**Perceived Message Relevance Scale**

1. The [message] seemed to be written personally for me.
2. The [message] was very relevant to my situation.
3. The [message] was primarily general information that wasn’t applicable to me
4. The [message] was not customized at all.

Response options for all items are *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* (5 pt. scale)

Descriptive Statistics:

Jensen, King et al. (2012) – 2 item measure: *M* = 3.77, *SD* = .87, *α* = .79

Jensen, King et al. (2014) – 4 item measure: *M* = 3.40, *SD* = .51, *α* = .63
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