

Pass 1, Sesh 3

- Page 6:
 - Quote:

Borrowing from Wu and Jang (2008), an MP3 player was chosen as the focal product because it is a ubiquitous staple of present-day young adults' consumer culture and represents a fundamental way in which undergraduate students **transform** their fashion consciousness.
 - Change:

Replacing "transform" with "express". I have no idea how (or why) a product is supposed to "transform" a person's fashion consciousness. Perhaps, if such a "transformation" is especially important, we can find a way to introduce it in a more intuitively apprehensible way.
- Page 7:
 - Quote:

The more the subject is anonymous or deindividuated, the more likely that data collected will be salient to considerations of the private self.
 - Change:
 - Comment:

This is an example where even an educated non-specialist reader might be confused; "anonymous" doesn't sound in the same league with "deindividuated" to me—at least, when I try to infer the definition of deindividuated from morphemic clues and from context. This is an example of the kind of language that needs to be argued over (in the good sense) and ironed out.
- Page 8:
 - Quote:

Then, subjects studied five-sentence statements written by their university students about their attitude positions, which were "**I felt great happiness when I discovered the GRD-2020 MP3 player. Its functions really suit my needs. I feel all my stress melting away when I'm listening to it. Even when I am doing other things, my GRD-2020 is always turned on. Each and every day I look forward to using my GRD-2020.**"
 - Comment:

I presume the original was in Chinese. I 1) touched up the "off" grammar, and 2) retranslated here and there; the idioms may sound natural to a Chinese person, but sound weird to a native English reader. I tried to divine the sense of the original, then retain it. You

might want to show me the original Chinese, later, and (w/ the help of a 辭典) I can verify these translations.

Pass 1, Sesh 2(a,b)

- GENERAL NOTES:

- Thinking more about the second reviewer's comments, I think one problem is that it's hard to know exactly where he/she thinks you "go off the rails." It may be that:

1. he/she thinks your model is overwrought for the target journal. If that's the case, then mere grammatical tweaking will be far from adequate. Or perhaps
2. he/she only feels that the model is suitably detailed and developed, but the citations and language used to bind cited concepts to that model are too detailed, rarified, or seem to strike "false notes." Then again, maybe
3. he/she feels that the understanding is fine, but the text still requires streamlining and fine-tuning.

Before I spend too much energy on this, I recommend you reread that commentary and be sure they're *not* talking about point #1 (at least!).

Of course, even if you decide that the commenter is trying to steer you away from trying to get picked up by that particular journal—based on an assessment that the complexity of your model is not what they're looking for—you're always welcome to withdraw the paper for consideration and submit it to a more psychologically rigorous journal, as suggested.

Of course, you may feel that a wonderfully clear presentation of your model should make the paper fit for publication in any serious marketing journal, and if so, I suspect you're right; but I wouldn't really know that for sure.

At any rate, I think there's some chance that we'll eventually need to do what we did before; sit together and go over the paper in a painstaking fashion, getting you to occasionally recast and rearrange your exposition so as to make it cleaner, clearer, and entirely fit to print.

- Page 4:

- *Quote:*

Allocentrists' Product Involvement and Attitudes.

Mitchell (1981) suggests that attention and processing are two critical stages in **this process**.

- *Content comment:* What "this process" is, at this point, is unclear.