

Jenny,

First, here's that bullet list of "hot" items derived from the Reviewers' comments:

- More anecdotal stuff.
I put the Ko ref. in the Introduction. Can you think of more of this kind of stuff?
- Recasting away from 1st person pronouns (e.g., "our").
- Special consideration of your "nomology", esp. wrt $H_{2a/b} \rightarrow H_{5a/b}$.

Next, here are my other notes:

- It might be nice to have a short and clever treatment of how "subjective norms" and "ego-focus" are not contradictory concepts in the marketing context. This can be understood as one reads on in your document, as is, but perhaps could be touched upon in the introduction, in a way that prepares the reader for what is to come.
- THE MOST IMPORTANT IDEA:
 - Recognize when a new concept is being introduced: Esp. when it takes the form of "jargon".
 - Make super sure that this new word/concept is not "left hung out to dry". This could take one of two forms:
 - The concept isn't subsequently shown to be relevant to the discussion. If it's not relevant, yank it (get rid of it).
 - The concept is subsequently referenced, but its meaning appears to "jump around" a bit. The core idea behind clean, clear prose (esp. technical writing) is that the reader doesn't have to be continuously uprooting and replanting the new ideas/jargon in different semantics spaces in his or her head. A good introduction of a new concept/jargon plants the word firmly in a useful place in the readers' minds, and subsequent references to the concept and jargon afford only small refinements and minor adjustments to that first impression. If this rule is abused, in worse cases, the reader concludes that the writer is an outright fraud! That, of course, you don't want. But lesser abuses are also poison for a scholarly writer, such as yourself.

Hope this all sheds light. If you have questions, call (of course!). I look forward to seeing a beautiful paper from you go to press! —raz