Scale Research Sources: Are shorter (3-point, 4, 5) scales better, or are longer ones (7, 10, 11)?

Based on the sources below: Moderately-long response scales categories are best. A 7-point response scale usually maximizes validity and reliability. The purpose of the survey must be taken into consideration when selecting a number of points to fully maximize results.

Source	Date	Source	Title	Key Point	Key point 1	Key point 2	Key point 3
https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/npb/people/amc/articles-pdfs/optinumb.pdf	1999	Acta Psychologica	Optimal Number of Response Categories in Rating Scales: Reliability, validity, discriminating power, and respondent preferences	Rating scales between 7 to 10-points are preferred over shorter rating scales (2-4-point). 7 to 10-point scales appear to generate higher levels of reliability, validity, discriminating power, and respondent preferences. However, it is important to consider the purpose of the questionnaire in deciding optimal scale. Variables such as time or respondent motivation may warrant use of shorter scales (5 or 3-point).	"The rating scales that yielded the least reliable scores turned out to be those with the fewest response categories. Test-retest reliability (stability) was lowest for two- point, three-point, and four-point scales and was significantly higher for scales with more response categories; the most reliable scores were derived from scales with 7, 8, 9, or 10 response categories." (p. 11)	"The criterion validity coefficients were lowest for the scales with two, three, or four response categories and were generally higher--though these differences were not statistically significant- for scales with five or more response categories. Discriminating power was lowest for the scales with two, three, or four response categories and statistically significantly higher for scales with 9 or 101 response categories." (p. 11)	"On the whole, taking all three respondent preference ratings into account, scales with two, three, or four response categories were least preferred, and scales with 10, 9, and 7 were most preferred." (p. 12)
https://pprg.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/1997-designing-rating-scales-for-effective-measurement-in-surveys.pdf	1997	Survey Measurement and Process Quality (Book)	Designing Rating Scales for Effective Measurement Surveys	A moderate number of rating scales are optimal. Respondents should be able to express their stance appropriately while still being able to identify a clear distinction between each scale point.	"It seems likely that people can readily conceive of zero, a slight amount, a moderate amount and a great deal along any unipolar continuum. And perhaps they are comfortable making slightly finer distinctions, so the optimal scale length might be expected to fall between 4-7 points. (p. 145)	"Thus, the optimal scale length would seem to be a moderate one." (p. 144)	"Taken as a whole, this research suggests that the optimal length of a rating scale is 5 to 7 points, because scales of this length appear to be more reliable and valid than shorter and longer scales." (p. 148)
https://web.stanford.edu/dept/communication/faculty/krosnick/docs/2009/2009_handbook_krosnick.pdf	2009	Handbook of Survey Research (2nd Edition)	Question and Questionnaire Design	7-point rating scales are optimal in the majority of instances. Validy and reliability improve with the number of response categories up to 7, before leveling off.	"Although there is some variation in the patterns yielded by these studies, they generally support the notion that reliability is lower for scales with only two or three points compared to those with more points, but suggest that the gain in reliability levels off after about 7 points." (p. 16)	"As with the research on reliability, these studies generally support the notion that validity is higher for scales with a moderate number of points than for scales with fewer, with the suggestion that validity is compromised by especially long scales." (p. 17)	"Overall, our review suggests that 7-point scales are probably optimal in many instances." (p. 20)