



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

A Query Approach to Modeling Attendance to Attributes in Discrete Choice Experiments

Authors*

Overlooking respondents' attribute attendance in choice experiments affects coefficient estimates, model fit, performance measures, and welfare estimates. How to best identify and account for individual attribute processing strategies is still unclear. Query Theory suggests that preferences are subject to the processes and dynamics associated with retrieval from memory. We apply Query Theory to the study of attendance to attributes to proximate the thoughts generated by individuals while making choices in a choice experiment. Our results demonstrate the stated and query approaches improve model fit and performance. The query approach has distinct advantages, but it also has important limitations.

Key words: attribute non-attendance, discrete choice experiments, genetically modified organisms, query theory

Introduction

In the last decade, discrete choice experiments (DCEs) have become one of the most widely used methods of consumer valuation. In a DCE, participants are asked to consider a product that is defined by several attributes (Hensher, Rose and Green, 2015) and often they are given a no-choice alternative. Conventionally, each attribute and attribute level are treated as relevant to the estimation of individual level utility (Hess and Hensher, 2010). More recently, research has focused on how people process attributes presented to them in choice experiments. Respondents may attend to some attributes and ignore others during each choice task (Hess and Hensher, 2010; Scarpa et al., 2013) and thereby may not make the trade-offs between all the attributes as assumed. Consequently, overlooking respondents' attendance to attributes (AA) in choice models can affect coefficient estimates, model fit, performance measures, and welfare estimates (Campbell, Hutchinson and Scarpa, 2008; Caputo et al., 2018; Carlsson, Kataria and Lampi, 2010; Hensher, 2014; Hensher and Rose, 2009; Scarpa et al., 2009; Scarpa et al., 2013). Hence, accounting for the patterns of AA is essential in estimating reliable results.

Previous studies have examined the strategies used by respondents in choice experiments (Ahi and Kipperberg, 2020; Balcombe, Fraser and McSorly, 2015; Bello and Abdulai, 2016; Erdem, Campbell and Hole, 2015; Hess and Hensher, 2010; Lew and Whitehead, 2020; Scarpa et

Nathan Kemper (corresponding author, nkemper@uark.edu) is an associate professor in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness at the University of Arkansas. Jennie Popp is a professor in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness and associate dean of the Honors College at the University of Arkansas. Rodolfo M. Nayga, Jr., is a professor and head of the Department of Agricultural Economics at Texas A&M University. Claudia Bazzani is assistant professor in the Department of Business Administration at the University of Verona, Italy.

The authors express their gratitude for contributions made by Keith Chrzan to the experimental design and survey construction. The authors would like to thank Vincenzina Caputo for helpful suggestions on a previous version of this paper. This material is based upon work that was supported by a research grant from the Arkansas Soybean Promotion Board. The authors are grateful for this support.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. Review coordinated by Christian A. Langpap.

al., 2009; Scarpa et al., 2013), and while much research has been devoted to various methods of identifying patterns of attribute attendance, it is still unclear how best to account for individual attribute processing strategies in DCEs. In light of this, our study explores the potential of Query Theory (Johnson, Häubl and Keinan, 2007) to examine the thought processes of individuals in a DCE. We suggest that respondents go through a series of mental queries when confronted with choice tasks and the content of these queries influences choice behavior. By asking respondents to use a report method called *aspect-listing*, useful information is produced that can help us better understand the information processing strategies of individuals in a DCE. Principally used to infer how thoughts influence valuation by examining the order and valence (value increasing or decreasing) of thoughts (Kemper et al., 2020; Dsouza et al., 2023), Query Theory data offer a robust pool of artifacts representing the thoughts given attention by individuals during each choice task. Our study explores whether such data can be useful in the accounting for patterns of AA.

Several approaches have been explored to account for AA including the inferred approach and the stated approach. In the inferred approach, the inference of AA is accomplished through the estimation of analytical models, which are often based on latent class or mixed logit models (Hess and Hensher, 2010; Caputo, Nayga and Scarpa, 2013; Scarpa et al., 2013; Collins and Hensher, 2015). One of the most common inferred approaches (Caputo, Nayga and Scarpa, 2013; Hensher and Greene, 2010; Scarpa et al., 2009; 2013) is the equality constrained latent class method that imposes specific restrictions on the utility functions for each class of respondents by constraining some coefficients to zero for selected attribute classes determined to be ignoring attributes. Hess and Hensher (2010) suggest inferring AA through the use of mixed (random parameters) logit models (MXLs). The MXLs are first used to derive individual-level estimates of coefficients and variance, which are then used to examine respondent-specific coefficients of variation to identify large “signal-to-noise” ratios and thereby infer attribute non-attendance.

In the stated approach, self-reported statements of AA have been included in surveys in order to condition models based on self-stated intentions of AA (Bello and Abdulai, 2016; Hensher, 2006; Hensher and Rose, 2009; Hess and Hensher, 2010; Islam, Louviere and Burke, 2007). Stated approach data are used in practice in two principal ways: these data can be used directly within utility functions, or incorporated using a latent variable approach (Hess et al., 2013). The latent variable structure approach was developed to avoid endogeneity issues with the direct approach; however, if the latent variable structure is suggested and then the latent variables are merely replaced with observable data (stated attendance to attributes) this would imply misspecification (Chalak, Abiad, and Balcombe, 2016). The direct use of stated attendance data can be thought of as a reduced form (Chalak, Abiad, and Balcombe, 2016) arising from an unobserved latent structure. In our study, we adopt this view and use the stated attendance data by directly incorporating these data into our utility functions.

While asking respondents direct questions seems to indicate that some respondents consistently ignore certain attributes, it is not clear whether researchers should rely on this information during model estimation (Hess and Hensher, 2010). To illustrate, endogeneity problems could occur by conditioning the modeled choice process on the stated processing strategies (Hensher, 2008); the same concerns about the quality of responses in the choice data extends to direct questions about decision-making heuristics. If stated measures of attendance are affected by respondent inaccuracies from accidental or intentional misrepresentation, such measures would be uninformative and invalid. Scarpa *et al.* (2013) compared the stated methods to both the latent class and MXL methods of inferring AA, concluding that it is not possible to identify which approach best accounts for these patterns, and that overlooking the issue in choice experiments can have significant consequences for welfare estimates.

As the literature demonstrates, stated AA data can be used in many ways. A common approach is to use an MXL model where attributes reported as ignored by respondents are eliminated from the model. Such “attribute elimination” models assign a zero-utility weight to attributes ignored. However, such an assumption is problematic because reporting that an attribute did not factor into a decision does not necessarily indicate that the attribute was ignored; it may

be the case that the attribute was indeed considered but did not factor into the decision. In other words, the attribute may have some weight in the decision-making process, it could even be associated with negative utility. Hess and Hensher (2010) propose a validation method using self-reported AA data to specify an indirect utility function that estimates two coefficients for each attribute. This eases the assumption of “all or nothing” AA and allows for the acknowledgement that ignoring an attribute does not necessarily indicate that it has zero utility weight.

As an alternative approach, we posit that attribute processing strategies can be examined using psychological theories of choice. Specifically, we suggest that Query Theory offers a psychological explanation for the decision heuristics used by individuals in DCEs. Query Theory suggests that decision makers construct their preferences by asking internal queries about the available options (Johnson, Häubl and Keinan, 2007; Weber et al., 2007). Preference construction and choice are an automatic and unconscious process of arguing with oneself (Weber and Johnson, 2011). People sequentially generate arguments for selecting each of the various choice options, with the first option considered having a major advantage because arguments for the default choice option are generated first (Johnson, Häubl and Keinan, 2007). Using an aspect-listing task where respondents list the thoughts they experienced while making each choice, our study explores the use of Query Theory to examine AA, and how utilizing these Query data affects model structure, fit, patterns of heterogeneity, and welfare estimates.

The main goal of this study is to evaluate, for the first time in the literature, the usefulness of the query approach in accounting for individuals’ information processing strategies in a DCE. Query Theory offers an unexplored avenue by which one can account for AA. Our study contributes to the literature by comparing the stated approach to the query approach, both at the choice task level, wherein we use the principles of Query Theory to account for the information processing strategies of individuals. Following the literature from social psychology (Johnson, Häubl and Keinan 2007 and Weber et al. 2007, and applied economics (Kemper et al. 2020), we use a verbal report method called “aspect listing” to obtain an approximation of the aspects (thoughts) considered during each choice task of the experiment. We then use the self-reported aspects listed by respondents to determine which attributes individuals attended during each choice task. Specifically, our study employs a between-subjects design where respondents are randomly assigned to one of the two groups: the stated approach group, or the query approach group.

Our study differs from previous research by being the first study to use Query Theory in an attempt to account for patterns of AA in a DCE. Second, our study offers new insights into the effectiveness of the stated approach. The remainder of this article is presented as follows: the next section expands on Query Theory and outlines its key premises. Then, we describe the experimental design and methods including a discussion of our choice set design, experimental treatments, and econometric methods employed. The findings of our analyses follow. We conclude the article with a discussion of the implications of our research.

Query Theory

The four key principles of how preferences are formed according to Query Theory (QT) (Weber and Johnson, 2011) are as follows: 1) people query past experience for evidence supporting different choice options; 2) these queries are executed sequentially and automatically; 3) the first query is weighed more heavily because of output interference (as evidence for the first considered option is generated, evidence supporting the alternative options is temporarily unavailable) and due to output interference, the first thought is more heavily weighted in the overall decision; and 4) choice is based on the resulting balance of evidence. Hence, the content of considered options is important because it influences the balance of evidence. QT suggests that if respondents in a DCE attend only to certain attributes, then the balance of evidence changes and models of choice should be adjusted for such behavior.

Johnson, Häubl and Keinan (2007) used QT to examine the endowment effect and suggested that people construct values by posing a series of queries whose order differs for sellers and choosers. Their results suggest that the variations in valuations between buyers and sellers were caused by the different aspects retrieved by buyers and sellers, resulting from output interference. Importantly, they demonstrated that the content of the recalled aspects differs for selling and choosing, and that the aspects predict valuations. Furthermore, Weber *et al.* (2007) provided empirical support for the QT premise that the order of thoughts matters by using QT to explain asymmetric discounting. They were successful in reducing people's discounting of future rewards by setting up an experiment where the decision was reframed in a way that directed attention to the delayed outcome.

QT documents the cognitive mechanisms used by individuals to form preferences; like all knowledge, preferences are subject to the processes associated with retrieval from memory, which can help explain a range of phenomena in valuation research (Johnson, Häubl and Keinan, 2007; Weber and Johnson, 2006). Our study extends this logic to explain AA in DCEs by examining the queries, albeit indirectly, generated by people in our experiment. QT should help document improvements to models based on the queries of individuals. If the content of aspects listed by respondents accurately documents AA, then individual, specific coefficient estimates for attributes that have been attended to, should be larger (in absolute terms) than those not attended to, as observed by Scarpa *et al.* (2013).

Materials and Methods

Choice Set Design

The product evaluated in this study was boneless skinless chicken breast. Table 1 summarizes the choice experiment attributes and describes each level. Effects coding was chosen over the dummy coding since it allows the attributes coefficients to be uncorrelated with the constants avoiding confounding effects (Bech and Gyrð-Hansen, 2005; de Marchi *et al.*, 2016; Hensher, Rose and Greene, 2005). The prices used in our study represented a sample of 2015 prices found in supermarkets (both physical locations and online) and in USDA price reports for chicken (USDA ERS, 2015). For the genetically modified (GM) content attributes, a Non-GMO Project Verified label¹ was included and the mandatory labeling style statement: "this product contains genetically engineered ingredients." The "this product contains GM" language was chosen to measure how consumers respond if such language appears on products due to new federal regulations. Additionally, two more sustainability related labels were included: carbon footprint² and local production. All attribute levels are described in table 1.

Respondents completed eight choice tasks in this experiment with each task consisting of two experimentally designed products and a no-buy option. The allocation of attribute levels to alternatives was designed using a D-efficient design (Bliemer and Rose, 2010) obtained in two stages. The first stage was an orthogonal design (Addelman, 1962) for the pilot that used 250 respondents. Next, a Multinomial Logit Model (MNL) was estimated using data from the pilot to obtain coefficient estimates to use as priors for the data from the second wave. The orthogonal design defined the first alternative in each choice set, and a shifting strategy was used to define the second alternative in each set as described in Bunch, Louviere, and Anderson (1994) and Street and Burgess (2007). Designs involved 32 choice tasks in four blocks of eight tasks.

¹ Permission was granted by the Non-GMO Project to use their logo, statement and label in our DCE (www.nongmoproject.org).

² The CO₂ levels followed those used by Van Loo, *et al.* (2014).

Table 1 Choice Experiment Attributes and Levels with Effects Coding

Attributes	Coding	Levels
Price	\$2.99	\$2.99 price level
	\$6.99	\$6.99 price level
	\$10.99	\$10.99 price level
	\$14.99	\$14.99 price level
	0	No-buy option ¹
GM Content	-1,-1	No information provided on GM content
	1, 0	The Non-GMO Project Verified label and statement
	0, 1	This product contains genetically modified ingredients
	0, 0	No-buy option ¹
Carbon Footprint	-1,-1,-1	No information provided on Carbon Footprint
	1, 0, 0	79 oz CO2e/lb representing the low carbon emissions level
	0, 1, 0	90 oz CO2e/lb representing the medium carbon emissions level
	0, 0, 1	112 oz CO2e/lb representing the high carbon emissions level
	0, 0, 0	No-buy option ¹
Local	-1	No information about where birds raised and food grown
	1	Birds raised and food grown in your state (local)
	0	No-buy option ¹

¹The no-buy option is a fixed comparator presented during all choice tasks. It is not an attribute level.

Experimental Treatments

Stated Approach

Using the stated approach, there are two opportunities to ask respondents about AA in an experiment: at the end of all choice tasks, or after each individual choice task (Bello and Abdulai 2016; Puckett and Hensher 2008; Scarpa et al. 2013; Scarpa Thiene and Hensher 2010). After completion of each of the eight respective choice tasks, respondents were presented with the following question: “*which of the following attributes did you IGNORE or CONSIDER when making your choice?*” The response options were binary for each attribute with the options “ignored” and “considered.” Our stated approach model estimated at the choice task level (SAT), attendance was allowed to vary across the eight tasks. The distribution of AA using the stated approach is reported in table 2.

Query Approach

To obtain information on the thoughts considered during each choice task of the experiment, a verbal report method called an *aspect listing* was used, following Johnson, Häubl and Keinan (2007), Weber et al. (2007), and Kemper et al. (2020). Respondents were asked: “*what were you thinking of as you made this decision. We would like you to list your reasons below one at a time and to consider both positive and negative reasons. You can list up to three reasons.*” Subsequently, the content of the responses was recorded to approximate the thought processes of respondents in each treatment. Each respondent completed eight choice tasks with three text

Table 2 Distribution of Attendance to Attributes across Two Approaches

Attributes		Stated Approach Choice Task (SAT)	Query Approach Choice Task (QAT)
Price	no. obs.	4040	3784
	no.	3411	2543
	percent	84.4%	67.2%
GM Content	no.	2753	976
	percent	68.1%	25.8%
Carbon Footprint	no.	2197	347
	percent	54.4%	9.2%
Local	no.	2503	571
	percent	62.0%	15.1%

fields³ for the aspect listing available at each task. This process provided 24 total opportunities for each respondent to list their thoughts during the experiment and respondents could list more than one aspect per text field, which each had a 100-character limit⁴. Notably, the aspects listed approximate the thoughts that actually occur as the respondents made decisions, particularly given that the queries themselves may be automatic and difficult to observe directly (Johnson, Häubl and Keinan, 2007). Specifically, the aspect-listing is designed to capture the effect of these unobservable queries by documenting what they produce; this method is easy to implement particularly in large sample market settings like the one used in this study. Participants in the query approach treatment (473 people) listed a total of 4,437 aspects that were usable. This means that on average, respondents listed 9.38 aspects during the experiment which consisted of 8 paired comparisons, or 1.17 aspects per choice task. This low response rate could indicate fatigue and that respondents were not attending all attributes in our study. Alternately, respondents could be fatigued and not listing all attributes that they are actually attending in the experiment.

Other QT studies (Johnson, Häubl and Keinan, 2007; Weber et al., 2007) asked participants to self-code aspects they had listed during the experiment; comparatively, this method was avoided in our study to minimize respondent fatigue. Accordingly, the individual responses were coded by our team⁵ (see Appendix 1 for more). Additionally, the aspect listing task was left more open and allowed for any comments regarding the individual’s decision to be entered⁶. Completion time grew by nine minutes on average (from 10 to 19 minutes) when aspect-listing task was requested; while the task of manually coding responses from 473 respondents, who provided text in three text fields per task across eight choice tasks. Aspect responses were coded by the attributes used in the study (price, gm content, carbon footprint, location), or by “other” in cases where responses listed aspects not related to the attributes of our study, such as “I don’t like white meat” or “prefer all-natural.” Table A1 in the Appendix 1 lists examples of value-decreasing, -increasing, and -neutral aspects listed by respondents for each attribute. Table 2 summarizes the distribution of AA in the query approach treatment. As shown, price is estimated

³ Prior research by Johnson, Häubl and Keinan (2007) indicated that on average, participants listed less than 3 responses during the aspects listing task in their experiment.

⁴ We acknowledge that limiting the amount of text that individuals could report in the aspect listing exercise could have limited some respondents from listing all of their thoughts and therefore we could be underreporting the number of aspects considered by some respondents.

⁵ Johnson, Häubl and Keinan (2007) note that aspects coded by novice raters produce similar results in their experiments.

⁶ Another reason for our choice to manually code the aspects data (which required a great deal of time) was the unique nature of individual responses.

to be ignored 33% of the time using the query approach. Notably, price was the most mentioned attribute, representing over half of all aspects listed by respondents.

An attribute mentioned by an individual was considered to be a signal that the attribute was attended by that individual. In this regard, how we implement the query approach is similar to the stated approach, with the main difference being that the stated approach asks the question directly and the query approach is open ended.

Using the query approach, if a respondent mentions an attribute, it was assumed that the person derives utility (either positive or negative) from the attribute mentioned. If a respondent does not attend an attribute (i.e., the attribute was not mentioned by the respondent), the coefficient was restricted to zero, thereby removing it from the utility function. This is the “attribute elimination” method mentioned previously. Due to the concerns of relying on such a strict “all or nothing” assumption about utility, this restriction was relaxed in subsequent analyses where these coefficients are not forced to be zero. Using the validation approach of Hess and Hensher (2010) we also estimated models with dual coefficients for each attribute using the query approach as well as the stated approach.

In contrast with the stated approach, where respondents were asked to indicate both considered and ignored attributes, in the query approach, respondents were asked to report their thoughts; thus, the data on ignored attributes were collected indirectly. We note this different because of the potential issue of reliability regarding the stated approach, which forces respondents to ponder the attributes they are ignoring. The question remains of whether requiring a person to report on the attributes they ignore also requires them to attend to the attribute in order to respond to the question. At the choice task level, as respondents progress through a series of choices, asking respondents to report on what they are not considering could influence their thought processes as they progress to each subsequent task. Our query approach addresses this by requesting that respondents list their thoughts while making decisions. While not requiring respondents to provide their thoughts about all attributes could lead to underreporting of AA, this smaller amount of data gained from our query approach could be viewed as more reliable due to the exertion of less direct influence over attributes considered by respondents.

Econometric Methodology

To examine respondents' preferences, a discrete choice framework was employed that is consistent with random utility theory (McFadden, 1974), as well as Lancaster Consumer Theory (Lancaster, 1966). The DCE literature emphasizes that individuals have heterogeneous preferences. Accordingly, the MXL approach with error components was used to evaluate attendance to attributes in the context of models to address random taste variation (Train 2005). The utility function is specified as follows:

$$(1) \quad U_{ijt} = \text{NONE} + \beta_{1i}PRICE_{ijt} + \beta_{2i}NGE_{ijt} + \beta_{3i}GME_{ijt} + \beta_{4i}LOE_{ijt} \\ + \beta_{5i}MDE_{ijt} + \beta_{6i}HIE_{ijt} + \beta_{7i}LCE_{ijt} + \eta_{ijt} + \varepsilon_{ijt}$$

where i is the respondent, j refers to three options available in the choice set, and t refers to the number of choice situations. The alternative-specific constant (NONE) takes a value of 1 if selected and a value of 0 when either of the two designed alternatives available is selected. We expect the constant “NONE” to be negative and significant, signifying that consumers obtain higher utility by selecting one of our designed alternatives than the no-buy option. PRICE is a continuous variable represented by the four experimentally designed price levels (\$2.99, \$6.99, \$10.99, \$14.99). The non-price attributes, Non-GMO (NGE), Contains Genetically Engineered Ingredients (GME), Low Carbon Footprint (LOE), Medium Carbon Footprint (MDE), High Carbon Footprint (HIE), and Local Production (LCE) are effects coded variables taking the value 1 if the product carries the corresponding labels, the value of -1 in the absence of the label (no label information presented), and 0 when the no-buy (NONE) option is selected. The utilities of

the two products are more likely to be correlated with each other than with the no purchase option (Scarpa, Ferrini and Willis 2005) because the no-buy option is always present across choice tasks and is actually experienced by the consumer, while the two product options are hypothetical and change across choice tasks. To capture this correlation across utilities, we include an error component, η_{ijt} , which is normally distributed, with a mean of zero, inflating the variance of utility for choice options apart from the no-buy option. Furthermore, ε_{ijt} is an unobserved random term that is distributed following an extreme value type-I (Gumbel) distribution independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) over alternatives.

Modeling Attendance to Attributes

We first employ the most conservative approach by assuming that when a respondent ignores an attribute in a choice task, the coefficient for that attribute is restricted to zero in utility parameters, β_s , in Equation (1). Hensher, Rose and Green (2005) argued that if a respondent ignores an attribute in a choice task, then the coefficient for the attribute should be zero in the utility function. However, the limitations of such an approach are documented (Hess and Hensher 2010). Therefore, we next employed the validation approach where utility parameters were not set to zero and dual coefficients for each attribute were estimated. Although a person may report that they have ignored an attribute, they may still have a marginal utility for that attribute that differs from zero (Carlsson, Kataria and Lampi, 2010). Likewise, with the query data, if a respondent does not mention an attribute, this may indicate low attendance to the attribute, rather than necessarily indicating that the attribute was ignored. For each attribute level in the utility function, two coefficients were estimated; one for the observations where individuals were considered to attend to the attribute (AA), and one for the observations where it is assumed that individuals only minimally attend to or do not attend to attributes (NA).

Scarpa, Thiene and Hensher (2010) noted that the individual processing strategies of respondents may change as they progress through a series of choice tasks. This finding implies that an individual's tendency to consider or ignore attributes may not be constant throughout the entire set of choice tasks. Therefore, it is important to allow an individual's patterns of AA and attribute non-attendance (ANA) to vary from one choice task to another. We adopted the choice task level approach when estimating our models.

Data

The data were collected through a national, web-based DCE survey built with the Sawtooth Software package (Sawtooth Software, 2016) and then collected by Survey Sampling International (SSI) (SSI, 2016) using their nationally representative consumer panel. The panel consisted of 978 participants who were the primary grocery shoppers for their households; hence, our subject pool is non-standard (Harrison and List, 2004).

A between-subjects design was used, where respondents were randomly assigned to only one of two treatments. The first treatment is the stated approach treatment and 505 participants were assigned to this group. In the stated approach treatment, respondents were asked after each choice task to state their consideration or ignoring of each attribute. The second treatment is the query approach treatment and 473 participants were assigned to this group. In the query approach treatment, respondents were asked to list their thoughts during each choice task.

The sample from SSI is balanced by socio-demographic characteristics and by four main US Census regions for regional balance across the US. Our experiment consisted of two tasks, with the first having respondents in both the stated approach treatment and the query approach treatment participate in a DCE in which they made choices between poultry products differentiated by the various genetically modified (GM) content labels, production location, and

carbon footprint. Once the DCE was finished, all respondents in both treatments were asked a series of survey questions related to food preferences and demographic data.

Results

This study incorporated 978 respondents in the two treatments, with each respondent completing eight choice tasks with three choices or alternatives per task. We also tested if there were differences in socio-demographic profiles across treatments using a chi-square test. The results show no significant differences in observable characteristics across treatments, which suggests that our randomization was successful in providing a balanced sample across the treatments. The demographic characteristics of our samples can be found in the appendix. We estimated Equation (1) using a MXL with correlated errors and variance-enhancing error components where price and all effects-coded attribute level variables are considered random, following a normal distribution⁷. Estimations were conducted using NLOGIT 5 using 1,000 Halton draws to provide more accurate simulation for the random parameters (Train, 1999)⁸.

In our results, we compared the performance of the stated approach in identifying patterns of AA with that of the query approach. Following Hess et al. (2013), we compared the two approaches based on: 1) the rates of AA between the various models, 2) differences in model fit between models, and 3) the heterogeneity patterns for individual coefficients. Welfare estimates from such models are often of importance; therefore, we also estimated willingness to pay and compared these values across the models using the combinatorial approach suggested by Poe, Giraud, and Loomis (2005). Finally, to test whether the query and stated approaches yield the same underlying preferences, a pooled model was estimated and results reported in table 3. This model was abbreviated as the pooled baseline (PAB).

Comparison of Model Fit and Heterogeneity Patterns

We abbreviated the respective models using the following notation: SAB (Stated Approach Baseline) refers to the baseline stated approach model and SAT (Stated Approach Choice Task) is the stated approach model at the choice task level. The attendance data from the stated approach treatment are presented in table 2. The percentage of respondents attending the price attribute was 84%, 68% for the GM content attribute, 54% for the carbon footprint attribute, and 62% for local production.

Next, we compared the model fit of the SAB with SAT and results are presented in Table 3. Comparing models using measures of estimation criteria with respect to the baseline model offers some clues as to whether our models improved. We focused on the Bayes Information Criterion (BIC) and the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) divided by the number of observations as shown in table 3. The SAT model offers improvements in fit over the baseline, with a BIC/N of 1.45 and AIC/N of 1.39. These results are in line with previous studies where accounting for AA improved model fit (Campbell, Hutchinson and Scarpa, 2008; Hensher, Rose and Greene, 2005). Comparing the baseline model (SAB) to the choice-task level model (SAT), the results indicate

⁷ Numerous versions of the MXL models were estimated, using normal, lognormal, and constrained triangular parameter distributions. Models were also estimated with independently distributed as well as correlated coefficients and both dummy coded and effects coded models were estimated. In the interest of brevity, we limit the results to the model using independent normal distributions for all random coefficients. Results from other models are available on request.

⁸ Following Hensher and Greene (2003) all MXL models were estimated using 25, 50, 150, 250, 500, 1,000, 2,000, 2,500, and 5,000 draws to identify the number of draws required to produce stable results. Shuffled Markov-Chain draws and Halton draws were compared for use in simulations and returned similar results. Stable results were obtained at 1,000 Halton draws and thus we adopted this for all of the models presented here.

Table 3 Pooled Baseline, Stated, and Query Data Models using the Choice Task Approach for Modeling Attributes Attended

Variables	Stated Base (SAB)			Stated Choice Task (SAT)			Query Base (QAB)			Query Choice Task (QAT)			Pooled Base (PAB)		
	Baseline			Stated Data			Baseline			Query Data			Pooled Baseline		
	Coeff.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.		Estimate	S.E.		Estimate	S.E.		Estimate	S.E.	
<i>PRICE</i>	μ	-0.40 ***	0.03	-0.44 ***	0.03		-0.53 ***	0.03		-0.46 ***	0.02		-0.45 ***	0.02	
	Σ	0.40 ***	0.03	0.43 ***	0.03		0.35 ***	0.03		0.26 ***	0.02		0.35 ***	0.02	
<i>NON-GM</i>	μ	1.27 ***	0.15	2.06 ***	0.15		1.44 ***	0.21		3.25 ***	0.19		1.35 ***	0.12	
	Σ	1.72 ***	0.14	1.98 ***	0.16		2.67 ***	0.18		3.58 ***	0.30		1.82 ***	0.16	
<i>GM</i>	μ	-0.74 ***	0.10	-1.06 ***	0.10		-1.02 ***	0.13		-2.08 ***	0.19		-0.87 ***	0.08	
	Σ	1.02 ***	0.10	1.16 ***	0.11		1.49 ***	0.13		2.50 ***	0.29		1.23 ***	0.13	
<i>LOWCO2</i>	μ	0.22 **	0.09	0.55 ***	0.11		0.31 ***	0.12		2.21 ***	0.31		0.25 ***	0.07	
	σ	0.29 *	0.15	0.48 ***	0.18		0.74 ***	0.15		0.83 *	0.49		0.70 **	0.32	
<i>MEDIUMCO2</i>	μ	0.06	0.09	0.22 *	0.12		-0.05	0.10		0.62 *	0.36		0.01	0.06	
	σ	0.22	0.16	0.48 ***	0.17		0.14	0.21		1.32 ***	0.49		0.46	0.34	
<i>HIGHCO2</i>	μ	-0.03	0.08	-0.26 **	0.12		-0.10	0.08		-2.06 ***	0.40		-0.06	0.06	
	σ	0.43 ***	0.17	0.73 **	0.31		0.52 ***	0.17		2.28 ***	0.57		1.18 ***	0.40	
<i>LOCAL</i>	μ	0.27 ***	0.05	0.54 ***	0.07		0.26 ***	0.06		2.23 ***	0.18		0.26 ***	0.04	
	σ	0.37	0.25	0.60 ***	0.21		0.54 ***	0.09		1.70 ***	0.21		0.32	0.42	
<i>No-buy</i>	μ	-5.76 ***	0.35	-6.00 ***	0.32		-4.98 ***	0.27		-3.83 ***	0.23		-5.27 ***	0.20	
<i>Error Component</i>	σ	3.64 ***	0.32	4.06 ***	0.30		2.60 ***	0.24		3.23 ***	0.16		3.03 ***	0.26	
Model Fit Measures		SAB		SAT		QAB		QAT		PAB					
Obs.		4040		4040		3784		3784		7824					
Log likelihood		-2923.68		-2766.67		-2684.23		-2490.66		-5645.06					
BIC		6154.60		5840.59		5673.28		5286.15		11621.83					
BIC/N		1.52		1.45		1.50		1.40		1.49					
AIC		5921.36		5607.34		5442.46		5055.32		11364.13					
AIC/N		1.47		1.39		1.47		1.34		1.45					
AIC3		5958.36		5644.34		5479.46		5092.32		11401.13					
AIC3/N		1.47		1.40		1.45		1.35		1.46					
Patterns of Heterogeneity		SAB		SAT		QAB		QAT		PAB					
<i>PRICE</i>	<i>cv</i>	-0.98		-0.99		-0.67		-0.56		-0.77					
<i>NON-GM (NGE)</i>	<i>cv</i>	1.36		0.96		1.85		1.10		1.35					
<i>GM (GME)</i>	<i>cv</i>	-1.37		-1.09		-1.46		-1.20		-1.41					
<i>LOWCO2 (LOE)</i>	<i>cv</i>	1.34		0.87		2.40		0.38		2.85					
<i>MEDIUMCO2 (MDE)</i>	<i>cv</i>	3.68		2.23		-2.77		2.15		50.09					
<i>HIGHCO2 (HIE)</i>	<i>cv</i>	-12.95		-2.77		-5.05		-1.11		-18.68					
<i>LOCAL (LCE)</i>	<i>cv</i>	0.63		0.75		0.51		0.98		0.22					

***, **, * Significance at 1%, 5%, 10% level

that all coefficients for our random parameters increase in magnitude with the most substantial increases in three carbon footprint attribute levels. Also, all random parameter coefficients in our SAT model are significant and have the expected signs.

We next compared the two stated approach models in terms of patterns of heterogeneity. We observed a decrease in heterogeneity, measured by coefficient of variation (*CV*) when moving from the base (SAB) to the SAT model for all coefficients for our random parameters in the model except price, which remained approximately the same. This finding indicates that what was previously captured as heterogeneity is now accommodated by our model conditioned for AA the stated approach.

Using the query approach, AA is based on the direct observations of attributes attended to as these represent the aspects listed by respondents. This approach differs from the stated approach, where respondents indicate both considered and ignored attributes. The query approach, therefore, should be viewed as a more conservative approach to the detection of AA. As with the stated approach results, we present the results of two query treatments (table 3). The respective models were abbreviated using the following notation: QAB (Query Approach Baseline) refers to the baseline model and QAT (Query Approach Choice Task) is the query approach model employed at the choice-task level.

The distribution of attendance to attributes across the two models using data from the query approach treatment are presented in table 2. The percentage of respondents attending the price attribute was 67%, 26% for the GM content attribute, only 9% for the carbon footprint attribute, and 15% for local production.

Next, we compared the model fit of the two query models presented in table 3, using measures of estimation criteria BIC/N and AIC/N. The QAT models experienced similar model improvements with respect to the baseline as the SAT. In terms of coefficient estimates, we observed that all coefficients for our random parameters increase in magnitude, in moving from the baseline model (QAB) to the choice-task level model using the query approach (QAT), with substantial increases observed in the medium and high carbon footprints and local production.

Compared the query approach models in terms of patterns of heterogeneity, we observed a decrease in heterogeneity (*CV*) when moving from the base to the QAT model, which suggests that the query approach at the choice task level (QAT) is addressing AA in our data.

Differences in Willingness to Pay

Table 4 shows the results of six hypothesis tests which compare the willingness to pay (WTP) values from each respective model, including the pooled baseline (PAB). Hypothesis 1 compares the WTP values for each attribute from the SAB and SAT models. The results indicate that the WTP for the non-GMO, GM, low carbon footprint, and local attributes are all significantly different between the SAB and SAT models. The WTP for each of these attributes in the SAT model were larger in magnitude compared to the baseline model (SAB). Hypothesis 2 compares the WTP values for each attribute from the query approach models, QAB and QAT. The results demonstrate that the WTP values for all attributes are all significantly different between the QAB and QAT models, with the increases in magnitude larger than those in the stated approach models.

Hypothesis 3 compares the two baseline models, SAB and QAB; no significant differences in WTP were found for any attribute. Hypothesis 4 compares the two choice task approach models, SAT and QAT. The WTP values from the QAT model were larger in magnitude for all attributes, and these differences were significant for the non-GMO, GM, low carbon footprint, and local attributes. Finally, hypotheses 5 and 6 compare the two approach baselines, SAB and QAB, to the pooled baseline, PAB; no significant differences in WTP values were found in either respective comparison.

Table 4 Willingness to Pay (\$/lb for Boneless Skinless Chicken Breast) Across Five Models and Hypothesis Tests

Hypotheses Tests	NON -GM	GM	LOWCO2	MEDIUMCO 2	HIGHCO 2	LOCA L
$H_{01} (WTP^{SAB} - WTP^{SAT}) = 0$						
^b WTP^{SAB}	3.16	-1.84	0.54	0.14	-0.08	0.68
^c WTP^{SAT}	4.71	-2.43	1.27	0.49	-0.60	1.24
mean difference	-1.55	0.58	-0.72	-0.35	0.52	-0.56
<i>p-value</i> ^a	0.001	0.034	0.019	0.151	0.071	0.002
$H_{02} (WTP^{QAB} - WTP^{QAT}) = 0$						
^d WTP^{QAB}	2.75	-1.94	0.58	-0.10	-0.18	0.50
^e WTP^{QAT}	8.05	-5.29	4.60	1.74	-4.51	6.11
mean difference	-5.29	3.34	-4.02	-1.83	4.32	-5.61
<i>p-value</i> ^a	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.012	0.000	0.000
$H_{03} (WTP^{SAB} - WTP^{QAB}) = 0$						
^b WTP^{SAB}	3.16	-1.84	0.54	0.14	-0.08	0.68
^d WTP^{QAB}	2.75	-1.94	0.58	-0.10	-0.18	0.50
mean difference	0.40	0.10	-0.04	0.23	0.11	0.18
<i>p-value</i> ^a	0.214	0.376	0.452	0.207	0.338	0.149
$H_{04} (WTP^{SAT} - WTP^{QAT}) = 0$						
^c WTP^{SAT}	4.71	-2.43	1.27	0.49	-0.60	1.24
^e WTP^{QAT}	8.05	-5.29	4.60	1.74	-4.51	6.11
mean difference	-3.34	2.86	-3.33	-1.25	3.91	-4.87
<i>p-value</i> ^a	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.065	0.002	0.000
$H_{05} (WTP^{SAB} - WTP^{PAB}) = 0$						
^b WTP^{SAB}	3.16	-1.84	0.54	0.14	-0.08	0.68
^f WTP^{PAB}	2.96	-1.90	0.54	0.02	-0.14	0.57
mean difference	0.20	0.06	0.00	0.11	0.06	0.11
<i>p-value</i> ^a	0.325	0.416	0.496	0.334	0.402	0.238
$H_{06} (WTP^{QAB} - WTP^{PAB}) = 0$						
^d WTP^{QAB}	2.75	-1.94	0.58	-0.10	-0.18	0.50
^f WTP^{PAB}	2.96	-1.90	0.54	0.02	-0.14	0.57
mean difference	-0.20	-0.04	0.04	-0.12	-0.05	-0.07
<i>p-value</i> ^a	0.325	0.416	0.496	0.334	0.402	0.238

^a p-values were estimated using the combinational method of Poe, Giraud, and Loomis (2005) with 1,000 Krinsky-Robb (1986) bootstrapped WTP estimates. The p-value reports results of the one-sided test for our hypotheses for each corresponding pair of attributes.

^b WTP^{SAB} indicates mean WTP estimates from the Stated Approach Baseline

^c WTP^{SAT} indicates mean WTP estimates from the Stated Approach Choice Task Attendance to Attributes

^d WTP^{QAB} indicates mean WTP estimates from the Query Approach Baseline

^e WTP^{QAT} indicates mean WTP estimates from the Query Approach Choice Task Attendance to Attributes

^f WTP^{PAB} indicates mean WTP estimates from the Stated and Query Pooled

Validation Method using Dual Coefficients for Attributes

Next, we estimated Equation (1) without restricting the coefficients (β) of “ignored” attributes to zero. This estimation provided two coefficients for each attribute; one for the observations where individuals are considered to be attending to attributes (AA), and one for the observations where we are less certain about AA. We estimated models using the stated and query approaches at the choice task level. Comparing across these models provided a further understanding of both

approaches in identifying patterns of AA. The results of these models are presented in table 5. The columns headed “AA” refer to coefficients where respondents are considered to be attending to attributes, while the “NA” columns refer to coefficients where attendance to attributes is uncertain. The model fit criteria of BIC/N and AIC/N indicate that the QAT dual coefficients model has slightly lower values than the SAT model, with BIC/N values of 1.43 and 1.57, and AIC/N values of 1.23 vs. 1.38, respectively. The patterns of heterogeneity (CV) associated with the two models offer further evidence regarding the effectiveness of each approach in identifying patterns of AA. As shown in table 5, the choice task level stated approach (SAT) appears effective at identifying patterns of AA based on the patterns of heterogeneity. If the model has properly identified patterns of AA, we would expect the CV associated with each AA attribute to be relatively lower than the CV associated with each NA attribute. This is the case in all but one attribute level, the medium carbon footprint. For all other attributes, the CV is larger in magnitude for the NA attribute compared to the AA equivalent attribute.

As for the query approach models with dual coefficients, the results reveal that the heterogeneity patterns for all AA attributes are smaller in magnitude than the CV associated with each NA attribute. In fact, each CV for the AA attributes are at 1.30 or below.

Table 6 presents the results of two hypothesis tests comparing the WTP values from the dual coefficient models SAT and QAT. WTP values were estimated for both sets of coefficients, the AA attributes and NA attributes and compared across treatments. Hypothesis 7 compared the WTP of the AA attributes from the SAT and QAT models. The QAT dual coefficient model was found to produce significantly larger WTP values in magnitude than the SAT dual model. This result could signal that the conservative query approach is doing a better job in identifying true AA leading to larger coefficient estimates and WTP values. However, these results could also be interpreted as the query approach simply identifying those with the strongest preferences and, therefore, the easiest to identify AA, which would also lead to higher WTP values where AA is determined by this approach. Hypothesis 8 compared the WTP for the NA attributes, with significant differences found for 5 of 6 attributes, but with mixed results regarding the differences in magnitude.

The results of the validation method with dual coefficients demonstrate the pitfalls associated with models where an ignored attribute is assumed to have zero utility. When comparing the results shown in table 3 and 5, the validation method using both the stated and query approach leads to improved model fit. Comparing the welfare estimates from table 4 and 6 also highlight the impact that using the validation method can have on WTP values. While the differences in WTP from the SAT “all or nothing” and dual coefficients models reveals only minor differences in the WTP from AA, with WTP differences ranging from \$0 to \$0.22. The disparity between these models using the query approach larger, with WTP differences ranging from \$0.17 to \$1.36. The ability of the validation method to relax the assumption of zero utility for attributes determined to be ignored is an advantage of this method.

Summary and Conclusions

Failure to account for patterns of AA in choice models can affect coefficient estimates, model fit, performance measures, and welfare estimates; therefore, accounting for patterns of AA is essential in estimating reliable results. While various methods for identifying patterns of AA have been proposed, it is still unclear how best to account for individual attribute processing strategies in DCEs. We use Query Theory, for the first time in the DCE literature, to account for attribute attendance by examining the thought processes of individuals in a DCE. We asked respondents to use a report method called *aspect-listing*, which allows individuals to report any thought that was relevant to their decision-making during each choice task. We observed that the majority of all aspects listed relate to the attributes in our DCE. This observation provides a high level of

Table 5 Stated and Query Approach Models with Dual Coefficients for Attributes Attended and Not Attended

Variables	Coeff.	Choice Task Stated (SAT)						Choice Task Query (QAT)					
		Attending (AA)			Not Attended (NA)			Attending (AA)		Not Attended (NA)			
		Estimate	S.E.		Estimate	S.E.		Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.		
<i>PRICE</i>	μ	-0.52	***	0.04	-0.18	***	0.06	-1.11	***	0.10	-0.44	***	0.08
	σ	0.46	***	0.04	0.39	***	0.11	0.41	***	0.06	0.76	***	0.10
<i>NON-GM</i>	μ	2.47	***	0.23	-0.72	**	0.31	7.41	***	0.95	1.38	***	0.36
	σ	2.43	***	0.22	1.01	*	0.58	8.74	***	1.13	3.48	***	0.48
<i>GM</i>	μ	-1.34	***	0.15	0.11		0.21	-5.06	***	0.76	-0.92	***	0.23
	σ	1.53	***	0.14	0.44		0.50	6.59	***	0.97	2.06	***	0.37
<i>LOWCO2</i>	μ	0.77	***	0.15	-0.18		0.23	4.02	***	1.10	0.29		0.25
	σ	0.76	***	0.26	0.50		0.69	3.94	***	1.45	1.43	***	0.51
<i>MEDIUMCO2</i>	μ	0.25	*	0.15	-0.14		0.20	1.65	**	0.74	-0.09		0.21
	σ	0.70	***	0.22	0.46		0.62	1.77	*	1.01	0.68		0.57
<i>HIGHCO2</i>	μ	-0.42	***	0.16	0.33	*	0.20	-4.61	***	1.31	0.01		0.21
	σ	1.02	***	0.37	0.51		0.58	5.57	***	2.05	1.34	**	0.55
<i>LOCAL</i>	μ	0.69	***	0.10	-0.22	*	0.13	6.58	***	0.99	0.04		0.14
	σ	0.79	***	0.11	0.37		0.32	5.20	***	1.10	1.03	***	0.26
<i>No-buy</i>	μ	-6.50	***	0.45				-7.40	***	0.70			
<i>Error Component</i>	σ	3.71	***	0.39				4.83	***	0.50			
Model Fit Measures				SAT				QAT					
Obs.				4040				3784					
Log likelihood				-2674.80				-2206.90					
BIC				6354.38				5410.66					
BIC/N				1.57				1.43					
AIC				5591.60				4655.79					
AIC/N				1.38				1.23					

AIC3		5712.60		4776.79	
AIC3/N		1.41		1.26	
Patterns of Heterogeneity		Attending (AA)	Not Attended (NA)	Attending (AA)	Not Attended (NA)
PRICE	cv	-0.90	-2.23	-0.37	-1.73
NON-GM (NGE)	cv	0.99	-1.40	1.18	2.51
GM (GME)	cv	-1.14	3.86	-1.30	-2.23
LOWCO2 (LOE)	cv	0.99	-2.71	0.98	4.98
MEDIUMCO2 (MDE)	cv	2.81	-3.27	1.07	-7.74
HIGHCO2 (HIE)	cv	-2.44	1.55	-1.21	108.58
LOCAL (LCE)	cv	1.14	-1.68	0.79	24.85

***, **, * Significance at 1%, 5%, 10% level

Table 6 Willingness to Pay (\$/lb for Chicken Breast) Across Two Dual Coefficients Models and Hypothesis Tests

Hypotheses Tests	NON-GM	GM	LOWCO2	MEDIUMCO2	HIGHCO2	LOCAL
$H0_7 (WTP^{SATAA} - WTP^{QATAA}) = 0$						
^b WTP^{SATAA}	4.78	-2.60	1.49	0.48	-0.81	1.34
^c WTP^{QATAA}	6.69	-4.56	3.63	1.49	-4.17	5.94
mean difference	-1.91	1.96	-2.14	-1.00	3.37	-4.60
<i>p-value</i> ^a	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$H0_8 (WTP^{SATNA} - WTP^{QATNA}) = 0$						
^d WTP^{SATNA}	-4.38	0.67	-1.14	-0.84	2.00	-1.36
^e WTP^{QATNA}	3.19	-2.12	0.66	-0.21	0.03	0.09
mean difference	-7.57	2.79	-1.79	-0.63	1.96	-1.45
<i>p-value</i> ^a	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.138	0.000	0.000

^a p-values were estimated using the combinational method of Poe, Giraud, and Loomis (2005) with 1,000 Krinsky-Robb (1986) bootstrapped WTP estimates. The p-value reports results of the one-sided test for our hypotheses for each corresponding pair of attributes.

^b WTP^{SATAA} indicates mean WTP estimates from the Stated Approach Choice Task Dual Coefficients Model, Attributes Attended

^c WTP^{QATAA} indicates mean WTP estimates from the Query Approach Choice Task Dual Coefficients Model, Attributes Attended

^d WTP^{SATNA} indicates mean WTP estimates from the Stated Approach Choice Task Dual Coefficients Model, Attributes Not Attended

^e WTP^{QATNA} indicates mean WTP estimates from the Query Approach Choice Task Dual Coefficients Model, Attributes Not Attended

certainty that the aspects listed can be considered as predictors of attribute attendance. In this regard, the query approach is conservative, as compared to the other common approaches, Baseline including the stated approach. We acknowledge that the mention of an attribute during the aspect listing exercise could also represent some other phenomenon rather than attendance to an attribute. The lack of mentioning an attribute does not necessarily indicate that the attribute was ignored. Nevertheless, our results appear to support the conclusion that the aspects listing task did indeed yield data useful in identifying patterns of attribute attendance.

Our comparison of the stated and query approaches highlights the challenges in identifying AA, and the difficulties that arise in properly modeling AA. The results of our validation models using the dual coefficients indicate that the patterns of AA reported by respondents using the stated approach may suffer from a lack of certainty. The heterogeneity patterns from the stated approach model indicate that some individuals stating they are ignoring attributes may not be ignoring attributes. This observation reveals a problem in relying on these data to accurately identify patterns of AA. The query approach on the other hand has the benefit of identifying attendance to attributes using a more general method where respondents are free to list all thoughts that were important as they made each choice. If we view mention of an attribute as attendance, this could represent a high level of certainty of attendance to that attribute. Importantly, negative or value decreasing thoughts listed about attributes are also considered attendance to attributes, allowing not only for non-zero values in the utility function, but negative values as well. The query approach represents a conservative one in identifying patterns of AA and more work is needed to better explore its usefulness compared to the stated approach.

Our results show that the stated and query approaches all improve model fit statistics; however, in terms of the improvement to model coefficients, the query approach outperforms the inferred stated approach by returning coefficients for attributes with patterns of heterogeneity (CV) that indicate the query approach has effectively identified patterns of AA. The heterogeneity estimates from our dual coefficients models offer perhaps the strongest support for the use of the query approach. When we relax the assumption that AA is “all or nothing”, we see more clearly how reliable the methods are in identifying patterns of AA. Our query approach outperformed the stated approach.

The stated approach does have a strong advantage: its questions are easy to implement in an online setting such as ours. In contrast, the query approach is time consuming, requiring additional steps to collect and synthesize text responses to open-ended questions, thereby potentially introducing new sources of error due to researcher bias and data entry errors. There is also some possible advantages to the open-ended nature of the query as it allows for greater expression of thoughts and for greater heterogeneity in responses. Individuals have different experiences and consider a range of information and memories when making a decision. Therefore, while not all aspects relate to attributes of a designed experience, the query approach has the advantage in that it may allow for a more accurate representation of the thoughts considered in a decision. We have also experimented with training subjects to self-categorize the aspects listed during an experiment, which saves a great deal of research time. Results between self-coded aspects and researcher coded aspects were not significantly different.

Perhaps the most important limitation is how we conducted our aspect-listing task. We did not force respondents in our experiment to list aspects for each attribute, or to provide more than one response per choice task. This could have led to underreporting, despite the results that indicate our query approach generally produced better models. Much remains to be learned about how to gather the aspects data and how to classify aspects in an experiment such as ours. In future experiments, it would be interesting to observe if the combination of the query approach with other indicators of attribute attendance and attention such as ranking data (Chalak, Abiad, and Balcombe, 2016) and eye tracking (Lewis, Grebitus, and Nayga, 2016; Van Loo et al., 2018) can better capture respondents' attention to various attributes in the choice tasks. Our study begins the conversation about the potential of using query theory in addressing attendance to attribute issues in DCEs.

[First submitted December 2021; accepted for publication October 2023.]

References

- Addelman, S., 1962. Orthogonal main-effect plans for asymmetrical factorial experiments. *Technometrics*, 4(1), pp.21-46.
- Ahi, J. C., and Kipperberg, G. 2020. Attribute Non-attendance in Environmental Discrete Choice Experiments: The Impact of Including an Employment Attribute. *Marine Resource Economics*, 35(3).
- Balcombe, K. G., Fraser, I. M. and McSorly, E. 2015. Visual attention and attribute attendance in multi-attribute choice experiments. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 30:447–467.
- Bech, M., and Gyrd-Hansen, D. 2005. Effects coding in discrete choice experiments. *Health economics*, 14(10), 1079-1083.
- Bello, M., and Abdulai, A. 2016. Impact of Ex-Ante Hypothetical Bias Mitigation Methods on Attribute Non-Attendance in Choice Experiments. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, aav098.
- Bliemer, M. C., and Rose, J. M. 2010. Construction of experimental designs for mixed logit models allowing for correlation across choice observations. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 44(6), 720-734.
- Bunch, David S., Jordan J. Louviere and Don Anderson 1994. "A Comparison of Experimental Design Strategies for Multinomial Logit Models: The Case of Generic Attributes." Working paper UCD-GSM-WP# 01-94. Graduate School of Management, University of California, Davis.
- Campbell, D., Hutchinson, W.G. and Scarpa, R. 2008. Incorporating discontinuous preferences into the analysis of discrete choice experiments. *Environmental & Resource Economics* 41:401-417.
- Caputo, V., Nayga, R.M. and Scarpa, R. 2013. Food miles or carbon emissions? Exploring labelling preference for food transport footprint with a stated choice study. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 57:465-482.
- Caputo, V., Van Loo, E. J., Scarpa, R., Nayga Jr, R. M., and Verbeke, W. 2018. Comparing serial, and choice task stated and inferred attribute non-attendance methods in food choice experiments. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 69(1), 35-57.
- De Marchi, E., Caputo, V., Nayga, R. M., and Banterle, A. 2016. Time preferences and food choices: Evidence from a choice experiment. *Food Policy*, 62, 99-109.
- Dsouza, Alwin, Di Fang, Wei Yang, Nathan P. Kemper, and Rodolfo M. Nayga Jr. 2023. "Consumers' valuation for a novel food waste reducing technology: The case of natural coating." *Journal of the Agricultural and Applied Economics Association*, 2, no. 1: 84-97.
- Carlsson, F., Kataria, M. and Lampi, E. 2010. Dealing with ignored attributes in choice experiments on valuation of Sweden's environmental quality objectives. *Environmental & Resource Economics* 47:65-89.
- Chalak, A., Abiad, M., and Balcombe, K. 2016. Joint use of attribute importance rankings and non-attendance data in choice experiments. *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, jbw004.
- Collins, A. T., and Hensher, D. A. 2015. The Influence of Varying Information Load on Inferred Attribute Non-Attendance. *Bounded Rational Choice Behaviour: Applications in Transport*, 73.
- Erdem, S., Campbell, D., and Hole, A. R. 2015. Accounting for Attribute-Level Non-Attendance in a Health Choice Experiment: Does it Matter? *Health economics*, 24(7), 773-789.
- Harrison, G. W., and List, J. A. 2004. Field experiments. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 42 (4), 1009-1055.

- Hensher, D., Rose, J., and Greene, W. 2005. 'The Implications on Willingness to Pay of Respondents Ignoring Specific Attributes,' *Transportation*, 32 (3), pp. 203-222.
- Hensher, D.A. 2006. How do respondents process stated choice experiments? Attribute consideration under varying information load. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 21:861-878.
- Hensher, D.A. 2008. "Joint Estimation of Process and Outcome in Choice Experiments and Implications for Willingness to Pay." *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy* 42(2):297-322.
- Hensher, D.A. 2014. Process heuristics in choice analysis: An editorial. *Journal of Choice Modelling* 11:1-3.
- Hensher, D. A., and Greene, W. H. 2003. The mixed logit model: the state of practice. *Transportation*, 30(2), 133-176.
- Hensher, D.A. and Greene, W.H. 2010. Non-attendance and dual processing of common metric attributes in choice analysis: A latent class specification. *Empirical Economics* 39:413-426.
- Hensher, D.A. and Rose, J.M. 2009. Simplifying choice through attribute preservation or non attendance: Implications for willingness to pay. *Transportation Research Part E* 45:583-590.
- Hensher, D.A., Rose, J.M. and Greene, W.H. 2015. Applied choice analysis. Second edition. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK.
- Hess, S. and Hensher, D.A. 2010. Using conditioning on observed choices to retrieve individual-specific attribute processing strategies. *Transportation Research Part B* 44:781-790.
- Hess, S., Stathopoulos, A., Campbell, D., O'Neill, V., and Caussade, S. 2013. It's not that I don't care, I just don't care very much: confounding between attribute non-attendance and taste heterogeneity. *Transportation*, 40(3), 583-607.
- Islam, T., J. J. Louviere, and P. F. Burke 2007. Modeling the Effects of Including/Excluding Attributes in Choice Experiments on Systematic and Random Components. *International Journal of Market Research* 24:289-300.
- Johnson, E. J., Häubl, G., and Keinan, A. 2007. Aspects of endowment: a query theory of value construction. *Journal of experimental psychology: Learning, memory, and cognition*, 33(3), 461.
- Kemper, N. P., Popp, J. S., and Nayga, R. M. 2020. A query theory account of a discrete choice experiment under oath. *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, 47(3), 1133-1172.
- Lancaster, K. J. 1966. A new approach to consumer theory. *The journal of political economy*, 132-157.
- Lew, D. K., and Whitehead, J. C. 2020. Attribute Non-attendance as an Information Processing Strategy in Stated Preference Choice Experiments: Origins, Current Practices, and Future Directions. *Marine Resource Economics*, 35(3), 000-000
- Lewis, K., C. Grebitus, and R.M. Nayga, Jr. 2016. "The Impact of Brand and Attention on Consumers' Willingness to Pay: Evidence from an Eye Tracking Experiment", *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, accepted and forthcoming.
- Mariel, P., Hoyos, D. and Meyerhoff, J. 2013. Stated or inferred attribute non-attendance? A simulation approach. *Economía Agraria y Recursos Naturales (Agricultural and Resource Economics)* 13:51-67.
- McFadden, D. 1974. The measurement of urban travel demand. *Journal of public economics*, 3(4), 303-328.
- Puckett, S.M. and Hensher, D.A. 2008. The role of attribute processing strategies in estimating the preferences of road freight stakeholders. *Transportation Research Part E* 44:379-395.
- Sawtooth Software, Inc. 2016. <http://www.sawtoothsoftware.com/>. Last accessed on 9 September, 2017.

- Scarpa, R., Ferrini, S. and Willis, K.G. 2005. Performance of Error Component Models for Status Quo Effects in Choice Experiment, in: Scarpa, R. and Alberini, A. (eds), *Applications of Simulation Method in Environmental and Resource Economics*. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp. 247–274.
- Scarpa, R., Thiene, M. and Hensher, D.A. 2010. Monitoring choice task attribute attendance in nonmarket valuation of multiple park management services: Does it matter? *Land Economics* 86:817-839.
- Scarpa, R., Zanolini, R., Bruschi, V. and Naspetti, S. 2013. Inferred and stated attribute nonattendance in food choice experiments. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 95:165-180.
- Scarpa, R., Gilbride, T.J., Campbell, D. and Hensher, D.A. 2009. Modelling attribute non attendance in choice experiments for rural landscape valuation. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 36:151-174.
- Street, D. J. and L. Burgess, L. 2007. The Construction of Optimal Stated Choice Experiments: Theory and Methods. Wiley, New York.
- Survey Sampling International (SSI). 2016. <https://www.surveysampling.com>. Last accessed on 9 September, 2017.
- Train, K. E. 2009. *Discrete choice methods with simulation*. Cambridge university press.
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Economic Research Service (ERS). 2015. Livestock and Meat Domestic Data. <https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/livestock-meat-domestic-data/>. Last accessed on 9 September, 2017.
- Van Loo, E. J., Nayga Jr, R. M., Campbell, D., Seo, H. S., and Verbeke, W. 2018. Using eye tracking to account for attribute non-attendance in choice experiments. *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, 45(3), 333-365.
- Weber, E. U., and Johnson, E. J. 2006. Constructing preferences from memory. *The Construction of Preference*, Lichtenstein, S. and Slovic, P.,(eds.), 397-410.
- Weber, E. U., and Johnson, E. J. 2011. Query theory: Knowing what we want by arguing with ourselves. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34(02), 91-92.
- Weber, E. U., Johnson, E. J., Milch, K. F., Chang, H., Brodscholl, J. C., and Goldstein, D. G. 2007. Asymmetric discounting in intertemporal choice a query-theory account. *Psychological science*, 18(6), 516-523.

Appendix: Coding of Aspects for the Query Method

Pilot Survey

We implemented a pilot survey utilizing 250 respondents. The data from the pilot were used to estimate a model whose coefficient estimates were then used as priors in our final experimental design. Both the pilot and final experiment involved 32 choice tasks arranged in four blocks of eight tasks each. The query data collected during the pilot were used to ensure the survey's reliability and validity in terms of providing the usable information during the aspect listing task. The results of the pilot survey indicated that respondents were listing thoughts that indicated the processes leading to their decisions in each choice task, including, importantly, references to the attributes of the experiment. The data from the pilot were similar to those from the full experiment, which found that approximately 95 percent of all thoughts listed made reference to the specific attributes of the experiment.

Coding of Aspects

Subjects in our experiment made eight paired comparisons between two hypothetical poultry products. We asked subjects to list aspects regarding each decision. However, because we were examining paired comparisons, we had to put great thought into how we coded responses. For instance, if product A has a lower price than product B, the subject may list "product A is cheaper" and "I would never spend that much on chicken." When coding aspects, we take into account the positive or negative framing of the aspects listed by subjects. Continuing with the previous example, in the context of our experiment, we posit that considering the negative and positive framing of aspects is necessary for our purposes of classification, because, in our experiment, the choices made in each paired comparison depend on multiple attributes, including three non-price attributes. In a choice experiment, the tradeoffs between attributes are critical to the estimation of utility and willingness to pay. When considering only the aspects concerning price, the distinction may seem minor; however, subjects also listed aspects referencing the non-price attributes of the products. For example, consider a paired comparison where product A is boneless skinless chicken breast priced at \$2.99/lb with no information about GM content and product B is the same product but with a price of \$6.99/lb and labeled as non-GMO. The subject lists the aspects of "too expensive" and "I prefer to buy non-GMO" and the subject chooses product A. In our study, we would code this as a value-increasing aspect for the GM-content attribute and a value-decreasing aspect for price. This means that in regards to attendance to attributes, we would code these responses as the participant attending to the price and GM attributes.

Because we are interested in the attributes truly being considered in the valuation exercise in each choice task, we also had to make decisions while coding the data as to how to handle responses that mentioned attributes but could have indicated non-attendance or other types of unhelpful information, such as protest responses. Given the topic of GM elicits, at times, strong responses from respondents, we had many responses that were classified as protest responses for the purpose of attribute attendance. For example, we had respondents who chose the "none" option regardless of whether a product was listed as non-GMO or GM, and the aspects listed were statements such as "I hate GMOs" or "I will not eat Frankenfoods". If these aspects had been listed in the context of the respondent choosing the non-GMO product, they would be categorized as attending to the GM content attribute; however, when the respondent chose "none" over all 8 choice tasks, including those tasks that had an option to avoid GM content, we classified these as unusable.

Finally, we used a blind process to code aspects. Two researchers (one professor and one student) discussed the coding process, then coded each response in isolation, first coding each comment based on the attribute mentioned (or "other" if no attribute was mentioned) then coded

based on whether the thought was value increasing, decreasing, or neutral. The two data sets were compared and discrepancies were compared and addressed by our full team (two coders and two additional professors). The blind coding process and reconciliation were used in an effort to reduce research bias and increase reliability of the measures. Examples of aspects listed by respondents and how they were coded are shown in table A1.

Table A1 Examples of Aspects listed by Respondents

Attributes	Value-Decreasing Aspects	Value-Increasing Aspects	Value-Neutral Aspects
price	I wouldn't pay \$6.99/lb for chicken	product 1 is more affordable	price is of no concern
gm	don't want my chicken fed a genetically engineered diet	I do like that its a verified non-GMO	I really don't care how its raised or fed
carbon	I don't like the high carbon footprint on the first chicken breasts	carbon footprint is acceptable	Carbon Footprint in regards to food production does not weigh on my decision at all
location	Would prefer origin listed	I like that the second choice is raised in my own state	It doesn't matter to me if the birds are raised in my state
other	I like to buy organic meats, I can't tell if the first is organic or not.	healthier option	no real difference

Table A2 Sample Characteristics, Counts and Percentages

	Query Approach		Stated Approach		Total	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Total	Percent
Gender						
Male	175	34.3%	171	32.7%	346	33.5%
Female	335	65.7%	352	67.3%	687	66.5%
$\chi^2 = 0.303$						
$p\text{-value} = 0.582$						
Age group	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Total	Percent
18–24 years	41	8.0%	47	9.0%	88	8.5%
25–34 years	110	21.6%	104	19.9%	214	20.7%
35–44 years	89	17.5%	116	22.2%	205	19.8%
45–54 years	84	16.5%	68	13.0%	152	14.7%
55–64 years	96	18.8%	88	16.8%	184	17.8%
65 years or older	90	17.6%	100	19.1%	190	18.4%
$\chi^2 = 6.529$						
$p\text{-value} = 0.258$						
Education Level	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Total	Percent
Some Grade School	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	1	0.1%
Some High School	8	1.6%	6	1.1%	14	1.4%
High School Diploma	169	33.1%	134	25.6%	303	29.3%
Associates Degree (2-year degree)	106	20.8%	103	19.7%	209	20.2%
Bachelor's Degree (4-year degree)	152	29.8%	175	33.5%	327	31.7%
Master's Degree	62	12.2%	77	14.7%	139	13.5%
Doctoral Degree	13	2.5%	27	5.2%	40	3.9%
$\chi^2 = 13.347$						
$p\text{-value} = 0.038$						
Income	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Total	Percent
Under \$20,000	68	13.3%	57	10.9%	125	12.1%
20,000-39,999	102	20.0%	106	20.3%	208	20.1%
40,000-59,999	111	21.8%	88	16.8%	199	19.3%
60,000-79,999	78	15.3%	79	15.1%	157	15.2%
80,000-99,999	62	12.2%	94	18.0%	156	15.1%
100,000-119,999	32	6.3%	36	6.9%	68	6.6%
120,000-139,999	18	3.5%	19	3.6%	37	3.6%
140,000-159,999	19	3.7%	19	3.6%	38	3.7%
160,000 and above	20	3.9%	25	4.8%	45	4.4%
$\chi^2 = 10.930$						
$p\text{-value} = 0.206$						
Race	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Total	Percent
American Indian or Alaska Native	6	1.2%	8	1.5%	14	1.4%
Asian	26	5.1%	23	4.4%	49	4.7%

