ABSTRACT

Comparison-Shopping (CS) websites, such as mySimon.com, assist consumers in managing the vast amount of information offered by multiple retailers on the Internet. Conventional wisdom would have dictated that the provision of the best set of alternatives by CS websites should lead to high consumer satisfaction and purchase propensity. However, consumers may experience decision difficulty to choose among alternatives that are non-dominated (i.e., none of the alternative is inferior for all product attributes). Consequently, they may simply avoid making a decision by not committing to any purchase. Grounded on behavioral and context-dependent decision-making literature, this paper builds a model that explores the effects of choice content and choice order sequence on consumer behavior and explains how they can potentially alleviate the difficulty of making purchase decisions.
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INTRODUCTION

Consumers, bounded with limited processing capacity, are turning to Comparison-Shopping (CS) websites, such as mySimon.com and Shopper.com, to assist them in managing the vast amount of information offered by multiple retailers on the Internet (Brynjolfsson and Smith, 2000). These CS websites assist consumers in matching their needs with the retailers’ product offers, by filtering and consolidating vast amounts of product information (Redmond, 2002), thus serve to enhance the consumer experience not only by getting the consumers to bypass the long lists of products with their prices and features, but also in presenting the consumers with a well-suited set of alternatives according to their specifications (Redmond, 2002).

However, the provision of the best set of alternatives may not necessarily lead to any purchase intention as consumers may experience difficulty in assessing or evaluating the tradeoffs among all the non-dominated alternatives (i.e. none of the alternative is inferior for all product attributes) (Anderson, 2003). Consequently, consumers may choose decision avoidance by not making any purchases. One way to overcome such information processing difficulties in making decision is to manipulate the display of information.

Despite prior attempts at investigating the influence of information presentation, the conditions and the degree in which the presentation of alternatives will influence the consumer response and decision remain relatively hazy. Relatively little research effort has been devoted to examine the impact of presentation strategies on the alternative selection process. Given the lack of evidence of how CS websites can influence consumer behavior through information display, it cannot be assumed that merely providing the consumers with product information and aesthetic website interface would please the consumers. This study attempts to provide suggestions on how CS website can influence consumer behavior through information display.

CONCEPTUAL MODEL

We posit that a better presentation of different product or service alternatives could improve the processing of the information, and hence reduce the decision difficulty encountered (Sen, 1998) by the customers. Building on this notion, processing of information and choice made by consumers can be improved via two aspects of information presentation: choice contrast and choice order sequence (Bettman, Luce and Payne, 1988) as displayed in Figure 1. The choice contrast is described as the degree of including dominated – if there is at least one other alternative that is superior on at least one attribute while not being inferior on any attribute – and non-dominated – if no other alternative is superior on an attribute nor being inferior on at least one other attribute - alternatives in one result display (Haubl and Trifts, 2000). For instance,
consider three alternatives in Table 1. It is obvious that alternative 1 dominates alternative 2 as alternative 1 has lower price and higher quality than alternative 2. The choice of the dominated alternative is clearly a suboptimal decision. As for alternative 1 and 3, neither alternative dominates the other. Hence, both alternatives 1 and 3 are considered to be non-dominated alternatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative number</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Dominated and Non-Dominated Alternatives

For the choice order sequence, it is characterized by the display sequence of the alternatives. These two independent variables will together influence the different decision outcomes, namely the perceived choice set comprehensiveness (i.e. the perceived value of the set of alternatives presented in facilitating a consumer to make an informed decision), the final decision made (i.e. whether a consumer chooses to avoid (or defer) making a choice or to make an explicit selection among the alternatives presented) and decision satisfaction (i.e. the extent to which the decision made fulfils or matches the initial purchase goal set by the consumer).

From the consumer perspective, it has been observed that the clear inferiority of the decoy alternative to the core alternative will serve as a reason for a consumer to choose the latter over the competing alternative. In other words, by increasing the range of values of the target’s weaker attribute, which is the processing speed of the core alternative, the perceived utility distance between the core and competing alternative based on this attribute is increased. This psychophysical distortion makes the first (core) alternative more attractive, resulting in attraction effect (Sen, 1998) and enhancing its choice probability (Tversky and Kahneman, 1991).

One could contest that the change in the decision pattern could possibly be due to the information display or limited product knowledge possessed by the consumer. In a series of experiments conducted by Tversky and Simonson (1993), they observed that the changes to the decision pattern were still taking place even when subjects viewed and were aware of all the alternatives before the decision task. One likely reason for this “consistent” change in decision pattern across situations is that consumers may exhibit a tendency to over-emphasize confirming evidence (Pyszczynski and Greenberg, 1987) and selectively search for confirming evidence (Snyder and Swann, 1978). In this sense, when consumers encounter a combination of dominated and non-dominated alternatives, they would always tend to focus on comparisons between the better (i.e., non-dominated) alternatives against the worse (i.e., dominated) alternatives and identifying the core and decoy alternatives to ascertain that they have made the correct choice. This notion in comparison is often reflected in price perception studies, where consumers may depend on the mean estimated prices of the products evaluated concurrently, the price range observed and the reference frames used to judge prices (Lynch et al., 1991). In this vein, searching for confirming evidence also seeks to justify goal-fulfillment (non-fulfillment), which ultimately leads to satisfaction (dissatisfaction).

In a nutshell, it appears that providing a decoy alternative could make the core alternative “stand out” relative to the other non-dominated alternatives enhance the probability of search termination, and thereby, lead to lower occurrence of decision avoidance (Tversky and Kahneman, 1991). More specifically, a right combination of alternatives (i.e., inclusion of decoy alternative) could prompt consumer to make choices in a much easier
fashion. To the extent that the core alternative is perceived more favorably in the presence of decoy alternative, CS website could capitalize on this behavioral tendency by inducing the consumers to purchase from retailers who offer higher commissions (i.e., the core alternative). This can be done via alternative contrast manipulation, in order to bring the intended preference into the limelight. Hence, we hypothesize that:

The inclusion of a decoy (dominated) alternative will:

H1a. increase the perceived choice set comprehensiveness;

H1b. decrease the propensity of avoiding making a decision; and

H1c. increase decision satisfaction.

Choice Order Sequence

While the provision of decoy alternative is very likely to increase the consumers’ propensity of choosing the core alternative, prior information presentation research has indicated that this provision could be further enhanced by the order sequence of the alternative presentation (Dhar and Simonson, 1992). According to behavioral research, consumers often exhibit the characteristic of cognitive miser by aiming to exert as little cognitive effort as possible while retrieving and processing information (Costley and Brucks, 1992). In the extreme situation, consumers may selectively choose to ignore certain alternatives to reduce the cognitive processing effort (Bettman et al., 1988). In this regard, if the decoy is placed at a non-strategic location, then it is very likely that the attractiveness of the core alternative may not be felt.

For these reasons, it is conjectured that when consumers perform the directed learning of the stimuli with the information processing as the primary goal to anticipate future choice decisions, consumers’ information processing outcome based on its acquisition could be affected by the sequence in which information is presented (Bettman and Kakkar, 1977). Essentially, we conjecture that the choice contrast strategy has to be complemented by an appropriate choice order sequence (Dhar and Simonson 1992) which refers to the alternative presentation sequence organization with the specific focus on ordering the core (non-dominated) and the decoy (dominated) alternatives by different placements among the choice set.

Relative Placement of Core and Decoy

When alternatives are presented sequentially, consumers conduct pair-wise comparisons among the alternatives in a first to last fashion (Hogarth and Einhorn, 1992). This view suggests that consumers initially compare between the two alternatives at the beginning of the list, by judging whether the first alternative is inferior (dominated) or not (non-dominated) compared to the second. A preliminary preference is made when one of the alternatives dominates another. Moreover, upon receiving the subsequent alternatives, consumers anchor on the current set of alternatives, and then adjust their belief on the basis of the strength and direction (positive or negative) of each new alternative (Hogarth and Einhorn, 1992). This process repeats until there is sufficient confirming evidence indicating that an alternative is the best among all the alternatives (Pyszczynski and Greenberg, 1987). In this regard, distancing the core and decoy alternatives with other competing alternatives between the two will increase the cognitive difficulty in identifying the core alternative. In this manner, the overall decision performance and satisfaction may subsequently be reduced. Hence, it is plausible to posit that the design of the choice order sequence by arranging the alternatives in an easy-to-process manner, particularly placing the decoy alternative next to the core one would minimize cognitive effort on information editing, memorizing, recalling and further increase the decision making outcome optimality. Then, should the decoy alternative be placed before or after the core alternative?

According to Dhar, Nowlis and Sherman (1999), consumers’ reaction towards the several alternatives presented is mainly based on the memorizing manner and the presentation of the decoy option may probably form a particularly inferior impression of overall attribute as a memorized reference point for future comparison. And in some researches examining the order in which consumers prefer to experience a series of consumption outcomes, results show that consumers mostly prefer to experience pleasant outcomes after experiencing unpleasant ones, rather than the reverse (Ross and Simonson, 1991).

Following this inclination, the subsequent presentation of the intended option (i.e. the core) is very likely to induce consumers’ attention by significantly increasing the features’ predominance against the immediate previous decoy option.

After comparing the core option which is most firmly memorized and most easily recalled by its apparently superior features relative to the decoy, consumers’ confidence over the judgment to choose the core is high, which could lead to the core alternative being chosen. In other words, as long as the core option is testified to be superior relative to the decoy, consumers’ choice of the core will hardly be flexuous any more. In this regard, placing the decoy option right before the core one is deemed to effectively enhance consumers’ decision making outcome by giving prominence to the intended option (i.e., the core) in the immediate contrasting process. Hence we hypothesize that:

The placement of the core alternative immediately after the decoy alternative will:

H2a. increase the perceived choice set comprehensiveness, compared to other placements;

H2b. decrease the propensity of avoiding making a decision, compared to other placements; and
that core alternative is more attractive compared to consumers have a tendency to create an initial impression by placing core and decoy alternatives (i.e., choice (Haugtvedt and Wegener, 1994). By ordering the better attributed alternative on a subject's final alternative there could be a disproportional influence of a previous placement order of the core and decoy alternatives could increase the consumers' propensity to choose the core alternative. However, from the cognitive miser view, consumers may find it time-wasting and cognitively exhaustive to continue searching and processing alternatives without the assurance that the most attractive alternative can be spotted towards the end of the choice set. Consequently, early search termination and decision avoidance are very likely. In this sense, placing the core and decoy alternatives right at the bottom of the choice set may not necessarily yield optimum results.

Another field of thoughts, which is more plausible in this case, is that it is more likely for a consumer to weigh the prior, as opposed to the recent alternative, more heavily, thereby leading to the primacy effect. This is because there could be a disproportional influence of a previous better attributed alternative on a subject's final alternative choice (Haugtvedt and Wegener, 1994). By ordering the alternatives by placing core and decoy alternatives (i.e., non-dominating alternative) at the top of the choice set, consumers have a tendency to create an initial impression that core alternative is more attractive compared to competing alternatives. Furthermore, having such top placement order of the core and decoy alternatives could reduce consumers' cognitive effort and time, as compared to bottom placement of core and decoy alternatives. This further facilitates effective and efficient decision making to avoid null-choice or unadvisable purchasing outcome, thereby leading to higher consumer satisfaction. Indeed, as opposed to recency effect, primacy effect may be more observable in the online shopping environment where consumers may not be willing to exert sufficient cognitive effort to diligently evaluate every single alternative and these judgments are very likely to be made under incomplete information integration because of time pressure or high level of expertise (Kruglanski and Freund, 1983).

In this view, we posit that placing the core and decoy alternatives before the other (i.e., competing) alternatives in the choice set could lead to higher decision performance and satisfaction, compared to other types of placements. For example, if the core and decoy alternatives are presented much later, consumers who are not always patient enough to browse and search the complete list may miss such alternatives. This could result in consumers giving up making a purchase decision before reaching the core and decoy alternatives. Hence, we hypothesize that:

**The placement of the core and decoy alternatives relatively at the top of the choice set will:**

H2d increase the perceived choice set comprehensiveness, compared to other placements;

H2e. decrease the propensity of avoiding making a decision, compared to other placements; and

H2f. increase decision satisfaction, compared to other placements.

**CONCLUSION**

Grounded on the theories of behavioral and context-dependent decision-making, this paper builds a research model to examine the effects of choice contrast and choice order sequence on consumer behavior in the context of CS website. From a theoretical perspective, this study will extend our current state of knowledge in online consumer decision-making behavior by examining the impact of information presentation, characterized by choice content and choice order sequence, and the degree of that influence. From a practical perspective, this study also has potential implications by providing CS website designers with possible combinational strategy in displaying the dominated versus non-dominated alternatives, as well as the order in presenting these alternatives to provide optimum decision quality and induce consumer satisfaction and repurchasing. This could lead to a win-win situation for both the consumers and retailers. This paper is an initial step towards empirically evaluating how choice contrast and choice order sequence influence consumer judgment and decision-making behavior. In future, empirical studies will be needed to test the accuracy and validity of the model built in this paper. At the present, we are in the process of designing the lab experiments. The main idea is to conduct a within-subject lab experiment in three phases using student subjects in order to investigate the three sets of hypotheses (H1a-c, H2a-c, H2d-f) in that sequence. Using a specially designed CS website to manipulate the different displays of alternatives, we hope...
to present a realistic CS website environment to the subjects. More details are to be worked out.
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