MARKETING SCALES HANDBOOK

Multi-Item Measures for Consumer Insight Research

VOLUME

X

GORDON C. BRUNER II

Marketing Scales Handbook

Multi-Item Measures for Consumer Insight Research

Volume 10

(sample)

Gordon C. Bruner II

GCBII Productions, LLC
Fort Worth, Texas USA

Marketing Scales Handbook, Volume 10.
Copyright © 2019, Gordon C. Bruner II. All rights reserved.

ISBN-13: 9781796226997

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

Published by:

GCBII Productions, LLC
6109 Timberwolfe Lane
Fort Worth, Texas 76135
USA
gcbii@marketingscales.com
817-677-8876

Printed by KDP, an Amazon.com Company.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Preface

. . . . .

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

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

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

Good luck in your research!

---

* As with Volumes 5-9, it is expected that this book will be released in proprietary format for sales by major suppliers of e-resources to university libraries.

Acknowledgements

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

Rajesh Bagchi
Steve Bellman
S. Adam Brasel
Chingching Chang
Meredith David
Cassandra Davis
Ping Dong
Paul W. Fombelle
Bart de Langhe
Johannes Habel
Henrik Hagtvedt
Patrick Hartmann
Tim Hilken
Yuwei Jiang
Andrea Kähr
Hean Tat Keh
Eunjin Kim
Amna Kirmani
Arie Kruglanski
Ashish Kumar
Jennifer Labreque
Elison Ai Ching Lim
Robert Madrigal
Kelly Martin
Ravi Mehta
Ravi Prakash
Kumar Rakesh Ranjan
Brandon Reich
Marisabel Romero
Yuhosua Ryoo
Aner Sela
Ilona Szőcs
Lena Steinhoff
Lei Su
Gabriela Tonietto
Noah VanBergen
Wenbo Wang
Morgan Ward
Liad Weiss
Karen Page Winterich
David M. Woisetschläger
Jeremy Wolter
Freeman Wu
Yi Xie
Dezhi Yin
James J. Zboja

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

May your measures always be valid!

Fort Worth, Texas
February 2019

Introduction

. . . .

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

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

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

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

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

The final major criterion used to manage the workload was to focus on articles from a two-year period. This was begun with Volume 7 because there are limits to the number of pages a printer such as Kindle Direct Publishing will allow for paperback books. With that in mind, an initial examination was conducted of over 600 articles published in six top marketing journals during 2016 and 2017. (The journals are specified in the table on the next page.) From that group, 213 articles received more scrutiny because they appeared to have measures of the type focused on in the series. After closer examination, some of those articles were dismissed because the measures they included did not meet enough of the stated criteria or the authors did not respond to requests for more information. Ultimately, there were 174 articles from the marketing literature that received the greatest attention and provided the 402 scales that are reviewed in this volume.

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

As for quickly finding scales of interest, the Table of Contents is useful place to start. Also, a Subject Index is provided at the back of the book. As useful as it can be, keep in mind that creating an Index is a difficult task. The result is quite imperfect given that the available space permits each scale to be associated with just a few keywords. If you need more assistance in finding scales of interest, consider using the search function at MarketingScales.com. It should help you see how measures are categorized in the full database which, in turn, may help you locate measures in this book that will suit your research needs.

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

TABLE
Scale Review Format

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

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

ORIGIN:

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

RELIABILITY:

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

VALIDITY:

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

COMMENTS:

This section of a review is used only occasionally. For example, if something about a scale is judged to be deficient then readers may be urged in this section to exercise caution in using the scale. Another example is that in many cases a scale was phrased by its creators for use in a particular context, but it is noted that with a little modification the scale could be usable in other contexts.

REFERENCES:

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

ITEMS:

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

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

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

Scale
Reviews

SAMPLE

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE FOOD PRODUCT (NUTRITIOUSNESS)

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

Origin:

Hagen, Krishna, and McFerran (2017) used the scale in Study 3 with 16[illegible] in the U.S. recruited from Amazon's MTurk. The source of the scale was not stated [illegible] ke[illegible]ds in the items (healthy, nutritious, and wholesome) are common to several meas[illegible]struct that have been used in other consumer studies, e.g., Olson et al. (20[illegible]6); Whi[illegible]16).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .95 (Hagen, Krishna, an[illegible] 201[illegible]

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Hagen, [illegible] nd [illegible]cFerran (2017).

References:

Hagen, Linda, Aradhna Krish[illegible] t M[illegible] 017), [illegible]jecting Responsibility: Low Physical Involvement in Obtaining F[illegible] hea[illegible]g," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (4), 589-604.

Olson, Jenny G., Brent McF[illegible] ndre[illegible] les, [illegible] Darren W. Dahl (2016), "Wealth and Welfare: Divergent Moral Re[illegible] Eth[illegible] mer Choices," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (6), 879-896[illegible]

White, Kathe[illegible] arren [illegible] nd [illegible]obin J. B. Ritchie (2016), "When Do Consumers Avoid Impe[illegible] ial Pac[illegible] mage as a Contamination Cue," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 5[illegible] 110[illegible]

S[illegible] Ite[illegible]

1. [illegible] healthy is [illegible]?
   [illegible] / healt[illegible]

2. H[illegible] is this food?
   not at a[illegible] ous / very nutritious

3. How w[illegible] e is this food?
   not at al[illegible] olesome / completely wholesome

---

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

COMMITMENT TO THE COMPANY (GENERAL)

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

Origin:

Wilson, Giebelhausen, and Brady (2017) referred to the measure as *sel[illegible] con[illegible]on* and used it in two studies. Data for one of the two studies came from data c[illegible] 2013 J.D. Power North American Hotel Guest Satisfaction study. The data[illegible]t create[illegible], Giebelhausen, and Brady (2017) had responses from 6,577 p[illegible]. The sec[illegible]2 full responses from people recruited from Amazon Mechanica[illegible]at study[illegible] examine some psychometric aspects of their measures. As for [illegible]l of the [illegible]as composed of items taken from the J.D. Power study. [illegible]d that, [illegible]f the key words and phrases in the scale are commonly found in measu[illegible] and [illegible]e.g., Garbarino and Johnson (1999); Price and Arnould (1999).

Reliability:

The scale was found to have high inte[illegible]sistenc[illegible]cally, an alpha of .94 was reported for the scale using data from the J.[illegible]e. A C[illegible] was found for the scale in the psychometric study.

Validity:

As noted above, a separat[illegible]as [illegible] by [illegible]on, Giebelhausen, and Brady (2017) to determine if the scales they [illegible]nd u[illegible]udies 1 and 2 were equivalent to scales created from items in the [illegible]ower s[illegible] CF[illegible]ed evidence that the scales were "substitutable[illegible]he AV[illegible]om[illegible]ment scale was .682.

Referen[illegible]

Ga[illegible]o, El[illegible] S.[illegible] (1999), "The Different Roles of Satisfaction, Trust, and C[illegible]ent in [illegible]elat[illegible]hips," *Journal of Marketing*, 63 (April), 70-87.

P[illegible]da L. and [illegible]ould (1999), "Commercial Friendships: Service Provider-Client R[illegible] in Cont[illegible]*rnal of Marketing*, 63 (October), 38-56.

Wi[illegible] Mich[illegible] D. Giebelhausen, and Michael K. Brady (2017), "Negative Word of Mouth c[illegible]sitive for Consumers Connected to the Brand," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing* S[illegible]45 (4), 534–547.

Scale Ite[illegible]

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

SAMPLE

KNOWLEDGE OF THE PRODUCT CLASS (EXPERT)

The scale uses three statements to measure a consumer's belief that he/she has expert level knowledge with respect to a specific product category and is an excellent source of information for friends buying such a product.

Origin:

Alavi, Wieseke, and Guba (2016) used the scale in a field study where data were [illegible]d f[illegible] 537 salesperson–customer interactions in a car retailing setting. This involved 28 [illegible] dealership chains that were located in 11 different cities and offered new [illegible]d used [illegible] different brands. The scale itself is a slight adaptation of a measure de[illegible]d and us[illegible] business-to-business context by Wagner, Klein, and Keith (2001).

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .89 (Alavi, Wieseke, and Guba 2016[illegible].

Validity:

Although the details were limited, Alavi, Wies[illegible]ba (20[illegible]ted that their scales showed evidence of discriminant validity. W[illegible]roduct[illegible]e, the AVE was .72.

References:

Alavi, Sascha, Jan Wieseke, and Jan[illegible] (20[illegible]ing [illegible]iscounts through Accurate Sensing – Salespeople's Estimations [illegible]er P[illegible]rtance and Their Effects on Negotiation Success," *Journal of Retaili[illegible]* [illegible] (1), 4[illegible]

Wagner, Judy A., Nore[illegible]d Jane[illegible] (20[illegible]1), "Selling Strategies: The Effects of Suggesting a Decision[illegible]ice an[illegible]Buyers," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 2[illegible]89[illegible]

Scale Ite[illegible][1]

1. I unde[illegible]he featur[illegible], enough to be considered an expert when evaluating differe[illegible]
2. I know [illegible]roduct [illegible]acteristics are needed when buying a _____.
3. If a friend [illegible]buying a _____, I would be an excellent source of information.

---

[1] The name of the focal prod[illegible]y should be placed in the blanks. The end points on the response scale used with these items were not stated by Alavi, Wieseke, and G[illegible]16). The anchors could have been *not at all* (1) and *extremely* (7) because they were used for all of the other multi-item scales in the study.

SAMPLE

PARENTAL MEDIA MEDIATION
(AUTONOMY-SUPPORTIVE RESTRICTIVE)

Four, five-point items are used in this scale to measure an adolescent’s belief about what his/her parents would say if they did not want him/her to watch television, movies, or video ga[illegible]es that contained too much violence. Specifically, this belief is a characterized by the parent[illegible]ricting” the time the child spends with the unacceptable media content and providing ratio[illegible]ich the perspective of the adolescent is taken seriously.

Origin:

Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave, and Ponnet (2016) used the scale in a study [illegible] collect[illegible] 780 young adolescents in the Dutch-speaking area of Belgium. The scale [illegible]loped by Valkenburg et al. (2013) as part of the multi-measure instrument [illegible] calle[illegible] [illegible]ceived Parental Media Mediation Scale (PPMMS). With multiple stud[illegible] [illegible]thors [illegible]dence of their scales’ reliabilities and validities.

Reliability:

The construct reliability of the scale as used by [illegible]enbee[illegible] [illegible]e, and Ponnet (2016) was .82. Alpha was .81.

Validity:

The measurement model tested by [illegible]enb[illegible] [illegible]rav[illegible] [illegible]onnet (2016) provided a good fit to the data. Items for one of the [illegible]ot t[illegible] [illegible]iew[illegible] here, were removed and the fit improved further. The AVE for the sc[illegible]ring [illegible]y-Supportive Restrictive Mediation was .54 and a test provide[illegible]ence of [illegible]’s di[illegible]nt validity.

Comments:

Items for each scale i[illegible]MMS w[illegible]id out contiguously in the questionnaire but were in a rather uniq[illegible]stion [illegible]at [illegible]stion was asked and then answers were provided with items [illegible]erent [illegible]ecau[illegible] the integratedness of items from the different scales and the wa[illegible] were con[illegible] the questionnaire, it may be best to use the scales as described [illegible]urg et al. [illegible]p. 464-466).

References:

Vanwesenbeeck, In[illegible] Walrave, and Koen Ponnet (2016), "Young Adolescents and Advertising on Social [illegible]ork Games: A Structural Equation Model of Perceived Parental Media Mediation, Advertising Literacy, and Behavioral Intention," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (2), 183−197.

Valkenburg, Patti M., Jessica Taylor Piotrowski, Jo Hermanns, and Rebecca Leeuw (2013), “Developing and Validating the Perceived Parental Media Mediation Scale: A Self-Determination Perspective,” *Human Communication Research*, 39 (4), 445−469.

SAMPLE

WEBSITE DESIGN (PRODUCT SELECTION)

Three, five-point Likert-type items compose the scale and are used to measure the degree to which a person believes the assortment of products available at a particular website is adequate for what he/she is interested in buying.

Origin:

The scale was used by Blut (2016) in an impressive study of e-service q[illegible] Dat[illegible] the study were collected by a market research firm in the U.S. from 358 people. R[illegible]e screened to ensure they made at least one purchase from an online store [illegible]ithin the [illegible]ix m[illegible]s and that they were to respond to the survey with respect to that r[illegible]

The scale was created by Blut (2016) from several sources. On[illegible]ms (#1[illegible]s from the WebQual instrument by Loiacono, Watson, and G[illegible] (200[illegible] th[illegible] item (#2 below) was borrowed from the eTailQ instrument by Wolfi[illegible]illy ([illegible]urce of the third item is less clear though it is very similar to [illegible]nesh [illegible] in a scale.

Reliability:

The scale's alpha was .79 (Blut 2016[illegible]

Validity:

Blut (2016, p. 509) provid[illegible] in s[illegible] the scale's face validity. He also appeared to say that evide[illegible] his [illegible]scri[illegible] validity was lacking with respect to some scales in his study using th[illegible] and [illegible] 198[illegible] test but that the scale passed the more lenient test suggested by An[illegible]d G[illegible]88). The AVE of the scale was .61.

Referenc[illegible]

Anderson, J[illegible] and [illegible] Gerbi[illegible] (1988), “Structural Equation Modeling in Practice: A Rev[illegible] and [illegible]ed[illegible] Approach,” *Psychological Bulletin*, 1003 (3), 411–423.

B[illegible]kus ([illegible]rvi[illegible]lity: Development of a Hierarchical Model," *Journal of* [illegible], 92 (4), [illegible]

F[illegible]es and D[illegible]rcker (1981), “Evaluating Structural Equation Models with U[illegible]riables [illegible] Measurement Error,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39–50.

Gane[illegible]r, Kristy E. Reynolds, Michael Luckett, and Nadia Pomirleanu (2010), "Online Shopper M[illegible]s, and e-Store Attributes: An Examination of Online Patronage Behavior and Shopper Ty[illegible]," *Journal of Retailing*, 86 (1), 106-115.

Loiacono, [illegible] T., Richard T. Watson, and Dale L. Goodhue (2002), “WebQual: A Measure of Website Qua[illegible]” *Marketing Theory and Applications*, 13 (3), 432–438.

Wolfinbarger, Mary and Mary C. Gilly (2003), “eTailQ: Dimensionalizing, Measuring and Predicting eTail Quality,” *Journal of Retailing*, 79 (3), 183-198.

SAMPLE

Subject Index[1]

……

Acceptance: 59, 219, 408, 427, 431
Achievement: 102, 318, 406, 411
Activity: 24, 490
Advertising: 3, 4, 7, 26-36, 47, 60, 156, 193, 236, 304, 360, 455
Advice: *(see Recommend & WOM)*
Aesthetics: 5, 41, 336, 494
Affect: 6, 45, 46
Affordability: 72, 191
Aggression: 258, 391
Anthropomorphism: 52, 54, 234
Anxiety: 13, 281
Appealing: 336, 494, 50
Appearance: 41, 52, 54, 340
Appreciation: 10
Appropriateness: 56, 221, 315
Approval: 11, 385
Art: 5, 27, 120
Attachment: 13, 15, 149
Attention: 7, 16, 70, 153, 243, 260-267, 270, 307
Attractiveness: 39, 428, 482, 494
Attributions: 52, 82, 83
Authenticity: 120, 467
Authority: 292, 294
Autonomy: 284, 296
Availability: 172, 342
Avoidance: 103, 145, 329, 331, 429
Awareness: 260
Banks: 37, 162, 185
Beliefs: 71, 449
Behavioral: 170, 232, 279
Benefits: 29, 115, 181, 228, 367, 488
Benevolence *(action):* 18, 42, 114-116
Body: 226, 264, 268, 270, 423
Brand: 38-40, 54, 69, 72-78, 128-132, 192, 217, 234, 254, 311, 312, 355, 372, 387, 396
Capability: 94, 276
Celebrity: 241
Certainty: 17, 143
Challenge: 152, 406
Change: 59, 226, 449
Character: 32, 467
Charities: 18, 154, 192, 252
Children: 284-296
Choice: 63, 76, 84, 86, 141, 143, 333, 366, 442
Clarity: 320, 495
Clean: 104, 335
Closure: 105, 415
Cognition: 238, 260
Color: 41, 266, 271
Comfortable: 88, 141, 187, 190, 438
Commitment: 89, 165 167, 369, 381, 449
Communication: 284, 286, 290, 423
Community: 112, 248
Company: 89-93, 110-118, 137, 138, 165, 167, 181-183, 210, 222, 224, 228, 319-328, 357, 369, 374, 426, 447, 481, 511, 513, 519
Compatibility: 99, 443
Comparison: 143, 195, 251, 424, 483
Competence: 94, 21, 404, 413, 416
Competition: 95, 413, 462
Complaining: 152, 521
Complexity: 317, 457
Co-production: 64, 110, 318, 398
Concern: 83, 169, 427
Confidence: 17, 37, 97, 276, 404, 407, 416
Conflict: 144, 152
Conformity: 98, 292
Confusion: 84, 333
Congruence: 99, 100, 192, 403, 424, 443
Consequences: *(see Outcomes)*
Control: 54, 107, 250, 310, 319, 327
Cooperation: 95, 110, 235
Cost: 114, 198
Creativity: 27, 120, 121, 134
Credibility; 26, 122, 360, 426
Credit: 163
Crisis: 169, 419

Crowded: 124, 126, 445
CSR[2]: 18, 42, 82, 83, 111-118
Culture: 127
Damage: 173, 217, 218
Deals: 58, 72, 150
Decision-making: 19, 84, 86, 141-145, 331
Deception: 273, 322
Delight: 146
Delivery: 67, 173, 174, 504
Demonstrations: 201, 298
Dependability: 468, 469
Design: 64, 66, 336, 444, 445, 501-503, 505-509
Desirability: 55, 148, 149, 312, 482
Development: 337
Differentiation: 127, 475
Difficulty: 84, 144, 156, 157, 163, 196, 317, 444, 457, 495, 507
Disagreement: 341
Discomfort: 6, 124
Disposal: 23, 151
Distraction: 153, 329
Dominance: 309, 310
Donate: 42, 154, 252
Drugs: 422
Eat: 212, 312, *(see also Food)*
Effectiveness: 160, 215, 161, 197, 201, 304, 502
Effort: 10, 24, 239, 243, 382
Embarrassment: 103, 162, 183, 385
Emotions: 6, 7, 8, 15, 141, 146, 151, 190, 222, 262, 267-270
Employees: 11, 112, 164, 200, 272, 273, 473
Engagement: 7, 16, 128-132, 153, 236, 345
Enjoyment: 45, 46, 305, 380, 458, 459, 491
Environmentalism: 23, 101, 104, 112, 165-170
Equity: 181, 375, 479
Esteem: 413, 414
Ethics: 274, 498
Evaluation: 55, 262, 339, 409
Excitement: 8, 240
Exercise: *(see Fitness)*
Expectations: 8, 73, 78, 92, 148, 281, 300, 395, 396, 400
Expensive: 38, 198
Experiences: 45, 46
Expertise: 244, 246
Fairness: 71, 138, 185, 272, 315, 321, 387
Faith: 379
Familiarity: 31, 244
Family: 21, 188, 518,
Fan: 460
Features: 244, 246
Feedback: 129, 371, 447
Fear: 13, 103, 326
Financial: 187-190, 405, 406
Fitness: 161, 197
Fluency: 193-196, 495
Food: 47-51, 158, 197, 198, 221, 339, 418
Freedom: 296, 442
Frequency: 254, 434
Friendly: 11, 44, 164, 199, 200, 279, 473, 499, 500
Friends: 87, 132, 522
Frustration: 217, 521
Fun: 45, 46, 240, 305, 458, 459
Future: 281, 282, 463
Games: 148, 201, 305, 462
Gender: 186, 202, 258
Gift: 373, 518
Global: 204
Goals: 3, 60, 145, 206, 405, 452
Groups: 235, 432
Guilt: 151, 212, 453
Habitual: 302, 343
Happiness: 6, 62, 101, 146, 187, 189
Harmful: 23, 47, 50, 51, 169, 170, 214, 272, 324, 334, 465
Hazard: 140, 214, 218, 419, 496
Health: 22, 48, 50-52, 161, 194, 195, 198, 214, 215, 334, 407, 422, 448, 463
Helpfulness: 42, 229, 384
Home: 149, 218
Honesty: 185, 273, 471
Hostility: 217
Hotel: 104, 399, 522

Ideas: 134, 182, 183, 232, 235, 346, 358, 420, 447
Identification: 202, 248, 204, 222, 224, 258, 425, 432
Image: 59, 230, 278, 408, 436
Importance: 239, 328
Improvement: 129 278, 300, 435, 446
Impulsive: 145, 343
Incentives: 132, 486
Income: 21, 282, 435, 436
Influence: 128, 132, 156, 408
Information: 16, 97, 228-230, 319-328, 502
Innovative: 231, 337
Integrity: 120, 468, 469
Intelligence: 94
Intention: 58, 104, 254, 255, 299, 350, 381, 447, 517
Interaction: 44, 107, 234, 241, 372, 429, 440, 503
Interest: 39, 109, 236, 345, 458, 459
Internet: 237, 329 *(see also Website)*
Involvement: 35, 236, 238-243, 298
Job: 80, 401
Judgment: 262
Kindness: 199, 274, 499, 500
Knowledge: 86, 244, 246, 316
Labels: *(see packaging)*
Language: 31, 423
Leadership: 276
Leisure: 80, 399, 522
Lifestyle: 283, 302, 433
Likeability: 41, 55, 340, 428, 466
Listen: 294, 511
Local: 154, 248
Logo: 52-54
Loneliness: 251, 431
Loss: 29, 385
Love: 13, 428
Loyalty: 77, 89, 131, 253-257, 299, 377, 381, 513, 519
Luxuries: 38, 314
Manipulation: 391, 393, 471
Manufacturer: *(see Production)*
Media: 275, 284-290
Medical: 215, 422
Members: *(see Groups)*
Memory: 30, 380, 387
Message: 3, 4, 29, 160, 465
Money: 37, 93, 163, 189, 302, 452, 453
Morality: 56, 272-274
Motivation: 82, 135, 252, 384, 411
Name: 39, 192
Nature: 101, 169, 283
Needs: 34, 278, 361
Negotiation: 181, 415
News: 122, 272
Newness: 231, 420
Nonprofit: *(see Charities)*
Norms: 11, 98, 200
Nostalgia: 30, 380
Novelty: 27, 121
Nutrition: 49-51, 194
Obligation: 24, 78
Openness: 134, 491
Optimism: 281, 282
Order: 67, 175, 465
Organizational: 59, 210
Orientation: 95, 302, 372, 390, 409, 411
Outcomes: 366, 385, 452
Packaging: 75, 194, 195, 231
Parents: 294-296
Participation: 3, 4, 298
Patronage: *(see Loyalty)*
Perception: 347, 440, 495
Performance: 102, 111, 300, 395, 400, 446
Personal: 228, 319
Personality *(traits)*: 95, 186, 202, 258, 260, 281, 331, 409, 499
Persuasion: 4, 35, 156, 160, 304, 449
Play: *(see Games)*
Pleasure: 5, 30, 145, 418, 484
Policies: 152, 178
Political: 168
Popularity: 342
Possessions: 154, 252
Power: 250, 309-311
Preference 64, 76, 253, 341
Price: 40, 72, 116, 150, 315-317, 352, 415, 479, 504, 513
Pride: 89, 208, 276, 318, 414, 481, 498
Privacy: 68, 176, 319-328

Product: 10, 15, 16, 22, 34, 60-64, 97, 110, 111, 155, 162, 168, 235, 244, 246, 300, 314, 334, 316, 333-343, 352-354, 357, 359, 360, 386, 438-440, 475, 479, 481, 484, 491, 493, 505, 515-518
Production: 10, 155, 357, 359
Profit: 92, 210
Protection: 229, 496
Proximity: 347, 463
Punishment: 98, 217, 288
Purchase: 40, 58, 62, 76, 115, 131, 135, 162, 168, 170, 254, 256, 257, 349-354, 386, 393, 442, 515-518
Quality: 65-68, 111, 155, 172-179, 340, 355-359, 467, 481, 484
Quantity: 105, 150, 219, 312, 418
Quit: 349, 350, 374
Read: 21, 196, 243, 509
Reality: 347, 360, 440
Reciprocity: 361, 363
Recommend: 256, 390, 393, 522
Recycling: 23, 151
Regret: 151, 212, 366
Relationships: 13, 44, 77, 87, 222, 224, 241, 361, 363, 367-377, 431, 466
Relevance: 34, 259
Reliability: 155, 175, 355, 468
Religion: 379
Reputation: 91, 102, 103, 118, 426
Resources: 100, 188, 189
Respect: 91, 182
Responsibility: 374, 375
Restaurant: 299
Restriction: 286-290
Retailer: 65-68, 347, 354, 359, 468
Reviews: 382-385
Rewards: 377, 486
Risk: 19, 218, 385, 386
Rules: 98, 511
Sacrifice: 388
Sadness: *(see Happiness)*
Safety: 49, 140, 496
Sales: 72, 117, 150, 391
Salespeople: 107, 367, 390-394, 469
Satisfaction: 73, 373, 395-400
Saving: 93, 163, 282, 302, 452, 453
Scarcity: 188, 342, 401, 474
Search: 97, 515
Security: 68, 179
Selection: 63, 505
Self: 230, 259, 413
Self-concept: 15, 100, 202, 204, 208, 224, 283, 403, 432
Self-efficacy: 311, 327, 404-407, 416
Self-regulation: 409, 411
Sensitivity: 264, 267, 270
Services: 65, 172-179, 255, 279, 361, 363, 375, 377, 399, 400
Severity: 56, 214, 419, 422
Sharing: 182, 183, 229, 230
Shopping: 126, 157, 206, 249, 349, 420, 421, 439, 476, 478
Similarity: 75, 192, 423-425, 490
Size: 150, 247
Skepticism: 426, 451
Skills: 21, 94
Smell: 158, 266
Smoking: 160
Social Class: 435, 436
Social Media: 19, 44, 382, 427, 433, 434
Sociability: 199, 429, 500
Society: 98, 140, 465, 496
Sound: 266, 268, 270
Spatial: 124, 126, 445
Speed: 163, 174, 215
Spiritual: 379
Sponsor: 78, 121, 443
Sports: 257, 460, 461
Stability: 226
Status: 38, 102, 137, 208, 219, 278, 314, 436, 439
Stimulation: 134, 135, 158, 232
Store: 126, 164, 206, 256, 333, 349, 350, 395, 421, 444, 445, 473, 478, 497

Story: 32, 122, 365
Strength: 310, 466
Stress: 187, 190, 421, 446
Success: 21, 91, 92
Superiority: 253, 309, 357
Support: 35, 82, 460
Switching: 206, 275, 307, 519
Talk: *(see WOM)*
Tangible: *(see Reality)*
Targeting: 455
Task: 153, 239, 275, 307, 318, 404, 457-459
Taste: 339 *(see also Food)*
Team: 257, 460, 462
Technology: 157, 476, 478
Telephone: 172, 507
Television: 345, 346
Threats: 217, 328, 422, 465, 496
Time: 80, 307, 329, 457, 463, 497
Touch: 334, 335
Trash: *(see Disposal)*
Treatment: 71, 137, 138, 215, 473
Truth: 26, 120, 175
Trust: 37, 77, 176, 185, 323, 451, 468-471
Typical: 279, 316
Uncertainty: 8, 86, 144, 320, 451
Understand: 31, 294, 193, 196, 317, 365, 509
Unique: 231, 403, 474, 475
Usage: 22, 62, 157, 237, 314, 343, 433, 434, 448, 493
Usefulness: 238, 358, 476, 478, 493
Vacation: 399, 522
Value: 40, 53, 58, 60, 69, 93, 109, 219, 259, 401, 414, 479-488
Values: 71, 83, 388
Variety: 490, 491, 505
Verbal: 69, 268
Visual: 158, 266, 494, 495, 501
Wait: 411, 497
Watch: 70, 284, 288, 290, 345, 345
Website: 65-68, 172-179, 501- 509
Weight: 226, 247
Willingness: 154, 352, 354, 388, 511-519
Win: 148, 460, 486
WOM[3]: 109, 128, 408, 521, 522
Work: 24, 80, 435
Worry: 13, 190, 386
Wrong: 387, 498

. . . . .

1. The keyword "attitude" is not in this index because many if not most of the scales in the book are measures of attitudes. Other words such as "customer" and "marketing" are not in the list for a similar reason.
2. Corporate Social Responsibility
3. Word-of-Mouth

About the Author

. . . .

Dr. Gordon C. Bruner II (Professor Emeritus, Southern Illinois University) received a B.B.A. and a M.S. in marketing from Texas A&M University. His Ph.D. is from the University of North Texas, with a major in marketing and a minor in music. It was during his doctoral work that he learned about scales, worked with them as he assisted his professors in their research, and eventually created scales of his own that were critical to his dissertation.

After several years of developing scales as part of his empirical research activities as a professor, Dr. Bruner realized the difficulty marketing researchers had in finding scales that had already been used in scholarly studies. The development of the first *Marketing Scales Handbook* began at Southern Illinois University in the late 1980s with a colleague (Dr. Paul Hensel). When that volume was published in 1992, it was the first book of its kind in the field of marketing. Eventually, Dr. Bruner was left as the sole author and the work continued in a more focused format. The handbooks are now used by thousands of professors, students, and practitioners around the world. Although the earliest volumes in the series are no longer available in print, the reviews of scales they contained having to do with consumer research can be found in revised form in the repository at *MarketingScales.com*. Indeed, the database is the largest collection of psychometrics that have been used in published marketing research, well over 4,100 scales at this time.

During his years in academia, Dr. Bruner's primary empirical research streams were consumer problem recognition and technology acceptance. His research has been published in the *Journal of Marketing*, the *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, the *Journal of Advertising Research*, the *Journal of Advertising,* the *Journal of Retailing*, *Psychology & Marketing*, the *Journal of Business Research*, as well as many other journals. Throughout his teaching career, his specialties were strategic promotion and consumer behavior.

Dr. Bruner has retired from his long academic career but remains active in reviewing scales. Along with his role as author, he is also a devoted husband, father, and grandfather. Additionally, he is an amateur musician, loving to write and record his own songs. Last but definitely not least, he is a devout Christian, an adherent of the faith though not the religion.