

Planning for Multiple Shopping Goals in the Marketplace**Web Appendix** (pages 2 to 12)**Methodological Data Appendix** (pages 13 to 39)

Jacob Suher, Szu-chi Huang, and Leonard Lee

Web Appendix

A. Pilot Test I: The Inverse Relationship between Motivation and Inter-choice Time through Self-report

We conducted two pilot tests to establish the inverse relationship between motivation to complete a shopping trip and inter-choice time. In the first pilot test, we directly manipulated motivation and measured participants' subsequent inter-choice times through self-report. In the second pilot test, we measured motivation through self-report and covertly recorded participants' actual inter-choice times to gauge the relationship between these two variables.

For the first pilot study, we recruited 150 participants through Prolific to participate in a short survey for monetary payment. The study used a shopping scenario to manipulate how motivated participants were to complete a shopping trip by changing how important it was to complete this trip (low importance vs. high importance, between-subjects); we captured participants' anticipated inter-choice times through three scale-based items in this study.

The shopping scenario asked participants to imagine that they were going on a shopping trip. In the low-importance condition, participants read that they had a low desire and it was *not important* to complete the shopping trip. In the high-importance condition, participants read that they had a high desire and it was *very important* to complete the shopping trip. Prior literature has shown that the importance of a task determines people's motivation to complete a task (e.g., Expectancy \times Value model, Liberman & Förster, 2008). Participants then responded to a motivation manipulation check. The manipulation check asked, "How motivated are you to complete this shopping trip?" (1 = Low level of motivation; 7 = High level of motivation). After reporting their motivation, we asked participants to imagine that they had then just entered the store. Following this prompt, participants responded to three questions regarding their

anticipated behaviors in the store. The first inter-choice time question asked, “Upon entering the store, how fast will you walk to the aisle that has the first item you need?” (1 = Very slowly; 4 = Neither slowly nor fast; 7 = Very fast). The second inter-choice time question asked, “After putting an item in your basket, how fast would you walk to get the next item you need?” (1 = Slower than normal; 4 = Normal speed; 7 = Faster than normal). The third inter-choice time question asked, “Overall, how much time will you spend between each purchase during this grocery shopping trip?” (1 = More time than normal; 4 = Normal amount of time; 7 = Less time than normal). The three choice time questions were averaged to create a single measure of anticipated time spent between choices ($\alpha = .90$).

The manipulation of motivation was successful; the high (vs. low) importance manipulation led to greater motivation to complete the shopping trip ($M_{\text{high}} = 6.62$, $SD = 0.70$; $M_{\text{low}} = 2.09$, $SD = 1.63$; $\beta = 2.2606$, $t(1,149) = 20.92$, $p < .0001$). Importantly, participants in the high-importance condition predicted moving faster between choices as compared to the participants in the low-importance condition ($M_{\text{high}} = 5.45$, $SD = 0.91$; $M_{\text{low}} = 4.62$, $SD = 1.60$; $\beta = 0.4113$, $t(1,149) = 3.71$, $p = .0003$). Thus, this study showed an inverse relationship between motivation and anticipated inter-choice time, such that the more motivated participants were to complete a shopping trip, the less time they anticipated spending between product choices in the store.

B. Pilot Test II: The Inverse Relationship between Motivation and Inter-choice Time through Behavioral Measure

For the second pilot test, we recruited 95 participants through Prolific to participate in a short survey for monetary payment. All participants completed an online shopping trip using the same procedure as the no-list condition from study 2. The only change was the addition of an in-

store intercept after participants viewed the sixth out of 15 total product categories, to capture how motivated they felt at the moment to complete the shopping trip. Specifically, we prompted participants with three questions. The first question asked, “So far, how motivated have you been in this shopping trip?” (1 = Low level of motivation; 7 = High level of motivation). The second question asked, “So far, what is your desire to complete this shopping trip?” (1 = Low desire; 7 = High desire). The third question asked, “So far, how important is it to purchase items in this shopping trip?” (1 = Not very important; 7 = Very important). We averaged responses to the three questions to create a single measure of reported motivation to complete the shopping trip ($\alpha = .81$). Similar to the procedures in study 2, we also covertly recorded the inter-choice times between all choices participants made up to this point (i.e., measuring the time from when shoppers entered the store to when they made the first product choice, and then the time from the first product choice to the second, and so on). This procedure allowed us to calculate two inter-choice time measures for analysis: the average inter-choice time preceding the motivation intercept as well as the immediate inter-choice time preceding the sixth product category (i.e., the category right before the motivation intercept). The following results exclude two participants who failed to make a single purchase before the motivation intercept, thereby preventing the calculation of inter-choice time.

As expected, we found a negative relationship between participants’ reported motivation and the two measures of inter-choice time. First, there was a negative relationship between average inter-choice time and the motivation measure ($\beta = -0.0375$, Wald $\chi^2(91) = 9.88$, $p = .002$); a decrease in the average time spent between choices predicted an increase in participants’ reported motivation to complete the shopping trip. Similarly, there was also a negative relationship between inter-choice time for the product category immediately preceding the

motivation intercept (i.e., product category six) and the motivation measure ($\beta = -0.0250$, Wald $\chi^2(91) = 5.84$, $p = .016$); less time spent before making the sixth product choice corresponded with higher reported motivation to complete the shopping trip. Together, two pilot tests provide consistent evidence that inter-choice time reflects consumers' motivation to complete a shopping trip, such that the more motivated a person is to complete the shopping trip, the less time is spent between product choices during the trip.

C. Study 1 Comparison of Shoppers With and Without Camera

To address the issue of whether wearing a camera would interfere with consumers' regular shopping behavior, we recruited 43 separate shoppers as a control group to complete the study without wearing a camera. The experimental groups (with shopping lists and without) and the control group did not differ in their regular tendency of using a shopping list, nor in the total amount of time spent shopping or the dollar value of purchases (i.e., all p -values $\geq .20$), suggesting that the shopping behavior of the experimental sample using the camera was representative of regular shopping behavior. In addition, if wearing the camera had introduced any delay in decision making in the store, shoppers using a list and those without a list would have shared this delay. The table below includes summary statistics and difference tests.

Study 1: Comparison of Shoppers With and Without Camera				
Variable	Shoppers With Camera	Shoppers Without Camera	F Value	Pr > F
Shopper Count	237	43		
Shopping List (Yes = 1; No = 0)	37%	35%	0.08	0.78
Trip Duration (minutes)	15.91	14.17	1.23	0.27
Total Spent (dollars)	\$42.13	\$34.84	1.64	0.20

D. Study 1 Analysis with Raw Accumulated Time as Trip Progress

We replicated study 1's analysis using an absolute, raw accumulated time measure as the proxy for trip progress. The use of raw accumulated time as a proxy for trip progress not only

serves as a robustness check but also is managerially actionable because it can be calculated before the total time in a trip is known (i.e., before the customer finishes the trip). For example, both in-store and online shopper tracking technology capture the raw time spent in a shopping trip. Hui, Bradlow, and Fader (2009) and Hui et al. (2013) thus use the raw trip time (captured with path-tracking technology) to operationalize trip progress for studying in-store shopping behavior. In the context of online shopping behavior, Park and Park (2016) examine the occurrence of website visits over raw accumulated time.

Consistent with the findings in study 1, there was again a positive interaction between squared trip progress and the list code ($\beta = 0.0010$, Wald $\chi^2(1958) = 34.58$, $p < .0001$). Spotlight analysis decomposed the results within the list and no-list conditions. In the list condition, there was a positive effect of trip progress ($\beta = 0.0247$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 37.79$, $p < .0001$); the quadratic effect of trip progress was not significant ($\beta = -0.0002$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 0.81$, $p = .37$). In the no-list condition, in contrast, there was a negative quadratic effect of trip progress ($\beta = -0.0023$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 56.02$, $p < .0001$); the effect of trip progress was not significant ($\beta = 0.0053$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 1.24$, $p = .27$).

E. Study 1 Analysis with Display Count as Trip Progress

We also replicated study 1's analysis using a display count measure as a proxy for trip progress—the accumulated number of displays considered by a shopper from the beginning of the trip to the moment of purchase (e.g., Hui et al., 2013); this served as an additional robustness test. The use of display count as a proxy for trip progress is similar to using the total number of shopping pages visited (Moe, 2003) or the total number of visits to an online review platform as a proxy for trip progress (Kivetz, Urminsky, & Zheng, 2006, p. 51).

Consistent with the findings in study 1, there was again a positive interaction between squared trip progress and the list code ($\beta = 0.007$, Wald $\chi^2(1958) = 12.52$, $p < .0004$). Spotlight analysis decomposed the results within the list and no-list conditions. In the list condition, there was a positive effect of trip progress ($\beta = 0.0145$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 4.65$, $p = .03$); the quadratic effect of trip progress was not significant ($\beta = 0.0002$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 0.38$, $p = .54$). In the no-list condition, in contrast, there was a negative quadratic effect of trip progress ($\beta = -0.0012$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 18.34$, $p < .0001$); the effect of trip progress was positive ($\beta = 0.0248$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 14.16$, $p = .0002$). Floodlight analysis within the no-list condition supports the hypothesized stuck-in-the-middle effect; trip progress was nonsignificant beginning at 17 displays ($\beta = 0.0078$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 2.73$, $p = .10$) and remained nonsignificant until 25 displays ($\beta = -0.0114$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 3.61$, $p = .06$). Then, as expected, there was a negative effect of trip progress at 26 displays or greater ($\beta = -0.0138$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 4.69$, $p = .03$).

F. Study 2's Replication 1

Study 2's results were replicated with 120 Prolific participants from the United States who reported being the primary grocery shoppers in their household. This study used the same paradigm as study 2 except the participants in the list condition were asked to make a list of exactly four categories (i.e., rather than four or more categories as in study 2) and the category pages omitted the dynamic budget information. We performed the same analysis as in previous studies ($N = 773$ inter-choice times from 102 participants who stayed within the stated budget and excluding one participant with unusable responses due to a survey error). On average, the list shoppers spent 167 seconds to select 9.26 items and the no-list shoppers spent 159 seconds to select 10.19 items. We again found a positive interaction between squared trip progress and the list code ($\beta = 1.8051$, Wald $\chi^2(653) = 11.28$, $p < .001$). Consistent with previous findings, we

observed a positive effect of trip progress among shoppers with a list ($\beta = 0.4808$, Wald $\chi^2(653) = 6.71$, $p = .01$) and we again observed a negative quadratic effect of trip progress among shoppers without a list ($\beta = -3.8959$, Wald $\chi^2(653) = 17.55$, $p < .0001$). The results were consistent when including participants who exceeded the trip budget. The observed motivational patterns thus were robust to a national sample of frequent grocery shoppers and a fixed number of list items.

G. Study 2's Replication 2

Study 2's results were again replicated with another 211 Prolific participants using the same paradigm as the first replication, except that the store randomized the order of product categories and all participants in the list condition received a pre-determined shopping list (i.e., bread, tortilla chips, cereal, and toothpaste). We performed the same analysis as in previous studies ($N = 1,445$ inter-choice times from 190 participants who stayed within the stated budget and excluding one participant with unusable responses due to a survey error). On average, the list shoppers spent 212 seconds to select 9.30 items and the no-list shoppers spent 202 seconds to select 9.29 items. We again found a positive interaction between squared trip progress and the list code ($\beta = 2.3615$, Wald $\chi^2(1236) = 46.43$, $p < .0001$). Consistent with previous findings, spotlight analyses revealed a positive effect of trip progress among shoppers with a list ($\beta = 1.0475$, Wald $\chi^2(1236) = 82.72$, $p < .0001$) and again a negative quadratic effect of trip progress among shoppers without a list ($\beta = -3.1073$, Wald $\chi^2(1236) = 29.70$, $p < .0001$). The observed motivational patterns thus were robust when the presentation order of the product categories was randomized (instead of fixed) and with an exogenously generated shopping list.

H. Study 3 Post-test – List Frame Single Intercept

We conducted two post-tests to ensure that our framing manipulations successfully shifted people's focus when tracking progress of their shopping trips. In the first post-test, we intercepted participants in the middle of their trips; in the second post-test, we intercepted participants at either the early stage or the later stage of their shopping trips. In both post-tests, we used a heat-map measure to capture participants' focus for tracking progress (i.e., a to-date frame vs. a to-go frame), and additionally asked them to report their present focus for tracking progress on their trips.

For the first post-test, we recruited 153 participants through Prolific to participate in a short survey for monetary payment. The study used the shopping task instructions from study 3 to manipulate list frame between participants (i.e., the to-date vs. to-go conditions). After reading the instructions, we informed participants that they were now in the middle of their shopping trip with two list items (out of a total of four list items) already selected and put in their cart. The next page presented an updated shopping list (as used in study 3) and asked participants to click on the list visual to indicate a spot that gets the most of their attention right now using a heat-map measure. As with the visuals used in study 3, in the to-date condition, participants viewed their shopping list with the selected list items crossed off with red lines. In the to-go condition, participants viewed their shopping list with the remaining items highlighted by red boxes. Our interest was whether our list frame manipulation influenced people's focus on the shopping list items. After clicking on the list, participants were also asked to directly indicate whether the list focused them on the items that "have been put" in the basket, on those that "have not been put" in the basket, or "does not have a specific focus."

We first examined participants' spots of focus on the shopping list captured by the heat-map measure. The coded responses reflected whether the spot of focus was on list item one, two,

three, or four. The following results exclude two participants who selected a spot of focus outside of the list items (i.e., the two words “Shopping list” that preceded the list items); results were consistent when including this spot as location zero in our analyses. As expected, a linear regression of spot of focus on the shopping list revealed that participants in the to-date condition focused more on items earlier in the list ($M = 2.77$, $SD = 0.99$) than did participants in the to-go condition ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.84$; $\beta = -0.2393$, $t(1,149) = -3.44$, $p = .0008$). Furthermore, we found that participants in the to-date condition were more likely to indicate that the list focused them on items that “have been put” in the basket (36%) than participants in the to-go condition (9%; $\chi^2(1, N = 151) = 13.4974$, $p = .0002$), whereas participants in the to-go condition were more likely to indicate that the list focused them on items that “have not been put” in the basket (80%) than participants in the to-date condition (53%; $\chi^2(1, N = 151) = 11.3135$, $p = .0008$). This post-test provides evidence that the list frame manipulation shifted participants’ focus when tracking their progress in the shopping trip.

I. Study 3 Post-test – List Frame Early versus Late Trip Progress Intercept

For the second post-test, we recruited 300 participants through Prolific to participate in a short survey for monetary payment. The study used a similar shopping scenario to manipulate shopping list frame (to-date vs. to-go) and trip progress (early vs. late) between participants. All participants received the same shopping task instructions as in the to-date and to-go list-frame conditions of study 3. We then manipulated trip progress. In the early progress condition, participants read that they started their shopping trip and had one list item in their cart. In the late progress condition, participants read that they were approaching the end of their shopping trip and had three (out of a total of four list items) already put in their cart. As in the first post-test, we measured participants’ spot of focus on the shopping list through a heat-map measure, as well

as asking them to indicate their present focus through the same 3-choice item. The following results exclude one participant who selected a spot of focus outside of the list items; results were consistent when including this spot as location zero in our analyses.

As expected, a linear regression of spot of focus on shopping list frame, trip progress, and their interaction revealed a significant main effect of list frame, such that participants in the to-date condition focused more on items earlier in the list ($M = 2.63$, $SD = 1.29$) than did those in the to-go condition ($M = 3.01$, $SD = 1.06$; $\beta = -0.1784$, $t(1,295) = -3.63$, $p = .0003$). This provided additional support for the focus manipulation used in study 3. In addition, we also found a main effect of trip progress such that being later in a trip increased the likelihood of focusing on later list items ($\beta = 0.8052$, $t(1,295) = 16.38$, $p < .0001$), and an interaction ($\beta = 0.1761$, $t(1,295) = 3.58$, $p = .0004$) such that the difference in focus was larger early in a shopping trip (early: $M_{\text{to-date}} = 1.71$, $SD_{\text{to-date}} = 0.89$; $M_{\text{to-go}} = 2.42$, $SD_{\text{to-go}} = 0.87$; late: $M_{\text{to-date}} = 3.67$, $SD_{\text{to-date}} = 0.77$; $M_{\text{to-go}} = 3.68$, $SD_{\text{to-go}} = 0.84$).

Consistent with the first post-test, we also found that participants in the to-date condition were more likely to indicate that the list focused them on items that “have been put” in the basket (39%) than participants in the to-go condition (10%; $\chi^2(1, N = 299) = 29.8261$, $p < .0001$), whereas participants in the to-go condition were more likely to indicate that the list focused them on items that “have not been put” in the basket (83%) than participants in the to-date condition (54%; $\chi^2(1, N = 299) = 26.1551$, $p < .0001$). Overall, these two post-tests suggested that the list frame manipulation successfully shifted people’s focus when tracking their progress in the trip.

J. Study 1 Analysis of Planned versus Unplanned Purchase Type

We regressed purchase type of a completed purchase (Unplanned Purchase = 1; Planned Purchase = 0) on the same explanatory variables as in study 1 using a logistic regression with

participant and product-category fixed effects. There was a positive interaction between squared trip progress and the list code ($\beta = 0.0015$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 5.67$, $p = .017$) suggesting that whether a purchase was planned or unplanned followed either a monotonic or a curvilinear trend based on shopping-list usage. We used spotlight analyses to decompose the results within list and no-list conditions. In the list condition, there was a positive effect of trip progress ($\beta = 0.0526$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 12.51$, $p < .001$); the quadratic effect of trip progress was not significant ($\beta = -0.0009$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 0.93$, $p = .33$). In the no-list condition, in contrast, there was a negative quadratic effect of trip progress ($\beta = -0.0038$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 16.41$, $p < .0001$); the effect of trip progress was not significant ($\beta = 0.0234$, Wald $\chi^2(1959) = 2.21$, $p = .14$).

Taken together, these results provide evidence that the likelihood that a given purchase is unplanned can follow two distinct patterns that are consistent with study 1's inter-choice time results. Shoppers with a list showed a monotonic increase in the likelihood that a purchase is unplanned as opposed to planned, and shoppers without a list showed a curvilinear pattern where a purchase being unplanned is most likely in the middle of a shopping trip. In other words, we find that the likelihood of an unplanned purchase increases as predicted shopping speed slows down (i.e., greater inter-choice time). These results have important implications for the design of dynamic in-store communications to stimulate incremental unplanned purchases.

Web Appendix Additional Reference

Liberman, N. and Förster, J. (2008). Expectancy, value and psychological distance: A new look at goal gradients. *Social Cognition*, 26(5), 515–33.

Methodological Data Appendix

A. Demographic Characteristics

Study 1: In-Store Video Tracking with Measured List Usage				
Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Gender (Female = 0; Male = 1)	0.37	0.48	0.00	1.00
Age (years)	53.27	13.79	21.00	69.00
Study 2: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated List Usage				
Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Gender (Female = 0; Male = 1)	0.51	0.50	0.00	1.00
Age (years)	23.23	7.87	19.00	59.00
Study 2 Replication 1: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated List Usage				
Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Gender (Female = 0; Male = 1)	0.53	0.50	0.00	1.00
Age (years)	30.59	6.31	18.00	59.00
Study 2 Replication 2: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated List Usage				
Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Gender (Female = 0; Male = 1)	0.53	0.50	0.00	1.00
Age (years)	34.00	13.25	19.00	69.00
Study 3: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated To-Date vs. To-Go List Framing				
Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Gender (Female = 0; Male = 1)	0.54	0.50	0.00	1.00
Age (years)	32.18	12.92	19.00	69.00

B. Sampling Method and Size

Study 1: In-Store Video Tracking with Measured List Usage	
Sampling:	Field intercept at medium-sized grocery store in Western USA, restricted to people over the age of 18.
Recruitment:	\$5 store giftcard received after completion of study.
Sample Size:	250 recruited participants leading to final sample of 237 participants with 2,285 inter-choice times.
Data screening:	13 participants excluded because of unusable video files (9 participants with shopping list and 4 participants without shopping list).
List Question:	"Do you have a shopping list today?"
Study 2: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated List Usage	
Sampling:	Undergraduate research panel from Principles of Marketing course at public U.S. university.
Recruitment:	Course credit.
Sample Size:	250 recruited participants leading to final sample of 250 participants with 1,835 inter-choice times.
Data screening:	Zero participants excluded based on unsuccessful completion of shopping activity because of exceeding stated budget.
Study 2 Replication 1: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated List Usage	
Sampling:	Prolific online research panel restricted to age over 18, U.S. residence, English as the first language, and self-identification as primary grocery shopper in household.
Recruitment:	Approximately \$8.00 per hour pro-rated payment.
Study description:	"Go on a simulated online grocery shopping trip. Please plan on 5 minutes without interruption to complete the survey. Thank you!"
Sample Size:	120 recruited participants leading to final sample of 102 participants with 773 inter-choice times.
Data screening:	One participant in no-list condition excluded because of an error recording trip progress (i.e., negative values) and 17 participants excluded based on unsuccessful completion of shopping activity because of exceeding stated budget (12 participants in no-list condition and 5 participants in list condition).
Study 2 Replication 2: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated List Usage	
Sampling:	Prolific online research panel restricted to age over 18, U.S. residence, English as the first language, and self-identification as primary grocery shopper in household.
Recruitment:	Approximately \$8.00 per hour pro-rated payment.
Study description:	"Go on a simulated online grocery shopping trip. Please plan on 5 minutes without interruption to complete the survey. Thank you!"
Sample Size:	211 recruited participants leading to final sample of 190 participants with 1,445 inter-choice times.
Data screening:	One participant in no-list condition excluded because of an error recording trip progress (i.e., negative values) and 20 participants excluded based on unsuccessful completion of shopping activity because of exceeding stated budget or zero purchases (9 participants in no-list condition and 11 participants in list condition).
Study 3: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated To-Date vs. To-Go List Framing	
Sampling:	Prolific online research panel restricted to age over 18, U.S. residence, and English as the first language.
Recruitment:	Approximately \$8.00 per hour pro-rated payment.
Study description:	"Go on a simulated online grocery shopping trip. Please plan on 5 minutes without interruption to complete the survey. Thank you!"
Sample Size:	184 recruited participants leading to final sample of 182 participants with 1,288 inter-choice times.
Data screening:	Two participants excluded because of an error recording trip (i.e., negative values; one in to-date list condition and one in to-go list condition).

C. Summary Statistics

Study 1: In-Store Video Tracking with Measured List Usage				
Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Inter-choice Time (minutes)	1.50	1.40	0.00	16.47
Purchase Type (Unplanned = 1; Planned = 0)	0.36	0.48	0.00	1.00
Trip Progress (% of trip)	0.42	0.24	0.00	0.98
Trip Progress Squared	0.24	0.22	0.00	0.96
List Usage (List = 1; No-List = -1)	-0.08	1.00	-1.00	1.00
Total Purchase Count	9.64	7.10	1.00	45.00
Study 2: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated List Usage				
Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Inter-choice Time (seconds)	24.76	18.56	3.00	155.00
Trip Progress (% of trip)	0.46	0.28	0.00	0.99
Trip Progress Squared	0.29	0.27	0.00	0.97
List Usage (List = 1; No-List = -1)	0.07	1.00	-1.00	1.00
Total Purchase Count	7.90	2.30	2.00	21.00
Study 2 Replication 1: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated List Usage				
Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Inter-choice Time (seconds)	19.98	19.25	2.00	258.00
Trip Progress (% of trip)	0.49	0.29	0.00	0.97
Trip Progress Squared	0.33	0.28	0.00	0.95
List Usage (List = 1; No-List = -1)	0.04	1.00	-1.00	1.00
Total Purchase Count	8.35	2.30	4.00	14.00
Study 2 Replication 2: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated List Usage				
Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Inter-choice Time (seconds)	25.31	29.86	0.00	620.00
Trip Progress (% of trip)	0.49	0.28	0.00	0.99
Trip Progress Squared	0.32	0.28	0.00	0.98
List Usage (List = 1; No-List = -1)	-0.08	1.00	-1.00	1.00
Total Purchase Count	7.97	2.37	3.00	14.00
Study 3: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated To-Date vs. To-Go List Framing				
Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Inter-choice Time (seconds)	21.27	20.49	2.00	191.00
Trip Progress (% of trip)	0.49	0.29	0.00	0.98
Trip Progress Squared	0.33	0.28	0.00	0.96
To-Date List (To-Date List = 1; No-List = -1)	0.12	0.79	-1.00	1.00
To-Go List (To-Go List = 1; No-List = -1)	0.10	0.78	-1.00	1.00
Total Purchase Count	7.49	3.24	1.00	20.00

D. Correlation Tables

Study 1: In-Store Video Tracking with Measured List Usage						
	Inter-choice Time	Purchase Type	Trip Progress	Trip Progress Squared	List Usage	Total Purchase Count
Inter-choice Time	1.00	0.07**	0.16**	0.15**	-0.05**	-0.13**
Purchase Type	0.07**	1.00	0.17**	0.17**	-0.10**	-0.04*
Trip Progress	0.16**	0.17**	1.00	0.97**	-0.03	0.01
Trip Progress Squared	0.15**	0.17**	0.97**	1.00	-0.03	0.02
List Usage	-0.05**	-0.10**	-0.03	-0.03	1.00	0.15**
Total Purchase Count	-0.13**	-0.04*	0.01	0.02	0.15**	1.00
** <i>p</i> < .01, * <i>p</i> < .05						
Study 2: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated List Usage						
	Inter-choice Time	Trip Progress	Trip Progress Squared	List Usage	Total Purchase Count	
Inter-choice Time	1.00	0.04	0.07**	0.03	-0.12**	
Trip Progress	0.04	1.00	0.96**	-0.05*	0.08**	
Trip Progress Squared	0.07**	0.96**	1.00	-0.05*	0.08**	
List Usage	0.03	-0.05*	-0.05*	1.00	-0.23**	
Total Purchase Count	-0.12**	0.08**	0.08**	-0.23**	1.00	
** <i>p</i> < .01, * <i>p</i> < .05						
Study 2 Replication 1: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated List Usage						
	Inter-choice Time	Trip Progress	Trip Progress Squared	List Usage	Total Purchase Count	
Inter-choice Time	1.00	-0.13**	-0.11**	0.05	-0.20**	
Trip Progress	-0.13**	1.00	0.96**	0.02	0.04	
Trip Progress Squared	-0.11**	0.96**	1.00	0.01	0.04	
List Usage	0.05	0.02	0.01	1.00	-0.12**	
Total Purchase Count	-0.20**	0.04	0.04	-0.12**	1.00	
** <i>p</i> < .01, * <i>p</i> < .05						
Study 2 Replication 2: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated List Usage						
	Inter-choice Time	Trip Progress	Trip Progress Squared	List Usage	Total Purchase Count	
Inter-choice Time	1.00	-0.03	-0.03	0.04	-0.17	
Trip Progress	-0.03	1.00	0.96**	-0.03	0	
Trip Progress Squared	-0.03	0.96**	1.00	-0.02	0.01	
List Usage	0.04	-0.03	-0.02	1.00	-0.21	
Total Purchase Count	-0.17	0	0.01	-0.21	1.00	
** <i>p</i> < .01, * <i>p</i> < .05						
Study 3: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated To-Date vs. To-Go List Framing						
	Inter-choice Time	Trip Progress	Trip Progress Squared	To-Date List Contrast	To-Go List Contrast	Total Purchase Count
Inter-choice Time	1.00	-0.10**	-0.10**	0.08*	0.04	-0.23**
Trip Progress	-0.10**	1.00	0.96	-0.05	-0.02	0.06*
Trip Progress Squared	-0.10**	0.96	1.00	-0.05	-0.02	0.06*
To-Date List Contrast	0.08	-0.05	-0.05	1.00	0.57*	-0.31**
To-Go List Contrast	0.04	-0.02	-0.02	0.57*	1.00	-0.14**
Total Purchase Count	-0.23**	0.06*	0.06*	-0.31**	-0.14**	1.00
** <i>p</i> < .01, * <i>p</i> < .05						

E. Model Results

Study 1: In-Store Video Tracking with Measured List Usage and Relative Trip Progress						
DV: Inter-choice Time (in minutes)						
Variable	Estimate	SE	95% Limits		Wald χ^2	Pr > χ^2
Intercept	-0.2478	0.307	-0.8496	0.354	0.65	0.4196
Trip Progress	0.9963	0.1111	0.7786	1.214	80.45	<.0001
Trip Progress Squared	-1.5543	0.3539	-2.2479	-0.8607	19.29	<.0001
List Usage (List = 1; No-List = -1)	-0.3006	0.4677	-1.2173	0.6161	0.41	0.5204
Trip Duration * List Usage	-0.1163	0.0905	-0.2937	0.0612	1.65	0.1991
Trip Duration Squared * List Usage	0.9993	0.326	0.3603	1.6383	9.4	0.0022
Total Purchase Count	-0.016	0.0605	-0.1346	0.1026	0.07	0.7914
SAS Genmod with normal distribution, log link, mean-centered trip progress, individual and category fixed effects (omitted from output).						
Study 1: In-Store Video Tracking with Measured List Usage and Absolute Trip Progress						
DV: Inter-choice Time (in minutes)						
Variable	Estimate	SE	95% Limits		Wald χ^2	Pr > χ^2
Intercept	-0.024	0.3094	-0.6304	0.5824	0.01	0.9382
Trip Progress	0.0399	0.0049	0.0303	0.0494	66.9	<.0001
Trip Progress Squared	-0.0012	0.0002	-0.0016	-0.0009	41.81	<.0001
List Usage (List = 1; No-List = -1)	-0.4994	0.4664	-1.4136	0.4148	1.15	0.2843
Trip Duration * List Usage	-0.0114	0.004	-0.0192	-0.0035	8.1	0.0044
Trip Duration Squared * List Usage	0.001	0.0002	0.0007	0.0014	34.58	<.0001
Total Purchase Count	-0.0198	0.0605	-0.1384	0.0987	0.11	0.743
SAS Genmod with normal distribution, log link, mean-centered trip progress, individual and category fixed effects (omitted from output).						
Study 1: In-Store Video Tracking with Measured List Usage and Consideration Count Trip Progress						
DV: Inter-choice Time (in minutes)						
Variable	Estimate	SE	95% Limits		Wald χ^2	Pr > χ^2
Intercept	-0.1431	0.315	-0.7605	0.4742	0.21	0.6496
Trip Progress	0.0196	0.0052	0.0094	0.0299	14.21	0.0002
Trip Progress Squared	-0.0005	0.0002	-0.0009	-0.0001	6	0.0143
List Usage (List = 1; No-List = -1)	-0.4121	0.475	-1.3432	0.5189	0.75	0.3856
Trip Duration * List Usage	-0.0052	0.0041	-0.0133	0.0029	1.56	0.2118
Trip Duration Squared * List Usage	0.0007	0.0002	0.0003	0.0011	12.52	0.0004
Total Purchase Count	-0.0206	0.0616	-0.1413	0.1002	0.11	0.7383
SAS Genmod with normal distribution, log link, mean-centered trip progress, individual and category fixed effects (omitted from output).						
Study 1: In-Store Video Tracking with Measured List Usage and Absolute Trip Progress						
DV: Purchase Type (Unplanned = 1; Planned = 0)						
Variable	Estimate	SE	95% Limits		Wald χ^2	Pr > χ^2
Intercept	-11.2699	21325.7	-41808.9	41786.3	0	0.9996
Trip Progress	0.038	0.0115	0.0155	0.0605	10.94	0.0009
Trip Progress Squared	-0.0023	0.0007	-0.0036	-0.001	12.11	0.0005
List Usage (List = 1; No-List = -1)	11.3026	21325.7	-41786.3	41808.9	0	0.9996
Trip Progress * List Usage	0.0146	0.0101	-0.0052	0.0344	2.09	0.1481
Trip Progress Squared * List Usage	0.0015	0.0006	0.0003	0.0027	5.67	0.0172
Total Purchase Count	-0.0666	0.1268	-0.3152	0.1819	0.28	0.5992
SAS Genmod with binary distribution, logit link, mean-centered trip progress, individual and category fixed effects (omitted from output).						

Study 2: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated List Usage						
DV: Inter-choice Time (in seconds)						
Variable	Estimate	SE	95% Limits		Wald χ^2	Pr > χ^2
Intercept	3.4044	0.1248	3.1598	3.649	744.06	<.0001
Trip Progress	0.2614	0.1103	0.0451	0.4776	5.61	0.0178
Trip Progress Squared	-0.838	0.3201	-1.4654	-0.2106	6.85	0.0089
List Usage (List = 1; No-List = -1)	-0.1792	0.1338	-0.4415	0.083	1.79	0.1804
Trip Progress * List Usage	0.2141	0.0595	0.0976	0.3307	12.96	0.0003
Trip Progress Squared * List Usage	0.6301	0.1681	0.3006	0.9596	14.05	0.0002
Total Purchase Count	0.0335	0.0541	-0.0725	0.1395	0.38	0.5353
SAS Genmod with normal distribution, log link, mean-centered trip progress, individual and category fixed effects (omitted from output).						
Study 2 Replication 1: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated List Usage						
DV: Inter-choice Time (in seconds)						
Variable	Estimate	SE	95% Limits		Wald χ^2	Pr > χ^2
Intercept	2.8948	0.2417	2.421	3.3686	143.4	<.0001
Trip Progress	0.3526	0.1562	0.0465	0.6586	5.1	0.024
Trip Progress Squared	-2.0908	0.6739	-3.4115	-0.77	9.63	0.0019
List Usage (List = 1; No-List = -1)	-0.3499	0.2759	-0.8906	0.1909	1.61	0.2047
Trip Progress * List Usage	0.1283	0.124	-0.1148	0.3714	1.07	0.301
Trip Progress Squared * List Usage	1.8051	0.5374	0.7518	2.8584	11.28	0.0008
Total Purchase Count	-0.0785	0.1939	-0.4585	0.3015	0.16	0.6856
SAS Genmod with normal distribution, log link, mean-centered trip progress, individual and category fixed effects (omitted from output).						
Study 2 Replication 2: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated List Usage						
DV: Inter-choice Time (in seconds)						
Variable	Estimate	SE	95% Limits		Wald χ^2	Pr > χ^2
Intercept	1.2288	0.9599	-0.6525	3.1101	1.64	0.2005
Trip Progress	0.2441	0.106	0.0364	0.4519	5.3	0.0213
Trip Progress Squared	-0.7457	0.3525	-1.4366	-0.0548	4.48	0.0344
List Usage (List = 1; No-List = -1)	-0.1111	0.3788	-0.8536	0.6314	0.09	0.7693
Trip Progress * List Usage	0.8034	0.1037	0.6001	1.0067	59.98	<.0001
Trip Progress Squared * List Usage	2.3615	0.3466	1.6823	3.0408	46.43	<.0001
Total Purchase Count	-0.5896	0.3265	-1.2295	0.0503	3.26	0.0709
SAS Genmod with normal distribution, log link, mean-centered trip progress, individual and category fixed effects (omitted from output).						
Study 3: Shopping Experiment with Manipulated To-Date vs. To-Go List Framing						
DV: Inter-choice Time (in seconds)						
Variable	Estimate	SE	95% Limits		Wald χ^2	Pr > χ^2
Intercept	4.5125	0.1011	4.3143	4.7107	1991.16	<.0001
Trip Progress	0.4473	0.1733	0.1076	0.787	6.66	0.0099
Trip Progress Squared	-4.0169	0.6166	-5.2254	-2.8083	42.43	<.0001
To-Date List Framing	-2.1927	0.417	-3.0099	-1.3754	27.65	<.0001
To-Go List Framing	-2.1785	0.2211	-2.6119	-1.7451	97.05	<.0001
Trip Progress * To-Date List Framing	2.6983	0.4866	1.7447	3.652	30.76	<.0001
Trip Progress * To-Go List Framing	-5.0654	0.6361	-6.312	-3.8187	63.42	<.0001
Trip Progress Squared * To-Date List Framing	3.7946	0.988	1.8581	5.731	14.75	0.0001
Trip Progress Squared * To-Go List Framing	3.3952	1.274	0.8983	5.8922	7.1	0.0077
Total Purchase Count	-0.0926	0.0466	-0.1839	-0.0012	3.94	0.0471
SAS Genmod with normal distribution, log link, mean-centered trip progress, individual and category fixed effects (omitted from output).						
Pre-trip planning condition (i.e., No List, To-Date List, To-Go List) is dummy coded with No List presented as the reference category.						

F. Study 2 Online Simulated Shopping Trip Stimuli

Grocery Shopping Study

We would like you to pretend that you are going on a grocery shopping trip. Please carefully read the shopping scenario on the next page.

Click >> to begin.

<<

>>

Shopping scenario (very important - please read carefully):

We would like you to imagine that you are going on a grocery shopping trip for food and home items.

You have a budget of **\$35.00** for this shopping trip. This means you can purchase items from your list as well as some, **but not all** of the categories in the store. **Only choose items that you want or need to purchase - it is ok to skip or leave a category without purchase.**

You can add items to your cart by clicking on the product. The categories will appear sequentially and you are free to move backwards and forwards and to add products in any order that you wish.

After viewing all categories you will have the option to "checkout" and finish the shopping trip or return to the store and continue browsing. Even though there is a limited selection, do your best to behave as you normally would on a typical shopping trip.

Click >> to continue.

A green rectangular button with white text '>>' located in the bottom right corner of the instruction box.

“No-List” Condition ONLY**Category list:**

Before going on your shopping trip, we would like you to look over the categories in the store.

After looking at the categories, click >> to begin shopping.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bread | <input type="checkbox"/> Tortilla Chips | <input type="checkbox"/> Toothpaste |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yogurt | <input type="checkbox"/> Cereal | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Freshener |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Orange Juice | <input type="checkbox"/> Granola | <input type="checkbox"/> Home Cleaners |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sports Drinks | <input type="checkbox"/> Crackers | <input type="checkbox"/> Candy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Canned Soup | <input type="checkbox"/> Cookies | <input type="checkbox"/> Chocolate |

<<

>>

“List” Condition ONLY**Category list:**

Before going on your shopping trip, we would like you to make a shopping list.
These are the product categories that you plan to buy before shopping.

Please select four (4) or more of the categories below. You must purchase one item from each of these categories.

After choosing your list categories, click >> to begin shopping.

☐ Bread☐ Tortilla Chips☐ Toothpaste☐ Yogurt☐ Cereal☐ Air Freshener☐ Orange Juice☐ Granola☐ Home Cleaners☐ Sports Drinks☐ Crackers☐ Candy☐ Canned Soup☐ Cookies☐ Chocolate

<<

>>

(Shopping List included in “List” Condition” ONLY)

Shopping list: Bread, Cereal, Granola, Toothpaste

Bread

(Category #1/15)



Dave's Killer Bread Organic White Bread Done Right Bread
\$6.59 each



Franz Bread, Organic, Twenty-Four
\$8.49 each



Dave's Killer Bread Thin Sliced 21 Whole Grains and Seeds Bread
\$6.89 each

Top Seller!



Sara Lee Soft & Smooth Whole Grain White Bread
\$5.19 each



Udi's Gluten Free Whole Grain Bread
\$7.39 each



Oroweat Original Oatnut Bread
\$4.89 each

Dollar total of selected items in current and previous categories:

\$0 / \$35.00

Bread | Yogurt | Orange Juice | Sports Drinks | Canned Soup | Tortilla Chips | Cereal | Granola
Crackers | Cookies | Toothpaste | Air Freshener | Home Cleaners | Candy | Chocolate

"Top Seller" indicates our most popular products based on sales; over 90% of customer reviews choose 5-stars!

Next Category

(Shopping List included in “List” Condition” ONLY)

Shopping list: Bread, Cereal, Granola, Toothpaste

Yogurt

(Category #2/15)



Top Seller!



Activia Vanilla Lowfat Probiotic Yogurt
\$3.49 each



Chobani Non-Fat Greek Yogurt With
Strawberries on the Bottom
\$6.09 each



DANNON Light & Fit Vanilla Greek
Yogurt
\$4.79 each



Stonyfield Organic YoBaby Peach &
Pear Whole Milk Organic Yogurt
\$5.59 each



DANNON Light & Fit Strawberry Greek
Yogurt
\$4.79 each



Chobani Non-Fat Blueberry on the
Bottom Greek Yogurt
\$6.09 each

Dollar total of selected items in current and previous categories:

\$0 / \$35.00

Bread | Yogurt | Orange Juice | Sports Drinks | Canned Soup | Tortilla Chips | Cereal | Granola
Crackers | Cookies | Toothpaste | Air Freshener | Home Cleaners | Candy | Chocolate

"Top Seller" indicates our most popular products based on sales; over 90% of customer reviews choose 5-stars!

[Previous Category](#)

[Next Category](#)

(Shopping List included in “List” Condition” ONLY)

Shopping list: Bread, Cereal, Granola, Toothpaste

Orange Juice

(Category #3/15)



Top Seller!



Columbia Gorge Organic Orange Juice
\$5.59



Trop50 No Pulp with Calcium & Vitamin
D Orange Juice
\$4.89



Minute Maid Pure Squeezed No Pulp
Orange Juice
\$4.89



Simply Beverages Simply Orange with
Mango Juice
\$4.89



Florida's Natural Premium Most Pulp
Orange Juice
\$4.09



Pure Premium Original No Pulp Orange
Juice
\$4.89

Dollar total of selected items in current and previous categories:

\$0 / \$35.00

Bread | Yogurt | [Orange Juice](#) | Sports Drinks | Canned Soup | Tortilla Chips | Cereal | Granola
Crackers | Cookies | Toothpaste | Air Freshener | Home Cleaners | Candy | Chocolate

"Top Seller" indicates our most popular products based on sales; over 90% of customer reviews choose 5-stars!

[Previous Category](#)

[Next Category](#)

(Shopping List included in “List” Condition” ONLY)

Shopping list: Bread, Cereal, Granola, Toothpaste

Sports Drinks

(Category #4/15)



Gatorade G 02 Perform Fruit Punch Sports Drink
\$1.29 each



Powerade Mountain Berry Blast Sports Drink
\$1.09 each



Powerade Zero Fruit Punch Sports Drink
\$1.09 each



Gatorade G2 Grape Sports Drink
\$1.29 each



Top Seller!



Gatorade G 02 Perform Orange Sports Drink
\$1.29 each



Gatorade G 02 Perform Lemon Lime Sports Drink
\$1.29 each

Dollar total of selected items in current and previous categories:

\$0 / \$35.00

Bread | Yogurt | Orange Juice | [Sports Drinks](#) | Canned Soup | Tortilla Chips | Cereal | Granola
Crackers | Cookies | Toothpaste | Air Freshener | Home Cleaners | Candy | Chocolate

"Top Seller" indicates our most popular products based on sales; over 90% of customer reviews choose 5-stars!

Previous Category

Next Category

(Shopping List included in “List” Condition” ONLY)

Shopping list: Bread, Cereal, Granola, Toothpaste

Canned Soup

(Category #5/15)



Campbell's Cream Of Mushroom,
Condensed Soup
\$1.69 each



Campbell's Chicken Noodle Condensed
Soup
\$1.69 each



Amy's Soups Low Fat No Chicken
Noodle
\$3.69 each



Pacific Organic Chicken Noodle Soup
\$3.69 each



Top Seller!



Progresso Traditional Chicken Noodle
Soup
\$2.29 each



Campbell's Condensed Soup Cream of
Chicken
\$1.69 each

Dollar total of selected items in current and previous categories:

\$0 / \$35.00

Bread | Yogurt | Orange Juice | Sports Drinks | Canned Soup | Tortilla Chips | Cereal | Granola
Crackers | Cookies | Toothpaste | Air Freshener | Home Cleaners | Candy | Chocolate

"Top Seller" indicates our most popular products based on sales; over 90% of customer reviews choose 5-stars!

Previous Category

Next Category

(Shopping List included in “List” Condition” ONLY)

Shopping list: Bread, Cereal, Granola, Toothpaste

Tortilla Chips

(Category #6/15)



Calidad White Corn Tortilla Chips
\$2.00 each



Tostitos Original Restaurant Style
Tortilla Chips
\$4.09 each



Doritos Nacho Cheese Tortilla Chips
\$3.89 each



Mission Restaurant Style Tortilla Chips
\$3.79 each



Tostitos Scoops! Tortilla Chips
\$4.09 each



Top Seller!



Santitas Yellow Corn Tortilla Triangles
\$2.00 each

Dollar total of selected items in current and previous categories:

\$0 / \$35.00

Bread | Yogurt | Orange Juice | Sports Drinks | Canned Soup | Tortilla Chips | Cereal | Granola
Crackers | Cookies | Toothpaste | Air Freshener | Home Cleaners | Candy | Chocolate

"Top Seller" indicates our most popular products based on sales; over 90% of customer reviews choose 5-stars!

[Previous Category](#)

[Next Category](#)

(Shopping List included in “List” Condition” ONLY)

Shopping list: Bread, Cereal, Granola, Toothpaste

Cereal

(Category #7/15)



Puffins Peanut Butter Cereal
\$4.39 each



Top Seller!



Cheerios Whole Grain Oat Cereal
\$4.89 each



General Mills Cinnamon Toast Crunch
Cereal
\$5.39 each



Lucky Charms Cereal
\$5.99 each



Cheerios Honey Nut
\$4.89 each



Post Honey Bunches With Almonds
Cereal
\$6.39 each

Dollar total of selected items in current and previous categories:

\$0 / \$35.00

Bread | Yogurt | Orange Juice | Sports Drinks | Canned Soup | Tortilla Chips | Cereal | Granola
Crackers | Cookies | Toothpaste | Air Freshener | Home Cleaners | Candy | Chocolate

"Top Seller" indicates our most popular products based on sales; over 90% of customer reviews choose 5-stars!

Previous Category

Next Category

(Shopping List included in “List” Condition” ONLY)

Shopping list: Bread, Cereal, Granola, Toothpaste

Granola

(Category #8/15)



Bear Naked Fit Triple Berry Granola
\$4.09 each



Kind Healthy Grains Oats & Honey
Clusters With Toasted Coconut
\$8.09 each



Kind Maple Quinoa Cluster with Chia
Seeds
\$8.09 each



Top Seller!



Bear Naked Fruit & Nut Granola
\$4.09 each



Nature Valley Protein Oats n' Honey
Crunchy
\$5.49 each



Kind Healthy Grains Peanut Butter
Whole Grain Clusters
\$8.09 each

Dollar total of selected items in current and previous categories:

\$0 / \$35.00

Bread | Yogurt | Orange Juice | Sports Drinks | Canned Soup | Tortilla Chips | Cereal | Granola
Crackers | Cookies | Toothpaste | Air Freshener | Home Cleaners | Candy | Chocolate

"Top Seller" indicates our most popular products based on sales; over 90% of customer reviews choose 5-stars!

Previous Category

Next Category

(Shopping List included in “List” Condition” ONLY)

Shopping list: Bread, Cereal, Granola, Toothpaste

Crackers

(Category #9/15)



Nabisco Ritz Crackers
\$3.59 each



Mary's Gone Crackers Organic Herb
\$5.99 each



Kashi 7 Grain Sea Salt Pita Crisps
\$6.09 each



Nabisco Triscuit Baked Whole Grain
Wheat Original Crackers
\$3.29 each for 7 oz



Blue Diamond Artisan Sesame Seeds
Nut & Rice Cracker Snacks
\$4.39 each



Back to Nature Spinach & Roasted
Garlic Crackers
\$4.19 each

Dollar total of selected items in current and previous categories:

\$0 / \$35.00

Bread | Yogurt | Orange Juice | Sports Drinks | Canned Soup | Tortilla Chips | Cereal | Granola
Crackers | Cookies | Toothpaste | Air Freshener | Home Cleaners | Candy | Chocolate

"Top Seller" indicates our most popular products based on sales; over 90% of customer reviews choose 5-stars!

Previous Category

Next Category

(Shopping List included in “List” Condition” ONLY)

Shopping list: Bread, Cereal, Granola, Toothpaste

Cookies

(Category #10/15)



Pepperidge Farm Milano Mint Cookies
\$4.79 each



Pepperidge Farm Cookies Double
Chocolate Nantucket Dark Chocolate
Crispy Cookies
\$4.49 each



Pepperidge Farm Milano Orange
Cookies
\$4.79 each



Top Seller!



Nabisco Chips Ahoy! Chocolate Chip
Cookies
\$3.19 each



Nabisco Oreo Double Stuf Chocolate
Sandwich Cookies
\$3.69 each



Pepperidge Farm Milano Double
Chocolate Cookies
\$4.79 each

Dollar total of selected items in current and previous categories:

\$0 / \$35.00

Bread | Yogurt | Orange Juice | Sports Drinks | Canned Soup | Tortilla Chips | Cereal | Granola
Crackers | Cookies | Toothpaste | Air Freshener | Home Cleaners | Candy | Chocolate

"Top Seller" indicates our most popular products based on sales; over 90% of customer reviews choose 5-stars!

Previous Category

Next Category

(Shopping List included in “List” Condition” ONLY)

Shopping list: Bread, Cereal, Granola, Toothpaste

Toothpaste

(Category #11/15)



Kiss My Face Triple Action Fluoride Free Toothpaste Cool Mint Gel
\$7.09 for 4.5 oz



Top Seller!



Arm & Hammer Truly Radiant Whitening & Enamel Strengthening Fresh Mint Toothpaste
\$4.89 for 4.3 oz



Tom's Simply White Mint Toothpaste
\$4.89 for 4.7 oz



Sensodyne Pronamel Fresh Wave Toothpaste
\$6.69 for 4 oz



Nature's Gate Natural Toothpaste Creme De Mint
\$4.89 for 6 oz



Ultra Brite All-in-One Advanced Whitening Clean Mint Toothpaste
\$2.19 for 6 oz

Dollar total of selected items in current and previous categories:

\$0 / \$35.00

Bread | Yogurt | Orange Juice | Sports Drinks | Canned Soup | Tortilla Chips | Cereal | Granola
Crackers | Cookies | Toothpaste | Air Freshener | Home Cleaners | Candy | Chocolate

"Top Seller" indicates our most popular products based on sales; over 90% of customer reviews choose 5-stars!

Previous Category

Next Category

(Shopping List included in “List” Condition” ONLY)

Shopping list: Bread, Cereal, Granola, Toothpaste

Air Freshener

(Category #12/15)



Febreze Unstopables Air Refresher,
Fresh
\$8.59 each



Febreze Unstopables Air Refresher,
Shimmer
\$8.59 each



Febreze Air Effects, Meadows & Rain
Air Refresher
\$4.09 each



Febreze Air Effects, Spring & Renewal
Air Refresher
\$4.09 each



Febreze Air Effects, Mediterranean
Lavender Air Freshener
\$4.09 each



Top Seller!



Febreze Air Effects, Linen & Sky
Air Refresher
\$4.09 each

Dollar total of selected items in current and previous categories:

\$0 / \$35.00

Bread | Yogurt | Orange Juice | Sports Drinks | Canned Soup | Tortilla Chips | Cereal | Granola
Crackers | Cookies | Toothpaste | [Air Freshener](#) | Home Cleaners | Candy | Chocolate

"Top Seller" indicates our most popular products based on sales; over 90% of customer reviews choose 5-stars!

Previous Category

Next Category

(Shopping List included in “List” Condition” ONLY)

Shopping list: Bread, Cereal, Granola, Toothpaste

Cleaners

(Category #13/15)



Mrs. Meyer's Lavender Multi-Surface
Everyday Cleaner
\$11.89 each



Earth Friendly Products Parsley Plus All
Surface Cleaner
\$4.59 each



Seventh Generation Disinfecting Multi-
Surface Cleaner Lemongrass
\$4.89 each



Biokleen All Purpose Cleaner Spray &
Wipe
\$4.29 each



Seventh Generation Natural Free &
Clear All-Purpose Cleaner
\$5.39 each



Pledge Glade Rainshower Multi Surface
Everyday Cleaner
\$9.39 each

Top Seller!

Dollar total of selected items in current and previous categories:

\$0 / \$35.00

Bread | Yogurt | Orange Juice | Sports Drinks | Canned Soup | Tortilla Chips | Cereal | Granola
Crackers | Cookies | Toothpaste | Air Freshener | Home Cleaners | Candy | Chocolate

"Top Seller" indicates our most popular products based on sales; over 90% of customer reviews choose 5-stars!

Previous Category

Next Category

(Shopping List included in “List” Condition” ONLY)

Shopping list: Bread, Cereal, Granola, Toothpaste

Candy

(Category #14/15)



Swedish Fish Soft & Chewy Candy
\$4.09 each



Sour Patch Kids Candy
\$1.29 each



Trolli Sour Brite Crawlers Gummi Candy
\$1.69 each



Trolli Sour Watermelon Sharks
\$1.69 each



Top Seller!



Haribo Happy Cola Gummi Candy
\$1.29 each



LifeSavers Lifesavers Hard Candy 5
Flavors
\$2.49 each

Dollar total of selected items in current and previous categories:

\$0 / \$35.00

Bread | Yogurt | Orange Juice | Sports Drinks | Canned Soup | Tortilla Chips | Cereal | Granola
Crackers | Cookies | Toothpaste | Air Freshener | Home Cleaners | Candy | Chocolate

"Top Seller" indicates our most popular products based on sales; over 90% of customer reviews choose 5-stars!

Previous Category

Next Category

(Shopping List included in “List” Condition” ONLY)

Shopping list: Bread, Cereal, Granola, Toothpaste

Chocolate

(Category #15/15)



Top Seller!



Lindt Excellence 85% Cocoa Extra
Dark Chocolate
\$3.29 each



Hershey Milk Chocolate XL Candy Bar
\$1.99 each



Ritter Sport Sport Alpine Milk Chocolate
\$3.69 each



Cadbury Dairy Milk Chocolate
\$2.49 each



Ghirardelli Chocolate Intense Dark
Twilight Delight 72% Cacao Chocolate
\$3.69 each



Green & Black's King Bars Dark with
85% Cacao Content Organic Chocolate
\$3.59 each

Dollar total of selected items in current and previous categories:

\$0 / \$35.00

Bread | Yogurt | Orange Juice | Sports Drinks | Canned Soup | Tortilla Chips | Cereal | Granola
Crackers | Cookies | Toothpaste | Air Freshener | Home Cleaners | Candy | Chocolate

"Top Seller" indicates our most popular products based on sales; over 90% of customer reviews choose 5-stars!

Previous Category

Next Category

You have reached the end of the categories.

Are you finished shopping?

Use the buttons below to return to the store or check out.

[Return to Store](#)

[Check Out](#)

How old are you?

- ☐ Under 18
 - ☐ 18-25
 - ☐ 26-34
 - ☐ 35-54
 - ☐ 55-64
 - ☐ 65 or over
-

What is your gender?

- ☐ Male
 - ☐ Female
 - ☐ Prefer not to answer
-

How many people (including yourself) currently live in your household?

- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5 or more

<<

>>