

























26. Gregory Neely. 1995. *Properties of a category ratio scale (CR-10) and the visual analogue scale (VAS): a comparison with magnitude estimation, line production, and category scaling*. Dept. of Psychology, Stockholm University.
27. Bing Pan, Arch G. Woodside, and Fang Meng. 2014. How Contextual Cues Impact Response and Conversion Rates of Online Surveys. *Journal of Travel Research* 53, 1: 58–68. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0047287513484195>
28. Agnès Paul-Dauphin, Francis Guillemin, Jean-Marc Virion, and Serge Briançon. 1999. Bias and Precision in Visual Analogue Scales: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 150, 10: 1117–1127. <http://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a009937>
29. Philip M. Podsakoff, Scott B. MacKenzie, and Nathan P. Podsakoff. 2012. Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology* 63: 539–569. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452>
30. Ulf-Dietrich Reips. 2010. Design and formatting in Internet-based research. In *Advanced methods for conducting online behavioral research*, S. D. Gosling and J. A. Johnson (eds.). American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US, 29–43.
31. Ulf-Dietrich Reips and Frederik Funke. 2008. Interval-level measurement with visual analogue scales in Internet-based research: VAS Generator. *Behavior Research Methods* 40, 3: 699–704. <http://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.40.3.699>
32. Joel Ross, Lilly Irani, M. Six Silberman, Andrew Zaldivar, and Bill Tomlinson. 2010. Who Are the Crowdworkers?: Shifting Demographics in Mechanical Turk. *CHI '10 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, ACM, 2863–2872. <http://doi.org/10.1145/1753846.1753873>
33. Paul van Schaik and Jonathan Ling. 2003. Using online surveys to measure three key constructs of the quality of human–computer interaction in web sites: psychometric properties and implications. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 59, 5: 545–567. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S1071-5819\(03\)00078-8](http://doi.org/10.1016/S1071-5819(03)00078-8)
34. J. Scott and E. C. Huskisson. 1976. Graphic representation of pain. *Pain* 2, 2: 175–184.
35. Daniel R. Smith and Bruce N. Walker. 2002. Tick-marks, axes, and labels: The effects of adding context to auditory graphs. *International Conference on Auditory Display (ICAD)*. Retrieved March 31, 2015 from <https://smartech.gatech.edu/handle/1853/51392>
36. George W. Torrance, David Feeny, and William Furlong. 2001. Visual Analog Scales Do They Have a Role in the Measurement of Preferences for Health States? *Medical Decision Making* 21, 4: 329–334.
37. Roger Tourangeau, Mick P. Couper, and Frederick Conrad. 2004. Spacing, Position, and Order Interpretive Heuristics for Visual Features of Survey Questions. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 68, 3: 368–393. <http://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfh035>
38. Li-Jen Weng. 2004. Impact of the Number of Response Categories and Anchor Labels on Coefficient Alpha and Test-Retest Reliability. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 64, 6: 956–972. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0013164404268674>
39. SurveyMonkey: Free online survey software & questionnaire tool. Retrieved March 30, 2015 from <https://www.surveymonkey.com/>
40. Google Forms - create and analyze surveys, for free. Retrieved March 30, 2015 from <http://www.google.ca/forms/about/>
41. Amazon Mechanical Turk - Welcome. Retrieved March 30, 2015 from <https://www.mturk.com/mturk/welcome>
42. Beyond Significance Testing: Statistics Reform in the Behavioral Sciences, Second Edition. <http://www.apa.org>. Retrieved March 25, 2015 from <http://www.apa.org/pubs/books/4316151.aspx>