giese, and Jean L. Johnson (2004), "Customer Retailer Loyalty in the Context of Multiple Channel Strategies," *JR*, 80 (4), 249-263.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. satisfied / dissatisfied
2. pleased / displeased
3. favorable / unfavorable
4. pleasant / unpleasant
5. I like it very much / I didn't like it at all
6. contented / frustrated
7. delighted / terrible

Crosby and Stephens (1987): 1, 2, 3 7-point

Eroglu and Machleit (1990): 1\*, 2, 4, 5 7-point

Niedrich, Kiryanova, and Black (2005): 1\*, 2\*, 6\*, 7\* 11-point

Nijssen et al. (2003): 1\*, 4\*, 7\* 10-point

**#528 Satisfaction (General)**

Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002): 1\*, 4\*, 7\* 10-point  
Spreng, MacKenzie, and Olshavsky (1996): 1\*, 2\*, 6, 7

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, ten-point statements that assess the extent to which a consumer is satisfied with something. The phrasing is probably more suited for measuring satisfaction with an organization (manufacturer, retailer) than with an individual product. Magi (2003) used it with respect to a grocery store.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Magi (2003) drew inspiration from previous attempts to measure satisfaction, this scale seems to be original to her.

**RELIABILITY:**

Magi (2003) reported an alpha of .84 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No information about the scale's validity was reported by Magi (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Magi, Anne W. (2003), "Share of Wallet in Retailing: the Effects of Customer Satisfaction, Loyalty Cards and Shopper Characteristics," *JR*, 79 (2), 97-106.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How satisfied are you with your primary \_\_\_\_\_?  
*very dissatisfied / very satisfied*
2. How well does your primary \_\_\_\_\_ match your expectations?  
*not at all / completely*
3. Imagine a perfect \_\_\_\_\_. How close to this ideal is your primary \_\_\_\_\_?  
*not at all close / very close*

---

<sup>1</sup> The object of the study should be stated in the blanks, e.g., grocery store.

## #530 Satisfaction (Voter)

**SCALE NAME:** Satisfaction (Voter)

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four item, seven-point Likert-type scale is intended to measure a voter's satisfaction with politics and election outcomes, particularly as it relates to the person's expectations.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although O'Cass (2002) stated the he scale was adapted from a satisfaction scale by Evrard and Aurier (1996), a comparison of the two scales indicates that they are different enough that it may be more accurate to say that O'Cass' scale is original.

**RELIABILITY:**

The internal consistency of the scale was .86 (O'Cass 2002, 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

The evidence provided by O'Cass (2002) for the scale's discriminant validity came from showing that the internal consistency of the scale was greater than every other scale in the study, a technique previously used by Gaski (1984).

**REFERENCES:**

- Evrard, Yves and Philippe Aurier (1996), "Identification and Validation of the Components of the Person-Object Relationship," *Journal of Business Research*, 37, (2), 127-134.
- O'Cass, Aron (2002), "Political Advertising Believability and Information Source Value During Elections," *JA*, 31 (1), 63-73.
- O'Cass, Aron (2004), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. In relation to my expectations, I am satisfied with the party I voted for at the last \_\_\_\_\_ election.
2. In relation to my expectations, I am satisfied with the politician I voted for at the last \_\_\_\_\_ election.
3. In relation to my expectations, I am satisfied with \_\_\_\_\_ politics in general.
4. In relation to my expectations, I am satisfied with political parties in general in \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> While the statements could be used as is, the measure would benefit from having descriptors in the blanks that could give some focus for the beliefs such as helping the respondent to think about *local*, *state*, or *national* elections.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Car Brand**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven items with a seven-point scale are used to measure a customer's level of satisfaction with several aspects of a brand of car.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale seems to have been developed by Brown et al. (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

Brown et al. (2005) reported an alpha of .85 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Using confirmatory factor analysis, Brown et al. (2005) provided evidence in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Brown, Tom J., Thomas E. Barry, Peter A. Dacin, and Richard F. Gunst (2005), "Spreading the Word: Investigating Antecedents of Consumers' Positive Word-of-Mouth Intentions and Behaviors in a Retailing Context," *JAMS*, 33 (2), 123-138.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: How satisfied are you with the following aspects of \_\_\_\_\_?

1. appearance
2. safety
3. price
4. quality
5. power
6. features
7. durability

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the brand of car should be placed in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Car Dealership**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Ten, seven-point items are used to measure a customer's level of satisfaction with several aspects of a relationship with a dealership where he/she has purchased a car.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale seems to have been developed by Brown et al. (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

Brown et al. (2005) reported an alpha of .94 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Using confirmatory factor analysis, Brown et al. (2005) provided evidence in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities. Although one test caused concern about the scale's discriminant validity with another scale (word-of-mouth intentions), another test was supportive enough that the authors said they were confident that each of constructs had discriminant validity with each other.

**REFERENCES:**

Brown, Tom J., Thomas E. Barry, Peter A. Dacin, and Richard F. Gunst (2005), "Spreading the Word: Investigating Antecedents of Consumers' Positive Word-of-Mouth Intentions and Behaviors in a Retailing Context," *JAMS*, 33 (2), 123-138.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Directions: Please indicate your satisfaction with the following aspects of the dealership?

1. overall quality of the dealership
2. effectiveness of salespeople
3. trustworthiness of the dealership
4. dealership management
5. service department honesty
6. quality of service performed
7. appearance of the dealership
8. customer treatment by the employees
9. customer amenities
10. ethics of business practices

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Choice of Service Provider**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four item scale measures the degree to which a customer is pleased with a decision that was made regarding the selection of service provider.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

A couple of the items are very similar to some in a scale originally developed by Westbrook and Oliver (1981). However, this scale is different enough that it is probably best to view it as original to Patterson and Smith (2003). Additionally, they used a two-country (two language), multi-stage process to develop and refine their measures.

**RELIABILITY:**

Patterson and Smith (2003) reported alphas for three different types of service providers that ranged from .92 to .96 in Australia and from .91 to .95 in Thailand.

**VALIDITY:**

With the results of confirmatory factor analysis and other tests, Patterson and Smith (2003) provided support for the unidimensionality as well as the convergent and discriminant validities of their scales. Average variances extracted ranged from .87 to .90 in Australia and from .74 to .78 in Thailand.

**REFERENCES:**

- Patterson, Paul G. and Tasman Smith (2003), "A Cross-Cultural Study of Switching Barriers and Propensity to Stay with Service Providers," *JR*, 79 (2), 107-120.
- Westbrook, Robert A. and Richard L. Oliver (1981), "Developing Better Measures of Consumer Satisfaction: Some Preliminary Results," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 8, Kent B. Monroe, ed., Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 94-99.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am happy with my decision to use this \_\_\_\_\_.
2. My choice of \_\_\_\_\_ was a wise one.
3. I feel good about my decision to use this \_\_\_\_\_.
4. Taking everything into consideration, how do you feel about the service you received from \_\_\_\_\_.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Details regarding the response format were not provided by Patterson and Smith (2003). Except for #4, it was likely to have been a five- or seven-point Likert-type response scale. The blanks in #1 and #3 should have the phrase *service provider* or something like it while the blanks in #2 and #4 should give the provider's name.

<sup>2</sup> As with the other items, Patterson and Smith (2003) did not describe the response scale anchors. They were likely something like *very dissatisfied* and *very satisfied*.

## #534 *Satisfaction with Company (Post-Complaint)*

### **SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Company (Post-Complaint)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the level of satisfaction a consumer expresses towards the purchase of product from a company to which he/she had complained.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Homburg and Fürst (2005) received inspiration from previous work by others, this scale is unique and was developed by them for their study.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

The alpha and composite reliability for this scale were both .94 (Homburg and Fürst 2005).

#### **VALIDITY:**

Homburg and Fürst (2005) used confirmatory factor analysis and examined the discriminant validity of their scales with two different tests. No problems were found with any of them.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Homburg, Christian and Andreas Fürst (2005), "How Organizational Complaint Handling Drives Customer Loyalty: An Analysis of the Mechanistic and the Organic Approach," *JM*, 69 (July), 95-114.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Overall, the purchase of the product from this company was a good decision.
2. Overall, after the complaint, I was very satisfied with the company.
3. Overall, so far, I have had positive experiences with this company.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem used with the items was "To what extent do you agree with the following statements?"

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Complaint Process**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, five-point Likert-type statements that measure the satisfaction level of a customer with the manner in which a company has handled his/her complaint.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Homburg and Fürst (2005) received inspiration from previous work by others, particularly Maxham and Netemeyer (2002), this scale is unique and was developed by them for their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha and composite reliability for this scale were both .94 (Homburg and Fürst 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Homburg and Fürst (2005) used confirmatory factor analysis and examined the discriminant validity of their scales with two different tests. No problems were found with any of them.

**REFERENCES:**

- Homburg, Christian and Andreas Fürst (2005), "How Organizational Complaint Handling Drives Customer Loyalty: An Analysis of the Mechanistic and the Organic Approach," *JM*, 69 (July), 95-114.
- 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," *JR*, 78 (4), 239-252.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I was not satisfied with the handling of my complaint. (r)
2. I had a positive experience when complaining to this company.
3. I was very satisfied with the complaint handling of the company.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale stem used with the items was "To what extent do you agree with the following statements?"

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Educational Institution**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the degree to which a person is satisfied with the institution where one received some education.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) indicated that they had adapted their scale from one by Westbrook and Oliver (1981). However, comparison of the two sets of items shows that they are so different that it is probably more accurate to describe Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) as being the source of their scale though they received conceptual inspiration from the work of Westbrook and Oliver (1981).

**RELIABILITY:**

The internal consistency of the scale was reported by Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) to be .84.

**VALIDITY:**

Based on their measurement model, Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) provided support for the scale's convergent and discriminant validity. Its average variance extracted was .64.

**REFERENCES:**

- Arnett, Dennis B., Steve D. German, and Shelby D. Hunt (2003), "The Identity Salience Model of Relationship Marketing Success: The Case of Nonprofit Marketing," *JM*, 67 (April), 89-105.
- Westbrook, Robert A. and Richard L. Oliver (1981), "Developing Better Measures of Consumer Satisfaction: Some Preliminary Results," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 8, Kent B. Monroe, ed., Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 94-99.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

I am satisfied with . . .

1. the education I received while at \_\_\_\_\_.
2. the facilities at \_\_\_\_\_ when I was a student.
3. the manner in which I was treated as a student at \_\_\_\_\_.
4. how \_\_\_\_\_ prepared me for a career.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the school or university should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Encounter**

The scale is composed of six, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure how positive a customer reports a recent “encounter” to have been. The encounter examined by Dolen et al. (2002) was between a customer and a salesperson in a retail store.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The items used by Dolen et al. (2002) were adapted from items that had been used by Oliver (1997, p. 343) and others for many years. (See #527 for more information about the original version of that scale.) Dolen et al. (2002) used the scale with both customers and salespeople.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .88 was reported by Dolen et al. (2002) for use of the scale with customers.

**VALIDITY:**

Although Dolen et al. (2002) used CFA to examine the psychometric quality of some of the other scales in their study, the CFA did not include this scale and no information about this scale’s validity was provided.

**REFERENCES:**

Dolen, Willemijn van, Jos Lemmink, Ko de Ruyter, and Ad de Jong (2002), “Customer-Sales Employee Encounters: A Dyadic Perspective,” *JR*, 78 (4), 265-279.  
Oliver, Richard L. (1997), *Satisfaction, a Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. This was one of the best encounters I could have had.
2. This encounter was exactly what I needed.
3. I am satisfied with this encounter.
4. I have truly enjoyed this encounter.
5. This encounter was a good experience.
6. I am not happy with this encounter. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Grocer's Customer Service**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven, six-point items are used to measure an aspect of grocery store satisfaction that focuses on various customer service attributes.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Gomez, McLaughlin, and Wittink (2004) said they got the data for their study from a publicly held supermarket chain operating in the eastern part of the United States. The chain included these items in the semi-annual survey that it conducted of its loyalty card customers. Additionally, several of these items are similar to ones used by two of the authors in an earlier study (Sirohi, McLaughlin, and Wittink 1998).

**RELIABILITY:**

Gomez, McLaughlin, and Wittink (2004) reported an alpha of .94 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not apparently examined by Gomez, McLaughlin, and Wittink (2004). However, they did conduct an EFA of 21 items and the ones in this scale had high loadings ( $> .65$ ) on the same factor.

**REFERENCES:**

Gomez, Miguel I., Edward W. McLaughlin, and Dick R. Wittink (2004), "Customer Satisfaction and Retail Sales Performance: An Empirical Investigation," *JR*, 80 (4), 265-278.

Sirohi, Niren, Edward W. McLaughlin, and Dick R. Wittink (1998), "A Model of Consumer Perceptions and Store Loyalty Intentions for a Supermarket Retailer," *JR*, 74 (2), 223-245.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. friendliness of cashiers
2. service provided by baggers
3. overall friendliness of our associates
4. speed of checkout
5. overall store service
6. accuracy of scanning prices at checkout
7. cleanliness of parking lot

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors of the response scale were *poor* (1) and *excellent* (6).

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Health Plan**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which respondents are pleased with their respective health plans and are confident that they will adequately provide for their needs in the future.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Caparo, Broniarczyk, and Srivastava (2003) drew inspiration from previous measures of satisfaction, the scale as a whole seems to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

The authors reported an alpha of .85 (n = 209) for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Based on analysis of the measurement model, Caparo, Broniarczyk, and Srivastava (2003) cited evidence of the scale being unidimensional as well as having discriminant and convergent validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Caparo, Anthony J., Susan Broniarczyk, and Rajendra K. Srivastava (2003), "Factors Influencing the Likelihood of Customer Defection: The Role of Consumer Knowledge," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 164-175.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I am satisfied with my current health plan.
2. I am satisfied with the way my plan handles financial matters (e.g., billings, reimbursements).
3. I have been pleased with my health plan's response when I have a question or complaint.
4. I am confident that my health plan will provide the care I need whenever I need it.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction With Hypothetical Experience**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four statements that measure the level of satisfaction a consumer believes he/she would experience if a certain set of events transpired as described in the study.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Homburg, Koschate, and Hoyer (2005) created the scale for use in their studies.

**RELIABILITY:**

Homburg, Koschate, and Hoyer (2005) reported the composite reliability of the scale to be .98 for Study 1. Two emotional items were added to the scale in Study 2 but their exact phrasing was not reported.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was discussed by Homburg, Koschate, and Hoyer (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Homburg, Christian, Nicole Koschate, and Wayne D. Hoyer (2005), "Do Satisfied Customers Really Pay More? A Study of the Relationship Between Customer Satisfaction and Willingness to Pay," *JM*, 69 (April), 84-96.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. All in all, I would be satisfied with this \_\_\_\_\_.
2. The \_\_\_\_\_ would meet my expectations.
3. The earlier scenario compares to an ideal \_\_\_\_\_.
4. Overall, how satisfied would you be with the \_\_\_\_\_ just described?

---

<sup>1</sup> Homburg, Koschate, and Hoyer (2005) used an eleven-point response format with *strongly agree* and *strongly disagree* as the verbal anchors for the first three items and *very satisfied* and *very dissatisfied* being the anchors of the response scale for item #4. The name of the good or service under examination should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Internet Search Process**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five statements that are intended to measure a person's satisfaction with the search process for a certain product recently conducted at a website.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was apparently developed by Diehl and Zauberan (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

Diehl and Zauberan (2005) calculated alphas for two different orderings of product listings: declining order of favorability and improving order. In Study 1, an alpha of .87 was found for both orders. In Study 2, the alphas were .91 (declining order) and .87 (improving order).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Diehl and Zauberan (2005).

**COMMENTS:**

As phrased by Diehl and Zauberan (2005), the items referred to a search being made on behalf of another person and using the other person's preferences. The items have been rephrased here for the more typical scenario where the person conducting the search uses his/her own preferences and is the one who will use product.

**REFERENCES:**

Diehl, Kristin and Gal Zauberan (2005), "Searching Ordered Sets: Evaluations from Sequences under Search," *JCR*, 31 (March), 824-832.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Considering all \_\_\_\_\_ you looked at, how well did this set of \_\_\_\_\_ match your preferences?
2. Considering all \_\_\_\_\_ you looked at, how satisfied were you with this set of \_\_\_\_\_?
3. How satisfied were you with the overall \_\_\_\_\_ search experience?
4. If you had to search again for a \_\_\_\_\_ in the future, what is the likelihood that you would use this site again to look for another \_\_\_\_\_?
5. How satisfied are you with the \_\_\_\_\_ you chose?

---

<sup>1</sup> The generic name of the product being searched for should be placed in the blanks, e.g., hotel(s). The scale was apparently presented to subjects on computers and they responded to these items using "bipolar sliders." Depending upon the position to which a subject slid the slider, a translation was made into a number along a 100-point scale. The verbal scale anchors were not stated by the authors.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Life**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point Likert-types statements are used to measure one's global attitude about his/her life. The measure seems to tap more into cognitive aspects of the attitude rather than the affective aspects.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005) was developed by Diener et al. (1985) and called the *Satisfaction With Life Scale* (SWLS). That set of studies provided evidence that the scale had good internal consistency and was unidimensional. Various forms of validity were shown and the scale was found to be free from socially desirable response tendencies.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha reported for the scale by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) was .91 ( $n \approx 373$ ).

**VALIDITY:**

Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) reported that the scale had a high positive correlation with a measure of well-being and strong negative correlations with measures of depression, neuroticism, and anxiety. These correlations along with general evidence from the LISREL analysis of all their measures provided evidence in support of the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.  
Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.  
Diener, Ed, Robert A. Emmons, Randy J. Larsen, and Sharon Griffin (1985), "The Satisfaction with Life Scale," *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49 (1), 71-75.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. In most ways my life is close to ideal.
2. The conditions of my life are excellent.
3. I am satisfied with my life.
4. So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life.
5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Most Recent Experience**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, seven-point items intended to measure both affective as well as cognitive aspects of satisfaction with regard to a person's most recent experience with something. The two semantic-differentials were expected to capture the affective aspect of satisfaction while the two Likert-type statements were expected to capture the cognitive aspect. The scale was used by Matilla (2003) with respect to the last of three stays at a hotel.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Matilla (2003) but it would appear to have been developed by her for this study.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .88 (Matilla 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

A CFA was conducted on the items in this scale and one other. The results provided some limited evidence of the scale's convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Matilla, Anna S. (2003), "The Impact of Cognitive Inertia on Postconsumption Evaluation Processes," *JAMS*, 31 (3), 287-299.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. terrible / delighted
2. unhappy / happy
3. I was satisfied with my most experience at \_\_\_\_\_.
4. I was dissatisfied with my last experience at \_\_\_\_\_. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Performance**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type items measuring the level of satisfaction a consumer expresses with regard to the performance of something like a product or company. Although it may be most natural for the scale to be completed by consumers with respect to their own satisfaction (Tsiros, Mittal, and Ross 2004), in the study by Tsiros and Mittal (2000) it had to do with the attribution of that reaction on others based on knowledge of what they had experienced. In other words, one party believes that another party who has made a certain purchase decision is feeling a certain way about it.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although some of the terms and phrases are similar to ones used in previous measures of satisfaction, this set of items as a whole appears to be original to Tsiros and Mittal (2000). The two of the items used by Tsiros, Mittal, and Ross (2004) were very similar to those used by Tsiros and Mittal (2000) and one was different.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .95 was reported for the scales used by both Tsiros and Mittal (2000) and Tsiros, Mittal, and Ross (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Little evidence relating to the scale's validity was reported by Tsiros and Mittal (2000). They did conduct confirmatory factor analysis of these three items along with three others intended to measure regret (V4, #360). The results showed that the two sets of items loaded on their respective factors as expected. Further, a two-factor solution provided better fit than a one-factor solution. Tsiros, Mittal, and Ross (2004) did not provide any evidence of their scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Tsiros, Michael and Vikas Mittal (2000), "Regret: A Model of Its Antecedents and Consequences in Consumer Decision Making," *JCR*, 26 (March), 401-417.
- Tsiros, Michael, Vikas Mittal and William T. Ross, Jr. (2004), "The Role of Attributes in Consumer Satisfaction: A Reexamination," *JCR*, 31 (September), 476-483.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ is happy with \_\_\_\_\_'s performance.

---

<sup>1</sup> Tsiros and Mittal (2000) used items #1-#3 where Tsiros, Mittal, and Ross (2004) used items #1, #2, and #4. As used by Tsiros and Mittal (2000), the name of the person experiencing the regret goes in the first blank of each item. Tsiros, Mittal, and Ross (2004) phrased their items in the first person so that the blanks of #1 and #4 were filled with "I am" and the blank of #2 was "I feel." The name of the focal object should be placed in the second blank of each item.

#544 *Satisfaction with Performance*

2. \_\_\_\_\_ is satisfied with \_\_\_\_\_'s performance.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ is disappointed with \_\_\_\_\_'s performance. (r)
4. \_\_\_\_\_ is pleased with \_\_\_\_\_'s performance.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Problem Resolution**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point Likert-type statements that are used to measure the degree to which it is believed that a business one has recently interacted with has resolved a particular problem in a satisfactory manner.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although the items are similar to many that have been used previously to measure the same construct, the scale as a whole seems to be distinct enough that it is probably original to Maxham and Netemeyer (2002a, 2002b, 2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .92 and .91 were reported for the version of the scale used by Maxham and Netemeyer (2002a) with bank customers (Study 1) and new home buyers (Study 2), respectively. An alpha of .83 was found for the version used with customers of an electronics dealer in the study by Maxham and Netemeyer (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

For both of their studies, Maxham and Netemeyer (2002a) tested a measurement model including the items in this scale as well as those intended to measure six other constructs. The model fit very well. In addition, the scale met a stringent test of discriminant validity. Likewise, Maxham and Netemeyer (2003) entered the items in this scale along with 25 others, representing eight constructs in total, into a confirmatory factor analysis. Several tests of convergent and discriminant validity were apparently conducted and provided support for the each scale's validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Maxham and Netemeyer (2002b).

**REFERENCES:**

- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2002a), "Modeling Customer Perceptions of Complaint Handling Over Time: The Effect of Perceived Justice on Satisfaction and Intent," *JR*, 78 (4), 239-252.
- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2002b), "A Longitudinal Study of Complaining Customers' Evaluations of Multiple Service Failures and Recovery Efforts," *JM*, 66 (October), 57-71.
- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2003), "Firms Reap What They Sow: the Effects of Shared Values and Perceived Organizational Justice on Customers' Evaluations of Complaint Handling," *JM*, 67 (January), 46-62.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. In my opinion, \_\_\_\_\_ provided a satisfactory resolution to my problem on this particular occasion.
2. I am not satisfied with \_\_\_\_\_'s handling of this particular problem. (r)
3. Regarding this particular event (most recent problem), I am satisfied with \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the business should be placed in each blank.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Purchase Experience**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a customer's global attitude regarding the quality of service he/she received from a firm. Although the purchase may have involved buying a physical good rather than just receiving service, the items seem to relate to the overall interaction with a business rather than just measuring the customer's reaction to the product.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is simple enough that its items bear similarity to many previous measures of satisfaction but, as a whole, it seems that the scale is distinct enough to be considered original to Maxham and Netemeyer (2002a, 2002b, 2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .89 and .88 were reported for the version of the scale used by Maxham and Netemeyer (2002a) with bank customers (Study 1) and new home buyers (Study 2), respectively. An alpha of .82 was found for the version used with customers of an electronics dealer in the study by Maxham and Netemeyer (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

For both of their studies, Maxham and Netemeyer (2002a) tested a measurement model including the items in this scale as well as those intended to measure six other constructs. The model fit very well. In addition, the scale met a stringent test of discriminant validity. Likewise, Maxham and Netemeyer (2003) entered the items in this scale along with 25 others, representing eight constructs in total, into a confirmatory factor analysis. Several tests of convergent and discriminant validity were apparently conducted and provided support for the each scale's validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Maxham and Netemeyer (2002b).

**REFERENCES:**

- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2002a), "Modeling Customer Perceptions of Complaint Handling Over Time: The Effect of Perceived Justice on Satisfaction and Intent," *JR*, 78 (4), 239-252.
- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2002b), "A Longitudinal Study of Complaining Customers' Evaluations of Multiple Service Failures and Recovery Efforts," *JM*, 66 (October), 57-71.
- Maxham III, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2003), "Firms Reap What They Sow: the Effects of Shared Values and Perceived Organizational Justice on Customers' Evaluations of Complaint Handling," *JM*, 67 (January), 46-62.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. I am satisfied with my overall experience with \_\_\_\_\_.
2. As a whole, I am not satisfied with \_\_\_\_\_. (r)
3. How satisfied are you overall with the quality of \_\_\_\_\_?

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the business should be placed in each blank. The anchors used with the first two items were of the *strongly disagree/strongly agree* variety but those for item #3 were probably something like *very dissatisfied /extremely satisfied*.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Retailers**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has five, five-point Likert-type statements that measure a consumer's attitude about retailers and their salespeople in general. A seven-item version of the scale with similar psychometric properties is also discussed below.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Gaski and Etgar (1986). By a formula described in the article, the scale can be combined with data from several other measures to form an index of consumer attitudes toward marketing-related activities. The authors request that the index be referred to as the *University of Notre Dame/Market Facts Index of Consumer Sentiment Toward Marketing*. Some items were taken or adapted from the literature, but the majority were written especially for the index. Pretesting involved 50 members of the Market Facts mail panel completing the index.

**RELIABILITY:**

Gaski and Etgar (1986) reported that a seven-item version of the scale had an alpha of .783 and, except for one item, the item-total correlations were .41 or higher. Two items with the lowest item-total correlations were eliminated, leaving a scale with an alpha of .819.

**VALIDITY:**

A factor analysis of the 20 items composing the entire index was conducted Gaski and Etgar (1986). The five items composing each of the four scales loaded most heavily on their respective factors and had extremely low loadings on the other three factors.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Mangleburg, Doney, and Bristol (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Gaski, John F. and Michael J. Etzel (1986), "The Index of Consumer Sentiment Toward Marketing," *JM*, 50 (July), 71-81.

Mangleburg, Tamara F., Patricia M. Doney, and Terry Bristol (2004), "Shopping with Friends and Teens' Susceptibility to Peer Influence," *JR*, 80 (2), 101-116.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Most retail stores serve their customers well. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> Items #4 and #5 were eliminated to produce the five-item version of the scale.

*#547 Satisfaction with Retailers*

2. Because of the way retailers treat me, most of my shopping is unpleasant.
3. I find most retail salespeople to be very helpful. (r)
4. Most retail stores provide an adequate selection of merchandise. (r)
5. In general, most middlemen make excessive profits.
6. When I need assistance in a store, I am usually not able to get it.
7. Most retailers provide adequate service. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Service**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements compose the scale. The items are intended to measure the degree to which a customer of a service provider is satisfied with a service that has been experienced or received.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although drawing upon the many satisfaction measures developed previously, this scale is original to the study by Voss, Parasuraman, and Grewal (1998).

**RELIABILITY:**

Average construct reliability was reported to be .83 (Voss, Parasuraman, and Grewal 1998).

**VALIDITY:**

Voss, Parasuraman, and Grewal (1998) reported an average variance extracted of .63. Evidence was also supplied in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Brady et al. (2005) who used a scale very similar to this one and translated into several languages for use in a set of multi-national studies.

**REFERENCES:**

- Brady, Michael K., Gary A. Knight, J. Joseph Cronin Jr., G. Tomas, M. Hult, and Bruce D. Keillor (2005), "Removing the Contextual Lens: A Multinational, Multi-Setting Comparison of Service Evaluation Methods," *JA*, 81 (3), 215-230.
- Voss, Glenn B., A. Parasuraman, and Dhruv Grewal (1998), "The Roles of Price, Performance, and Expectations in Determining Satisfaction in Service Exchanges," *JM*, 62 (October), 46-61.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I was satisfied with the service provided.
2. I was delighted with the service provided.
3. I was unhappy with the service provided. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> Responses to the items were made using a seven-point Likert-type scale using the following anchors: *disagree very strongly* (1) and *agree very strongly* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Service**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of seven, five-point items measuring the degree of satisfaction a consumer reports with respect to the services provided by a certain company/business.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002) stated that they adapted some of the items from work by Singh (1990) while others were original. Although they referred to the scale as a measure of satisfaction, several of the items bear strong resemblance to items used in service quality scales.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had a composite reliability of .83 in the main studies conducted by Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002) and Verhoef (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002) followed a multi-step process in the development and testing of the scales they used in their study. They provide a variety of evidence in support of the scale's content, convergent, and discriminant validity. However, the AVE of the final scale was .42, lower than the .50 minimum expected for a scale (Fornell and Larcker 1981), and raising some doubt about the scale's convergent validity. While Verhoef (2003) described in general terms that the scales he used were examined in a multi-stage purification process, specific evidence regarding this scale's validity was not provided.

**COMMENTS:**

The entity used in the study by Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002) was a company that used direct channels to sell insurance and some other financial services. That affected the phrasing of one or more of the scale items, e.g., #4 (below). If the measure is applied to other businesses then some rephrasing and retesting will be called for, particularly since the items shown below are translations of what was actually used.

**REFERENCES:**

Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *JMR*, 18 (February), 39-50.  
Singh, Jagdip (1990), "Voice, Exit, and Negative Word-of-Mouth Behaviors: An Investigation Across Three Service Categories," *JAMS*, 18 (Winter 1), 1-15.

## #549 *Satisfaction with Service*

Verhoef, Peter C. (2003), "Understanding the Effect of Customer Relationship Management Efforts on Customer Retention and Customer Retention and Customer Share Development," *JM*, 67 (October), 30-45.

Verhoef, Peter C., Philip Hans Franses, and Janny C. Hoekstra (2002), "The Effects of Relational Constructs on Customer Referrals and Number of Services Purchased From a Multiservice Provider: Does Age of Relationship Matter?" *JAMS*, 30 (3), 202-216.

### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

How satisfied are you about the following?

1. Personal attention of \_\_\_\_\_
2. Willingness of \_\_\_\_\_ to explain procedures
3. Service quality of \_\_\_\_\_
4. Response to claims
5. Expertise of the personnel of \_\_\_\_\_
6. Your relationship with \_\_\_\_\_
7. Alertness of \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the business/organization should be placed in the blanks. These statements are the translations provided in the article by Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002); the actual items used in their study were phrased in Dutch.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Service**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used in the scale to measure the degree to which a customer is pleased with the service received from a store/company in the sense that it has met his/her needs.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Hui et al. (2004) indicated that the items were taken from Westbrook (1980). While the items are similar to some tested by Westbrook (1980), they were not used in that early study as a multi-item scale. Thus, it may be more accurate to say that Hui et al. (2004) developed the scale with inspiration from the work of Westbrook (1980).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .96 (Experiment 1) and .92 (Experiment 2) were reported for the scale (Hui et al. 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Hui et al. (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Hui, Michael K. (2007), Personal Correspondence.

Hui, Michael K., Xiande Zhao, Xiucheng Fan, and Kevin Au (2004), "When Does the Service Process Matter? A Test of Two Competing Theories," *JCR*, 31 (September), 465-475.

Westbrook, Robert A. (1980), "A Rating Scale for Measuring Product/Service Satisfaction," *JM*, 44 (Fall), 68-72.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am satisfied with the service.
2. I feel pleased with what \_\_\_\_\_ has done in the scenario.<sup>2</sup>
3. The service met my needs very well.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale items were provided by Hui (2007).

<sup>2</sup> The name of the service provider should be placed in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Service Provider**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, five-point items that measure the level of general satisfaction a consumer expresses towards a service provider, in particular how well the service provider is viewed compared to what the consumer expects and compared to the “ideal” provider.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated explicitly, the scale appears to have been developed by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003). However, key phrases in the items are very similar to those found in the American Customer Satisfaction Index (Fornell et al. 1996). A pretest and the main study helped Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) develop and refine the many scales they used to measure switching costs as well as its antecedents and consequences. Satisfaction was viewed as one of the consequences of switching costs.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .85 and .84 were reported by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) for long-distance and credit card applications, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

Little information bearing on the validity of this scale was provided.

**REFERENCES:**

- Burnham, Thomas A., Judy K. Frels, and Vijay Mahajan (2003), “Consumer Switching Costs: A Topology, Antecedents and Consequences,” *JAMS*, 31 (2), 109-126.
- Fornell, Claes, Michael D. Johnson, Eugene W. Anderson, Jaesung Cha, & Barbara Everitt Bryant (1996), “The American Customer Satisfaction Index: Nature, Purpose, and Findings,” *JM*, 60 (October), 7-18.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am satisfied with my service provider.
2. What I get from my service provider falls short of what I expect for this type of service. (r)
3. Imagine an ideal service provider—one that does everything a provider of this service should do. How does your service provider compare with this ideal service provider?
4. How well does your service provider meet your needs at this time?

---

<sup>1</sup> The first two items used a Likert-type response format (*strongly disagree/strongly agree*) whereas the anchors for #3 were *far below ideal equal to ideal* and the anchors for #4 were *extremely poorly/extremely well*.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Service Provider**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, ten-point semantic differentials are used to measure the level of general satisfaction a customer has with a certain service provider, combining aspects of disconfirmation with a comparison to the “ideal” provider.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Gustafsson, Johnson, and Roos (2005) is either the same or similar to the American Customer Satisfaction Index (Fornell et al. 1996).

**RELIABILITY:**

No direct measure of reliability was provided for the scale but its AVE (average variance extracted) was .766, suggesting acceptable reliability.

**VALIDITY:**

Gustafsson, Johnson, and Roos (2005) provided information in support of the scale’s convergent and discriminant validities.

**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,” *JM*, 60 (October), 7-18.
- Gustafsson, Anders, Michael D. Johnson, and Inger Roos (2005), “The Effects of Customer Satisfaction, Relationship Commitment Dimensions, and Triggers on Customer Retention,” *JM*, 69 (October), 210-218.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Very dissatisfied / very satisfied
2. Falls short of expectations / exceeds expectations
3. Not very close to ideal provider / very close to ideal provider

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Shopping Experience**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three Likert-type statements that measure a consumer's level of satisfaction received from shopping at a particular store.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Seiders et al. (2005) drew upon previous measures for inspirations, the scale as a whole appears to be original to them. Their focus was on shopping at a specialty retailer but the items seem to be amenable for use with other types of retailers, brick-and-mortar as well as online.

**RELIABILITY:**

Seiders et al. (2005) reported the construct reliability for the scale to be .90 (n = 945).

**VALIDITY:**

Seiders et al. (2005) did not explicitly address the validity of their scales. However, the strength of the item loadings on the construct and the average variance extracted (.74) offer some evidence of convergent validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Seiders, Kathleen, Glenn B. Voss, Dhruv Grewal, and Andrea L. Godfrey (2005), "Do Satisfied Customers Buy More? Examining Moderating Influences in a Retailing Context," *JM*, 69 (October), 26-43.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ takes care of product exchanges and returns promptly.
2. Any after-purchase problems I experience are quickly resolved at \_\_\_\_\_.
3. It is easy to take care of returns and exchanges at \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the retailer should be placed in the blanks. Seiders et al. (2005) did not state the number of points on the response scale. The verbal anchors were not described either but would appear to be of the *agree/disagree* type.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Store**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's belief that the right decision was made to buy items from a particular vendor. The scale taps into affective aspects of satisfaction (items #1 and #2, below) as well as evaluative (#3-#5). The scale was used by Harris and Goode (2004) with an online store but it appears to be appropriate for use with a brick-and-mortar store as well.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Four of the items in the scale used by Harris and Goode (2004) were adapted from two different satisfaction scales by Cronin, Brady, and Hult (2000). The source of the fifth item (#3, below) is unknown and may be original.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .72 (study 1) and .73 (study 2) were found by Harris and Goode (2004) for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Harris and Goode (2004) provided evidence in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities. However, since four of the items come from scales measuring two different types of satisfaction, it raises doubt that the scale as a whole is unidimensional.

**REFERENCES:**

- Cronin, Jr., J. Joseph, Michael K. Brady, and G. Tomas M. Hult (2000), "Assessing the Effects of Quality, Value, and Customer Satisfaction on Consumer Behavioral Intentions in Service Environments," *JR*, 79 (2), 193-218.
- Harris, Lloyd C and Mark M.H. Goode (2004), "The Four Levels of Loyalty and the Pivotal Role of Trust: A Study of Online Service Dynamics," *JR*, 80 (2), 139-158.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. When purchasing products from \_\_\_\_\_ I feel surprised, amazed or astonished.
2. When purchasing products from \_\_\_\_\_ I sometimes feel angry, enraged or annoyed. (r)
3. I continue to use \_\_\_\_\_ because other firms aren't as good.
4. My choice to purchase from \_\_\_\_\_ was a wise one.
5. I think I did the wrong thing when I purchased book/flights from \_\_\_\_\_. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal store should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Satisfaction with Weight Loss Program**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This eight item, seven-point Likert-type scale is intended to measure the degree to which a person expresses satisfaction with a weight loss program he/she is involved with.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Dellande, Gilly, and Graham (2004) as an adaptation of scale items used by Oliver (1980) and Westbrook and Oliver (1981).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .85 was reported for the scale by Dellande, Gilly, and Graham (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Information bearing on the scale's validity was not reported by Dellande, Gilly, and Graham (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Dellande, Stephanie, Mary C. Gilly, and John L. Graham (2004), "Gaining Compliance and Losing Weight: The Role of the Service Provider in Health Care Services," *JM*, 68 (3), 78-91.
- Oliver, Richard L. (1980), "A Cognitive Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Satisfaction Decisions," *JMR*, 17 (November), 460-469.
- Westbrook, Robert A. and Richard L. Oliver (1981), "Developing Better Measures of Consumer Satisfaction: Some Preliminary Results," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 8, Kent B. Monroe, ed. Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 94-99.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. My choice to join this weight loss program is a wise decision.
2. I am satisfied with the design of the weight loss program.
3. I am satisfied with my decision to join this weight loss program.
4. I am satisfied with the results that I have achieved with this weight loss program.
5. If I had to choose all over again, I would join this weight loss program.
6. If I had to choose again, I would work with this nurse.
7. I am satisfied with my nurse.
8. I am satisfied with the job that my nurse is doing for me.

**SCALE NAME: Security Importance**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of seven, nine-point statements that attempt to assess the value a person places on the safety and stability of individual and group relationships.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005) was derived from Schwartz (1992). It is part of the Schwartz Value Survey which has been tested in many different countries and is intended to capture ten important human values. Due to the unconventional psychometric techniques used to develop the instrument, many issues regarding each scale's dimensionality and validity are worthy of further testing.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) was .62 (Burroughs 2005). This value is low enough that it raises doubt about the scale's internal consistency as well as its dimensionality.

**VALIDITY:**

Although the scale's validity was not directly assessed by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002), the results of multidimensional scaling analysis showed that security was located along an axis with other "conservation" values such as tradition and conformity and was in opposition to "openness to change" values such as stimulation and self-direction. This provides at least some modicum of evidence of the scale's nomological validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Richins (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.
- Richins, Marsha L. (2004), "The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form," *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.
- Schwartz, Shalom H. (1992), "Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, V. 25, Mark P. Zanna, ed., San Diego: Academic Press, Inc, 1-65.

## #556 Security Importance

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

Directions: Rate each value listed below as a guiding principle in your life using the following nine-point scale: *opposed to my values* (-1), *not important* (0), (1 and 2, unlabeled), *important* (3), (4 and 5, unlabeled), *very important* (6), and *of supreme importance* (7).

1. CLEAN (neat, tidy)
2. NATIONAL SECURITY (protection of my nation from enemies)
3. RECIPROCATION OF FAVORS (avoidance of indebtedness)
4. SOCIAL ORDER (stability of society)
5. FAMILY SECURITY (safety for loved ones)
6. A SENSE OF BELONGING (feeling that others care about me)
7. HEALTHY (not being sick physically or mentally)

7

---

<sup>1</sup> The same nine-point response scale and anchors were used by Schwartz (1992) and Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005). The directions shown here were recreated based on a description by Schwartz (1992, p. 17).

**SCALE NAME: Security of Internet Financial Transactions**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three statements are used in this scale to measure how secure a person feels about engaging in various financial transactions online. The scale was called *security risk perceptions* by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale seems to be original to Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003) although they drew some inspiration from others such as Swaminathan, Lepkowska-White, and Rao (1999).

**RELIABILITY:**

Construct reliabilities of .87 (Study 1) and .74 (Study 2) were reported for the scale by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not explicitly addressed by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003). However, from the information provided it appears that the scale had acceptable levels of convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Montoya-Weiss, Mitzi M., Glenn B. Voss, and Dhruv Grewal (2003), "Determinants of Online Channel Use and Overall Satisfaction With a Relational, Multichannel Service Provider," *JAMS*, 31 (4), 448-458.

Swaminathan, Vanitha, Elzbieta Lepkowska-White, and Bharat P. Rao (1999), "Browsers or Buyers in Cyberspace? An Investigation of Factors Influencing Electronic Exchange," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 5 (2), <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol5/issue2/>.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How secure do you feel about applying for a loan or credit online?
2. How secure do you feel about doing online investment activities?
3. How secure do you feel about doing online banking (e.g., view account balance, transfer funds, make payments)?

---

<sup>1</sup> Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003) did not specify the response format but it appears that *extremely insecure/extremely secure* along with a five or seven-point scale would be appropriate. These are the statements used in Study 1; Study 2 involved a university's registration process (telephone or online) and required some modification to the items.

**SCALE NAME: Self-Confidence (Bargaining Tactics)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six Likert-type statements are used to measure one's familiarity with the persuasion tactics used by marketers to sell products and having confidence in his/her ability to deal with those tactics.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose (2001). It was developed as part of a larger consumer self-confidence instrument using an admiral, multi-study process in which the instrument's psychometric quality was thoroughly tested and confirmed.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .83 (n = 252 undergraduate students) was reported for the scale in Study 3 (Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose 2001). In addition, the stability of the scale (two-week test-retest) was checked along with the other dimensions of the instrument and found to be between .60 and .84.

**VALIDITY:**

In the several studies conducted by Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose (2001) many types of validity were examined (content, convergent, discriminant, predictive, known-group). The evidence provides strong support for a claim of the scale being a valid measure of the construct.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Brown and Krishna (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Bearden, William O., David M. Hardesty, and Randall L. Rose (2001), "Consumer Self-Confidence: Refinements in Conceptualization and Measurement," *JCR*, 28 (June), 121-134.
- Brown, Christina L. and Aradhna Krishna (2004), "The Skeptical Shopper: A Metacognitive Account for the Effects of Default Options on Choice," *JCR*, 31 (December), 529-539.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I know when an offer is "too good to be true."
2. I can tell when an offer has strings attached.
3. I have no trouble understanding the bargaining tactics used by salespersons.
4. I know when a marketer is pressuring me to buy.
5. I can see through sales gimmicks used to get consumers to buy.
6. I can separate fact from fantasy in advertising.

**SCALE NAME: Self-Confidence (Expressing Opinions in Stores)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five Likert-type statements that are used to measure one's tendency to "speak up" when dealing with marketers (e.g., salespersons) by expressing concerns and desires. Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose (2001) referred to this scale as the *marketplace interfaces* dimension of consumer self-confidence.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose (2001) constructed the scale as part of a larger consumer self-confidence instrument. An admiral, multi-study process was used in which the instrument's psychometric quality was thoroughly tested and confirmed.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .86 (n = 252 undergraduate students) was reported for the scale in Study 3 (Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose 2001). In addition, the stability of the scale (two-week test-retest) was checked along with the other dimensions of the instrument and found to be between .60 and .84.

**VALIDITY:**

In the several studies conducted by Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose (2001) many types of validity were examined (content, convergent, discriminant, predictive, known-group). The evidence provides strong support for a claim of the scale being a valid measure of the construct.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Brown and Krishna (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Bearden, William O., David M. Hardesty, and Randall L. Rose, (2001), "Consumer Self-Confidence: Refinements in Conceptualization and Measurement," *JCR*, 28 (June), 121-134.
- Brown, Christina L. and Aradhna Krishna (2004), "The Skeptical Shopper: A Metacognitive Account for the Effects of Default Options on Choice," *JCR*, 31 (December), 529-539.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I am afraid to "ask to speak to the manager."
2. I don't like to tell a salesperson something is wrong in the store.
3. I have a hard time saying "no" to a salesperson.
4. I am too timid when problems arise while shopping.
5. I am hesitant to complain when shopping.

**SCALE NAME: Self-Confidence (Judgment Correctness)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three semantic differentials measuring the degree to which a person feels certain about something. As used by Urbany et al. (1997), the confidence respondents had in their judgments of product quality was being measured. Similarly, Zhang and Budda (1999) examined the confidence respondents had in their perceptions of product performance. Health risk estimates were the focus of the measure as used by Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

There is no information to indicate that the scale is anything other than original to the studies by Urbany et al. (1997). No source was cited by Zhang and Budda (1999) or Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .93 (n = 200) and .94 (n = 393) were reported for the scale by Urbany et al. (1997). The scale had an alpha of .85 (n = 160) in the study by Zhang and Budda (1999) and an alpha of .95 in experiment 2 (n = 74) by Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported in any of the studies.

**REFERENCES:**

- Keller, Punan Anand, Issac M. Lipkus, and Barbara K. Rimer (2002), "Depressive Realism and Health Risk Accuracy: The Negative Consequences of Positive Mood," *JCR*, 29 (June), 57-69.
- Urbany, Joel E., William O. Bearden, Ajit Kaicker, and Melinda Smith-de Borrero (1997), "Transaction Utility Effects When Quality is Uncertain," *JAMS*, 25 (Winter), 45-55.
- Urbany, Joel E. and Richard Buda (1999), "Moderating Effects of Need for Cognition on Responses to Positively versus Negatively Framed Advertising Messages," *JA*, 28 (2), 1-15.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. uncertain / certain
2. not sure / sure
3. not confident / confident

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale directions were not reported for any of the studies but may have been like what is shown here. The items shown are those used by Urbany et al. (1997) as well as Keller, Lipkus, and Rimer (2002); the version by Zhang and Budda (1999) was very similar but used *unsure* rather than *not sure* and *not certain* rather than *uncertain*.

**SCALE NAME: Self-Consciousness (Private)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of ten statements measuring the degree to which a person has an inner focus, attending more to one's thoughts and feelings about self rather than as a special object with an effect on others.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Feningstein, Scheier, and Buss (1975). After identifying behaviors contained in the construct domain, 38 items were created and tested. Factor analysis indicated that there were three main factors: private self-consciousness, public self-consciousness, and social anxiety. The items were modified and retested several times, and the same three factors consistently were found. The 10 items composing the private self-consciousness scale had a two week stability (test-retest correlation) of .79.

**RELIABILITY:**

Although it is not clear that Petrova and Cialdini (2005) used the complete scale, the alpha they reported for the version they used was .65.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Petrova and Cialdini (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- Feningstein, Allan, Michael F. Scheier, and Arnold H. Buss (1975), "Public and Private Self-Consciousness: Assessment and Theory," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 43 (4), 522-527.
- Petrova, Petia K. and Robert B. Cialdini (2005), "Fluency of Consumption Imagery and the Backfire Effects of Imagery Appeals," *JCR*, 32 (December), 442-452.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I'm always trying to figure myself out.
2. Generally, I'm not very aware of myself. (r)
3. I reflect about myself a lot.
4. I'm often the subject of my own fantasies.
5. I never scrutinize myself. (r)
6. I'm generally attentive to my inner feelings.
7. I'm constantly examining my motives.
8. I sometimes have the feeling that I'm off somewhere watching myself.
9. I'm alert to changes in my mood.
10. I'm aware of the way my mind works when I work through a problem.

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors of the response scale were not specified by Feningstein, Scheier, and Buss (1975) or Petrova and Cialdini (2005). However, a Likert-type with *agree/disagree* anchors would appear to be suitable.

**SCALE NAME: Self-Consciousness (Public)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of seven-point, Likert-type statements measuring the degree to which a person expresses an awareness of self as a social object with an effect on others.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Feningstein, Scheier, and Buss (1975). Preliminary work involved identifying behaviors contained in the domain of the construct. Then, 38 items were created and tested. Factor analysis indicated that there were three main factors: private self-consciousness, public self-consciousness, and social anxiety. The items were modified and retested several times, and the same three factors consistently were found. The seven items composing the public self-consciousness scale had a test-retest correlation of .84.

**RELIABILITY:**

Bearden and Rose (1990) reported alphas of .83, .74, and .79 for the scale in studies 1, 2, and 4, respectively. An alpha of .75 was reported for the scale by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Bearden and Rose (1990) did not directly examine the validity of the scale. Based on the results of a CFA, evidence was provided by Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002) in support of the convergent and discriminant validity of the scale after a couple of items were dropped.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bearden, William O. and Randall L. Rose (1990), "Attention to Social Comparison Information: An Individual Difference Factor Affecting Consumer Conformity," *JCR*, 16 (March), 461-71.
- Dabholkar, Pratibha and Richard P. Bagozzi (2002), "An Attitudinal Model of Technology-Based Self-Service: Moderating Effects of Consumer Traits and Situational Factors," *JAMS*, 30 (3), 184-201.
- Feningstein, Allan, Michael F. Scheier, and Arnold H. Buss (1975), "Public and Private Self-Consciousness: Assessment and Theory," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 43 (4), 522-527.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> Feningstein, Scheier, and Buss (1975) used a five-point response scale ranging from 0 (*extremely uncharacteristic*) to 4 (*extremely characteristic*). Bearden and Rose (1990) used a seven-point *disagree-*

1. I'm concerned about my style of doing things.
2. I'm concerned about the way I present myself.
3. I'm self-conscious about the way I look.
4. I usually worry about making a good impression.
5. One of the last things I do before leaving my house is look in the mirror.
6. I'm concerned about what other people think of me.
7. I'm usually aware of my appearance.

---

*agree* response format as apparently Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002) did as well. The final version of the scale used by the latter was composed of items #1-#4 and #6.

**SCALE NAME: Self-Direction Importance**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six, nine-point statements are used to measure the value placed by a person on independent thought and action.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005) was derived from Schwartz (1992). It is part of the Schwartz Value Survey which has been tested in many different countries and is intended to capture ten important human values. Due to the unconventional psychometric techniques used to develop the instrument, many issues regarding each scale's dimensionality and validity are worthy of further testing.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) was .719 (Burroughs 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No evidence regarding the scale's validity was reported by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002).

**COMMENTS:**

See also Richins (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.  
Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.  
Richins, Marsha L. (2004), "The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form," *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.  
Schwartz, Shalom H. (1992), "Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, V. 25, Mark P. Zanna, ed., San Diego: Academic Press, Inc, 1-65.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: Rate each value listed below as a guiding principle in your life using the following nine-point scale: *opposed to my values* (-1), *not important* (0), (1 and 2,

---

<sup>1</sup> The same nine-point response scale and anchors were used by Schwartz (1992) and Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005). The directions shown here were recreated based on a description by Schwartz (1992, p. 17).

## #563 *Self-Direction Importance*

unlabeled), *important* (3), (4 and 5, unlabeled), *very important* (6), and *of supreme importance* (7).

1. CURIIOUS (interested in everything, exploring)
2. CREATIVITY (uniqueness, imagination)
3. FREEDOM (freedom of action and thought)
4. CHOOSING OWN GOALS (selecting own purpose)
5. INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
6. SELF-RESPECT (belief in one's own worth)

7

**SCALE NAME: Self-Efficacy**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a consumer's belief in him/her ability to successfully complete a specified task. The tasks examined by Meuter et al. (2005) were two kinds of self-service technologies.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Meuter et al. (2005) drew upon past measures of self-efficacy, particularly Jones (1986), in developing their measure.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .94 and .96 were reported by Meuter et al. (2005) for use of the scale in Studies 1 and 2, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

At a general level, Meuter et al. (2005) tested a measurement model containing all of their constructs and indicators. Its fit was acceptable. The factor loadings were reported to be significant and evidence of discriminant validity was provided for each construct using two different tests (confidence interval, variance extracted).

**REFERENCES:**

- Jones, Gareth R. (1986), "Socialization Tactics, Self-Efficacy, and Newcomers' Adjustments to Organizations," *Academy of Management Journal*, 29 (June), 262–279.
- Meuter, Matthew L., Mary Jo Bitner, Amy L. Ostrom, and Stephen W. Brown (2005), "Choosing Among Alternative Service Delivery Modes: An Investigation of Customer Trial of Self-Service Technologies," *JM*, 69 (April), 61-83.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am fully capable of using the \_\_\_\_\_.
2. I am confident in my ability to use the \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Using the \_\_\_\_\_ is well within the scope of my abilities.
4. I do NOT feel I am qualified for the task of \_\_\_\_\_. (r)
5. My past experiences increase my confidence that I will be able to successfully use the \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the good or service should be placed in the blanks. More wording is probably necessary for #4 in order to describe the task as well as name the focal object.

**SCALE NAME: Self-Efficacy (Resisting Pressure to Smoke)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, five point statements that assess the extent to which a person feels capable of rebuffing the attempts of others to get him/her to smoke. The scale was called *self-efficacy at refusing cigarette offers* by Pechmann et al. (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information about the scale's source was provided by Pechmann et al. (2003) but it would appear to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

The construct reliability was reported by Pechmann et al. (2003) to be .87.

**VALIDITY:**

Based on the CFA, evidence was provided by Pechmann et al. (2003) in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The scale's AVE was .70.

**REFERENCES:**

Pechmann, Cornelia, Guangzhi Zhao, Marvin E. Goldberg and Ellen Thomas Reibling (2003), "What to Convey in Antismoking Advertisements for Adolescents: The Use of Protection Motivation Theory to Identify Effective Message Themes," *JM*, 67 (April), 1-18.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

If others pressure you to smoke, you can:

1. say "no."
2. walk away.
3. change the subject.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale anchors used by Pechmann et al. (2003) were *sure you can not* (1) and *sure you can* (5).

**SCALE NAME: Self-Monitoring**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The eighteen-item scale is intended to measure the extent to which a person observes and controls his/her expressive behavior for the purpose of managing a desired appearance to others.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

A twenty-five-item version was originally published by Snyder (1974) with the eighteen-item version being slightly abridged, having higher reliability, and being more “factorially pure” (Snyder and Gangestad 1986, p. 137). The shorter version was reported to have an internal consistency of over .70 but still may not be unidimensional. Criticism of the scale’s validity as well as support for it are presented in Snyder and Gangestad (1986).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .82 (Study 1) and .80 (Study 2) were reported for the scale by Aaker (1999). An alpha of .71 (Study 2) was reported for the scale by Ratner and Kahn (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale’s validity was reported by Aaker (1999) or Ratner and Kahn (2002).

**COMMENTS:**

See also Agrawal and Maheswaran (2005) as well as Wirtz and Kum (2004) where the twenty-five item version of the scale was used.

**REFERENCES:**

- Aaker, Jennifer L. (1999), “The Malleable Self: The Role of Self-Expression in Persuasion,” *JMR*, 36 (February), 45-57.
- Agrawal, Nidhi and Durairaj Maheswaran (2005), “Motivated Reasoning in Outcome-Bias Effects,” *JCR*, 31 (March), 798-805.
- Ratner, Rebecca K. and Barbara E. Kahn (2002), “The Impact of Private versus Public Consumption on Variety-Seeking Behavior,” *JCR*, 29 (September), 246-257.
- Snyder, Mark (1974), “The Self-Monitoring of Expressive Behavior,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30 (October), 526-537.
- Snyder, Mark and Steve Gangestad (1986), “On the Nature of Self-Monitoring: Matters of Assessment, Matters of Validity,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51 (1), 125-139.
- Wirtz, Jochen and Doreen Kum (2004), “Consumers Cheating on Service Guarantees,” *JAMS*, 32 (2), 159-175.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people. (F)
2. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like. (F)
3. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe. (F)
4. I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information. (T)
5. I guess I could put on a show to impress or entertain others. (T)
6. I would probably make a good actor. (T)
7. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention. (F)
8. In different situations with different people, I often act like very different persons. (T)
9. I am not particularly good at making other people like me. (F)
10. I'm not always the person I appear to be. (T)
11. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone or win their favor. (F)
12. I have considered being an entertainer. (T)
13. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting. (F)
14. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations. (F)
15. At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going. (F)
16. I feel a bit awkward in public and do not show up quite as well as I should. (F)
17. I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end). (T)
18. I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them. (T)

---

<sup>1</sup> High self-monitoring people are expected to answer True or False as indicated by the key at the end of each item whereas low self-monitoring people would likely answer in the other direction (Snyder and Gangestad 1986, p. 137).

**SCALE NAME: Self-Referencing**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven, five-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a person processes an advertisement, particularly the model featured in the ad, such that it is related to one's self-concept. The emphasis of the construct is on the way the ad is processed rather than on self-concept itself.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Martin, Lee, and Yang (2004) by drawing on the work of several previous authors, particularly a scale by Burnkrant and Unnava (1995). (See V3, #480.)

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .88 was reported for the scale (Martin, Lee, and Yang 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Analysis of the scale's validity was not reported by Martin, Lee, and Yang (2004) but they did indicate that the items loaded together in a factor analysis.

**REFERENCES:**

- Burnkrant, Robert E. and H. Rao Unnava (1995), "Effects of Self-Referencing on Persuasion," *JCR*, 22 (June), 17-26.
- Martin, Brett A. S., Christina Kwai-Choi Lee, and Feng Yang (2004), "The Influence of Ad Model Ethnicity and Self-Referencing on Attitudes," *JA*, 33 (4), 27-37.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The ad made me think about my personal experiences with the product.
2. The ad seemed to relate to me personally.
3. I can easily relate myself to the advertising model.
4. The ad seemed to be written with me in mind.
5. I can easily form similarity judgments between myself and the advertising model.
6. I can easily picture myself using the product portrayed in the ad.
7. The advertising model speaks for a group of which I am a member.

**SCALE NAME: Self-Regulatory Focus (Prevention)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five statements are used to measure a person's chronic tendency to use an avoidance strategy to attain goals. The emphasis is on avoiding undesirable ends rather than pursuing desirable ones.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Higgins and colleagues (e.g., 1997, 2001). In brief, the original item pool was balanced between promotion and prevention items. The items were administered successively to several large samples and psychometric tests were conducted following each administration. After several iterations, a final scale containing 11 items remained. A factor analysis showed there were two dimensions, one reflecting a chronic promotion focus and the other reflecting a chronic prevention focus.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .73 was reported for the scale by Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- Harlow, Robert E., Ronald S. Friedman, and E. Tory Higgins (1997), "The Regulatory Focus Questionnaire," unpublished manuscript, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027.
- Higgins, E. Tory, Ronald S. Friedman, Robert E. Harlow, Lorraine Chen Idson, Ozlem N. Ayduk, and Amy Taylor (2001), "Achievement Orientations from Subjective Histories of Success: Promotion Pride versus Prevention Pride," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31 (1), 3-23.
- Louro, Maria J., Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2005), "Negative Returns on Positive Emotions: The Influence of Pride and Self-Regulatory Goals on Repurchase Decisions," *JCR*, 31 (March), 833-840.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Growing up, would you ever "cross the line" by doing things that your parents would not tolerate? (r)
2. Did you get on your parents' nerves often when you were growing up? (r)
3. How often did you obey rules and regulations that were established by your parents?

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format used by Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005) was not stated. A five point scale was used by Higgins et al. (2001) with *never or seldom / very often* as the verbal anchors.

*#568 Self-Regulatory Focus (Prevention)*

4. Growing up, did you ever act in ways that your parents thought were objectionable?  
(r)
5. Not being careful enough has gotten me into trouble at times. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Self-Regulatory Focus (Promotion)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale uses six statements to measure a person's chronic tendency to use an approach strategy to attain goals. The emphasis is on pursuing desirable ends rather than avoiding undesirable ones.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Higgins and colleagues (e.g., 1997, 2001). In brief, the original item pool was balanced between promotion and prevention items. The items were administered successively to several large samples and psychometric tests were conducted following each administration. After several iterations, a final scale containing 11 items remained. A factor analysis showed there were two dimensions, one reflecting a chronic promotion focus and the other reflecting a chronic prevention focus.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .62 was reported for the scale by Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- Harlow, Robert E., Ronald S. Friedman, and E. Tory Higgins (1997), "The Regulatory Focus Questionnaire," unpublished manuscript, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027.
- Higgins, E. Tory, Ronald S. Friedman, Robert E. Harlow, Lorraine Chen Idson, Ozlem N. Ayduk, and Amy Taylor (2001), "Achievement Orientations from Subjective Histories of Success: Promotion Pride versus Prevention Pride," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31 (1), 3-23.
- Louro, Maria J., Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2005), "Negative Returns on Positive Emotions: The Influence of Pride and Self-Regulatory Goals on Repurchase Decisions," *JCR*, 31 (March), 833-840.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Compared to most people, are you typically unable to get what you want out of life?  
(r)
2. How often have you accomplished things that got you "psyched" to work even harder?

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format used by Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005) was not stated. A five point response format was used by Higgins et al. (2001) with the following verbal anchors: *never or seldom / very often* (#1-#3), *never true / very often true* (#4), *certainly false / certainly true* (#5 and #6).

*#569 Self-Regulatory Focus (Promotion)*

3. Do you often do well at different things that you try?
4. When it comes to achieving things that are important to me, I find that I don't perform as well as I ideally would like to do. (r)
5. I feel like I have made progress toward being successful in my life.
6. I have found very few hobbies or activities in my life that capture my interest or motivate me to put effort into them. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Self-View in Choice Task**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of eight, seven-point Likert-type statements that are intended to measure the degree to which a person has made a decision with self foremost in mind rather than the needs of others. The decision examined in the studies by Hamilton and Biehal (2005) involved investing. Given that, some adjustment in phrasing will be necessary if the scale is used with other types of decisions.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Hamilton and Biehal (2005) did not cite the source of the scale and it appears to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

The both Study 1 and 2 the scale was reported to have an alpha of .79 (Hamilton and Biehal 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No details regarding the scale's validity were provided in the article by Hamilton and Biehal (2005). However, Hamilton (2008) indicated that a factor analysis showed the set of items were unidimensional despite earlier concerns that items #1-#4 and #5-#8 would load on different factors.

**REFERENCES:**

Hamilton, Rebecca W (2008), Personal Correspondence.  
Hamilton, Rebecca W. and Gabriel J. Biehal (2005), "Achieving Your Goals or Protecting Their Future? The Effects of Self-View on Goals and Choices," *JCR*, 32 (September), 277-283.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I thought about living the life I want to live.
2. My primary concern was meeting my own needs.
3. I was concerned about how my fund choice would affect me personally.
4. I was investing for myself.
5. I thought about helping those I care about live the life they want to live. (r)
6. My primary concern was meeting the needs of others who depend on me. (r)
7. I was concerned about how my fund choice would affect others I care about. (r)
8. I was investing for other people who depend on me. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> Hamilton (2008) provided the items. Items for Study 1 are listed with the changes for Study 2 noted in parentheses.

**SCALE NAME: Service Failure Attributions (Internal)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three statements are used to measure a person's beliefs about a particular service failure being due to something under the control of the immediate service provider (internal) rather than being beyond his/her control (external).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Mattila and Patterson (2004) received inspiration for their scale from past studies but ultimately the scale seems to be original to their work.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of 0.71 was reported by Mattila and Patterson (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Mattila and Patterson (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Mattila, Anna S. and Paul G. Patterson (2004), "The Impact of Culture on Consumers' Perceptions of Service Recovery Efforts," *JR*, 80 (3), 196-206.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. To what extent did the service failure occur due to the \_\_\_\_\_ being lazy?
2. Did you get the impression that the \_\_\_\_\_ intentionally gave you slow service?
3. Did you think the \_\_\_\_\_ had control over the service failure?

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors and number of points on the response scale were not specified by Mattila and Patterson (2004).

**SCALE NAME: Service Failure Cause Permanency**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point semantic-differentials are used to measure the degree to which a customer expects the cause of a service failure to persist over time. The scale was called *attributions of stability* by Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003) adapted a scale by Russell (1982). That measure is a part of the Causal Dimension Scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had an alpha of .62 (Hess, Ganesan, and Klein 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale and several others were examined by Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003) using confirmatory factor analysis. A strong fit was found for the measurement model, however, the low reliability and variance extracted (.42) suggest that the scale's quality should be improved.

**REFERENCES:**

Hess, Jr., Ronald L, Shankar Ganesan, and Noreen M. Klein (2003), "Service Failure and Recovery: the Impact of Relationship Factors on Customer Satisfaction," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 127-145.

Russell, Daniel (1982), "The Causal Dimension Scale: A Measure of How Individuals Perceive Causes," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42 (June), 1137-1145.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

The cause of the \_\_\_\_\_ is likely to be:

1. temporary / permanent
2. stable over time / varies over time (r)
3. occurring frequently / occurring infrequently (r)
4. changing over time / unchanging over time

---

<sup>1</sup> A brief description of the service failure should be stated in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Service Failure Severity**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point semantic differentials that measure the degree to which a certain problem that could be experienced at a business is viewed by a consumer as being very important rather than trivial.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had an alpha of .96 (Hess, Ganesan, and Klein 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of this scale's validity was reported by Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003). However, the scale was used as a manipulation check and to the degree that the manipulation was successful that provides some limited evidence of the scale's predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Hess, Jr., Ronald L, Shankar Ganesan, and Noreen M. Klein (2003), "Service Failure and Recovery: the Impact of Relationship Factors on Customer Satisfaction," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 127-145.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Based on your experience with \_\_\_\_\_, how would you describe \_\_\_\_\_?<sup>1</sup>

1. mild service problem / severe service problem
2. major service problem / minor service problem (r)
3. insignificant service problem / significant service problem

---

<sup>1</sup> A descriptor of the service provider category should be placed in the first blank, e.g., *restaurants*. A description of the "service failure" should be placed in the second blank, e.g., *being served a steak that is slightly undercooked/gristly* (Hess, Ganesan, and Klein 2003).

**SCALE NAME: Service Failure Typicality**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point semantic differentials are used to assess a customer's belief that a certain problem with respect to service delivery is typical.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had an alpha of .76 (Hess, Ganesan, and Klein 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of this scale's validity was reported by Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Hess, Jr., Ronald L, Shankar Ganesan, and Noreen M. Klein (2003), "Service Failure and Recovery: the Impact of Relationship Factors on Customer Satisfaction," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 127-145.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Based on your experience with \_\_\_\_\_, how typical is it to \_\_\_\_\_, as described in the scenario?  
*extremely atypical / extremely typical*
2. Based on your experience with \_\_\_\_\_, how characteristic is the problem described in the scenario?  
*extremely uncharacteristic / extremely characteristic*
3. Based on your experience, how frequently do problems such as that described in the scenario take place?  
*Frequently / frequently (r)*

---

<sup>1</sup> The description of the activity that led to the problem should be placed in the first blank of item #1 and the blank of #2, e.g., ordering steaks (Hess, Ganesan, and Klein 2003). The second blank in item #1 should describe the actual problem, e.g., get a steak that is overcooked (Hess, Ganesan, and Klein 2003).

**SCALE NAME: Service Personalization Effort**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three item, five-point Likert-type statements measure the degree to which a consumer has modified services offered by a provider so as to better suit his/her needs. The scale was called *modification* by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated explicitly, the scale appears to have been developed by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003). A pretest and the main study helped develop and refine the many scales they used to measure switching costs as well as its antecedents and consequences. Service Personalization Effort was viewed as an antecedent of switching costs.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .92 and .86 were reported by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) for long-distance and credit card applications, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale as well as those for five other scales used to measure the antecedents of switching costs were examined using CFA. The results provided support for this scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Burnham, Thomas A., Judy K. Frels, and Vijay Mahajan (2003), "Consumer Switching Costs: A Topology, Antecedents and Consequences," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 109-126.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. My service is personalized in some way.
2. I "set up" my service to use it the way I want to.
3. I have put effort into adapting my service to meet my needs.

**SCALE NAME: Service Quality (Empathy)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six, five point Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a customer believes a service provider is trustworthy and caring based on a recent encounter. Hausman (2004) used the scale in the patient-physician context and referred it as Social Aspects of Professional Service.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Hausman and Mader (2004).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale by Hausman (2004) had alphas ranging from .92 to .94, with an alpha of .93 for the combined samples.

**VALIDITY:**

Using CFA, evidence was provided by Hausman (2004) in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Hausman, Angela (2004), "Modeling the Patient-Physician Service Encounter: Improving Patient Outcomes," *JAMS*, 32 (4), 403-417.
- Hausman, Angela and Deanna Mader (2004), "Measuring Social Aspects in the Physician/Patient Relationship," *Health Marketing Quarterly*, 21 (3), 3-26.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I trust my \_\_\_\_\_ judgment.
2. I feel my \_\_\_\_\_ accepts me for who I am.
3. My \_\_\_\_\_ appears sympathetic to my problems.
4. My \_\_\_\_\_ seems to care about me.
5. My \_\_\_\_\_ is honest with me.
6. My \_\_\_\_\_ is very attentive with me.

---

<sup>1</sup> The generic name for the service provider should be placed in the blanks. In the case of Hausman (2004), the service provider was a physician and the term *doctor* was used in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Service Quality (Global)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point items are purported to measure the degree to which a consumer believes the quality of service provided by some specified company is excellent.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not explicitly stated, the scale seems to be original to Taylor and Baker (1994).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .88 and .8325 were reported for the scale by Taylor and Baker (1994) and Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

Limited scrutiny of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities was made by Taylor and Baker (1994) on the basis of observed patterns in a correlation matrix. It appears from these correlations that the items in this scale and those in a related one (V3, #305) do not have adequate discriminant validity.

Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) used both exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis to refine the many scales in their study. Once some poorly loading items for other scales were eliminated, the model fit the data. They also provided further evidence of the scale's convergent validity based on factor loadings and squared multiple correlations.

**REFERENCES:**

Bansal, Harvir S., Shirley F. Taylor, and Yannik St. James (2005), "Migrating' to New Service Providers: Toward a Unifying Framework of Consumers' Switching Behaviors," *JAMS*, 33 (1), 96-115.

Taylor, Steven A. and Thomas L. Baker (1994), "An Assessment of the Relationship Between Service Quality and Customer Satisfaction in the Formation of Consumers' Purchase Intentions," *JR*, 70 (2), 163-78.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I believe that the general quality of \_\_\_\_\_ services is low. (r)
2. Overall, I consider \_\_\_\_\_ services to be excellent.
3. The quality of \_\_\_\_\_ services is generally \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The specific name of the provider (e.g., American Airlines, my hair stylist) should be placed in the blanks of #1 and #2 and the first blank of #3. The verbal anchors for the first two items were *strongly disagree* / *strongly agree* whereas the anchors for #3 were *poor* and *excellent*.

**SCALE NAME: Service Quality (Heterogeneity)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four, five-point Likert-type statements measure the degree to which a person views the services provided by competing providers in an industry as varying a lot in their quality. If reversed from the way the items are as shown as being scored (below) the scale could be considered a measure of *parity*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated explicitly, the scale appears to have been developed by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003). A pretest and the main study helped develop and refine the many scales they used to measure switching costs as well as its antecedents and consequences. Heterogeneity was viewed as an antecedent of switching costs.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .72 and .69 were reported by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) for long-distance and credit card applications, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale as well as those for five other scales used to measure the antecedents of switching costs were examined using CFA. The results provided support for this scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Burnham, Thomas A., Judy K. Frels, and Vijay Mahajan (2003), "Consumer Switching Costs: A Topology, Antecedents and Consequences," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 109-126.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The quality of service varies a lot between different service providers in this industry.
2. I could be using a competing service provider and not notice much difference. (r)
3. Different service providers in this industry offer very different programs/features.
4. It really doesn't matter what service provider I use; they are all pretty much the same. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Service Quality (Outcome-Related for Financial Adviser)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure a customer's attitude about the success of a financial adviser in helping to achieve one's investment goals. The scale was called *technical service quality* by Bell, Seigyoung, and Smalley (2005).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Bell, Seigyoung, and Smalley (2005) was developed by Sharma and Patterson (1999). In their study the scale has an alpha of .84.

**RELIABILITY:**

Bell, Seigyoung, and Smalley (2005) reported an alpha of .96.

**VALIDITY:**

A series of exploratory and confirmatory analyses were conducted by Bell, Seigyoung, and Smalley (2005) that purified the scale and provided evidence of its unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities. The scale was calculated to have an AVE of .85.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bell, Simon J., Seigyoung Auh, and Karen Smalley (2005), "Customer Relationship Dynamics: Service Quality and Customer Loyalty in the Context of Varying Levels of Customer Expertise and Switching Costs," *JAMS*, 33 (2), 169-183.
- Sharma, Neeru and Paul G. Patterson (1999), "The Impact of Communication Effectiveness and Service Quality on Relationship Commitment," *Journal of Services Marketing*, 13 (2/3), 151-170.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. My adviser has assisted me to achieve my financial goals.
2. My adviser has performed well in providing the best return on my investments.
3. My adviser has helped me to protect my current position by recommending the best investing options.
4. My adviser has performed well in investing my money in appropriate investment options.

**SCALE NAME: Service Quality (Process-Related for Financial Adviser)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure an investor's attitude regarding the relationship with a financial adviser, emphasizing the personal attention and concern shown by the adviser. The scale was called *functional service quality* by Bell, Seigyoung, and Smalley (2005).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although a couple of items used by Bell, Seigyoung, and Smalley (2005) are similar to items in a scale developed by Hartline and Ferrell (1996), the two scales are distinct.

**RELIABILITY:**

Bell, Seigyoung, and Smalley (2005) reported an alpha of .85.

**VALIDITY:**

A series of exploratory and confirmatory analyses were conducted by Bell, Seigyoung, and Smalley (2005) that purified the scale and provided evidence of its unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities. The scale was calculated to have an AVE of .66.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bell, Simon J., Seigyoung Auh, and Karen Smalley (2005), "Customer Relationship Dynamics: Service Quality and Customer Loyalty in the Context of Varying Levels of Customer Expertise and Switching Costs," *JAMS*, 33 (2), 169-183.
- Hartline, Michael D. and O.C. Ferrell (1996), "The Management of Customer-Contact Service Employees: An Empirical Investigation," *JM*, 60 (October), 52-70.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. My adviser gives me personal attention.
2. My adviser has my best interests at heart.
3. I share my thoughts with my adviser.

**SCALE NAME: Service Quality of the Employee**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point statements are used in the scale to measure the degree to which a customer believes that a service provider was helpful and allowed the customer to explain the problem. The scale may make most sense for use in the context of repair services.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No source for the scale was mentioned by Hui et al. (2004), thus, it appears to be original to their studies.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .94 was reported for the scale (Hui et al. 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Hui et al. (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Hui, Michael K. (2007), Personal Correspondence.

Hui, Michael K., Xiande Zhao, Xiucheng Fan, and Kevin Au (2004), "When Does the Service Process Matter? A Test of Two Competing Theories," *JCR*, 31 (September), 465-475.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

During your visit to the store, \_\_\_\_\_ appeared to be:

1. extremely helpful / not at all helpful
2. had a good attitude / had a poor attitude

Were you given a fair chance to explain the problems to \_\_\_\_\_?

3. very much / not at all

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale items were provided by Hui (2007). The name of the employee should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Service Quality of the Employees**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, nine-point Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a customer expresses a positive attitude about the manner in which employees of a certain business have treated him/her.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Brady et al. (2005) developed items based upon dimensions discussed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985). The items ended up being similar but not exactly the same as found in other service quality scales focusing on employees. The authors used at least a couple of rounds of pretesting to refine the items for use in multiple countries. They gave great care to ensure that the non-English versions were functionally and semantically similar to the English one.

**RELIABILITY:**

The composite reliabilities in Study 1 by Brady et al. (2005) ranged from .79 (Hong Kong) to .95 (USA). Study 2 was just in the U.S. and the reliability was .92.

**VALIDITY:**

Evidence was provided by Brady et al. (2005) in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities. Its average variance extracted ranged in Study 1 from .49 (Hong Kong) to .82 (USA). In Study 2, it was .74. Evidence was also provided in support of the configural and metric invariance of the items composing their scales.

**REFERENCES:**

- Brady, Michael K., Gary A. Knight, J. Joseph Cronin Jr., G. Tomas, M. Hult, and Bruce D. Keillor (2005), "Removing the Contextual Lens: A Multinational, Multi-Setting Comparison of Service Evaluation Methods," *JA*, 81 (3), 215-230.
- Parasuraman, A., Valarie A. Zeithaml, and Leonard L. Berry (1985), "A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Its Implications for Future Research," *JM*, 49 (Fall), 41-50.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Their employees offer the personal attention I need from them.
2. The behavior of their employees instills confidence in me.
3. Their employees are courteous.
4. I receive enough individual attention from their employees.

**SCALE NAME: Service Quality of the Store's Employees**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The seven-point Likert-type scale is used to measure a consumer's general attitude regarding the quality of service received from a certain store with an emphasis on the manner of treatment given by the employees.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale as a whole is original to Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994) although they drew heavily upon the SERVQUAL scales (e.g., Parasuraman, Berry, and Zeithaml 1991), particularly the *responsiveness* and *empathy* dimensions, for items.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .84 was reported for the version of the scale used by Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994). Construct reliabilities of .85 (Study 1) and .80 (Study 2) were reported for the version used by Baker et al. (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not specifically addressed by Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994). A sense of its unidimensionality can be gleaned, however, from the results of the principal components factor analysis that was conducted on items from this scale as well as two others. The five items in this scale loaded highest on the same factor ( $\geq .66$ ) and had low loadings on the other two factors ( $\leq .36$ ). Baker et al. (2002) conducted several tests of their scales' discriminant validities. This particular scale showed evidence of discriminant validity in each test. Its average variance extracted was .58 (Study 1) and .51 (Study 2).

**REFERENCES:**

- Baker, Julie, Dhruv Grewal, and A. Parasuraman (1994), "The Influence of Store Environment on Quality Inferences and Store Image," *JAMS*, 22 (4), 328-339.
- Baker, Julie, A. Parasuraman, Dhruv Grewal, and Glenn B. Voss (2002), "The Influence of Multiple Store Environment Cues on Perceived Merchandise Value and Patronage Intentions," *JM*, 66 (April), 120-141.
- Parasuraman, A., Leonard L. Berry, and Valarie A. Zeithaml (1991), "Refinement and Reassessment of the SERVQUAL Scale," *JR*, 67 (Winter), 420-450.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Customers could expect to be treated well in this store.
2. Employees of this store could be expected to give customers personal attention.
3. This store's employees would be willing to help customers.

---

<sup>1</sup> Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994) used the first five items whereas Baker et al. (2002) used just #1, #2, and #6 (a variation of #5).

*#583 Service Quality of the Store's Employees*

4. This store would offer high-quality service.
5. Employees of this store would not be too busy to respond to customers' requests promptly.
6. It would be realistic to expect prompt service from employees of this store.

**SCALE NAME: Service Quality of the Website**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four statements are used to measure a person's beliefs regarding the quality of service provided by a company at its website. The scale was called *online channel service quality perceptions* by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003). They drew some inspiration for items from SERVQUAL (e.g., Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry 1988), trying to have items from each of the most relevant dimensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

Construct reliabilities of .89 (Study 1) and .76 (Study 2) were reported for the scale by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not explicitly addressed by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003). However, from the information provided it appears that the scale had acceptable levels of convergent and discriminant validity.

**COMMENTS:**

The study by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003) also had a scale they called *alternative channel service quality perceptions*. It had the same items as this scale does except that instead of the word "site" at the end, each of them had the word "branches." The alphas of that version of the scale were .88 (Study 1) and .78 (Study 2).

**REFERENCES:**

- Montoya-Weiss, Mitzi M., Glenn B. Voss, and Dhruv Grewal (2003), "Determinants of Online Channel Use and Overall Satisfaction With a Relational, Multichannel Service Provider," *JAMS*, 31 (4), 448-458.
- Parasuraman, A., Valarie A. Zeithaml, and Leonard L. Berry (1988), "SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality," *JR*, 64 (Spring), 12-40.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ provides a high level of overall service through its site.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ provides convenient service through its site.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the website should fill the blanks. Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003) did not specify the response format but it appears the typical *agree/disagree* verbal anchors along with a five or seven-point scale would be appropriate. These are the statements used in Study 1; Study 2 involved a university's registration process (telephone or online) and required some modification to the items.

*#584 Service Quality of the Website*

3. \_\_\_\_\_ provides reliable service through its site.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ provides helpful assistance through its site.

**SCALE NAME: Service Quality of the Website**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Twenty-one statements with nine-point response scales are used to measure the overall quality of a website.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Harris and Goode (2004) is an adaptation of a scale by Cronin and Taylor (1992). In addition to much rephrasing of the items, one item was dropped for lack of relevance.

The items in Cronin and Taylor's (1992) scale were taken directly from the performance portion of the SERVQUAL instrument described by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988) which measures five separate dimensions of service quality. The chief difference between their instrument and that of Cronin and Taylor (1992) is that Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988) treated all of the items as one summated scale whereas the former used the items to compose five different subscales.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .97 (study 1) and .95 (study 2) were reported for the scale by Harris and Goode (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Harris and Goode (2004) provided evidence in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**COMMENTS:**

The findings in several key studies (e.g., Carman 1990; Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry 1988) supported a multidimensional structure of service quality. Since the items in this scale refer to multiple dimensions of service quality, the unidimensionality of the scale is in doubt.

**REFERENCES:**

- Carman, James M. (1990), "Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality: An Assessment of the SERVQUAL Dimensions," *JR*, 66 (Spring), 33-55.
- Cronin, J. Joseph, Jr., and Stephen A. Taylor (1992), "Measuring Service Quality: A Reexamination and Extension," *JM*, 56 (July), 55-68.
- Harris, Lloyd C and Mark M.H. Goode (2004), "The Four Levels of Loyalty and the Pivotal Role of Trust: A Study of Online Service Dynamics," *JR*, 80 (2), 139-158.
- Parasuraman, A., Valerie A. Zeithaml, and Leonard L. Berry (1988), "SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Customer Perceptions of Service Quality," *JR*, 64 (Spring), 12-40.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Providing services as promised
2. Dependability in handling customers' service problems
3. Performing services right the first time
4. Providing services at the promised time
5. Keeping customers informed about when services will be performed
6. Prompt service to customers
7. Willingness to help customers
8. Readiness to respond to customers' requests
9. Web site should instill confidence in its customers
10. Making customers feel safe when buying online
11. The web site is polite and courteous
12. Web site provides useful information to answer customer questions
13. Individual attention is given
14. That the web site is designed to provide a caring service
15. Having the customer's best interest at heart
16. The web page should understand the needs of their customers
17. Modern design and graphics are used
18. Visually appealing pages are used
19. The web site is well designed and has a professional appearance
20. The site is visually appealing
21. The web site is easily accessible

---

<sup>1</sup> The nature of the verbal anchors used on the response scale by Harris and Goode (2004) were not described. However, the phrasing of the scale stem suggests that they were probably something like *not important at all / extremely important*.

**SCALE NAME: Service Recovery Expectations**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point statements and measures the degree to which a customer expects a business to solve a certain problem the customer has experienced.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had an alpha of .65 (Hess, Ganesan, and Klein 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale and several others were examined by Hess, Ganesan, and Klein (2003) using confirmatory factor analysis. A strong fit was found for the measurement model and it provides some limited evidence of this scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Hess, Jr., Ronald L, Shankar Ganesan, and Noreen M. Klein (2003), "Service Failure and Recovery: the Impact of Relationship Factors on Customer Satisfaction," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 127-145.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I expect the \_\_\_\_\_ to do everything in its power to solve the problem.
2. I don't expect the \_\_\_\_\_ to exert much effort to solve the problem. (r)
3. I expect the \_\_\_\_\_ to try to make up for the steak being:<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The description of the type of business should be placed in the blanks, e.g., restaurant (Hess, Ganesan, and Klein 2003). The response anchors for the first two items were *strongly disagree / strongly agree*.

<sup>2</sup> For item #3 the anchors were *slightly undercooked-gristly / very overcooked*. The phrasing of this statement and its anchors will have to be changed for other contexts.

**SCALE NAME: Service Usage Breadth**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four item scale measures the degree to which a consumer expresses usage of multiple offerings of a service provider rather than just using one service/program/feature.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated explicitly, the scale appears to have been developed by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003). A pretest and the main study helped develop and refine the many scales they used to measure switching costs as well as its antecedents and consequences. Breadth was viewed as an antecedent of switching costs.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .87 and .88 were reported by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) for long-distance and credit card applications, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale as well as those for five other scales used to measure the antecedents of switching costs were examined using CFA. The results provided support for this scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Burnham, Thomas A., Judy K. Frels, and Vijay Mahajan (2003), "Consumer Switching Costs: A Topology, Antecedents and Consequences," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 109-126.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I take advantage of additional programs/services offered by my service provider.
2. I use the services offered by my service provider in many different ways.
3. I have used a variety of my service providers' services.
4. I currently use \_\_\_\_ different features that are offered by my service provider.

---

<sup>1</sup> The first three items appear to have used a Likert-type response format (*strongly disagree/strongly agree*) whereas respondents were apparently expected to supply a specific number for the blank in items #4.

**SCALE NAME: Shame**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, four-point items are intended to capture a person's negative emotional regret and uneasiness related to a consumption experience.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Richins (1997) drew on terms in previous measures, as well as her own series of studies, to develop and refine several emotion-related scales into the CES (Consumption Emotion Set).

Two versions of the scale were used by Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002). One version had to do with the lack of possession-related pride while the other had to do with the lack of pride related to performance of a particular activity.

**RELIABILITY:**

Reliability was reported by Richins (1997) only for Studies 4 and 5 in which the scale had alphas of .82 and .85, respectively. The reliabilities of the two versions of the scale were not reported by Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002) but the average variance extracted was .80 (possessions) and .81 (performance).

**VALIDITY:**

Richins (1997) did not directly examine the validity of the scale. A great deal of effort was expended, however, in a creative use of multidimensional scaling to note whether the items that composed each scale clustered together or not. No information regarding the scales validity was reported by Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

- Laverie, Debra A., Robert E. Kleine III, and Susan Schultz Kleine (2002), "Reexamination and Extension of Kleine, Kleine, and Kernan's Social Identity Model of Mundane Consumption: the Mediating Role of the Appraisal Process," *JCR*, 28 (March), 659-669.
- Richins, Marsha L. (1997), "Measuring Emotions in the Consumption Experience," *JCR*, 24 (September), 127-46.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale anchors used by Richins (1997) were *Not at all* (1), *A little* (2), *Moderately* (3), and *Strongly* (4). In Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002), the instructions for the possession version said that "the products I use for tennis make me feel . . ." while the performance version said "When I think of myself as a tennis player I feel . . ." Anchors for their seven-point response scale were *not at all* (1) and *very much so* (7).

1. Embarrassed
2. Ashamed
3. Humiliated

**SCALE NAME: Shame**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Twelve, seven-point statements are used to measure the degree to which a person describes several specific examples of socially embarrassing circumstances as being of “bad” if they were experienced.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is a revised version of the Johnson and Noel’s (1970) Dimensions of Conscience Questionnaire. Wirtz and Kum (2004) say that 28 items were used in their study from the original 121 items by Johnson and Noel (1970) and they were selected based on their relevance in an Asian context. However, only 12 items composed the final version of the scale (Wirtz 2006).

**RELIABILITY:**

A Cronbach’s alpha of 0.84 was reported for the scale by Wirtz and Kum (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Wirtz and Kum (2004) did not perform any validity testing.

**REFERENCES:**

- Wirtz, Jochen (2006), Personal Correspondence.  
Wirtz, Jochen and Doreen Kum (2004), “Consumers Cheating on Service Guarantees,” *JAMS*, 32 (2), 159-175.  
Johnson, Ronald C., and R. Noel (1970), “Dimensions of Conscience,” unpublished Manuscript, University of Hawaii, Honolulu.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: The following questions refer to feelings you might experience in some difficult circumstances. Please state how badly you would feel if you were in such situations. For each statement, circle the number that best describes what you feel.

1. Strongly defending an idea or point of view in a discussion only to learn later that it was incorrect.
2. Your home is very messy and you get unexpected guests.
3. Finding that your clothes have become disarranged, exposing part of you that usually is covered.
4. Giving a talk on a topic which you’re supposed to know, and having persons in your audience demonstrate that you are factually wrong.

---

<sup>1</sup> The directions and items were provided by Wirtz (2006). The response scale items were anchored by *not bad at all* and *as bad as I could possibly feel*.

5. Making a scene at the corner of a busy business street.
6. Unwittingly making a remark disparaging to a minority group in front of the member of that group.
7. Unconsciously resorting to eating with your fingers at a formal restaurant as the rest of the diners stare.
8. Getting so bored listening to someone that you tell the person to shut up.
9. Stumbling and stuttering in an oral presentation, having the instructor use yours as an example of a poor presentation.
10. Upon making new acquaintances at a party, you tell a risqué or dirty joke and many are offended by it.
11. Going to a party in casual clothes and finding that everyone is dressed up.
12. Spilling a plate full of food at the buffet dinner.

**SCALE NAME: Shame**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure the level of negative emotion one has experienced with the emphasis being on the regretful feelings about something that could be viewed as improper.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although pairs of the key descriptors (shown below) can be found in previous scales, the scale as a whole used by Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005) is unique enough to be considered original.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .64 was reported by Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Louro, Maria J., Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2005), "Negative Returns on Positive Emotions: The Influence of Pride and Self-Regulatory Goals on Repurchase Decisions," *JCR*, 31 (March), 833-840.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. not at all guilty / very guilty
2. not at all embarrassed / very embarrassed
3. not at all ashamed / very ashamed

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Convenience (Check-Out)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three statements that measure how easy it is complete the purchase transaction at a particular store. Seiders et al. (2005) referred to the scale as *transaction convenience*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Seiders et al. (2005) along with four other measures of convenience as it has to do with shopping. Their focus was on shopping at a specialty retailer but the items seem to be amenable for use with other types of retailers. Beyond brick-and-mortar stores, the scales might even be appropriate for studies involving online vendors.

**RELIABILITY:**

Seiders et al. (2005) reported the construct reliability for the scale to be .89 (n = 945).

**VALIDITY:**

Seiders et al. (2005) did not explicitly address the validity of their scales. However, the strength of the item loadings on the construct and the average variance extracted (.73) offer some evidence of convergent validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Seiders, Kathleen, Glenn B. Voss, Dhruv Grewal, and Andrea L. Godfrey (2005), "Do Satisfied Customers Buy More? Examining Moderating Influences in a Retailing Context," *JM*, 69 (October), 26-43.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am able to complete my purchase quickly at \_\_\_\_\_.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ makes it easy for me to conclude my transaction.
3. It takes little time to pay for my purchase at \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the retailer should be placed in the blanks. Seiders et al. (2005) did not state the number of points on the response scale. The verbal anchors were not described either but would appear to be of the *agree/disagree* type.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Convenience (Finding Products)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has four Likert-type items that measure the ease with which products can be located in a store along with information to help in the selection. Seiders et al. (2005) referred to the scale as *benefit convenience*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Seiders et al. (2005) along with four other measures of convenience as it has to do with shopping. Their focus was on shopping at a specialty retailer but the items seem to be amenable for use with other types of retailers. Beyond brick-and-mortar stores, the scales might even be adapted for studies involving online vendors.

**RELIABILITY:**

Seiders et al. (2005) reported the construct reliability for the scale to be .84 (n = 945).

**VALIDITY:**

Seiders et al. (2005) did not explicitly address the validity of their scales. However, the strength of the item loadings on the construct and the average variance extracted (.57) offer some evidence of convergent validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Seiders, Kathleen, Glenn B. Voss, Dhruv Grewal, and Andrea L. Godfrey (2005), "Do Satisfied Customers Buy More? Examining Moderating Influences in a Retailing Context," *JM*, 69 (October), 26-43.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. It is easy to find the products I am looking for at \_\_\_\_\_.
2. I can easily get product advice at \_\_\_\_\_.
3. The merchandise I want at \_\_\_\_\_ can be located quickly.
4. It is easy to evaluate the merchandise at \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the retailer should be placed in the blanks. Seiders et al. (2005) did not state the number of points on the response scale. The verbal anchors were not described either but would appear to be of the *agree/disagree* type.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Convenience (Post-Purchase Activities)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three Likert-type statements that measure a consumer's attitude regarding the ease with which issues that arise after buying products from a particular store can be easily resolved. Seiders et al. (2005) referred to the scale as *postbenefit convenience*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Seiders et al. (2005) along with four other measures of convenience as it has to do with shopping. Their focus was on shopping at a specialty retailer but the items seem to be amenable for use with other types of retailers. Beyond brick-and-mortar stores, the scales might even be adapted for studies involving online vendors.

**RELIABILITY:**

Seiders et al. (2005) reported the construct reliability for the scale to be .80 (n = 945).

**VALIDITY:**

Seiders et al. (2005) did not explicitly address the validity of their scales. However, the strength of the item loadings on the construct and the average variance extracted (.61) offer some evidence of convergent validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Seiders, Kathleen, Glenn B. Voss, Dhruv Grewal, and Andrea L. Godfrey (2005), "Do Satisfied Customers Buy More? Examining Moderating Influences in a Retailing Context," *JM*, 69 (October), 26-43.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ takes care of product exchanges and returns promptly.
2. Any after-purchase problems I experience are quickly resolved at \_\_\_\_\_.
3. It is easy to take care of returns and exchanges at \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the retailer should be placed in the blanks. Seiders et al. (2005) did not state the number of points on the response scale. The verbal anchors were not described either but would appear to be of the *agree/disagree* type.

## #594 Shopping Convenience (Store Access)

### **SCALE NAME: Shopping Convenience (Store Access)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four Likert-type items are used to measure how easy it is to go to a certain store in terms of its location, parking, and hours of operation.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Seiders et al. (2005) along with four other measures of convenience as it has to do with shopping. Their focus was on shopping at a specialty retailer but the items seem to be amenable for use with other types of retailers. Beyond brick-and-mortar stores, the scales might even be appropriate for studies involving online vendors.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Seiders et al. (2005) reported the construct reliability for the scale to be .82 (n = 945).

#### **VALIDITY:**

Seiders et al. (2005) did not explicitly address the validity of their scales. However, the strength of the item loadings on the construct and the average variance extracted (.54) offer some evidence of convergent validity.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Seiders, Kathleen, Glenn B. Voss, Dhruv Grewal, and Andrea L. Godfrey (2005), "Do Satisfied Customers Buy More? Examining Moderating Influences in a Retailing Context," *JM*, 69 (October), 26-43.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I am able to get to \_\_\_\_\_ quickly and easily.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ offers convenient parking.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ offers convenient locations.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ offers convenient store hours.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the retailer should be placed in the blanks. Seiders et al. (2005) did not state the number of points on the response scale. The verbal anchors were not described either but would appear to be of the *agree/disagree* type.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Convenience (Store Selection)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three statements with a Likert-type response format are used to measure how easy it is to know *before* going to a particular store that it will have what is needed. Seiders et al. (2005) referred to the scale as *decision convenience*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Seiders et al. (2005) along with four other measures of convenience as it has to do with shopping. Their focus was on shopping at a specialty retailer but the items seem to be amenable for use with other types of retailers. Beyond brick-and-mortar stores, the scales might even be appropriate for studies involving online vendors.

**RELIABILITY:**

Seiders et al. (2005) reported the construct reliability for the scale to be .75 (n = 945).

**VALIDITY:**

Seiders et al. (2005) did not explicitly address the validity of their scales. However, the strength of the item loadings on the construct and the average variance extracted (.52) offer some evidence of convergent validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Seiders, Kathleen, Glenn B. Voss, Dhruv Grewal, and Andrea L. Godfrey (2005), "Do Satisfied Customers Buy More? Examining Moderating Influences in a Retailing Context," *JM*, 69 (October), 26-43.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I can easily determine prior to shopping whether \_\_\_\_\_ will offer what I need.
2. Deciding to shop at \_\_\_\_\_ is quick and easy.
3. I can quickly find information before I shop to decide if \_\_\_\_\_ has what I'm looking for.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the retailer should be placed in the blanks. Seiders et al. (2005) did not describe the number of points on the response scale. The verbal anchors were not stated either but would appear to be of the *agree/disagree* type.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Costs**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A three-item, seven-point Likert-type scale is used to measure a consumer's attitude regarding the time and effort perceived to be necessary to shop at a certain store. Baker et al. (2002) referred to the scale as *time/effort cost perceptions*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Baker et al. (2002) suggested that the scale was adapted from work by Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991). However, it appears that while they drew inspiration from that earlier work, the scale itself is original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

Construct reliabilities of .76 (Study 1) and .78 (Study 2) were reported by Baker et al. (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Baker et al. (2002) conducted several tests of their scales' discriminant validities. This particular scale showed evidence of discriminant validity in each test. Its average variance extracted was .52 (Study 1) and .55 (Study 2).

**COMMENTS:**

Some slight modification in the wording of the items might be necessary if the scale is used with actual shoppers who had been in a store rather than subjects simulating a shopping experience as in the studies cited here.

**REFERENCES:**

- Baker, Julie, A. Parasuraman, Dhruv Grewal, and Glenn B. Voss (2002), "The Influence of Multiple Store Environment Cues on Perceived Merchandise Value and Patronage Intentions," *JM*, 66 (April), 120-141.
- Dodds, William B., Kent B. Monroe, and Dhruv Grewal (1991), "The Effects of Price, Brand, and Store Information on Buyers' Product Evaluations," *JMR*, 28 (August), 307-319.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Shopping for \_\_\_\_\_ at this store would require a lot of effort.
2. I would have to sacrifice a great deal of time to shop at this store.
3. If I shopped at this store, I would have to search too hard to find the items that I wanted.

---

<sup>1</sup> A general descriptor of the type of items a potential shopper would search for in the focal store should be placed in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Enjoyment**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The five-item, five-point Likert-type scale measures the enduring tendency of a consumer to derive pleasure from shopping. The scale appears to be tapping into recreational shopping more than focused prepurchase search.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Dawson, Bloch, and Ridgway (1990) was original to their study but was described as being based on work by Bellenger and Korgaonkar (1980).

**RELIABILITY:**

Dawson, Bloch, and Ridgway (1990) reported an alpha of .81 for the scale. Alphas of .86 (Study 3) and .87 (Study 4) were reported for the scale by Peck and Childers (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

Neither of the studies provided evidence of scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bellenger, Danny N. and Pradeep Korgaonkar (1980), "Profiling the Recreational Shopper," *JR*, 56 (Fall), 77-92.
- Dawson, Scott, Peter H. Bloch, and Nancy M. Ridgway (1990), "Shopping Motives, Emotional States, and Retail Outcomes," *JR*, 66 (Winter), 408-427.
- Peck, Joann and Terry L. Childers (2003), "Individual Differences in Haptic Information Processing: The 'Need for Touch' Scale," *JCR*, 30 (December), 430-442.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I consider shopping a big hassle. (r)
2. When traveling, I enjoy visiting new and interesting shops.
3. Shopping is generally a lot of fun for me.
4. I enjoy browsing for things even if I cannot buy them yet.
5. I often visit shopping malls or markets just for something to do, rather than to buy something specific.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Enjoyment**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure how much pleasure a consumer expresses having with shopping. The activities are viewed as more than just a necessary means to an end but as something enjoyable in themselves including focused and nonfocused search aspects.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale developed by Roehm, Pullins, and Roehm (2002) borrowed two items from a scale by Marmorstein, Grewal, and Fishe (1992) and three items from a scale by Dawson, Bloch, and Ridgway (1990). (See V2, #268 and V5, #597.) In addition, they added two more items of their own.

**RELIABILITY:**

Roehm, Pullins, and Roehm (2002) reported that the scale had alphas of .89 (Study 2a) and .92 (Study 2b).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Roehm, Pullins, and Roehm (2002). They did, however, indicate that the items loaded on a single dimension in the factor analyses that were conducted.

**REFERENCES:**

- Dawson, Scott, Peter H. Bloch, and Nancy M. Ridgway (1990), "Shopping Motives, Emotional States, and Retail Outcomes," *JR*, 66 (Winter), 408-427.
- Marmorstein, Howard, Dhruv Grewal, and Raymond P. H. Fishe (1992), "The Value of Time Spent in Price-Comparison Shopping: Survey and Experimental Evidence," *JCR*, 19 (June), 52-61.
- Roehm, Michelle L., Ellen Bolman Pullins, and Harper A. Roehm, Jr. (2002), "Designing Loyalty-Building Programs for Packaged Goods Brands," *JMR*, 39 (May), 202-213.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I really enjoy gathering information before I make a purchase.
2. Overall, I really enjoy shopping before I make a purchase.
3. I consider shopping a big hassle. (r)
4. Shopping is generally a lot of fun to me.
5. I enjoy browsing for things, even when I am not buying them.
6. I take my time when shopping for even small items such as toothpaste.
7. When I shop for most things, I try to get in and out of the store as quickly as possible. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the brand or the product category should be placed in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Enjoyment**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a consumer holds a positive attitude about shopping such that it is enjoyable and worth the time and effort.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Taylor and Neslin (2005) did not state the source of the scale. Although some concepts and phrases can be found in previous measures, the differences are great enough to consider this scale as a whole to be unique and to probably have been developed by Taylor and Neslin (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .86 was reported for the scale by Taylor and Neslin (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Taylor and Neslin (2005) did not discuss the scale's validity. They did, however, indicate that the items composing this scale and one other (price consciousness) were examined using exploratory factor analysis and loaded "cleanly" (p. 296).

**REFERENCES:**

Taylor, Gail Ayala and Scott A. Neslin (2005), "The Current and Future Sales Impact of a Retail Frequency Reward Program," *JR*, 81 (4), 293-305.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I enjoy \_\_\_\_\_ shopping.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ shopping takes too much time. (r)
3. I wish I could get someone else to do my \_\_\_\_\_ shopping. (r)
4. I look forward to my trips to the \_\_\_\_\_ store.
5. I do not mind spending a lot of time shopping for \_\_\_\_\_.
6. \_\_\_\_\_ shopping is a necessary evil. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name for a type of shopping can be placed in the blanks, e.g., grocery. Alternatively, the blanks can be removed if a more generalized measure is desired.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Intention**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A three-item, seven-point Likert-type scale is used to measure the self-reported likelihood that a consumer will shop at a specified store as well as recommend it to others. Baker, Levy, and Grewal (1992) called the scale *willingness to buy* while Baker et al. (2002) as well as Grewal et al. (2003) referred to it as *store patronage intention*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Baker, Levy, and Grewal (1992), Baker et al. (2002), and Grewal et al. (2003) suggested that the scale was developed by Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991). However, the scale developed by Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991; V. II, #202) had five items related to the purchase of a product and had only one item similar to the scale used by the others in their studies. Therefore, it would appear that the scale used by Baker et al. (2002) and Grewal et al. (2003) was developed by Baker, Levy, and Grewal (1992) who had drawn inspiration for the scale from work by Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .86 was reported for the scale by Baker, Levy, and Grewal (1992). Construct reliabilities of .88 (Study 1) and .84 (Study 2) were reported by Baker et al. (2002). Grewal et al. (2003) reported a construct validity of .88.

**VALIDITY:**

Baker, Levy, and Grewal (1992) reported no examination of the scale's validity. Baker et al. (2002) conducted several tests of their scales' discriminant validities. This particular scale showed evidence of discriminant validity in each test. Its average variance extracted was .71 (Study 1) and .64 (Study 2).

Grewal et al. (2003) provided evidence in support of their scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for the shopping intention scale was .70.

**COMMENTS:**

See also a slightly modified version of this scale by Arnett et al. (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

- Arnett, Dennis B., Debra A. Laverie and Amanda Meiers (2003), "Developing Parsimonious Retailer Equity Indexes Using Partial Least Squares Analysis: A Method and Applications," *JR*, 79 (3), 161-170.
- Baker, Julie, Michael Levy, and Dhruv Grewal (1992), "An Experimental Approach to Making Retail Store Environmental Decisions," *JR*, 68 (Winter), 445-460.
- Baker, Julie, A. Parasuraman, Dhruv Grewal, and Glenn B. Voss (2002), "The Influence of Multiple Store Environment Cues on Perceived Merchandise Value and Patronage Intentions," *JM*, 66 (April), 120-141.

Dodds, William B., Kent B. Monroe, and Dhruv Grewal (1991), "The Effects of Price, Brand, and Store Information on Buyers' Product Evaluations," *JMR*, 28 (August), 307-319.

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," *JR*, 79 (4), 259-268.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. The likelihood that I would shop in this store is high.
2. I would be willing to buy gifts in this store.
3. I would be willing to recommend this store to my friends.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Orientation (Adventure)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three item, seven-point Likert-type scale measures the extent to which a consumer expresses a tendency to shop for the arousal and excitement it brings.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Arnold and Reynolds (2003) developed the scale as part of a series of studies examining hedonic shopping motivations. The process involved use a qualitative study (98 depth interviews) to help in the understanding of the different types of hedonic motivations and the generation of items that would represent the constructs. Several marketing scholars evaluated the initial set of items and helped identify weak items. That was followed by an initial quantitative study (n = 266) and then a validation study (n = 251).

**RELIABILITY:**

Arnold and Reynolds (2003) reported an alpha of .86 for their quantitative studies. Composite reliabilities were .88 (Study 1) and .92 (Study 2).

**VALIDITY:**

The care given upfront in their series of studies support a claim of the scale's content validity. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent, discriminant, nomological, and predictive validities. The average variances extracted were .72 (Study 1) and .78 (Study 2).

**REFERENCES:**

Arnold, Mark J. and Kristy E. Reynolds (2003), "Hedonic Shopping Motivations," *JR*, 79 (2), 77-95.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. To me, shopping is an adventure.
2. I find shopping stimulating.
3. Shopping makes me feel like I am in my own universe.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Orientation (Apathetic)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, ten-point items are used to measure the degree to which a consumer expresses little if any interest in retail shopping with respect to some product category.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Magi (2003) said that she modified some shopping orientation scales developed by Laaksonen (1993).

**RELIABILITY:**

Magi (2003) reported an alpha of .83 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No information about the scale's validity was reported by Magi (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Laaksonen, Martti (1993), "Retail Patronage Dynamics: Learning about Daily Shopping Behavior in Contexts of Changing Retail Structures," *Journal of Business Research*, 28 (September-October), 3-174.

Magi, Anne W. (2003), "Share of Wallet in Retailing: the Effects of Customer Satisfaction, Loyalty Cards and Shopper Characteristics," *JR*, 79 (2), 97-106.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I want to spend as little effort as possible on \_\_\_\_\_ shopping.
2. I think \_\_\_\_\_ shopping is a necessary evil.
3. I enjoy shopping for \_\_\_\_\_. (r)
4. I spend as little time as possible on \_\_\_\_\_ shopping.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response scale anchors were not specified by Magi (2003) but would appear to have been of the Likert-type, e.g., *agree / disagree*. The type of store/products being studied should be placed in the blanks, e.g., grocery.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Orientation (Economic)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has four, ten-point statements that assess the extent to which a consumer expresses an economic motivation in selecting stores such that stores are shopped at based on the prices and deals they have.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Mägi (2003) said that she modified some shopping orientation scales developed by Laaksonen (1993).

**RELIABILITY:**

Mägi (2003) reported an alpha of .76 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No information about the scale's validity was reported by Mägi (2003).

**COMMENTS:**

See also a variation of this scale reported by Mägi and Julander (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- Laaksonen, Martti (1993), "Retail Patronage Dynamics: Learning about Daily Shopping Behavior in Contexts of Changing Retail Structures," *Journal of Business Research*, 28 (September-October ), 3-174.
- Mägi, Anne W. (2003), "Share of Wallet in Retailing: the Effects of Customer Satisfaction, Loyalty Cards and Shopper Characteristics," *JR*, 79 (2), 97-106.
- Mägi, Anne W. and Claes-Robert Julander (2005), "Consumers' Store-Level Price Knowledge: Why Are Some Consumers More Knowledgeable Than Others?," *JR*, 81 (4), 319-329.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I choose to shop at the \_\_\_\_\_ store that has the best deals at the time.
2. I compare what I get for my money in different stores.
3. You profit from comparing prices across stores.
4. I choose what store to go to on the basis of where I find what I need for the best prices.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response scale anchors were not specified by Mägi (2003) but would appear to have been of the Likert-type, e.g., *agree / disagree*. The name of the type of store being studied should be placed in the blank of item #1, e.g., grocery.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Orientation (Gratification)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a consumer expresses a tendency to shop because of its therapeutic value, especially when stressed or in a bad mood.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Arnold and Reynolds (2003) developed the scale as part of a series of studies examining hedonic shopping motivations. The process involved use a qualitative study (98 depth interviews) to help in the understanding of the different types of hedonic motivations and the generation of items that would represent the constructs. Several marketing scholars evaluated the initial set of items and helped identify weak items. That was followed by an initial quantitative study (n = 266) and then a validation study (n = 251).

**RELIABILITY:**

Arnold and Reynolds (2003) reported alphas of .79 and .77 for their quantitative studies (Study 1 and 2, respectively). Composite reliabilities were .83 (Study 1) and .80 (Study 2).

**VALIDITY:**

The care given upfront in their series of studies support a claim of the scale's content validity. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent, nomological, and predictive validities. The average variances extracted were .71 (Study 1) and .58 (Study 2). Although one test in Study 2 cast doubt on the scale's discriminant validity, the preponderance of evidence in both studies was in support of it.

**REFERENCES:**

Arnold, Mark J. and Kristy E. Reynolds (2003), "Hedonic Shopping Motivations," *JR*, 79 (2), 77-95.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. When I'm in a down mood, I go shopping to make me feel better.
2. To me, shopping is a way to relieve stress.
3. I go shopping when I want to treat myself to something special.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Orientation (Personalizing)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three, six-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a consumer's interest in shopping at stores where he or she is known by those who work there.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

It is not clear where the items originated or where they were first used as a multi-item summated ratings scale, though they bear some similarity to items used in a couple of scales by Darden and Reynolds (1971).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .89, .8492, and .826 were calculated by Arnold and Reynolds (2003), Lumpkin (1985), and Hawes and Lumpkin (1984), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

The factor analysis conducted by Lumpkin (1985) indicated the items loaded together.

**REFERENCES:**

- Arnold, Mark J. and Kristy E. Reynolds (2003), "Hedonic Shopping Motivations," *JR*, 79 (2), 77-95.
- Darden, William R. and Fred D. Reynolds (1971), "Shopping Orientations and Product Usage Rates," *JMR*, 8 (November), 505-508.
- Hawes, Jon M. and James R. Lumpkin (1984), "Understanding the Outshopper," *JAMS*, 12 (Fall), 200-218.
- Lumpkin, James R. (1985), "Shopping Orientation Segmentation of the Elderly Consumer," *JAMS*, 13 (Spring), 271-289.
- Lumpkin, James (1990), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I like to shop where people know me.
2. I like to shop where the clerks know my name.
3. I try to get to know the clerks in the stores where I shop.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lumpkin (1985, 1990) used all three, six-point items but Hawes and Lumpkin (1984) used only #1 and #2. Arnold and Reynolds (2003) seem to have used these three items and a seven-point response format.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Orientation (Personalizing)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, ten-point statements that measure the degree to which a shopper places importance on being recognized and treated in a friendly manner by a store's employees.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Magi (2003) said that she modified some shopping orientation scales developed by Laaksonen (1993).

**RELIABILITY:**

Magi (2003) reported an alpha of .78 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No information about the scale's validity was reported by Magi (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

- Laaksonen, Martti (1993), "Retail Patronage Dynamics: Learning about Daily Shopping Behavior in Contexts of Changing Retail Structures," *Journal of Business Research*, 28 (September-October), 3-174.
- Magi, Anne W. (2003), "Share of Wallet in Retailing: the Effects of Customer Satisfaction, Loyalty Cards and Shopper Characteristics," *JR*, 79 (2), 97-106.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I think personal contact with store personnel is important.
2. I think it is important to be recognized by the store's personnel.
3. I only shop in stores where I know the staff is friendly.
4. I think it is important that there are staff members to talk to in the store in which I shop.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response scale anchors were not specified by Magi (2003) but would appear to have been of the Likert-type, e.g., *agree / disagree*.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Orientation (Role)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type items are used to assess the extent to which a shopper enjoys shopping for others.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Arnold and Reynolds (2003) developed the scale as part of a series of studies examining hedonic shopping motivations. The process involved use a qualitative study (98 depth interviews) to help in the understanding of the different types of hedonic motivations and the generation of items that would represent the constructs. Several marketing scholars evaluated the initial set of items and helped identify weak items. That was followed by an initial quantitative study (n = 266) and then a validation study (n = 251).

**RELIABILITY:**

Arnold and Reynolds (2003) reported alphas of .83 and .84 for their quantitative studies (Study 1 and 2, respectively). Composite reliabilities were .86 (Study 1) and .88 (Study 2).

**VALIDITY:**

The care given upfront in their series of studies support a claim of the scale's content validity. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent, discriminant, nomological, and predictive validities. The average variances extracted were .67 (Study 1) and .71 (Study 2).

**REFERENCES:**

Arnold, Mark J. and Kristy E. Reynolds (2003), "Hedonic Shopping Motivations," *JR*, 79 (2), 77-95.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I like shopping for others because when they feel good I feel good.
2. I enjoy shopping for my friends and family
3. I enjoy shopping around to find the perfect gift for someone.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Orientation (Staying Informed)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale measures the degree to which a consumer shops in order to gather information that will keep one informed about trends and what is available. The measure is composed of three items that utilize a seven-point Likert-type response format. The scale was called *idea shopping* by Arnold and Reynolds (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Arnold and Reynolds (2003) developed the scale as part of a series of studies examining hedonic shopping motivations. The process involved use a qualitative study (98 depth interviews) to help in the understanding of the different types of hedonic motivations and the generation of items that would represent the constructs. Several marketing scholars evaluated the initial set of items and helped identify weak items. That was followed by an initial quantitative study (n = 266) and then a validation study (n = 251).

**RELIABILITY:**

Arnold and Reynolds (2003) reported alphas of .84 and .87 for their quantitative studies (Study 1 and 2, respectively). Composite reliabilities were .88 (Study 1) and .90 (Study 2).

**VALIDITY:**

The care given upfront in their series of studies support a claim of the scale's content validity. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent, discriminant, nomological, and predictive validities. The average variances extracted were .71 (Study 1) and .75 (Study 2).

**REFERENCES:**

Arnold, Mark J. and Kristy E. Reynolds (2003), "Hedonic Shopping Motivations," *JR*, 79 (2), 77-95.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I go shopping to keep up with the trends.
2. I go shopping to keep up with the new fashions.
3. I go shopping to see what new products are available.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Orientation (Value)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three statements with a seven-point Likert-type response format are used to assess the degree to which a consumer is a bargain hunter and enjoys searching for good deals.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Arnold and Reynolds (2003) developed the scale as part of a series of studies examining hedonic shopping motivations. The process involved use a qualitative study (98 depth interviews) to help in the understanding of the different types of hedonic motivations and the generation of items that would represent the constructs. Several marketing scholars evaluated the initial set of items and helped identify weak items. That was followed by an initial quantitative study (n = 266) and then a validation study (n = 251).

**RELIABILITY:**

Arnold and Reynolds (2003) reported alphas of .85 and .87 for their quantitative studies (Study 1 and 2, respectively). Composite reliabilities were .88 (Study 1) and .90 (Study 2).

**VALIDITY:**

The care given upfront in their series of studies support a claim of the scale's content validity. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent, discriminant, nomological, and predictive validities. The average variances extracted were .71 (Study 1) and .76 (Study 2).

**REFERENCES:**

Arnold, Mark J. and Kristy E. Reynolds (2003), "Hedonic Shopping Motivations," *JR*, 79 (2), 77-95.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. For the most part. I go shopping when there are sales.
2. I enjoy looking for discounts when I shop.
3. I enjoy hunting for bargains when I shop.

**SCALE NAME: Shopping Smart**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure a consumer's thoughts about the degree to which he/she is a smart shopper and considers that to be a positive behavior. Burton et al. (1998) referred to the scale as *smart shopper self-perception*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to the study of Burton et al. (1998). They said items were generated that were consistent with the construct's domain. The items were assessed in a pretest and less reliable ones were deleted from further use.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .94 was reported for the scale by both Burton et al. (1998) and Garretson, Fisher, and Burton (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No information relating to the scale's validity was reported by Burton et al. (1998). Garretson, Fisher, and Burton (2002) examined the items in this scale along with the items for several other scales using confirmatory factor analysis. The acceptable fit of the model along with some other typical tests provided support for the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Burton, Scot (2000), Personal Correspondence.  
Burton, Scot, Donald R. Lichtenstein, Richard G. Netemeyer, and Judith A. Garretson (1998), "A Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward Private Label Products and an Examination of Its Psychological and Behavioral Correlates," *JAMS*, 26 (4), 293-306.  
Garretson, Judith A., Dan Fisher, and Scot Burton (2002), "Antecedents of Private Label Attitude and National Brand Promotion Attitude: Similarities and Differences," *JR*, 78 (2), 91-99.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. When I shop smartly, I feel like a winner.
2. When I go shopping, I take a lot of pride in making smart purchases.
3. Making smart purchases makes me feel good about myself.
4. I get a real sense of joy when I make wise purchases.

---

<sup>1</sup> One sample item was provided in the article by Burton et al. (1998). The other items were supplied personally by Burton (2000).

**SCALE NAME: Shopping with Friends**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point statements are intended to measure the frequency with which a consumer shops with friends.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) stated that they developed the scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .75 was reported for the scale by Bristol and Mangleburg (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) used the results of their initial confirmatory factor analysis to drop one item from the four that had been used in the survey to measure to construct. The reanalysis of the three items along with items from several other scales produced a satisfactory fit. Evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity was provided as well.

**REFERENCES:**

Bristol, Terry and Tamara F. Mangleburg (2005), "Not Telling the Whole Story: Teen Deception in Purchasing," *JAMS*, 33 (1), 79-95.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How often do you go to the mall with friends?
2. How often do you shop with friends when making a purchase for yourself?
3. How often do you go to the store with your friends?

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors for the response scale were *never* and *very often*.

**SCALE NAME: Smoking Intention**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five point statements are used to measure the degree to which a person expresses the possibility of smoking, even a little bit, in the unspecified future.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information about the scale's source was provided by Pechmann et al. (2003) but it would appear to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

The construct reliability was reported by Pechmann et al. (2003) to be .94.

**VALIDITY:**

Based on the CFA, evidence was provided by Pechmann et al. (2003) in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The scale's AVE was .85.

**REFERENCES:**

Pechmann, Cornelia, Guangzhi Zhao, Marvin E. Goldberg and Ellen Thomas Reibling (2003), "What to Convey in Antismoking Advertisements for Adolescents: The Use of Protection Motivation Theory to Identify Effective Message Themes," *JM*, 67 (April), 1-18.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. In the future, you might smoke one puff or more of a cigarette.
2. You might try out cigarette smoking for a while.
3. If one of your best friends were to offer you a cigarette, you would smoke it.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale anchors used by Pechmann et al. (2003) were *definitely yes* and *definitely not*.

**SCALE NAME: Smoking Intention**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, four-point items are used to measure a person's expressed likelihood of smoking in the future.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Andrews et al. (2004) seems to be patterned after the one by Pechmann et al. (2003) since they both have three items, one of which is essentially the same, and the two scales share the same type of response format. However, because two of the three items are different, they are considered here to be different measures of the same construct.

**RELIABILITY:**

Andrews et al. (2004) reported an alpha of .85 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Little explicit information about the scale's validity was provided by Andrews et al. (2004) though it appears they conducted the typical analyses using confirmatory factor analysis.

**REFERENCES:**

- Andrews, J. Craig, Richard G. Netemeyer, Scot Burton, Paul D. Moberg, Ann Christiansen (2004), "Understanding Adolescent Intentions to Smoke: An Examination of Relationships Among Social Influence, Prior Trial Behavior, and Anti-tobacco Campaign Advertising," *JM*, 68 (3), 110-123.
- Pechmann, Cornelia, Guangzhi Zhao, Marvin E. Goldberg and Ellen Thomas Reibling (2003), "What to Convey in Antismoking Advertisements for Adolescents: The Use of Protection Motivation Theory to Identify Effective Message Themes," *JM*, 67 (April), 1-18.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. If one of your best friends offered you a cigarette, would you smoke it?
2. Do you think you will smoke a cigarette at anytime during the next year?
3. Do you think you will be smoking cigarettes five years from now?

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors for the response scale used by Andrews et al. (2003) were *definitely no* and *definitely yes*.

**SCALE NAME: Smoking-Related Beliefs (Negative)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Twelve, four-point Likert-type items are used to measure a person's beliefs about three negative aspects of smoking: tobacco company deception, secondhand smoke dangers, and addictiveness.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Andrews et al. (2004) may be original as a whole to their study, however, it appears that they drew upon items that had been used in previous studies of smoking.

**RELIABILITY:**

Andrews et al. (2004) reported an alpha of .79 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Little explicit information about the scale's validity was provided by Andrews et al. (2004). On the surface, it would be easy to think the set of twelve items would not be unidimensional. Although that issue was not directly dealt with in the article, the authors briefly described some testing that led them to conclude that the set of items measured "a single anti-smoking beliefs construct" (p. 116).

**REFERENCES:**

- Andrews, J. Craig, Richard G. Netemeyer, Scot Burton, Paul D. Moberg, and Ann Christiansen (2004), "Understanding Adolescent Intentions to Smoke: An Examination of Relationships Among Social Influence, Prior Trial Behavior, and Anti-tobacco Campaign Advertising," *JM*, 68 (3), 110-123.
- Pechmann, Cornelia, Guangzhi Zhao, Marvin E. Goldberg, and Ellen Thomas Reibling (2003), "What to Convey in Antismoking Advertisements for Adolescents: The Use of Protection Motivation Theory to Identify Effective Message Themes," *JM*, 67 (April), 1-18.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Tobacco companies specifically try to get young people to start smoking.
2. Tobacco companies fool young people into believing smoking is okay.
3. Tobacco companies encourage people to start smoking.
4. Tobacco companies use deceptive practices to get people hooked on smoking.
5. Breathing smoke from someone else's cigarette is harmful.
6. Secondhand smoke is dangerous to nonsmokers.

---

<sup>1</sup> Items #1-#4 were intended to capture beliefs about tobacco company deception, #5-#8 were intended to capture beliefs about secondhand smoke, and the remaining four items were intended to measure beliefs about the addictiveness of smoking..

*#614 Smoking-Related Beliefs (Negative)*

7. Secondhand smoke is not as dangerous as people make it out to be. (r)
8. Secondhand smoke kills people.
9. Smoking is addictive.
10. Nicotine is physically addictive.
11. Tobacco is a deadly product in any form.
12. Tobacco is a dangerous product.

**SCALE NAME: Social Acceptance Importance**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, five point statements are used to measure the degree of importance a person places on being accepted by others their own age. Given the phrasing of several of the items, especially #3, the scale is currently most appropriate for teens.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information about the scale's source was provided by Pechmann et al. (2003) but it would appear to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

The construct reliability was reported by Pechmann et al. (2003) to be .96.

**VALIDITY:**

Based on the CFA, evidence was provided by Pechmann et al. (2003) in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The scale's AVE was .85.

**REFERENCES:**

Pechmann, Cornelia, Guangzhi Zhao, Marvin E. Goldberg and Ellen Thomas Reibling (2003), "What to Convey in Antismoking Advertisements for Adolescents: The Use of Protection Motivation Theory to Identify Effective Message Themes," *JM*, 67 (April), 1-18.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How important is it for you to look attractive to others?
2. How important is it for you to look attractive to dates or potential dates?
3. How important is it for you to fit in with kids your age?
4. How important is it for you to fit in at parties?

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale anchors used by Pechmann et al. (2003) were *very unimportant* and *very important*.

**SCALE NAME: Social Acceptance of Smoking**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has five, five point statements and measures the degree to which a person believes that smoking is acceptable and, in fact, attractive to his/her circle of friends. Given the phrasing of several of items #4 and #5, the scale is most appropriate for teens. The scale was called *severity of social disapproval risks* by Pechmann et al. (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information about the scale's source was provided by Pechmann et al. (2003) but it would appear to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

The construct reliability was reported by Pechmann et al. (2003) to be .89.

**VALIDITY:**

Based on the CFA, evidence was provided by Pechmann et al. (2003) in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities. The scale's AVE was .79.

**REFERENCES:**

Pechmann, Cornelia, Guangzhi Zhao, Marvin E. Goldberg and Ellen Thomas Reibling (2003), "What to Convey in Antismoking Advertisements for Adolescents: The Use of Protection Motivation Theory to Identify Effective Message Themes," *JM*, 67 (April), 1-18.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. How acceptable is smoking cigarettes to your close friends?  
*They really don't like it / They really like it*
2. How do you think your close friends feel, or would feel, about you smoking cigarettes?  
*Strongly disapprove / Strongly approve*
3. How attractive would you look to others if you smoked?  
*Very unattractive / Very attractive*
4. How attractive would you look to dates or potential dates if you smoked?  
*Very unattractive / Very attractive*
5. How well would you fit in with kids your age if you smoked?  
*Very poorly / Very well*

**SCALE NAME: Social Attraction**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three statements that are intended to measure the degree to which a person believes that being associated with a certain group would be either positive or negative. To the extent that a person believes the association would be very positive then the group can be called an aspirational group. At the other extreme, if a group would not be desirable to identify with then it is referred to as a dissociative group.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is apparently original to Escalas and Bettman (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was used in Study 2 by Escalas and Bettman (2005) and had an alpha of .93.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Escalas and Bettman (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Escalas, Jennifer Edson and James R. Bettman (2005), "Self-Construal, Reference Groups, and Brand Meaning," *JCR*, 32 (December), 378-389.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How would being associated with this group reflect on someone?  
*very negatively / very positively*
2. How much would you like to be identified with this group and what they represent?  
*not at all / very much*
3. To what extent would you like being linked to this group and what they stand for?  
*definitely dislike being linked / definitely like being linked*

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format used by Escalas and Bettman (2005) was not described.

**SCALE NAME: Social Comparison Tendency**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of eleven, five-point Likert-type statements that are intended to measure the extent to which a person has a propensity to engage in social comparison. The full formal name of the scale is the *Iowa-Netherlands Comparison Orientation Measure*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was constructed by Gibbons and Buunk (1999) and tested in numerous studies. It was reported to have an eight month stability of .72 and not to be sensitive to social desirability response bias. Evidence was provided for several forms of validity. One of the few concerns about it had to do with its dimensionality. Although there seems to be little doubt that the eleven items represent two factors (abilities vs. opinions), the authors argued for using the items together if possible. Among their reasons for this is that the two factors correlated highly and a single-factor structure fit the data well (though not as well as the two-factor structure).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .76 was reported for the scale by Zhou and Soman (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Zhou and Soman (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

- Gibbons, Frederick and Bram Buunk (1999), "Individual Differences in Social Comparison: Development of a Scale of Social Comparison Orientation," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76 (January), 129-142.
- Zhou, Rongrong and Dilip Soman (2003), "Looking back: Exploring the Psychology of Queuing and the Effect of the Number of People Behind," *JCR*, 29 (March), 517-530.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Directions: Most people compare themselves from time to time with others. For example, they may compare the way they feel, their opinions, their abilities, and/or their situation with those of other people. There is nothing "good" or "bad" about this type of comparison, and some people do it more than others. We would like to find out how often you compare yourself with other people. To do that we would like to ask you to indicate how much you agree with each statement.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> These are the directions used by Gibbons and Buunk (1999). The first six items are the "ability" dimension and the other five items are the "opinions" dimension.

*#618 Social Comparison Tendency*

1. I often compare how my loved ones (boy or girlfriend, family members, etc.) are doing with how others are doing.
2. I always pay a lot of attention to how I do things with how others do things.
3. If I want to find out how well I have done something, I compare what I have done with how others have done.
4. I often compare how I am doing socially (e.g., social skills, popularity) with other people.
5. I am not the type of person who compares often with others.
6. I often compare myself with others with respect to what I have accomplished in life.
7. I often like to talk with others about mutual opinions and experiences.
8. I often try to find out what others think who face similar problems as I face.
9. I always like to know what others in a similar situation would do.
10. If I want to learn more about something, I try to find out what others think about it.
11. I never consider my situation in life relative to that of other people.

**SCALE NAME: Social Desirability Bias**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This summated ratings scale is intended to measure the degree to which people describe themselves in socially acceptable terms in order to gain the approval of others. The original version scale of the scale has thirty-three items and uses a True/False response format. However, abbreviated versions have typically been used in marketing research and Likert-type response scales have been applied in a few cases.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Crowne and Marlowe (1960) by generating items related to behaviors that are culturally sanctioned but are unlikely to occur. Two sets of ten faculty and graduate student judges helped narrow an original inventory of 50 items down to the final set of thirty-three. An internal consistency of .88 (KR-20) was calculated for the scale using a sample of 10 male and 29 female undergraduates. Thirty-one of these same people completed the instrument a month later and a test-retest correlation of .89 was calculated. Scores of those 31 students plus 81 others in a course on exceptional children were found to have a correlation of .35 ( $p < .01$ ) with scores on the Edward's Social Desirability Scale (1957). Considerable work was performed on correlating scale scores with MMPI variables. The authors interpreted the findings as being "more in accord with a definition of social desirability" than the Edwards scale.

Examinations of abbreviated versions of the scale can be found in Ballard, Crino, and Reubenfeld (1988), Fraboni and Cooper (1989), Reynolds (1982), as well as Strahan and Gerbasi (1972).

**RELIABILITY:**

Most of the studies have not provided information regarding the reliability of the scale. The internal consistencies that have been reported have ranged from .65 (KR-20,  $n = 120$ ) by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) to .83 (KR-20,  $n = 198$ ) by Moore et al. (1985).

**VALIDITY:**

Grossbart, Carlson, and Walsh (1991) reported a beta of .50 for the modified version of the scale they used. Some evidence of the ten item version's convergent validity was provided by Goldsmith and Hofacker (1991) who reported a significant positive correlation between the social desirability scale and a lie scale (Eysenck 1958).

No specific examination of the scale's validity was conducted in the other studies. However, the scale has been typically used to provide evidence of other scales' discriminant validity.

**COMMENTS:**

This scale is typically used when constructing scales for measuring particular constructs and not by itself. If the correlation between scores on the social desirability scale and another measure is high then that suggests the latter is measuring respondents' desire to answer in socially acceptable ways. If the correlation is low then it is evidence that the scale is

relatively free of social desirability bias. However, caution is urged in the scale's use since it may not be unidimensional (e.g., Grossbart, Carlson, and Walsh 1991).

See other uses of the scale by: Bagozzi and Warshaw (1990); Carlson, Lacznia, and Walsh (2001); Childers, Houston, and Heckler (1985); Friedman and Churchill (1987); Lastovicka et al. (1999); Peck and Childers (2003); Putrevu and Lord (1994); Raju (1980); Richins (1983; 2004); Saxe and Weitz (1982); Tian, Bearden, and Hunter (2001); Unger and Kernan (1983); Walsh, Lacznia, and Carlson (1998); and, Westbrook (1980, 1987). For further information on this scale and social desirability bias in general, refer to King and Bruner (2000) as well as other articles in that same special issue of *Psychology & Marketing* (2000) devoted to the topic.

## REFERENCES:

- Bagozzi, Richard P. (1994), Personal Correspondence.
- Bagozzi, Richard P. and Paul R. Warshaw (1990), "Trying to Consume," *JCR*, 17 (September), 127-140.
- Ballard, Rebecca, Michael D. Crino, and Stephen Rubinfeld (1988), "Social Desirability Response Bias and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale," *Psychological Reports*, 63 (August), 227-237.
- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.
- Carlson, Les and Sanford Grossbart (1988), "Parental Style and Consumer Socialization of Children," *JCR*, 15 (June), 77-94.
- Carlson, Les, Russell N. Lacznia, and Ann Walsh (2001), "Socializing Children about Television: An Intergenerational Study," *JAMS*, 29 (3), 276-288.
- Childers, Terry L., Michael J. Houston, and Susan E. Heckler (1985), "Measurement of Individual Differences in Visual Versus Verbal Information Processing," *JCR*, 12 (September), 125-134.
- Crowne, Douglas P. and David Marlowe (1960), "A New Scale of Social Desirability Independent of Psychopathology," *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24 (August), 349-354.
- Edwards, A. L. (1957), *The Social Desirability Variable in Personality Assessment and Research*, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Eysenck, Hans J. (1958), "A Short Questionnaire for the Measurement of Two Dimensions of Personality," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 42 (1), 14-17.
- Fisher, Robert J. (1993), "Social Desirability Bias and the Validity of Indirect Questioning," *JCR*, 20 (September), 303-315.
- Fraboni, Maryann and Douglas Cooper (1989), "Further Validation of Three Short Forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale of Social Desirability," *Psychological Reports*, 65 (2), 595-600.
- Friedman, Margaret L. and Gilbert A. Churchill, Jr. (1987), "Using Consumer Perceptions and a Contingency Approach to Improve Health Care Delivery," *JCR*, 13 (March), 492-510.
- Goldsmith, Ronald E. and Charles F. Hofacker (1991), "Measuring Consumer Innovativeness," *JAMS*, 19 (Summer), 209-221.

## #619 Social Desirability Bias

- Grossbart, Sanford, Les Carlson, and Ann Walsh (1991), "Consumer Socialization and Frequency of Shopping with Children," *JAMS*, 19 (Summer), 155-163.
- King, Maryon F. and Gordon C. Bruner II (2000), "Social Desirability Bias: A Neglected Aspect of Validity Testing," *Psychology & Marketing*, 17 (2), 79-103.
- Lastovicka, John L., Lance A. Bettencourt, Renee Shaw Hughner, and Ronald J. Kuntze (1999), "Lifestyle of the Tight and Frugal: Theory and Measurement," *JCR*, 26 (June), 85-98.
- Mick, David Glen (1996), "Are Studies of Dark Side Variables Confounded by Socially Desirable Responding? The Case of Materialism," *JCR*, 23 (September), 106-119.
- Moore, Ellen M., William O. Bearden, and Jesse E. Teel (1985), "Use of Labeling and Assertions of Dependency in Appeals for Consumer Support," *JCR*, 12 (June), 90-96.
- Netemeyer, Richard G. (1997), Personal Correspondence.
- Netemeyer, Richard G., Scot Burton, and Donald R. Lichtenstein (1995), "Trait Aspects of Vanity: Measurement and Relevance to Consumer Behavior," *JCR*, 21 (March), 612-626.
- Peck, Joann and Terry L. Childers (2003), "Individual Differences in Haptic Information Processing: The 'Need for Touch' Scale," *JCR*, 30 (December), 430-442.
- Putrevu, Sanjay and Kenneth R. Lord (1994), "Comparative and Noncomparative Advertising: Attitudinal Effects Under Cognitive and Affective Involvement Conditions," *JA*, 23 (June), 77-90.
- Raju, P. S. (1980), "Optimum Stimulation Level: Its Relationship to Personality, Demographics, and Exploratory Behavior," *JCR*, 7 (December), 272-282.
- Reynolds, William M. (1982), "Development of Reliable and Valid Short Forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38 (January), 119-125.
- Richins, Marsha L. (1983), "An Analysis of Consumer Interaction Styles in the Marketplace," *JCR*, 10 (June), 73-82.
- Richins, Marsha L. (1994), Personal Correspondence.
- Richins, Marsha L. and Scott Dawson (1992), "A Consumer Values Orientation for Materialism and Its Measurement: Scale Development and Validation," *JCR*, 19 (December), 303-316.
- Richins, Marsha L. (2004), "The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form," *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.
- Saxe, Robert and Barton A. Weitz (1982), "The SOCO Scale: A Measure of the Customer Orientation of Salespeople," *JMR*, 19 (August), 343-351.
- Strahan, Robert and Kathleen Carrese Gerbasi (1972), "Short, Homogeneous Versions of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 28 (April), 191-193.
- Tian, Kelly T., William O. Bearden and Gary L. Hunter (2001), "Consumers' Need for Uniqueness: Scale Development and Validation," *JCR*, 28 (June), 50-66.
- Unger, Lynette S. and Jerome B. Kernan (1983), "On the Meaning of Leisure: An Investigation of Some Determinants of the Subjective Experience," *JCR*, 9 (March), 381-391.
- Walsh, Ann D., Russell N. Laczniaak, and Les Carlson (1998), "Mothers' Preferences for Regulating Children's Television," *JA*, 27 (3), 23-36.

Westbrook, Robert A. (1980), "Intrapersonal Affective Influences on Consumer Satisfaction with Products," *JCR*, 7 (June), 49-54.

Westbrook, Robert A. (1987), "Product/Consumption-Based Affective Responses and Postpurchase Processes," *JMR*, 24 (August), 258-270.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates. (T)
2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble. (T)
3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. (F)
4. I have never intensely disliked anyone. (T)
5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life. (F)
6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. (F)
7. I am always careful about my manner of dress. (T)
8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant. (T)
9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it. (F)
10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. (F)
11. I like gossip at times. (F)
12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right. (F)
13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener. (T)
14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something. (F)
15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. (F)
16. I'm always willing to admit it when I've made a mistake. (T)
17. I always try to practice what I preach. (T)
18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people. (T)
19. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget. (F)
20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it. (T)
21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. (T)
22. At times I have really insisted on having things my way. (F)
23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. (F)
24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrong-doings. (T)
25. I never resent being asked to return a favor. (T)
26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. (T)
27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car. (T)
28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. (F)
29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off. (T)
30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. (F)
31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause. (T)

---

<sup>1</sup> Respondents should receive a point each time they answer in a socially desirable manner. Social desirability is indicated if respondents answer as indicated at the end of each item above. For example, if a respondent answers "True" to #1 then that is considered to be answering in a socially desirable manner.

**#619 Social Desirability Bias**

32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.  
(F)
33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. (T)

Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005): 6, 10, 12-16, 19, 20, 30, 33 T/F

Carlson and Grossbart (1988; Grossbart, Carlson, and Walsh 1991): 1 to 19 T/F

Fisher (1993): 3, 6, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 26, 28, 30, and 33 T/F

Goldsmith and Hofacker (1991): 11, 15 to 17, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, and 33 T/F

Mick (1996): 1 to 33 T/F

Netemeyer, Burton, and Lichtenstein (1995; Netemeyer 1997): 11, 15 to 17, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, and 33 7-point

Richins and Dawson (1992): 6-8, 12, 16, 19, 21, 26, 30, and 33 5-point

**SCALE NAME: Social Desirability of Eating Particular Food**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a person believes that consuming a specified food item is socially acceptable and appealing. While the scale could be used at a general level, such as “eating meat,” Ding, Grewal, and Liechty (2005) used it more specifically with respect to consuming chicken, shrimp, and beef.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale’s origin was provided by Ding, Grewal, and Liechty (2005) but its nature suggests that they developed it themselves as part of their research.

**RELIABILITY:**

Ding, Grewal, and Liechty (2005) used the scale for three types of meat and described the alphas as being greater than .84.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale’s validity was discussed by Ding, Grewal, and Liechty (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Ding, Min, Rajdeep Grewal and John Liechty (2005), “Incentive-Aligned Conjoint Analysis,” *JMR*, 42 (February), 67-82.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I think it is socially desirable to eat \_\_\_\_\_.
2. My friends and family would agree that it is socially desirable to consume \_\_\_\_\_.
3. There is a general perception that consuming \_\_\_\_\_ is socially desirable.

**SCALE NAME: Social Identification**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of seven-point Likert-type statements measuring the importance of a specified stimulus to one's identity.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002) borrowed three items from a four item scale used by Kleine, Kleine, and Kernan (1993). The latter had, in turn, worked with a five item scale by Callero (1985) but concluded that one of the items did not perform well.

Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) cited Callero (1985) as the source of their items though they made some minor modifications for the context they applied the scale to (being a graduate of particular university).

**RELIABILITY:**

The reliability of the scale was not reported by Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002) but the average variance extracted was .79. The internal consistency for the version of the scale used by Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) was .86 and the average variance extracted was .62.

**VALIDITY:**

Although Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002) did not discuss the details of the scale's validity they did say that there were "acceptable levels of discriminant validity among all construct pairs" in their study.

Based on their measurement model, Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) provided support for the scale's convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Arnett, Dennis B., Steve D. German, and Shelby D. Hunt (2003), "The Identity Salience Model of Relationship Marketing Success: The Case of Nonprofit Marketing," *JM*, 67 (April), 89-105.
- Callero, Peter (1985), "Role-Identity Salience," *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 48 (September), 203-215.
- Kleine, Robert E., III, Susan Schultz Kleine, and Jerome B. Kernan (1993), "Mundane Consumption and the Self: A Social-Identity Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 2 (3), 209-235.
- Laverie, Debra A., Robert E. Kleine III, and Susan Schultz Kleine (2002), "Reexamination and Extension of Kleine, Kleine, and Kernan's Social Identity Model of Mundane Consumption: the Mediating Role of the Appraisal Process," *JCR*, 28 (March), 659-669.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. \_\_\_\_\_ is something I rarely even think about. (r)
2. I really don't have any clear feelings about \_\_\_\_\_. (r)
3. \_\_\_\_\_ is an important part of who I am.
4. . . . means more to me than just \_\_\_\_\_.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the object should be placed in each of the blanks of #1-#3, e.g., tennis. The first three items were used by Laverie, Kleine, and Kleine (2002). Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) used #4 and items similar to #1-#3. Their scale stem was "Being a \_\_\_\_\_ graduate . . ." with the name of the university placed in the blank.

<sup>2</sup> Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) used "having a degree" in the blank while Callero (1985) had "donating blood."

**SCALE NAME: Social Identification**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three items are used to measure the degree to which a person views him/herself as belonging to a specified group.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information was provided by Reed (2004) regarding the scale's origin but it would appear to have been developed by him.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .85 was reported for the scale (Reed 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Reed (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Reed II, Americus (2004), "Activating the Self-Importance of Consumer Selves: Exploring Identity Salience Effects on Judgments," *JCR*, 31 (September), 286-295.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. To what extent do \_\_\_\_\_ describe you?  
*does not describe / describes me perfectly*
2. To what extent do you identify with \_\_\_\_\_?  
*do not identify with group in any way / strong identity with the group*
3. Do you admire \_\_\_\_\_?  
*do not admire / really admire*

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the group should be placed in the blanks, e.g., Republicans.

**SCALE NAME: Social Identification**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three Likert-type statements that are intended to measure the degree to which a person believes that he/she belongs to a particular group of people. To the extent that the person views him/herself as being part of the group and refers to it in determining attitudes and behaviors then it is a reference group.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is apparently original to Escalas and Bettman (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale was used in the two studies reported by Escalas and Bettman (2005) and in both cases had alphas of .96.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Escalas and Bettman (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Escalas, Jennifer Edson and James R. Bettman (2005), "Self-Construal, Reference Groups, and Brand Meaning," *JCR*, 32 (December), 378-389.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I consider myself to be this type of person.
2. I belong to this group.
3. I fit in with this group of people.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format used by Escalas and Bettman (2005) had 101 points and ranged from *strongly disagree* (0) to *strongly agree* (100).

**SCALE NAME: Special Treatment from the Service Provider**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four item scale measures the degree that a customer believes that a particular service provider will provide him/her with a good deal and preferential treatment.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although Patterson and Smith (2003) received inspiration from previous study of this and related topics, the scale seems to be original to them. A two-country (two language), multi-stage process was used to develop and refine the measure.

**RELIABILITY:**

Patterson and Smith (2003) reported alphas for three different types of service providers that ranged from .85 to .94 in Australia and from .86 to .93 in Thailand.

**VALIDITY:**

With the results of confirmatory factor analysis and other tests, Patterson and Smith (2003) provided support for the unidimensionality as well as the convergent and discriminant validities of their scales. Average variances extracted ranged from .62 to .73 in Australia and from .47 to .60 in Thailand.

**REFERENCES:**

Patterson, Paul G. and Tasman Smith (2003), "A Cross-Cultural Study of Switching Barriers and Propensity to Stay with Service Providers," *JR*, 79 (2), 107-120.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ will go out of their way to search for a special deal for me.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ will always search for the most reasonably priced solution.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ will more likely help me if something goes wrong.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ will be more likely to do what I want.

---

<sup>1</sup> Details regarding the response format were not provided by Patterson and Smith (2003). It was likely to have been a five- or seven-point Likert-type response scale. The generic name for the type of service provider being studied should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Speed**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, nine point semantic differentials items are used to measure how quickly something appears to have occurred. Subjects in the studies by Gorn et al. (2004) described how fast they thought certain web pages had downloaded. The scale was referred to as *perceived quickness*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Gorn et al. (2004) did not specify the source of the scale used in their four experiments but it seems to have been developed by them for these studies.

**RELIABILITY:**

Cronbach alphas for the scale ranged from .93 to .97 in the four experiments in which it was used by Gorn et al. (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No test on the scale's validity was performed by Gorn et al. (2004)

**REFERENCES:**

Gorn, Gerald J., Amitava Chattopadhyay, Jaideep Sengupta, and Sashank Tripathi (2004), "Waiting for the Web: How Screen Color Affects Time Perception," *JMR*, 41 (2), 215-225.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. slow / fast
2. not speedy / speedy
3. not quick / quick

**SCALE NAME: Sponsor's Self-Interest**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

These three, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure the extent to which a person believes that the party asking or “sponsoring” a question about intended behavior is actually trying to persuade him/her to do engage in that behavior because the party has something to gain from it, e.g., profit.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Williams, Fitzsimons, and Block (2004) did not state the source of the scale but its unique nature suggests they developed it themselves. The scale appears to only have been used in a pretest for Experiment 1.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .82 (n = 22) was reported for the scale by Williams, Fitzsimons, and Block (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Williams, Fitzsimons, and Block (2004) did not explicitly examine the scale’s validity. However, since the scale was used as manipulation check and showed that the manipulation was successful, that provided some limited evidence of the scale’s predictive validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Williams, Patti, Gavan J. Fitzsimons, and Lauren G. Block (2004), “When Consumers Do Not Recognize ‘Benign’ Intention Questions as Persuasion Attempts,” *JCR*, 31 (December), 540-550.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. not at all self-interested / very self-interested
2. did not have direct profit motive / had a very direct profit motive
3. very objective / not at all objective

**SCALE NAME: Spousal Influence Strategy (Coercive)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has six, seven-point Likert-type statements that are used to measure the degree to which a person tends to resolve conflicts with his/her spouse by use of coercive tactics.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Su, Fern and Ye (2003) developed the scale using items drawn from previous study of the topic (Nelson 1988; Spiro 1983). Then, using the results of a pilot test, the list of items was whittled down to 12. As noted below, factor analysis indicated that there were two factors, one of which was composed mostly of items involving coercion with the other set of items involving other means of resolving conflicts.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .85 (wives) and .76 (husbands) were reported for the scale by Su, Fern and Ye (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No explicit examination of the scale's validity was reported by Su, Fern and Ye (2003). They did, however, provide the results of two EFAs which showed that the items in the scale loaded highest on the same dimension for both husbands and wives with one exception. Although item #4 (below) loaded with the other five coercive items for women, it loaded by itself for men. Given that, the item should not be used when the scale is completed by men until and unless further testing shows that it is appropriate.

**REFERENCES:**

- Nelson, Margaret C. (1988), "The Resolution of Conflict in Joint Purchase Decision by Husbands and Wives: A Review and Empirical Test," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 15, Michael J. Houston, ed. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 436-441.
- Spiro, Rosann L. (1983), "Persuasion in Family Decision-Making," *JCR*, 9 (March), 394-402.
- Su, Chenting, Edward F. Fern and Keying Ye (2003), "A Temporal Dynamic Model of Spousal Family Purchase-Decision Behavior," *JMR*, 40 (August), 268-281.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I voiced my point of view loudly.
2. I got angry and demanded that he or she give in.
3. I pointed out that he or she had no right to disagree with me on this issue.
4. I clammed up and refused to discuss the issue.
5. I showed how much his or her stand hurt me by looking unhappy.
6. I mentioned the children's preferences to back up my point of view.

**SCALE NAME: Spousal Influence Strategy (Non-Coercive)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a person tends to resolve conflicts with his/her spouse by use of reason and negotiation rather than coercive means.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Su, Fern and Ye (2003) developed the scale using items drawn from previous study of the topic (Nelson 1988; Spiro 1983). Then, using the results of a pilot test, the list of items was whittled down to 12. As noted below, factor analysis indicated that there were two factors, one of which was composed mostly of items involving coercion with the other set of items involving other means of resolving conflicts.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .75 (wives) and .79 (husbands) were reported for the scale by Su, Fern and Ye (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No explicit examination of the scale's validity was reported by Su, Fern and Ye (2003). They did, however, provide the results of two EFAs which showed that the items in the scale loaded highest on the same dimension for both husbands and wives.

**REFERENCES:**

- Nelson, Margaret C. (1988), "The Resolution of Conflict in Joint Purchase Decision by Husbands and Wives: A Review and Empirical Test," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 15, Michael J. Houston, ed. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 436-441.
- Spiro, Rosann L. (1983), "Persuasion in Family Decision-Making," *JCR*, 9 (March), 394-402.
- Su, Chenting, Edward F. Fern and Keying Ye (2003), "A Temporal Dynamic Model of Spousal Family Purchase-Decision Behavior," *JMR*, 40 (August), 268-281.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I kept repeating or arguing my point of view.
2. I made the other person believe he or she was doing me a favor.
3. I tried to negotiate something agreeable to both of us.
4. I told him or her I have more experience with such matters.
5. I reasoned with him or her about why he or she should agree with my decision.
6. I just stated my needs. I told him or her what I wanted.

**SCALE NAME: Stimulation Importance**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, nine-point statements that measure the value a person places on novelty and excitement in life.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005) was derived from Schwartz (1992). It is part of the Schwartz Value Survey which has been tested in many different countries and is intended to capture ten important human values. Due to the unconventional psychometric techniques used to develop the instrument, many issues regarding each scale's dimensionality and validity are worthy of further testing.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) was .713 (Burroughs 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Although the scale's validity was not directly assessed by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002), the results of multidimensional scaling analysis showed that stimulation was located along an axis with other "openness to change" values and was in opposition to "conservation" values. This provides at least some modicum of evidence of the scale's nomological validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Richins (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.  
Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.  
Richins, Marsha L. (2004), "The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form," *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.  
Schwartz, Shalom H. (1992), "Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, V. 25, Mark P. Zanna, ed., San Diego: Academic Press, Inc, 1-65.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> The same nine-point response scale and anchors were used by Schwartz (1992) and Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005). The directions shown here were recreated based on a description by Schwartz (1992, p. 17).

## #629 *Stimulation Importance*

Directions: Rate each value listed below as a guiding principle in your life using the following nine-point scale: *opposed to my values* (-1), *not important* (0), (1 and 2, unlabeled), *important* (3), (4 and 5, unlabeled), *very important* (6), and *of supreme importance* (7).

1. DARING (seeking adventure, risk)
2. A VARIED LIFE (filled with challenge, novelty, and change)
3. AN EXCITING LIFE (stimulating experiences)

7

**SCALE NAME: Stimulation Potential**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point bi-polar adjectives are used to measure how stimulating a person believes a particular object to be. As used by Roehm and Roehm (2005), the scale measured the potential stimulation of a described activity but the items appear to be amenable for use in measuring the perceived stimulation of a stimulus that has actually been experienced.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Roehm and Roehm (2005) did not cite a source for the scale, thus, it may have been developed by them since no similar scale is known.

**RELIABILITY:**

Roehm and Roehm (2005) used the scale to rate the stimulation potential of a list of unspecified activities, the alphas of which were stated to range from .80 to .89.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was discussed by Roehm and Roehm (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Roehm, Harper A. Jr. and Michelle L. Roehm (2005), "Revisiting the Effect of Positive Mood on Variety Seeking," *JCR*, 32 (September), 330-336.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. stimulating / unstimulating
2. high activity / low activity
3. exciting / not exciting

**SCALE NAME: Stimulation Preference**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point statements that are intended to measure a person's desire for more or less stimulation at a particular point in time. Theoretically, this provides an idea of a person's optimum stimulation level with respect to a certain context.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Roehm and Roehm (2005) did not cite a source for the scale, thus, it may have been developed by them since no similar scale is known.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .81 was reported for the scale (Roehm and Roehm 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was discussed by Roehm and Roehm (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Roehm, Harper A. Jr. and Michelle L. Roehm (2005), "Revisiting the Effect of Positive Mood on Variety Seeking," *JCR*, 32 (September), 330-336.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I would prefer more activity right now.
2. I would prefer more stimulation right now.
3. I would prefer more excitement right now.

**SCALE NAME: Store Atmosphere****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The seven-point Likert-type scale measures the degree to which a customer holds positive perceptions of a retail store, particularly with regard to the pleasantness of the shopping environment.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale as a whole is probably original to Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994), though they say they drew on previous work by others. For example, several of the items are very similar to items used by Wu and Petroschius (1987).

**RELIABILITY:**

Internal consistencies of .81 (alpha) and .90 (construct reliability) were reported for the versions of the scale used by Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994) and Grewal et al. (2003), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not specifically addressed by Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994). A sense of its unidimensionality can be gleaned, however, from the results of the principal components factor analysis that was conducted on items from this scale as well as two others. The four items in this scale loaded highest on the same factor ( $\geq .70$ ) and had low loadings on the other two factors ( $\leq .38$ ).

Grewal et al. (2003) provided evidence in support of their scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Baker, Julie, Dhruv Grewal, and A. Parasuraman (1994), "The Influence of Store Environment on Quality Inferences and Store Image," *JAMS*, 22 (4), 328-339.
- 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," *JR*, 79 (4), 259-268.
- Wu, Bob T. W. and Susan M. Petroschius (1987), "The Halo Effect in Store Image Measurement," *JAMS*, 15 (Fall), 44-51.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. This store would be a pleasant place to shop.
2. The store has a pleasant atmosphere.
3. This store is clean.

---

<sup>1</sup> Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994) used all of these items whereas Grewal et al. (2003) used #1, #2, and #4.

*#632 Store Atmosphere*

4. The store is attractive.

**SCALE NAME: Store Atmosphere Evaluation**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale assesses a shopper's affectively-laden evaluation of a store's "atmosphere." The version used by Mattila and Wirtz (2001) had seven, seven-point bi-polar adjectives and was called *store environment*. In contrast, the version used by Baker et al. (2002) had three uni-polar adjectives, a six-point response format, and was referred to as *psychic cost perceptions*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Mattila and Wirtz (2001) implied that they pretested a 12-item measure of environmental quality by Fisher (1974). However, several of the items did not work well with their stimulus so the authors dropped them and added one of their own for the main study. Ultimately, of the seven items used by Mattila and Wirtz (2001), six were taken from the Fisher (1974) scale.

The version of the scale used by Baker et al. (2002) appears to be original to them and was based on a different set of literature than used by Mattila and Wirtz (2001). Since both scales examine the same construct and one is a subset of items in the other, they are both reviewed together here.

**RELIABILITY:**

Construct reliabilities of .79 (Study 1) and .86 (Study 2) were reported by Baker et al. (2002) for their version of the scale. The alpha for the version used by Mattila and Wirtz (2001) was .92.

**VALIDITY:**

Baker et al. (2002) conducted several tests of their scales' discriminant validities. This particular scale showed evidence of discriminant validity in each test. Its average variance extracted was .56 (Study 1) and .67 (Study 2). No examination of their scale's validity was reported by Mattila and Wirtz (2001).

**REFERENCES:**

- Baker, Julie, A. Parasuraman, Dhruv Grewal, and Glenn B. Voss (2002), "The Influence of Multiple Store Environment Cues on Perceived Merchandise Value and Patronage Intentions," *JM*, 66 (April), 120-141.
- Fisher, Jeffrey David (1974), "Situation-Specific Variables as Determinants of Perceived Environmental Esthetic Quality and Perceived Crowdedness," *Journal of Research in Personality*, 8 (August), 177-188.
- Mattila, Anna S. (2004), Personal Correspondence.
- Mattila, Anna S. and Jochen Wirtz (2001), "Congruency of Scent and Music as a Driver of In-store Evaluations and Behaviour," *JR*, 77 (2), 273-289.

## #633 Store Atmosphere Evaluation

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

Directions: How did you find the store environment? Please rate the store environment on the following dimensions:

1. unattractive / attractive
2. uninteresting / interesting
3. bad / good
4. depressing / cheerful
5. dull / bright
6. uncomfortable / comfortable
7. pleasant / unpleasant

---

<sup>1</sup> These directions were provided by Mattila (2004). The directions used by Baker et al. (2002) were as follows: "Below is a list of words that can be used to describe places. Please rate how accurately each word below describes the physical environment (atmosphere) of the store that you viewed in the video." Their scale used *pleasant*, *unpleasant*, and *uncomfortable* as separate uni-polar items and a six-point response scale anchored by *extremely accurate* and *extremely inaccurate*.

**SCALE NAME: Store Design****SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A four item, seven point Likert-type scale is used to measure the degree to which a customer holds positive perceptions of a retail store's facilities, particularly with regard to interior design factors such as color scheme and organization of merchandise.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Baker et al. (2002) used three of the four items in the scale used by Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994). The latter did not explicitly state the source of the scale. It may have been developed for their study though it appears they drew heavily upon Baker (1986).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .78 was reported for the scale by Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994). Construct reliabilities of .76 (Study 1) and .82 (Study 2) were reported by Baker et al. (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not specifically addressed by Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994). However, a sense of the scale's unidimensionality comes from the results of a principal components factor analysis they conducted which shows items from this scale as well as two others supported a three factor solution. Baker et al. (2002) conducted several tests of their scales' discriminant validities. This particular scale showed evidence of discriminant validity in each test. Its average variance extracted was .52 (Study 1) and .61 (Study 2).

**REFERENCES:**

- Baker, Julie (1986), "The Role of the Environment in Marketing Services: The Consumer Perspective," in *The Services Challenge: Integrating for Competitive Advantage*, John A. Cepeil et al., eds. Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association, 79-84.
- Baker, Julie, Dhruv Grewal, and A. Parasuraman (1994), "The Influence of Store Environment on Quality Inferences and Store Image," *JAMS*, 22 (4), 328-339.
- Baker, Julie, A. Parasuraman, Dhruv Grewal, and Glenn B. Voss (2002), "The Influence of Multiple Store Environment Cues on Perceived Merchandise Value and Patronage Intentions," *JM*, 66 (April), 120-141.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The color scheme was pleasing.
2. The colors used in the store appeared to be currently fashionable.

---

<sup>1</sup> Baker et al. (2002) used items #1, #3, and #4.

### #634 *Store Design*

3. The physical facilities were attractive.
4. The merchandise in the store appeared organized.

**SCALE NAME: Store Personnel (Quantity & Quality)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This is a four item, seven point Likert-type scale measuring a shopper's attitude about the number and quality of the employees working in a store. Although Baker, Levy, and Grewal (1992) as well as Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994) described the scale as measuring "the store social factor," it seems from an examination of the items themselves that only the employee aspect of retail social interaction was assessed. In addition, the items involve superficial observations that customer's can make rather than tapping into insights that might only be possible after personal interaction with the employees.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Baker, Levy, and Grewal (1992), Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994), as well as Baker et al. (2002) was original to the 1992 study (Baker 1993).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .86 and .83 were reported for the version of the scale used by Baker, Levy, and Grewal (1992) and Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994), respectively. Construct reliabilities of .89 (Study 1) and .92 (Study 2) were reported by Baker et al. (2002) for the version they used.

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not specifically addressed by Baker, Levy, and Grewal (1992) or Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994). However, a sense of the scale's unidimensionality is provided in Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994) where it is stated that the results of a principal components factor analysis conducted on items from this scale as well as two others supported a three factor solution. Baker et al. (2002) conducted several tests of their scales' discriminant validities. This particular scale showed evidence of discriminant validity in each test. Its average variance extracted was .73 (Study 1) and .80 (Study 2).

**COMMENTS:**

Some slight modification in the wording of the items might be necessary if the scale is used with actual shoppers who had been in a store rather than subjects simulating a shopping experience as in the studies cited here.

**REFERENCES:**

- Baker, Julie (1993), Personal Correspondence.  
Baker, Julie, Dhruv Grewal, and A. Parasuraman (1994), "The Influence of Store Environment on Quality Inferences and Store Image," *JAMS*, 22 (4), 328-339.  
Baker, Julie, Michael Levy, and Dhruv Grewal (1992), "An Experimental Approach to Making Retail Store Environmental Decisions," *JR*, 68 (Winter), 445-460.

### #635 *Store Personnel (Quantity & Quality)*

Baker, Julie, A. Parasuraman, Dhruv Grewal, and Glenn B. Voss (2002), "The Influence of Multiple Store Environment Cues on Perceived Merchandise Value and Patronage Intentions," *JM*, 66 (April), 120-141.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. There were enough employees in the store to service customers.
2. The employees were well dressed and appeared neat.
3. The employees seemed like they would be friendly.
4. The employees seemed like they would be helpful.

---

<sup>1</sup> Baker, Levy, and Grewal (1992) and Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994) used all four items whereas Baker et al. (2002) used just #2-#4. Each set of authors used a seven-point, Likert-type response format.

**SCALE NAME: Store's Provision of Information**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point statements are used to measure the degree to which a person believes that a particular store provides sufficient information about a product category so that a decision can be made of what/where to buy.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated explicitly by Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005), the scale seems to have been developed by them.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .77 was reported by Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Louro, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2005). They did, however, factor analyze these items along with those for another scale (#209) and found a two-dimensional solution.

**REFERENCES:**

Louro, Maria J., Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2005), "Negative Returns on Positive Emotions: The Influence of Pride and Self-Regulatory Goals on Repurchase Decisions," *JCR*, 31 (March), 833-840.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Do you think that (on a similar occasion) going to \_\_\_\_\_ is sufficient in order to make a good decision?
2. Do you feel that you can make a good decision by simply considering the \_\_\_\_\_ store (after this experience)?
3. To what extent is having information on the \_\_\_\_\_ store enough to choose where to buy \_\_\_\_\_?
4. Is visiting the \_\_\_\_\_ store something that you feel is suitable to make a good purchase in the future?

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors for this scale were *not at all / very much*. The name of the store should be placed in the blanks. The second blank of #3 should be filled with the name of the focal product category. The parenthetical material in the first two items can be removed if reference to a past experience is not desired.

**SCALE NAME: Stress**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The seven-item, seven-point Likert-type scale measures the extent to which a person is chronically aroused leading to impaired functionality.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Burroughs (Burroughs 2005; Burroughs and Rindfleisch 2002) is a slight adaptation of a scale developed by Lovibond and Lovibond (1995). The former phrased the items in the present tense while the latter phrased them in the past tense. Also, the former used a seven-point *agree-disagree* response scale while the latter used a four-point response format ranging from *did not apply to me at all* to *applied to me very much or most of the time*. The seven-item scale is the short version of the stress subscale of a larger instrument called DASS (depression, anxiety, and stress scales).

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale as used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) was .86 ( $n \approx 373$ ).

**VALIDITY:**

Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) reported that scores on the scale were negatively related to happiness and life satisfaction while being positively related to neuroticism, depression, and anxiety. This pattern of correlations along with general evidence from the LISREL analysis of all their measures provided evidence of the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.  
Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.  
Lovibond, P. F. and S. H. Lovibond (1995), "The Structure of Negative Emotional States: Comparison of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) with the Beck Depression and Anxiety Inventories," *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 33 (3), 335-343.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I find it hard to wind down.
2. I find it difficult to relax.
3. I find I have a lot of nervous energy to expend.
4. I find myself easily agitated.
5. I tend to over-react to situations.
6. I tend to be rather touchy.

7. I quickly become intolerant of anything that keeps me from getting on with what I am doing.

**SCALE NAME: Susceptibility to Peer Influence**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale(s) measures the degree to which a person expresses the tendency to seek information about products by observing others' behavior and asking for their opinions. Bearden, Netemeyer, and Teel (1989) referred to the scale as *consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence* (CSII) and defined it to be a consumer's "willingness to conform to the expectations of others regarding the purchase decision" (p. 473). They measured it using two scales with a total of twelve items in a seven-point response format. As noted below, some researchers have used variations of the scale.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

This measure was constructed by Bearden, Netemeyer, and Teel (1989). A series of studies were conducted by the authors to determine the reliability and validity of the scale, only a portion of which are discussed here. Based upon a review of previous research, 166 items were generated that were suspected to measure one of the three hypothesized dimensions of interpersonal influence susceptibility: *informational*, *normative*, and *value expressiveness*. After ambiguous and essentially identical items were dropped, the content validity of the remaining items was evaluated by five judges. Then, the remaining items were rated again for their clarity in representing one of the dimensions of the construct by four more judges. Some other aspects of the analysis are described below.

Boush, Friestad, and Rose (1994) performed a pretest on items borrowed from the Bearden, Netemeyer, and Teel (1989). Two items were taken from the *informational* version of the CSII (V. I, #121) and one item was taken from the *normative* version (see V. I, #135). Some change in wording was also made.

Day and Stafford (1997) choose to combine the items from the two dimensions (*informational* and *normative*) of the original set of measures used by Bearden, Netemeyer, and Teel (1989). The former also modified the wording of items in some cases to make them more amenable to the retail context.

**RELIABILITY:**

Bearden, Netemeyer, and Teel (1989) reported alphas for the eight-item normative dimension as being .87 (n = 220) and .88 (n = 141) in the first and second administrations, respectively. The alphas for the four-item informational dimension were .83 and .82 in the first and second administrations, respectively. Thirty-five students from the second administration participated in a test of the scales' three week stabilities (test-retest reliability). Correlations of .75 and .79 were reported between the scores for the informational and normative dimensions, respectively.

Alphas of .62 and .67 (n = 426 for both) were reported for the scale for its first and second administrations to middle school students, respectively by Boush, Friestad, and Rose (1994). The version of the scale used by Day and Stafford (1997) was reported to have an alpha of .87 (n = 126). Mangleburg and Bristol (1998) used the scales with high school students (n = 296) and reported composite reliabilities of .84 and .74 for the normative and informational components, respectively. Alphas of .93, .83, .88, and .90 were reported for the normative dimension of the scale as used by Bearden, Hardesty, and

Rose (2001), Bristol and Mangleburg (2005), Sen, Gurhan-Canli, and Morwitz (2001), and Wooten and Reed (2004), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

While there was initial effort by Bearden, Netemeyer, and Teel (1989) to develop separate scales to measure the three hypothesized dimensions of the construct (consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence), there was strong evidence of discriminant and convergent validity for the informational dimension but not for the utilitarian and value expressive dimensions. Their items were combined to form one scale. Confirmatory factor analysis indicated a stable two-factor correlated structure (the normative and informational factors).

The validity of the scale was not specifically addressed in the study by Boush, Friestad, and Rose (1994). However, the authors did perform a principal components analysis of the combined items of this scale with those of another scale (V.III, #315). They reported that the results “yielded a simple structure solution” (p. 170).

The results of the initial confirmatory factor analysis conducted by Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) did not lead them to dropping any items from their three item version of the scale. After dropping items from some other scales, a reanalysis showed that the measurement model produced a satisfactory fit. Evidence in support of the scale’s discriminant validity was provided as well.

**COMMENTS:**

There is evidence that the full set of 12 items developed by Bearden, Netemeyer, and Teel (1989) is multi-dimensional. Yet, the studies by Boush, Friestad, and Rose (1994) as well as Day and Stafford (1997) combined items from both dimensions. Further testing appears to be called for to determine what is most appropriate.

As acknowledged by Boush, Friestad, and Rose (1994, p. 173), the internal consistency of their version of the scale is low enough to warrant caution in using it again, particularly with non-adolescents respondents.

See also Lastovicka et al. (1999) as well as Mangleburg, Doney, and Bristol (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Bearden, William O., Richard G. Netemeyer, and Jesse E. Teel (1989), “Measurement of Consumer Susceptibility to Interpersonal Influence,” *JCR*, 15 (March), 473-481.
- Bearden, William O., David M. Hardesty, and Randall L. Rose (2001), “Consumer Self-Confidence: Refinements in Conceptualization and Measurement,” *JCR*, 28 (June), 121-134.
- Bristol, Terry and Tamara F. Mangleburg (2005), “Not Telling the Whole Story: Teen Deception in Purchasing,” *JAMS*, 33 (1), 79-95.
- Boush, David M., Marian Friestad, and Gregory M. Rose (1994), “Adolescent Skepticism Toward TV Advertising and Knowledge of Advertiser Tactics,” *JCR*, 21 (June), 165-175.

## #638 Susceptibility to Peer Influence

- Day, Ellen and Marla Royne Stafford (1997), "Age-Related Cues in Retail Services Advertising: Their Effects on Younger Consumers," *JR*, 73 (2), 211-233.
- Lastovicka, John L., Lance A. Bettencourt, Renee Shaw Hughner, and Ronald J. Kuntze (1999), "Lifestyle of the Tight and Frugal: Theory and Measurement," *JCR*, 26 (June), 85-98.
- Mangleburg, Tamara F. and Terry Bristol (1998), "Socialization and Adolescents' Skepticism Toward Advertising," *JA*, 27 (3), 11-21.
- Mangleburg, Tamara F., Patricia M. Doney, and Terry Bristol (2004), "Shopping with Friends and Teens' Susceptibility to Peer Influence," *JR*, 80 (2), 101-116.
- Sen, Sankar, Zeynep Gurhan-Canli, and Vicki Morwitz (2001), "Withholding Consumption: A Social Dilemma Perspective on Consumer Boycotts," *JCR*, 28 (December), 399-417.
- Wooten, David B. and Americus Reed II (2004), "Playing it safe: Susceptibility to Normative Influence and Protective Self-Presentation," *JCR*, 31 (December), 551-556.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. I rarely purchase the latest fashion styles until I am sure my friends approve of them.
2. It is important that others like the products and brands I buy.
3. When buying products, I generally purchase those brands that I think others will approve of.
4. If other people can see me using a product, I often purchase the brand they expect me to buy.
5. I like to know what brands and products make good impressions on others.
6. I achieve a sense of belonging by purchasing the same products and brands that others purchase.
7. If I want to be like someone, I often try to buy the same brands that they buy.
8. I often identify with other people by purchasing the same products and brands they purchase.
9. To make sure I buy the right product or brand, I often observe what others are buying and using.
10. If I have little experience with a product, I often ask my friends about the product.
11. I often consult other people to help choose the best alternative available from a product class.
12. I frequently gather information from friends or family about a product before I buy.

---

<sup>1</sup> Items #1-#8 and #9-#12 compose the normative and informational dimensions, respectively, as used by Bearden, Netemeyer, and Teel (1989). Boush, Friestad, and Rose (1994) used a five-point response format along with items similar to #3, #9, and #10. Day and Stafford (1997) used all twelve items but with slightly modified wording such that references to products and brands were changed to store or service firm. Mangleburg and Bristol (1998) used a seven-point Likert-type response format and items similar to #2, #3, and #5 to measure the normative component and items similar to #9-#12 to measure the informational component. Likewise, Bristol and Mangleburg (2005) used a seven-point Likert-type response format and items similar to #2, #3, and #5 to measure the normative component. Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose (2001) as well as Sen, Gurhan-Canli, and Morwitz (2001) and Wooten and Reed (2004) just used the eight items measuring the normative dimension.

**SCALE NAME: Switching Costs (Benefits Lost)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, five-point statements are used to assess the degree to which a person believes that changing service providers will involve losing economic benefits which had been earned over time with the previous provider, e.g., points, discounts, rewards.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale appears to have been developed by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) though they drew some inspiration from previous research. A pretest and the main study helped develop and refine eight scales for measuring various facets of switching costs.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .81 and .76 were reported by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) for long-distance and credit card applications, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale as well as those for seven other switching costs scales were examined using CFA with the main study's data. The results provided support for the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Burnham, Thomas A., Judy K. Frels, and Vijay Mahajan (2003), "Consumer Switching Costs: A Topology, Antecedents and Consequences," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 109-126.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. Switching to a new service provider would mean losing or replacing points, credits, services, and so on that I have accumulated with my service provider.
2. How much would you lose in credits, accumulated points, services you have already paid for, and so on if you switched to a new service provider?
3. I will lose benefits of being a long-term customer if I leave my service provider.

---

<sup>1</sup> Items #1 and #3 used a five-point response format and *strongly disagree/strongly agree* anchors. Item #2 used *lose nothing/lose a lot*.

## #640 *Switching Costs (Brand Relationship Loss)*

### **SCALE NAME: Switching Costs (Brand Relationship Loss)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three, five-point Likert-type statements measure the degree to which a person identifies with the image of his/her service provider. In that sense it is somewhat like a measure of *company/consumer image congruity*. As used by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) in the context of switching service providers, the scale taps into the “loss” one perceives would be incurred by not being associated with the current provider’s image anymore.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale appears to have been developed by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) though they drew some inspiration from previous research. A pretest and the main study helped develop and refine eight scales for measuring various facets of switching costs.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .77 and .68 were reported by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) for long-distance and credit card applications, respectively.

#### **VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale as well as those for seven other switching costs scales were examined using CFA with the main study’s data. The results provided support for the scale’s unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Burnham, Thomas A., Judy K. Frels, and Vijay Mahajan (2003), “Consumer Switching Costs: A Topology, Antecedents and Consequences,” *JAMS*, 31 (2), 109-126.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I like the public image my service provider has.
2. I support my service provider as a firm.
3. I do not care about the brand/company name of the service provider I use. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Switching Costs (Economic)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The six item, five-point Likert-type scale is intended to measure the perceived potential “costs” of changing service providers that have negative performance, financial, and/or convenience consequences.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale appears to have been developed by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) though they drew some inspiration from previous research. A pretest and the main study helped develop and refine eight scales for measuring various facets of switching costs.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .85 and .87 were reported by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) for long-distance and credit card applications, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale as well as those for seven other switching costs scales were examined using CFA with the main study’s data. The results provided support for the scale’s unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Burnham, Thomas A., Judy K. Frels, and Vijay Mahajan (2003), “Consumer Switching Costs: A Topology, Antecedents and Consequences,” *JAMS*, 31 (2), 109-126.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I worry that the service offered by other service providers won’t work as well as expected.
2. If I try to switch service providers, I might end up with bad service for a while.
3. Switching to a new service provider will probably involve hidden costs/charges.
4. I am likely to end up with a bad deal financially if I switch to a new service provider.
5. Switching to a new service provider will probably result in some unexpected hassle.
6. I don’t know what I’ll end up having to deal with while switching to a new service provider.

**SCALE NAME: Switching Costs (Evaluation)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, five-point items intended to measure the perceived potential “costs” of changing service providers that have to do with the time and effort needed to search for information regarding alternative providers and analyzing that information in order to make a decision.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale appears to have been developed by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) though they drew some inspiration from previous research. A pretest and the main study helped develop and refine eight scales for measuring various facets of switching costs.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .80 and .83 were reported by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) for long-distance and credit card applications, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale as well as those for seven other switching costs scales were examined using CFA with the main study’s data. The results provided support for the scale’s unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Burnham, Thomas A., Judy K. Frels, and Vijay Mahajan (2003), “Consumer Switching Costs: A Topology, Antecedents and Consequences,” *JAMS*, 31 (2), 109-126.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I cannot afford the time to get the information to fully evaluate other service providers.
2. How much time/effort does it take to get the information you need to feel comfortable evaluating new service providers?
3. Comparing the benefits of my service provider with the benefits of other service providers takes too much time/effort, even when I have the information.
4. It is tough to compare the other service providers.

---

<sup>1</sup> Each item used a five-point response format and *strongly disagree / strongly agree* anchors except for #2 which used *very little / a lot*.

**SCALE NAME: Switching Costs (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Multiple seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a customer's thoughts regarding the degree of costs (time, money, and effort) that would be associated with changing service providers. Ganesh, Arnold, and Reynolds (2000) referred to their scale as a measure of *dependence*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

All of the authors cited Ping (1993) as the source of their scales but they all modified his scale in slightly different ways. In Ping's original version of the scale, the items were phrased for a business-to-business application. (See V. III, #897 for that version of the scale.) Although the various versions are not exactly the same they are included together here because they were derived from the same source and a majority of their content in common.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .89, .9025, .921, .76, and .91 were reported for the versions of the scale by Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004), Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005), Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003), Ganesh, Arnold, and Reynolds (2000), and Jones, Mothersbaugh, and Beatty (2000), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

While Ganesh, Arnold, and Reynolds (2000) did not examine their scale's validity they did include its items in an EFA along with items intended to measure two other constructs. All items loaded strongly on the expected dimensions with no significant cross-loadings.

Based on the CFA and other tests that were conducted on this and other scales, Jones, Mothersbaugh, and Beatty (2000) concluded that their version of the scale was unidimensional and showed evidence of discriminant validity. In addition, the scale was reported to have a variance extracted of .76.

Using the results of their EFA and CFA tests, Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) implied that there was evidence in support of this scale's validity but specific tests of convergent and discriminant validity were not reported.

Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) used both exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis to refine the many scales in their study. One of their switching costs scale's original items as well as a couple of items from another scale were dropped after "reliability analysis." After doing that, the model fit the data. They also provided further evidence of the final scale's convergent validity based on factor loadings and squared multiple correlations.

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

## #643 Switching Costs (General)

- Bansal, Harvir S., P. Gregory Irving, and Shirley F. Taylor (2004), "A Three-Component Model of Customer Commitment to Service Providers," *JAMS*, 32 (3), 234-250.
- Bansal, Harvir S., Shirley F. Taylor, and Yannik St. James (2005), "Migrating' to New Service Providers: Toward a Unifying Framework of Consumers' Switching Behaviors," *JAMS*, 33 (1), 96-115.
- Bougie, Roger, Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2003), "Angry Customers Don't Come Back, They Get Back: The Experience and Behavioral Implications of Anger and Dissatisfaction in Services," *JAMS*, 31 (4), 377-393.
- Ganesh, Jaishanker, Mark J. Arnold, and Kristy E. Reynolds (2000), "Understanding the Customer Base of Service Providers: An Examination of the Differences Between Switchers and Stayers," *JM*, 64 (3), 65-87.
- Jones, Michael A., David L. Mothersbaugh, and Sharon E. Beatty (2000), "Switching Barriers and Repurchase Intentions in Services," *JR*, 79 (2), 259-274.
- Ping, Robert A., Jr. (1993), "The Effects of Satisfaction and Structural Constraints on Retailer Exiting, Voice, Loyalty, Opportunism, and Neglect," *JR*, 69 (Fall), 320-352.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. On the whole, I would spend a lot of time and money to switch from my \_\_\_\_\_<sup>2</sup>.
2. Generally speaking, the costs in time, money, effort, and grief to switch from my \_\_\_\_\_ would be high.
3. Overall, I would spend a lot and lose a lot if I switched from my \_\_\_\_\_.
4. Considering everything, the costs to stop doing business with my \_\_\_\_\_ and start up with a new \_\_\_\_\_ would be high.
5. All things considered, I would lose a lot in changing service providers.
6. Generally speaking, the costs in time, effort, and grief to switch service providers would be high.
7. It is very easy to switch service providers. (r)
8. In general, it would be a hassle changing \_\_\_\_\_.
9. It would take a lot of time and effort changing \_\_\_\_\_.
10. For me, the costs in time, money, and effort to switch \_\_\_\_\_ are high.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) as well as Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) used the first four items. Items #5-#7 were used by Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003). The items used by Ganesh, Arnold, and Reynolds (2000) as well as Jones, Mothersbaugh, and Beatty (2000) are #8-#10.

<sup>2</sup> A generic descriptor of the service provider should go in the blanks, e.g., banks, auto service company.

**SCALE NAME: Switching Costs (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree to which a consumer believes it is not worth it to change from one thing to another. The switch examined by Meuter et al. (2005) had to do with a new method of ordering prescription refills. The authors referred to the scale as *inertia*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Meuter et al. (2005) said that they adapted items from Gremler (1995), but it also seems appropriate to give credit to Ping (1993) since key phrases and concepts come from his switching cost scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .90 and .91 were reported by Meuter et al. (2005) for use of the scale in Studies 1 and 2, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

At a general level, Meuter et al. (2005) tested a measurement model containing all of their constructs and indicators. Its fit was acceptable. The factor loadings were reported to be significant and evidence of discriminant validity was provided for each construct using two different tests (confidence interval, variance extracted).

**REFERENCES:**

- Gremler, Dwayne D. (1995), "The Effect of Satisfaction, Switching Costs, and Interpersonal Bonds on Service Loyalty," doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University.
- Meuter, Matthew L., Mary Jo Bitner, Amy L. Ostrom, and Stephen W. Brown (2005), "Choosing Among Alternative Service Delivery Modes: An Investigation of Customer Trial of Self-Service Technologies," *JM*, 69 (April), 61-83.
- Ping, Robert A., Jr. (1993), "The Effects of Satisfaction and Structural Constraints on Retailer Exiting, Voice, Loyalty, Opportunism, and Neglect," *JR*, 69 (Fall), 320-352.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Changing \_\_\_\_\_ would be a bother.
2. For me, the cost in time, effort, and grief to switch \_\_\_\_\_ is high.
3. It's just not worth the hassle for me to switch \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the good or service should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Switching Costs (Learning)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, five-point Likert-type statements that measure the type of perceived potential “costs” of changing service providers that have to do with the time and effort needed to develop the knowledge and skills needed to interact effectively with a new service provider and its products.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale appears to have been developed by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) though they drew some inspiration from previous research. A pretest and the main study helped develop and refine eight scales for measuring various facets of switching costs.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had an alpha of .85 for both the long-distance and credit card applications (Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan 2003).

**VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale as well as those for seven other switching costs scales were examined using CFA with the main study’s data. The results provided support for the scale’s unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Burnham, Thomas A., Judy K. Frels, and Vijay Mahajan (2003), “Consumer Switching Costs: A Topology, Antecedents and Consequences,” *JAMS*, 31 (2), 109-126.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Learning to use the features offered by a new service provider as well as I use my service would take time.
2. There is not much involved in understanding a new service provider well. (r)
3. Even after switching, it would take effort to “get up to speed” with a new service.
4. Getting used to how another service provider works would be easy. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Switching Costs (Personal Relationships Lost)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The four, five-point Likert-type statements measure the degree to which a person believes that changing service providers would mean losing the enjoyment of interacting with particular employees of the current service provider whom the person had come to know over time.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale appears to have been developed by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) though they drew some inspiration from previous research. A pretest and the main study helped develop and refine eight scales for measuring various facets of switching costs.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .87 and .85 were reported by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) for long-distance and credit card applications, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale as well as those for seven other switching costs scales were examined using CFA with the main study's data. The results provided support for the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Burnham, Thomas A., Judy K. Frels, and Vijay Mahajan (2003), "Consumer Switching Costs: A Topology, Antecedents and Consequences," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 109-126.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I would miss working with the people at my service provider if I switched providers.
2. I am more comfortable interacting with the people working for my service provider than I would be if I switched providers.
3. The people where I currently get my service matter to me.
4. I like talking to the people where I get my service.

## #647 *Switching Costs (Setup)*

### **SCALE NAME: Switching Costs (Setup)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has four, five-point Likert-type items that assess the degree to which a person believes that changing service providers will require time and effort in order to initiate the relationship with the new provider.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale appears to have been developed by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) though they drew some inspiration from previous research. A pretest and the main study helped develop and refine eight scales for measuring various facets of switching costs.

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .74 and .80 were reported by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) for long-distance and credit card applications, respectively.

#### **VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale as well as those for seven other switching costs scales were examined using CFA with the main study's data. The results provided support for the scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Burnham, Thomas A., Judy K. Frels, and Vijay Mahajan (2003), "Consumer Switching Costs: A Topology, Antecedents and Consequences," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 109-126.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:**

1. It takes time to go through the steps of switching to a new service provider.
2. Switching service providers involves an unpleasant sales process.
3. The process of starting up with a new service is quick/easy. (r)
4. There are a lot of formalities involved in switching to a new service provider.

**SCALE NAME: Switching Costs (Setup)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's concerns about the time and effort perceived to be required to find and setup a relationship with a new provider if he/she were to switch. The type of provider examined by Bell, Seigyoung, and Smalley (2005) was a financial adviser.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Bell, Seigyoung, and Smalley (2005) examined the battery of scales developed by Jones, Mothersbaugh, and Beatty (2002) and picked a few items that they thought would fit the financial services context.

**RELIABILITY:**

Bell, Seigyoung, and Smalley (2005) reported an alpha of .89.

**VALIDITY:**

A series of exploratory and confirmatory analyses were conducted by Bell, Seigyoung, and Smalley (2005) that purified the scale and provided evidence of its unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities. An AVE of .74 was calculated for the scale.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bell, Simon J., Seigyoung Auh, and Karen Smalley (2005), "Customer Relationship Dynamics: Service Quality and Customer Loyalty in the Context of Varying Levels of Customer Expertise and Switching Costs," *JAMS*, 33 (2), 169-183.
- Jones, Michael A., David L. Mothersbaugh, and Sharon E. Beatty (2002), "Why Customers Stay: Measuring the Underlying Dimensions of Services Switching Costs and Managing Their Differential Strategic Outcomes," *Journal of Business Research*, 55 (6), 441-450.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. If I changed firms, it would take a lot of effort to find a new one.
2. If I changed firms, it would take a lot of time and effort on my part to explain to the new \_\_\_\_\_ what I like and what I want.<sup>1</sup>
3. If I were to switch firms, I would have to learn how things work at the new one.

---

<sup>1</sup> The generic name for the service provider should be placed in the blank, e.g., financial adviser.

**SCALE NAME: Switching Experience**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three item, five-point statements measure how much a consumer has changed service providers in the recent past (e.g., two years). It is not clear from the items themselves if the responses are supposed to be limited to switching experience within an industry or over all but it would appear to be the former. That would need to be clarified for respondents in the scale instructions. Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) used another scale to measure this same (or similar construct) but it emphasizes familiarity with other providers rather than the rate of switching. (See #650.)

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated explicitly, the scale appears to have been developed by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003). A pretest and the main study helped develop and refine the many scales they used to measure switching costs as well as its antecedents and consequences. Switching Experience was viewed as an antecedent of switching costs.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .78 and .72 were reported by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) for long-distance and credit card applications, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale as well as those for five other scales used to measure the antecedents of switching costs were examined using CFA. The results provided support for this scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Burnham, Thomas A., Judy K. Frels, and Vijay Mahajan (2003), "Consumer Switching Costs: A Topology, Antecedents and Consequences," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 109-126.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I have switched between service providers a lot.
2. I occasionally try other service providers.
3. How many competing service providers have you tried in the last two years?

---

<sup>1</sup> The first two items appear to have used a Likert-type response format (*strongly disagree/strongly agree*) whereas the anchors for #3 were *zero, one, two, three, four or more*.

**SCALE NAME: Switching Experience**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, five-point Likert-type items that measure the degree to which a consumer is familiar with the quality of other service providers and has, in fact, tried some other providers over time. This scale was called *alternative experience* by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) to distinguish it from the other scale of switching experience they used (#649). That one appears to tap into the same construct as this one except that it emphasizes the quantity of switching a bit more, especially in the last two years.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated explicitly, the scale appears to have been developed by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003). A pretest and the main study helped develop and refine the many scales they used to measure switching costs as well as its antecedents and consequences. Switching Experience was viewed as one of the antecedents of switching costs.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .74 and .76 were reported by Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003) for long-distance and credit card applications, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

The items in this scale as well as those for five other scales used to measure the antecedents of switching costs were examined using CFA. The results provided support for this scale's unidimensionality as well as its convergent and discriminant validities.

**COMMENTS:**

It is not clear from the items themselves if the responses are supposed to be limited to switching experience within an industry or over all but it would appear to be the former. That should be clarified for respondents in the scale instructions.

**REFERENCES:**

Burnham, Thomas A., Judy K. Frels, and Vijay Mahajan (2003), "Consumer Switching Costs: A Topology, Antecedents and Consequences," *JAMS*, 31 (2), 109-126.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I have tried the services offered by other service providers.
2. I am familiar with the quality of service that other service providers offer.
3. My experience with other service providers is limited. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Switching Intention**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of eight, seven-point statements measuring the degree to which a customer of a service provider plans to continue receiving services from the provider or, instead, intends to switch to a competitor.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) cited Oliver (1996) as the source of the scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) reported an alpha of .86 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

- Bougie, Roger, Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2003), "Angry Customers Don't Come Back, They Get Back: The Experience and Behavioral Implications of Anger and Dissatisfaction in Services," *JAMS*, 31 (4), 377-393.
- Oliver, Richard L. (1996), *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I use the services of this service provider because it is the best choice for me. (r)
2. To me, the service quality this service provider offers is higher than the service quality of other service providers. (r)
3. I have grown to like this service provider more than other service providers in this category. (r)
4. This service provider is my preferred service provider in this category. (r)
5. I have acquired the services of this organization less frequently than before.
6. I have switched to a competitor of the service organization.
7. I will not acquire services of this organization anymore in the future.
8. I intend to switch to a competitor of the service organization in the future.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale anchors used by Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg (2003) were *not at all* and *very much*.

**SCALE NAME: Tangibility (Physical)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, nine-point Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a person believes that something such as a good or service has a physical presence and can be accessed via the human senses. As used by Laroche et al. (2005), the items were reverse-coded so that the scale became a measure of intangibility.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Laroche et al. (2005) was borrowed from previous work by a couple of the authors (Laroche, Bergeron, and Goutland 2001). In that earlier article, details were provided regarding the development of the scale along with others related to intangibility. The alpha for the physical intangibility scale was .85. A close reading of the two articles indicates that Experiment 1 in the second article (Laroche et al. 2005) was based on the same dataset as the one used in the earlier article (Laroche, Bergeron, and Goutland 2001).

**RELIABILITY:**

In Experiment 1, Laroche et al. (2005) reported the scale's alpha to be .871. In Experiment 2, the alphas were .945 (off-line subsample) and .947 (online subsample).

**VALIDITY:**

No information was provided by Laroche et al. (2005) regarding the scale's validity. However, it did appear that in both experiments the measurement model fit the data well. Evidence was provided in the earlier article (Laroche, Bergeron, Goutland 2001) in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

- Laroche, Michel, Jasmin Bergeron, and Christine Goutland (2001), "A Three-Dimensional Scale of Intangibility," *Journal of Service Research*, 4 (1), 26-38.
- Laroche, Michel, Zhiyong Yang, Gordon H.G. McDougall, and Jasmin Bergeron (2005), "Internet Versus Bricks-and-Mortar Retailers: An Investigation into Intangibility and Its Consequences," *JR*, 81 (4), 251-267.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. This \_\_\_\_\_ is very easy to see and touch.
2. I can physically grasp \_\_\_\_\_.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ is very physically tangible.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the good, service, or other object should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Taste-Fat Relationship**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The three item, eleven-point Likert-type scale measures the degree to which a person believes that there is a strong positive relationship between the taste of a food and how fattening it is.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not identified by Desai and Ratneshwar (2002). It was probably developed as part of their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had an alpha of .89 according to Desai and Ratneshwar (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Desai and Ratneshwar (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Desai, Kalpesh Kaushik and S. Ratneshwar (2003), "Consumer Perceptions of Product Variants Positioned on Atypical Attributes," *JAMS*, 31 (1), 22-35.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. In general, low-fat \_\_\_\_\_ is not very tasty.
2. The more tasty a \_\_\_\_\_ is, the more fattening it is likely to be.
3. There is no relationship between the taste of a \_\_\_\_\_ and how fattening it is. (r)

---

<sup>1</sup> The blanks are to be filled with the food of interest, e.g., snack food (Desai and Ratneshwar 2002).

**SCALE NAME: Thought Focus (Others)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, seven-point statements that are intended to measure the degree to which a certain stimulus has focused a person's thoughts on others more than on self.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Hamilton and Biehal (2005) adapted items in a scale by Aaker and Lee (2001). The object in Study 1 was an ad intended to prime either an independent or an interdependent self-view. In Study 2, the object was a description of an investment club that participants were asked to imagine they were part of.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .75 (pretest), .88 (Study 1), and Study 2 (.84) were reported for the scale by Hamilton and Biehal (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Hamilton and Biehal (2005) did not address the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Aaker, Jennifer L. and Angela Y. Lee (2001), "I Seek Pleasures and We Avoid Pains: The Role of Self-Regulatory Goals in Information Processing and Persuasion," *JCR*, 28 (June), 33-49.
- Hamilton, Rebecca W (2008), Personal Correspondence.
- Hamilton, Rebecca W. and Gabriel J. Biehal (2005), "Achieving Your Goals or Protecting Their Future? The Effects of Self-View on Goals and Choices," *JCR*, 32 (September), 277-283.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The ad (investment club) encouraged me to focus on others I care about (the other members of the investment club).
2. You thought about other people you care about (the other members of the investment club).
3. Your thoughts about the ad (investment club) were focused on other people you care about (the other members of the club).
4. Your thoughts were focused on other people you care about (the other members of the investment club).

---

<sup>1</sup> Hamilton (2008) provided the items. Items for Study 1 are listed below with the changes for Study 2 noted in parentheses. Responses to the items were made on a scale anchored with *not at all* (1) and *a lot* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Thought Focus (Self)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

These four, seven-point items are intended to measure the degree to which a certain stimulus has focused a person's thoughts on self rather than others.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Hamilton and Biehal (2005) adapted items in a scale by Aaker and Lee (2001). The object in Study 1 was an ad intended to prime either an independent or an interdependent self-view. In Study 2, the object was a description of an investment club that participants were asked to imagine they were part of.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .75 (pretest), .84 (Study 1), and Study 2 (.89) were reported for the scale by Hamilton and Biehal (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Hamilton and Biehal (2005) did not address the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Aaker, Jennifer L. and Angela Y. Lee (2001), "I Seek Pleasures and We Avoid Pains: The Role of Self-Regulatory Goals in Information Processing and Persuasion," *JCR*, 28 (June), 33-49.

Hamilton, Rebecca W (2008), Personal Correspondence.

Hamilton, Rebecca W. and Gabriel J. Biehal (2005), "Achieving Your Goals or Protecting Their Future? The Effects of Self-View on Goals and Choices," *JCR*, 32 (September), 277-283.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The \_\_\_\_\_ encouraged me to focus on myself.
2. You thought just about yourself.
3. Your thoughts about the \_\_\_\_\_ were focused on just yourself
4. Your thoughts were focused on just you.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hamilton (2008) provided the items. The blanks should be filled with the name of the object to which participants attended to and which may have primed their thoughts, e.g., an ad. Responses to the items were made on a scale anchored with *not at all* (1) and *a lot* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Time Pressure**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point semantic differentials that measure the degree to which a person feels that there is not enough time available for performing a specific task. In the study by Suri and Monroe (2003), the scale was used with subjects who had been asked to evaluate some product-related information in a certain period of time.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information about the scale's origin was provided by Suri and Monroe (2003). It seems to be original to their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was said to be above .80 in the pretest and then to be .89 in the main study (n = 306 undergraduate business students).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Suri and Monroe (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Suri, Rajineesh and Kent B. Monroe (2003), "The Effects of Time Constraints on Consumers' Judgments of Prices and Products," *JCR*, 30 (June), 92-104.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. no time pressure / too much time pressure
2. more than adequate time available / not adequate time available
3. need a lot more time to do this task / no more time needed to do this task

**SCALE NAME: Tolerance for Ambiguity**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

It is a twelve-item, seven-point Likert-type scale measuring the degree of openness one has in general toward stimuli that are less than clear, puzzling, or indefinite.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

McQuarrie and Mick (1992) reported that they drew upon items that had been used in one or more of three previous studies (Budner 1962; MacDonald 1970; Norton 1975). A twenty-item scale was developed and tested. An alpha of .64 resulted which lead the authors to eliminate all items with item-total correlations less than .15. With another pretest sample, the twelve-item version of the scale yielded an alpha of .70.

**RELIABILITY:**

As used by Phillips (2000, 2002), the scale had an alpha of .67. No information was provided by McQuarrie and Mick (1992) regarding the scale's reliability beyond what is noted above concerning its development.

**VALIDITY:**

No specific testing of the scale's validity was reported by either McQuarrie and Mick (1992) or Phillips (2000).

**COMMENTS:**

McQuarrie (1994) has indicated that this scale is barely adequate in its present form. Potential users are urged to review the larger list of potential scale items that can be found in Budner (1962), MacDonald (1970), and Norton (1975) and are encouraged to attempt revisions. Further, conceptually similar scales measuring exploratory tendencies (#289) and need-for-cognition (#426) could also be considered. See also Nowlis, Kahn, and Dhar (2002) for a use of the long version of the scale.

**REFERENCES:**

- Budner, Stanley (1962), "Intolerance of Ambiguity as a Personality Variable," *Journal of Personality*, 30 (March), 29-50.
- MacDonald, A. P. (1970), "Revised Scale for Ambiguity Tolerance: Reliability and Validity," *Psychological Reports*, 26 (June), 791-798.
- McQuarrie, Edward F. and David Glen Mick (1992), "On Resonance: A Critical Pluralistic Inquiry into Advertising Rhetoric," *JCR*, 19 (Sept.), 180-197.
- McQuarrie, Edward F. (1994), Personal Correspondence.
- Norton, Robert W. (1975), "Measurement of Ambiguity Tolerance," *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 39 (6), 607-619.
- Nowlis, Stephen M., Barbara E. Kahn and Ravi Dhar (2002), "Coping with Ambivalence: The Effect of Removing a Neutral Option on Consumer Attitude and Preference Judgments," *JCR*, 29 (December), 319-334.

Phillips, Barbara J. (2000), "The Impact of Verbal Anchoring on Consumer Response to Image Ads," *JA*, 29 (1), 15-24.

Phillips, Barbara J. (2002), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Directions: To help us understand you better we would like to know your opinions about some common objects, situations, and activities. There are no right or wrong answers and therefore your first response is important. Circle a number to indicate your agreement or disagreement.

1. I like movies or stories with definite endings. (r)
2. I always want to know what people are laughing at. (r)
3. I would like to live in a foreign country for a while.
4. A good job is one where what is to be done and how it is to be done are always clear. (r)
5. I tend to like obscure or hidden symbolism.
6. It really disturbs me when I am unable to follow another person's train of thought. (r)
7. I am tolerant of ambiguous situations.
8. A poem should never contain contradictions. (r)
9. Vague and impressionistic pictures appeal to me more than realistic pictures.
10. I don't like to work on a problem unless there is a possibility of coming out with a clear-cut and unambiguous answer. (r)
11. Generally, the more meanings a poem has, the better I like it.
12. I like parties where I know most of the people more than ones where all or most of the people are complete strangers. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Tradition Importance**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six, nine-point statements that measure the value a person places on the maintenance of the shared symbols and practices of a group.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005) was derived from Schwartz (1992). It is part of the Schwartz Value Survey which has been tested in many different countries and is intended to capture ten important human values. Due to the unconventional psychometric techniques used to develop the instrument, many issues regarding each scale's dimensionality and validity are worthy of further testing.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) was .723 (Burroughs 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Although the scale's validity was not directly assessed by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002), the results of multidimensional scaling analysis showed that the tradition motivation was located along an axis with other "conservation" values and was in opposition to "openness to change" values. Likewise, it was located along an axis with other "self-transcendent" values and in opposition to "self-enhancement" values. This provides at least some modicum of evidence of the scale's nomological validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Richins (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.
- Richins, Marsha L. (2004), "The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form," *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.
- Schwartz, Shalom H. (1992), "Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, V. 25, Mark P. Zanna, ed., San Diego: Academic Press, Inc, 1-65.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: Rate each value listed below as a guiding principle in your life using the following nine-point scale: *opposed to my values* (-1), *not important* (0), (1 and 2, unlabeled), *important* (3), (4 and 5, unlabeled), *very important* (6), and *of supreme importance* (7).

1. ACCEPTING MY PORTION IN LIFE (submitting to life's circumstances)
2. DEVOUT (holding to religious faith and beliefs)
3. HUMBLE (modest, self-effacing)
4. RESPECT FOR TRADITION (preservation of time-honored customs)
5. MODERATE (avoiding extremes of feelings and action)
6. DETACHMENT (from worldly concerns)

---

<sup>1</sup> The same nine-point response scale and anchors were used by Schwartz (1992) and Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005). The directions shown here were recreated based on a description by Schwartz (1992, p. 17).

**SCALE NAME: Trust (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure the degree of trust a person has in a person or organization.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) said that they adapted their scale from one by Morgan and Hunt (1994). However, as implied by Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005), the scale was actually developed by Larzelere and Huston (1980) from their work with couples. Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) as well as Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) used the scale with consumers as they thought about a business they had dealt with.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .94 and .9119 were reported by Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

Although the authors reported that the items in this scale were unidimensional, they also reported that the items and those of another scale (satisfaction) did not have discriminant validity since they loaded on a single factor in principal components analysis.

Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) used both exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis to refine the many scales in their study. After some poorly loading items for other scales were eliminated, the model fit the data. They also provided further evidence of the scale's convergent validity based on factor loadings and squared multiple correlations.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bansal, Harvir S., P. Gregory Irving, and Shirley F. Taylor (2004), "A Three-Component Model of Customer Commitment to Service Providers," *JAMS*, 32 (3), 234-250.
- Larzelere, Robert E. and Ted L. Huston (1980), "The Dyadic Trust Scale: Toward Understanding Interpersonal Trust in Close Relationships," *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 42 (3), 595-604.
- Morgan, Robert M. and Shelby D. Hunt (1994), "The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing," *JM*, 58 (July), 20-38.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I feel that I can trust my \_\_\_\_\_ completely.
2. My \_\_\_\_\_ is truly sincere in its promises.
3. My \_\_\_\_\_ is honest and truthful with me.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bansal, Irving, and Taylor (2004) used items #1-#5 while Bansal, Taylor, and James (2005) used all six.

4. My \_\_\_\_\_ treats me fairly and justly.
5. I feel that \_\_\_\_\_ can be counted on to help me when I need it.
6. I feel that \_\_\_\_\_ does not show me enough consideration. (r)

**SCALE NAME: Trust in the Company**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, five-point Likert-type statements that attempt to assess a person's attitude toward a company with an emphasis on the degree to which the company is considered trustworthy.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002) drew items from several previous studies (Crosby, Evans, and Cowles 1990; Garbarino and Johnson 1999; Kumar, Scheer, and Steenkamp 1995).

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had a composite reliability of .76 in the main study conducted by Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002) followed a multi-step process in the development and testing of the scales they used in their study. They provide a variety of evidence in support of the scale's content, convergent, and discriminant validity. However, the AVE of the final scale was .45, somewhat lower than the .50 minimum expected for a scale (Fornell and Larcker 1981), and raising some doubt about the scale's convergent validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Crosby, Lawrence A., Kenneth R. Evans, and Deborah Cowles (1990), "Relationship Quality in Services Selling: An Interpersonal Influence Perspective," *JM*, 54 (July), 68-81.
- Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *JMR*, 18 (February), 39-50.
- Garbarino, Ellen and Mark S. Johnson (1999), "The Different Roles of Satisfaction, Trust, and Commitment in Customer Relationships," *JM*, 63 (April), 70-87.
- Kumar, Nirmalya, Lisa K. Scheer, and Jan-Benedict E. M. Steenkamp (1995), "The Effects of Perceived Interdependence on Dealer Attitudes," *JMR*, 32 (August), 348-356.
- Verhoef, Peter C., Philip Hans Franses, and Janny C. Hoekstra (2002), "The Effects of Relational Constructs on Customer Referrals and Number of Services Purchased From a Multiservice Provider: Does Age of Relationship Matter?" *JAMS*, 30 (3), 202-216.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ can be relied on to keep its promises.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ puts the customer's interest first.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ usually keeps the promises that it makes to me.
4. I can count on \_\_\_\_\_ to provide a good service.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the business/organization should be placed in the blanks. These statements are the translations provided in the article by Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002); the actual items used in their study were phrased in Dutch.

**SCALE NAME: Trust in the Company**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, ten-point semantic differentials are used to assess the degree to which a customer believes a business is reliable and capable.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) stated that the scale was adapted from previous measures of trust, however, examination shows very little similarity in those items and the ones used by the authors. Given this, it is most accurate to consider the scale to be original to Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .96 was reported for the scale by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) for both the retail store and the airline that were studied.

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**COMMENTS:**

See also Nijssen et al. (2003) for combining the items in this scale with those of another scale (#663) to measure “overall trust in the service provider.” Although both sets of items are the same, they are directed at different objects. The constructs may be highly related in most situations but they are not the same. They should not be treated as if they are unidimensional unless support is provided across a variety of situations or if it is shown that they are dimensions of a higher order factor. A similar combination of items from two different scales was used to by Agustin and Singh (2005) to produce a six-item measure they referred to as *relational trust*.

**REFERENCES:**

- Agustin, Clara and Jagdip Singh (2005), “Curvilinear Effects of Consumer Loyalty Determinants in Relational Exchanges,” *JMR*, 42 (February), 96-108.
- Nijssen, Edwin, Jagdip Singh, Deepak Sirdeshmukh, and Hartmut Holzmüller (2003), “Investigating Industry Context Effects in Consumer-Firm Relationships: Preliminary Results from a Dispositional Approach,” *JAMS*, 31 (1), 46-60.
- Sirdeshmukh, Deepak, Jagdip Singh, and Barry Sabol (2002), “Consumer Trust, Value, and Loyalty in Relational Exchanges,” *JM*, 66 (January), 15-37.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

I feel that this \_\_\_\_\_ is:<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the type of business can be placed in the blank. Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) used “store” and “airline.”

1. very undependable / very dependable
2. very incompetent / very competent
3. of very low integrity / of very high integrity
4. very unresponsive to customers / very responsive to customers

**SCALE NAME: Trust in the Company**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The six item, seven-point Likert-type scale assesses the degree to which a customer expresses confidence in the dependability and quality of a company/brand. Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) referred to the scale as *partner quality*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although they drew inspiration from previous work, Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) appear to have developed the scale themselves.

**RELIABILITY:**

Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) reported alphas ranging from .86 to .91 over three time periods.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Aaker, Jennifer, Susan Fournier, and S. Adam Brasel (2004), "When Good Brands Do Bad," *JCR*, 31 (June), 1-16.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I can always count on \_\_\_\_\_ to do what's best.
2. If \_\_\_\_\_ makes a mistake, it will try its best to make up for it.
3. I know I can hold \_\_\_\_\_ accountable for its actions.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ is reliable.
5. Given my image of \_\_\_\_\_, letting me down would surprise me.
6. A brand failure would be inconsistent with my expectations.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal company/brand should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Trust in the Employees**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, ten-point semantic differentials that measure the extent to which a customer believes the employees of a store or company are capable and trustworthy.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) stated that the scale was adapted from previous measures of trust, however, comparison shows very little similarity in this scale's items and those used in the studies cited. Given this, it is most accurate to consider this scale to be original to Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .96 (retail) and .97 (airline) were reported for the scale by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**COMMENTS:**

See also Nijssen et al. (2003) for combining the items in this scale with those of another scale (#661) to measure "overall trust in the service provider." Although both sets of items are the same, they are directed at different objects. The constructs may be highly related in most situations but they are not the same. They should not be treated as if they are unidimensional unless support is provided across a variety of situations or if it is shown that they are dimensions of a higher order factor. A similar combination of items from two different scales was used to by Agustin and Singh (2005) to produce a six-item measure they referred to as *relational trust*.

**REFERENCES:**

- Agustin, Clara and Jagdip Singh (2005), "Curvilinear Effects of Consumer Loyalty Determinants in Relational Exchanges," *JMR*, 42 (February), 96-108.
- Nijssen, Edwin, Jagdip Singh, Deepak Sirdeshmukh, and Hartmut Holzmüller (2003), "Investigating Industry Context Effects in Consumer-Firm Relationships: Preliminary Results from a Dispositional Approach," *JAMS*, 31 (1), 46-60.
- Sirdeshmukh, Deepak, Jagdip Singh, and Barry Sabol (2002), "Consumer Trust, Value, and Loyalty in Relational Exchanges," *JM*, 66 (January), 15-37.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

### #663 *Trust in the Employees*

I feel that the employees of this \_\_\_\_\_ are:<sup>1</sup>

1. very undependable / very dependable
2. very incompetent / very competent
3. of very low integrity / of very high integrity
4. very unresponsive to customers / very responsive to customers

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the type of business can be placed in the blank. Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) used “store” and “airline.”

**SCALE NAME: Trust in the Service Provider**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven, seven-point Likert-type statements are used in the scale to measure the degree to which a customer can count on a service provider and believes it to be honest.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Hui et al. (2004) indicated that the source of the items was Morgan and Hunt (1994).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .94 (Experiment 1) and .93 (Experiment 2) were reported for the scale (Hui et al. 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Hui et al. (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Hui, Michael K. (2007), Personal Correspondence.

Hui, Michael K., Xiande Zhao, Xiucheng Fan, and Kevin Au (2004), "When Does the Service Process Matter? A Test of Two Competing Theories," *JCR*, 31 (September), 465-475.

Morgan, Robert M. and Shelby D. Hunt (1994), "The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing," *JM*, 58 (July), 20-38.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

As your supplier, \_\_\_\_\_:<sup>2</sup>

1. . . . cannot be trusted at times. (r)
2. . . . is perfectly honest and truthful.
3. . . . can be trusted completely.
4. . . . can be counted on to do what is right.
5. . . . is always faithful.
6. . . . is someone that I have great confidence in.
7. . . . has high integrity.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale items were provided by Hui (2007).

<sup>2</sup> The name of the service provider should be placed in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Trust in the Service Provider**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Eight, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's belief that a particular vendor is dependable and trustworthy. The scale was used by Harris and Goode (2004) with online stores but it appears to be appropriate for use a variety of vendors that provide both goods and services.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Harris and Goode (2004) stated that their scale was adapted from work by Hess (1995).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .77 (study 1) and .80 (study 2) were found for the scale by Harris and Goode (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

Harris and Goode (2004) provided evidence in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Harris, Lloyd C and Mark M.H. Goode (2004), "The Four Levels of Loyalty and the Pivotal Role of Trust: A Study of Online Service Dynamics," *JR*, 80 (2), 139-158.  
Hess, Jeffery S. (1995), "Construction and Assessment of a Scale to Measure Consumer Trust," in *AMA Winters Educators' Proceedings*, Barbara Stern & George M. Zinkhan, eds. Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association, 20-26.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ is interested in more than just selling me goods and making a profit.
2. There are no limits to how far \_\_\_\_\_ will go to solve a service problem I may have.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ is genuinely committed to my satisfaction.
4. Most of what \_\_\_\_\_ says about its products is true.
5. I think some of \_\_\_\_\_'s claims about its service are exaggerated. (r)
6. If \_\_\_\_\_ makes a claim or promise about its product, it's probably true.
7. In my experience, \_\_\_\_\_ is very reliable.
8. I feel I know what to expect from \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal store should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: TV Viewing (Attention)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five Likert-type statements measure the relative degree to which a person focuses on programs when watching television or, instead, pays attention to something else.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Shrum, Burroughs, and Rindfleisch (2005) was borrowed from Rubin, Perse, and Taylor (1988). The latter conducted exploratory factor analysis of the scale's five items along with 15 other items. The five items were found to be unidimensional and had an alpha of .77.

**RELIABILITY:**

Shrum, Burroughs, and Rindfleisch (2005) reported the composite reliability of the scale to be 0.85.

**VALIDITY:**

Referring to Study 1, Shrum, Burroughs, and Rindfleisch (2005) stated that the fit of the measurement model was good. Additionally, the authors cited evidence of the scale's discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

Rubin, Alan M., Elizabeth M. Perse, and Donald S. Taylor (1988), "A Methodological Examination of Cultivation," *Communication Research*, 15 (April), 107-134.  
Shrum, L. J., James E. Burroughs, and Aric Rindfleisch (2005), "Television's Cultivation of Material Values," *JCR*, 32 (December), 473-479.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I'm often thinking about something else when I'm watching television. (r)
2. I often miss what is happening on the program when I watch television. (r)
3. My mind often wanders when I watch television. (r)
4. I pay close attention to the program when I watch television.
5. I listen carefully when I watch television.

---

<sup>1</sup> The full set of items was provided by Burroughs (2005).

## #667 TV Viewing (Time Spent)

### **SCALE NAME: TV Viewing (Time Spent)**

#### **SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six, seven-point Likert-type statements measure the relative level of television programming a person admits to viewing on a general basis.

#### **SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Shrum, Burroughs, and Rindfleisch (2005).

#### **RELIABILITY:**

Composite reliabilities of .87 (Study 1) and .78 (Study 2) were reported for the scale (Shrum, Burroughs, and Rindfleisch 2005).

#### **VALIDITY:**

Referring to Study 1, Shrum, Burroughs, and Rindfleisch (2005) stated that the fit of the measurement model was good. Additionally, the authors cited evidence of their scales' discriminant validities.

#### **REFERENCES:**

Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.  
Shrum, L. J., James E. Burroughs, and Aric Rindfleisch (2005), "Television's Cultivation of Material Values," *JCR*, 32 (December), 473-479.

#### **SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I watch less television than most people I know. (r)
2. I often watch television on weekends.
3. I spend time watching television almost every day.
4. One of the first things I do in the evening is turn on the television.
5. I hardly ever watch television. (r)
6. I have to admit, I watch a lot of television.

---

<sup>1</sup> The full set of items was provided by Burroughs (2005).

**SCALE NAME: Uniqueness of Product's Attributes**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, nine-point semantic differentials and measures the degree to which a person believes some features are shared by a specific set of products or are generally shared among a wider set of products.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No source for the scale was specified by Gurhan-Canli (2003) but it seems to be original to her study.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .96 was reported for the scale in Experiment 3 by Gurhan-Canli (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No explicit examination of the scale's validity was reported by Gurhan-Canli (2003). However, some evidence of the scale's predictive validity was evident when it confirmed the treatment manipulations.

**REFERENCES:**

Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep (2003), "The Effect of Expected Variability of Product Quality and Attribute Uniqueness on Family Brand Evaluations," *JCR*, 30 (June), 105-114.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. very specific / very general
2. very narrow / very broad
3. very unlikely to be generalized / very likely to be generalized

**SCALE NAME: Unity in the Object**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three, seven-point semantic differentials that are intended to measure the degree to which a person believes that the parts of a particular stimulus fit together well.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Lam and Mukherjee (2005) was developed by Bell, Holbrook, and Solomon (1991). The latter reported the alpha of the scale to be .75.

**RELIABILITY:**

Lam and Mukherjee (2005) reported composite reliabilities for the scale ranging from .94 to .96 for three different conditions for the men's wear sample. For women's wear the reliabilities ranged from .97 to .98.

**VALIDITY:**

Evidence in support of the convergent and discriminant validities of the scale were provided by Lam and Mukherjee (2005). The average variance extracted ranged from .89 to .91 for the men's wear sample and .91 to .93 for the women's wear sample.

**REFERENCES:**

Bell, Stephen S., Morris B. Holbrook, and Michael R. Solomon (1991), "Combining Esthetic and Social Value to Explain preferences for Product Styles with the Incorporation of Personality and Ensemble Effect," *Journal of Social behavior and Personality*, 6 (6), 243-273.

Lam, Shun Yin and Avinandan Mukherjee (2005), "The Effects of Merchandise Coordination and Juxtaposition on Consumers' Product Evaluation and Purchase Intention in Store-Based Retailing," *JR*, 81 (3), 231-250.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Low in unity / high in unity
2. Poorly coordinated / well-coordinated
3. Inconsistent / consistent

**SCALE NAME: Universalism Importance**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Nine, nine-point statements are used to assess the value placed by a person on an understanding of and desire to protect the welfare of all people and nature.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005) was derived from Schwartz (1992). It is part of the Schwartz Value Survey which has been tested in many different countries and is intended to capture ten important human values. Due to the unconventional psychometric techniques used to develop the instrument, many issues regarding each scale's dimensionality and validity are worthy of further testing.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) was .817 (Burroughs 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Although the scale's validity was not directly assessed by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002), the results of multidimensional scaling analysis showed that universalism leaned more towards self-transcendent values such as community and benevolence and was in opposition to self-enhancement values such as hedonism and materialism. This provides at least some modicum of evidence of the scale's nomological validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Richins (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.  
Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.  
Richins, Marsha L. (2004), "The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form," *JCR*, 31 (June), 209-219.  
Schwartz, Shalom H. (1992), "Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, V. 25, Mark P. Zanna, ed., San Diego: Academic Press, Inc, 1-65.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> The same nine-point response scale and anchors were used by Schwartz (1992) and Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005). The directions shown here were recreated based on a description by Schwartz (1992, p. 17).

## #670 *Universalism Importance*

Directions: Rate each value listed below as a guiding principle in your life using the following nine-point scale: *opposed to my values* (-1), *not important* (0), (1 and 2, unlabeled), *important* (3), (4 and 5, unlabeled), *very important* (6), and *of supreme importance* (7).

1. PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT (preserving nature)
2. UNITY WITH NATURE (fitting into nature)
3. A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)
4. BROAD-MINDED (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs)
5. SOCIAL JUSTICE (correcting injustice, care for the weak)
6. WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)
7. EQUALITY (equal opportunity for all)
8. A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)
9. INNER HARMONY (at peace with oneself)

**SCALE NAME: Usage Clarity**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a consumer's certainty about how to properly use an object. The objects examined by Meuter et al. (2005) were two kinds of self-service technologies. In the context of co-production, the authors viewed the scale as a measure of *role clarity*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Meuter et al. (2005) but they drew phrases and concepts from the work of Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970).

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .96 and .94 were reported by Meuter et al. (2005) for use of the scale in Studies 1 and 2, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

At a general level, Meuter et al. (2005) tested a measurement model containing all of their constructs and indicators. Its fit was acceptable. The factor loadings were reported to be significant and evidence of discriminant validity was provided for each construct using two different tests (confidence interval, variance extracted).

**REFERENCES:**

- Meuter, Matthew L., Mary Jo Bitner, Amy L. Ostrom, and Stephen W. Brown (2005), "Choosing Among Alternative Service Delivery Modes: An Investigation of Customer Trial of Self-Service Technologies," *JM*, 69 (April), 61-83.
- Rizzo, John R., Robert J. House, and Sidney I. Lirtzman (1970), "Role Conflict and Ambiguity in Complex Organizations," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15 (June), 150-163.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I feel certain about how to effectively use the \_\_\_\_\_.
2. I am NOT sure how to use the \_\_\_\_\_ properly. (r)
3. I know what is expected of me if I use the \_\_\_\_\_.
4. The steps in the process of using the \_\_\_\_\_ are clear to me.
5. I believe there are only vague directions regarding how to use the \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the good or service should be placed in the blanks.

#672 *Usefulness (General)*

**SCALE NAME: Usefulness (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point bi-polar adjectives intended to measure the extent to which a person perceives a stimulus to be useful with the emphasis on its practicality. The stimuli with which the scale was used by Cox and Cox (2002) were drawings of dress designs.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information about the scale's origin was stated by Cox and Cox (2002). Given that the scale does not match any known scale, it is likely to be original to their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .78 ( $n = 47$ ) was reported for the scale (Cox and Cox 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Cox and Cox (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Cox, Dena S. and Anthony D. Cox (2002), "Beyond First Impressions: The Effects of Repeated Exposure on Consumer Liking of Visually Complex and Simple Product Designs," *JAMS*, 30 (2), 119-130.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. not useful / useful
2. not functional / functional
3. not practical / practical

**SCALE NAME: Usefulness of the Object**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type statements intended to measure the extent to which a person views the usage of something as helping to improve one's efficiency and effectiveness. Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) used the scale with mobile services but it appears to be amenable for use with goods as well.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) though they drew upon Davis for ideas (e.g., Davis, Bagozzi, and Warshaw 1989). Four mobile services were examined in their study: text messaging, contact, payment, and gaming.

**RELIABILITY:**

The construct reliability for the scale across four mobile services studied was .87 (Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Nysveen, Pederson and Thorbjørnsen (2005) supported the scale's validity by testing their measurement model. The model had 26 items measuring eight factors. The results indicated that each construct shared more variance with its indicators than with the other constructs in the study. Further, the fit indices indicated that the measurement model was acceptable for each of the four applications.

**REFERENCES:**

- Davis, Fred D., Richard P. Bagozzi, and Paul R. Warshaw (1989), "User Acceptance of Computer Technology: A Comparison of Two Theoretical Models," *Management Science*, 35 (8), 982-1003.
- Nysveen, Herbjørn, Per E. Pederson and Helge Thorbjørnsen (2005), "Intentions to Use Mobile Services: Antecedents and Cross-Service Comparisons," *JAMS*, 33 (3), 330-346.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Using \_\_\_\_\_ makes me save time.
2. Using \_\_\_\_\_ improves my efficiency.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ is useful to me.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the object should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Value Consciousness**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

A seven-item, seven-point Likert-type scale measuring the concern a consumer has for paying low prices contingent on some product quality expectations.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1990). Five marketing academicians judged the appropriateness of 33 items generated to represent the construct. Eighteen items remained after this procedure. Based upon a second round of five additional judges assessing the face validity of the items, fifteen items were retained. The items were then interspersed throughout a questionnaire given to 263 undergraduate and graduate business students. The seven items composing the final version of the scale were those that had corrected item-total correlations equal to or greater than .40. Confirmatory factor analysis provided evidence that the items were unidimensional and had discriminant validity. The construct reliability was calculated to be .80.

**RELIABILITY:**

As in the pretest, the internal consistency of the scale was calculated by Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, and Burton (1990) to be .80 and item-total correlations were above .40. The main study by Lichtenstein, Ridgway, and Netemeyer (1993) also showed an alpha for the scale of .82. Burton et al. (1998) reported an alpha of .86. In Study 1 by Burton, Lichtenstein, and Netemeyer (1999) an alpha of .86 was reported; in Study 2 it was merely reported to be greater than .85. Garretson, Fisher, and Burton (2002) and Lastovicka et al. (1999) reported alphas of .86 and .91, respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

In the process of validating another scale (#43), Burton et al. (1998) conducted multiple tests of the scale's discriminant validity. The evidence provided support for a claim of discriminant validity for the Value Consciousness scale as well.

Lastovicka et al. (1999) used this scale in the process of validating another scale (V4, #177). Based upon that, their data indicated that scores on the value consciousness scale were significantly related to frugality but not to a measure of response bias (#267).

Confirmatory factor analysis was used by Garretson, Fisher, and Burton (2002) as well as Lichtenstein et al. (1990, 1993) to provide evidence of the scale's unidimensionality as well as its discriminant validity.

**COMMENTS:**

See also Dutta and Biswas (2005) as well as Swaminathan and Bawa (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- Burton, Scot, Donald R. Lichtenstein, and Richard G. Netemeyer (1999), "Exposure to Sales Flyers and Increased Purchases in Retail Supermarkets," *JAR*, 39 (September/October), 7-14.
- Burton, Scot, Donald R. Lichtenstein, Richard G. Netemeyer, and Judith A. Garretson (1998), "A Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward Private Label Products and an Examination of Its Psychological and Behavioral Correlates," *JAMS*, 26 (4), 293-306.
- Dutta, Sujay and Abhijit Biswas (2005), "Effects of Low Price Guarantees on Consumer Post-Purchase Search Intention: The Moderating Roles of Value Consciousness and Penalty Level," *JR*, 81 (4), 283-291.
- Garretson, Judith A., Dan Fisher, and Scot Burton (2002), "Antecedents of Private Label Attitude and National Brand Promotion Attitude: Similarities and Differences," *JR*, 78 (2), 91-99.
- Lastovicka, John L., Lance A. Bettencourt, Renee Shaw Hughner, and Ronald J. Kuntze (1999), "Lifestyle of the Tight and Frugal: Theory and Measurement," *JCR*, 26 (June), 85-98.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R., Richard D. Netemeyer, and Scot Burton (1990), "Distinguishing Coupon Proneness From Value Consciousness: An Acquisition-Transaction Utility Theory Perspective," *JM*, 54 (July), 54-67.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R., Nancy M. Ridgway, and Richard G. Netemeyer (1993), "Price Perceptions and Consumer Shopping Behavior: A Field Study," *JMR*, 30 (May), 234-245.
- Swaminathan, Srinivasan and Kapil Bawa (2005), "Category-Specific Coupon Proneness: The Impact of Individual Characteristics and Category-Specific Variables," *JR*, 81 (3), 205-214.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I am very concerned about low prices, but I am equally concerned about product quality.
2. When grocery shopping, I compare the prices of different brands to be sure I get the best value for the money.
3. When purchasing a product, I always try to maximize the quality I get for the money I spend.
4. When I buy products, I like to be sure that I am getting my money's worth.
5. I generally shop around for lower prices on products, but they still must meet certain quality requirements before I buy them.
6. When I shop, I usually compare the "price per ounce" information for brands I normally buy.
7. I always check the prices at the grocery store to be sure I get the best value for the money I spend.

**SCALE NAME: Value of External Information**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The five item, seven-point Likert-type scale is intended to measure the value of several sources of information that could have been used when a recent decision was made. Since the items are summated, the relevance of any one source is not as important as what the items as a whole have in common such as being external sources of information.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

O’Cass (2002) implied that the source of the scale was Mittal (1989) but it may be more accurate to say that the *information seeking* item used by the latter gave the former inspiration for development of his multi-item scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

The internal consistency of the scale was .88 (O’Cass 2002, 2004).

**VALIDITY:**

O’Cass (2002) claimed evidence for the scale’s discriminant validity using a simple but less popular technique (Gaski 1984) whereby the internal consistency of a scale is compared to its correlations with every other scale in a study. To the extent that the internal consistency is higher than the correlations then some evidence for discriminant validity is shown. O’Cass implied that the value scale successfully met this criterion.

**COMMENTS:**

Despite the acceptable reliability, it is difficult to see how this scale is unidimensional. A person could easily have widely different beliefs about the value of information from TV vs. Internet vs. political advertising, etc., and this appears to be shown in the article (O’Cass 2002, p.69). Further evidence of the scale’s weakness comes from its low AVE (.41). Great care should be exercised in use of this scale for theory testing until its psychometric quality can be assessed further.

**REFERENCES:**

- Mittal, Banwari (1989), “Must Consumer Involvement Always Imply More Information Search?” in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 16, T.K. Srull, ed. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 167-172.
- O’Cass, Aron (2002), “Political Advertising Believability and Information Source Value During Elections,” *JA*, 31 (1), 63-73.
- O’Cass, Aron (2004), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> As used by O’Cass (2002), each of these items ended with “the election.”

#675 *Value of External Information*

1. To me, TV news and a current affair programs have been a valuable source of information in \_\_\_\_\_.
2. To me, newspapers have been a valuable source of information during \_\_\_\_\_.
3. To me, the Internet has been a good source of information during \_\_\_\_\_.
4. To me, political advertising has been a good source of information during \_\_\_\_\_.
5. To me, other people (friends, family etc) have been a good source of information during \_\_\_\_\_.

**SCALE NAME: Value of Supermarket Offers**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, six-point items are used to measure a person's attitude regarding the prices of products and the value of loyalty card specials offered by a particular grocery store.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Gomez, McLaughlin, and Wittink (2004) said they got the data for their study from a publicly held supermarket chain operating in the eastern part of the United States. The chain included these items in the semi-annual survey that it conducted of its loyalty card customers.

**RELIABILITY:**

Gomez, McLaughlin, and Wittink (2004) reported an alpha of .89 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not apparently examined by Gomez, McLaughlin, and Wittink (2004). However, they did conduct an EFA of 21 items and the ones in this scale had high loadings ( $> .60$ ) on the same factor.

**REFERENCES:**

Gomez, Miguel I., Edward W. McLaughlin, and Dick R. Wittink (2004), "Customer Satisfaction and Retail Sales Performance: An Empirical Investigation," *JR*, 80 (4), 265-278.

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. overall value for your money
2. overall prices compared to the competition
3. prices of loyalty card specials
4. availability of loyalty card specials
5. variety of advertised loyalty card items

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors of the response scale were *poor* (1) and *excellent* (6).

**SCALE NAME: Value of the Added Service**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point statements are used to measure the value a person places on a service provided to him/her personally by a business that is above and beyond what is normally provided. The scale was referred to as *reactions to marketing actions* by Aggarwal (2004).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is apparently original to Aggarwal (2004) and was used in the first of three experiments described in his article.

**RELIABILITY:**

Aggarwal (2004) reported that the scale had an alpha of .81.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Aggarwal (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Aggarwal, Pankaj (2004), "The Effects of Brand Relationship Norms on Consumer Attitudes and Behavior," *JCR*, 31 (June), 87-101.  
Aggarwal, Pankaj (2007), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How much would you be willing to pay Grove Bank for the extra service provided?
2. No charges (The charges) for the extra service seemed very appropriate.
3. No charges (The charges) for the extra service seemed like a good business practice.

---

<sup>1</sup> The phrasing of the scale was provided by Aggarwal (2007). The response format was a seven point scale with *not at all* (1) and *very much* (7) as anchors. The alternative beginnings of items #2 and #3 have to do with the two different conditions in the experiment: one group of subjects was told there would be a charge for the service while the other group was told there would be no charge.

**SCALE NAME: Value of the Loyalty Program**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point statements that measure the degree to which a person views a loyalty program as being financially valuable, relevant, and desirable.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Yi and Jeon (2003) appear to have developed the scale themselves but got their inspiration for the items from a discussion by O'Brien and Jones (1995) about how consumers value a loyalty program.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .80 (high involvement) and .79 (low involvement) were reported for the scale by Yi and Jeon (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

Yi and Jeon (2003) used confirmatory factor analysis and, based on that as well as supplementary analyses, they stated that all of their scales showed evidence of convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- O'Brien, Louise and Charles Jones (1995), "Do Rewards Really Create Loyalty?" *Harvard Business Review*, 73 (3), 75-82.
- Yi, Youjae and Hoseong Jeon (2003), "Effects of Loyalty Programs on Value Perception, Program Loyalty, and Brand Loyalty," *JAMS*, 31 (3), 229-240.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The proposed rewards have high cash value.
2. It is likely to get the proposed rewards.
3. The proposed rewards are what I have wanted.

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors for the seven-point response scale were *not at all* and *quite a lot*.

**SCALE NAME: Value of the Offer**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of Likert-type statements intended to measure a consumer's attitude about a particular price-deal he/she has been exposed to.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although bearing some similarity to previous measures of value (e.g., V3, #391), this set of items appears to be original to Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998). Taylor and Bearden (2002) cited several sources for their scale but the Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998) scale seems to be especially obvious. The source of the scale used by Suri and Monroe (2003) was not stated but they obviously drew upon one or more of these previous studies.

**RELIABILITY:**

Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998) reported construct reliabilities of .95 (n = 361) and .97 (n = 328) for use of the scale in their first and second studies, respectively. The alpha for the version used by Suri and Monroe (2003) was .70. The version of the scale used by Taylor and Bearden (2002) had a construct reliability of .94 (n = 285).

**VALIDITY:**

A variety of evidence was provided by Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998) from both of their studies in support of the scale's unidimensionality, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. Especially abundant was the evidence indicating the discriminant validity between this scale and one measuring another type of value (V4, #497). Taylor and Bearden (2002) provided evidence of the scale's discriminant validity based on several different tests. No evidence of the scale's validity was provided by Suri and Monroe (2003).

**COMMENTS:**

The product examined by Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998) was a bicycle. All of the scale items seem amenable for use with a variety of other products except for #9. Suri and Monroe (2003) used the scale with a television and a telephone. The product used by Taylor and Bearden (2002) was a hypothetical brand extension.

**REFERENCES:**

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," *JM*, 62 (April), 46-59.

## #679 Value of the Offer

Suri, Rajineesh and Kent B. Monroe (2003), "The Effects of Time Constraints on Consumers' Judgments of Prices and Products," *JCR*, 30 (June), 92-104.

Taylor, Valerie A. and William O. Bearden (2002), "The Effects of Price on Brand Extension Evaluations: The Moderating Role of Extension Similarity," *JAMS*, 30 (2), 131-140.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

1. If I bought this \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_, I feel I would be getting my money's worth.
2. I feel that I am getting a good quality \_\_\_\_\_ for a reasonable price.
3. After evaluating the advertised \_\_\_\_\_ features, I am confident that I am getting quality features for \_\_\_\_\_.
4. If I acquired this \_\_\_\_\_, I think I would be getting good value for the money I spend.
5. I think that given this \_\_\_\_\_'s features, it is good value for the money.
6. I feel that acquiring this \_\_\_\_\_ meets both my high quality and low price requirements.
7. Compared to the maximum price I would be willing to pay for this \_\_\_\_\_, the sale price conveys good value.
8. I would value this \_\_\_\_\_ as it would meet my needs for a reasonable price.
9. This \_\_\_\_\_ would be a worthwhile acquisition because it would help me exercise at a reasonable price.

---

<sup>1</sup> Items #1 to #9 are the items used by Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998) along with a seven-point response format. Suri and Monroe (2003) used items similar to #1, #2, and #5 with a seven-point response format. Taylor and Bearden (2002) used items similar to #1, #2, and #4 with a nine-point response scale.

**SCALE NAME: Value of the Offer**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The five item, nine-point scale attempts to assess a consumer's perceived worth of a product versus the price required to purchase it.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Hardesty, Carlson, and Bearden (2002) cited Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan (1998) as the source of the scale but the adaptation was significant enough to consider the result to be a unique measure.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .94 was reported for the scale by Hardesty, Carlson, and Bearden (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

In a CFA of several measures used in their study, Hardesty, Carlson, and Bearden (2002) provided evidence in support of the scale's discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- 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," *JM*, 62 (April), 46-59.
- Hardesty, David M. (2004), Personal Correspondence.
- Hardesty, David M., Jay P. Carlson, and William O. Bearden (2002), "Brand Familiarity and Invoice Price Effects on Consumer Evaluations: The Moderating Role of Skepticism Toward Advertising," *JA*, 31 (2), 1-15.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. At this sale price, the \_\_\_\_\_ is a very good value for the money.
2. For this sale price, the \_\_\_\_\_ is worth the money.
3. The \_\_\_\_\_ is not a very good buy for the money.
4. In your opinion, the value that you would receive for the money if you purchased the \_\_\_\_\_ is a . . .
5. If I bought the \_\_\_\_\_ at this sale price, I would be getting my money's worth.

---

<sup>1</sup> All items used *strongly agree/strongly disagree* as anchors (Hardesty 2004) except for #4 which used *poor value for the money/good value for the money*. A product descriptor should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Value of the Offer**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of four, seven-point Likert-type items that measure the degree to which a consumer has a positive attitude toward an offer in terms of its economic value.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although similar items have been used in several previous studies, these items as a whole in this format were assembled by Hardesty and Bearden (2003).

**RELIABILITY:**

The alphas reported by Hardesty and Bearden (2003) for the scale were .89 (toothpaste, Study 1), .94 (toothpaste, Study 2), and .92 (bath soap, Study 2).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Hardesty and Bearden (2003).

**REFERENCES:**

Hardesty, David M. and William O. Bearden (2003), "Consumer Evaluations of Different Promotion Types and Price Presentations: the Moderating Role of Promotional Benefit Level," *JR*, 79 (1), 17-25.

Hardesty, David M. (2006), Personal Correspondence.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The offer is an excellent value for the money.
2. Overall, the offer is a POOR VALUE for the money. (r)
3. Overall, the offer is a ...  
*very poor value for the money / very good value for the money*
4. The offer looks like a good buy.

---

<sup>1</sup> The items were provided by Hardesty (2006). Except for #3, a seven-point Likert-type response format was used.

**SCALE NAME: Value of the Offer**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure how a consumer views the fairness and attractiveness of a particular purchase given what is known about the quality of the product versus the cost to get it.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

These items can be found in many previous measures of the same or a similar construct. In particular, Darke and Chung (2005) combined items from scales used by Lichtenstein and Bearden (1989) and Inman, Peter, and Raghurir (1997). (See V3, #51 and #392.)

**RELIABILITY:**

Darke and Chung (2005) reported alphas for the scale of .75 (Experiment 1) and .85 (Experiment 3).

**VALIDITY:**

No discussion of the scale's validity was provided by Darke and Chung (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- Darke, Peter R. and Cindy M.Y. Chung (2005), "Effects of Pricing and Promotion on Consumer Perceptions: It Depends on How You Frame It," *JR*, 81 (1), 35-47.
- Inman, J. Jeffrey, Anil C. Peter, and Priya Raghurir (1997), "Framing the Deal: The Role of Restrictions in Accentuating Deal Value," *JCR*, 24 (June), 68-79.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R. and William O. Bearden (1989), "Contextual Influences on Perceptions of Merchant-Supplied Reference Prices," *JCR*, 16 (June), 55-66.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. unattractive / attractive
2. bad buy / excellent buy
3. extremely unfair / extremely fair
4. no savings at all / extremely large savings
5. extremely worthless / extremely valuable

**SCALE NAME: Value of the Offer**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point items are used to measure how much value a person places on a specified object.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Okada (2005) but it appears to have been developed by her.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .81 (\$50 dinner certificate) and .82 (\$50 grocery certificate) were reported for the scale (Okada 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No information about the scale's validity was provided by Okada (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Okada, Erica Mina (2005), "Justification Effects on Consumer Choice of Hedonic and Utilitarian Goods," *JMR*, 42 (February), 43-53.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. What is the value of the \_\_\_\_\_?  
*not at all valuable / extremely valuable*
2. How well off would you be with the \_\_\_\_\_?  
*not at all well off / extremely well off*
3. How happy would you be with the \_\_\_\_\_?  
*I would not care about it at all / I would be the happiest I've been all year*

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the verbal response for each item were provided in the article by Okada (2005), the questions themselves were not and were created here based on their description. The name or brief description of the object should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Value of the Product**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point semantic differentials are used to measure a person's attitude toward the price of a product with an emphasis on the extent to which it is viewed as a good deal.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the origin of the scale was provided by Raghbir and Srivastava (2002). While it bears some similarity to previous measures (V1, #273 and V4, #494), it is probably best to view the scale as original.

**RELIABILITY:**

The scale had an alpha of .74 (Raghbir and Srivastava 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported (Raghbir and Srivastava 2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Raghbir, Priya and Joydeep Srivastava (2002), "Effect of Value on Product Valuation in Foreign Currencies," *JCR*, 29 (December), 335-347.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. not at all expensive / very expensive
2. poor value for the money / good value for the money
3. a bad bargain / an excellent bargain

**SCALE NAME: Value of the Product**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, eleven-point semantic differentials are used to measure the degree to which a consumer believes that a product being offered at a certain price would be a worthwhile purchase.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not stated by Adaval and Monroe (2002). Even though this set of semantic differentials is not known to have been used previously it is striking to note how similar the key terms in this scale are to those in Likert-type measures of value (e.g., Grewal, Monroe, and Krishnan 1998) as well as other semantic differential versions (e.g., Wakefield and Barnes 1996).

**RELIABILITY:**

In Experiment 4 the scale had alphas of .8556 and .9535 for low- and high-priced products, respectively (Adaval and Monroe 2002; Adaval 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Adaval and Monroe (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

- Adaval, Rashmi (2005), Personal Correspondence.
- Adaval, Rashmi and Kent B. Monroe (2002), "Automatic Construction and Use of Contextual Information for Product and Price Evaluations," *JCR*, 28 (March), 572-588.
- 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," *JM*, 62 (April), 46-59.
- Wakefield, Kirk L. and James H. Barnes (1996), "Retailing Hedonic Consumption: A Model of Sales Promotion of a Leisure Service," *JR*, 72 (4), 409-427.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. extremely bad buy / extremely good buy
2. not worth the money / well worth the money
3. very bad bargain / very good bargain

---

<sup>1</sup> The response scale used with these items ranged from -5 to 5 including a 0 (zero) point thus producing an eleven point scale.

**SCALE NAME: Value of the Store's Products**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type statements attempting to assess a consumer's opinion of the prices charged by a certain store given the perceived quality of the products carried. Baker et al. (2002) referred to the scale as *merchandise value perceptions*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The items in this scale are similar to many that have been used by a variety of researchers over the years to measure perceived value, particularly Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991). The difference in this case is that Baker et al. (2002) have adapted the items to be store specific rather than product specific.

**RELIABILITY:**

Construct reliabilities of .75 (Study 1) and .64 (Study 2) were reported by Baker et al. (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Baker et al. (2002) conducted several tests of their scales' discriminant validities. This particular scale passed a couple of tests but failed one. In particular, in Study 2 it did not have discriminant validity with a measure of shopping intention. The scale's average variance extracted was .50 (Study 1) and .38 (Study 2).

**COMMENTS:**

The reliability reported for the scale in Study 2 (above) is low and its AVE is unacceptable. Further testing is needed to determine if those results are an aberration or if instead the scale requires needs improvement. Also, some slight modification in the wording of the items might be necessary if the scale is used with actual shoppers who had been in a store rather than subjects simulating a shopping experience as in the studies cited here.

**REFERENCES:**

- Baker, Julie, A. Parasuraman, Dhruv Grewal, and Glenn B. Voss (2002), "The Influence of Multiple Store Environment Cues on Perceived Merchandise Value and Patronage Intentions," *JM*, 66 (April), 120-141.
- Dodds, William B., Kent B. Monroe, and Dhruv Grewal (1991), "The Effects of Price, Brand, and Store Information on Buyers' Product Evaluations," *JMR*, 28 (August), 307-319.

#686 *Value of the Store's Products*

**SCALE ITEMS:**<sup>1</sup>

1. This store would offer \_\_\_\_\_ that are of good value for the money.
2. The prices of \_\_\_\_\_ in this store would be fair.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ purchased from this store would be economical.

---

<sup>1</sup> A term should be placed in the blanks generally describing the type of merchandise relevant for the focal store, e.g., clothing, appliances, furniture, gifts, etc.

**SCALE NAME: Value of the Store's Products**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point Likert-type statements are used to measure a person's belief that the goods and services available from a particular vendor are a very good value given the prices charged for them. The scale was used by Harris and Goode (2004) with online stores but it appears to be appropriate for use with brick-and-mortar stores as well.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Harris and Goode (2004) stated that their scale was adapted from a couple of others. However, a comparison indicates that there is little similarity except at the conceptual level.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .83 was found for the scale by Harris and Goode (2004) in both of their studies.

**VALIDITY:**

Harris and Goode (2004) provided evidence in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

**REFERENCES:**

Harris, Lloyd C and Mark M.H. Goode (2004), "The Four Levels of Loyalty and the Pivotal Role of Trust: A Study of Online Service Dynamics," *JR*, 80 (2), 139-158.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ products are excellent value for the money.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ services are an excellent value.
3. I am happy with the value for the money I get at \_\_\_\_\_.
4. The goods I purchase from \_\_\_\_\_ are worth every cent.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the focal store should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Value of the Store's Products**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, nine-point Likert-type items are used to measure the degree to which a customer believes that great deals can be received on the products sold by a particular business.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The items in this scale are similar to those found in previous measures of value and, no doubt, Brady et al. (2005) received inspiration from those scales when developing theirs. Ultimately, the scale as a whole should be viewed as being original to them. The authors used at least a couple of rounds of pretesting to refine the items for use in multiple countries. They gave great care to ensure that the non-English versions were functionally and semantically similar to the English one.

**RELIABILITY:**

The composite reliabilities in Study 1 by Brady et al. (2005) ranged from .82 (Netherlands) to .95 (Australia). Study 2 was just in the U.S. and the reliability was .92.

**VALIDITY:**

Evidence was provided by Brady et al. (2005) in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities. Its average variance extracted ranged in Study 1 from .61 (Netherlands) to .86 (Australia). In Study 2, it was .79. Evidence was also provided in support of the configural and metric invariance of the items composing their scales.

**REFERENCES:**

Brady, Michael K., Gary A. Knight, J. Joseph Cronin Jr., G. Tomas, M. Hult, and Bruce D. Keillor (2005), "Removing the Contextual Lens: A Multinational, Multi-Setting Comparison of Service Evaluation Methods," *JA*, 81 (3), 215-230.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Their products are an excellent value.
2. At this \_\_\_\_\_, you get a great deal for your money.
3. What I get from this \_\_\_\_\_, and its cost, makes it a great value.

---

<sup>1</sup> An appropriate term such as *retailer, shop, website*, et cetera should be placed in the blanks.

**SCALE NAME: Value of the Transaction**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, ten-point items are used to assess a customer's evaluation of his/her business transactions with a specified store or company in terms of their perceived value (money, time, and effort).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Nijssen et al. (2003) and Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) stated that the scale was "adapted" from previous measures of value, particularly Grisaffe and Kumar (1998). Although they may have received some inspiration from that study, it is probably best to think of their scale as original to their work.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .88 and .92 were reported for the scales by Nijssen et al. (2003) and Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002), respectively.

**VALIDITY:**

The confirmatory factor analysis by Nijssen et al. (2003) showed a good fit and evidence was provided in support of their scales' convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for this scale was .79. The validity of the scale was not addressed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002).

**COMMENTS:**

Based on the material provided in the respective articles, there were very slight wording differences between the items used by Nijssen et al. (2003) and Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002). It is not clear if these were true differences or if they have more to do with the way the phrases were abbreviated for the articles, especially since the studies seem to have used the same database. In addition, the items were apparently a little different depending upon the context being examined. (Both articles report on use of the scales in a retail clothing context as well as an airline context. See also Agustin and Singh [2005] who used a three item version of the scale, possibly drawn from the same database.)

**REFERENCES:**

- Agustin, Clara and Jagdip Singh (2005), "Curvilinear Effects of Consumer Loyalty Determinants in Relational Exchanges," *JMR*, 42 (February), 96-108.
- Grisaffe, Douglas P. and Anand Kumar (1998), *Antecedents and Consequences of Customer Value: Testing an Expanded Framework*, Working Paper 98-107. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute.
- Nijssen, Edwin, Jagdip Singh, Deepak Sirdeshmukh, and Hartmut Holzmüller (2003), "Investigating Industry Context Effects in Consumer-Firm Relationships: Preliminary Results from a Dispositional Approach," *JAMS*, 31 (1), 46-60.

## #689 Value of the Transaction

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

### SCALE ITEMS:

Please evaluate the \_\_\_\_\_ on the following factors:<sup>1</sup>

1. For the prices you pay for \_\_\_\_\_, would you say it is a: *very poor deal / very good deal?*
2. For the time you spent in order to \_\_\_\_\_, would you say it is: *highly unreasonable / highly reasonable?*
3. For the effort involved in \_\_\_\_\_, would you say it is: *not at all worthwhile / very worthwhile?*
4. How would you rate your overall experience? *Extremely poor value / extremely good value*

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the type of business can be placed in the blank. Nijssen et al. (2003) as well as Sirdeshmukh, Singh, and Sabol (2002) used "store" and "airline." Likewise, the blanks in the items were filled with phrases appropriate for the business being evaluated.

**SCALE NAME: Variability**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, nine-point semantic differentials and measures the extent to which a person believes there are differences among some specified set stimuli. As used by Gurhan-Canli (2003), the stimuli were different products within the same brand family and the perceived difference in quality among those products was being examined.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No source for the scale was specified by Gurhan-Canli (2003) but it seems to be original to her study.

**RELIABILITY:**

Alphas of .96 were reported for the scale in both Experiments 2 and 3 by Gurhan-Canli (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

No explicit examination of the scale's validity was reported by Gurhan-Canli (2003). However, some evidence of the scale's predictive validity was evident when it confirmed the treatment manipulations.

**REFERENCES:**

Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep (2003), "The Effect of Expected Variability of Product Quality and Attribute Uniqueness on Family Brand Evaluations," *JCR*, 30 (June), 105-114.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. low variability / high variability
2. little variability / a great deal of variability
3. small difference / big difference

**SCALE NAME: Variety Within Assortment**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The nine-point, four item scale is intended to measure the degree of variety a consumer perceives there to be in some particular assortment of some product and the enjoyment derived from having access to that variety.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The source of the scale was not identified by Kahn and Wansink (2004) but it clearly appears to have been developed for use in Study 5 of six studies described in their article.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .81 was reported for the scale by Kahn and Wansink (2004).

**VALIDITY:**

No information about the scale's validity was reported by Kahn and Wansink (2004). They did state, however, that all of their scales "yielded one factor solutions."

**REFERENCES:**

Kahn, Barbara E. and Brian Wansink (2004), "The Influence of Assortment Structure on Perceived Variety and Consumption Quantities," *JCR*, 30 (March), 519-533.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. This assortment of \_\_\_\_\_ gives me a lot of variety for me to enjoy.
2. This assortment of \_\_\_\_\_ gives me at least one flavor I like.<sup>2</sup>
3. This assortment of \_\_\_\_\_ offers more ways to enjoy it.
4. How much variety do you think there is in this assortment?

---

<sup>1</sup> The first three items had *strongly disagree/strongly agree* as the verbal anchors while item #4 used *very little variety/very much variety*.

<sup>2</sup> If the assortment being examined is not food-related then the word "flavor" in this item will need to be replaced based upon the nature of the product being used.

**SCALE NAME: Verbal-Visual Processing Style**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The full version of the scale has twenty-two statements measuring a person's preference for processing information in either a verbal or a visual modality. The measure was referred to as the Style of Processing (SOP) scale by Childers, Houston, and Heckler (1985).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to Childers, Houston, and Heckler (1985). The measure was developed after work with another measure, the Verbal-Visualizer Questionnaire (VVQ, Richardson 1977) failed to have satisfactory reliability or dimensionality. Thirty-six new items were generated in addition to using six from the VVQ. After administering the 42 item scale to 35 undergraduate students, item-total correlations were used to construct the final 22 item scale. Half of the items tapped the visual component and the other half tapped the verbal component. This final version of the scale included the six items from the VVQ.

The version of the scale used by Bezjian-Avery, Calder, and Iacobucci (1998) had only eight items. They did not indicate the reasoning for use of those particular items.

**RELIABILITY:**

Bezjian-Avery, Calder, and Iacobucci (1998) reported an alpha of .88 ( $n = 96$ ) for the overall scale. The scale used by Petrova and Cialdini (2005), assumed to be the full version, had an alpha of .69 (63 males, 72 females).

An alpha of .88 ( $n = 54$ ) was reported by Childers, Houston, and Heckler (1985) for the overall scale. The eleven items measuring the verbal component had an alpha of .81 and the eleven items measuring the visual component had an alpha of .86.

The overall scale had an alpha of .73 ( $n = 124$ ) and alphas of .72 and .73 were calculated for the verbal and visual subscales, respectively, by Miller and Marks (1992; Marks 1994). Likewise, Burns, Biwas, and Babin (1993) reported alphas of .75 and .74 for the verbal and visual subscales ( $n = 377$ ), respectively.

Alphas of .70 and .78 were reported for the visual subscale by McQuarrie and Mick (1999) and Bloch, Brunel, and Arnold (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

Evidence of the scale's discriminant validity came from the insignificant correlations with two measures of processing ability (not style) by Childers, Houston, and Heckler (1985). It also had no correlation with a measure of social desirability. Criterion validity was evident due to the scale's significant correlations with measures of recall and recognition. None of the other studies reported any examination of the scale's validity.

McQuarrie and Mick (1999) intended to use the scale to distinguish between those who process verbally and those who process visually. Scores for the two subscales were

## #692 Verbal-Visual Processing Style

expected to be somewhat opposite. Based on a pilot test, however, no linear association was found between them. Given this, they only used the visual subscale. This finding suggests that further testing of the scale is necessary.

### COMMENTS:

Although Childers, Houston, and Heckler (1985) preferred to compute a single score for the items in this scale, they did point out that some researchers might desire to treat the visual and verbal components as separate dimensions.

See also a revised version of the scale for which several forms of validity were provided (Heckler, Childers, and Houston 1993). For some insight into the verbal component's performance in other languages see Wong, Rindfleisch, and Burroughs (2003).

### REFERENCES:

- Bezjian-Avery, Alexa, Bobby Calder, and Dawn Iacobucci (1998), "New Media Interactive Advertising vs. Traditional Advertising," *JAR*, 38 (July/August), 23-32.
- Bloch, Peter H., Frédéric F. Brunel, and Todd J. Arnold (2003), "Individual Differences in the Centrality of Visual Product Aesthetics: Concept and Measurement," *JCR*, 29 (March), 551-565.
- Burns, Alvin C., Abhijit Biwas, and Laurie A. Babin (1993), "The Operation of Visual Imagery as a Mediator of Advertising Effects," *JA*, 22 (June), 71-85.
- Childers, Terry L., Michael J. Houston, and Susan E. Heckler (1985), "Measurement of Individual Differences in Visual Versus Verbal Information Processing," *JCR*, 12 (September), 125-134.
- Heckler, Susan E., Terry L. Childers, and Michael J. Houston (1993), "On the Construct Validity of the SOP Scale," *Journal of Mental Imagery*, 17 (3 & 4), 119-132.
- Marks, Lawrence J. (1994), Personal Correspondence.
- McQuarrie, Edward F. and David Glen Mick (1999), "Visual Rhetoric in Advertising: Text-Interpretive, Experimental, and Reader-Response Analyses," *JCR*, 26 (June), 37-54.
- Miller, Darryl W. and Lawrence J. Marks (1992), "Mental Imagery and Sound Effects in Radio Commercials," *JA*, 21 (4), 83-93.
- Petrova, Petia K. and Robert B. Cialdini (2005), "Fluency of Consumption Imagery and the Backfire Effects of Imagery Appeals," *JCR*, 32 (December), 442-452.
- Richardson, Alan (1977), "Verbalizer-Visualizer: A Cognitive Style Dimension," *Journal of Mental Imagery*, *JA*, 1 (1), 109-125.
- Wong, Nancy, Aric Rindfleisch, and James E. Burroughs (2003), "Do Reverse-Worded Items Confound Measures in Cross-Cultural Consumer Research? The Case of the Material Values Scale," *JCR*, 30 (June), 72-91.

### SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> (W) = Verbal Items, (P) = Visual Items. Childers, Houston, and Heckler (1985) used a four-point response scale ranging from *always true* (1) to *always false* (4). Burns, Biwas, and Babin (1993) apparently used a seven point response scale with the items. Bezjian-Avery, Calder, and Iacobucci (1998) used items #1, #3, #5, #10, #11, #18, #19, and #22. Only the visual items were used by McQuarrie and Mick (1999) as well as

Directions: The aim of this exercise is to determine the style or manner you use when carrying out different mental tasks. Your answers to the questions should reflect the manner in which you typically engage in each of the tasks mentioned. There are no right or wrong answers, we only ask that you provide honest and accurate answers. Please answer each question by circling one of the four possible responses. For example, if I provided the statement, "I seldom read books," and this was your typical behavior, even though you might read say one book a year, you would circle the "ALWAYS TRUE" response.

1. I enjoy doing work that requires the use of words. (W)
2. There are some special times in my life that I like to relive by mentally "picturing" just how everything looked. (P) (r)
3. I can never seem to find the right word when I need it. (W) (r)
4. I do a lot of reading. (W)
5. When I'm trying to learn something new, I'd rather watch a demonstration than read how to do it. (P) (r)
6. I think I often use words in the wrong way. (W) (r)
7. I enjoy learning new words. (W)
8. I like to picture how I could fix up my apartment or a room if I could buy anything I wanted. (P) (r)
9. I often make written notes to myself. (W)
10. I like to daydream. (P) (r)
11. I generally prefer to use a diagram than a written set of instructions. (P) (r)
12. I like to "doodle." (P) (r)
13. I find it helps to think in terms of mental pictures when doing many things. (P) (r)
14. After I meet someone for the first time, I can usually remember what they look like, but not much about them. (P) (r)
15. I like to think of synonyms for words. (W)
16. When I have forgotten something, I frequently try to form a mental picture to remember it. (P) (r)
17. I like learning new words. (W)
18. I prefer to read instructions about how to do something rather than have someone show me. (W)
19. I prefer activities that don't require a lot of reading. (W) (r)
20. I seldom daydream. (P)
21. I spend very little time attempting to increase my vocabulary. (W) (r)
22. My thinking often consists of mental "pictures" or images. (P) (r)

---

Bloch, Brunel, and Arnold (2003). It is assumed that Petrova and Cialdini (2005) used the full, original version of the scale.

**SCALE NAME: Visibility of Product (Social)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of five, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the degree to which a person believes that a certain product is “public” in the sense that if he/she were to purchase and use it others would be aware of it. DelVecchio and Smith (2005) referred to the scale as *social risk – evaluation by others*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although DelVecchio and Smith (2005) drew inspiration from previous research, this scale is original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .814 was reported for the scale by DelVecchio and Smith (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond the implication that the items for this scale loaded together in a factor analysis of the study’s many items, no information regarding the scale’s validity was reported by DelVecchio and Smith (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

DelVecchio, Devon and Daniel C. Smith (2005), “Brand-Extension Price Premiums: The Effects of Perceived Fit and Extension Product Category Risk,” *JAMS*, 33 (2), 184-196.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. If I buy a \_\_\_\_\_, other people are likely to know that I own and use it.
2. If I buy a \_\_\_\_\_, other people are likely to evaluate my purchase.
3. If I buy a \_\_\_\_\_, people will see me using it.
4. If I buy a \_\_\_\_\_, people will ask me questions about it.
5. If I buy a \_\_\_\_\_, I will probably have to explain to some people how I chose it.

---

<sup>1</sup> The blank in each sentence indicates where the focal product name/description should go.

**SCALE NAME: Visual Aesthetics Centrality**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of eleven Likert-type statements intended to assess the degree that the look and beauty of a product play an important role in a consumer's purchase decisions and product usage. The scale was called *centrality of visual product aesthetics* (CVPA) by Bloch, Brunel, and Arnold (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Bloch, Brunel, and Arnold (2003). The construct was viewed as a general consumer trait with three facets although the scale itself was unidimensional (as described below). Their article provides a variety of evidence from eight studies attesting to the reliability and validity of the scale.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .89 was reported for the scale by Bloch, Brunel, and Arnold (2003) in two of their studies, one a random sample of adult consumers (n = 136) and another a convenience sample of college students (n = 108 college students). No evidence of the stability of scale scores over time was provided. This would be useful in judging the scale's quality since the construct being measured is supposed to be an enduring trait.

**VALIDITY:**

The eight studies conducted by Bloch, Brunel, and Arnold (2003) examined most aspects of the scale's validity. Evidence was provided in support of the scale's content, convergent, discriminant, known-group, and nomological validities. Despite the fact that the construct was viewed as having three "dimensions" or facets, the authors argued that the construct was unidimensional and, indeed, evidence was provided in support of that.

**REFERENCES:**

Bloch, Peter H., Frédéric F. Brunel, and Todd J. Arnold (2003), "Individual Differences in the Centrality of Visual Product Aesthetics: Concept and Measurement," *JCR*, 29 (March), 551-565.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Owning products that have superior designs makes me feel good about myself.
2. I enjoy seeing displays of products that have superior designs.
3. A product's design is a source of pleasure for me.

---

<sup>1</sup> It appears that both five- and seven-point Likert-type response formats were used by Bloch, Brunel, and Arnold (2003) in their series of studies.

*#694 Visual Aesthetics Centrality*

4. Beautiful product designs make our world a better place to live.
5. Being able to see subtle differences in product designs is one skill that I have developed over time.
6. I see things in a product's design that other people tend to pass over.
7. I have the ability to imagine how a product will fit in with designs of other things I already own.
8. I have a pretty good idea of what makes one product look better than its competitors.
9. Sometimes the way a product looks seems to reach out and grab me.
10. If a product's design really "speaks" to me, I feel that I must buy it.
11. When I see a product that has a really great design, I feel a strong urge to buy it.

**SCALE NAME: Visual Appeal**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six, seven-point bi-polar adjectives intended to measure the extent to which a person perceives a stimulus to be aesthetically pleasing with the emphasis on its visual aspects. The stimuli with which the scale was used by Cox and Cox (2002) were drawings of dress designs.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The first three items on the scale (provided below) have been used by the authors (Cox and Cox 1988) and many others in brand attitude scales. Cox and Cox (2002) stated that the other three items were added to make the scale more relevant for fashion.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .93 was reported for the scale (Cox and Cox 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Although the validity of the scale was not addressed by Cox and Cox (2002) they did say that a factor analysis indicated that all of the scale's items loaded on the same dimension.

**REFERENCES:**

- Cox, Dena S. and Anthony D. Cox (1988), "What Does Familiarity Breed? Complexity as a Moderator of Repetition Effects in Advertisement Evaluation," *JCR*, 15 (June), 111-16.
- Cox, Dena S. and Anthony D. Cox (2002), "Beyond First Impressions: The Effects of Repeated Exposure on Consumer Liking of Visually Complex and Simple Product Designs," *JAMS*, 30 (32), 119-130.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. bad / good
2. unpleasant / pleasant
3. not likable / likable
4. unflattering / flattering
5. unattractive / attractive
6. not stylish / stylish

**SCALE NAME: Vividness (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six words and phrases are used to measure the extent to which a stimulus is viewed as being clear and defined.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Petrova and Cialdini (2005) did not state the source of the scale but it appears to be original to them.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .82 was reported for the scale by Petrova and Cialdini (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was provided by Petrova and Cialdini (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

Petrova, Petia K. and Robert B. Cialdini (2005), "Fluency of Consumption Imagery and the Backfire Effects of Imagery Appeals," *JCR*, 32 (December), 442-452.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. attention getting
2. clear
3. exciting
4. detailed
5. concrete
6. communicating a strong image

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format was not stated by Petrova and Cialdini (2005) but an *agree/disagree* format would appear to be suitable.

**SCALE NAME: Vividness of Product Presentation at Website**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, five-point statements are used to measure the degree to which the information and interactivity provided at a website regarding a product has evoked mental images of the product and its usage. The scale was called *mental imagery* by Schlosser (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information was provided by Schlosser (2003) about the scale's source. It seems to have been developed by her.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha reported by Schlosser (2003) for the scale in Experiment 3 in her series of studies was .82.

**VALIDITY:**

No information regarding the scale's validity was reported by Schlosser (2003). However, a sense of its predictive validity comes from noting that the scale successfully distinguished between a website created to allow object interactivity and one that did not.

**REFERENCES:**

Schlosser, Ann E. (2003), "Experiencing Products in the Virtual World: The Role of Goal and Imagery in Influencing Attitudes versus Purchase Intentions," *JCR*, 30 (September), 184-198.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. How vivid did you find the product description on this website to be?
2. How much did the website bring to mind concrete images or mental pictures?
3. How much did the website provide features to help you imagine using the product?
4. How much did the website include features that helped you visualize a product trial?

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors used with the scale ranged from *not at all* (0) to *a lot* (4).

**SCALE NAME: Website Comparison Shopping**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Five, seven-point Likert-type statements compose the scale. Together they measure the degree to which a person spends time gathering information from ads, friends, and personal experience to better select between competing e-retail websites. The scale was referred to as *search* by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) with some inspiration coming from work by Urbany, Dickson, and Kalapurakal (1996).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .82 was reported for the scale by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Evidence in support of this scale's validity was not provided by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Srinivasan, Srini S., Rolph Anderson, and Kishore Ponnnavolu (2002), "Customer Loyalty in E-commerce: An Exploration of its Antecedents and Consequences," *JR*, 78 (1), 41-50.

Urbany, Joel E., Peter R. Dickson, and Rosemary Kalapurakal (1996), "Price Search in the Retail Grocery Market," *JM*, 60 (April), 91-104.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I regularly read/watch advertisements to compare competing websites.
2. I decide on visiting competing websites for shopping on the basis of advertisements.
3. I often talk to friends about their experiences with competing websites.
4. I explored many competing websites in order to find an alternative to this site.
5. I conducted an extensive search before making a purchase at this website.

**SCALE NAME: Website Ease-of-Use**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is intended to measure the degree to which a person believes that an e-retail website is easy to use in terms of finding things, getting around, and placing orders. Five, seven-point Likert-type statements compose the measure.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) as part of a larger set of scales that the authors ultimately called the 8Cs since all of the scales began with the letter S. The in-depth interviews helped to identify eight factors that seemed to influence e-loyalty. Following that, more in-depth interviews were conducted to help generate scale items. They were evaluated by a group of academics and then pretested with a small sample.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .80 was reported for the scale by Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Beyond what was stated (above) regarding the Origin of the scale, Srinivasan, Anderson, and Ponnnavolu (2002) divided the main study's sample into three parts. One part was for an exploratory factor analysis (n=180) and one was for a confirmatory factor analysis (n=180). These analyses led to the scales being purified for model estimation using the largest portion of the main study's sample (n=851). Having said that, specific evidence in support of this scale's validity was not provided.

**REFERENCES:**

Srinivasan, Srini S., Rolph Anderson, and Kishore Ponnnavolu (2002), "Customer Loyalty in E-commerce: An Exploration of its Antecedents and Consequences," *JR*, 78 (1), 41-50.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Navigation through this website is not very intuitive. (r)
2. A first-time buyer can make a purchase from this website without much help.
3. It takes a long time to shop at this website. (r)
4. This website is a user-friendly site.
5. This website is very convenient to use.

**SCALE NAME: Website Ease-of-Use**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four statements are used to measure a person's beliefs regarding the ease with which a person can find things at a website and move around in it. The scale was called *navigation structure perceptions* by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale seems to be original to Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003) though the general construct come from the work of Davis (e.g., 1989).

**RELIABILITY:**

Construct reliabilities of .91 (Study 1) and .84 (Study 2) were reported for the scale by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not explicitly addressed by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003). However, from the information provided it appears that the scale had acceptable levels of convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Davis Fred D. (1989), "Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use and User Acceptance of Information Technology," *MIS Quarterly*, 13 (2), 319-339.
- Montoya-Weiss, Mitzi M., Glenn B. Voss, and Dhruv Grewal (2003), "Determinants of Online Channel Use and Overall Satisfaction With a Relational, Multichannel Service Provider," *JAMS*, 31 (4), 448-458.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. It is easy to find what I am looking for on the \_\_\_\_\_ site.
2. The \_\_\_\_\_ site provides a clear directory of products and services.
3. It is easy to move around on the \_\_\_\_\_ site.
4. The \_\_\_\_\_ site offers a logical layout that is easy to follow.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the website should fill the blanks. Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003) did not specify the response format but it appears the typical *agree/disagree* verbal anchors along with a five or seven-point scale would be appropriate. These are the statements used in Study 1; Study 2 involved a university's registration process (telephone or online) and required some modification to the items.

**SCALE NAME: Website Ease-of-Use**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of six statements that are intended to measure a consumer's belief that the website for a particular store he/she has just visited is easy to understand and use.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The construct was popularized in the technology context by Davis (e.g., 1989). Vrechopoulos et al. (2004) drew upon Davis' work but developed their own a scale for their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

A Cronbach's alpha value of .9488 was reported for this scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Vrechopoulos et al. (2004) did not provide any information about the validity of the scale.

**REFERENCES:**

- Davis Fred D. (1989), "Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use and user acceptance of information technology," *MIS Quarterly*, 13 (2), 319-339.
- Vrechopoulos, Adam P., Robert M. O'Keefe, Georgios I. Doukidis, and George J. Siomkos (2004), "Virtual Store Layout: An Experimental Comparison in the Context of Grocery Retail," *JR*, 80 (1), 13-22.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The store that I have just visited is easy to use.
2. It is easy to become skillful at using the store I have just visited.
3. Learning to operate the store I have just visited is easy.
4. The store that I have just visited is flexible to interact with.
5. My interaction with the store I have just visited is clear and understandable.
6. It is easy to interact with the store that I have just visited.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format of the scale was not specified by Vrechopoulos et al. (2004) but it appears to have been a seven-point Likert-type scale.

**SCALE NAME: Website Interactivity (Content Usefulness)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has four, seven-point statements that are suppose to measure how much a person would interact with a website in the future because of its content-related usefulness such as providing a search function, detailed information, and multimedia features.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed along with another scale based upon a two-dimensional view of interactivity. Both Korean and English versions of the scale were developed.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .78 (Ko, Cho, and Roberts 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Some purification in the scale may have been done by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005) in a pretest but the details were not provided. In the main study, all that the authors said with bearing on validity was that the scale was one of many measures in a confirmatory factor analysis that was considered to have fit the data well.

**REFERENCES:**

Ko, Hanjun, Chang-Hoan Cho, and Marilyn S. Roberts (2005), "Internet Uses and Gratifications: A Structural Equation Model of Interactive Advertising," *JA*, 34 (2), 57-70.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I would click into deeper links
2. I would stay longer for details
3. I would use multimedia features
4. I would use a search engine

---

<sup>1</sup> The directions were not reported in the article by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005) but seem to have asked respondents about their future intentions to use a website. The verbal anchors for the response scale were *not at all* (1) and *frequently* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Website Interactivity (Engaging)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of eight items with a seven-point response format and attempts to measure the perceived interactivity of a website with the focus on the site having content that can be managed and keeps the user's attention.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to McMillan and Hwang (2002). Item generation was based upon a literature review, expert interviews, and focus groups. Following an initial study, minor rewording of some items was made. That was followed by a second study which reduced the list to the final of 18 items representing three dimensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

In Study 2, the scale had an alpha of .7889 (McMillan and Hwang 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The procedures followed by McMillan and Hwang (2002) during the item generation stage provide some support for the scale's content validity. Likewise, the CFA showed evidence of good fit.

**COMMENTS:**

McMillan and Hwang (2002) admitted that the three factors resulting from their studies did not correspond exactly to those they theorized. Thus, depending upon one's view of interactivity, the resulting scales may not adequately capture the overall construct and/or its dimensions.

**REFERENCES:**

McMillan, Sally J. (2004), Personal Correspondence.

McMillan, Sally J. and Jang-Sun Hwang (2002), "Measures of Perceived Interactivity: An Explosion of the Role of Direction of Communication, User Control, and Time in Shaping Perceptions of Interactivity," *JA*, 29 (3), 29-42.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: Please click the appropriate circle that indicates how well you believe each of the following words or phrases describes the Web site you viewed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format used by McMillan and Hwang (2002) had seven points and was anchored by *not at all descriptive/very descriptive* (McMillan 2004).

*#703 Website Interactivity (Engaging)*

1. Variety of content
2. Keeps my attention
3. Easy to find my way through the site
4. Unmanageable (r)
5. Doesn't keep my attention (r)
6. Passive (r)
7. Immediate answers to questions
8. Lacks content (r)

**SCALE NAME: Website Interactivity (General)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

This three item, seven-point Likert-type scale attempts to measure the degree to which a person perceives that a website is interactive, with an emphasis on its capability to provide two-way flow of information and keep the user's attention.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Sicilia, Ruiz, and Munuera (2005) cited McMillan and Hwang (2002) as the source of the scale. However, the latter used three scales to measure different facets of interactivity. Sicilia, Ruiz, and Munuera (2005) used two items from one of the scales and one item from another.

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .94 was reported for the scale by Sicilia, Ruiz, and Munuera (2005).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Sicilia, Ruiz, and Munuera (2005).

**REFERENCES:**

- McMillan, Sally J. and Jang-Sun Hwang (2002), "Measures of Perceived Interactivity: An Explosion of the Role of Direction of Communication, User Control, and Time in Shaping Perceptions of Interactivity," *JA*, 29 (3), 29-42.
- Sicilia, Maria, Salvador Ruiz, and Jose L. Munuera (2005), "Effects of Interactivity in a Web Site," *JA*, 34 (3), 31-45.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

Directions: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree that each of the following phrases accurately describes the website you viewed.<sup>1</sup>

1. Enables two-way communication
2. Is interactive
3. Keeps my attention

---

<sup>1</sup> The directions were not provided by Sicilia, Ruiz, and Munuera (2005) but may have been something like this.

**SCALE NAME: Website Interactivity (Human-Human)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four, seven-point statements are used to measure how much a person says s/he would interact with a website in the future because of its features that enable communication with others.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed along with another scale based upon a two-dimensional view of interactivity. Both Korean and English versions of the scale were developed.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .79 (Ko, Cho, and Roberts 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

Some purification in the scale may have been done by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005) in a pretest but the details were not provided. In the main study, all that the authors said with bearing on validity was that the scale was one of many measures in a confirmatory factor analysis that was considered to have fit the data well.

**REFERENCES:**

Ko, Hanjun, Chang-Hoan Cho, and Marilyn S. Roberts (2005), "Internet Uses and Gratifications: A Structural Equation Model of Interactive Advertising," *JA*, 34 (2), 57-70.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I would participate in customer discussions
2. I would provide my feedback to the site
3. I would contact the company
4. I would sign in at the site for information

---

<sup>1</sup> The directions were not reported in the article by Ko, Cho, and Roberts (2005) but seem to have asked respondents about their future intentions to use a website. The verbal anchors for the response scale were *not at all* (1) and *frequently* (7).

**SCALE NAME: Website Interactivity (Real-Time Communication)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The seven item, seven-point scale attempts to measure a person's attitude about a website's interactivity with the emphasis on a dimension having to do with the site's ability to provide synchronous, two-way flow of information.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to McMillan and Hwang (2002). Item generation was based upon a literature review, expert interviews, and focus groups. Following an initial study, minor rewording of some items was made. That was followed by a second study which reduced the list to the final of 18 items representing three dimensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

In Study 2, the scale had an alpha of .9034 (McMillan and Hwang 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The procedures followed by McMillan and Hwang (2002) during the item generation stage provide some support for the scale's content validity. Likewise, the CFA showed evidence of good fit.

**COMMENTS:**

McMillan and Hwang (2002) admitted that the three factors resulting from their studies did not correspond exactly to those they theorized. Thus, depending upon one's view of interactivity, the resulting scales may not adequately capture the overall construct and/or its dimensions.

**REFERENCES:**

McMillan, Sally J.(2004), Personal Correspondence.

McMillan, Sally J. and Jang-Sun Hwang (2002), "Measures of Perceived Interactivity: An Explosion of the Role of Direction of Communication, User Control, and Time in Shaping Perceptions of Interactivity," *JA*, 29 (3), 29-42.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: Please click the appropriate circle that indicates how well you believe each of the following words or phrases describes the Web site you viewed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format used by McMillan and Hwang (2002) had seven points and was anchored by *not at all descriptive/very descriptive* (McMillan 2004).

*#706 Website Interactivity (Real-Time Communication)*

1. Enables two-way communication
2. Enables concurrent communication
3. Non-concurrent communication (r)
4. Is interactive
5. Primarily one-way communication (r)
6. Is interpersonal
7. Enables conversation

**SCALE NAME: Website Interactivity (Speed)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Three, seven-point items are used to measure a person's attitude about a website's interactivity with the focus on a dimension having to do with the time required for the site's pages to load.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale is original to McMillan and Hwang (2002). Item generation was based upon a literature review, expert interviews, and focus groups. Following an initial study, minor rewording of some items was made. That was followed by a second study which reduced the list to the final of 18 items representing three dimensions.

**RELIABILITY:**

In Study 2, the scale had an alpha of .9195 (McMillan and Hwang 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

The procedures followed by McMillan and Hwang (2002) during the item generation stage provide some support for the scale's content validity. Likewise, the CFA showed evidence of good fit.

**COMMENTS:**

McMillan and Hwang (2002) admitted that the three factors resulting from their studies did not correspond exactly to those they theorized. Thus, depending upon one's view of interactivity, the resulting scales may not adequately capture the overall construct and/or its dimensions.

**REFERENCES:**

McMillan, Sally J. (2004), Personal Correspondence.  
McMillan, Sally J. and Jang-Sun Hwang (2002), "Measures of Perceived Interactivity: An Explosion of the Role of Direction of Communication, User Control, and Time in Shaping Perceptions of Interactivity," *JA*, 29 (3), 29-42.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

Directions: Please click the appropriate circle that indicates how well you believe each of the following words or phrases describes the Web site you viewed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format used by McMillan and Hwang (2002) had seven points and was anchored by *not at all descriptive/very descriptive* (McMillan 2004).

*#707 Website Interactivity (Speed)*

1. Loads fast
2. Loads slow (r)
3. Operates at high speed

**SCALE NAME: Website Preference (Exciting)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The five item, nine-point scale measures the degree to which a person desires websites that are surprising and exciting rather than ones that are familiar and predictable, particularly given the mood the person is in at the time. Menon and Kahn (2002) referred to the scale as *excitement seeking*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale as a whole seems to have been developed by Menon and Kahn (2002) based on ideas they got from work by Mehrabian and Russell (1974, Appendix A).

**RELIABILITY:**

An alpha of .81 was reported for the scale (Menon and Kahn 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Menon and Kahn (2002).

**REFERENCES:**

Mehrabian, Albert and James A. Russell (1974), *An Approach to Environmental Psychology*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Menon, Satya and Barbara Kahn (2002), "Cross-category Effects of Induced Arousal and Pleasure on the Internet Shopping Experience," *JR*, 78 (1), 31-40.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. I want sites that: stir me up / are relaxing
2. I want sites that are: new and unfamiliar / familiar and unusual
3. I want sites that are: varied and contrasting / similar in content
4. I am in the mood for sites that are: surprising and exciting / predictable and familiar
5. I want to look at sites that are: bright and colorful / serene and quiet

**SCALE NAME: Website Usage Intention**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale has three items that are supposed to measure various intentions a customer has with regard to a certain website, in particular that the person would register at it as well as purchase at it and recommend its usage to friends. To make the scale less hypothetical, the term “would” could be replaced with “will.” The scale was called *behavioral intent* by Bart et al. (2005).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

No information regarding the scale’s origin was provided by Bart et al. (2005). It appears to be original to their work.

**RELIABILITY:**

The authors reported that the scale to had an alpha of .88 (Bart et al. 2005).

**VALIDITY:**

The authors provided evidence that the measurement model was acceptable. Additionally, evidence was provided in support of this scale’s convergent and discriminant validities. The average variance extracted for this construct was .72. Despite this evidence, the lack of face validity raises doubts about the scale’s unidimensionality.

**REFERENCES:**

Bart, Yakov, Venkatesh Shankar, Fareena Sultan, and Glen L. Urban (2005), “Are the Drivers and Role of Online Trust the Same for All Web Sites and Consumers? A Large-Scale Exploratory Study,” *JM*, 69 (October), 133-152.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I would purchase an item at this site.
2. I would recommend this site to a friend.
3. I would register at this site.

---

<sup>1</sup> The nature of the response format was not described by Bart et al. (2005).

**SCALE NAME: Website Usefulness**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Four statements are used to measure a person's beliefs regarding the helpfulness of information provided at a website. The scale was called *information content perceptions* by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003) implied that the scale was based on work by Deshpande and Zaltman (1982; 1987). Since the latter did not have any scales similar to the one shown here, the former seem to have developed the scale based on inspiration received from the latter's work.

**RELIABILITY:**

Construct reliabilities of .86 (Study 1) and .83 (Study 2) were reported for the scale by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003).

**VALIDITY:**

The validity of the scale was not explicitly addressed by Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003). However, from the information provided it appears that the scale had acceptable levels of convergent and discriminant validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Deshpandé, Rohit and Gerald Zaltman (1982), "Factors Affecting the Use of Market Research Information: A Path Analysis," *JMR*, 19 (February), 14-31.
- Deshpandé, Rohit and Gerald Zaltman (1987), "A Comparison of Factors Affecting Use of Marketing Information in Consumer and Industrial Firms," *JMR*, 24 (February), 114-118.
- Montoya-Weiss, Mitzi M., Glenn B. Voss, and Dhruv Grewal (2003), "Determinants of Online Channel Use and Overall Satisfaction With a Relational, Multichannel Service Provider," *JAMS*, 31 (4), 448-458.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The \_\_\_\_\_ site provides the information necessary to make informed decisions.
2. The \_\_\_\_\_ site provides me with useful information.
3. Information on the \_\_\_\_\_ site is accurate.
4. Information on the \_\_\_\_\_ site is up-to-date.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the website should fill the blanks. Montoya-Weiss, Voss, and Grewal (2003) did not specify the response format but it appears the typical *agree/disagree* verbal anchors along with a five or seven-point scale would be appropriate. These are the statements used in Study 1; Study 2 involved a university's registration process (telephone or online) and required some modification to the items.

**SCALE NAME: Website Usefulness**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six statements are used to measure the degree to which a consumer believes that a particular online store she/he recently used is helpful in searching for and purchasing products.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The construct was popularized in the technology context by Davis (e.g., 1989). Vrechopoulos et al. (2004) drew upon Davis' work but developed their own a scale for their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

A Cronbach's alpha value of .9776 was reported for this scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Vrechopoulos et al. (2004) did not provide any information about the validity of the scale.

**REFERENCES:**

- Davis Fred D. (1989), "Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use and user acceptance of information technology," *MIS Quarterly*, 13 (2), 319-339.
- Vrechopoulos, Adam P., Robert M. O'Keefe, Georgios I. Doukidis, and George J. Siomkos (2004), "Virtual Store Layout: An Experimental Comparison in the Context of Grocery Retail," *JR*, 80 (1), 13-22.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. The store that I have just visited is useful for searching and buying products.
2. The store I that I have just visited improves my performance in product searching and buying.
3. The store that I have just visited enables me to search and buy products faster.
4. The store that I have just visited enhances my effectiveness in product searching and buying.
5. The store that I have just visited makes it easier to search for and purchase products.
6. The store that I have just visited increases my productivity in searching and purchasing products.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response format of the scale was not specified by Vrechopoulos et al. (2004) but it appears to have been a seven-point Likert-type scale.

**SCALE NAME: Website Visit Intention**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale uses three, five-point statements to measure the likelihood that a person who is familiar with a website will go back to it sometime in the future. Due to the phrasing of one of the items, the website should have some sort of subscription aspect to it such as with the online versions of newspapers and magazines.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Although not stated by Rodgers (2004), the scale seems to be original to her.

**RELIABILITY:**

Rodgers (2004) indicated that the scale's alpha was .84.

**VALIDITY:**

No examination of the scale's validity was reported by Rodgers (2004).

**REFERENCES:**

Rodgers, Shelly (2004), "The Effects of Sponsor Relevance on Consumer Reactions to Internet Sponsorships," *JA*, 32 (4), 67-76.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. What is the likelihood that you will return to this website sometime in the near future?
2. What is the likelihood that you will subscribe to this website?
3. What is the likelihood that you will return to the \_\_\_\_\_ section of this website?<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The anchors used by Rodgers (2004) for the response scale were *unlikely* (1) and *likely* (5).

<sup>2</sup> The name of a specific section of the website should be placed in the blank.

**SCALE NAME: Well-Being**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The eight-item semantic-differential scale measures a person's sense of life satisfaction as currently experienced.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) used a portion of an instrument by Campbell, Converse, and Rodgers (1976) called the *Index of Well-Being*. The complete instrument has nine items (eight semantic-differentials as well as a Likert-type statement). The semantic-differential part of the instrument was called the *Index of General Affect* and was reported by the developers to have an alpha of .89 based on a nationally representative sample of 2,164. The eight-month stability of the scale was estimated to be .56 (n = 285).

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale as used by Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) was .73 (n ≈ 373).

**VALIDITY:**

Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) reported that the scale had a high positive correlation with a measure of life satisfaction and strong negative correlations with measures of depression, stress, and anxiety. These correlations along with general evidence from the LISREL analysis of all their measures provided evidence of the scale's validity.

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.  
Campbell, Angus, Phillip E. Converse, and Willard L. Rodgers (1976), *The Quality of American Life: Perceptions, Evaluation, and Satisfaction*, New York: Sage.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. interesting / boring
2. enjoyable / miserable
3. worthwhile / useless
4. friendly / lonely
5. full / empty
6. hopeful / discouraging
7. rewarding / disappointing
8. brings out the best in me / doesn't give me much chance

---

<sup>1</sup> Campbell, Converse, and Rodgers (1976) used a seven-point response format. Their directions began with "Here are some words and phrases which we would like you to use to describe how you feel about your present life" (p. 38).

**SCALE NAME: Word-of-Mouth (Positive)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

The scale is composed of three, seven-point Likert-type statements that measure the degree to which a person speaks well of something and does so in an active manner. The object of the measurement in the study by Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) was a university and how well graduates talked about it. The authors referred to the scale as *promoting*.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale was developed by Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) for their study.

**RELIABILITY:**

The internal consistency of the scale was reported by Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) to be .90.

**VALIDITY:**

Based on their measurement model, Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) provided support for the scale's convergent and discriminant validity. Its average variance extracted was .75.

**REFERENCES:**

Arnett, Dennis B., Steve D. German, and Shelby D. Hunt (2003), "The Identity Salience Model of Relationship Marketing Success: The Case of Nonprofit Marketing," *JM*, 67 (April), 89-105.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. I "talk up" \_\_\_\_\_ to people I know.
2. I bring up \_\_\_\_\_ in a positive way in conversations I have with friends and acquaintances.
3. In social situations, I often speak favorably about \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the object should be placed in the blank, e.g., the university.

**SCALE NAME: Word-of-Mouth (Positive)**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Seven, seven-point items are used to measure the frequency with which a customer speaks well about his/her relationship with a particular dealership and has recommended it to others. A car dealership was examined by Brown et al. (2005).

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

The scale seems to have been developed by Brown et al. (2005).

**RELIABILITY:**

Brown et al. (2005) reported an alpha of .95 for the scale.

**VALIDITY:**

Using confirmatory factor analysis, Brown et al. (2005) provided evidence in support of the scale's convergent and discriminant validities. Although one test caused concern about the scale's discriminant validity with another scale (satisfaction with the dealership), another test was supportive enough that the authors said they were confident that each of constructs had discriminant validity with each other.

**REFERENCES:**

Brown, Tom J., Thomas E. Barry, Peter A. Dacin, and Richard F. Gunst (2005), "Spreading the Word: Investigating Antecedents of Consumers' Positive Word-of-Mouth Intentions and Behaviors in a Retailing Context," *JAMS*, 33 (2), 123-138.

**SCALE ITEMS:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Mentioned to others that you do business with the dealership.
2. Made sure that others know that you do business with the dealership.
3. Spoke positively about the dealership employee(s) to others.
4. Recommended the dealership to family members.
5. Spoke positively of the dealership to others.
6. Recommended the dealer to acquaintances.
7. Recommended the dealership to close personal friends.

---

<sup>1</sup> The verbal anchors for the response scale were *never* and *frequently*.

**SCALE NAME: Work Importance**

**SCALE DESCRIPTION:**

Six, seven-point Likert-type items are used to measure the value a person places on work in his/her life.

**SCALE ORIGIN:**

Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002; Burroughs 2005) used a scale developed by Kanungo (1982). In its initial test, an alpha of .75 (n = 703) was reported and its three-week stability (test-retest) was .67. Evidence of several forms of validity was also provided.

**RELIABILITY:**

The alpha for the scale was .82 (Burroughs and Rindfleisch 2002).

**VALIDITY:**

Using LISREL, Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) provided general validation evidence for all of the scales they used.

**REFERENCES:**

- Burroughs, James E. (2005), Personal Correspondence.  
Burroughs, James E. and Aric Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *JCR*, 29 (December), 348-370.  
Kanungo, Rabindra N. (1982), "Measurement of Job and Work Involvement," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67 (3), 341-349.

**SCALE ITEMS:**

1. Work (i.e. one's job) should be considered central to life.
2. The most important things that happen in life involve work.
3. Work is something people should get involved in most of the time.
4. Work should be only a small part of one's life.
5. In my view, an individual's personal life goals should be work-oriented.
6. Life is worth living only when people get absorbed in work.

# Subject Index\*

• • • • •

## ---A---

Account Planners: 3-5  
Actor: 174, 190, 344, 347, 827  
Adaptation: 39, 42, 307, 391, 585, 812, 850, 918, 975  
Affective Response: 15-16, 20-23, 25-29, 31, 33-35, 37-38, 87, 91-92, 137, 503, 681  
Airline: 252-253, 316, 320, 431, 576, 606, 610, 707-708, 747, 778, 950, 953-954, 985-986  
Alumni: 261, 453, 665  
Ambiguity: 635, 942, 963  
Anxiety: 42, 44, 93, 391, 451-452, 652, 794, 918, 1016  
Arousal: 22, 45, 138, 284-285, 379, 681, 729, 870  
Assortment: 349-351, 988  
Attachment: 294, 296, 298, 302, 310  
Attractiveness: 173, 194, 200, 234, 243, 365-368, 372, 374, 977  
Attributes: 282, 465, 485, 676, 710, 790  
Automobiles: 84, 148, 399, 481, 583, 588, 626, 773, 776

## ---B---

Bargains: 695, 700, 878, 979-980  
Behavioral Intentions: 67, 69, 163, 231, 239-241, 246-247, 309, 594, 597, 717  
Benevolence: 250, 252-253, 689, 961  
Boycott: 71, 257-259, 434  
Brand Community: 147, 260-263, 474, 578, 599  
Brand Extensions: 117, 267-269, 440, 463, 465, 733  
Brand Loyalty: 141, 291, 603  
Brand Names: 121, 266, 281-282, 438-440, 463, 557, 739  
Brand Personality: 271, 273-275, 277, 279  
Brands (new): 282-283, 431, 496, 615  
Breast Cancer: 451, 499, 591-592, 614  
Browsing: 138, 204, 210, 430, 509, 643, 865-866

## ---C---

Calm: 27, 47, 284, 478  
Cameras: 49, 437, 485  
Candidates: 387, 478, 559, 893  
Careers: 446, 490, 650, 666, 788  
Catalog: 206-209, 211-212, 225-226, 228-229  
Celebrity Endorsers: 365, 367, 372, 426  
Charities: 122, 129-130, 287-288, 312, 461  
Cheating: 469, 613, 826, 856  
Children: 442, 444, 446, 450, 561, 612, 666, 731-732, 903  
Chocolate: 28, 183, 186, 533  
Clothes: 346-347, 431, 480, 484, 626, 856-857  
Cognitive Effort: 50, 532, 534, 631, 759

Colors: 94, 112, 182, 374, 466  
Commitment: 263, 291, 293-294, 296, 298-299, 301-304, 306-310, 607  
Community: 127-128, 198, 250, 261, 312, 362-363, 665-666, 749, 961  
Compensation: 61, 123, 567  
Competence: 9, 273, 316-317, 319-321  
Competition: 234-235, 305, 314, 415, 593, 600, 602, 696, 936, 970, 994  
Complaining: 322-325, 563-564, 567-568, 572, 575, 605, 744, 786-787, 791, 817  
Complexity: 328, 406, 410  
Computer: 50, 333-334, 426, 497, 584, 793  
Confident: 336-337, 387, 395, 403, 412, 451, 456, 580, 645, 661, 743, 784, 791, 818, 824, 974  
Conflict: 81, 338, 724, 903-904, 962  
Conformity: 340, 488, 813  
Congruency: 342, 344, 463  
Control: 237-238, 255, 330, 353, 361, 394, 444, 517, 590-591, 612, 685, 689-690, 834  
Convenience: 508-509, 512, 859-863  
Conversation: 311, 1008, 1017  
Costs: 160, 299-300, 421, 614, 695, 761-762, 925-930, 977, 984  
Coupons: 132, 240, 535, 537  
Courteous: 341, 569, 845, 851, 893  
Credibility: 80, 94, 112, 163, 200, 365-368, 370-374, 376-377  
Cultural: 381, 383, 420

## ---D---

Dealer: 308, 399, 500, 773, 784, 1018  
Death: 450, 613, 650  
Decision: 6-8, 313, 338, 580, 812, 863  
Depression: 42, 389, 391, 652, 794, 918, 1016  
Design: 13, 82, 204-205, 485, 964, 993-995  
Difficult: 289, 299-300, 328, 338-339, 403, 406-407, 410, 459, 498, 549, 633, 743, 758-760, 918  
Discounts: 748, 878, 923  
Dissatisfaction: 40, 175, 323, 398, 401, 809  
Doctor: 311, 329, 670  
Dominance: 45-46, 379, 681, 690  
Donate: 287-288, 312, 402, 461  
Dull: 47, 78, 98, 103, 185, 504, 912

## ---E---

Easiness: 406, 409-410, 511  
Educational Institution: 453, 665, 788, 896-897, 1017  
Effectiveness: 90, 499, 784, 965, 1014  
Effort: 85, 119, 201, 289, 306, 308, 353-354, 361, 390, 404, 406, 408-409, 413, 467, 512, 532,

## Subject Index

- 565, 568-569, 571, 589, 596, 633, 663, 702-703, 707, 744, 758-760, 832, 838, 852, 854, 864, 867, 871, 921, 926-930, 932-933, 985-986
- Elections: 231, 337, 388, 559, 782, 968
- E-mail: 197, 201, 217, 334, 516
- Emotions: 16-17, 22, 28-29, 31, 34-35, 37, 39-40, 45, 47, 295, 335, 358, 361, 394, 560, 679, 681, 683, 706, 771, 854, 858
- Empathy: 33, 38, 839
- Employees: 123, 253, 317-320, 404, 413, 457, 568-569, 571-572, 663, 672, 708, 784, 844-847, 915-916, 931, 953-954
- Enjoyment: 138, 352, 457, 513, 540, 931, 988
- Entertainment: 209, 513, 827
- E-tailer: 198, 201, 205, 213, 221, 223, 607, 750
- Ethics: 200, 416, 571, 674, 784
- Excitement: 22, 271, 870, 905, 908, 1011
- Expertise: 200, 367-370, 372, 375, 377-378, 422-423, 425-427, 578, 581-582, 584-585, 588, 687, 806
- F---**
- Failure: 152, 390, 669
- Fairness: 364, 435, 565, 570, 573, 694, 977
- Familiarity: 92, 166, 220, 423, 437-438, 440, 519, 577, 581, 583, 816
- Family: 71, 295, 416-417, 442, 444, 446-450, 814
- Fate: 394, 490, 589
- Financial: 301, 453, 608, 748, 762, 769, 842-843, 933
- Food: 349-351, 448, 456, 659-660, 736, 742, 763, 768, 938
- Foreign: 123, 364, 421
- Friendships: 251, 261, 749
- Frugality: 394, 535, 701, 966
- Fun: 26, 66, 86, 138, 147, 185, 194, 210, 218, 283, 350, 352, 457-458, 555, 636, 643, 865-866
- Funds: 520-521, 608
- Funny: 26, 102-104, 639-640
- G---**
- Goal: 11, 117, 462-463, 465, 520-521
- Government: 254, 256, 386-387, 411
- Grocery: 59, 129-130, 431, 611, 699, 737, 790, 867, 871-872, 970
- Group: 251, 381-383, 490, 502, 745, 813, 827, 887, 898-899, 944
- Guilt: 18, 20, 71, 231, 307, 331, 339, 653, 858
- H---**
- Habits: 12, 394-395, 675
- Happiness: 382, 490, 502, 560, 619-621, 623, 747
- Hassle: 566, 573, 925, 928-929
- Health: 57, 151, 183, 456, 491, 591, 660, 764
- Hedonic: 184, 186, 352, 545, 547, 642, 870, 873, 876
- Helpful: 468, 750, 752, 1013
- History: 471, 493, 770
- Home: 154, 333-334, 446, 449-450, 461
- Honesty: 372, 469, 613, 784
- Humor: 34, 102, 104, 639-640
- Husbands: 730, 903-904
- I---**
- Ideals: 77, 79, 106, 146, 465
- Identification: 261, 296, 303, 473-475
- Images: 127, 282, 454, 473-474, 478-481, 483-484, 498, 555, 668, 739, 924, 991, 997
- Independence: 488-490, 502
- Inferior: 69, 378, 601, 734
- Innovations: 144, 311, 315, 406, 711, 751
- Innovativeness: 496-497, 615, 667
- Intangibility: 459, 498, 937
- Intentions: 239-241, 244, 323, 354, 361, 499-500, 593, 599, 608, 722, 757, 1002, 1006, 1012
- Interactivity: 997, 1002-1003, 1005-1007, 1009
- Interdependence: 381, 488-490, 502
- Internet: 207, 209, 212, 218, 226, 229, 412, 507-510, 512-518, 793, 815, 969, 1002, 1006, 1011
- Investing: 520-521, 608, 762, 842, 939
- Involvement: 48, 293, 522-523, 528-535, 538-540, 542-543, 545, 547, 549, 551, 553-555, 557, 559
- Irritation: 34, 77, 87-88, 97, 107, 111, 140, 233, 652
- J---**
- Joy: 26, 28, 35, 537, 560-562, 683, 879
- Judgment: 57, 395, 818, 839
- Justice: 563, 565, 567-568, 570, 572-573, 575
- K---**
- Knowledge: 149, 367, 422-423, 437, 456, 577-579, 581, 583-585, 587-588, 661
- L---**
- Liking: 26, 98, 125
- Losses: 450, 455, 462, 520-521, 924
- Low-fat: 456, 660, 938
- Loyalty: 133, 296, 303, 307, 593-594, 597-602, 605-610, 748, 756-757, 972
- M---**
- Magazine: 74, 107, 139, 503, 506
- Managers: 434, 478, 817
- Manufacturer: 61, 123, 134-135, 161, 267, 281, 364, 378, 781
- Materialism: 9, 42, 414, 448, 460, 616-617, 619, 621-622, 624-625, 685, 689
- Mobile Services: 138, 237, 409, 432, 656, 965
- Money: 60, 175, 263, 287-288, 312, 331-332, 353, 402, 442-444, 469, 521, 537, 541, 620, 690, 700, 702, 761-762, 842, 872, 927-928, 967, 970, 974-976, 979-980, 982-985
- Mother: 442-445, 730
- Motivation: 52, 57, 240, 257, 296, 331, 355-360, 486, 497, 512-515, 520-521, 528, 531, 647, 649,

## Subject Index

- 659, 872  
Music: 64-65, 344, 581-582, 679
- N---
- Navigation: 204, 517-518, 999  
Neighbors: 312, 382, 461, 606, 611, 615  
Neuroticism: 42, 391, 652, 918  
Nutrition: 91, 151, 164, 168, 372-373, 456, 659-661
- O---
- Obligation: 305, 307, 312  
Offensive: 14, 54, 97, 111, 434  
Optimum Stimulation Level: 285, 428, 908  
Owning: 147, 262, 545, 616, 686, 777, 993
- P---
- Packages: 430, 659, 722  
Parents: 442, 444, 450, 475, 731, 829  
Passive: 478, 602, 1004  
Patient (medical): 311, 329, 670  
Performance: 145, 148, 187, 237, 476-477, 598, 601, 712, 738, 742, 766-767, 796-797, 1014  
Personality: 428, 432, 469, 942  
Persuasion: 37, 92, 232, 674-676, 816, 904  
Physician: 311, 329, 670, 839  
Pictures: 480, 483-484, 498, 828, 943, 991, 997  
Pleasantness: 28-29, 162, 218, 679, 681, 909  
Policies: 252-253, 256, 316, 320, 573-574, 707-709  
Politics: 58, 231, 337, 386-388, 411, 478, 538, 559, 674, 782  
Possessions: 147, 414, 476-477, 618, 621, 624, 685-686  
Power: 687, 689-691  
Prevention: 152, 520, 829  
Price Consciousness: 698, 701, 703  
Price Perceptions: 695-697, 704, 967  
Prices (low/high): 701-703, 746, 761, 967  
Prices (sale): 435, 974-975  
Pride: 706, 744, 879  
Privacy: 154-155, 195, 221, 384, 770  
Private Label Brands: 59-60  
Processing (cognitive): 467, 532, 534, 630, 710, 758  
Product Attributes: 485, 654, 754, 959  
Product Class: 422-423, 577, 579, 581, 583-585, 587-588  
Product Usage: 407, 656, 678  
Profit: 128, 803, 902, 956  
Program (broadcast): 52, 62, 506, 957  
Promises: 120, 946, 949, 956  
Purchase Experience: 400, 716, 800  
Purchase Intentions: 4, 72, 181, 239, 717, 720-723, 725-727, 729
- Q---
- Qualified: 200, 369, 478, 688, 824  
Quality: 220, 739, 790, 848, 915
- R---
- Recovery Efforts: 563, 568, 571, 852  
Reference Groups: 150, 154, 490, 745, 887, 899  
Refund: 326, 696, 746  
Regret: 747, 762, 796, 854  
Regulations: 254, 256, 829  
Regulatory Focus: 145, 152, 829, 831  
Relevance: 48-49, 201, 233, 485, 526, 529, 531, 538, 554, 558, 627-628, 752-754  
Religion: 250, 340, 755, 945  
Repeat Purchases: 149-150, 154, 156-158, 576, 662, 711-712, 748, 756-757  
Reputation: 314, 367, 372, 665-666  
Restaurant: 344, 404, 430-431, 457, 563-564, 568, 663, 671-672, 722, 742, 756, 774, 778, 836, 852, 857, 893  
Retailing: 64, 695, 737, 790, 802-803, 810, 859-863, 909, 915  
Retrieval: 94, 148, 403, 410, 743  
Rewards: 157, 310, 446, 923, 972  
Risk: 57, 254, 281, 428, 431, 451, 520-521, 547, 549, 591-592, 762-763, 765-768, 770, 906, 992  
Roles: 54, 896, 963
- S---
- Safety: 221, 255, 783, 813-814  
Sales: 292, 698, 700, 702, 816, 878, 967  
Sales People: 317, 319, 328, 399, 589, 774, 784, 789, 802, 816-817  
Satisfaction: 230, 773, 776, 778, 792, 794-796, 798, 800, 802, 804-805, 807-812  
Search: 119, 199, 211, 507, 517, 793, 864, 866, 878, 900, 926, 998, 1002, 1014  
Security: 152, 221-222, 813, 815  
Selection: 559, 579, 785  
Self-concept: 158, 343, 346, 473, 477, 488, 502, 555, 637, 819-820, 828  
Self-transcendence: 250, 340, 944, 961  
Service Failure: 326, 563, 568, 834-837, 852  
Service Providers (changing): 923, 925-928, 930-932  
Service Quality: 608, 806, 839-846, 848, 850, 936  
Service Recovery: 433, 565-566, 852  
Shame: 854, 856, 858  
Shopping Malls: 13, 455, 865  
Shopping Orientation: 310, 331-332, 455, 508, 700, 810, 817, 859-867, 870-880  
Similarity: 267, 269, 282, 343, 381  
Sincerity: 114, 190, 251, 277-278, 372, 375, 478, 946  
Skills: 268, 330, 367, 370, 518, 687, 889, 930, 994  
Smoking: 66, 825, 881-884, 886  
Social Influence: 260-261, 263, 882  
Socialization: 442, 444, 922  
Social Responsibility (corporate): 123, 128, 131, 363  
Speed: 790, 901, 1009-1010  
Spokesperson: 189-190, 232, 366, 368, 478  
Standards: 9, 477, 650  
Stimulation: 285, 428, 668, 905, 907-908  
Store (grocery): 700, 763, 781, 967, 970

## Subject Index

Store Ambience: 64, 379, 909, 911-913  
Stress: 42, 354-361, 379, 391, 449, 652, 873, 918, 1016  
Switching: 2, 283, 299-300, 428, 430-431, 496, 603-604, 607, 609, 923-936  
Symbols: 156, 222, 944

### ---T---

Taste: 481, 736, 938  
Technology: 44, 148, 711-713  
Teenagers: 66, 442, 444, 730-731, 880, 885-886  
Television: 33, 38, 61-62, 84, 107, 191, 346, 506, 714, 957-958  
Tense: 18, 42, 284, 653, 918  
Terrible: 88, 476-477, 779, 795  
Time: 455, 901, 926, 941, 1009  
Touch: 492-493, 642, 644-646, 937  
Trust: 120, 134-135, 200, 227, 298, 303, 365, 367-368, 372-374, 376-378, 387-388, 412, 707-709, 839, 850, 946, 948, 950, 952-953, 955-956, 983

### ---U---

Ugly: 14, 78, 366  
Uniqueness: 647, 649-650, 823, 959  
Usage: 44, 67, 132, 269, 327, 373, 417, 853, 963,

965, 1012  
Utilitarian: 157, 187, 352

### ---V---

Value (price-related): 206, 524, 536, 541, 966-967, 970  
Values (personal/cultural): 9-10, 250-251, 312, 338, 340-341, 446, 461, 617-618, 620, 622-623, 625-626, 633, 686, 689-690, 756, 794, 813-814, 822, 905-906, 944-945, 961-962, 1019  
Vanity: 618, 626, 892  
Visual: 204, 222, 228, 230, 483-484, 989-990, 992-993, 995  
Vividness: 480, 483-484, 996-997  
Voting: 231, 337, 387, 411, 559, 782

### ---W---

Watch: 52, 74, 86, 506, 700, 957-958, 991  
Web: 192, 194-195, 197, 204, 210, 214-215, 217, 219-220, 222, 224, 227, 412, 507, 510, 516, 518, 607, 851, 901, 998-999, 1002-1003, 1005-1007, 1009, 1011-1012  
Women: 54, 446, 499, 903  
Word-of-Mouth: 500, 594, 1017-1018  
Worry: 43, 451-452, 653, 762, 821, 925

\* The numbers following key words refer to page numbers, not scale numbers. These index terms have been intentionally selected because they each refer to at least three different scales.