



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_3751
Title of the Manuscript:	Purifying a Television Viewing Measure for Use in Consumer Socialization Research: An Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis Approach

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	- Authors need to emphasize why the measurement was modified. - the authors should emphasize the idea to modify from frequency to hours, as stated previously that television viewing is defined as frequency.....etc. - item analysis and scale reliabilities should be performed and presented before deploying the instrument. but seems they performed it having distributed questionnaire to 1200 respondents. - it's uncommon to judge something better than another based on numbers. greater or smaller number is not always showing significantly different. author should refer to statistics method correctly. See for detail on article	Changes were made according to reviewer's comments. Please see Methodology section on Measurement of constructs, 3rd paragraph added. With regards to scale reliability, a pilot study was conducted and has been included in the methodology section. The item reliability has however remained unchanged, as the study wanted to test if after factor analysis the scale will maintain high internal reliability, as in factor analysis items may dropped thus affecting the reliability of the scale.
Minor REVISION comments	- line 119 - 123 is simply the repetition of line 102-105. the author suggested to write efficiently. some of previous study for instances can be combined and highlight clearly - table 2 is simply the replication of previous paragraphs (respondent characteristics). suggested to choose between paraphrasing or table.	Sentences were rephrased to reflect the distinction between the studies and combined (referring to line 119-123/ 102-105). Table 2 has been removed from the study and replaced by paragraphs.
Optional/General comments		