Comparability research

* Trueblood et al 2014 MLBA
  + each option accumulates evidence through pairwise comparisons to all other available options. This comparison is modulated by several processes, such as distance in attribute space and extremeness aversion.
* Chang & Liu 2008
  + Chang & Liu (2008) tested the compromise effect (see Chapter 1) by varying the display. In the compromise effect, a “middle” ground option decreases the choice share of two dissimilar, “extreme” options. Chang & Liu displayed the options either by-alternative format, where option names are listed as columns while attribute values are listed as rows, or by-attribute, where option attributes are columns while option names are rows. The former display makes it more difficult to compare options on a single attribute, while the latter makes it easier. Chang & Liu found that listing options by-attribute increased the choice share of the compromise option, relative to a by-alternative display
* Cataldo & Cohen 2019
  + Cataldo & Cohen (2019) replicated this result, also finding that a by-alternative format nullified the attraction effect. The authors attributed this result to a “flexible comparison process”, where the comparison strategy is to some extent dictated by display format. According to this account, the by-attribute format increases the ease of target-decoy comparisons relative to the by-alternative format.
  + Include footnote about Hasan et al
* Noguchi & Stewart 2014
  + studied context effects using eye-tracking, showing that people tend to compare pairs of options on a single attribute, and that this appears to drive the attraction effect. They also found that transitions between two options are negatively related to the choice share of a third option.
* Trueblood et al 2023
  + re-analyzed previously collected context effect data (Trueblood et al., 2015) by examining the order of the options on the screen. They found that the attraction effect was strongest when the target and decoy were next to each other, while the effect was weak (or even nullified) when the options were separated spatially. Evans, Holmes, Dasari, & Trueblood (2021) found a similar result in perceptual choice, though in their experiment the options were separated both spatially and temporally.
* Hayes, Holmes, & Trueblood (2023) manipulated attribute comparability, such that the dimensions of each option were either measured in the same unit (high comparability, e.g., 0-10 ratings) or in different units (low comparability, e.g., CPU speed vs. RAM for laptops). They found that the attraction effect only occurred in the low comparability condition.
* Hsee & colleagues (Hsee, 1996, 1998; Hsee & LeClerc, 1998; Hsee, Loewenstein, Blount, & Bazerman, 1999) have also shown that the comparison of options affects consumer behavior. For example, they repeatedly showed that participants’ evaluation of a given option can change with the addition of a reference point (i.e., lower valued options improve with a high reference point and vice versa). That is, participants’ judgments are different when options are evaluated jointly, compared to separately (Hsee et al, 1999).
* Cataldo & Cohen 2018 show that presenting options in a format that encourages within-dimension comparisons on pairs of options can reverse the well-studied similarity effect.
* Landry & Webb 2021
  + Choice model based on neural compuations that suggests that option value is coded relative to relative to the value of each other option in the choice set see also Louie et al 2013, Gluth et al 2020, Gluth et al 2020b, Webb et al 2020).