Levi Sassaman University at Albany, State University of New York

Abstract

Recently, Cheek & Schwartz (2016) proposed a model of maximizing tendency that defines a maximizer as someone with both a maximizing goal (i.e., high standards) and maximizing strategy (i.e., high search). Across two studies, we tested the implied interaction of standards and search. Using archival data, Study 1 found no support for the proposed interaction effects across 16 outcome variables. To resolve questions regarding the alternative search measure from Study 1, we developed a new measure of alternative search to include in the interaction effect. Initial results from the second study likewise fail to uncover the proposed interactions.

Introduction

Maximizing Tendency

- Maximizing Tendency is a decision style described as the refusal to satisfice on decisions, and a need to meet a high standard (Diab et al., 2008).
- Research debating the nature of maximizing has become centered around the construct of Alternative Search.
- One model defines a maximizer as someone who exhibits both high standards and high search (Cheek & Schwartz, 2016).
- Another model defines a maximizer solely as an individual with high standards (Dalal et al., 2015).
- Both theoretical arguments derive support from the work of Herbert Simon (1955, 1956). However, thus far the maximizing strategy-maximizing goal model have not beer empirically tested.
- Study 1 was an initial test of the two proposed models of Maximizing Tendency using archival data.
- Study 2 was a follow up test of the proposed model using revised measure of Alternative Search that was designed using domain sampling techniques.

Strategy-Goal Model

Theoretical Proposition:

- Maximizing tendency encompasses a decision goal (i.e., High Standards) and a decision strategy (i.e. Alternative Search).
- Maximizing means being high on both.

Hypothesis:

High standards will interact with alternative search to predict decision outcomes, such that those who are high on both will exhibit maximizing behaviors.

Who are Maximizers, Really?

ATALBANY State University of New York

UNIVERSITY

Study 1

Procedure

- University students (N = 81).
- Self-reported maximizing tendency (MTS), alternative search (MS-AS), and outcomes (Table 1).

Results and Discussion

- There was no significant interaction effect found between High Standards and Alternative Search for any of the outcomes
- No initial support for the proposed interactive relation.
- Some concerns over the measure of alternative search. • Study 2:
 - develops a new measure of alternative search.
 - Provides initial test of the interactions with the new measure.

Table: Outcomes and expected relations

h	Outcome Variable	Expected Relation
۵	STUDY 1	
	Time in search	Maximizers > Satisficers
S	Count of information searched	Maximizers > Satisficers
, - ,	Proportion of information searched	Maximizers > Satisficers
1	Number of options for which at least one dimension was searched	Maximizers > Satisficers
f e 1	Number of dimensions for which at least one options was searched	Maximizers > Satisficers
	Searching all of one dimension	Maximizers > Satisficers
of	Searching all of one option	Maximizers > Satisficers
a d	Search variability	Maximizers < Satisficers
	Number of times shifted across dimensions and options	Maximizers > Satisficers
	Employing a strategic search	Maximizers > Satisficers
	Asking to see more options	Maximizers > Satisficers
	Switching from an initial decision	Maximizers > Satisficers
	Total time to make a decision	Maximizers > Satisficers
,	Indecisiveness	Maximizers > Satisficers
	STUDY 2	
	Indecisiveness	Maximizers > Satisficers
C	Rational decision making	Maximizers > Satisficers
2	Intuitive decision making	Maximizers < Satisficers
	Need for cognition	Maximizers > Satisficers

Dev K. Dalal

University at Albany, State University of New York

Study 2: Scale Development

Item Development and Refinement

- about the options in the decision set."
- Eight individuals wrote an initial 32 items.
- Subject Matter Experts (N = 14, Mean Age = 37.71 years; SD = 9.29 years) were asked rate match of 32 items to construct definition.
- Items with a mean rating of 4 or less were removed from the scale.
- Twenty items remained for further evaluations.

- An EFA (N=253) was conducted on the 20 remaining items:
- 2 Items were removed for dual factor loading
- 1 Item was removed because it was specific to the school domain "I collect information about classes before I register"
- Additional items were removed in order of lowest factor loading to make scale length manageable for future studies
- Final scale was 13 items with alpha .90

Study 2: Test of Proposition

- alternative search measure, and outcomes (Table 1).

Results and Discussion

General Discussion

- Two models of maximizing tendency have been proposed: • Model 1: High standards model
- Model 2: Strategy-Goal model
- Whereas past research has found support for Model 1, no empirical evidence has directly tested Model 2.
- Initial empirical evidence does not seem to support Model 2.
- Across two studies, utilizing different measures of alternative search, and with different behavioral and self-report outcomes, the proposed interaction from Model 2 was not supported.
- Based on these initial research findings, the high standards model seems to explain maximizing tendency best.
- Limitations & Future Directions:
 - Replication and cross-validation of alternative search scale is needed.
 - new alternative search measure.

• Construct definition: "Alternative Search is the tendency to search for alternative options to form a decision set, and/or to collect information

Item Analysis

Procedure

• University students (N = 253, Mean Age = 19.04 years; SD = 2.36 years) • Participants self-reported maximizing tendency (MTS), the new

• Like study 1, there were no significant interactions between High Standards and Alternative Search for the outcomes as would be expected according to the strategy-goal model of maximizing.

• Future research should explore more behavioral outcomes with the