

Relieving the regret for maximizers

Hassan, Louise; Shiu, Edward; McGowan, Miriam

DOI:

[10.1108/EJM-03-2018-0200](https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-03-2018-0200)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Hassan, L, Shiu, E & McGowan, M 2019, 'Relieving the regret for maximizers: the role of construal level across comparable and non-comparable choice sets', *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 282-304.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-03-2018-0200>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.



Relieving the regret for maximizers: The role of construal level across comparable and non-comparable choice sets

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>European Journal of Marketing</i> |
| Manuscript ID | EJM-03-2018-0200.R2 |
| Manuscript Type: | Original Article |
| Keywords: | consumer choice, construal level theory, maximisation, regret, comparable and noncomparable choice sets, experimentation |
| | |

Abstract

Purpose - Maximization orientation represents consumers' tendency to pursue the 'best possible' option as opposed to a 'good enough' option, which is acceptable for satisficers.

Maximizers tend to experience greater regret over their choices than satisficers. Research to date has yet to show how the negative state of regret can be reduced for maximizers.

Design/methodology/approach – We examine construal level theory (CLT) in conjunction with the choice context (comparable and noncomparable choices). Three experimental studies tested our assertion that a match between CLT mindset and choice set relieves regret for maximizers.

Findings - We show maximizers experience similar levels of regret compared to satisficers, when considering comparable options in a concrete mindset, and noncomparable options in an abstract mindset. However, maximizers experience heightened regret in comparison to satisficers when considering noncomparable (comparable) options in a concrete (abstract) mindset. Choice difficulty mediates our effect.

Limitations, research and practical implications - Future research is needed to replicate our results in real-life settings. If marketers think that their product is likely to be compared with other comparable products, they should adopt product-specific information that focuses on how the product would be used. However, if marketers think that consumers will compare across noncomparable products, then they should focus on why their product is the most suitable to fulfil consumers' needs.

Originality/value - This research represents the first attempt at reducing regret for maximizers and answers the call for an examination of the relationship between maximization and CLT. Our research adds to the maximization literature by evidencing a CLT-based strategy that attenuates the negative experience of regret for maximizers.

1
2
3 **Keywords** Maximizers, Satisficers, Regret, Construal level theory, Decision difficulty,
4
5 Comparable and noncomparable choice options
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

European Journal of Marketing

Introduction

Consider the scenario where two consumers subscribe to a magazine and as a reward can choose either a case of wines or a set of towels. Once the decision is finalised, one consumer is happy with her chosen reward, but the other consumer feels disappointed and regrets her decision. One reason for this divergent outcome may be that these consumers differ in their tendency to exhibit the maximizing trait, with the former consumer being a satisficer and the latter a maximizer (Schwartz *et al.*, 2002). According to Schwartz *et al.* (2002), maximizers are individuals who strive to secure the ‘best possible’ option, as opposed to satisficers who aim to secure a ‘good enough’ option. For example, a maximizer would be reluctant to choose a reward unless she is certain that there is no ‘better’ alternative reward to be gained. Satisficers, on the other hand, would happily settle for a reward as long as it meets a predetermined set of criteria that signals the option is ‘good enough’. One unpleasant problem maximizers face is the “maximize-regret-maximize cycle”, whereby attempts to maximize unavoidably lead to further episodes of regret, despite maximizers investing greater time and effort during the decision-making process (e.g., Chowdhury *et al.*, 2009; Pieters and Zeelenberg, 2007). A solution to the “maximize-regret-maximize cycle” and the inevitable regret maximizers face has yet to be found. Regret is an important outcome as it negatively impacts well-being (e.g., Polman, 2010; Purvis *et al.*, 2011), causes rumination and brand-switching (Bui *et al.*, 2011; Ma and Roese, 2014; Schwartz *et al.*, 2002) and negatively biases decision-making (Saffrey *et al.*, 2008). Our research attempts to find a way to prevent maximizers from experiencing heightened levels of post choice regret by drawing on construal level theory (CLT; Trope and Liberman, 2010). Specifically, we draw on research that has explored the link between CLT and comparable and non-comparable choice sets (Cho *et al.*, 2013).

1
2
3 Consumers are often faced with making a choice between competing alternatives that
4 are either comparable options (e.g., choosing between two or more laptop computers within a
5 specified price range) or noncomparable options (e.g., choosing between spending disposable
6 income on a holiday or on a new mobile phone). Previous research by Cho *et al.* (2013)
7 showed that decision making for comparable options results in higher levels of satisfaction
8 with the choice if the consumer adopts a concrete mindset, whereas decisions involving
9 noncomparable options benefit from an abstract mindset. The rationale is that a match
10 between the mindset and the choice set reduces the perceived difficulty of the choice. Thus,
11 Cho *et al.*'s (2013) research potentially offers a solution to benefit maximizers. Such findings
12 are consistent with similar arguments (see Broniarczyk and Griffin, 2014) that nonalignable
13 attributes are more difficult to compare and hence require a wider comparison on a, higher
14 level, global scale than alignable attributes. As such, an abstract mental representation of the
15 choice set helps the decision maker to focus on high level considerations that facilitate
16 processing of decision criteria across noncomparable options. On the other hand, a low level
17 construal (concrete mindset) is more beneficial when deciding across comparable options that
18 differ on concrete (low level) attributes.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 This research makes two contributions to the maximization and CLT literature.
41 Firstly, we propose and evidence that a match between the consumer's mindset and the
42 choice set will benefit maximizers and provide a solution to break the "maximize-regret-
43 maximize cycle". Our research is the first to evidence that elevated (post choice) regret is not
44 a pre-determined outcome for maximizers but is influenced jointly by the consumer's
45 (concrete vs. abstract) mindset and the choice context (comparable vs. noncomparable choice
46 sets).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Secondly, we contribute to the CLT literature by evidencing the differential effects of
58 CLT on affective outcomes depends on whether a match occurs between the mindset and the
59
60

1
2
3 choice set. Previous research has focused mainly on the effects of construal level and
4
5 psychological distance on cognitive processes with limited insight gained regarding their
6
7 effects on affective outcomes (Williams *et al.*, 2014). Nevertheless, Trope and Liberman
8
9 (2010) asserted that increased psychological distance to an object will reduce the intensity of
10
11 affective response to that object. A test of this assertion was undertaken by Williams *et al.*
12
13 (2014) who found that psychological distance indeed reduces the intensity of both the
14
15 positive affect related to positive experiences and the negative affect linked to negative
16
17 experiences. However, these authors did not examine the specific emotion of regret. Our
18
19 research shows an abstract mindset does not always lead to reduced affective responses (such
20
21 as regret) by showing that a beneficial effect of CLT is only present where the mindset fits
22
23 with the choice context. Furthermore, fit effects in past studies mostly concern a match
24
25 between construal level and individual goal orientation (such as regulatory focus; e.g., Lee *et*
26
27 *al.*, 2010). Our research, however, examines the effects of a fit (and non-fit) between the
28
29 consumers' mindset and consumption situations that consumers often face in the marketplace.
30
31 In particular, we demonstrate that, compared against satisficers, maximizers do not exhibit
32
33 greater regret over their choices when they adopt an abstract mindset in choosing between
34
35 noncomparable options and when they adopt a concrete mindset in choosing between
36
37 comparable options. Further, we also evidence that this beneficial effect on choice regret is
38
39 caused by a lowering of maximizers' perceptions of difficulty in making the choice.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 This paper is organized as follows. First, we develop and justify our conceptual
49
50 framework (see Figure 1) which is examined through three experimental studies. Next, we
51
52 outline the methodological steps taken and discuss the analysis and results in each of the
53
54 three studies. In particular, Study 1 proposes and evidences an interaction effect of
55
56 maximization (maximizer vs. satisficer) and choice set (comparable vs. noncomparable) on
57
58 post choice regret, whilst assuming that consumers will adopt a concrete mindset as a default.
59
60

1
2
3 Study 1 further demonstrates that under a (default) concrete mindset, the observed interaction
4 exerts a continued (mediated) effect on choice satisfaction via regret. Study 2 extends the
5 findings of Study 1 by manipulating construal level (how/concrete vs. why/abstract). Study 3
6 replicates the findings of Study 2 with a different manipulation of construal level, via the
7 psychological distance of hypotheticality, and demonstrates the mediating role of choice
8 difficulty on regret. Finally, we provide a discussion of the overall findings across the studies
9 coupled with a discussion on implications and limitations arising from this research.

20 **Theoretical Framework**

22 *Maximization and regret*

24 Regret is a negative emotion based on a self-focused upward counterfactual inference (e.g.,
25 Ma and Roese, 2014; Zeelenberg and Pieters, 2007). In the context of consumers making
26 consumption choices, it means that a regretful person believes that a different choice would
27 have led to a different – and better – outcome. The literature shows that compared to
28 satisficers, maximizers tend to experience greater regret (e.g., Besharat *et al.*, 2014; Ma and
29 Roese, 2014; Polman, 2010; Schwartz *et al.*, 2002) even when getting objectively better
30 outcomes (e.g., Iyengar *et al.*, 2006).

41 Maximizers and satisficers have a different approach to making choices. Satisficers
42 choose the first option that meets their (good enough) standards (Cheek and Schwartz, 2016).
43 In contrast, maximizers want the best of all possible options. Maximizers are motivated to
44 engage in an exhaustive search of all available options, continuing their search for the ‘best
45 possible’ option even after finding an option that meets their initial standards (Cheek and
46 Schwartz, 2016). Furthermore, maximizers are more willing to expend effort and sacrifice
47 resources to obtain a larger assortment (Dar-Nimrod *et al.*, 2009), and compare more options
48 more deeply (e.g., Chowdury *et al.*, 2009; Dar-Nimrod *et al.*, 2009; Polman, 2010; Schwartz
49 *et al.*, 2002) than satisficers.

1
2
3 The 'best possible' option is illusive in the marketplace given regular promotions as
4 well as entrance of new 'improved' models and products. Thus, maximizers are likely to find
5 making a decision more difficult (e.g., Schwartz *et al.*, 2002). When practical constraints
6 make an exhaustive search, and comparisons across all alternatives, impossible or
7 impractical, maximizers experience regret about options foregone, fearing that they may have
8 missed the best option (Schwartz *et al.*, 2002). Satisficers, on the other hand, perceive less
9 complexity regarding the choice decision because they are looking for an option that meets
10 their threshold of acceptability, namely something that is 'good enough' as opposed to
11 something that is the 'best possible'. As a consequence, satisficers find making a choice
12 across available options less difficult, report lower levels of regret, and are more satisfied
13 with their choice (Huber *et al.*, 2012). Critically, the threshold of acceptability for
14 maximizers (acceptable only if the option is the best possible) is much higher than that for
15 satisficers (acceptable if the option is good enough). Moreover, options not yet considered
16 have no relevance to satisficers once they have found their 'good enough' choice. However,
17 the potential for regret is ever present for maximizers because they cannot be sure if there
18 exists somewhere an option left unexplored that might be better than all the alternatives so far
19 examined.

41 42 *Construal level theory*

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Construal level theory (CLT; Trope and Liberman, 2010) is a leading contemporary theory,
explaining how mental construal affects people's perception of objects or events. CLT asserts
that individuals can move from a concrete representation of an object (e.g., as a mobile
phone) or event (e.g., revising for an exam) to a relatively abstract representation of the same
object (e.g., as a communication device) or event (e.g., learning). CLT further predicts a
bidirectional relationship between level of construal and psychological distance (Trope and
Liberman, 2010). Psychological distance refers to the perceived distance of a target

1
2
3 event/object to the self on one of four dimensions. Trope and Liberman (2010) distinguished
4 between spatial (“where” - how distal in physical space is the event/object from the self?),
5 temporal (“when” - how far removed in time – past or future – is the event/object?), social
6 (“who” - how different is the social target from the self?; e.g., self vs. friend, self vs.
7 stranger), and hypotheticality (“whether” – the likelihood of the event happening or the
8 amount of uncertainty involved) dimensions. Across all dimensions, the anchoring point is
9 the perceiver’s direct experience of the target event/object, with psychologically distant
10 entities lying outside the perceiver’s direct experience. In particular, the more distant an
11 event/object is perceived on any of the four dimensions, the more abstractly it is represented
12 in one’s mindset (Trope and Liberman, 2010). Due to the bidirectional relationship between
13 psychological distance and level of construal, a high/low level of construal in turn results in
14 greater/lower perceived psychological distance (e.g., Liberman and Förster, 2009; Smith *et*
15 *al.*, 2008).

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 Research shows that at high levels of construal, an event/object is conceptualized in
35 terms of its central and enduring features, while peripheral and contextualized characteristics
36 are ignored (Trope and Liberman, 2010). This change in focus has implications for
37 consumers’ cognitive processes and perceptions. In the context of making choices, when the
38 outcome of the decision is proximal, people adopt a concrete mindset, and pay more attention
39 to alignable over non-alignable attributes (e.g., Malkoc *et al.*, 2005) and find choices across
40 noncomparable options more difficult than comparable options (Cho *et al.*, 2013). Lastly,
41 previous research shows that people tend to, by default, approach and make decisions at a
42 low level concrete representation (Cho *et al.*, 2013; Khan *et al.*, 2011; Malkoc *et al.*, 2010).
43 In particular, Malkoc *et al.* (2010; experiment 1B) evidenced that the default mindset for
44 people is concrete, leading to high levels of present (temporal) bias.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 To the best of our knowledge, only one paper has examined the influence of CLT on
4 maximization wherein Luan and Li (2017) clarified why satisficers might settle for a less
5 valued option. In their 2 (choice level: desirability vs. feasibility) \times 2 (orientation:
6 maximizing vs. satisficing) mixed design study, with choice level as the within-subjects
7 factor, these authors found that feasibility (low level concerns), but not desirability (high
8 level concerns), was more important to satisficers than to maximizers, and that satisficers are
9 less likely to sacrifice feasibility in order to secure a desirable choice. However, whilst urging
10 future research to examine the relationship between maximization and CLT, these authors did
11 not examine regret nor did they consider the role of (comparable vs. noncomparable) choice
12 sets.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 *Fit effect of CLT*

27
28 Past research evidenced beneficial effects from a match (or fit) between mindset and choice
29 set (e.g., lower decision difficulty and higher post choice satisfaction; Cho *et al.*, 2013).
30
31 Therefore, it is important to review the existing literature in CLT that has indicated or
32 evidenced similar fit effects. For example, Eyal *et al.* (2009), in their review, made the
33 suggestion that a match between the construal of the decision and the consumer's mindset
34 might help to reduce regret. A fit effect between CLT and regulatory focus has also been
35 evidenced in the literature. For example, Lee *et al.* (2010) showed a fit effect occurred, when
36 prevention- (vs. promotion-) focused consumers are presented with low (vs. high) level
37 construed information, leading these consumers to "feel right" about their choice and more
38 favourable attitudes. Moreover, a fit effect between CLT and psychological distance has also
39 been evidenced (e.g., between CLT and temporal distance; Kim *et al.*, 2009).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 The literature also provides other examples of the beneficial effects of a fit from
55 construal. In examining the effectiveness of health messages, Han *et al.* (2015) found such a
56 beneficial effect where consumers primed with problem- (vs. emotion-) focused strategies are
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 more persuaded by messages framed at lower (vs. higher) levels of construal. Similarly,
4
5 Spassova and Lee (2013) evidenced an increase in advertising effectiveness when there is a
6
7 match between the temporal (distal vs. proximal) frame of the advert and the self-view
8
9 (independent/abstract vs. interdependent/concrete) of the perceiver. In a service context, Jin
10
11 and He (2013) found a construal fit between service guarantees (guarantee element: full
12
13 satisfaction/abstract vs. attribute-specific/concrete) and temporal distance (purchase time
14
15 frame: distal vs. proximal) enhances perceptions of effectiveness of the guarantee. In
16
17 examining the process of making decisions, Yao and Chen (2014) evidenced the beneficial
18
19 effect of a fit from construal. These authors found a fit between the decisional task (gift card /
20
21 low level construal vs. gift cash / high level construal) and persuasive message, framed to
22
23 match the level of construal, led to more favourable attitudes and higher purchase intentions.
24
25
26
27

28 *Hypotheses development*

30
31 Research has evidenced the beneficial effects of a fit between (concrete vs. abstract) mindset
32
33 and the choice set (comparable vs. noncomparable). In particular, Cho *et al.* (2013) showed
34
35 that consumers perceive noncomparable options as more difficult to choose from than
36
37 comparable options when a concrete mindset is adopted, but this effect reverses when an
38
39 abstract mindset is adopted. These authors further evidenced the downstream effect of choice
40
41 difficulty on choice satisfaction. A lack of congruency between the consumer's mindset and
42
43 the choice context would heighten choice difficulty with subsequent negative outcomes such
44
45 as lower decision satisfaction. Heightened perception of choice difficulty arises because when
46
47 deciding between comparable options under an abstract mindset, the decision maker must
48
49 shift and maintain their focus on low level differences across options. Similarly, when
50
51 deciding between noncomparable options under a concrete mindset, the decision maker needs
52
53 to shift and maintain their focus on high level differences across options. This line of
54
55 reasoning is consistent with Hamilton *et al.*'s (2011) findings that showed switching from one
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 mindset to another is effortful and leads to a lack of confidence and feelings of difficulty in
4 making the decision. However, Cho *et al.*'s (2013) findings may not be applicable to post
5 choice regret. Indeed, previous research has shown that satisfaction and regret are distinct
6 constructs with different antecedents and consequences (Tsiros and Mittal, 2000). In
7 particular, regret is conditional on the generation of counterfactuals regarding the option(s)
8 foregone (Pieters and Zeelenberg, 2007), whereas dissatisfaction is a consequence of a
9 disconfirmation between reality and prior expectation (Anderson, 1973). Moreover, research
10 has shown that regret can have a negative consequence on satisfaction (Inman *et al.*, 1997;
11 Taylor, 1997; Tsiros and Mittal, 2000). Nevertheless, the linkage between a (non-fit) fit and
12 regret can be argued because in addition to the findings of Cho *et al.* (2013), those of Lee *et*
13 *al.* (2010) also offer support. Specifically, a fit from construal leads the decision maker to
14 perceive the choice made as being more correct (feeling right about the decision/choice; Lee
15 *et al.*, 2010). As a consequence, one would expect such a fit to also reduce the potential for
16 feeling (post choice) regret. The reason is that post choice regret arises from feelings that the
17 choice made was wrong or at least that it was less than correct (Pieters and Zeelenberg,
18 2007).

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 The literature also provides supporting arguments as to why such a fit would offer
42 different levels of benefits between maximizers and satisficers. Research shows that it is
43 generally difficult for decision makers to single out the best option and the next-best
44 alternative (Sagi and Friedland, 2007), a factor pertinent to maximizers, but not to satisficers.
45 With a 'good enough' (vs. 'best possible') decision criterion, satisficers would generally find
46 the decision to be less difficult than maximizers. Given the relatively low (high) levels of
47 perceived decision difficulty for satisficers (maximizers), the impact of a fit (or non-fit) on
48 decision difficulty will be less pronounced for satisficers when compared against that of
49 maximizers. The underpinning rationale is that maximizers adopt a strategy that combines the
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 process of seeking out and comparing across alternatives. For them, seeking out alternatives
4 is relevant when evaluating across many options, but when faced with only a few options,
5 maximizers would seek out more information about the available options and compare
6 extensively among them (Cheek and Schwartz, 2016). When maximizers have been primed
7 into a mindset that does not fit the choice context, the process of seeking out and evaluating
8 trade-offs is made much more difficult, as their mindset is not conducive to the type of choice
9 comparisons needed to make a decision. In contrast, when they have been primed into a
10 mindset compatible with the choice context, they should find it much less difficult to make a
11 comparison. On the other hand, satisficers do not engage in an extensive comparison and
12 information seeking process, and would not consider further trade-off comparisons once a
13 suitable (good enough) option has been identified (Cheek and Schwartz, 2016). As a result,
14 the impact of a non-fit (vs. fit) should be much less for satisficers than for maximizers.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Drawing together the above discussions, we would expect maximizers (vs. satisficers)
32 to report higher levels of decision difficulty and post choice regret when there is a lack of fit
33 between their mindset and the choice set (concrete mindset and noncomparable options or
34 abstract mindset and comparable options). Importantly, we would also expect a fit (vs. a non-
35 fit) to attenuate the disparities in decision difficulty and post choice regret across maximizers
36 and satisficers. We thus hypothesize the following:
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 *H1a.* Under concrete construal, maximizers, compared to satisficers, will report
47 higher levels of post choice regret when choosing between noncomparable
48 options.
49
50
51

52 *H1b.* Under abstract construal, maximizers, compared to satisficers, will report
53 higher levels of post choice regret when choosing between comparable
54 options.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *H2.* The difference in post choice regret hypothesized in *H1a* and *H1b* will be
4 attenuated when choosing between comparable (noncomparable) options under
5 concrete (abstract) construal.
6
7
8

9
10 *H3.* The effects outlined in *H1a* and *H1b* will be mediated by choice difficulty.
11

12 13 *Overview of our studies*

14
15 We test our theory and hypotheses across three studies (see Figure 1 conceptual framework).
16
17 Studies 1 and 2 examine our hypotheses that a match between choice context (comparable vs.
18 noncomparable) and CLT (concrete vs. abstract) will help to reduce maximizers' level of post
19 choice regret. Study 1 examines the default position where CLT was not manipulated (with a
20 concrete construal level assumed across all participants). Study 3 replicates the findings of
21 Study 2 using a psychological distance (hypotheticality) manipulation for CLT and provides
22 mediational evidence of choice difficulty as our proposed underlying psychological
23 mechanism. Across all studies, participants took as much time as needed to make their
24 choices. PROCESS (version 3.1; Hayes, 2017) was used within SPSS across all studies.
25
26 Spotlight analyses were undertaken and reported in Studies 2 and 3 where maximization
27 orientation was measured, with the means reported representing maximizers at 84th and
28 satisficers at 16th percentiles.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Insert Figure 1 about here

45 **Study 1**

46
47 Study 1 assumed that consumers will adopt a concrete mindset as a default and tested *H1a*
48 that maximizers would experience higher regret when choosing between noncomparable
49 versus comparable options. Further, it was expected that the difference in regret between
50 maximizers and satisficers will be attenuated when choosing from comparable options (*H2*).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57 Maximizing and satisficing orientations were manipulated in line with Ma and Roese (2014).
58
59
60

1
2
3 Additionally, Study 1 assessed if regret mediates the interaction effect of maximization and
4
5 choice set on choice satisfaction.
6
7

8 *Pretests*

9
10 Two separate pretests were conducted to assess the effectiveness of the maximization
11
12 manipulation (Pretest 1), and to ensure that the comparable and noncomparable choice sets
13
14 are perceived as equally attractive (Pretest 2). In Pretest 1, 71 MTurk participants (41 male,
15
16 30 female; $M_{\text{age}} = 39$ years) answered 9 multiple choice and 2 open response questions
17
18 designed to activate a satisficing or maximizing orientation. The manipulation was similar to
19
20 that used by Ma and Roese (2014, Experiment 2) but also included open response questions
21
22 similar to their open-ended items in other experiments reported in their paper (See Appendix
23
24 1 for full manipulation items). The participants then answered a bi-polar scale item “When
25
26 deciding among the options to what extent was your choice motivated by.....?” (1 = “choosing
27
28 one that is good enough” to 9 = “choosing the optimal option”). This item was adapted from
29
30 Luan and Li (2017). As expected, participants under the maximizing condition were more
31
32 likely to be motivated to choose the optimal option ($M_{\text{satisficers}} = 5.03$, $M_{\text{maximizers}} = 6.79$; $t(69)$
33
34 $= 2.79$, $p < .01$).
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 In Pretest 2, 60 MTurk participants (31 male, 29 female; $M_{\text{age}} = 36$ years) rated the
42
43 attractiveness of a set of either comparable (4 keychains available for sale from Amazon
44
45 around \$4.00 each) or noncomparable (4 products: USB, salt grinder, house plant, and
46
47 keychain; all available for sale from Amazon around \$4.00 each) options. Attractiveness was
48
49 measured by a single item using a 9-point scale (1 = “very unattractive” to 9 = “very
50
51 attractive”) adapted from Page and Herr (2002). Results of a repeated-measures ANOVA
52
53 assessing if there were differences in attractiveness, within the comparable or noncomparable
54
55 choices shown, revealed no difference in attractiveness for the comparable ($F(3,26) = .49$, $p >$
56
57 $.7$) or noncomparable ($F(3,28) = .91$, $p > .4$) choice sets. Furthermore, no difference in
58
59
60

1
2
3 attractiveness was found when comparing average attractiveness of the options across the two
4
5 choice sets ($M_{\text{comparable}} = 4.97$, $M_{\text{noncomparable}} = 5.36$; $t(58) = 1.02$, $p > .3$).

8 *Main Study*

10 *Method.* One hundred and fifty two MTurk participants took part in the main study (73 male,
11
12 79 female; $M_{\text{age}} = 39$ years). The satisficing (coded -.5) and maximizing (coded .5) conditions
13
14 were primed as detailed in Pretest 1 (see Appendix 1 for items). Following the priming task,
15
16 participants were asked to choose from either the comparable (coded -.5) or noncomparable
17
18 (coded .5) choice sets. Participants were simultaneously shown images of all four options
19
20 with the order within the presentation randomized. A list of four attributes for each option, as
21
22 well as the price, was presented beneath each product. Prior to showing the images,
23
24 participants were told that they would be entered into a lottery where 10 lucky winners will
25
26 be given the product they choose as a free gift. This information was intended to increase the
27
28 realism of the scenario whilst heightening the potential for regret. In line with Ma and Roese
29
30 (2014; Experiment 2), prize winners received an Amazon gift token for \$4 which is slightly
31
32 above the cost of the products shown. After indicating their preferred option, participants
33
34 rated their level of regret and satisfaction regarding their choice. Choice regret was captured
35
36 with two items (“Imagine that you have received the free gift from us, you will regret your
37
38 choice” and “Imagine that you have received the free gift from us, you will think you should
39
40 have chosen another option”). These two items, adapted from Tsiros and Mittal (2000), were
41
42 combined into a single score ($\alpha = .93$). Choice satisfaction was measured with one item (“I
43
44 am satisfied with my choice”). Regret and satisfaction items were measured on 7-point
45
46 degree of agreement scale (1 = “strongly disagree” to 7 = “strongly agree”). To assess if
47
48 respondents were in a default concrete mindset when undertaking the choice task, we asked
49
50 them towards the end of the questionnaire to indicate their level of construal. This was
51
52 captured with an item adapted from Irmak *et al.* (2013; “When making your evaluations of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the products did you think more about how you would use the product or why you would use
4 the product?") on a 7-point scale (1 = "focused on how" to 7 = "focused on why"). Taken
5
6
7
8 together, Study 1 was a 2 (maximization orientation: satisficing vs. maximizing) \times 2 (choice
9
10 set: comparable vs. noncomparable) between-subjects design.

11
12
13 *Results.* The data supported a default concrete mindset with respondents more focused on
14 how they use the product. Specifically, a one-sample t-test showed that the mean value of the
15 single item capturing participants' level of construal was significantly lower than the mid-
16 point of 4 ($M = 3.41$; $t(151) = -3.47$, $p < .01$). To ensure that there were no differences in the
17 level of construal reported across the conditions, a PROCESS Model 1 examining the effects
18 of maximization orientation and choice set on the measure of construal revealed no
19
20 significant main or interaction effects (p 's $> .5$).

21
22
23 To test *H1a* and *H2*, PROCESS Model 1 examined the effects of maximization
24 orientation and choice set on choice regret, revealing the predicted two-way interaction ($b =$
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
To test *H1a* and *H2*, PROCESS Model 1 examined the effects of maximization orientation and choice set on choice regret, revealing the predicted two-way interaction ($b = .89$, $t = 2.52$, $p < .05$). Neither main effects were significant (p 's $> .1$). As expected, spotlight analysis revealed that levels of choice regret were not different across maximizers ($M_{\text{maximizers}} = 1.30$) and satisficers ($M_{\text{satisficers}} = 1.55$) in the comparable condition ($p > .3$), but differed ($M_{\text{maximizers}} = 1.99$, $M_{\text{satisficers}} = 1.35$) in the noncomparable condition ($b = .63$, $t = 2.55$, $p < .05$). Figure 2 illustrates the observed interaction effect. Thus, *H1a* and *H2* are supported.

To test if choice regret mediated the observed interaction effect on choice satisfaction, an analysis employing PROCESS Model 7 (5,000 bootstrap samples, 95% CI) was undertaken and confirmed that regret played a significant mediational role (index of moderated mediation = $-.47$, $CI_{95\%} = [-.86, -.12]$). The analysis further revealed that the conditional indirect effect of maximization on choice satisfaction was only significant in the

1
2
3 noncomparable condition (indirect effect = $-.32$, $CI_{95\%} = [-.69, -.05]$), but not in the
4
5 comparable condition (indirect effect = $.12$, $CI_{95\%} = [-.09, .32]$).
6
7

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Insert Figure 2 about here

Discussion

The findings of our first study provided initial support of our theorizing underpinning *H1a* and *H2*. With a default concrete mindset, maximizers experienced higher levels of post choice regret compared to satisficers when faced with noncomparable choices. The moderated mediation analysis showed the importance of choice regret as an antecedent of choice satisfaction. Importantly, Study 1 indicated a way in which the level of choice regret felt by maximizers can be attenuated. To provide further evidence of the critical role of (concrete vs. abstract) mindsets in alleviating regret for maximizers, Study 2 directly manipulated (concrete/abstract) mindset. Study 2 also employed a different choice context and study population while maintaining a focus on the key outcome of choice regret.

Study 2

The objective of Study 2 is to provide evidence that the heightened levels of choice regret for maximizers (relative to satisficers) will be attenuated when their mindset fit the choice set.

We tested our hypothesis using a scenario based around a free gift that accompanies a magazine subscription. By manipulating CLT, Study 2 extends the findings of Study 1 by examining the role of both concrete and abstract mindsets in their interaction with the choice context.

Pretest

Participants were recruited from a lifestyle event ($N = 32$; 14 male, 18 female; $M_{age} = 36$ years) and rated the attractiveness of either two sets of towels (comparable choice set), or a set of towels and a case of wine (noncomparable choice set). Participants were told that the

1
2
3 gifts were of equal monetary value. Each option was further described by six attributes (see
4 Appendix 2). Participants were randomly assigned to view either the comparable or the
5 noncomparable choice set and indicated the level of attractiveness of the options (“How
6 attractive do you think the two ‘free gift’ options are?”) on a 7-point scale (-3 = “Option A is
7 much more attractive” to 0 = “Options A and B are equally attractive” to 3 = “Option B is
8 much more attractive”). Results of two separate one-sample t-tests showed that the level of
9 attractiveness did not differ from zero (i.e. the options are equally attractive) within both the
10 comparable and the noncomparable choice sets (p 's > .1). Further, an independent samples t-
11 test comparing the level of attractiveness showed that the attractiveness of the gifts did not
12 differ across the choice sets ($M_{\text{comparable}} = .88$, $M_{\text{noncomparable}} = .58$; $t(30) = .67$, $p > .6$).

26 *Main Study*

27
28 *Method.* Two hundred and twenty nine participants (93 male, 136 female; $M_{\text{age}} = 38$ years)
29 were recruited at a lifestyle event in exchange for a snack. Participants were randomly
30 assigned to one of four conditions in a 2 (Choice set: comparable vs. noncomparable) \times 2
31 (Construal level: concrete vs. abstract) \times maximization design. Choice set and construal level
32 were manipulated between subjects and maximization measured. The same choice sets as the
33 pretest were employed. Construal level was manipulated in line with Freitas *et al.* (2004) who
34 showed that when individuals are primed to think repeatedly in terms of “why” (as opposed
35 to “how”), superordinate, abstract thoughts are activated. Subordinate, concrete thinking was
36 activated under the “how” condition. Thus, prior to the main experiment, participants
37 assigned to the abstract (coded .5) construal condition were asked to consider why they
38 would want to maintain and improve their health. Participants assigned to a concrete
39 construal (coded -.5) condition were asked to consider how they would go about maintaining
40 and improving their health. In a following separate task, a scenario was presented which
41 offered participants a free gift if they took out a magazine subscription. Participants were
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 randomly assigned to either the comparable (coded -.5) or noncomparable (coded .5) free gift
4 condition. Participants were told that the gift options were of equivalent value. All other
5 scenario aspects were held constant across the four conditions. Participants then indicated
6 which gift they would choose followed by the same (2-item) measure of regret that was used
7 in Study 1 ($\alpha = .87$). At the end of the task, participants completed Schwartz *et al.*'s (2002)
8 13-item maximizing orientation scale ($\alpha = .74$; 0 = "strongly disagree" to 6 = "strongly
9 agree") on a separate sheet, with higher values indicating a stronger maximizing orientation.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 *Results.* We conducted PROCESS Model 3 to examine if regret differed across the (choice
21 set and construal level) conditions and maximization. The results revealed a conditional
22 direct effect of maximization ($b = .36, t = 4.26, p < .001$) on regret, consistent with prior
23 literature. The results also revealed a significant conditional two-way interaction between
24 choice set and construal level ($b = 2.82, t = 2.71, p < .01$). More importantly, a three-way
25 interaction effect was evidenced ($b = -1.02, t = -2.99, p < .01$). No other effects reached
26 significance (p 's $> .4$).

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Spotlight analysis (see Figure 3) further showed that when choosing from comparable
options in an abstract mindset, maximizers reported increased regret compared to satisficers
($M_{\text{maximizers}} = 3.20, M_{\text{satisficers}} = 1.98; b = .71, t = 3.98, p < .001$), supporting *H1b*. A significant
difference also emerged when choosing from noncomparable options in a concrete mindset,
where maximizers reported increased regret compared to satisficers ($M_{\text{maximizers}} = 2.49,$
 $M_{\text{satisficers}} = 1.58; b = .53, t = 3.13, p < .01$), supporting *H1a*. No differences in regret between
maximizers and satisficers were found when choosing between comparable options in a
concrete mindset or when choosing from noncomparable options in an abstract mindset (p 's $>$
.4). Thus, *H2* is supported.

Insert Figure 3 about here

Discussion

Study 2 replicated and extended Study 1 by showing that maximizers experienced similar levels of regret compared to satisficers when considering comparable (noncomparable) options in a concrete (abstract) mindset, but higher levels of regret when considering noncomparable (comparable) options in a concrete (abstract) mindset. Thus, Study 2 confirmed the rationale underpinning *H2* that a match between the consumer's mindset and the choice set has a beneficial effect for maximizers. Afforded such a match, the level of choice regret for maximizers was attenuated with maximizers not suffering more regret than satisficers. The next study elucidates the underlying mechanism by examining the mediating effect of choice difficulty.

Study 3

Study 3 investigated the proposed psychological process resulting in maximizers feeling more regret than satisficers when experiencing a mismatch between the choice set (comparable vs. noncomparable) and their mindset (concrete vs. abstract). Our hypothesis (*H3*) was that a mismatch (non-fit) will lead maximizers to feel a heightened sense of difficulty in choosing between the options presented, thus leading to increased choice regret. Therefore, we tested a moderated mediation model in which a mismatch/non-fit (vs. match/fit) between choice set and mindset leads maximizers (vs. satisficers) to experience higher levels of choice difficulty, which in turn makes them report higher levels of choice regret. An additional objective of Study 3 was to replicate the findings of Study 2 using a different manipulation of CLT based on psychological distance (hypotheticality). Psychological distance can be manipulated by a variety of means, including varying temporal, social, spatial, or hypotheticality dimensions (see Trope and Liberman, 2010 for a discussion). We chose to manipulate psychological distance by means of hypotheticality

1
2
3 because varying the probability associated with obtaining a free gift in return for taking out a
4 magazine subscription is realistic.
5
6

7 8 *Method* 9

10 Two hundred and fifty three participants (90 male, 161 female, 2 gender unknown;
11 $M_{\text{age}} = 40$ years) were recruited at a food fair in exchange for a snack. Participants were
12 randomly assigned to one of four conditions in a 2 (Choice set: comparable vs.
13 noncomparable) \times 2 (Hypotheticality: high vs. low) \times maximization design, with choice set
14 and hypotheticality manipulated between subjects and maximization being measured.
15
16 Participants were offered a chance of winning a free gift if they took out a magazine
17 subscription. Participants were told that all new subscribers would be entered into a prize
18 draw and would have either an almost guaranteed chance or a low chance of winning the free
19 gift. This manipulation of hypotheticality was similar to two approaches taken by Wakslak *et*
20 *al.* (2006), who in their Study 2 used a raffle scenario and told participants that they were
21 either “almost certain” (concrete construal) or had a “1/100 chance” (abstract construal) of
22 obtaining a voucher for a product that they had evaluated during the experiment. In their
23 Study 3, they used 95% and 5% to signal high and low probability respectively. As a result,
24 in developing our manipulation we decided to combine the approaches taken by Wakslak *et*
25 *al.* (2006) in their Studies 2 and 3 by using percentages within our free gift scenario which is
26 analogous to a raffle. Using percentages made the phrasing of the manipulations more similar
27 and ensured that respondents were clear of the exact chance of obtaining the gift in both
28 construal level conditions. Thus, participants were randomly assigned to one of two
29 conditions (concrete construal: high 95% probability, coded -.5; abstract construal: low 5%
30 probability, coded .5) related to winning a gift if the respondent took out a magazine
31 subscription. In all other respects, the scenario was identical to that employed in Study 2,
32 with coding for the choice set conditions as Studies 1 and 2. Participants indicated which gift
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 they would choose followed by a two-item measure of choice difficulty (“How difficult was
4 it for you to decide which option to choose?” 1 = “Very easy” to 7 “Very difficult”; “How
5 complex did you find it to make your decision?” 1 = “Not at all complex” to 7 = “Very
6 complex”). The measure of choice difficulty was adapted from Chatterjee and Heath (1996).
7
8 Participants then reported their level of choice regret based on the same measure of regret as
9
10 in previous studies ($\alpha = .88$). Participants also completed a single item manipulation check
11
12 (“The probability of you winning the ‘free gift’ is” 1 = “Very low” to 7 = “Very high”).
13
14 At the end of the task participants completed Schwartz *et al.*’s (2002) 13-item maximizing
15
16 orientation scale ($\alpha = .72$; 0 = “Strongly disagree” to 6 = “Strongly agree”) on a separate
17
18 sheet, with higher values indicating a stronger maximizing orientation.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Results

28
29 Analysis via PROCESS Model 3 revealed that the manipulation of hypotheticality
30
31 was successful with a direct effect of hypotheticality ($b = -4.44, t = -7.18, p < .0001$) on the
32
33 manipulation check question ($M_{\text{high}} = 5.94, M_{\text{low}} = 2.16$). Neither choice set, or maximization
34
35 exerted a significant direct effect (p 's $> .4$) nor did the two-way or three-way interactions
36
37 reach significance (p 's $> .2$).
38
39
40

41 Analysis based on PROCESS Model 3 revealed a conditional direct effect of
42
43 maximization ($b = .32, t = 3.88, p < .001$) and hypotheticality ($b = .98, t = 2.04, p < .05$) on
44
45 regret. The results also revealed two significant two-way interactions between choice set and
46
47 hypotheticality ($b = 2.07, t = 2.16, p < .05$) and between hypotheticality and maximization (b
48
49 $= -.41, t = -2.54, p < .05$) on to regret. Importantly, as in Study 2, a three-way interaction
50
51 effect was evidenced ($b = -.92, t = -2.81, p < .01$). No other effects reached significance (p 's
52
53 $> .2$).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Spotlight analysis further revealed that, when choosing from comparable options in an abstract mindset (i.e., low hypotheticality condition), maximizers reported increased regret compared to satisficers ($M_{\text{maximizers}} = 2.45$, $M_{\text{satisficers}} = 1.95$; $b = .31$, $t = 2.43$, $p < .05$), supporting *H1b*. A significant difference also emerged when choosing from noncomparable options in a concrete mindset (i.e. high hypotheticality condition), where maximizers reported increased regret compared to satisficers ($M_{\text{maximizers}} = 2.69$, $M_{\text{satisficers}} = 1.43$; $b = .78$; $t = 4.25$, $p < .0001$), supporting *H1a*. No significant differences in regret between maximizers and satisficers were found when they chose between comparable options in a concrete mindset or when they chose from noncomparable options in an abstract mindset (p 's $> .1$). Thus, *H2* is supported. Figure 4 illustrates the findings of Study 3 which echoed those of Study 2, thereby offering additional support to our theorizing with an alternative manipulation of construal level based on psychological distance.

Insert Figure 4 about here

We hypothesized in *H3* that maximizers will experience greater choice difficulty when their level of construal does not match the choice set and that this would result in increased regret over their choice. We tested this hypothesis using the moderated mediation PROCESS Model 12 (5,000 bootstrap samples, 95% CI). The results revealed a significant indirect effect of the three-way interaction between maximization orientation, choice set, and construal level on choice regret through choice difficulty (Index of moderated moderated mediation = $-.29$; $CI_{95\%} = [-.56, -.07]$). The analysis further revealed a significant indirect path from maximization to regret through choice difficulty when the choice set was comparable and hypotheticality was low (i.e. abstract mindset was induced; point estimate = $.10$; $CI_{95\%} = [.002, .226]$) as well as when the choice set was noncomparable and hypotheticality was high (i.e. concrete mindset was induced; point estimate = $.20$; $CI_{95\%} =$

1
2
3 [.07, .38]). Thus, *H3* is supported. In contrast, choice difficulty did not mediate the
4
5 conditional effect in the comparable and high hypotheticality (concrete mindset) condition
6
7 ($CI_{95\%} = [-.05, .21]$) nor in the noncomparable and low hypotheticality condition ($CI_{95\%} = [-$
8
9 $.139, .006]$).

12 13 *Discussion*

14
15
16 Study 3 replicated the pattern of effects found in Study 2 and offers strong support for the
17
18 beneficial effect of a match between the consumer's level of construal and the choice set for
19
20 maximizers. This study further confirmed the mediating role of choice difficulty in
21
22 influencing post-choice regret in our context. With the consistent results reported across
23
24 multiple target audiences and scenarios, our studies jointly offer strong evidence of the
25
26 efficacy of our proposed mechanism that would alleviate the heightened levels of choice
27
28 regret consistently reported in the literature for maximizers.
29
30
31

32 33 **Discussion**

34 35 36 *Theoretical contributions*

37
38 This research answers the call for further research into how the negative state of regret can be
39
40 reduced for maximizers (Dar-Nimrod *et al.*, 2009; Lia, 2010) and for an examination of the
41
42 relationship between maximization and CLT (Luan and Li, 2017). The maximization
43
44 literature has consistently reported on the negative effect of maximization whereby
45
46 maximizers feel more regret when compared against satisficers (e.g., Besharat *et al.*, 2014;
47
48 Ma and Roese, 2014; Polman, 2010; Purvis *et al.* 2011; Schwartz *et al.*, 2002). However,
49
50 research has yet to provide a solution to alleviate the heightened feelings of regret suffered by
51
52 maximizers. The current research is the first to deliver such a relief for maximizers by
53
54 drawing on CLT and evidencing the beneficial effect of a fit (or match) between the
55
56 consumer's mindset (concrete vs. abstract construal) and the choice task (choice set:
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 comparable vs. noncomparable choices). Taken together, across three studies we found
4
5 support for our hypothesis that regret for maximizers can be attenuated when the choice set is
6
7 presented in a way that matches their current level of construal, or their default (concrete)
8
9
10 construal. Further, this beneficial effect for maximizers occurs through a reduction in the
11
12 perceived difficulty of making the choice. Moreover, our findings have practical relevance, as
13
14 consumers often face consumption choices that are presented as either comparable or
15
16 noncomparable. Given the default (concrete) mindset adopted by consumers, marketers need
17
18 to be aware of the detrimental effect on post choice regret by maximizers who are looking for
19
20 the best option across noncomparable choice sets. Our findings also show that if maximizers
21
22 are inadvertently induced into an abstract mindset (e.g., led to consider why they want to buy
23
24 the options on offer) when choosing across comparable options, heightened regret will ensue.
25
26
27
28

29
30 Our research adds to findings in construal level theory literature (Williams *et al.*,
31
32 2014) that found differences in the effects of psychological distance, and construal level, on
33
34 affect-based evaluations. In particular, Williams *et al.* (2014) showed that psychological
35
36 distance (i.e. closeness) affects the intensity of felt emotions with abstract (vs. concrete)
37
38 mindset affecting a (positive) valence shift. However, our results suggest a more complex
39
40 pattern of effects depending on the choice set being evaluated. Williams *et al.* (2014)
41
42 considered a range of scenarios that were not choice-based nor did they involve a comparison
43
44 among alternatives. Thus, our findings contribute to construal level theory by extending
45
46 insight into affective responses in decision-making contexts.
47
48
49

50
51 Our research builds on Cho *et al.*'s (2013) work that suggested the potential for a fit
52
53 effect in the context of choosing between comparable versus noncomparable options. Whilst
54
55 past studies mainly focused on fit effects between the level of construal of the task, object, or
56
57 framing of a message, and the goal orientation of the individual, our research addresses the
58
59 role of a fit between the consumer's (concrete vs. abstract) mindset and the contextual
60

1
2
3 demands of the task. In particular, the task of choosing between comparable options naturally
4
5 directs cognitive attention toward low level attribute-based comparisons (such as screen size,
6
7 processing speed, etc.), which are not afforded when comparing across noncomparable
8
9 options. Rather, deciding between noncomparable options requires higher level
10
11 considerations (such as how much pleasure or other benefits can be gained) that are less
12
13 influenced by the specific attributes of the options shown. Unfortunately for many marketers,
14
15 whether their products are offered in a comparable or noncomparable retail (in-store or
16
17 online) setting is often out of their control. As such, an understanding of the consequences of
18
19 a fit and non-fit between the consumers' mindset and the retail setting is important.
20
21 Moreover, past studies on fit effects focused on cognitive outcomes (such as attitudes and
22
23 purchase intention) with no attention paid to affective outcomes. Yet negative emotional
24
25 outcomes (such as regret) are important from a well-being as well as marketing management
26
27 perspective.
28
29
30
31
32

33 *Managerial implications*

34
35 Firms need to take into account the way in which consumers may categorise or compare their
36
37 product offerings. If their products are primarily grouped within distinct product categories
38
39 (e.g., mobile phones) where potential buyers are likely to make a choice across comparable
40
41 options, then a default (concrete) mindset would yield a match and serves their customers
42
43 well regardless of their tendency to maximise. The approach that many stores use to group
44
45 comparable products together (e.g., all hairdryers) should therefore work equally well for
46
47 maximizers and satisficers. However, for firms where customers are more likely to consider
48
49 options across product categories (e.g., weight loss solutions), it is then prudent to introduce a
50
51 mechanism whereby potential buyers are induced into a more abstract mindset. For example,
52
53 faced with a customer who is hunting for that perfect birthday present for a loved one, the
54
55 sales person should communicate higher level aspects related to the products on offer (such
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 as benefits and pleasures one might derive from each product, or the reasons to own said
4 product) and not focus on specific product features and other details such as how one would
5 go about using the product.
6
7
8
9

10 For e-marketing, an abstract mindset could be induced online by focusing on
11 benefits of the product (e.g., saves you time) rather than its features (e.g., has 10 settings).
12
13 Marketers could also make use of the psychological distances as a way of inducing an
14 abstract or concrete mindset. For instance, by changing the delivery timescale, (e.g., Cho *et*
15 *al.*, 2013), or suggesting narrow-appeal (e.g., perfect for you) versus broad-appeal (e.g., best
16 seller). Psychological distance can also be primed by using signal words in describing the
17 product (e.g., right now vs. in the long run; certain vs. likely; you vs. everyone).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Given the central role of choice difficulty, firms will need to take care that the
28 choice situation does not become perceived as complex and difficult. In particular, large
29 assortments likely lead to increased decision difficulty for maximizers as many more choice
30 evaluations need to be undertaken. New technology such as Amazon's Echo, with the ability
31 to ask Alexa, provides potential useful solutions for the problems associated with large
32 assortments. Alexa typically provides the consumer with the top three results for comparable
33 products, for instance in response to a shopping query on candle making kits. Hence,
34 reducing the difficulty in sifting through the 1000's of results available on Amazon.
35
36 However, if Alexa is asked for gift options for a baby shower, a list of many noncomparable
37 products from hoodies, baby carriers, photo albums, storage baskets, and quirky t-shirts is
38 provided. Furthermore, many online retailers allow consumers the option to compare a small
39 number of products directly on one screen. Such comparisons, although available for
40 noncomparable products (e.g. John Lewis allows comparisons across noncomparable
41 products such as a camcorder vs. headphones vs. pizza oven vs. tablet), make little sense
42 given that the product features are not directly comparable. Thus, these technological
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 innovations are less adept at providing reduced choice sets for noncomparable options.

4
5 Moreover, the reduced set of products suggested by Alexa may not suit maximizers as these
6
7 consumers would harbour doubts that they could have found a better option by searching
8
9 more extensively.
10

11
12
13 To reduce the complexity of the decision making process for maximizers, marketers
14
15 need to make clear the unique advantages of their product over others. One way this can be
16
17 achieved is through information on product updates or upgrades. For example, a search on
18
19 Amazon for Philips Sonicare toothbrush replacement heads, potential customers are notified
20
21 of newer 'improved' versions of some available products. Another tactic is the use of
22
23 recommendations. For example, Amazon now provides signages to categorize products as
24
25 best seller, most gifted, most wished for, recommended for you, as well as providing
26
27 endorsements such as Amazon's choice. These marketing tools can be useful in breaking
28
29 down the level of complexity in making choices and highlighting the most relevant products
30
31 for further comparison. Signal words such as 'best' and 'most' may appeal to maximizers's
32
33 quest for the 'best possible' option. However, caution must be heeded as research shows that
34
35 generic recommendation signages have the potential to increase decision difficulty unless
36
37 they are tailored to individual preferences and decision history (Goodman *et al.*, 2013).
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 Lastly, given that consumers are likely to adopt a concrete mindset as default and the
45
46 technological innovations and marketing tools discussed above are mostly applicable to
47
48 comparable products, marketers need to invest in alternative mechanisms that would induce
49
50 an abstract mindset for considerations across noncomparable products. To do so, marketers
51
52 could explore the ideas listed above (such as priming increased psychological distances or
53
54 leading the consumer to reflect on why they might want the product as opposed to how to buy
55
56 or use the product) or try more novel approaches. One such novel idea worth exploring is to
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 include a picture of bank notes on the website or promotion materials, as doing so has been
4
5 found to induce an abstract mindset (Hansen *et al.*, 2013).
6
7

8 *Limitations and future research directions*

9

10 The current research is not without limitations that open up numerous avenues for future
11 research. First, the research suffers from the problems generally associated with scenario-
12 based experiments, although non-student samples were used. The hypothetical and low
13 involvement nature of the scenarios adopted has likely led to overall low levels of choice
14 regret felt by participants. Future research should aim to replicate our findings using
15 alternative scenarios with high involvement products in a real-life field experiment. Second,
16 we assumed that the choice regret felt arose from self-blame as the choice scenarios did not
17 involve information regarding others. But future research should consider that regret can be
18 focused on self-blame or other-blame with Wu and Wang (2017) finding important
19 differences in negative emotions associated with these different conceptualisations of regret.
20 Third, despite replicating the findings using different manipulations of construal level,
21 researchers may wish to further replicate these findings using other psychological distance
22 manipulations (temporal, social, and spatial). Future research could also take into account
23 consumers' chronic level of construal in building on our modelled effects. Fourth, we did not
24 examine within our scenarios the possibility of allowing the consumer to change the choice
25 made. Future studies should explore the importance of choice reversibility, given that
26 maximizers are more satisfied with a decision when it is reversible (Shiner, 2015). Relatedly,
27 previous research has found negative emotions to lead to choice deferral (Garg *et al.*, 2017)
28 and therefore future studies could include the option of deferring to make a choice. Fifth, we
29 employed Schwartz *et al.*'s (2002) scale in two of our studies. It is important to note that this
30 scale, although still widely used in research, has been criticized because its items extend
31 beyond the definition of maximization theorized by the authors (see Dalal *et al.*, 2015; Diab
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *et al.*, 2008). As a result, several other maximization scales have been developed and future
4
5 research should assess if our findings hold across different ways of assessing maximization
6
7 orientation. Sixth, given the gain-framing of our scenarios, future research should examine if
8
9 a choice context that could be perceived as a negative event would lead to findings counter to
10
11 those reported in the current research. Lastly, we have used product options throughout our
12
13 studies. Future research could clarify if our findings would also apply to consumers making
14
15 choices across service offerings.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Anderson, R.E. (1973), "Consumer dissatisfaction: The effect of disconfirmed expectancy on perceived product performance", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 10, pp.38-44.
- Besharat, A., Ladik, D.M. and Carrillat, F.A. (2014), "Are maximizers blind to the future?", When today's best does not make for a better tomorrow", *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 25, pp. 77-91.
- Broniarczyk, S.M. and Griffin, J.G. (2014), "Decision difficulty in the age of consumer empowerment", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 608-625.
- Bui, M., Krishen, A.S. and Bates, K. (2011), "Modeling regret effects on consumer postpurchase decisions", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 45, pp.1068-1090.
- Chatterjee, S. and Heath, T.B. (1996), "Conflict and loss aversion in multiattribute choice: The effects of trade-off size and reference dependence on decision difficulty", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 67 No. 2, pp. 144-155.
- Cheek, N.N. and Schwartz, B. (2016), "On the meaning and measurement of maximization", *Judgement and Decision Making*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 126-146.
- Cho, E.K., Khan, U. and Dhar, R. (2013), "Comparing apples to apples or apples to oranges: The role of mental representation in choice difficulty", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 50 No. 4, pp. 505-516.
- Chowdhury, T.G., Ratneshwar, S. and Mohanty, P. (2009), "The time-harried shopper: Exploring the differences between maximizers and satisficers", *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 20, pp. 155-167.

- 1
2
3 Dalal, D.K., Diab, D.L., Zhu, X.S. and Hwang, T. (2015), "Understanding the construct of
4 maximizing tendency: A theoretical and empirical evaluation", *Journal of Behavioral*
5
6 *Decision Making*, Vol. 28 No. 5, pp. 437-450.
7
8
9
10
11 Dar-Nimrod, I., Rawn, C.D., Lehman, D.R. and Schwartz, B. (2009), "The maximization
12 paradox: The costs of seeking alternatives", *Personality and Individual Differences*,
13
14 Vol. 46 No. 5, pp. 631-635.
15
16
17
18 Diab, D.L., Gillespie, M.A. and Highhouse, S. (2008), "Are maximizers really unhappy? The
19 measurement of maximizing tendency", *Judgment and Decision Making*, Vol. 3, pp.
20
21 364–370.
22
23
24
25 Eyal, T., Liberman, N. and Trope, Y. (2009), "Psychological distance and consumer
26 behavior: A construal level theory perspective", in Wänke, M. (Ed), *Social Psychology*
27
28 *of Consumer Behavior*, Psychology Press, New York, NY, pp. 61-83.
29
30
31
32 Freitas, A.L., Gollwitzer, P.M. and Trope, Y. (2004), "The influence of abstract and concrete
33 mindsets on anticipating and guiding others' self-regulatory efforts", *Journal of*
34
35 *Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 40, pp. 739-752.
36
37
38
39 Garg, N., Inman, J.J. and Mittal, V. (2017), "Emotion effects on choice deferral: The
40 moderating role of outcome and process accountability", *European Journal of*
41
42 *Marketing*, Vol. 51 Issue: 9/10, pp.1631-1649.
43
44
45
46 Goodman, J.K., Broniarczyk, S.M., Griffin, J.G. and McAlister, L. (2013), "Help or hinder?
47 When recommendation signage expands consideration sets and heightens decision
48
49 difficulty", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 165-174.
50
51
52
53 Hamilton, R., Vohs, K., Sellier, A-L. and Meyvis, T. (2011), "Being of two minds: Switching
54
55 mindsets exhausts self-regulatory resources", *Organizational Behavior and Human*
56
57 *Decision Processes*, Vol. 115 No. 1, pp. 13-24.
58
59
60


- 1
2
3 Han, D., Duhachek, A. and Rucker, D.D. (2015), "Distinct threats, common remedies: How
4 consumers cope with psychological threat", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 25
5
6 No. 4, pp. 531-545.
7
8
9
- 10 Hansen, J., Kutzner, F. and Wänke, M. (2013), "Money and thinking: Reminders of money
11 trigger abstract construal and shape consumer judgments", *Journal of Consumer*
12
13 *Research*, Vol. 39 No. 6, pp. 1154-1166.
14
15
16
- 17 Hayes, A.F. (2017), *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis:*
18
19 *A regression based approach*, Second Edition, The Guilford Press, New York.
20
21
- 22 Huber, F., Köcher, S., Vogel, J. and Meyer, F. (2012), "Dazing diversity: Investigating the
23 determinants and consequences of decision paralysis", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol.
24
25 29 No. 6, pp. 467-478.
26
27
- 28 Inman, J., Dyer, J.S. and Jia, J. (1997), "A generalized utility model of disappointment and
29 regret effects on post-choice valuation", *Marketing Science*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp.97-111.
30
31
- 32 Irmak, C., Wakslak, C.J. and Trope, Y. (2013), "Selling the forest, buying the trees: The
33 effect of construal level on seller-buyer price discrepancy", *Journal of Consumer*
34
35 *Research*, Vol. 40 No. 2, pp. 284-297.
36
37
38
- 39 Iyengar, S.S., Wells, R.E. and Schwartz, B. (2006), "Doing better but feeling worse: Looking
40 for the "best" job undermines satisfaction", *Psychological Science*, Vol. 17, pp. 143-
41
42 150.
43
44
45
- 46 Jin, L. and He, Y. (2013), "Designing service guarantees with construal fit: Effects of
47 temporal distance on consumer responses to service guarantees", *Journal of Service*
48
49 *Research*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 202-215.
50
51
52
- 53 Khan, U., Zhu, M. and Kalra, A. (2011), "When trade-offs matter: The effect of choice
54 construal on context effects", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 48, pp. 62-71.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kim, H., Rao, A.R. and Lee, A.Y. (2009), "It's time to vote: The effect of matching message
4 orientation and temporal frame on political persuasion", *Journal of Consumer*
5
6 *Research*, Vol. 35 No. 6, pp. 877-889.
7
8
9
- 10 Lee, A.Y., Keller, P.A. and Sternthal, B. (2010), "Value from regulatory construal fit: The
11 persuasive impact of fit between consumer goals and message concreteness", *Journal*
12
13 *of Consumer Research*, Vol. 36 No. 5, pp. 735-747.
14
15
16
- 17 Lia, L. (2010), "Maximizing without difficulty: A modified maximizing scale and its
18 correlates", *Judgement and Decision Making*, Vol. 5, pp. 164-175.
19
20
21
- 22 Liberman, N. and Förster, J. (2009), "Distancing from experienced self: How global-versus-
23 local perception affects estimation of psychological distance", *Journal of Personality*
24
25 *and Social Psychology*, Vol. 97, pp. 203-216.
26
27
28
- 29 Luan, M. and Li, H. (2017), "Good enough—compromise between desirability and
30 feasibility: An alternative perspective on satisficing", *Journal of Experimental Social*
31
32 *Psychology*, Vol. 70, pp. 110-116.
33
34
35
- 36 Ma, J. and Roese, N.J. (2014), "The maximizing mind-set", *Journal of Consumer Research*,
37
38 Vol. 41, pp. 71-92.
39
40
41
- 42 Malkoc, S.A., Zauberger, G. and Ulu, C. (2005), "Consuming now or later? The interactive
43 effect of timing and attribute alignability", *Psychological Science*, Vol. 16, pp. 411–
44
45 417.
46
47
48
- 49 Malkoc, S.A., Zauberger, G. and Bettman, J.R. (2010), "Unstuck from the concrete:
50 Carryover effects of abstract mindsets in intertemporal preferences", *Organizational*
51
52 *Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 113 No. 2, pp. 112-126.
53
54
55
- 56 Page, C. and Herr, P.M. (2002), "An investigation of the processes by which product design
57 and brand strength interact to determine initial affect and quality judgments", *Journal*
58
59 *of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 133-147.
60

- 1
2
3 Pieters, R. and Zeelenberg, M. (2007), "A theory of regret regulation 1.1", *Journal of*
4
5 *Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 29-35.
6
7
8 Polman, E. (2010), "Why are maximizers less happy than satisficers? Because they maximize
9
10 positive and negative outcomes", *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, Vol. 23, pp.
11
12 179-190.
13
14
15 Purvis, A., Howell, R.T. and Iyer, R. (2011), "Exploring the role of personality in the
16
17 relationship between maximization and well-being", *Personality and Individual*
18
19 *Differences*, Vol. 50, pp. 370-375.
20
21
22 Saffrey, C., Summerville, A. and Roese, N.J. (2008), "Praise for regret: People value regret
23
24 above other negative emotions", *Motivation and Emotion*, Vol. 32, pp. 46-54.
25
26
27 Sagi, A., and Friedland, N. (2007), "The cost of richness: The effect of the size and diversity
28
29 of decision sets on post-decision regret", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,
30
31 Vol. 93, pp. 515-524.
32
33
34 Schwartz, B., Ward, A., Monterosso, J., Lyubomirsky, S., White, K. and Lehman, D. (2002),
35
36 "Maximizing versus satisficing: Happiness is a matter of choice", *Journal of*
37
38 *Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 83, pp. 1178-1197.
39
40
41 Shiner, R.L. (2015), "Maximizers, satisficers, and their satisfaction with and preferences for
42
43 reversible versus irreversible decisions", *Social Psychological and Personality Science*,
44
45 Vol. 6 No. 8, pp. 896-903.
46
47
48
49 Smith, P.K., Wigboldus, D.H.J. and Dijksterhuis, A. (2008), "Abstract thinking increases
50
51 one's sense of power", *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 44, pp. 378-
52
53 385.
54
55
56 Spassova, G. and Lee, A.Y. (2013), "Looking into the future: A match between self-view and
57
58 temporal distance", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 159-171.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Taylor, K. (1997), "A regret theory approach to assessing consumer satisfaction", *Marketing*
4
5 *Letters*, Vol 8 No. 2, pp. 229-238.
6
7
8 Trope, Y. and Liberman, N. (2010), "Construal-level theory of psychological distance",
9
10 *Psychological Review*, Vol. 117 No. 2, pp. 440-463.
11
12 Tsiros, M. and Mittal, V. (2000), "Regret: A model of its antecedents and consequences in
13
14 consumer decision making", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 401-
15
16 417.
17
18
19 Wakslak, C.J., Trope, Y., Liberman, N. and Alony, R. (2006), "Seeing the forest when entry
20
21 is unlikely: Probability and the mental representation of events", *Journal of*
22
23 *Experimental Psychology: General*, Vol. 135, pp. 641-653.
24
25
26 Williams, L., Stein, R. and Galguera, L. (2014), "The distinct affective consequences of
27
28 psychological distance and construal level", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 40,
29
30 pp. 1123-1138.
31
32
33 Wu, R. and Wang, C.L. (2017), "The asymmetric impact of other-blame regret versus self-
34
35 blame regret on negative word of mouth: Empirical evidence from China", *European*
36
37 *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 51 Issue: 11/12, pp.1799-1816.
38
39
40 Yao, Q. and Chen, R. (2014), "Gift cards and gifted cash: The impact of fit between gift type
41
42 and message construal", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 90 No. 4, pp. 481-492.
43
44
45 Zeelenberg, M. and Pieters, R. (2007), "A theory of regret regulation 1.0", *Journal of*
46
47 *Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 17, pp. 3-18.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. Conceptual framework



Journal of Marketing

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Figure 2.** Study 1: Maximization \times choice set on post choice regret
4






Figure 3. Study 2: Maximization \times choice set \times construal level (how/why) on post choice regret



Notes: Maximizers (84th percentile), Satisficers (16th percentile)

Figure 4. Study 3: Maximization \times choice set \times construal level (hypotheticality high/low) on post choice regret



Notes: Maximizers (84th percentile), Satisficers (16th percentile)

Appendix 1. Maximizing versus satisficing priming

Items to prime maximizing have a dark circle and items to prime satisficing have a clear circle.

- Please choose the male actor you think has the best acting skill: (choose only one)
- Please choose the male actor(s) whose acting skill you think is good enough? (choose at least one)
 - Robert De Niro
 - Tom Hanks
 - Denzel Washington
 - Morgan Freeman
 - Matt Damon
- Please choose the country you think is the best place to visit: (choose only one)
- Please choose the countries you think would be acceptable to visit: (choose at least one)
 - Belgium
 - Denmark
 - The Netherlands
 - Sweden
 - Norway
- Please choose the university you think offers the best education: (choose only one)
 - Harvard
 - Yale
 - Princeton
 - UPenn
 - Columbia
- Please choose the universities you think are affordable to study at: (choose at least one)
 - The Ohio State University
 - Boston College
 - University of Phoenix
 - University of Washington-Seattle
 - University of Delaware
- Please choose the industry sector you think offers the best job: (choose only one)
- Please choose the industry sector(s) you think offers jobs that pay well enough to live on: (choose at least one)
 - Professional and business services
 - State and local government
 - Charitv / non-profit (Non Governmental Organization)
 - Health care and social assistance
 - Manufacturing
- Please choose the type of pet you think is the smartest: (choose only one)
- Please choose the pets that you would be willing to live with: (choose at least one)
 - rabbit
 - hamster

- 1
2
3
4 - turtle
5 - fish
6 - cat
7 ● Please choose the best snack for you: (choose only one)
8 ○ Please choose snack(s) that are good enough to eat: (choose at least one)
9
10 - a piece of fruit
11 - cookie
12 - chocolate
13 - yogurt
14 - popcorn
15 ● Please choose the best thing to do during a lunch break: (choose only one)
16 ○ Please choose the things you wouldn't mind doing during a lunch break: (choose at
17 least one)
18 - go for a walk or exercise
19 - catch up on social media
20 - go shopping
21 - play a game
22 - listen to music
23 ● Please choose the best gift to take to a dinner party: (choose only one)
24 ○ Please choose gift(s) that are acceptable to take to a dinner party: (choose at least one)
25 - wine
26 - house plant
27 - candles
28 - flowers
29 - gourmet coffee
30 ● Please choose the best thing to do on a night out: (choose only one)
31 ○ Please choose the things you find acceptable to do on a night out: (choose at least one)
32 - cinema
33 - meal at restaurant
34 - theatre
35 - bowling
36 - bar
37 ● Please state the best movie you have ever watched:
38 ○ Please state a movie you have recently watched that was good enough to recommend
39 to a friend:
40 ● Please state what you consider the best day trip you can have:
41 ○ Please state what you would consider as an OK/acceptable day trip to go on:
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix 2. List of attributes used in Experiment 2 and 3

Comparable

| Product features | Towel option A | Towel option B |
|----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Organic | 100% organic | 20% organic |
| Fair trade | No | Yes |
| Weight (g/m ²) | 550 gsm | 700 gsm |
| Absorbent | Super absorbent | Absorbent |
| Pile | Short pile | Deep pile |
| Colour | Cream | Cream |

Noncomparable

| Option A - towels | Option B - wine |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Colour: Classic cream | 750 ml each |
| Super absorbent and luxurious | 3 red and 3 white |
| Weight 550 g/m ² | Country of origin: Various |
| Machine washable at 40° C | Fairtrade certified |
| 100% organic cotton | Organic |
| Fairtrade certified | Suitable for all occasions |