Karlsruhe Institute of Technology



FONDS NATIONAL SUISSE Schweizerischer Nationalfonds FONDO NAZIONALE SVIZZERO **Swiss National Science Foundation**  Preregistered on

# The Influence of Option Complexity on Risky **Judgment and Choice**

Yvonne Oberholzer<sup>1</sup>, Sebastian Olschewski<sup>2</sup>, Benjamin Scheibehenne<sup>1</sup>

(1) Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (2) University of Warwick

**Contact: Zoom Office Hours** yvonne.oberholzer@kit.edu @YvonneOberholz



## Results

Main Effects (Bayesian MLM):

#### Abstract

In two studies, we investigated the influence of option complexity (i.e. number of outcomes) on valuations and choice. We found that complexity was disliked especially in choice (-7.5% value), but also in valuations (-3.3% value).

### Introduction

Previous research revealed that complexity is disliked in risky choice <sup>[1,2,3]</sup> and potentially also in valuations <sup>[4,5]</sup>. The consistency of the effect and the underlying mechanism are unclear. We investigated:

Study 1: No effect of complexity on valuation. Study 2: Negative effect of complexity on valuation and choice.



Effect on Choice

Individual aggregated data (n = 279) for choice in study 2. Overall M =0.38, 95% CI [0.35, 0.40]. Arrows denote 95% CI based on std. errors.

**Moderator** (Interaction in Bayesian MLM):

- if complexity aversion exists in (i) judgment and choice,
- (ii) if so, what the underlying mechanism is (not on this poster) and
- (iii) which individuals within the population are most affected by it.

## Methods

complex simple Study 1 (*n* = 112): 139 with 18% 20 with 26% Valuations, marketing 127 with 16% students 123 with 74% 84 with 11% Study 2 (n = 279): 110 with 18% 54 with 9% Valuations, Choice & Cogni-

Study 2: Cognitive Ability moderates the influence of complexity. No complexity aversion at cognitive ability level of 6 in choices and 4 in valuations.

#### **Cognitive Ability and** Valuation

Descriptive plot for cognitive ability and complexity aversion in valuation based on individual aggregated data. Arrows denote 95% CI based on std. errors.



## **Discussion / Conclusion**

 Complexity aversion exists in choice and to a lesser degree in valuations.

105 with 19% 224 with 9%



#### Risky Lotteries matched on EV (expected value), variance and skewness.

- Complexity affects people with higher cognitive ability less (e.g. university students).
- Ideally, experiment designs should control for complexity to avoid bias.

#### **References:**

[1] Huck, S., & Weizsäcker, G. (1999). Risk, complexity, and deviations from expected-value maximization: Results of a lottery choice experiment. Journal of Economic Psychology, 20(6), 699–715. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-4870(99)00031-8

[2] Sonsino, D., Benzion, U., & Mador, G. (2002). The Complexity Effects on Choice with Uncertainty—Experimental Evidence\*. The Economic Journal, 112(482), 936–965. [3] Zilker, V., Hertwig, R., & Pachur, T. (2020). Age differences in risk attitude are shaped by option complexity. Journal of Experimental Psychology. General

[4] Bruce, A. C., & Johnson, J. E. V. (1996). Decision-Making under Risk: Effect of Complexity on Performance. Psychological Reports, 79(1), 67–76. [5] Mador, G., Sonsino, D., & Benzion, U. (2000). On complexity and lotteries' evaluation - three experimental observations. Journal of Economic Psychology, 21(6), 625–637.

[6] Heydasch, T., Haubrich, J., & K. -H, R. (2020). Short Form of the Hagen Matrices Test (HMT-S). ZIS - The Collection of Items and Scales for the Social Sciences.

KIT – The Research University in the Helmholtz Association

