

Satisfaction (General)

In its fullest form, the scale is composed of twelve Likert-type items and measures a consumer's degree of satisfaction with a product he/she has recently purchased. Most of its uses have been in reference to the purchase of cars but Mano and Oliver (1993) appear to have adapted it so as to be general enough to apply to whatever product a respondent was thinking about. Mattila and Wirtz (2001) adapted a short version of the scale to measure customers' satisfaction with a shopping experience. Seven of the items were modified by Hausman (2004) for use with the patient-physician encounter..

Scale Origin

The scale was originally constructed and used by Westbrook and Oliver (1981) to measure consumer satisfaction with cars and with calculators. Four other satisfaction measures were used as well and their results were compared in a multi-trait multi-method matrix. Convenience samples of students were used from two different universities ($n = 68 + 107$). In terms of internal consistency, the alphas were .93 and .96 as measured for cars in the two samples. For both samples, the scale showed strong evidence of construct validity by converging with like constructs and discriminating between unlike constructs. Compared to the other measures of satisfaction, this Likert version produced the greatest dispersion of individual scores while maintaining a symmetrical distribution.

Reliability

Alphas of .95, .98, .94, and .94 were reported for the scale by Mano and Oliver (1993), Oliver (1993), Oliver and Swan (1989b), and Westbrook and Oliver (1991), respectively. Oliver, Rust, and Varki (1997) reported that the reliabilities were .89 and .87 in their first and second studies, respectively. The version of the scale used by Mattila and Wirtz (2001) had an alpha of .72. The seven-item adaptation of the scale by Hausman (2004) had alphas ranging from .79 to .94, with an alpha of .85 for the combined samples.

Validity

Examination of scale's validity was rarely reported in the studies. However, Mano and Oliver (1993) performed a factor analysis which provided evidence that the scale was unidimensional. Using CFA, evidence was provided by Hausman (2004) in support of her scale's convergent and discriminant validities.

Comments

See Wolfenbarger and Gilly (2003) where the authors modified five of this scale's items in order to measure satisfaction with a consumer's most recent online purchase at a website.

References

Hausman, Angela (2004), "Modeling the Patient-Physician Service Encounter: Improving Patient Outcomes," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32 (4), 403-417.

Mano, Haim and Richard L. Oliver (1993), "Assessing the Dimensionality and Structure of the Consumption Experience: Evaluation, Feeling, and Satisfaction," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20 (December), 451-466.

Mattila, Anna S. and Jochen Wirtz (2001), "Congruency of Scent and Music as a Driver of In-store Evaluations and Behaviour," *Journal of Retailing*, 77 (2), 273-289.

Oliver, Richard L. (1993), "Cognitive, Affective, and Attribute Bases of the Satisfaction Response," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20 (December), 418-430.

Oliver, Richard L., Roland T. Rust, and Sajeev Varki (1997), "Customer Delight: Foundations, Findings, and Managerial Insight," *Journal of Retailing*, 73 (3), 311-336.

Oliver, Richard L. and John E. Swan (1989), "Equity and Disconfirmation Perceptions as Influences on Merchant and Product Satisfaction," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16 (December), 372-383.

Westbrook, Robert A. and Richard L. Oliver (1981), "Developing Better Measures of Consumer Satisfaction: Some Preliminary Results," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, V. 8, Kent B. Monroe, ed. Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 94-99.

Westbrook, Robert A. and Richard L. Oliver (1991), "The Dimensionality of Consumption Emotion Patterns and Consumer Satisfaction," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18 (June), 84-91.

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

Scale Items

1. This is one of the best _____ I could have bought.
2. This _____ is exactly what I need.
3. This _____ hasn't worked out as well as I thought it would. (r)
4. I am satisfied with my decision to buy this _____.
5. Sometimes I have mixed feelings about keeping it. (r)
6. My choice to buy this _____ was a wise one.
7. If I could do it over again, I'd buy a different make/model. (r)
8. I have truly enjoyed this _____.
9. I feel bad about my decision to buy this _____. (r)
10. I am not happy that I bought this _____. (r)
11. Owning this _____ has been a good experience.
12. I'm sure it was the right thing to buy this _____.

Foot Notes

1. Mano and Oliver (1993), Oliver (1993), and Westbrook and Oliver (1981) used five-point scales whereas Oliver and Swan (1989) used a seven-point format. Oliver, Rust, and Varki (1997) only used ten of these items (unspecified) and a five-point response scale. Mattila and Wirtz (2001) used seven-point items adapted from #4, #6, and #8. Hausman (2004) used a five-point response format with adjusted phrasings of items #1, #2, #4, #6-#8, and #10.

Copyright of the reviews is owned by GCBII Productions. Copyright of the scales themselves is rarely clear. Unless otherwise noted, the scales can be freely used but citations of the original source or some previous users is expected when reports, papers, or articles are written that refer to them.