PROPOSITIONS

I. Review writers paid a small (vs. large or no) monetary incentive are more uncertain of the attitudes expressed in their review (Chapter 2)

II. The effect of receiving a small monetary incentive on writer uncertainty is mediated by the writer’s perception of his/ her own legitimacy as a reviewer (Chapter 2)

III. Reviews written for small (vs. large or no) monetary incentives yield lower product evaluations among readers blind to the incentive condition (H4), because they infer increased uncertainty in these reviews, then doubt the quality of the product, and hence lower their product evaluations (Chapter 2)

IV. When consumers judge their doubt in the trustworthiness of a review writer to be integral (incidental) to judgement formation, their doubt will (will not) have a negative effect on their evaluation of the reviewed product when they spend more (versus less) time thinking about the review (Chapter 3)

V. The use of 2-cell instead of 3-cell designs in the study of social power may lead to the incorrect conclusion that the effects of social power are linear (Chapter 4)

VI. Consumers will send more positive messages about products to people above them (vs. below them or at their level) in the social hierarchy.

VII. Consumers share more word-of-mouth that is positive with people higher in the social hierarchy because they seek approval from these individuals.

VIII. Powerful individuals will take more risks when the resources and abilities afforded by their position of power allow them to take risks successfully.

IX. Powerless individuals will take more risks when taking a risk enables them to gain power.

X. Consumers who occupy either a high power or low power position in the social hierarchy will have a decreased propensity to consume products that represent their authentic self. However, this will occur to a lesser extent for the powerful.

XI. “See first, think later, and then test. But always see first. Otherwise you will only see what you were expecting” – Douglas Adams