MARKETING SCALES HANDBOOK

Multi-Item Measures for Consumer Insight Research

VOLUME 11

SAMPLE

GORDON C. BRUNER II

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface xvii
Acknowledgements xviii
Introduction xix
Scale Reviews 1
  Abandonment Likelihood (Permanent) 3
  Activation (Energetic) 4
  Ad Elicited Inspiration 5
  Ad Targeting Based on Cross-Website Tracking 6
  Ad Targeting Based on Inferred Personal Information 7
  Ad Targeting Based on Stated Personal Information 9
  Ad Targeting Based on Within-Website Tracking 10
  Adventurous Self-Image 12
  Affect Toward Receiving the Refund 14
  Affective Response to the Ad (Fear) 15
  Affective Response to the Brand (Evoking Nature) 16
  Affective Response to the Object 17
  Agentic Orientation of the Company (High) 19
  Agentic Orientation of the Company (Low) 21
  Aggression (Anger) 22
  Aggression (Hostile) 24
  Aggression (Physical) 25
  Aggression (Verbal) 27
  Aggressiveness of the Source 29
  Agitation 30
  Agreeableness 31
  Anxiety (Death) 33
  Appropriateness (General) 35
  Arousal (Energetic) 36
  Arousal (Hedonic Tone) 38

Arousal (Tense) 40
Association Between Two Products Promoted Together 42
Attachment to the Brand 43
Attachment to the Branded Product 44
Attention to the Person 45
Attitude Toward Advertising (Informative) 46
Attitude Toward Buying Locally Produced Foods 48
Attitude Toward Commercials (Negative) 49
Attitude Toward Customizing Products 51
Attitude Toward Referral Programs 52
Attitude Toward Rent-to-Own Businesses 53
Attitude Toward the Ad (Credibility) 54
Attitude Toward the Ad (Greenwashing) 56
Attitude Toward the Charity’s Financial Needs 58
Attitude Toward the Family Brand 59
Attitude Toward the Offer 60
Attitude Toward the Person (Admiration) 61
Attitude Toward the Person (Humorous) 62
Attitude Toward the Political Candidate 63
Attitude Toward the Sales Promotion (Price) 64
Attitude Toward the Service Provider (Knowledge of Customer’s Needs) 65
Attitude Toward the Sponsorship 66
Attitude Toward the Sponsorship 68
Attitude Toward the Webpage (Entertaining) 69
Attitude Toward the Webpage (Informativeness) 71
Attitude Toward the Webpage (Sensory Appeal) 72
Avoidance of Large Food Businesses 73
Avoidance of Products with a Particular Chemical 74
Behavioral Control (Situational) 75
Belief in Luck 77
Believability of the Virtual Reality Display 78

Belongingness (State) 79
Blame Attribution 80
Blameworthiness..82
Brand Anthropomorphism (Supportive) 83
Brand Authenticity..84
Brand Concept Fluency 86
Brand Exclusivity 87
Brand Forgiveness 88
Brand Improvement...89
Brand Loyalty...90
Brand Personality (Authoritative) 91
Brand Preference Compatibility With Partner 93
Branded App Usability (Personalization)..94
Branded App Usability (Speed)..95
Branded App Usability (User-Friendliness) 96
Charitability (General) 97
Child Labor Importance in Purchase Decisions 99
Chronotype 100
Closeness in the Dyadic Task 104
Cognitive Flexibility.. 105
Color Intensity 107
Commitment to the Service Provider... 108
Communal Motive Attributions by the Company 109
Communal Orientation of the Company (High)..................................... 111
Communal Orientation of the Company (Low) 113
Community Participation Intentions 114
Community Support for the Team 116
Company Ratings Typicality 118
Competence (General).. 120
Competitive Intensity of the Auction 122
Competitiveness (Interpersonal).. 123

Concern About Time Until Retirement 125
Conflict Between Partners 126
Conformity of the Person in the Ad 128
Congruence (Self with Brand)..130
Congruence (Self with Brand Users) 131
Connectedness to the Community 133
Connectedness with an Individual 135
Corporate Social Responsibility (Company’s Ability) 137
Corporate Social Responsibility (Company’s Commitment)...........................138
Credibility of the Reviewer...139
Crowding 140
Cultural Orientation (Horizontal Individualism) 142
Cultural Orientation (Vertical Collectivism) 144
Customer Journey Design (Consistency of Touchpoints) 146
Customer Journey Design (Context Sensitivity of Touchpoints) 147
Customer Journey Design (Thematic Cohesion of Touchpoints) 148
Customer Journey Effectiveness 149
Customer Participation Formalization 151
Decision-Making Avoidance (Domain Specific) 152
Decision-Making Confidence (Domain Specific) 153
Dejection...154
Depletion of Mental Energy 155
Desirability of Control 156
Desirability of the Person 157
Desire for Autonomy 158
Desire for Competence 159
Desire for More Precise Information 160
Desire for Predictability 161
Desire for Rewards 162
Desire for Sensory Contact with the Person 163
Desire for Status Among Brand Users 164

Desire to Create by Hand 165
Developmental Feedback on Customer Participation 166
Diagnostic Cue Superiority (Sales vs. Stock Level) 168
Dichotomous Thinking 170
Diet Restriction 172
Disappointment (Anticipated Choice) 174
Discomfort (Affective) 176
Discomfort (Physical) 177
Discount Size 178
Disgust (Animal Reminder) 179
Disgust (Contamination) 181
Disgust (Core) 183
Distraction During the Shopping Trip 185
Distraction During the Shopping Trip Task 186
Distraction During the Task 187
Dominance of the Object 188
Donation Choice Autonomy 189
Donation Effort 190
Donation Likelihood 192
Drinking Intentions (Alcohol) 193
Driving Expertise 194
Ease of Visualization (Furniture in a House) 195
Economic Mobility 196
Eeriness of the Object 197
Efficacy of the App in Goal Pursuit 198
Effort to Follow Professional's Advice 199
Emotionality (Anxiety) 200
Employee’s Active Problem Solving 201
Empowerment (Customer with Company) 202
Empowerment (Interpersonal) 203
Emptiness 204

Engagement with the Brand in the Game (Affective) 205
Engagement with the Brand in the Game (Cognitive) 206
Engagement with the Virtual Reality Display 207
Enjoyment 208
Entitativity 209
Entitativity 211
Entitativity of the Sales Team (Cohesiveness) 213
Environmentalism Felt with the Product..214
External Search Ability 215
Extraversion 216
Extraversion 217
Facing Obstacles..219
Fashionable Self-Image 220
Financial Behaviors (Positive) 221
Financial Goal (Maximizing Gains) 223
Financial Goal (Minimizing Losses) 224
Financial Knowledge Confidence 225
Financial Literacy 226
Financial Responsibility..229
Financial Security (Expected Future) 230
Financial Situation (Negative Affect)...231
Financial Status...233
Financial Stress 234
Financially Constrained..235
Fit (Brand with Brand)..236
Fit (Brand With Cause) 237
Flow Experience 238
Flow (Going Against)...240
Fluency of the Font 242
Fresh Start Mindset 244
Goal Activation (Outcome-Focused Self-Improvement) 246

Goal Activation (Process-Focused Self-Improvement) 247
Goal Attainment Motivation 248
GOD’s Help with Personal Problems 249
GOD’s Intervention in One's Life 250
GOD’s Protection From Harm 251
Health Condition Controllability 252
Healthiness of the Food 253
Healthy Eater Self-Image 254
Hispanic Acculturation in the U.S. (Language Use) 255
Hispanic Acculturation in the U.S. (Media Use) 257
Hispanic Acculturation in the U.S. (Social Relations) 258
Homophily 260
Homophily 261
Humanization of the Product 262
Identification with the Company 263
Identification with the Hobby 264
Identity Threat 265
Identity Threat (Language) 266
Imagery (Purchasing Associated Products) 267
Implicit Health Theory (Immutability) 268
Implicit Health Theory (Malleability) 269
Impression Management (Opinion Change) 270
Informativeness of the Recommendation 271
Informedness (Pre-purchase) 272
Interest in the Object’s Creation Story 273
Interest in the Sale 274
Intrasexual Competition 275
Involvement in the Study 276
Involvement with a Direct Bank Choice 278
Involvement with the Vlogger (Parasocial) 279
Isolation (Social) 280

Justice Restoration 281
Knowledge of Annuities (Subjective) 282
Lethargy 283
Liberalism (Political) 284
Likelihood of Saving Money..285
Love for a Partner 287
Machinization 288
Misrepresentation by the Person 290
Mobile Financial App Error 291
Mobile Financial App Usage Likelihood 292
Mobile Phone Dependence 294
Morality of the Object 296
Morality of the Person 297
Motivation to Please 298
Narrative Transportation 300
Narrative Transportation of the Ad 301
Need to Connect with Other FAns 302
Neglect of Patient's Medical Uniqueness 303
Openness 304
Openness to Learning 306
Originality of the Object..307
Owner Status Compared to Non-Owners...308
Parental Mediation of Child's Online Activity 309
Parenting Emotions 310
Parenting Thoughts 311
Participation in Referral Reward Programs......................................312
Permanence of the Medium's Format 314
Perseverance of Effort 315
Photo-Taking Distraction From the Experience 317
Power (Situational) 324
Power Distance in Organizations 318

Power in Product Domains (Companies vs. Consumers) 319
Power of the Company 320
Power of the Employee 322
Pressure to Finish 325
Price Consciousness 327
Primary Parental Responsibility for Child’s Future Needs 328
Primary Parental Responsibility for Child’s Immediate Needs 329
Produce Abnormality 330
Produce Safety 331
Product Anonymity 332
Product Experience Accuracy 333
Product Innovativeness (Comparative) 334
Product Purchase Embarrassment 335
Product Usage (Aggregate) 337
Product Usage (Periodic) 338
Product Usage (Public or Private) 339
Product’s Past Identity 340
Product’s Story 341
Prosocial Behavior (Interpersonal) 342
Psychological Ownership (Control Route) 343
Psychological Ownership (Knowledge Route) 344
Psychological Ownership (Self-investment Route) 345
Psychological Ownership By Another Customer 346
Psychological Ownership By Another Person 347
Public Commitment to a Brand 348
Purchase Likelihood 349
Pushed By an External Force 350
Quality Consciousness 351
Quality of the Produced Foods (Local vs. Distant) 352
Quality of the Product 354
Quality Variance (Products) 355

Reactance (Need for Agency) 356
Recycling Rumination (Transformation into New Products)............................357
Regret (Anticipated Choice) 358
Regret for Actions Taken...360
Relational Influence on Food Decisions..361
Relationship Formation Activation 362
Relationship Maintenance Activation 363
Relationship Norm Orientation (Communal vs. Exchange)............................364
Repatronage Intention 366
Request for Legal Help 367
Resilience 368
Response to Sub-Goal Success (Licensing)..369
Response to Sub-Goal Success (Persistence) 371
Responsibility in the Dyadic Decision Process 373
Revenge Intensity 374
Review Specificity 375
Reviewer’s Writing Effort...376
Risk (Financial) 377
Risk (Psychological)..379
Risk (Social)...381
Riskiness of the Purchase 383
Role Clarity in the Community 384
Romantic Attachment Style (Anxiety) 386
Romantic Motivation Activity 388
Romantic Relationship Intentions 390
Romantic Status 391
Satisfaction with Personal Sacrifice 392
Satisfaction with the Bank 393
Satisfaction with the Product Purchased from a Particular Retailer 394
Satisfaction with the Salespeople’s Service...395
Saving Money a Particular Way 396

Schadenfreude (Malicious Joy) 397
Security of the Credit Card App 399
Self-Brand Signaling in Online Posting 400
Self-Consciousness (Private) 401
Self-Control (Spending) 402
Self-Efficacy (Financial) 403
Self-Efficacy (Financial) 404
Self-Efficacy (General) 405
Self-Efficacy (General) 407
Self-Efficacy (Life) 408
Self-Importance 409
Self-Worth Due to GOD’s Love 410
Seller Influence Tactics (Information Exchange & Recommendations) 411
Seller Influence Tactics (Ingratiation & Inspirational) 413
Seller Influence Tactics (Threats & Promises) 415
Sensory Control (Touch) 417
Sensory Control (Voice) 418
Sensory Feedback (Visual) 419
Sensory Stimulation 420
Service Failure Severity 421
Service Performance Expectations 422
Service Quality (Employee’s Empathy) 423
Similarity to Members of the Community 425
Size (General) 426
Social Bonding Importance 427
Social Categorization Within the Community 428
Social Costs of Making Recommendations 429
Social Dominance Orientation 431
Social Dominance Orientation 433
Social Rejection Due to Choice 434
Social Status Pursuit Within the Community 435

Softness of the Object 436
Softness of the Object 437
Softness of the Object 438
Softness of the Object 439
Spatial Presence 440
Special Treatment of Customers Based on Financial Status 441
Specialness Felt with the Product 442
Sponsor’s Concern For the Event 443
Sponsor’s Effect on Brand Purchase 445
Sponsor’s Effect on Event Attendance 446
Stability (Personal) 447
Stability (Social) 448
Status Felt in The Restaurant 449
Status of the Employee 451
Status of the Restaurant 452
Stock Market Investment Experience 454
Stock Market Investment Risk Aversion 456
Stock Performance Expectations 457
Stock Performance Uncertainty 458
Subscription’s Benefits 459
Subscription’s Cost 460
Success In the Class 461
Success on the Exam 462
Sunscreen Usage Likelihood 463
Support for the Upgrade 464
Supported in All Situations 465
Tangibility 466
Task Affirmation of Core Values 467
Taste Evaluation 468
Temporal Focus 469
Temporal Proximity of Wait Period 470

Thinness Importance 471
Threatened (Identity) 472
Tie Strength 473
Tightness (Country) 475
Tightness (Personal) 476
Tipping Importance 477
Travel Intention 479
Trust in Algorithms (Affective) 481
Trust in Algorithms (Cognitive) 482
Trust in the Technological Interface 483
Uncertainty (Aleatory) 484
Uncertainty (Epistemic) 485
Understanding the Company’s Business 487
Uniqueness 488
Uniqueness of the Object 489
Uniqueness (Self) 490
Value of the Company’s Donation 491
Value of the Investment 492
Variety in Product-by-Attribute Table 493
Variety-Seeking Tendency (Brands) 494
Visual Attractiveness 495
Visual Complexity of the Object 497
Vitality 498
Warmth (General) 499
Warmth (General) 501
Website Usage Intensity 503
Website Usage Intention 505
Willingness to Interact with the Salesclerk Again 506
Willingness to Recycle 507
Willingness to Take Investment Risk 508
Willingness to Visit Again 510

  - Word-of-Mouth Intention (Positive) 511
  - Word-of-Mouth Intention (Positive) 512
  - Word-of-Mouth Pleasure (Product) 513

Subject Index 515

About the Author...521

Acknowledgements

. . . .

When describing scales, I primarily depend upon information in the journal articles in which the scales were reported. There are 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:

Ozgun Atasoy
Dipayan (Dip) Biswas
Irene Consiglio
Maria Jose del Rio Olivares
Lauren S. Grewal
Sara Hanson
Yongfu He
Xun (Irene) Huang
Mina Kwon
Xiaolin Li
Maria Logkizidou
Jeffrey R. Parker
Mike R. Sciandra
Ronn J. Smith
Tom van Laer
Caleb Warren
Sunyee Yoon
Lin Yang

As with previous volumes, I thank my wife for understanding the time I put into this work, especially since I am retired from academia and could be doing things with her and the rest of the family that are a lot more fun.

May your measures always be valid!

Fort Worth, Texas
April 2021

Introduction

. . . .

Volumes 1 to 10 of this series contained multi-item scales that had been included in articles published in six of the top marketing journals between 1980 and 2017. (See the table below for the six journals.) This eleventh volume of the series covers the scales that were reported in articles published in 2018 and 2019. 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 a measure of something and are not finding it in this book, they should check out the full database at *MarketingScales.com* where several thousand scales are available.

Similar to Volumes 4 to 10, 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, there were measures reported in the domain of articles examined that 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 the online reviews as "see also."

Another criterion used to help 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 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 of the options and choose the one 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 the articles published in six top marketing journals during 2018 and 2019. (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 194 articles from the marketing literature that received the greatest attention and provided the 400 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 common name is used by 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 its length?

As for finding scales of interest, the Table of Contents is a useful place to start. Also, a Subject Index is provided at the back of the book. As helpful 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., Financial Stress, Homophily, Softness of the Object.

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 or adapted it from another source. 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 validity that the work is merely summarized. Interested 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 the scale could be usable in other contexts with a bit modification.

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 over half did not respond. If they did respond and provide useful information, they are cited.

Scale Items:

The statements, adjectives, or questions composing a scale are listed in this area of a review and are generally referred to as the *scale items*. Also, an indication of the response format is provided in this section unless it has been adequately specified in the description at the beginning of the review. For example, many of the measures were merely described by authors of the source articles as "Likert-type" and the verbal anchors of the response scales were not stated. Unless stated otherwise in this section, the extreme anchors of "Likert-type" scales were *strongly agree / strongly disagree* or some close variant. The graphic versions of the scales and how authors displayed them 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 the cited authors or books that specifically deal with questionnaire development.

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. Because of that, users of scales are urged to examine items closely to confirm which ones should be reverse-coded when determining scale scores.

Finally, the instructions that were given to participants when they responded to scales, are rarely provided in the descriptions provided here because they are rarely provided in the source articles. Despite that, some suggestions have been provided in many cases, especially when the scales do not make sense without directions or scale stems. Potential users of a measure should feel free to contact those researches cited in a review and ask them about the instructions as well as any other issues that are unclear about the measure.

Scale
Reviews

BRAND AUTHENTICITY

The extent to which a brand is viewed as authentic and credible is measured with three, nine-[illegible] uni-polar items.

Origin:

Luffarelli, Mukesh, and Mahmood (2019) used the scale in Studies 1 to 5. It was also us[illegible] replication Studies 1 and 2 provided in the appendix. The authors indicated that their scale [illegible] adapted from work by Morhart et al. (2015) as well as Napoli et al. (2014) [illegible] See Comments below.)

Reliability:

In the many studies in which the scale was used by by Luffar[illegible]h, and [illegible] (201[illegible] the alphas ranged from .81 to .90.

Validity:

The scale's validity was not discussed by Luffar[illegible]i, Mukes[illegible]mood (2019).

Comments:

Morhart et al. (2015) as well as Na[illegible]li et al. (2[illegible]iewed bra[illegible] authenticity as multi-dimensional. However, their wor[illegible]d s[illegible]po[illegible]ls with very different dimensions. As noted above, Luffarelli, Mukesh[illegible]201[illegible] their work but created a scale that is not consistent with either co[illegible]. G[illegible] the validity of this scale depends upon the way the construct is viewed.

References:

Luffarelli, Jonathan, M[illegible]nd Amma[illegible]Mahmood (2019), “Let the Logo Do the Talking: The Influence of Logo Des[illegible] Brand Equity,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 56 (5), 862–878.

Morhar[illegible]citas, Lucia [illegible]alär[illegible]vremont, Florent Girardin, and Bianca Grohmann (201[illegible]), “Bra[illegible] Authentici[illegible] An Inte[illegible]tive Framework and Measurement Scale,” *Journal of C[illegible]sumer Psychology*, 25 ([illegible], 200–218.

[illegible]li, Juli[illegible]Dickins[illegible]ichael B. Beverland, and Francis Farrelly (2014), “Measuring [illegible]Auth[illegible]icity,” *Journal of Business Research*, 67 (6), 1090–1098.

Sca[illegible]ns:[1]

_____ is:

1. authentic

SAMPLE

DONATION EFFORT

The extent to which an individual or company has put a lot of thought, work, and sacrifice int[illegible] particular donation is measured with five items.

Origin:

Except for a little bit of phrasing from two items in a measure of effort by Bechwati and X[illegible] the rest of the scale seems to have been created by Gershon and Cryder (2018). They ref[illegible] the measure as *effort/sacrifice* because they originally expected the items [illegible] measure separa[illegible] constructs, but based on the results of factor analyses conducted in at le[illegible] ix studies, they decided to combine them into one scale.

Reliability:

Across the several studies in which it was used by Gershon [illegible] 018), t[illegible] lphas ranged from .85 to .92.

Validity:

Although Gershon and Cryder (2018) did not [illegible] ess the sc[illegible] y *per se*, they did mention that the items were factor analyzed in sev[illegible] s along w[illegible] ected to measure other constructs. The five donation effort items a[illegible] ed by them[illegible] hose results provide evidence of the scale's unidimensionality and [illegible] onvergent [illegible] iscriminant validities.

Comments:

In most of the studies by Gershon and C[illegible] 8), th[illegible] le was used with respect to a company, but the donation effort of a p[illegible] rticu[illegible] vidua[illegible] was measured in one of the studies (3A). It appears the [illegible] could also be u[illegible] d with[illegible] er entities but, of course, pretesting should be conducted to c[illegible] sychometric q[illegible] lity of such applications.

References:

Bechwat[illegible] da N. and L[illegible] n Xia [illegible] Computers Sweat? The Impact of Perceived Effort of Onli[illegible] Aids on C[illegible] s[illegible] er's S[illegible] sfaction with the Decision Process," *Journal of Consumer Ps[illegible] hology*, 13 (1), 139–14[illegible]

G[illegible] shon, Ra[illegible] Cynthia Cryder (2018), "Goods Donations Increase Charitable Credit for Low-[illegible] *al of C[illegible] sumer Research*, 45 (2), 451–469.

Sc[illegible] s:[1]

1. ______ [illegible] t a lot of effort into this donation.
2. ______ w[illegible] hard on this donation.
3. ______ put [illegible] hought into this donation.
4. How big was ______ 's sacrifice when making this donation?

SAMPLE

SAMPLE

MACHINIZATION

This scale measures how much a person considers an object to be a machine rather than a hu[illegible] and can be easily replaced because of that. Ten, seven-point Likert-type items compose th[illegible].

Origin:

Mende et al. (2019, web appendix, p. 4) used the scale in the Study 4 pretest with data [illegible] from 100 participants via Amazon MTurk. The scale was apparently created by the authors [illegible] on the work by Stenzel et al. (2012) as well as Waytz and Epley (2012).

Reliability:

The alpha for the scale was .87 (Mende et al. 2019, web appendix, p. 4).

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not addressed by Mend[illegible]19). [illegible]ever, since t[illegible] scale was used as a manipulation check and the manipulation was [illegible], it provides some preliminary support for a claim of the scale's predictive validity.

References:

Mende, Martin, Maura L. Scott, Jen[illegible] van Doo[illegible]ewal, and [illegible]na Shanks (2019), “Service Robots Rising: How Humanoid Ro[illegible] S[illegible]riences and Elicit Compensatory Consumer Responses,” *Journal [illegible]earc[illegible]5–556.

Stenzel, Anna, Eris Chinellato, Maria [illegible], Áng[illegible] Pobil, Markus Lappe, and Roman Liepelt (2012), “When Humanoid Robots [illegible]uman-[illegible]e Interaction Partners: Co-representation of Robo[illegible]ic Actions,” *Jour[illegible]ental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 38 (5), [illegible]1077.

Waytz, Adam and [illegible] (2012), “So[illegible] Connection Enables Dehumanization,” *Journal of Experimental Social* [illegible](1), 70-76.

Scale Items:[1]

This ______ [illegible][2]

1. [illegible]
2. [illegible]
3. [illegible]
4. [illegible] tool.
5. is lifeless.
6. is diff[illegible]ent than a person.
7. has a [illegible]is/her/its own. (r)
8. It is not i[illegible]ortant how I treat the ______ because this ______ is just a machine.
9. This ______ is easily replaced because he/she/it is just a machine.

SERVICE QUALITY (EMPLOYEE'S EMPATHY)

SAMPLE

The scale uses three, seven-point Likert-type items to measure how strongly a pers[illegible]lieves that an employee has engaged in behaviors to politely and attentively address a custo[illegible] co[illegible]cerns (unspecified).

Origin:

Marinova, Singh, and Singh (2018) used the scale in Study 2. Data were gathere[illegible] participants in an online panel who had flown in the previous two [illegible]ars. As for the [illegible]in, the authors cited Mattila and Enz (2002) and may have receive[illegible]e inspiration fro[illegible] but none of the items came from that source. Curiously, the[illegible] more similar to t[illegible]ns in a scale by Andaleeb and Basu (1994). Ultimately, it appe[illegible] Singh, an[illegible] Singh [illegible]018) created the scale by drawing ideas from multiple sources.

Reliability:

The composite reliability reported for the sc[illegible]89 wh[illegible]ed with resp[illegible] to a missed flight and .88 with respect to lost luggage (Mari[illegible] and [illegible]gh 2018, p. 1[illegible] of web appendix).

Validity:

All of the multi-item scales used i[illegible] were exa[illegible]arinova, Singh, and Singh (2018, p. 188) with two CFAs: one for the [illegible]t scenario [illegible]e for lost luggage. Reasonable fits were found in both cases[illegible]Es were [illegible] for the m[illegible]sing flight and lost luggage scenarios, respectively (web appe[illegible]upp[illegible]so found for the scale's discriminant validity. Finally, the scale wa[illegible]latio[illegible] since the manipulation was successful, it provided some evidence o[illegible]edict[illegible]ity.

Referenc[illegible]

Andaleeb, [illegible]d Amiya K. B[illegible](1994), "Technical Complexity and Consumer Knowledge as Moderators [illegible]ality Eval[illegible]on in the Automobile Service Industry," *Journal of Retailing*, 70[illegible]4), [illegible]

[illegible]arinova, Det[illegible]ina, S[illegible], and Jagdip Singh (2018), "Frontline Problem-Solving [illegible]ctiveness: A Dyn[illegible]ic A[illegible]sis of Verbal and Nonverbal Cues," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 55 ([illegible]), 178-192.

Mattila, Anna S., a[illegible]d Cathy A. Enz (2002), "The Role of Emotions in Service Encounters," *Journal* [illegible]*search*[illegible]4), 268–277.

[illegible]It[illegible]s:[1]

The extent [illegible] which the ______ agent in the interaction . . .[2]

1. [illegible]oke politely.
2. listened carefully to the customer's situation.

WEBSITE USAGE INTENSITY

SAMPLE

This scale uses six items to measure how involved a person is with a website such th[illegible] connects one to a community and is part of daily life. The scale appears to be most relevan[illegible] with social media websites.

Origin:

Kitirattarkarn, Araujo, and Neijens (2019) used the scale with data collected from [illegible]ook users living in the U.S., South Korea, the Netherlands, and Thaila[illegible]. The samples w[illegible]hed as being comparable across the four counties in terms of sever[illegible]ic demographic c[illegible]s. Although the authors did not identify the source of the meas[illegible]ems are from an e[illegible]n scale created by Ellison, Steinfield, and Lampe (2007) and is s[illegible]eferred to[illegible]s the [illegible] Facebook Intensity Scale (FBI).

Reliability:

As used by Kitirattarkarn, Araujo, and Neije[illegible] p. 2[illegible]e scale's a[illegible]s were .93, .88, .88, and .93 for the U.S., the Netherlands[illegible] Thail[illegible], respectively.

Validity:

The validity of the scale was not [illegible] Kitirattar[illegible]jo, and Neijens (2019). While they mentioned that they had condu[illegible] analyses [illegible] many scales, specific results were not provided.

Comments:

The scale items were phrased [illegible] the [illegible] lang[illegible]age of participants in the four samples using the translation/[illegible]translation meth[illegible]d. The[illegible]ecific phrasings were not provided in the article apart from the [illegible]ion. Interest[illegible] users should contact the authors for the translations.

Referenc[illegible]

[illegible]ison, Nicole [illegible], Cha[illegible]ld, and Cliff Lampe (2007), "The Benefits of Facebook ''Friends:'' S[illegible]l Capital a[illegible] C[illegible]ege S[illegible]ents' Use of Online Social Network Sites," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Commu[illegible]cation*, 12 (4), 1143-1168.

Kit[illegible]n, Gau[illegible]P, Theo Araujo, and Peter Neijens (2019), "Challenging Traditional Culture? [illegible]and N[illegible]onal Collectivism-Individualism Moderates the Effects of Content [illegible]and Social Relationships on Consumer Engagement with Brand-Related User-[illegible]ent," *Journal of Advertising*, 48 (2), 197-214.

Scale Items:[1]

1. ______ is a part of my everyday activity.
2. I am proud to tell people I'm on ______.

Subject Index[1]

. . . .

Ability: *(see Capability)*
Acceptance: 35, 260, 434
Achievement: 248
Activity: 36, 309, 388
Adaptation: 105, 147
Advantage: 77
Advertising: 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 15, 46, 49, 54, 56, 128, 301, 497
Advice: 199
Aesthetics: 344, 495
Affect: 14, 16, 205, 240
Aggression: 22-29, 188
Agreement: 27, 31
Analytical: 401
Anger: 17, 22, 25, 126
Anthropomorphism: 83, 262, 288
Anxiety: 15, 30, 33, 40, 154, 176, 200, 386
App: 94-96, 198, 399
Appeal: 64, 66, 72, 149
Appearance: 471
Appropriateness: 35, 429
Approval: 260, 434
Arousal: 4, 12, 36, 38, 40, 283, 498
Assertiveness: 2,
Assessment: 375, 462
Association: 42, 237, 267
Atmospherics: 350, 449
Attachment: 43, 44, 104, 133, 386
Attendance: 446
Attention: 45, 185, 332
Attractiveness: 157, 275, 471, 495
Attributions: 80, 82
Augmented Reality: *(see Reality)*
Authenticity: 84, 297, 501
Authority: 91, 318
Autonomy: 142, 158, 356
Avoidance: 73, 74, 152, 179, 181, 183, 456
Banks: 278, 393
Benefits: 109, 337, 338, 411, 459
Benevolence: 97, 109
Blame: 80, 82
Body: 177, 471
Brand: 16, 43, 44, 59, 83, 84, 86-96, 130, 131, 146-149, 164, 205, 206, 236, 237, 308, 348, 445, 494, 511
Capability: 137, 159, 194, 269, 408, 454
Cars: 194, 272
Celebrity: 10, 279
Certainty: 161
Challenge: 219, 238, 405
Change: 268-270, 448
Charities: 58, 192
Children: 49, 99, 309, 311, 328, 329
Choice: 174, 189, 434
Clarity: 192, 384
Cleanliness: 181, 183
Clothing: 220, 152
Color: 107
Cognition: 105, 155, 170, 206
Comfortable: 436, 438, 439
Commitment: 44, 108, 138, 315, 371, 473
Community: 48, 114, 116, 133, 383, 425, 428, 435
Company: 19, 21, 109, 111, 113, 118, 151, 202, 263, 319, 320, 374, 487, 491
Compatibility: 93, 236
Comparison: 168, 235, 278, 308

Competence: 19, 120, 159
Competition: 122, 123, 275
Complexity: 242, 497
Compliance: 128, 199, 475, 476
Computers: 481, 482
Concern: 125, 214, 443
Confidence: 120, 153, 198, 203, 216
Conflict: 126, 317
Congruence: 130, 131, 236, 237, 261
Connectedness: 79, 135, 209, 211, 262, 302
Consequences: 246, 429
Consistency: 146, 161
Contamination: 181
Control: 75, 156, 158, 234, 252, 268, 324, 343, 402, 417, 418
Coordination: 213
Coping: 407
Cost: 429, 460
Creativity: 165, 273, 304
Credibility; 46, 54, 84, 139
Crowded: 140, 280
CSR^2: 137, 138
Culture: 142-145, 475
Curiosity: 274, 306
Customization: 51, 94
Damage: 360, 374, 397
Deals: 60, 396
Death: 33, 179
Decision-making: 152, 153, 160, 190, 298, 361, 373, 403
Deception: 56, 113, 290
Delight: 14
Dependability: 354, 483
Dependency: 294
Design: 51, 148, 319, 489
Desirability: 157, 162
Devotion: 287, 310
Diet: 172, 253
Differentiation: 355, 490
Difficulty: 153, 195, 219, 465
Discomfort: 176, 177, 179, 204
Discount: 178
Discrimination: 441
Dissonance: 240, 360
Distraction: 185-188, 317
Dominance: 188, 431-433
Donate: 58, 97, 189-192, 491
Drink: 193, 468
Dyads: 104, 373,
Eat: 172, 254, 468
Effectiveness: 19, 21, 405
Efficiency: 19, 21
Effort: 138, 190, 199, 276, 315, 376
Embarrassment: 332, 335
Emotions: 4, 17, 22, 24, 154, 204, 208
Empathy: 31, 423
Employees: 201, 318, 322, 423, 427, 451
Engagement: 45, 207, 238
Enjoyment: 69, 207, 208, 312, 397
Entertaining: 62, 301
Environmentalism: 56, 214
Equality: 431, 433
Esteem: 61, 381
Ethics: 99, 297
Ethnicity: 255-259
Excitement: 4, 72, 283, 420, 498
Expectations: 118, 161, 174, -325, 422, 457, 484
Expensive: 327, 460
Experiences: 333, 375
Extension: 59, 86
Fairness: 24, 281
Familiarity: 161, 242
Family: 59, 144, 309, 364
Fans: 116, 302
Fashion: 220
Features: 343, 493
Feedback: 166, 419
Fear: 15, 17, 33, 197
Financial: 58, 221-235, 282, 291, 292, 403, 404, 441, 454-458, 492
Flow: 238, 240, 300, 301
Fluency: 86, 195, 242
Food: 48, 73, 253, 330, 331, 352, 361
Freedom: 158, 189, 369
Friendly: 113, 216, 217, 364, 413, 499, 501
Friends: 258, 298, 512
Frustration: 126, 231
Fun: 62, 69, 208
Future: 86, 229, 230, 244, 469, 484, 485, 510

Games: 205, 206
Gender: 275, 361
Goals: 198, 223, 246-248, 369, 371, 407
GOD: 249, 251, 410
Groups: 209, 211, 280, 431, 433
Habitual: 100, 447
Happiness: 14, 38, 342, 397
Harmful: 296, 331
Health: 181, 252-254, 268, 269, 282, 331, 498
Hedonic: 38, 468
Helpfulness: 71, 83, 97, 250, 271, 342, 367, 465
Honesty: 63, 111, 139, 297
Hostility: 22, 24, 25
Humor: 62
Identification: 131, 263, 264, 270, 413, 425
Image: 12, 220, 254, 290
Importance: 271, 351, 409, 427, 467, 469, 477
Improvement: 53, 89, 246, 246, 388, 464
Influence: 202, 203, 270, 322, 350, 356
Information: 46, 71, 160, 272, 399, 411, 485
Innovative: 332, 334
Inspiration: 5
Intelligence: 120, 159
Intensity: 107, 122, 374, 503
Intention: 193, 285, 285, 349, 463, 479
Interaction: 217, 364, 506
Interest: 273, 274, 276
Internet: 279, 309 *(see also Website)*
Intoxication: 193
Intrusive: 346
Investments: 221-228, 282, 345, 383, 403, 454-458, 492, 508
Involvement: 114, 250, 264, 279, 391, 443, 503
Irritation: 49, 421
Job: 156 *(see also Work)*
Judgment: 82, 170, 296, 297
Justice: 281
Kindness: 31, 111, 296, 499, 501
Knowledge: 63, 65, 194, 215, 225344, 404, 487
Language: 255, 257, 265
Leadership: 319-321
Learning: 306, 461, 462
Legal: 347, 367
Lifestyle: 100, 408, 447
Likeability: 60, 66, 68, 273, 495
Location: 48, 352
Loneliness: 204, 280
Loss: 224, 397
Love: 157, 163, 287, 310, 388, 390, 391, 410
Loyalty: 3, 88, 90, 348, 366, 506, 510
Marriage: 93, 126
Media: 257, 126
Medical: 152, 303
Mobile: 94-96, 291-295
Money: 285, 377, 396
Morality: 111, 284, 296, 297
Motivation: 109, 135, 156, 162, 165, 248, 298, 362, 363, 390, 505
Movement: 350, 417, 418
Name: 59, 91
Nature: 16
Needs: 302, 328, 329, 469
Nervousness: 30, 40, 200, 472
Newness: 334, 464
Norms: 128, 475, 476
Novelty: 242, 307, 489
Nutrition: 254, 352
Obligation: 108, 144
Offensive: 183, 265
Openness: 304, 306
Opportunities: 196
Optimism: 66-68, 244
Order: *(see Structure)*
Orders: *(see Purchase)*
Orientation: 19, 21, 111, 113, 142, 144, 431, 433
Outcomes: *(see Consequences)*
Ownership: 53, 343-347
Pain: *(see Discomfort)*
Parents: 328, 329
Participation: 52, 114, 151, 166, 312
Past: 244, 340, 341
Patients: 303, 309, 311
Patronage: *(see*

Loyalty)
Perception: 45, 78, 105, 119, 195, 419
Performance: 123, 422, 461, 462, 482
Personality *(traits)*: 12, 31, 91, 216, 217, 304 401
Persuasion: *(See Influence)*
Photography: 317
Pleasure: 459, 513
Political: 63, 284
Possessions: 233, 347
Power: 75, 188, 202, 318-324
Preference: 93, 168, 447
Price: 60, 64, 178, 327, 377
Privacy: 339, 401
Problem: 80, 206, 249, 251, 291, 367, 374
Process: 247, 297, 373
Product: 42, 51, 56, 72, 74, 168, 178, 214, 267, 274, 307, 319, 327, 332-341, 349, 354, 355, 357, 394, 400, 442, 463, 464, 493, 513
Professional: 199, 364, 427
Promotions: 42, 60, 64
Protection: 181, 251
Proximity: 163, 470
Purchase: 88, 90, 99, 231, 272, 349, 366, 377-383, 402, 445, 463, 494
Quality: 59, 89, 351-355
Quantity: 168, 426
Read: 242, 255
Reality: 78, 170, 207, 300, 419, 440, 466
Recognition: 225, 303, 442
Recommendation: 52, 271, 411, 429, 511, 512
Recovery: 368
Recycling: 357, 507
Redress: 201, 281
Refunds: 14
Regret: 358, 360
Relationships: 43, 65, 79, 108, 133, 135, 270, 287, 362-365, 386-392, 427, 473
Reliability: 314, 353
Replacement: 3, 288
Reputation: 59, 451
Resources: 137, 345
Respect: 61, 451
Responsibility: 80, 82, 229, 252, 310, 311, 328, 329, 358, 373
Restaurant: 449, 452, 477
Restriction: 140, 172, 176, 356, 402
Retail: 186, 187, 332, 335 *(see also Store)*
Reviews: 139, 375, 376
Rewards: 162, 312, 369, 415, 477
Risk: 12, 358, 377-383, 456, 508
Roles: 328, 329, 384
Rules: 128, 151, 309
Rumination: 357, 362, 363
Sacrifice: 190, 144, 392
Sadness: 17, 154, 204, 360
Safety: 74, 330, 331
Sales: 64, 274
Salespeople: 213, 395, 411-416, 506
Satisfaction: 3, 233, 235, 392-395
Saving: 221, 226, 239, 285, 285, 396
Search: 215, 351
Security: 266, 399, 483
Self: 401, 409, 472, 490
Self-concept: 130, 264, 379, 400
Self-efficacy: 75, 105, 269, 324, 403-408
Self-regulation: 369, 371
Senses: 417-420, 437
Services: 65, 166, 393, 395, 421-424
Severity: 193, 374, 421
Sharing: 342, 511, 513
Shopping: 185, 186, 267, 272
Signal: 347, 400
Similarity: 261, 425
Size: 178, 321, 426
Skills: 120, 215, 225, 238, 265
Social: 19, 21, 61, 79, 142, 144, 203, 209, 211, 260, 261, 289, 409, 476
Social Class: *(see Status)*
Social Media: 376, 400, 473, 503

Sociability: 216, 217 258, 262, 501
Society: 53, 448
Softness: 436-439
Source: 29, 46
Spatial: 140, 346, 440
Speed: 95, 325
Sponsor: 66, 68, 443-446
Sports: 66, 68, 116
Stability: 314, 447, 448
Status: 87, 164, 187, 233, 428, 435, 449, 451, 452
Stimulation: 5, 420
Store: 267, 348, 366, 394 *(See also Retail)*
Story: 273, 300, 340, 341, 366
Strength: 214, 368, 388, 473
Stress: 155, 325, 368
Structure: 341, 448
Students: 461, 462
Subscription: 337, 338, 459, 460
Success: 77, 196, 405, 461, 462
Superiority: 87, 164, 308, 428, 431, 433, 449, 452
Support: 116, 249, 464, 465
Tangible: 78, 466
Targeting: 6, 7, 9, 10
Task: 104, 186, 187, 276, 467, 481, 482
Taste: 352, 468
Technology: 288, 483
Tension: 30, 40, 200
Threats: 25, 183, 197, 219, 265, 266, 425, 472
Time: 100, 125, 470
Touch: 163, 165, 417, 436-440, 466
Touchpoints: 146-148
Travel: 479
Truth: 56, 290
Trust: 54, 73, 481-483, 499
Typical: 118, 333, 488
Uncertainty: 174, 458, 484, 485
Understanding: 282, 487
Unique: 303, 307, 442, 488-490
United: 209-213
Unusual: 197, 330, 488
Usage: 42, 292, 337-339, 343, 505
Usefulness: 71, 96, 160, 482
Value *(worth)*: 64, 178, 410, 491, 492
Values: 244, 467
Variety: 493, 494
Verbal: 27, 418
Virtual Reality: *(see Reality)*
Visual: 107, 195, 267, 348, 419, 497
Vote: 99, 284
Wait: 125, 470
Watch: 179, 300, 446
Website: 6, 7, 9, 10, 69, 71, 72, 503, 505
Willingness: 192, 506-510
Win: 77, 122, 123
WOM[3]: 52, 511-513
Work: 125, 196, 315
Worry: 151, 234, 266, 448, 481

. . . . .

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 only 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 of 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 at *MarketingScales.com*. Indeed, the database is the largest collection of psychometrics that have been used in published marketing research, well over 4,500 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 promotion management 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.