How Selection Can Beget Fun: Examining a New Product Selection Method

Alexander G. Fulmer

Taly Reich

Yale School of Management

Revise and Resubmit at the Journal of Marketing Research

How Selection Can Beget Fun: Examining a New Product Selection Method

ABSTRACT

The authors propose a new product selection method, showing in one field experiment and nine laboratory studies that consumers prefer hedonic products when a company selects which products to promote using chance rather than the traditional intentional method. Without consumers experiencing any chance themselves, consumer awareness of the company's chance method of selection increases preference by influencing hedonic perceptions. This preference arises due to consumers perceiving chance selection processes as more fun, and consequently viewing a company engaging in chance selection as more fun, which drives preference. The authors find converging evidence for this preference, demonstrating the effect in consumer intentions, click-through rates, and real consumption decisions, while ruling out multiple alternative explanations. Importantly, because the increased preference is driven by heightened hedonic perceptions, the authors find that this preference emerges for hedonic products, but not for utilitarian products. Additionally, this preference emerges even after consumers gain some familiarity with this strategy, persisting across multiple uses of chance selection.

Keywords: hedonic perceptions, company image, consumer preference, fun, chance

Imagine an ice cream company that has decided to promote one of its flavors for an upcoming holiday. Rather than basing its decision on market research, the ice cream company chooses which flavor to promote by spinning a wheel of all of its ice cream flavors, which lands on vanilla. Would learning that the ice cream company selected vanilla to promote in this way influence consumers' preference for the vanilla ice cream? Companies frequently strive to infuse their marketing practices and brand images with elements and perceptions of fun (Mukherjee 2010; Oh and Pham 2018), and this paper develops and proposes one new type of promotional strategy to do so: deliberately selecting a product from a company's line of existing products for promotion by chance and communicating this selection strategy to consumers. By pitting this new promotional strategy against what companies typically do, intentionally, and often effortfully, selecting products for promotion, the current research proposes that it could benefit companies to consider engaging in this new promotional strategy in certain contexts.

Companies enact a variety of consumer promotions such as price discounts, rebates, sweepstakes, special events for a brand or product, and many others (Inc. 2020). The costs of these promotions can be large, with over 2 billion dollars annually devoted to special events promoting specific products (Inc. 2020). The present studies introduce a new promotional strategy, revealing contexts in which chance selection of an already existing product for promotion can heighten consumer preference. Rather than having consumers *experience* chance by participating in probabilistic promotions such as scratching a ticket to determine level of product discount (Ailawadi et al. 2014; Hock, Bagchi, and Anderson 2020; Laran and Tsiros 2013; Ruan, Hsee, and Lu 2018; Shen, Hsee, and Talloen 2018), the present work suggests that when the company itself engages in chance to select which hedonic product to promote, it can heighten consumer preference. Without consumers experiencing any chance themselves,

consumer awareness of the company's chance selection increases preference by influencing hedonic *perceptions*. We extend work showing that chance occurrences are perceived as fun (Hume and Mort 2011; Wagenaar and Keren 1988; Zaman et al. 2020) to propose that because the process of a company employing chance in the selection of a product for promotion is perceived as more fun by consumers than traditional selection, companies engaging in and communicating chance selection will in turn be perceived as more fun, resulting in heightened consumer preference for hedonic products chosen for promotion by chance. Importantly, because we propose that this increased preference is driven by heightened hedonic perceptions, we predict that this preference emerges for hedonic products because of a congruence between the hedonic image of the promoting company and the promoted product type (Kamins and Gupta 1994; Lynch and Schuler 1994; Till and Busler 2000), but not for utilitarian products because of an incongruence between the hedonic image of the promoting company and the promoted product type (Escalas and Bettman 2009). This incongruency is due to the fact that utilitarian products are perceived not as sources of fun but as instruments with which to perform intended functions (Addis and Holbrook 2001; Dhar and Wertenbroch 2000; Holbrook and Hirschman 1982; Ladhari, Souiden, and Dufour 2017; Park and Moon 2003). Additionally, we provide evidence inconsistent with alternative mechanisms of negative inferences about product quality or company trustworthiness from intentional selection, and about novelty of chance selection.

"FUN" AND PERCEPTIONS OF CHANCE EVENTS

"Fun" has been identified as a unique and important psychological construct in consumer research, distinct from related constructs such as "happiness" (Holbrook et al. 1984; Oh and Pham 2018). Fun is perceived by consumers to be a desirable trait to signal in their relationships with others (Kim, Ratner, and Paharia 2021), and has been identified as a common goal both for people (Reis, O'Keefe, and Lane 2017) and for companies hoping to infuse fun into their marketing practices and brand images (Mukherjee 2010; Oh and Pham 2018). One way in which fun has been studied previously in consumer research is through the ability of consumers' *experience* of chance processes in promotions to feel pleasurable and heighten consumer preference through strategies such as gambled price discounts, conditional rebates, and uncertain incentives associated with purchases (Ailawadi et al. 2014; Hock et al. 2020; Laran and Tsiros 2013; Ruan et al. 2018; Shen et al. 2018). For example, Hock et al. (2020) show that consumers experience fun from promotional discounts won by actively participating in games of chance.

Unlike these lines of previous research, the present work does not examine consumers' hedonic experience of chance promotional strategies. Instead, the current studies propose that a company's engagement in and description of chance selection of hedonic products for promotion can drive consumer preference due to chance's elicitation of hedonic *perceptions*, without consumers experiencing chance. Indeed, work by Wagenaar and Keren (1988) exploring perceptions of chance demonstrates that chance events are perceived as "fun". Specifically, when people were given descriptions of chance events and evaluated the extent to which different concepts applied to them, "fun" emerged as a core dimension of chance events (Wagenaar and Keren 1988). The idea that chance events are perceived as "fun" is further supported by qualitative work examining perceptions of games of chance in both youth and adult samples and across different cultures (Hume and Mort 2011; Zaman et al. 2020). The present work shows that chance selection heightens consumer preference for promoted hedonic products because consumers perceive such chance selection processes, and subsequently perceive the companies

engaging in them, as more fun. The current research examines consumer preference for products described as selected by chance using concrete randomizers (selection tools in which all potential options have an equal chance of being chosen) versus otherwise identical products selected by traditional marketing practices.

We propose that because "fun" is perceived to be a core dimension of chance events (Hume and Mort 2011; Wagenaar and Keren 1988; Zaman et al. 2020), the description of a company's process of chance selection of products for promotion leads consumers to perceive this selection process as more fun than traditional selection. Work in consumer research on the "halo effect" has indicated that perceptions of a company's actions can spillover into overall evaluations of the company (Aaker, Vohs, and Mogilner 2010). For example, Aaker et al. (2010) demonstrated that companies engaging in socially responsible activities are perceived to be overall warmer organizations, whereas companies engaging in for-profit activities are perceived to be overall more competent organizations. Given that perceptions of a company's actions can spillover into global evaluations of the company in this way, we posit that hedonic perceptions of a company's chance selection process of a product for promotion consequently spillover into hedonic overall evaluations of the company engaging in chance selection, making the company itself appear as more fun, which consumers ultimately reward through increased preference for promoted hedonic products. We formally predict the following:

H1: Consumers will be more likely to purchase hedonic products selected for promotion by chance (vs. otherwise identical products selected for promotion intentionally).
H2A: Consumers will perceive a company's product promotion selection process to be more fun when the company engages in chance selection of a product for promotion (vs. intentional selection of a product for promotion).

H_{2B}: Consumers will perceive a company to be more fun when the company engages in chance selection of a product for promotion (vs. intentional selection of a product for promotion).

H3: Perceptions of fun of the promotion selection process will lead consumers to perceive the company to be more fun, serially mediating the relationship between a company's engagement in chance selection of a product for promotion and likelihood of purchasing the promoted product.

CONGRUENCE BETWEEN COMPANY IMAGE AND PRODUCT TYPE MODERATOR

If indeed consumers prefer products selected for promotion by chance because chance selection elicits hedonic perceptions, making the selection process and consequently the company appear more fun to them, this theorizing implies an important boundary condition of congruence between company image and the type of promoted product. Congruence between the image of a promoter and a promoted product's type increases the effectiveness of the promotion on consumer preference (Kamins and Gupta 1994; Lynch and Schuler 1994; Till and Busler 2000). Conversely, incongruence between a promoter's image and a promoted product's type dampens the effectiveness of a promotion (Escalas and Bettman 2009). Therefore, a match between the image of the promoting company and the type of product promoted should enhance consumer preference for a product selected for promotion by chance, whereas a mismatch should not enhance consumer preference for the promoted product. Because we propose that chance selection contributes to the perception of companies along a hedonic dimension by making companies appear more fun, the image of a company employing chance in promotional selection should be congruent with hedonic products which are perceived as able to create fun and pleasure (Addis and Holbrook 2001; Hoyer and Stokburger-Sauer 2012; Ladhari et al. 2017).

Conversely, because utilitarian products are perceived not as sources of fun, but rather as valuable instruments in their performance of specific functions (Addis and Holbrook 2001; Dhar and Wertenbroch 2000; Holbrook and Hirschman 1982; Ladhari et al. 2017; Park and Moon 2003), there is an incongruence between utilitarian products and a company which is perceived as holding heightened hedonic qualities because of its use of chance selection. Consequently, while we expect preference to increase for hedonic products selected for promotion by chance, we do not expect preference to increase for utilitarian products selected for promotion by chance.

H4: Consumers will be more likely to purchase hedonic products selected for promotion by chance (vs. hedonic products selected for promotion intentionally), but will not be more likely to purchase utilitarian products selected for promotion by chance (vs. utilitarian products selected for promotion intentionally).

As a corollary of this prediction, we investigated the influence of describing chance selection of products for promotion on consumer preference using hedonic products such as a humorous article (Study 1), pop music (Study 2A), snacks (Study 2C), desserts (Study 3C), candy (Studies 2B, 3A-3B, and 4), and toys (Studies 5 and 6). Further, our test to determine if product type will moderate the relationship between a company's description of its chance selection of products for promotion and consumer preference (Study 5) compared the effectiveness of describing chance selection to traditional practices with both a hedonic and a utilitarian product.

PERSISTENCE OF PREFERENCE ACROSS MULTIPLE USES OF CHANCE SELECTION

Given that the promotional strategy that this research proposes is not one currently used in the marketplace, it is inherently novel to consumers. This raises the question of the longevity of this strategy in practical application. Work has shown that novelty deteriorates from multiple exposures to a stimulus (Zajonc 1968), and stakeholders considering the chance selection of products for promotion may wonder whether consumer preference for chance selection persists over multiple uses of this promotional strategy. To investigate this, we had consumers report their preference for two different discounted hedonic products, the second product discounted six months after the first, described as selected by a company for this promotion either by chance or intentionally (Study 6). Our theoretical framework contends that the preference for products selected for promotion by chance is driven by perceptions of fun, not novelty, leading to a formal prediction:

Hs: Consumers will be more likely to purchase hedonic products selected for promotion by chance (vs. hedonic products selected for promotion intentionally) even when they have been exposed to this promotional strategy previously.

OVERVIEW OF STUDIES

One field experiment and nine laboratory studies examined preference for products described as selected by a company for promotion by chance. We operationalized the description of chance selection in multiple ways such as informing participants that a company had spun a wheel of possible outcomes, or had used a generic randomizer to select a product for promotion. We compared preference for products described to participants as selected in this way to preference in control conditions either involving nonrandom selection of a product for promotion in which the explanation for selection was explicitly given, or was unspecified, as is almost invariably the case in traditional practice. Study 1 established our core effect in a field study, showing that Facebook users were more likely to click on an advertisement to read a humorous article linking chocolate consumption to winning Nobel Prizes when they read that this article had been selected for promotion by chance versus a control. Study 2A provided converging evidence for our effect using a cover of a pop song again in a real consumption situation and further ruled out an alternative explanation, demonstrating that merely providing information explaining the nature of the selection process of a product for promotion cannot be driving the preference we see for products described as selected for promotion by chance. Study 2B offered converging evidence for chance selection's effect on click-through rate using a commonplace hedonic consumer product by demonstrating that consumers will click on a link to a page selling chocolate at higher rates when the chocolate is described as selected for promotion by chance. Study 2C replicated this phenomenon in an incentive compatible design, showing that consumers prefer hedonic products described as selected for promotion by chance over otherwise identical products described as selected for promotion through traditional practices. Study 3A-3C demonstrated our proposed mechanism, that consumers perceive chance promotional selection processes as more fun, using mediation. Further, Study 3B and 3C ruled out alternative explanations, showing that the preference for hedonic products described as selected for promotion by chance is not driven by reducing negative inferences about a product's quality when it is intentionally selected for promotion (3B), and is not driven by intentional selection causing consumers to doubt the trustworthiness of the company (3C). A posttest confirmed that

chance selection prompts consumers to perceive the company that is engaging in chance selection as more fun, but does not affect how fun consumers perceive the promoted product to be. Study 4 documented the serial mediation of perceived fun in the selection process driving perceptions of the company engaging in chance selection as more fun, ultimately heightening consumer preference for hedonic products described as selected for promotion by chance. Study 5 examined an important boundary condition of the effect and demonstrated that preference for products described as selected for promotion by chance depends on product type. It arises for hedonic products due to their congruence with the hedonic image of a company selecting products to promote by chance (Kamins and Gupta 1994; Lynch and Schuler 1994; Till and Busler 2000), but attenuates for utilitarian products due to incongruence with the promoting company's image (Escalas and Bettman 2009). Finally, Study 6 demonstrated that the preference for hedonic products selected for promotion by chance persists across multiple uses of this promotional strategy, suggesting that novelty of the strategy is not driving the effect.

For all studies, we report all measures and conditions and have no data exclusions. Target sample sizes for experiments 2A-6 were determined in advance of data collection based on the principle that researchers should collect well-powered samples large enough to detect even small effects (100 participants per cell, Simmons, Nelson, and Simonsohn 2018).

STUDY 1: FIELD EXPERIMENT: PREFERENCE FOR CHANCE SELECTION

In a field experiment conducted on Facebook, we tested our core effect and provided support for the ecological validity of the effect of describing the chance selection of a hedonic product for promotion on preference for that product. Specifically, Facebook's split test function allowed us to test two versions of an advertisement for a humorous article linking chocolate consumption to winning Nobel Prizes (Messerli 2012) that was being promoted by a university's behavioral lab, and was described as either having been selected by the behavioral lab for promotion (control condition), or selected by the behavioral lab by chance (chance condition). Facebook's functionality allowed us to capture the number of times each version of the advertisement was clicked as well as the number of times each advertisement was shown to a unique Facebook user (defined as "reach"). "Click-through rate," or the frequency with which a user clicks on a link, is an important marketing metric as it influences sales (Dinner, Heerde, and Neslin 2014) and can be used to estimate advertisement revenue and user experience of search engines (Richardson, Dominowska, and Ragno 2007). In line with consumer research utilizing Facebook's split test function, we operationalize click-through rate as the number of times a version of the ad was clicked / reach \times 100 (To and Patrick 2020). We predicted that clickthrough rate would be higher among Facebook users who read that the article had been selected for promotion by chance. This study was pre-registered on AsPredicted.org (https://aspredicted.org/blind.php?x=zv92bv).

Method

Participants. A total of 10,293 Facebook users (18+ years of age in the United States) saw one of the two versions of the advertisement (see Web Appendix). The advertisements ran for one full day (a 24 hour period).

Procedure. Random non-overlapping Facebook users were shown advertisements corresponding to one of two product promotion selection process conditions: control or chance. All participants read "Checkout this article linking chocolate consumption to winning Nobel Prizes!". Facebook users who saw the control condition version of the advertisement read that a university's behavioral lab "chose this article to promote." Facebook users who saw the chance condition version of the advertisement read that the university's behavioral lab "chose this article to promote by chance by spinning a wheel of articles." All participants who clicked on either version of the advertisement were taken to a debrief page before being redirected to the Messerli (2012) article *Chocolate Consumption, Cognitive Function, and Nobel Laureates*.

Results and Discussion

Preference. As predicted, a chi-square analysis revealed that Facebook users clicked on the advertisement at a significantly higher rate when the article was selected for promotion by chance (3.4%) compared to the control (2.5%; χ^2 (df = 1, n = 10,293) = 7.37, *p* = .007; Odds Ratio = 1.38, 95% CI = [1.09, 1.74].

This result establishes our core effect, and further demonstrates its ecological validity by showing the preference for chance selection in a real-world situation in which consumers viewed Facebook advertisements. Facebook users who read that a university behavioral lab had selected the article linking chocolate consumption to winning Nobel prizes by chance clicked on the advertisement in order to read the article more than Facebook users in a control condition. This result indicates how stakeholders such as marketing managers could engage in and communicate the chance selection of products for promotion to customers through advertisements in order to heighten consumer preference in the real world. While our control condition in Study 1 was meant to simulate what traditionally occurs in the marketplace by not specifying the nature of the selection process, in the next study we aimed to rule out the alternative explanation that the preference for chance selection might be driven by the specificity of explanation of promotion strategy.

STUDY 2A: CONVERGING EVIDENCE FOR PREFERENCE FOR CHANCE SELECTION IN REAL CONSUMPTION

While Study 1 demonstrated our core effect in a field study, Study 2A provided converging evidence that consumers prefer hedonic products described as selected for promotion by chance over otherwise identical products described as selected for promotion by traditional marketing practices. Further, Study 2A ruled out the possible alternative explanation that simply providing explicit information about how the selection process was performed increases preference for promoted products. Participants in Study 2A experienced a real consumption decision in which they chose whether or not to listen to a cover of a pop song.

Method

Participants. 300 participants ($M_{age} = 37.67$, SD = 12.22; 49.0% female) from Amazon Mechanical Turk participated in exchange for monetary payment.

Procedure. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three product promotion selection process conditions: a control condition including an explanation for how intentional selection was made, a control condition in which the explanation behind intentional selection was not specified as traditionally occurs in the marketplace, or a chance condition (see Web Appendix). In the control condition that included an explanation, participants read the following: "A new music streaming service that exclusively produces covers sung by professional musicians and charges its users a monthly subscription fee, has selected one of its covers to promote this month based on extensive market research. The song that the music streaming service selected was a cover of Taylor Swift's *Blank Space*." In the control condition meant to simulate traditional marketing practices, participants read the following: "A new music streaming service that exclusively produces covers sung by professional musicians and charges its users a monthly subscription fee, has selected one of its covers to promote this month. The song that the music streaming service selected was a cover of Taylor Swift's *Blank Space*." In the chance condition, participants read: "A new music streaming service that exclusively produces covers sung by professional musicians and charges its users a monthly subscription fee, has selected one of its covers to promote this covers to produce that exclusively produces covers sung by professional musicians and charges its users a monthly subscription fee, has selected one of its covers to promote this month by spinning an online wheel of chance of all the covers it has produced. The song that the music streaming service selected was a cover of Taylor Swift's *Blank Space*."

Participants were then told: "As part of your participation in this survey, you may listen to the cover that the music streaming service selected to promote. Otherwise, please feel free to continue on to the next page of the survey. Would you like to listen to the cover right now?" (*Yes/No*). Participants who opted to listen to the cover then listened to a cover of Taylor Swift's *Blank Space*. Finally, participants completed demographic measures (gender and age). *Results and Discussion*

Preference. Two dummy variables were created for the Control Including an Explanation condition (Control Including an Explanation = 1, Traditional Control = 0, Chance = 0) and the Traditional Control condition (Control Including an Explanation = 0, Traditional Control = 1, Chance = 0) to allow comparison with the Chance condition. The dependent variable of song choice was coded as Chose to Listen = 1 and Chose not to Listen = 0. As predicted, a binary logistic regression revealed that participants who were informed that the song had been selected for promotion by chance (48.5%) were more likely to listen to the song than participants who were informed that the song had been selected based on extensive market research (33.0%; b =

.65, SE = .29, Wald = 4.96, p = .026, Odds Ratio = 1.91, 95% CI = [1.08, 3.39]), and participants who were not given an explanation for how the song was selected (32.3%; b = .68, SE = .29, Wald = 5.38, p = .020, Odds Ratio = 1.97, 95% CI = [1.11, .3.50]). Rates of choosing to listen to the song did not differ between the two control conditions (b = -.03, SE = .30, Wald = .01, p = .919, Odds Ratio = .97, 95% CI = [.54, 1.75]).

These results indicate that consumers prefer hedonic products described as selected for promotion by chance to otherwise identical products described as selected for promotion by extensive market research or when no explanation behind selection is provided as is typical in the marketplace. Rates of consumers opting to listen to the cover song were highest when the cover song was described as selected for promotion by spinning a wheel of cover songs, providing converging evidence for the effect of describing chance selection on consumer preference, again in a paradigm in which a product could actually be consumed. Because compensation did not differ between those who listened to the cover song and those who did not, consumers who opted to listen to the song were effectively incurring a cost of their time, demonstrating an especially conservative test of the effect given that the sample used was comprised of workers from Amazon Mechanical Turk for whom time spent on surveys is directly linked to net income (Ipeirotis 2010). That the two control conditions did not differ indicates that merely providing information explaining the selection process cannot be driving the effect.

STUDY 2B: CONVERGING EVIDENCE FOR INFLUENCE ON CLICK-THROUGH RATE

While Study 1 demonstrated a preference for a humorous article described as selected for promotion by chance in a field experiment, Study 2B provided converging evidence to show that

describing chance selection will influence consumer click-through rate using a commonplace consumer product. Study 2B described a promotion on Amazon for a flavor available in Dove Chocolate's line of chocolates, further demonstrating the immediate applicability of the strategy presented in this paper to digital marketplace contexts.

Method

Participants. 200 participants ($M_{age} = 36.13$, SD = 11.44; 50.5% female) from Amazon Mechanical Turk participated in exchange for monetary payment.

Procedure. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two product promotion selection process conditions: control or chance (see Web Appendix). In both conditions, participants were told that Dove Chocolate had selected a chocolate to promote on Amazon. This study was run in the month leading up to Valentine's Day and utilized Valentine's Day in the cover story, demonstrating the face validity of the effect by illustrating how informing consumers of selection by chance could be used in a realistic setting promoting an upcoming holiday sale. In the control condition, participants read the following: "As a special occasion for the upcoming Valentine's Day, Amazon has partnered with Dove Chocolate to promote one of Dove's products. For this promotion, Dove selected a flavor from its line of chocolate products. The flavor that Dove selected was caramel chocolate." In the chance condition, participants read: "As a special occasion for the upcoming Valentine's Day, Amazon has partnered with Dove Chocolate to promote one of Dove's products. For this promotion, Dove used a random generator to select a flavor by chance from its line of chocolate products. The flavor that the random generator selected was caramel chocolate."

Participants were then provided with a link to Amazon's web page for Dove Valentine's Caramel chocolate and told: "Below is a link to the Dove Valentine's Caramel chocolate web page on Amazon which you can click if you are interested in learning more about the product (it will not take you out of this survey rather the link will open in a new window). Otherwise, please feel free to continue to the next page of the survey." The actual click-through rates were captured using JavaScript code such that when a participant clicked on the link it was recorded as a 1 and when a participant did not click on the link it was recorded as a 0. Finally, participants completed demographic measures (gender and age).

Results and Discussion

Preference. As predicted, a chi-square analysis revealed that participants were significantly more likely to click on the link for Dove Valentine's Caramel Chocolate when the flavor was described as selected by chance (32.4%) compared to the control condition (19.4%; $\chi^2(df = 1, n = 200) = 4.37, p = .037$; Odds Ratio = 1.99, 95% CI = [1.04, 3.81]).

These results provide converging evidence for the effect of chance selection on clickthrough rate for a promoted hedonic product. More participants clicked the link for the promoted chocolate when the chocolate was described as selected by chance than did in the control condition. Like Study 2A, Study 2B demonstrates an especially conservative test of the behavioral consequences of chance selection given that it also used a sample of workers from Amazon Mechanical Turk who have an incentive to finish surveys as fast as possible to maximize their income (Ipeirotis 2010), indicating the strength of describing chance selection that it steered more workers towards examination of an Amazon web page.

STUDY 2C: INCENTIVE COMPATIBLE REPLICATION

While Study 2A examined preference through consumers' decision to consume a pop song, and Studies 1 and 2B explored consumers' actual click-through rates on an advertisement or link to a product, Study 2C demonstrated that consumers will show a preference for products described as selected for promotion by chance in an incentive compatible product choice in which they may actually receive and consume the product. Study 2C described a promotion on Amazon for a flavor available in Pringles' line of potato chips.

Method

Participants. 200 participants ($M_{age} = 36.52$, SD = 11.87; 53.8% female) from Amazon Mechanical Turk participated in exchange for monetary payment.

Procedure. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two product promotion selection process conditions: control or chance (see Web Appendix). In both conditions, participants were told that Pringles had selected a potato chip flavor to promote on Amazon. This study was run in the weeks leading up to the Super Bowl and utilized the Super Bowl in the cover story, again illustrating how describing chance selection could be used in a realistic marketing situation to increase consumer preference. In the control condition, participants read the following: "As a special occasion for the upcoming Super Bowl, Amazon has partnered with Pringles to promote one of Pringles' products. For this promotion, Pringles selected a flavor from its line of potato chips. The flavor Pringles selected was Pringles Ranch. We would like you to briefly evaluate this product. In addition to the compensation that you will receive for this survey, your evaluation of the product will make you eligible for the chance to win a pack of 3 cans of this flavor and have it shipped to you." In the chance condition, participants read: "As a

special occasion for the upcoming Super Bowl, Amazon has partnered with Pringles to promote one of Pringles' products. For this promotion, Pringles used a random generator to select a flavor by chance from its line of potato chips. The flavor that the random generator selected was Pringles Ranch. We would like you to briefly evaluate this product. In addition to the compensation that you will receive for this survey, your evaluation of the product will make you eligible for the chance to win a pack of 3 cans of this flavor and have it shipped to you."

Participants were then shown a picture of a Pringles Ranch can and told the following: "Below is Pringles' Ranch potato chips. Please answer the following questions." before filling out three brief filler questions (see Web Appendix) to make the cover story believable. Finally, participants were told: "Thank you for participating! As a token of our appreciation, you will be entered into a lottery for a chance to win a pack of 3 cans of the Pringles Ranch potato chips mentioned earlier. However, if you would prefer to be entered into a lottery for a chance to win a pack of 3 cans of Salt and Vinegar potato chips instead, you may indicate that below and continue on to the next page. Which flavor would you prefer to be entered into a lottery for the chance to win?" (*Ranch/Salt and Vinegar*) and were shown images of the Pringles Ranch and Pringles Salt and Vinegar potato chip cans between which to choose. Finally, participants completed demographic measures (gender and age). Upon culmination of the study, one participant was randomly chosen to be shipped three cans of that participant's preferred flavor. *Results and Discussion*

Preference. As predicted, a chi-square analysis revealed that participants were significantly more likely to choose the target flavor (Ranch) when that flavor was described as selected by chance (68%) compared to the control condition (53%; χ^2 (df = 1, n = 200) = 4.71, *p* = .030; Odds Ratio = 1.88, 95% CI = [1.06, 3.35]).

These results show that describing chance selection of products for promotion can influence product choice in an incentive compatible study design. More participants opted to participate in the lottery to win the target flavor of Pringles when this flavor was described as selected by chance compared to a control condition. This indicates that consumers are not only more likely to forgo time in order to consume products when the products were described as selected for promotion by chance as in Studies 1-2B, but also show preference for hedonic products described as selected for promotion by chance when they are choosing between multiple products to receive and consume in an incentive compatible design.

STUDY 3A: THE UNDERLYING ROLE OF FUN PERCEPTIONS OF CHANCE SELECTION

Through mediation analysis, Study 3A examined the underlying mechanism driving the effect, investigating why describing chance selection of a hedonic product for promotion enhances consumer preference. Work exploring perceptions of chance indicates that "fun" is widely perceived to be a core dimension of chance events (Hume and Mort 2011; Wagenaar and Keren 1988; Zaman et al. 2020). Therefore, we propose that the description of a company's chance selection of a product for promotion leads consumers to perceive this selection process as more fun, which consequently increases consumer preference for hedonic products. Specifically, we measured how fun consumers perceived the selection process of a promoted flavor of gum to be. We predicted that when consumers were informed that a company selected the flavor of gum by chance, consumers would perceive the selection process as more fun, and these perceptions of fun would subsequently drive heightened product preference. Study 3A described a promotion for a flavor available in Trident's line of gum.

Method

Participants. 372 participants ($M_{age} = 36.35$, SD = 11.49; 53.5% female) from Amazon Mechanical Turk participated in exchange for monetary payment.

Procedure. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two product promotion selection process conditions: control or chance (see Web Appendix). In both conditions, participants were told that Trident gum was offering "watermelon twist" at a 10% discount. In the control condition, participants read the following: "Trident is a company that makes sugar free chewing gum in 21 different flavors. Their chewing gum can be found in any supermarket. Imagine walking into a supermarket and seeing that Trident is offering a 10% discount on the 'watermelon twist' flavor." In the chance condition, participants read: "Trident is a company that makes sugar free chewing gum in 21 different flavors. Their chewing gum can be found in any supermarket. Imagine walking into a supermarket and seeing that Trident is offering a 10% discount on the 'watermelon twist' flavor. Trident used a wheel of flavors to determine which flavor out of their 21 flavors to discount."

Participants then indicated "How likely would you be to purchase this "watermelon twist" flavor?" (1 = Not Likely at All, 9 = Extremely Likely), and "How fun was the way in which the flavor was selected for promotion?" (1 = Not Fun at All, 9 = Extremely Fun). Finally, participants completed demographic measures (gender and age).

Results and Discussion

Preference. As predicted, participants were significantly more likely to purchase the "watermelon twist" flavor when it was described as selected by chance (M = 5.17, SD = 2.65) compared to the control condition (M = 4.46, SD = 2.78; t(370) = 2.51, p = .013; d = .26, 95% CI = [.15, 1.26]).

Perceptions of selection. Also as predicted, participants indicated that the way in which the flavor was selected for promotion was significantly more fun when the flavor was described as selected by chance (M = 6.03, SD = 2.56) compared to the control condition (M = 4.80, SD = 2.52; t(370) = 5.03, p < .001, d = .48, 95% CI = [.75, 1.71]).

Mediation analysis. To test if consumers prefer hedonic products described as selected by companies for promotion by chance because they perceive a selection process by chance as more fun, we conducted a bootstrap analysis with 5,000 samples (Hayes 2013) using product promotion selection process as the independent variable, perceived fun as the mediator, and purchase likelihood as the dependent variable. Consistent with our theorizing, the analysis revealed that participants in the chance condition perceived the product promotion selection process as more fun, resulting in a greater likelihood of purchasing the product (*95% CI*: .41 to 1.00; see figure 1).

Figure 1: Mediation of Product Promotion Selection Process Condition on





NOTES — The path coefficients are unstandardized betas. Values in parentheses indicate the effect of Product Promotion Selection Process condition on the dependent variable after controlling for the mediator. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

These results provide support for the proposed mechanism driving the effect of describing a company's chance selection, according to which preference for hedonic products

that a company describes as selected for a promotion by chance is driven by perceptions that this promotional selection process is more fun. This finding is accordant with research indicating that "fun" is perceived to be a core dimension of chance events (Hume and Mort 2011; Wagenaar and Keren 1988; Zaman et al. 2020).

STUDY 3B: RULING OUT NEGATIVE INFERENCES ABOUT INTENTIONALLY SELECTED PRODUCTS

Study 3A demonstrated that consumers perceive chance selection processes of a hedonic product for promotion as more fun than intentional selection processes of the same product for promotion, and that these heightened perceptions of fun added by describing chance selection drive consumer preference. Study 3B ruled out a competing potential explanation that consumers may be making negative inferences about a product's overall quality when it is intentionally selected for promotion. Alavi, Bornemann, and Wieseke (2015) indicated that unlike gambled price discounts, certain price discounts lower consumers' internal reference price for products, making them less likely to repurchase these products after a price promotion ends. Because this effect attenuates when an external quality cue is provided in reference to the discounted product, Alavi et al. (2015) suggest that the influence of certain price discounts on internal reference prices may be due to negative consumer inferences about the quality of discounted products. In order to rule out the alternative explanation that describing chance selection of a product for promotion drives consumer preference by alleviating negative product quality inferences resulting from intentional selection, we measured product quality inferences as well as how fun consumers perceived the selection process to be within the same study.

Method

Participants. 300 participants ($M_{age} = 39.18$, SD = 12.22; 54.0% female) from Amazon Mechanical Turk participated in exchange for monetary payment.

Procedure. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two product promotion selection process conditions: control or chance (see Web Appendix). Participants read the exact same scenarios described in Study 3A, except that they read that Trident had discounted its "spearmint" flavor, to demonstrate the robustness of the effect across flavors of the same product.

Participants then indicated: "How likely would you be to purchase this spearmint flavor?" (1 = Not Likely at All, 9 = Extremely Likely), and "How fun was the way in which the flavor was selected for promotion?" (1 = Not Fun at All, 9 = Extremely Fun). We also assessed perceptions of product quality by asking participants to report "What is the overall quality of the gum selected for promotion?" (1 = Not So Good, 9 = Very Good) using a measure adapted from previous research (Cho and Schwarz 2008). Finally, participants completed demographic measures (gender and age).

Results and Discussion

Preference. As predicted, participants were significantly more likely to purchase the spearmint flavor when it was described as selected by chance (M = 5.75, SD = 2.53) compared to the control condition (M = 5.10, SD = 2.58; t(298) = 2.21, p = .028; d = .25, 95% CI = [.07, 1.24]).

Perceptions of selection. Also as predicted, participants indicated that the way in which the flavor was selected for promotion was significantly more fun when the flavor was described

as selected by chance (M = 5.89, SD = 2.21) compared to the control condition (M = 4.09, SD = 2.34; t(298) = 6.85, p < .001, d = .79, 95% CI = [1.28, 2.32]).

Overall quality. Also as predicted, participants indicated that the overall quality of the gum described as selected for promotion by chance (M = 6.63, SD = 1.90) did not differ from the overall quality of the gum in the control condition (M = 6.45, SD = 1.88; t(298) = .86, p = .393, d = .10, 95% CI = [-.24, .62]).

Mediation analyses. Again, to test if consumers prefer hedonic products described as selected by companies for promotion by chance because they perceive a selection process by chance as more fun, we conducted a bootstrap analysis with 5,000 samples (Hayes 2013) using product promotion selection process as the independent variable, perceived fun as the mediator, and purchase likelihood as the dependent variable. Reinforcing the results of Study 3A, the analysis revealed that participants in the chance condition perceived the company product promotion selection process as more fun, resulting in a greater likelihood of purchasing the product (*95% CI*: .60 to 1.32; see figure 2).

To test if consumers prefer hedonic products described as selected by companies for promotion by chance because these products are perceived as overall higher quality, we conducted a bootstrap analysis with 5,000 samples (Hayes 2013) using product promotion selection process as the independent variable, overall quality as the mediator, and purchase likelihood as the dependent variable. The analysis revealed that perceived quality did not mediate the effect of product promotion selection process on purchase likelihood (*95% CI*: -.19 to .48).





NOTES — The path coefficients are unstandardized betas. Values in parentheses indicate the effect of Product Promotion Selection Process condition on the dependent variable after controlling for the mediator. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

These results lend further support to our proposed mechanism that describing a company's use of chance selection prompts consumers to perceive the promotional selection process as more fun, driving the preference for products described as selected for promotion by chance. Furthermore, these results rule out the alternative explanation that the preference for products described as selected for promotion by chance is driven by reducing negative inferences about a product's quality when it is intentionally selected for promotion.

STUDY 3C: RULING OUT NEGATIVE INFERENCES ABOUT TRUSTWORTHINESS

In addition to providing additional support for our proposed mechanism, Study 3B ruled out a competing potential explanation that consumers make negative inferences about a product's overall quality when it is intentionally selected for a promotion. Study 3C ruled out another competing potential explanation that intentional selection of a product for promotion may activate the persuasion knowledge model (Friestad and Wright 1994), making consumers more suspicious of the trustworthiness of a company than when told that it selects a product for promotion by chance. Indeed, Morales (2005) found that while consumers exhibited higher evaluations of companies which put more effort into their product displays, this effect attenuated when consumers were suspicious the company's effort was motivated by an attempt to persuade. *Method*

Participants. 297 participants ($M_{age} = 36.22$, SD = 12.73; 53.5% female) from Amazon Mechanical Turk participated in exchange for monetary payment.

Procedure. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two product promotion selection process conditions: control or chance (see Web Appendix). In both conditions, participants were told that an ice cream company "Mountaintop Creamery" selected chocolate chip cookie dough to be its new "flavor of the month". In the control condition, participants read the following: "Mountaintop Creamery is an ice cream company that has been making ice cream for the past 10 years. Each month, Mountaintop Creamery selects a different ice cream flavor to be the 'flavor of the month'. This month, Mountaintop Creamery selected chocolate chip cookie dough to be the new 'flavor of the month'." In the chance condition, participants read: "Mountaintop Creamery is an ice cream company that has been making ice cream for the past 10 years. Each month, Mountaintop Creamery selects a different ice cream for the past 10 years. Each month, Mountaintop Creamery selects a different ice cream for the past 10 years. Each month, Mountaintop Creamery selects a different ice cream for the past 10 years. Each month, Mountaintop Creamery selects a different ice cream for the past 10 years. Each month, Mountaintop Creamery selects a different ice cream flavor to be the 'flavor of the month' by spinning the wheel of flavors. This month, when the wheel was spun, chocolate chip cookie dough was selected as the new 'flavor of the month'."

Participants then indicated "How likely would you be to purchase this new "flavor of the month" ice cream?" (1 = Not Likely at All, 9 = Extremely Likely).

We assessed perceived trustworthiness of the company using a 2-item scale adapted from previous research (Hagtvedt 2011). Specifically, participants indicated: "How trustworthy is the

Mountaintop Creamery company?" and "How reliable is the Mountaintop Creamery company?" $(1 = Not \ at \ All, \ 9 = Extremely)$. Participant responses were then averaged together to create a single index of perceived trustworthiness (r = .78).

Participants then indicated "How fun was the way in which this new "flavor of the month" ice cream was selected for promotion?" ($1 = Not Fun \ at \ All, \ 9 = Extremely \ Fun$). Finally, participants completed demographic measures (gender and age).

Results and Discussion

Preference. As predicted, participants were significantly more likely to purchase the "flavor of the month" Ice Cream described as selected by chance (M = 7.21, SD = 2.08) compared to the control condition (M = 6.70, SD = 2.10; t(295) = 2.14, p = .033; d = .24, 95% CI = [.04, 1.00]).

Trustworthiness. Also as predicted, participants indicated that the perceived trustworthiness of the company described as having selected the "flavor of the month" Ice Cream by chance (M = 6.77, SD = 1.22) did not differ from the perceived trustworthiness of the company in the control condition (M = 6.74, SD = 1.35; t(295) = .21, p = .831, d = .03, 95% CI = [-.26, .33]).

Perceptions of selection. Also as predicted, participants indicated that the way in which the "flavor of the month" Ice Cream was selected for promotion was more fun when it was described as selected by chance (M = 7.19, SD = 1.58) compared to the control condition (M = 5.85, SD = 2.11; t(295) = 6.18, p < .001, d = .72, 95% CI = [.91, 1.76]).

Mediation analyses. Again, to test if consumers prefer hedonic products described as selected by companies for promotion by chance because they perceive a selection process by chance as more fun, we conducted a bootstrap analysis with 5,000 samples (Hayes 2013) using

product promotion selection process as the independent variable, perceived fun as the mediator, and purchase likelihood as the dependent variable. Reinforcing the results of Studies 3A and 3B, the analysis revealed that participants in the chance condition perceived the company product promotion selection process as more fun, resulting in a greater likelihood of purchasing the product (*95% CI*: .32 to .73; see figure 3).

To test if consumers prefer hedonic products described as selected by companies for promotion by chance because intentional selection makes them doubt the trustworthiness of the company engaging in a promotion, we conducted a bootstrap analysis with 5,000 samples (Hayes 2013) using product promotion selection process as the independent variable, perceived trustworthiness as the mediator, and purchase likelihood as the dependent variable. The analysis revealed that perceived trustworthiness did not mediate the effect of product promotion selection process on purchase likelihood (*95% CI*: -.14 to .16).

Figure 3: Mediation of Product Promotion Selection Process Condition on





NOTES — The path coefficients are unstandardized betas. Values in parentheses indicate the effect of Product Promotion Selection Process condition on the dependent variable after controlling for the mediator. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

These results add support to our proposed mechanism that description of a company's use of chance selection prompts consumers to perceive the promotional selection process as more fun, driving the preference for hedonic products described as selected for promotion by chance. Furthermore, these results rule out the alternative explanation that the preference for hedonic products described as selected for promotion by chance is driven by intentional selection of a product for promotion activating the persuasion knowledge model (Friestad and Wright 1994) and causing consumers to doubt the trustworthiness of the company.

Posttest

While Studies 3A-3C demonstrated that describing hedonic products as selected for promotion by chance prompts consumers to perceive the selection process as more fun than a control condition, it is not entirely clear if consumers prefer products selected for promotion by chance because this selection method makes the product itself seem more fun, or because this selection method makes the company engaging in chance selection seem more fun. Consumers have been shown to psychologically imbue products with features of their creation process, consequently driving product valuation (Cho and Schwarz 2008; Fuchs, Schreier, and van Osselaer 2015; Kruger et al. 2004; Reich, Kupor, and Smith 2017). However, the current research concerns the description of chance selection of already existing products (i.e., post creation) rather than the creation of products. Consequently, we predict that products described as selected for promotion by chance will not be perceived as more fun. However, because perceptions of a company's actions can spillover into overall perceptions of the company (Aaker et al. 2010), we predict that companies described as engaging in chance selection will be perceived as more fun. A posttest examined this issue by measuring not only how much fun consumers perceive the selection process of a promoted flavor of gum to be when the gum is described as selected by chance versus a control condition, but also how fun consumers perceive both the promoted product itself and the company engaging in such a selection process to be.

352 participants ($M_{age} = 38.22$, SD = 12.81; 59.9% female) from Amazon Mechanical Turk participated in exchange for monetary payment. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two product promotion selection process conditions: control or chance (see Web Appendix). Participants read the exact same scenarios as described in Study 3A. Participants then indicated in random order "How fun was the way in which the flavor was selected for promotion?", "How fun is the 'watermelon twist' chewing gum?", and "How fun is the Trident company?" ($1 = Not Fun \ at \ All, 9 = Extremely \ Fun$). Finally, participants completed demographic measures (gender and age).

Participants indicated that the way in which the flavor was selected for promotion was significantly more fun when the flavor was described as selected by chance (M = 6.06, SD = 2.12) compared to a control condition (M = 4.85, SD = 2.30; t(350) = 5.14, p < .001, d = .55, 95% CI = [.75, 1.64]). As predicted, participants did not perceive the "watermelon twist" chewing gum as any more fun when it was described as selected for promotion by chance (M = 6.07, SD = 2.32) compared to the control condition (M = 5.95, SD = 2.24; t(350) = .49, p = .625, d = .05, 95% CI = [-.36, .60]). However, as predicted, participants did perceive the Trident company as significantly more fun when it was described as selecting the flavor by chance (M = 6.18, SD = 1.87) compared to the control condition (M = 5.75, SD = 2.00; t(350) = 2.04, p = .042, d = .22, 95% CI = [.02, .83]).

This indicates that the fun added to perceptions of the selection process when a hedonic product is described as selected for promotion by chance spillover to perceptions of a company engaging in this kind of selection process, but do not affect perceptions of the product itself.

STUDY 4: FULL MECHANISM

Studies 3A-3C and their posttest provided evidence that consumer preference for hedonic products described as selected for promotion by chance is driven by the description of chance selection making consumers perceive such a selection process as more fun, and also that consumers perceive a company described as engaging in chance selection as more fun. Study 4 examined whether these two influences of describing chance selection on perceptions along the hedonic dimension of fun work together sequentially to enhance product preference. Consumer research on the halo effect indicates that perceptions of a company's actions spillover into overall evaluations of the company (Aaker et al. 2010). Applying this framework, we predict that perceptions that a chance selection process is more fun should in turn spillover into evaluations of the company engaging in such a process, making consumers perceive it as more fun as well. *Method*

Participants. 200 participants ($M_{age} = 40.31$, SD = 12.12; 58.0% female) from Amazon Mechanical Turk participated in exchange for monetary payment.

Procedure. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two product promotion selection process conditions: control or chance (see Web Appendix). Participants read the exact same scenarios as described in Study 3A.

Participants then indicated in random order "How fun was the way in which the flavor was selected for promotion?" and "How fun is the Trident company?" ($1 = Not Fun \ at \ All, 9 = Extremely \ Fun$). Participants then indicated "How likely are you to purchase the 'watermelon twist' chewing gum?" ($1 = Not \ Likely \ at \ All, 9 = Extremely \ Likely$). Finally, participants completed demographic measures (gender and age).

Preference. As predicted, participants were significantly more likely to purchase the "watermelon twist" flavor when it was described as selected by chance (M = 5.01, SD = 2.69) than in the control condition (M = 4.03, SD = 2.68; t(198) = 2.57, p = .011, d = .37, 95% CI = [.23, 1.73]).

Perceptions of selection. Also as predicted, participants indicated that the way in which the flavor was selected for promotion was significantly more fun when the flavor was described as selected by chance (M = 6.05, SD = 2.01) than in the control condition (M = 4.43, SD = 2.44; t(198) = 5.13, p < .001, d = .73, 95% CI = [1.00, 2.24]).

Perceptions of the company. Also as predicted, participants indicated that the Trident company was significantly more fun when the flavor was described as selected by chance (M = 5.93, SD = 1.86) than in the control condition (M = 5.16, SD = 1.95; t(198) = 5.13, p = .005, d = .40, 95% CI = [.24, 1.31]).

Mediation analysis. To test our proposed process, we conducted a bootstrap analysis with 5,000 samples (Hayes 2013) using product promotion selection process as the independent variable, perceptions of fun in the selection process and perceptions of the company as fun as sequential mediators, and purchase likelihood as the dependent variable. Consistent with our theorizing, the analysis revealed that participants in the chance condition perceived the company product promotion selection process as more fun, which increased perceptions of the company as fun, resulting in a greater likelihood of purchasing the product (*95% CI*: .12 to .42; see figure 4).

Figure 4: Mediation of Product Promotion Selection Process Condition on



Purchase Likelihood for Study 4

NOTES — The path coefficients are unstandardized betas. Values in parentheses indicate the effect of Product Promotion Selection Process condition on the dependent variable after controlling for the mediator. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

Study 4 documented the full mechanistic model underlying consumer preference for hedonic products described as selected for promotion by chance. Specifically, consumers perceive the selection process of a hedonic product by chance as more fun than the process of selecting an otherwise identical product for promotion through traditional practices, leading consumers to perceive the company as more fun, and the fun added to the company's image results in higher purchase likelihood. This causal chain is accordant with research on the "halo effect" which demonstrates that perceptions of specific actions taken by companies can spillover into overall evaluations of those companies (Aaker et al. 2010).

STUDY 5: HEDONIC VS. UTILITARIAN PRODUCTS

Study 4 demonstrated the full mediating path driving the influence of describing chance selection on preference. It does so by providing evidence that describing the chance selection of a hedonic product for promotion enhances consumer preference by increasing perceptions along the hedonic dimension of fun in a company's selection process, which in turn causes consumers to perceive the company as more fun. One potential boundary condition these findings suggest is a product type that is incongruent with a fun company image. With such a product type, consumers should be less likely to exhibit this preference for products described as selected for promotion by chance, which bestows a fun image upon the company engaging in chance selection. Of note, the previous studies examined the preference for products in the domains of a humorous article (Study 1), pop music (Study 2A), snacks (Study 2C), desserts (Study 3C), and candy (Studies 2B, 3A-3B, and 4); hedonic products which are perceived as sources of fun (Addis and Holbrook 2001; Hoyer and Stokburger-Sauer 2012; Ladhari et al. 2017). Thus, when consumers are informed that a company selects a hedonic product to promote by chance, increasing the fun that consumers perceive in the selection process and consequently that they perceive in the company's image, there is a fit between the image of the company promoting the product and the product type itself, which has been shown to enhance the effectiveness of the promotion (Kamins and Gupta 1994; Lynch and Schuler 1994; Till and Busler 2000).

In contrast, incongruence between a promoter's image and the promoted product type dampens the effectiveness of product promotions (Escalas and Bettman 2009). Utilitarian products are perceived not as sources of fun but as instruments with which to perform intended functions (Addis and Holbrook 2001; Dhar and Wertenbroch 2000; Holbrook and Hirschman 1982; Ladhari et al. 2017; Park and Moon 2003). Therefore, in the case of utilitarian products, there is incongruence between promoted product type and the image of a company perceived as fun due to its employment of chance. Consequently, describing chance in a company's selection of utilitarian products for promotion should not increase consumer preference. To test this
theory, consumers in Study 5 reported their preference for either a utilitarian or hedonic product that was described as selected either by chance or not.

Method

Participants. 600 participants ($M_{age} = 40.31$, SD = 12.89; 53.3% female) from Amazon Mechanical Turk participated in exchange for monetary payment.

Procedure. Participants were randomly assigned to one condition in a 2 (product promotion selection process: control vs. chance) x 2 (product type: hedonic vs. utilitarian) between-subjects design (see Web Appendix). We adapted our product type manipulation from previous research by framing liquid soap as either hedonic or utilitarian (Kronrod and Danziger 2013; Reich et al. 2017). All participants read that a company that makes liquid soap solutions selected one of its products for a 25% discount. In the hedonic condition, participants read that the company: "makes bubble soap solutions for children to play with" and that it selected "Lavender Scented Bubbles soap to sell at a 25% discount." In the utilitarian condition, participants read that the company: "makes liquid soap to sell at a 25% discount." Participants in the chance conditions were told that the company selected the specific soap for discount by "spinning a wheel" of all of the products it manufactures as in Studies 1, 2A, and 3A-4.

Participants then indicated "How likely are you to purchase this discounted Lavender Scented Bubbles[Lavender Scented Disinfectant] soap?" (1 = Not Likely at All, 9 = Extremely Likely). Finally, participants completed demographic measures (gender and age). *Results and Discussion*

Preference. A 2 (product promotion selection process: control vs. chance) x 2 (product type: hedonic vs. utilitarian) ANOVA on the purchase likelihood revealed a main effect of

selection process condition, F(1, 596) = 5.25, p = .022, $\eta^2 = .01$, such that purchase likelihood for a product selected by chance (M = 5.72, SD = 2.34) was significantly higher than in the control condition (M = 5.32, SD = 2.59), and a main effect of product type, F(1, 596) = 12.38, p < .001, $\eta^2 = .02$, such that purchase likelihood for the utilitarian product (M = 5.85, SD = 2.35) was significantly higher than for the hedonic product (M = 5.18, SD = 2.56). However, as predicted, a two-way ANOVA revealed a significant interaction between product promotion selection process and product type for purchase likelihood, F(1, 596) = 4.56, p = .033, $\eta^2 = .01$; see figure 5. Planned contrasts revealed that when the product was hedonic and was described as selected for promotion by chance, participants were significantly more likely to purchase the soap (M =5.59, SD = 2.32) than participants in the control condition (M = 4.71, SD = 2.74; F(1, 596) =9.79, Fisher's LSD: p = .002; d = .35, 95% CI = [.32, 1.44]). However, the effect attenuated when the product was utilitarian; participants in the chance condition were no more likely to purchase the soap (M = 5.87, SD = 2.36) than participants in the control condition (M = 5.84, SD= 2.34; F(1, 596) < 1, Fisher's LSD: p = .912; d = .01, 95% CI = [-.52, .59]).





These results indicate an important boundary condition to the influence of describing chance selection of products for promotion; describing a company's employment of chance as a selection strategy of products for promotion is beneficial for hedonic products but not for utilitarian products. Only when the product was hedonic and was congruent with the fun image bestowed upon the company by engaging in chance selection did participants show a preference for the product described as selected by chance. When the product was utilitarian and was incongruent with the company's fun image created by chance selection, this effect attenuated.

STUDY 6: PERSISTENCE OF EFFECT OVER MULTIPLE USES OF CHANCE SELECTION

While Study 5 illuminated an important boundary condition of product type, Study 6 explored another potential boundary of the new promotional strategy: whether consumer preference for chance selection persists over multiple uses of this promotional strategy. Research has well established that novelty deteriorates from multiple exposures to a stimulus (Zajonc 1968). Because the promotional strategy that we propose is not being used in the marketplace, and is therefore novel to consumers, a boundary condition this might suggest is that chance selection of products for promotion will increase consumer preference when consumers are first exposed to this strategy, as we have tested by gaging consumer's first time reactions to the strategy in Studies 1-5, but will not persist across multiple uses of this strategy when consumers are already familiar with it. Consumers in Study 6 reported their preference for two different discounted hedonic products, the second product discounted six months after the first, that were described as selected by a company for this promotion either by chance or not. Our theoretical framework argues that the preference for products selected for promotion by chance is driven by perceptions of fun, and not by perceived novelty of the promotion. Therefore, we predict that consumers will prefer a hedonic product selected for promotion by chance even when these consumers are familiar with this chance promotional strategy.

Method

Participants. 200 participants ($M_{age} = 37.94$, SD = 12.11; 44.4% female) from Amazon Mechanical Turk participated in exchange for monetary payment.

Procedure. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two product promotion selection process conditions: control or chance (see Web Appendix). In both conditions, as in the

hedonic product type conditions of Study 5, participants were first told that a company that makes bubble soap solutions for children to play with selected Lavender Scented Bubbles soap for a 25% discount promotion. In the control condition, participants read the following: "A company that makes bubble soap solutions for children to play with has selected Lavender Scented Bubbles soap to sell at a 25% discount." In the chance condition, participants read: "A company that makes bubble soap solutions for children to play with has selected Lavender Scented Bubbles soap to sell at a 25% discount." In the chance condition, participants read: "A company that makes bubble soap solutions for children to play with has selected Lavender Scented Bubbles soap to sell at a 25% discount by spinning a wheel of all of the bubble soap solutions it manufactures."

Participants then indicated "How likely are you to purchase this discounted Lavender Scented Bubbles soap?" (I = Not Likely at All, 9 = Extremely Likely).

On the next page of the survey, all participants then read about the company selecting Grape Scented Bubbles soap for a 25% discount promotion a half a year later. Participants in the control condition read: "Half a year later you see that the same company that makes bubble soap solutions for children to play with has selected Grape Scented Bubbles soap to sell at a 25% discount." Participants in the chance condition read: "Half a year later you see that the same company that makes bubble soap solutions for children to play with has selected Grape Scented Bubbles soap to sell at a 25% discount by spinning a wheel of all of the bubble soap solutions it manufactures."

Participants then indicated "How likely are you to purchase this discounted Grape Scented Bubbles soap?" (1 = Not Likely at All, 9 = Extremely Likely). Finally, participants completed demographic measures (gender and age).

Results and Discussion

Preference at time 1. As predicted, participants were significantly more likely to purchase the Lavender Scented Bubbles soap when it was described as selected by chance (M = 6.20, SD = 2.45) than in the control condition (M = 5.36, SD = 2.59; t(198) = 2.36, p = .019; d = .33, 95% CI = [.14, 1.54]).

Preference at time 2. Also as predicted, participants were significantly more likely to purchase the Grape Scented Bubbles soap when it was described as selected by chance (M = 6.08, SD = 2.53) than in the control condition (M = 5.24, SD = 2.76; t(198) = 2.25, p = .026; d = .32, 95% CI = [.10, 1.58]).

These results indicate that the preference for a product selected for promotion by chance persists across multiple uses of this promotional strategy. Consumers showed a preference both for the Lavender Scented Bubbles soap when it was selected for promotion by chance, and also for the Grape Scented Bubbles soap when it was selected for promotion using the same chance procedure by the company at a later date when consumers were already familiar with this selection strategy. This indicates that repeated use of the strategy of chance selection in promotion is not a boundary condition to its effect on consumer preference, and further suggests that novelty of the strategy is not driving the effect given that the chance selection of a scent of soap for a promotion increased preference for the soap even when consumers were familiar with the use of this promotional strategy.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Companies typically do not employ chance in their marketing strategies to select products for promotion; in fact, they invest significant resources into market research for the purpose of careful and intentional selection. However, we find that consumers prefer hedonic products described as selected by the company for promotion by chance to otherwise identical products selected by traditional practices. We find that this effect is driven by the ability of describing chance selection to influence perceptions along a hedonic dimension, increasing the fun consumers perceive in the selection process of products for promotion, which subsequently makes the company engaging in such selection appear as more fun. The results of this paper offer companies a new promotional strategy, delineating the conditions under which it could be used to draw consumers in, piquing their interest, creating a fun impression of the company, and enticing them towards a consumption experience of hedonic products.

In support of this effect, we find a preference for hedonic products described as selected by companies for promotion using chance in Studies 1-6. Study 1 demonstrated the ecological validity of our core effect in a field experiment on Facebook, showing that consumers were more likely to click an advertisement to read a humorous article when the article was described as selected for promotion by chance. Studies 2A-2C provided converging evidence for this phenomenon using different products and a variety of behavioral operationalizations of preference. By directly measuring how fun consumers perceive the selection process of a hedonic product for promotion by chance to be compared to a control condition, Studies 3A-3C provided mediation support for the idea that this preference is driven by heightened perceptions of fun in the selection process of a product for promotion by chance and further ruled out multiple alternative mechanisms. A posttest revealed that while describing a company's selection by chance bestows an image of fun upon the company, it does not change perceptions of how fun the promoted product is. Through serial mediation, Study 4 showed that the heightened perceptions of fun in the selection process lead to perceptions of the company described as engaging in chance selection as more fun, ultimately driving consumer preference. Study 5 identifies an important boundary condition to the effect of describing chance selection, showing that because describing chance selection influences hedonic perceptions, consumer preference for products described as selected for promotion by chance emerges for hedonic products, but not for utilitarian products which are perceived as incongruent with the image of a fun company. Finally, Study 6 indicates that the preference for products selected for promotion by chance persists over multiple uses of this strategy even after consumers are familiar with it, suggesting that novelty is not driving the effect of chance selection on preference for hedonic products. *Theoretical Implications*

The current research is the first to reveal that a company's description of chance selection of a hedonic product for promotion can increase consumer preference. This research also demonstrates that this preference emerges because of chance's ability to heighten hedonic perceptions, increasing perceptions of fun for the consumer regarding a company's product promotion selection process, resulting in consumers perceiving the company as more fun. This illuminates a novel mechanism through which information about a company's chance selection of a hedonic product for promotion can positively influence consumer preference, and contributes to our understanding of the understudied psychological construct of "fun" in consumer perceptions and behavior (Holbrook et al. 1984; Kim et al. 2021; Oh and Pham 2018) by exploring how to create it and when it can heighten product preference. Rather than having consumers *experience* chance by participating in probabilistic promotions such as scratching a ticket to determine level of product discount (Ailawadi et al. 2014; Hock, Bagchi, and Anderson 2020; Laran and Tsiros 2013; Ruan, Hsee, and Lu 2018; Shen, Hsee, and Talloen 2018), the present work suggests that when the company itself engages in chance to select which hedonic product to promote, it can heighten consumer preference. Without consumers experiencing any chance themselves, consumer awareness of the company's chance selection increases preference by influencing hedonic *perceptions*. In doing so, the current research builds upon work examining chance in promotions, as well as work investigating perceptions of chance events which has shown that "fun" is perceived to be a core dimension of chance events (Hume and Mort 2011; Wagenaar and Keren 1988; Zaman et al. 2020), to show that chance processes in marketing strategies are perceived as fun and that this perception is rewarded with increased hedonic product preference.

Finally, these studies add to work examining the "halo effect" in consumer research, providing additional support for the notion that perceptions of a company's actions can spill into overall evaluations of a company. Previous work on the "halo effect" in marketing research has indicated that companies engaging in socially responsible or for-profit activities are consequently globally evaluated as warm or competent respectively (Aaker et al. 2010). Accordant with and adding to these findings, the current research indicates that a company's engagement in and description of a chance promotional selection process can spillover into overall evaluations of the company, making the company itself appear fun.

Practical Implications

Illuminating the effect of describing chance selection of products for promotion has important prescriptive applications for real world marketing practices in that this strategy could be implemented by marketing managers to increase product sales. Because chance selection heightens preference by increasing hedonic perceptions, we find that while this preference emerges for hedonic products due to their congruence with the hedonic image of the promoting company (Kamins and Gupta 1994; Lynch and Schuler 1994; Till and Busler 2000), it does not emerge for utilitarian products due to their incongruence with the hedonic image of the promoting company (Escalas and Bettman 2009). Indeed, firms often desire to position themselves as "fun" brands (Mukherjee 2010; Oh and Pham 2018), and marketers could use these findings to determine when they can benefit from cultivating a "fun" brand image by engaging in chance selection and explicitly conveying the nature of the selection process to consumers.

That Study 1 was conducted as a field experiment on Facebook using advertisements for an actual hedonic article indicates the ecological validity of the effect presented in this work, and its applicability to real-world stakeholders in executing and communicating marketing strategy for promoted hedonic products. Studies 2A-6 provide converging evidence that marketing managers could increase preference for consumer products by using and communicating this new promotional strategy by demonstrating consumer preference in actual consumption, click rate, consequential product choice, and behavioral intentions. Further, Study 6 suggests that companies can benefit from repeated use of this strategy because consumers who have already gained some familiarity with the strategy continue to show a preference for hedonic products selected for promotion by chance across multiple uses of the strategy and for different products.

Additionally, these results show the generalizability and applicability of the effect across multiple promotion types. While Studies 1-2C and Study 3C indicate that consumers prefer hedonic products described as selected for promotion by chance when the promotion simply

highlights the product, Studies 3A and 3B, and Studies 4, 5, and 6 demonstrate that this phenomenon extends to selecting products for various magnitudes of price discount promotions. This indicates the applicability of the new strategy that we propose to different types of promotions used in the marketplace and its potential benefit to stakeholders.

Limitations and Future Directions

Although the new promotional strategy presented by the current research does demonstrate a way to increase consumer preference for promoted hedonic products, marketing managers can select products to promote for a variety of reasons beyond simply accelerating purchase; for example, clearing out soon to expire inventory, inducing trial of new products, unloading excess supply of products, or encouraging product switching. In those situations, research should establish if choosing at random from the subset of products to be promoted will prove effective or whether the effect hinges on selection from the entire line of products.

Additionally, future directions could examine downstream consequences of engaging in this new promotional strategy. Since chance selection of one product for promotion spills over into global fun perceptions of the company, future research could examine if chance selection of one product for promotion increases consumer preference for other hedonic products promoted by the same company.

REFERENCES

- Aaker, Jennifer, Kathleen D. Vohs, and Cassie Mogilner (2010), "Nonprofits are Seen as Warm and for-profits as Competent: Firm Stereotypes Matter," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37 (2), 224-237.
- Addis, Michela, and Morris B. Holbrook (2001), "On the Conceptual Link Between Mass Customisation and Experiential Consumption: An Explosion of Subjectivity," *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 1 (1), 50-66.
- Ailawadi, Kusum L., Karen Gedenk, Tobias Langer, Yu Ma, and Scott A. Neslin (2014),
 "Consumer Response to Uncertain Promotions: An Empirical Analysis of Conditional Rebates," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 31 (1), 94-106.
- Alavi, Sascha, Torsten Bornemann, and Jan Wieseke (2015), "Gambled Price Discounts: A Remedy to the Negative Side Effects of Regular Price Discounts," *Journal of Marketing*, 79 (2), 62-78.
- Cho, Hyejeung, and Norbert Schwarz (2008), "Of Great Art and Untalented Artists: Effort Information and the Flexible Construction of Judgmental Heuristics," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 18 (3), 205-211.
- Dhar, Ravi, and Klaus Wertenbroch (2000), "Consumer Choice between Hedonic and Utilitarian Goods," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 37 (1), 60-71.
- Dinner, Isaac M., Harald J. Van Heerde, and Scott A. Neslin (2014), "Driving Online and Offline Sales: The Cross Channel Effects of Traditional, Online Display, and Paid Search Advertising," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40 (5), 527-545.

- Escalas, Jennifer E., and James R. Bettman (2009), "Connecting with Celebrities: Celebrity Endorsement, Brand Meaning, and Self-brand Connections," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 13 (3), 339-348.
- Friestad, Marian, and Peter Wright (1994), "The Persuasion Knowledge Model: How People Cope with Persuasion Attempts," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21 (1), 1-31.
- Fuchs, Christoph, Martin Schreier, and Stijn M.J. van Osselaer (2015), "The Handmade Effect: What's Love Got to Do with It?," *Journal of Marketing*, 79 (2), 98-110.
- Hayes, Andrew F. (2013), Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression-based Approach, New York: Guilford Press.
- Hagtvedt, Henrik (2011), "The Impact of Incomplete Typeface Logos on Perceptions of the Firm," *Journal of Marketing*, 75 (4), 86-93.
- Hock, Stefan J., Rajesh Bagchi, and Thomas M. Anderson (2020), "Promotional Games Increase
 Consumer Conversion Rates and Spending," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 47 (1), 79-99.
- Holbrook, Morris B., Robert W. Chestnut, Terence A. Oliva, and Eric A. Greenleaf (1984), "Play as a consumption experience: The roles of emotions, performance, and personality in the enjoyment of games," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11 (2), 728-739.
- Holbrook, Morris B., and Elizabeth C. Hirschman (1982), "The Experiential Aspects of Consumption: Consumer Fantasies, Feelings, and Fun," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (2), 132-140.
- Hoyer, Wayne D., and Nicola E. Stokburger-Sauer (2012), "The Role of Aesthetic Taste in Consumer Behavior," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 40 (1), 167-180.

- Hume, Margee, and Gillian Sullivan Mort (2011), "Fun, Friend, or Foe: Youth Perceptions and Definitions of Online Gambling," *Social Marketing Quarterly*, 17 (1), 109-133.
- Ipeirotis, Panagiotis G. (2010), "Analyzing the Amazon Mechanical Turk Marketplace," *XRDS: Crossroads, The ACM Magazine for Students*, 17 (2), 16-21.
- Kamins, Michael A., and Kamal Gupta (1994), "Congruence Between Spokesperson and Product Type: A Matchup Hypothesis Perspective," *Psychology and Marketing*, 11 (6), 569-586.

Wagenaar, Willem A., and Gideon B. Keren (1988), "Chance and Luck are not the Same," *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 1 (2), 65-75.

- Kim, Nicole Y., Rebecca K. Ratner, and Neeru Paharia (2021), "Friendship Utility: Signaling Friendship Motivation Through Hedonic Consumption Choices," *Manuscript in* preparation for submission.
- Kronrod, Ann, and Shai Danziger (2013), "Wii Will Rock You!' The Use and Effect of Figurative Language in Consumer Reviews of Hedonic and Utilitarian Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40 (4), 726–739.
- Kruger, Justin, Derrick Wirtz, Leaf Van Boven, and T. William Altermatt (2004), "The Effort Heuristic," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40 (1), 91-98.
- Ladhari, Riad, Nizar Souiden, and Beatrice Dufour (2017), "The Role of Emotions in Utilitarian Service Settings: The Effects of Emotional Satisfaction on Product Perception and Behavioral Intentions," *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 34, 10-18.
- Laran, Juliano, and Michael Tsiros (2013), "An investigation of the effectiveness of uncertainty in marketing promotions involving free gifts," *Journal of Marketing*, 77 (2), 112-123.

- Lynch, James, and Drue Schuler (1994), "The Matchup Effect of Spokesperson and Product Congruency: A Schema Theory Interpretation," *Psychology and Marketing*, 11 (5), 417-445.
- Messerli, Franz H. (2012), "Chocolate Consumption, Cognitive Function, and Nobel Laureates," *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 367 (16), 1562-1564.
- Morales, Andrea C. (2005), "Giving Firms an 'E' for Effort: Consumer Responses to High-Effort Firms," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (4), 806-812.
- Mukherjee, Sayantani (2010), "Let the Games Begin: Evaluating Fun Experiences," *ACR North American Advances*.
- To, Rita Ngoc, and Vanessa M. Patrick (2020), "How the Eyes Connect to the Heart: The Influence of Eye Gaze Direction on Advertising Effectiveness." Journal of Consumer Research, 1-24.
- Tae Oh, Travis, and Michel Tuan Pham (2018), "The Psychology of Fun: Inquiry Into Consumers' Fun Experiences," *ACR North American Advances*.
- Park, Chan-Wook, and Byeong-Joon Moon (2003), "The Relationship between Product Involvement and Product Knowledge: Moderating Roles of Product Type and Product Knowledge Type," *Psychology and Marketing*, 20 (11), 977-997.
- Reich, Taly, Daniella M. Kupor, and Rosanna K. Smith (2017), "Made by Mistake: When Mistakes Increase Product Preference," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 45 (5), 1085-1103.
- Reis, Harry T., Stephanie D. O'Keefe, and Richard D. Lane (2017), "Fun is More Fun when Others are Involved," *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12 (6), 547-557.

Richardson, Matthew, Ewa Dominowska, and Robert Ragno (2007), "Predicting Clicks: Estimating the Click-Through Rate for New Ads," *Proceeding of the 16th International Conference on World Wide Web*, 521-530.

Ruan, Bowen, Christopher K. Hsee, and Zoe Y. Lu (2018), "The Teasing Effect: An Underappreciated Benefit of Creating and Resolving an Uncertainty," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 55 (4), 556–570.

Sales Promotion (2020). Inc. https://www.inc.com/encyclopedia/sales-promotion.html

- Simmons, Joseph P., Leif D. Nelson, and Uri Simonsohn (2018), "False-positive citations," *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 13 (2), 255-259.
- Shen, Luxi, Christopher K. Hsee, and Joachim H. Talloen (2018), "The Fun and Function of Uncertainty: Uncertain Incentives Reinforce Repetition Decisions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 46 (1), 69-81.
- Till, Brian D., and Michael Busler (2000), "The Match-up Hypothesis: Physical Attractiveness, Expertise, and the Role of Fit On Brand Attitude, Purchase Intent and Brand Beliefs," *Journal of Advertising*, 29 (3), 1-13.
- Zajonc, Robert B. (1968), "Attitudinal effects of mere exposure," *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 9 (2), 1-27.
- Zaman, Bieke, Maarten Van Mechelen, Rozane De Cock, and Jonathan Huyghe (2020),
 "Perceptions of and Exposure to Games of Chance, Gambling, and Video Gaming: Self-Reports of Preadolescents and Parents," *Journal of Gambling Issues*, 46.

WEB APPENDIX

This web appendix includes questionnaires and stimuli provided to participants in all studies in the order seen by participants. This includes any additional measures noted in the main text.

STUDY 1

Conditions (Facebook Advertisements) (Details revealing the identity of the university behavioral lab are removed)

B Facebook Feeds	G Facebook Feeds
CREST UNIVERSITY NAME Behavioral Lab Sponsored - C	CREST UNIVERSITY NAME Behavioral Lab Sponsored e
Checkout this article linking chocolate consumption to winning Nobel Prizes! The UNIVERSITY NAME Behavioral Lab chose this article to promote.	Checkout this article linking chocolate consumption to winning Nobel Prizes! The UNIVERSITY NAME Behavioral Lab chose this article to promote by chance by spinning a wheel of articles.
UNIVERSITY NAME Online Survey Software Qualtrics Survey Solutions	UNIVERSITY NAME QUALTRICS.C Online Survey Software Qualtrics Survey Solutions
🖒 Like 💭 Comment 🔗 Share	🖞 Like 💭 Comment 🔗 Share
Control	Chanca

STUDY 2A

CONDITIONS

Control Including an Explanation

A new music streaming service that exclusively produces covers sung by professional musicians and charges its users a monthly subscription fee, has selected one of its covers to promote this month based on extensive market research. The song that the music streaming service selected was a cover of Taylor Swift's *Blank Space*.

Traditional Control

A new music streaming service that exclusively produces covers sung by professional musicians and charges its users a monthly subscription fee, has selected one of its covers to promote this month. The song that the music streaming service selected was a cover of Taylor Swift's *Blank Space*.

Chance

A new music streaming service that exclusively produces covers sung by professional musicians and charges its users a monthly subscription fee, has selected one of its covers to promote this month by spinning an online wheel of chance of all the covers it has produced. The song that the music streaming service selected was a cover of Taylor Swift's *Blank Space*.

Choice

As part of your participation in this survey, you may listen to the cover that the music streaming service selected to promote. Otherwise, please feel free to continue on to the next page of the survey.

Would you like to listen to the cover right now?

Yes	No
0	0

Instructions (IF PARTICIPANT CHOSE "YES")

Before proceeding to the next page, make sure the volume on your computer is audible.

Please click play below to listen to the song (you may listen for as long as you would like and can proceed at any point).

▶ 0:00 / 4:11 → ● :
 Demographics
 What is your gender?
 Male Female Other
 O Other

Please indicate your age:

STUDY 2B

Introduction

Thank you for signing up to take this survey!

Please read the instructions carefully and complete this short survey in one seating.

CONDITIONS

Control

As a special occasion for the upcoming Valentine's Day, Amazon has partnered with Dove Chocolate to promote one of Dove's products. For this promotion, Dove selected a flavor from its line of chocolate products.

The flavor that Dove selected was caramel chocolate.

Chance

As a special occasion for the upcoming Valentine's Day, Amazon has partnered with Dove Chocolate to promote one of Dove's products. For this promotion, Dove used a random generator to select a flavor by chance from its line of chocolate products.

The flavor that the random generator selected was caramel chocolate.

Click Rate

Below is a link to the Dove Valentine's Caramel chocolate web page on Amazon which you can click if you are interested in learning more about the product (it will not take you out of this survey rather the link will open in a new window).

Otherwise, please feel free to continue to the next page of the survey.

Demographics

What is your gender?		
Male	Female	Other
0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

Please indicate your age:

*

Please let us know any comments you have about this survey:

STUDY 2C

Introduction

Thank you for signing up to take this survey!

Please read the instructions carefully and complete this short survey in one seating. Please do not leave the survey or go to any other web page at any point.

CONDITIONS

Control

As a special occasion for the upcoming Super Bowl, Amazon has partnered with Pringles to promote one of Pringles' products. For this promotion, Pringles selected a flavor from its line of potato chips.

The flavor Pringles selected was Pringles Ranch.

We would like you to briefly evaluate this product. In addition to the compensation that you will receive for this survey, your evaluation of the product will make you eligible for the chance to win a pack of 3 cans of this flavor and have it shipped to you.

Chance

As a special occasion for the upcoming Super Bowl, Amazon has partnered with Pringles to promote one of Pringles' products. For this promotion, Pringles used a random generator to select a flavor by chance from its line of potato chips.

The flavor that the random generator selected was Pringles Ranch.

We would like you to briefly evaluate this product. In addition to the compensation that you will receive for this survey, your evaluation of the product will make you eligible for the chance to win a pack of 3 cans of this flavor and have it shipped to you.

Filler Questions

Below is Pringles' Ranch potato chips. Please answer the following questions.



Does this flavor of potato chips seem like a good snack for the Super Bowl?

Yes	No
0	0

Have you ever purchased this flavor of potato chips before?

Yes	No
0	0

How often do you purchase potato chips?

Never	Weekly	Monthly	Half-yearly	Once a Year
0	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

Choice

Thank you for participating! As a token of our appreciation, you will be entered into a lottery for a chance to win a pack of 3 cans of the Pringles Ranch potato chips

mentioned earlier. However, if you would prefer to be entered into a lottery for a chance to win a pack of 3 cans of Salt and Vinegar potato chips instead, you may indicate that below and continue on to the next page.

Which flavor would you prefer to be entered into a lottery for the chance to win?



Email for Compensation

As explained, you will be entered into a drawing for a chance to win a pack of 3 cans of Pringles.

The prize drawing will be conducted at the conclusion of the study by the protocol director. The winner of the drawing will receive notification via e-mail.

Below, please enter the e-mail address to which, if you should win the prize drawing, you would like to be notified.

E-mail Address:

Please let us know any comments you have about this survey:

STUDY 3A

Introduction

In order to make sure you are indeed a human participant rather than a bot please write what you had for breakfast this morning.

CONDITIONS

Control

Trident is a company that makes sugar free chewing gum in 21 different flavors. Their chewing gum can be found in any supermarket. Imagine walking into a supermarket and seeing that Trident is offering a 10% discount on the "watermelon twist" flavor.

Chance

Trident is a company that makes sugar free chewing gum in 21 different flavors. Their chewing gum can be found in any supermarket. Imagine walking into a supermarket and seeing that Trident is offering a 10% discount on the "watermelon twist" flavor. Trident used a wheel of flavors to determine which flavor out of their 21 flavors to discount.

Purchase Likelihood

How likely would you be to purchase this "watermelon twist" flavor?

				Neither				
Not Likely at				Likely nor				Extremely
All		Unlikely						Likely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

Perceptions of Selection

How fun was the way in which the flavor was selected for promotion?

Not Fun at								Extremely
All								Fun
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
\bigcirc								

Demographics



Captcha

I'm not a robot	
	reCAPTCHA
	Privacy - Term

CONDITIONS

Control

Trident is a company that makes sugar free chewing gum in 21 different flavors. Their chewing gum can be found in any supermarket. Imagine walking into a supermarket and seeing that Trident is offering a 10% discount on the spearmint flavor.

Chance

Trident is a company that makes sugar free chewing gum in 21 different flavors. Their chewing gum can be found in any supermarket. Imagine walking into a supermarket and seeing that Trident is offering a 10% discount on the spearmint flavor. Trident used a wheel of flavors to determine which flavor out of their 21 flavors to discount.

Purchase Likelihood

How likely would you be to purchase this spearmint flavor?

				Neither				
Not Likely at	Likely nor							
All				Unlikely				Likely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

Perceptions of Selection

How fun was the way in which the flavor was selected for promotion?

Not Fun at								Extremely
All								Fun
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
\bigcirc								

Perceptions of Quality

What is the overall quality of the gum selected for promotion?

Not So Good								Very Good
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

Demographics

Finally, we ask that you provide us with some basic demographic information. Your answers will be kept completely confidential, and you are free to skip any of the questions.

Gender

O Male

O Female

O Other

Age

STUDY 3C

Captcha



CONDITIONS

Control

Mountaintop Creamery is an ice cream company that has been making ice cream for the past 10 years. Each month, Mountaintop Creamery selects a different ice cream flavor to be the "flavor of the month".

This month, Mountaintop Creamery selected chocolate chip cookie dough to be the new "flavor of the month".

Chance

Mountaintop Creamery is an ice cream company that has been making ice cream for the past 10 years. Each month, Mountaintop Creamery selects a different ice cream flavor to be the "flavor of the month" by spinning the wheel of flavors.

This month, when the wheel was spun, chocolate chip cookie dough was selected as the new "flavor of the month".

Purchase Likelihood

How likely would you be to purchase this new "flavor of the month" ice cream?

				Neither				
Not Likely				Likely nor				Extremely
at All				Unlikely				Likely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
\bigcirc								

Trustworthiness

How trustworthy is the Mountaintop Creamery company? Not at All Extremely 6 1 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 \bigcirc How reliable is the Mountaintop Creamery company? Not at All Extremely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 0 0 0 \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc

Perceptions of Selection

How fun was the way in which this new "flavor of the month" ice cream was selected for promotion?

Not Fun at								Extremely
All								Fun
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
\bigcirc								

Demographics

What is your gender?

Male	Female	Other
0	0	0

Please indicate your age:

POSTTEST

Introduction

In order to make sure you are indeed a human participant rather than a bot please write what you had for breakfast this morning.

CONDITIONS

Control

Trident is a company that makes sugar free chewing gum in 21 different flavors. Their chewing gum can be found in any supermarket. Imagine walking into a supermarket and seeing that Trident is offering a 10% discount on the "watermelon twist" flavor.

Chance

Trident is a company that makes sugar free chewing gum in 21 different flavors. Their chewing gum can be found in any supermarket. Imagine walking into a supermarket and seeing that Trident is offering a 10% discount on the "watermelon twist" flavor. Trident used a wheel of flavors to determine which flavor out of their 21 flavors to discount.

(FOLLOWING THREE QUESTIONS PRESENTED IN RANDOM ORDER)

Perceptions of Selection

How fun was the way in which the flavor was selected for promotion?

Not Fun at								Extremely
All								Fun
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
\bigcirc								

Perceptions of Product

How fun is the "watermelon twist" chewing gum?

Not Fun at								Extremely
All								Fun
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
\bigcirc								

Perceptions of the Company

How fun is the Trident company?

Not Fun at								Extremely
All								Fun
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
\bigcirc								

Demographics



Captcha

I'm not a rabat	<u></u>
I'm not a robot	
	reCAPTCHA
	Privacy - Terms

CONDITIONS

Control

Trident is a company that makes sugar free chewing gum in 21 different flavors. Their chewing gum can be found in any supermarket. Imagine walking into a supermarket and seeing that Trident is offering a 10% discount on the "watermelon twist" flavor.

Chance

Trident is a company that makes sugar free chewing gum in 21 different flavors. Their chewing gum can be found in any supermarket. Imagine walking into a supermarket and seeing that Trident is offering a 10% discount on the "watermelon twist" flavor. Trident used a wheel of flavors to determine which flavor out of their 21 flavors to discount.

(FOLLOWING TWO QUESTIONS PRESENTED IN RANDOM ORDER) Perceptions of the Company

How fun is the Trident company?

Not Fun at								Extremely
All								Fun
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
\bigcirc								

Perceptions of Selection

How fun was the way in which the flavor was selected for promotion?

Not Fun at								Extremely
All								Fun
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
\bigcirc								

Purchase Likelihood

How likely are you to purchase the "watermelon twist" chewing gum?

Not Likely at								Extremely
All								Likely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

Demographics





Please indicate your age:

STUDY 5

Introduction

Thank you for taking this survey!

Please read the instructions carefully.

CONDITIONS

Control-Hedonic

A company that makes bubble soap solutions for children to play with has selected Lavender Scented Bubbles soap to sell at a 25% discount.
Chance-Hedonic

A company that makes bubble soap solutions for children to play with has selected Lavender Scented Bubbles soap to sell at a 25% discount by spinning a wheel of all of the bubble soap solutions it manufactures.

Control-Utilitarian

A company that makes liquid soap cleaning products has selected Lavender Scented Disinfectant soap to sell at a 25% discount.

Chance-Utilitarian

A company that makes liquid soap cleaning products has selected Lavender Scented Disinfectant soap to sell at a 25% discount by spinning a wheel of all of the liquid soap cleaning products it manufactures.

Purchase Likelihood-Utilitarian

How likely are you to purchase this discounted Lavender Scented Disinfectant soap?

				Neither					
Not Likely at				Likely nor				Extremely	
All		Unlikely							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	

74

Purchase Likelihood-Hedonic

How likely are you to purchase this discounted Lavender Scented Bubbles soap?

Not Likely at All				Neither Likely nor Unlikely				Extremely Likely	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	
Demographi	CS								
What is y	/our gen	ider?							
	Male	9		Fema	ale		C	ther	
\bigcirc			\bigcirc				\bigcirc		

Please indicate your age:

STUDY 6

Introduction

Before we start, we'd like to know if you are human or a robot.

If you are a human, in the space below, please write down your favorite food.

TIME 1 CONDITIONS AND PURCHASE LIKELIHOOD

Time 1-Control

A company that makes bubble soap solutions for children to play with has selected Lavender Scented Bubbles soap to sell at a 25% discount.

Time 1-Chance

A company that makes bubble soap solutions for children to play with has selected Lavender Scented Bubbles soap to sell at a 25% discount by spinning a wheel of all of the bubble soap solutions it manufactures.

Time 1-Purchase Likelihood

How likely are you to purchase this discounted Lavender Scented Bubbles soap?

				Neither					
Not Likely at				Likely nor				Extremely	
All		Unlikely							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	

TIME 2 CONDITIONS AND PURCHASE LIKELIHOOD

Time 2-Control

Half a year later you see that the same company that makes bubble soap solutions for children to play with has selected Grape Scented Bubbles soap to sell at a 25% discount. Time 2-Chance

Half a year later you see that the same company that makes bubble soap solutions for children to play with has selected Grape Scented Bubbles soap to sell at a 25% discount by spinning a wheel of all of the bubble soap solutions it manufactures.

Time 2-Purchase Likelihood

How likely are you to purchase this discounted Grape Scented Bubbles soap?

				Neither					
Not Likely at Likely nor									
All		Unlikely							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	

Please indicate your age:



What is your gender?

Male	Female	Other
0	0	\bigcirc