



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Mahmood, A., Guo, B. & Sismeiro, C. S. (2016). Choice Overload or Time Stress: What Determines Purchase Decisions for Airline Tickets?. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 44, pp. 548-550.

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://city-ref-test.eprints-hosting.org/id/eprint/15972/>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

Choice Overload or Time Stress: What Determines Purchase Decisions for Airline Tickets?

Dr. Ammara Mahmood is a Lecturer in Marketing at Cass Business School, City University London

106 Bunhill Row, London EC1Y 8TZ, the United Kingdom

Ammara.Mahmood.1@city.ac.uk

Boshuo Guo is a PhD Student in Marketing at Imperial Business School, Imperial College London

Level 2, Tanaka Building, South Kensington Campus

London SW7 2AZ, the United Kingdom

boshuo.guo12@imperial.ac.uk

Dr. Catarina Sismeiro is an Associate Professor in Marketing at Imperial Business School, Imperial College London

Level 2, Tanaka Building, South Kensington Campus

London SW7 2AZ, the United Kingdom

c.sismeiro@imperial.ac.uk

Abstract

Previous research has identified choice overload as a potential cause for purchase deferral. Researchers suggest that the decision difficulties and frustration consumers experience when processing significant amounts of information can lead to decision avoidance and have also found that, consistent with such explanation, that time constraints act as a moderator: approaching deadlines seems to amplify choice overload due to an increased cognitive burden. Identifying moderators of choice overload and discovering contexts in which choice overload occurs is a promising research direction and more importantly it is still unclear whether this phenomenon exists in real business contexts. With the present study, we address this gap and study the interaction between assortment size and time constraints in a purchase context dominated by uncertainty. We conducted two studies to investigate how number of options and time pressure influence purchase decisions. Past research in time effects vary in understanding of time pressure and focus on either real decision deadlines (physical time) or subjective feeling of pressure associated with time (sense of urgency or psychological time). We test both the moderating effect of physical time and psychological time and compare their impact.

In Study 1, we investigate the effect of number of choices and purchase deadlines (physical time limit) on consumers' purchase decisions using secondary data on consumers' purchase and search of airline tickets. We collected secondary data from a European online travel agency, an ideal context with large number of options and in which both deadlines and subjective feeling of time pressure can have influence on people's decisions. Our results are consistent with the presence of choice overload: we find a negative relationship between number of options and purchase probability. Due to nature and detail of the data, we are also able to exclude alternative explanations including option filtering as consumers go through the purchase funnel. However, our results suggest an alternative mechanism behind the choice-overload phenomenon. We then test for the potential moderating effect of time pressure: further away from departure we expect consumers to experience little if any time pressure leaving sufficient cognitive resources to process the available information as a result choice overload is less likely to impact purchase. In contrast we find that further away from departure the negative effect of having more options is stronger. This means that purchase deferral is more likely when consumers face greater options far from departure. Closer to departure, the negative impact of number of options is not as strong. These results suggest that it is likely that number of options, though negatively impacting purchase decision (i.e., leading to a postponed purchase) is not the result of choice overload but perhaps the result of other alternative psychological mechanisms. This mechanism is the temporal shift of choice preferences. While processing information of an activity in a near future, decision makers tend to use a lower level construal that is more concrete, detailed and includes "contextual and incidental features" (Trope and Liberman, 2003) of the activity. Decision makers prefer the desirability to the feasibility of a decision outcome when they are distant from the decision deadline, because decision makers are able to postpone their choice till they are closer to the decision deadline and therefore postpone thinking of the information that can be used to evaluate the feasibility of the decision, such as details, concrete aspects and context of the decision. When the decision deadline approaches, however, decision makers prefer feasibility to desirability. In the context of purchasing airline tickets online, desirability of a decision is finding an ideal option such as lowest price, most convenient departure / arrival time etc. Feasibility of the decision, however, is to have one airline ticket before planned departure date and avoid missing the travel

plan. The interaction between number of options and decision time limit (number of days till planned travel date) has a negative effect on purchase probabilities. This negative effect indicates that when purchase deadline is distant and there are numerous options, customers tend to construct a higher-level construal and are attracted by desirability of the decision and therefore prefer to defer choice and continue to search for the best option. While purchase deadlines are near or number of options decrease, customers form a lower-level construal, prefer feasibility of the decision and are more likely to make a purchase to avoid having no options or missing planned travel dates. The uncertainty regarding alternatives and recent price changes, seem to contribute to shifts to lower-level construal. We find also that consumers' subjective sense of urgency, or *psychological time*, has a greater impact on this shift than physical time and the number of options. Despite controls for heterogeneous personal characteristics that may influence people's psychological time pressure, these effects exist.

In Study 2, we conducted an experiment to further verify the effect of sense of urgency. We constructed a mock website of an online travel agency, providing either 6 or 12 options of flight tickets to choose from. We set up two planned travel dates (purchase deadlines) for participants: 7 days till departure and 30 days till departure. We randomly assign participants to each of these departure dates. In order to manipulate sense of urgency, we established four scenarios of scarcity: flight departure in 7 days; flight departure in 7 days with limited seats available; flight departure in 30 days; flight departure in 30 days with limited seats available. An icon of "3 seats left" was shown to participants in scenarios of scarcity for example a scenario of "flight departure in 7 days with limited seats". Participants' sense of urgency of making a purchase will be activated when customers observe this scarcity icon. These scenarios were randomly presented to participants. Participants were asked to make a decision of either "Confirm and Purchase Now" or "Cancel and Make Purchase Later" on last page of this mock website. 205 respondents show that in scenarios with same level of scarcity, average purchase rate is higher when purchase deadline is near (7 days till departure) than when deadline is distant away. However, both scenarios with scarcity have higher purchase rates than scenarios without scarcity. Our experimental results verify that while decision time limit moderates the effect of number of options on purchase decisions, perceptions of time stress play a greater role in changing behaviour.

Through this study we highlight that a sense of urgency or *psychological time* play a significant role both in the shift of decision makers' temporal construal levels and in moderating the impact of number of options on purchase deferral. We also suggested that the shift of consumers' temporal construal levels is the mechanism behind the choice overload effect in a context where customers have a purchase deadline. As information gathered while searching could influence the perceived time pressure resulting in a sense of urgency and a shift to prevention focus resulting in less choice deferral despite large assortments. Thus there is a close association between a consumer's real or psychological perceptions of time and assortment size. Our findings suggest that managers can manipulate consumers' sense of urgency by showing different numbers of options, different varieties, price increase/decrease to customers in order to decrease choice deferrals.

References

- Anderson, C. 2007, *The long tail: how endless choice is creating unlimited demand*, Random House.
- Ariely, D. & Levav, J. 2000, "Sequential choice in group settings: Taking the road less traveled and less enjoyed", *Journal of consumer Research*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 279-290.
- Bettman, J. R., Luce, M. F., & Payne, J. W. 1998, "Constructive consumer choice processes", *Journal of consumer research*, 25(3), 187-217.
- Boatwright, P. & Nunes, J.C. 2001, "Reducing assortment: An attribute-based approach", *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 50-63.
- Brynjolfsson, E., Dick, A.A. & Smith, M.D. 2010, "A nearly perfect market?", *QME*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1-33.
- Carmon, Z., Wertenbroch, K. & Zeelenberg, M. 2003, "Option attachment: When deliberating makes choosing feel like losing", *Journal of Consumer research*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 15-29.
- Chernev, A. 2005, "Feature complementarity and assortment in choice", *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 748-759.
- Chernev, A., Böckenholt, U. & Goodman, J. 2010, "Commentary on Scheibehenne, Greifeneder, and Todd choice overload: Is there anything to it?", *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 426-428.
- Cottle, T.J. 1976, *Perceiving time: A psychological investigation with men and women*, Wiley New York.
- De los Santos, B. 2008, "Consumer search on the internet", *Available at SSRN 1285773, Working Paper*.
- Dhar, R. 1996, "The effect of decision strategy on deciding to defer choice", *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 265-281.
- Dhar, R. & Nowlis, S.M. 1999, "The effect of time pressure on consumer choice deferral", *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 369-384.
- Diehl, K. 2005, "When two rights make a wrong: Searching too much in ordered environments", *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 313-322.
- Diehl, K., Kornish, L.J. & Lynch, J.G. 2003, "Smart agents: When lower search costs for quality information increase price sensitivity", *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 56-71.
- Diehl, K. & Poynor, C. 2010, "Great expectations? Assortment size, expectations, and satisfaction", *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 312-322.
- Erdem, T. & Keane, M.P., 1996. "Decision-making under uncertainty: Capturing dynamic brand choice processes in turbulent consumer goods markets." *Marketing science*, 15(1), pp.1-20.
- Gorn, G.J., Chattopadhyay, A., Sengupta, J. & Tripathi, S. 2004, "Waiting for the web: how screen color affects time perception", *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 215-225.
- Hamermesh, D.S. & Lee, J. 2007, "Stressed out on four continents: Time crunch or yuppie kvetch?", *The review of economics and statistics*, vol. 89, no. 2, pp. 374-383.
- Haynes, G.A. 2009, "Testing the boundaries of the choice overload phenomenon: The effect of number of options and time pressure on decision difficulty and satisfaction", *Psychology & Marketing*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 204-212.
- Hoch, S.J., Bradlow, E.T. & Wansink, B. 1999, "The variety of an assortment", *Marketing Science*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 527-546.

- Hornik, J. 1984, "Subjective vs. objective time measures: A note on the perception of time in consumer behavior", *Journal of Consumer Research*, , pp. 615-618.
- Inbar, Y., Botti, S. & Hanks, K. 2011, "Decision speed and choice regret: When haste feels like waste", *Journal of experimental social psychology*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 533-540.
- Iyengar, S.S., Huberman, G. & Jiang, W. 2004, "How much choice is too much? Contributions to 401 (k) retirement plans", *Pension design and structure: New lessons from behavioral finance*, pp. 83-95.
- Iyengar, S.S. & Lepper, M.R. 2000, "When choice is demotivating: Can one desire too much of a good thing?", *Journal of personality and social psychology*, vol. 79, no. 6, pp. 995.
- Jacobson, R. & Obermiller, C., 1990. "The formation of expected future price: A reference price for forward-looking consumers." *Journal of Consumer Research*, pp.420-432.
- Kaplan, M.F., Wanshula, L.T. & Zanna, M.P. 1993, "Time pressure and information integration in social judgment" in *Time pressure and stress in human judgment and decision making* Springer, pp. 255-267.
- Keough, K.A., Zimbardo, P.G. & Boyd, J.N. 1999, "Who's smoking, drinking, and using drugs? Time perspective as a predictor of substance use", *Basic and applied social psychology*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 149-164.
- Ku, H., Kuo, C. & Kuo, T. 2012, "The effect of scarcity on the purchase intentions of prevention and promotion motivated consumers", *Psychology & Marketing*, vol. 29, no. 8, pp. 541-548.
- Lemieux, J. and Peterson, R.A., 2011, "Purchase deadline as a moderator of the effects of price uncertainty on search duration." *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 32(1), pp.33-44.
- Liberman, N. & Trope, Y. 1998, "The role of feasibility and desirability considerations in near and distant future decisions: A test of temporal construal theory.", *Journal of personality and social psychology*, vol. 75, no. 1, pp. 5.
- Maule, A.J. & Edland, A.C. 1997, "The effects of time pressure on human judgment and decision making", *Decision making: Cognitive models and explanations*, , pp. 189-204.
- Maule, A.J., Hockey, G.R.J. & Bdzola, L. 2000, "Effects of time-pressure on decision-making under uncertainty: changes in affective state and information processing strategy", *Acta Psychologica*, vol. 104, no. 3, pp. 283-301.
- Mogilner, C., Rudnick, T. & Iyengar, S.S. 2008, "The mere categorization effect: How the presence of categories increases choosers' perceptions of assortment variety and outcome satisfaction", *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 202-215.
- Northcraft, G.B. & Neale, M.A. 1986, "Opportunity costs and the framing of resource allocation decisions", *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 348-356.
- Payne, J.W., Bettman, J.R. & Johnson, E.J. 1993, *The adaptive decision maker*, Cambridge University Press.
- Rastegary, H. & Landy, F.J. 1993, "The interactions among time urgency, uncertainty, and time pressure" in *Time pressure and stress in human judgment and decision making* Springer, , pp. 217-239.
- Reed, D.D., Reed, F.D.D., Chok, J. & Brozyna, G.A. 2011, "The" tyranny of choice": Choice overload as a possible instance of effort discounting", *The Psychological Record*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 547.

- Reutskaja, E. & Hogarth, R.M. 2009, "Satisfaction in choice as a function of the number of alternatives: When "goods satiate"", *Psychology & Marketing*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 197-203.
- Sagristano, M.D., Trope, Y. & Liberman, N. 2002, "Time-dependent gambling: odds now, money later.", *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, vol. 131, no. 3, pp. 364.
- Scheibehenne, B., Greifeneder, R. & Todd, P.M. 2010, "Can there ever be too many options? A meta-analytic review of choice overload", *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 409-425.
- Schwartz, B. 2004, "The paradox of choice", *Why More is Less*. New York, .
- Simon, H.A. 1957, "The compensation of executives", *Sociometry*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 32-35.
- Simon, H.A. 1956, "Rational choice and the structure of the environment.", *Psychological review*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 129.
- Simon, H.A. 1955, "A behavioral model of rational choice", *The quarterly journal of economics* , pp. 99-118.
- Smith, M.D. & Brynjolfsson, E. 2001, "Consumer decision- making at an Internet shopbot: Brand still matters", *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 541-558.
- Suri, R. & Monroe, K.B. 2003, "The effects of time constraints on consumers' judgments of prices and products", *Journal of consumer research*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 92-104.
- Thomas, E.A. & Weaver, W.B. 1975, "Cognitive processing and time perception", *Perception & psychophysics*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 363-367.
- Trope, Y. & Liberman, N. 2003, "Temporal construal," *Psychological review*, vol. 110, no. 3, pp. 403.
- Urbany, J.E., 1986. "An experimental examination of the economics of information". *Journal of Consumer Research*, pp.257-271.
- Wright, P. 1974, "The harassed decision maker: Time pressures, distractions, and the use of evidence.", *Journal of applied psychology*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 555.
- Zakay, D. 2014, "Psychological time as information: the case of boredom", *Frontiers in psychology*, vol. 5, pp. 917.
- Zur, H.B. & Breznitz, S.J. 1981, "The effect of time pressure on risky choice behavior", *Acta Psychologica*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 89-104.

Table 1 Summary Statistics of Main Variables of Study One

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation
Predicted price	146.33	60.86
Price standard deviation among available options	24.75	35.63
Number of available flight options	6.80	4.12
Days till departure (real decision time constraint)	38.97	42.83
Price change since last search	1.93	48.38

Table 2 Research Result of Study One: Model Parameters

Variable	Model1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Predicted price		-0.02* [-0.024, -0.021]	-0.015* [-0.017 -0.012]	-0.017* [-0.019,-0.015]	-0.024** [-0.027, -0.022]
Standard deviation in Price			-0.085* [-0.104, -0.065]	-0.106* [-0.124, -0.087]	-0.126** [-0.136, -0.118)]
Number of options	-0.24* [-0.247, -0.218]		-0.133* [-0.154, -0.106]	-0.0119* [-0.139, -0.095]	-0.111** [-0.162 -0.069]
Price change since last search			0.010* [-0.09, -0.012]	0.010* [0.009, 0.012]	0.008** [0.004, 0.011]
Days till departure		-0.003* [-0.004, -0.002]		-0.001 [-0.013, 0.001]	0.015** [0.008, 0.020]
Days till departure × number of options					-0.004** [-0.005, -0.003]
Days till departure × price standard deviation among available options					-0.0019** [-0.002, -0.0015]
Days till departure × price change since last search					0.0001** [0.000, 0.001]
DIC	23,801.29	24,344.47	20,252.79	19,807.79	16,518.47

Note: The results include means of individual specific parameters. Route dummies for not included in the interest of space. * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Table 3 Research Result of Study Two: Difference among Scenarios

Scenario	N	Mean	Mean diff.	t-value	Significance
6 options	412	0.80	0.03	1.098	0.272
	408	0.83			
12 options					
30 days	410	0.77	0.09	3.335	0.001***
	410	0.86			
7 days					
Without urgency	410	0.75	0.13	4.625	0.000***
	410	0.88			
With urgency					

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Table 4 Research of Study Two: Influence of Sense of Urgency in each Scenario

Assortment	Scenario	N	Mean	Mean diff.	t-value	Significance
6	30 days	103	0.68	0.11	1.882	0.063
	7 days	103	0.79			
	30 days scarcity	103	0.83	0.06	1.421	0.158
	7 days scarcity	103	0.89			
	30 days	103	0.68	0.15	3.152	0.002***
	30 days scarcity	103	0.83			
	7 days	103	0.79	0.10	2.593	0.011***
	7 days scarcity	103	0.89			
	30 days	102	0.72	0.10	2.076	0.040***
	7days	102	0.82			
	30 days scarcity	102	0.84	0.09	2.563	0.012***

12	7 days scarcity	102	0.93			
	30 days	102	0.72	0.08	2.570	0.012***
	30 days scarcity	102	0.84			
	7 days	102	0.82	0.11	2.945	0.004***
	7 days scarcity	102	0.93			

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$