

## **JCR MANUSCRIPT REVIEW HISTORY 004-3 (REVISION NOTES FROM AUTHORS)**

We are delighted that our paper has been conditionally accepted. This short document explains how we have responded to the few remaining issues.

### **AE:**

Motivation: Because the editor felt that nothing more was needed to address how our work relates to consumer issues, we did not make any major changes in this area. We did, however, add the consumer/marketing citations that Rev C asked us to include, and we changed the term “people” to “consumer” in a number of places, as Rev B requested.

What does Ceiling Prime?: 1. Per your and Rev A’s directive, we elaborated a bit more on the room volume issue (it is actually part of our proposed explanation, not a counter-explanation) in the Gen Discussion (pg 29). We also still mention this issue in the intro, as we believe it would be inappropriate not to discuss it there as well.

2. Per you and Rev B, we now mention in the Gen Discussion the possibility that ceiling height also may prime other, even more distal concepts (pg 31; especially in the high ceiling height condition).

3 & 4. As you requested and per Rev D, we added a brief discussion of the additional study that addressed the ceiling lantern-low point explanation as well as the possibility that mood/affect differences might explain our findings (pg 27). The latter point is also touched on in footnote 1, which discussed that issue in the previous version.

Sophistication: Per Rev A and D and editor’s suggestion, we changed the term “sophistication” to the less value laden term, “sleekness”

Mediation: We added the path material that you and Rev D asked us to include.

### **Rev A:**

As mentioned above, we replaced “people” with “consumer” in a number of places, elaborated further on the room volume issue, and corrected the typo.

We also added some of the ceiling height info that was in our previous revision note (pg. 30-31) and changed the term “sophistication” to “sleekness.” However, we did not address the scale midpoint issue because this issue would be valid only if our scale allowed us to make inferences about the meaning of particular scale points; our scale does not for it is an interval (not ratio) scale (see Nunnally, *Psychometric Theory*, 1978, pg 14-18). We also did not separate H4 into two parts, as this did not seem to be a concern for any other readers/reviewers of the paper.

### **Rev B:**

CH → Prime Relationship: We are sorry that we misunderstood what Rev B was saying in our previous revision. However, as noted above, we now address the point by noting the possibility that ceiling height may also prime other, more distal concepts (pg 31).

CH → Freedom Prime: As the paper states, there are three sources that we could find, which imply higher ceilings may prime freedom: Hall 1966, Moore et al. 1979, and Kraft 1987. We now mention in Gen Discussion (pg 31) the reviewer's suggestion that at times high and low ceilings may also prime concepts that are *opposite* to those that we mention.

**Rev C:**

1-4: We added all but one of the references that the reviewer asked us to include, altho as the AE requested, we did so in places that were appropriate and would not break the paper's flow (not necessarily where the reviewer suggested). The single omitted reference (Law 2002) did not seem relevant.

Minor Point: We tried dropping one of the items to improve the reliability, but this did not have the desired effect.

**Rev D:**

1. We cannot know for sure if the observed effects are primarily due to heightening or lowering the ceiling. If we assume that responses in the low salience condition represent a control (no treatment) group, the data often suggest that either heightening or lowering the ceiling can produce an effect. However, the data don't allow us to make a definitive claim. As for the pleasantness, crowdedness of low ceiling, the additional study that we ran to assess this issue indicates that these factors played no role in any effects that we observed (pg 27). This study also shows that the experience was not more negative in one of the ceiling height conditions, so this too played no role in the processing used or the outcomes.

2. We changed "sophistication" to "sleekness." Recall that participants in the high vs. low ceiling condition engaged in relational processing, which itself encourages abstract (overall thematic) ideation. Because when the products were viewed at an abstract level emphasis should be placed on the product's dominant or abstract theme (sleekness) and on not its few cruder features, respondents in the high ceiling condition viewed the products as relatively sleek. However, because a low ceiling induces item-specific processing or attention to each specific product feature--including the few crude ones, respondents in the low ceiling condition viewed the products as relatively non-sleek (or more crude).

3. We note on pg 10 that RT were measured in milliseconds. We have added the mediation path data that was requested on pg. 24.