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Abstract

A large component of marketing communication consists of service providers trying to persuade clients to use their services. This persuasive information frequently takes the form of service providers’ past experience, some of which is highly relevant to the clients’ interest and others less so. Two essays investigated how different ways of describing the work experience of service providers influence clients’ choices.

The first essay examined how service providers and clients chose between two work descriptions which described the less relevant work experience using either a specific (e.g., fund manager) or general (e.g., financial service) job category. Findings show that service providers choose a specific description of their work experience with more information than clients would want to see. It was because service providers judged presenting specific descriptions as a signal
of their transparency more than clients judged it. Specific descriptions were judged as transparent when participants considered that a service provider could have described the same experience using a less-revealing general description. Considering that the service provider could have chosen a less transparent description was easier for service providers whereas this same transparency is more difficult for clients to observe.

The second essay identified two types of experience, broad and deep, and examined whether and when each type of experience is evaluated more favorably. Drawing upon the theory of mindset, I found that deep experience is evaluated highly when clients adopt an implemental mindset. Clients evaluated a service provider with deep experience more favorably when they need someone to implement a task than when they need someone to consult with to find a solution for their problem. Moreover, a service provider with deep experience was evaluated highly when clients needed the service immediately and reviewed implemental steps for solving their problem.

The current research contributes to the literature by showing that evaluation of a specific information format and an information format highlighting depth of experience depends on the type of viewer and implemental mindset. Furthermore, the findings offer insights into service literature by showing transparency inferred from self-description and depth of experience as factors influencing choice.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

According to World Bank data, the value generated by the service industry made up 69% of the worldwide gross domestic production in 2015 (World Bank 2017). In the United States, 80% of the labor population was employed in the service sector in 2016 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017). In the current service-driven economy, consumers frequently need to make choices between service providers. These may include choosing a real estate agent for real estate transactions, a hair stylist for a haircut, or a doctor for treatments. Although the choices between service providers are based on various attributes, one key attribute is the experience of service providers. When providing or choosing a service, we frequently use the information about the experience of service providers—a restaurant may emphasize the length of deep experience in a certain cuisine, or a lawyer may highlight the breadth of case-winning experiences and so on. Considering the fact that the majority has work experiences in multiple career fields (Workopolis, 2014), how can service providers effectively advertise their diverse experience to clients? For example, if a real estate agent who has experience in both residential and commercial real estate is meeting a home buyer, would a detailed description of the commercial real estate experience be beneficial? Would framing the agent’s experience to emphasize the breadth or depth be more effective? The two essays in this thesis look at two different aspects of how service providers can present their information to potential clients and how these clients respond.

The first essay focuses on the specificity of information and shows a mismatch between clients and service providers in their preferred level of specificity of provided information. It is common for service providers to have a breadth of experience, some directly relevant and others less relevant to the task that clients want them to perform. The less relevant experience can be described in specific job categories to fully provide the details to clients or described in general
job categories to prevent diluting the service provider’s expertise in the relevant field. Yet, when the less relevant experience is described in a specific manner, some may appreciate the service provider for being transparent to the clients. I have found that service providers believed presenting specific details would show their transparency more than clients realized. Hence, when choosing between a specific and a general description of one’s experience, service providers prefer to choose the specific description more than clients would want to see. The first essay advances the field by (a) showing a discrepancy in preferred information format between service providers and clients and (b) showing that such discrepancy is partially caused by the fact that the information about service providers is more accessible to service providers than to clients.

The second essay explores whether and how the breadth vs. depth of one’s experience matters. Conditioned on a fixed amount of experience, a service provider may have broad experience (i.e., a collection of numerous related experiences, each of which is shorter in duration) or deep experience (i.e., a long duration of one particular experience). Drawing upon the mindset theory of action phases demonstrating that an implemental mindset induces selective information processing, I show that deep experience would be evaluated more favorably when implementation is a main concern for clients. Particularly, deep experience was rated more positively when clients needed an implementation service (vs. consultation) or an immediate implementation of the service and when they mentally represented the service focusing on implemental steps. The findings add contributions to the literature by (a) introducing new factors useful in studying services (implementation vs. consultation service, broad vs. deep experience) and (b) showing how an implemental mindset increases selectivity in one’s responses.

I expect that the two essays will contribute to the information format and service literature by proposing new factors explaining choices. The two essays examine how different
formats for describing a set of information influence the evaluation and how the effect of information format is moderated by whether the decision-maker is the self who presents their own information or others (Essay 1), and how much the decision-maker has an implemental mindset (Essay 2). The literature on information format has shown that the way choice options are presented affects the final choice; for example, describing the same event using the gain–loss frame or varying numerical units for the same quantity impacts what consumers choose (Kahneman & Tversky, 2013; Monga & Bagchi, 2012; Wadhwa & Zhang, 2015; Zhang & Schwarz, 2012). In most cases, the described object in the previous articles was a simple object, and few researchers have addressed what formats can be used to describe complex objects such as a set containing multiple experiences and their effects. Except for the presentation order of elements, specificity of information about each element and the breadth among elements in a set (Clarkson, Janiszewski, & Cinelli, 2013) are under-researched topics despite the ease and prevalence of manipulating these factors.

In addition, the two essays contribute to the service literature by introducing characteristics of service providers’ experience and descriptions of experience as factors affecting service choice. Unlike products, service often lacks tangible attributes such as physical appearance, and this intangibility makes services difficult to evaluate (Bebko, 2000; Levitt, 1981). Building on the literature regarding what kinds of tangible and intangible attributes are available for evaluating services (Ding & Keh, 2017; Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman, 1993), I focus on the work experience of a service provider, which is one of the most easily obtainable and important intangible attributes. Because experience involves unique characteristics such as limits of one’s capacity and relevance to one’s identity, which distinguish it from other attributes, it is worth examining how people use the information about experience. Although the two essays are both about choices based on the experience of service providers, they are different in terms of
the characteristics of experience highlighted by information format (specificity in Essay 1 vs. breadth in Essay 2) and factors moderating the basic effect.

In chapter 4, I discuss how Essay 1 and Essay 2 are related to each other yet unique in their own ways. They share common ground as both address how to communicate one’s career which includes some experience less relevant to the client’s interest. The first essay questions whether it is beneficial to specify less relevant experience while the second essay investigates whether it is good to list different kinds of less relevant experience to signal the breadth of the experience. Yet, they provide different insights as the first essay focuses on service providers’ transparency inferred from a specified description whereas the second essay studies how one’s mindset affects their attitude toward less relevant experience. Further, I discuss future research questions inspired by these two essays. One question is whether the effect would be generalized to situations when consumers evaluate a product rather than a service provider. Also, would the effect be generalized when clients evaluate the machine service provider such as a machine financial advisor rather than a human advisor? The empirical findings in the two essays provide a new understanding of, and a new approach to, study communication between clients and service providers.
Chapter 2: Essay 1

Presenting Information about the Self: Why Do Service Providers Specify More Than Clients Want to See?

It is probably uncontroversial to say that one of the most ubiquitous activities in marketing is communications. The current research focuses on service providers communicating their experience to potential clients to persuade them to choose their services. Presenting and evaluating a service provider based on one’s work experience is ubiquitous in the current society. Individual service providers and service companies describe the details of their experiences in their profiles on professional networking websites or company websites in hopes of adding a new client or receiving a job offer. Worldwide, there are more than half a billion members on LinkedIn, a website for networking and sharing professional profiles (Escobedo, 2017). In the USA and Canada alone, more than two million résumés are shared every month (Indeed 2017) and an estimated 20 million service providers (e.g., housekeeping, child care, tax filing, massage therapists, counselors) and business service (e.g., auditors, lawyers, logistics) firms are continually looking for new service clients (estimates based on SME Research 2017 and SBE Council 2017).

Given that a majority of service providers have multiple careers in their lives these days (Workopolis 2014), efficiently presenting one’s expertise from work descriptions is challenging. Consider an example of a hypothetical service provider in the financial industry, Nina, writing a profile to present to potential clients (including employers) who are interested in work experience suitable for a loan officer. It is common that someone like Nina will have previous experience that is highly relevant to the particular role she is applying for, as well as other experience that may be less relevant. For instance, if Nina is applying for a job as a loan officer,
her prior experience as a loan officer in another bank will be highly relevant, but her experience as an insurance underwriter would be less relevant. For her less relevant experience, Nina could choose a specific description for the experience (e.g., experience as an insurance underwriter) or a general description (e.g., experience in the financial services industry). The focus of the current research is the specific vs. general manner in which service providers choose to describe their less relevant work experience (or aspects of their products or services) to clients who evaluate the work experience.

When we compare two descriptions in the opening example, specific descriptions of one’s experience are different from general descriptions as the former discloses details that are only vaguely described in general descriptions. The greater disclosure implied in specific self-descriptions shows the person’s willingness to disclose more about the self and signals his/her transparency which could be important in choosing a service provider (Brambilla, Rusconi, Sacchi, & Cherubini, 2011; Brambilla, Sacchi, Rusconi, Cherubini, & Yzerbyt, 2012; Zeithaml, Parasuraman, & Berry, 1985). The transparency conveyed via specific self-descriptions may influence the choice between two descriptions differently among service providers and clients. The current research investigates whether the service provider’s choice between two formats of description match to the client’s choice. Here, clients refer to individual consumers and potential employers. Also, the current research focuses only on presenting information about the self rather than an external object. The list below summarizes research questions:

1) How do service providers choose between a specific and a general description of their less relevant experience? A meta-analysis of 17 studies reveals that service providers choose specific descriptions more than clients do.
2) Why is there an asymmetry between service providers and clients? The current research proposes two groups choose differently because they differently perceive whether the specific self-description signals service providers’ willingness to be transparent. For the service providers, a self-description is judged as transparent when one considers the fact that they had a choice not to present; however, they rejected this and instead chose to disclose, so the presented specific description is judged as transparent. Since what service providers could have done -- the less transparent description -- is more accessible to service providers than to clients, service providers are more likely to consider that they rejected choosing a less transparent description and view a specific description more favorably.

The rest of this research is organized into three sections. The first section summarizes relevant literature on the specificity of information, transparency, and self-other differences and develops the theoretical framework that perceived transparency from a specific description differs between the two groups (i.e., self as the information presenter vs. others as the information evaluator). The second section describes results from four main studies and a meta-analysis of 17 studies showing that two groups choose differently and the choice is mediated by perceived transparency. The last section concludes with a summary, contributions on self-other judgment and moral judgment literature, and directions for further research.

2.1 Conceptual Framework

A dominant theme in behavioral research in marketing is the idea that clients use various categorical representations to describe and understand information (Barsalou, 1983; Loken, Barsalou, & Joiner, 2008; Rosch & Mervis, 1975). Categorization allows clients to simplify and
make sense of the world (Medin & Smith, 1984), to organize and interpret new information or new products (Moreau, Lehmann, & Markman, 2001), and to formulate judgments about the relationship of one object to another (e.g., similarity and differences, relevance, prototypicality; Barsalou 1983; Mervis and Rosch 1981; Tversky 1977). The present research focuses on specific representation formats which use specific and subordinate categories to describe the object and general representation formats which use general and superordinate categories. There have been investigations that showed consumers use product categories to describe or understand products (Cooper, 1988; Ratneshwar, Pechmann, & Shocker, 1996; Srivastava, Alpert, & Shocker, 1984).

In a similar vein, service providers’ services and work experiences can be represented using general or specific categories. Consider a dietician who is trying to influence a client who has a health goal. Perhaps the service provider may describe himself as a health expert who can advise them on various aspects of healthy eating (a general description) or a dietician who can advise them on healthy lunches in the context of a busy corporate life (a more specific description). As another example, work experience as a loan officer for a bank can be described as loan officer experience (specific description) or experience in the finance industry (general description). As the use of subordinate categories increases, the description becomes more precise and specific (see figure 2.1 for an incomplete and stylized example of such a structure).

Going back to the opening example, Nina was looking to communicate her experience to a recruiter who was interested in hiring a loan officer. In the context of figure 2.1, the work experience sought by this recruiter (the client) is represented in a specific category located at the lowest level of the category structure. Recall that Nina had two previous jobs. In one, she worked as a loan officer – this is highly relevant as it shares a common category (loan officer) with the client’s interest. Her second job – as an insurance underwriter – does not. Nina needs to move upward to a superordinate category (to financial services industry jobs) for there to be a match
between the recruiter’s target experience and her experience as an insurance underwriter. If Nina has previous work experience as a media planner, she would need to go up more superordinate categories for a match to occur. The relevance of experience is determined by its distance to the most specific common category with the target experience. The fewer the superordinate categories that one needs to go up to get a match, the greater is the relevance.

In writing her professional profile, Nina will obviously communicate her more relevant experience as a loan officer but now has a decision to make about how she communicates her less relevant experience as an insurance underwriter. In particular, should she use the lowest category from figure 2.1 (e.g., insurance underwriter) or two categories higher (e.g., financial services industry job)? The present research uses the term-specific or general descriptions to refer to the category used to communicate the experience. In the present example, an “insurance underwriter” is a specific description, a “job in the insurance industry” is more general, and “job in financial services” is even more general. Note that if the goal of the recruiter was to hire a branch manager for a bank – or more generally for a job in banking – (the second category level from the bottom), then a “job in the insurance industry” might be relatively more specific and “job in financial services” more general. The absolute level of specificity is not a focus of the research, but the relative level of specificity in describing the less relevant experience is.

Also, while the current theorizing is based on work experience in the context of a job search, the same set of decisions needs to be made in all forms of persuasive communication. For example, a market research company making a pitch to a client looking to do ethnographic research could specify their other research expertise in details (e.g., surveys, field experiments, A/B testing) or not (e.g., all common market research techniques). And an advertisement for cameras targeted to photographers may specify the inessential attributes either in a specific description (e.g., black color, metallic finish, light weight) or in a general description.
The focus of the research is on self-descriptions presented by individuals communicating their experience to others, rather than salespeople describing products.

For successful communication, it is important for service providers to decide to what extent less relevant information should be specified. How do service providers choose between specific and general self-descriptions of their less relevant experience? While both self-descriptions are truthful, specific self-descriptions reveal more information about the individual and there is a trade-off for giving additional details. On one hand, giving specific details may violate the cooperative principle of conversation norm to give an adequate amount of information (Grice, 1975), especially when the specified information is less relevant to and far away from a client’s interest. Besides, providing inessential detail about less relevant information could also dilute the impact of the more relevant information. For example, in the domain of product quality evaluations, providing irrelevant information in addition to diagnostic information weakened consumers’ beliefs that the product could deliver the promised benefits (Meyvis & Janiszewski, 2002).

On the other hand, specific self-description may signal the service provider’s willingness to be transparent as it removes hidden information and vagueness. Greater transparency in communication increases the service provider’s honesty and trustworthiness which are important traits when deciding a service provider. Clients generally view honesty positively and sometimes value the honesty even more than a service provider’s competence (Brambilla et al., 2011). Since there are pros and cons of presenting specific self-descriptions, two forces drive the choice between two descriptions – transparency consideration pushes choice toward a more specific description while the dilution consideration pushes choice toward a general description (figure 2.2). If one believes that specific self-description is a signal of transparency, then he/she would choose the specific description over a general description. The following section presents that
service providers and clients associate self-description with transparency to a different extent, which leads to different choices of specific vs. general description.

**Perception of Transparency Depends on the Context**

A rich stream of research shows that individuals disclose information about themselves in an attempt to be honest and transparent (Ariely, 2013), and the amount of disclosed information influences judgment of one’s transparency. Self-disclosure – defined as “any information about himself which person A communicates verbally to a person B” (Cozby, 1973, 73) – signals the service provider’s transparency. Signaling honesty is important in communications as it guides whether to trust and cooperate with the partner (Brambilla et al., 2012; Omarzu, 2000; Van Lange & Kuhlman, 1994). Because of this benefit, service providers may intentionally disclose some information to signal their transparency and trustworthiness. However, the literature on moral judgment suggests what service providers judge as transparent may be perceived differently by clients because moral judgments depend on the context (James, 1909).

As one example of context-dependent judgments, research showed that consumers differently perceive the virtue of making a virtuous choice depending on whether there was a less-virtuous alternative that could have been selected (Dhar & Wertenbroch, 2012; Lepper, 1973; Strickland, 1958). Making a virtuous choice is viewed to be even more virtuous when a less-virtuous alternative was available for a comparison. For example, a healthy snack choice is viewed as more virtuous when the choice was made from a mixed set consisting of healthy and unhealthy snacks where the less-virtuous choice was available rather than from a homogeneous set of healthy snacks where such an alternative was not available (Dhar & Wertenbroch, 2012). Similarly, participants who could have chosen a racist action but did not do so in a criminal guessing task judged themselves to be more moral than those who did not have a racist action to
choose from (Effron, Miller, & Monin, 2012). And a student who took a test without cheating was judged to be more honest when it was possible to cheat than when cheating was not possible (Miller, Visser, and Staub, 2005). In the above examples where actors chose healthy food, not cheating, and non-racist action, choice of unhealthy food, cheating, and racist action are counterfactual choices that the actor could have made but did not do. Considering that the actor could have chosen a less-virtuous action does not change what the actor did, but it changes the evaluation of the actual choice, increasing the perceived virtuousness of the actual choice.

Similarly, knowing that one could have disclosed less could make the same information presentation even more revealing, transparent, and virtuous. As being honest involves rejecting the temptation to fake (Becker, 1998; Peikoff & Ward, 1993; Rand, 1964) or hide reality, the thought that one could have concealed the information in describing their service experience (but did not) would make the information even more transparent. For instance, when a service provider presented two pieces of information about the self, his presentation would be viewed to be more transparent when one thinks the service provider could have been presented one piece of information than when one does not consider such counterfactual choices.

**Differences between Service Providers and Clients**

The current research posits that service providers and clients differ in their judgment on transparency due to information asymmetry between them that results in different judgments on the self and others (Pronin, 2008). When an individual is judged by the self and others, there’s a difference in available information between the two since the individual’s internal feelings and situations are easily accessible to the self but not to others (Jones & Nisbett, 1971; Shelton & Richeson, 2005). For example, people view their value statements to be revealing who they are more than observers view them for one’s strong feeling toward a personal value that is not
visible to others (Mandelbaum, 2014; Pronin, Fleming, & Steffel, 2008). Like feelings, the self and others have different accessibility to what the actor could have done, and it can result in different judgment by the two. Illustrating this, information about an alternative product that could have been launched is available to the firm but not to consumers, resulting in different reference points and hence different evaluations for the launched product (Gourville, 2003; Krüger, Mata, & Ihmels, 2014).

When service providers decide how to present themselves to clients, they can compare a specific and a general self-description about themselves. However, clients do not view multiple profiles (or résumés) for the same individual but only see the finalized profile. Thus, when evaluating the final profile, service providers are more likely to consider how they could have described differently. Consequently, service providers evaluate their description with a comparison with their less or more transparent counterfactual description and judge a specific description as transparent and revealing. In contrast, such consideration is difficult for clients as how a service provider could have described differently is not readily accessible to observers. Some may argue that clients can imagine what could have been if they jointly compare a service provider who presents a specific description and another service provider presenting a general description. However, clients still need to put forth effort to imagine others’ counterfactual choices. Considering a service provider’s counterfactual choice is more difficult for clients because people heavily focus on what is presented rather than reframing it or actively seeking unpresented information (Payne & Braunstein, 1971; Slovic, 1972). Secondly, counterfactual thinking is effortful – and indeed in many cases even impossible – for clients. Current theorizing is captured in the following hypotheses.
H1: In choosing between a specific and a general description of a service provider’s less relevant experience, service providers are more likely to choose the specific self-description than clients would.

H2: Service providers would rate the transparency of the specific self-description more highly than clients would.

H3: The difference will diminish when clients are encouraged to consider that the service providers could have chosen a less transparent choice because the difference in transparency perception is rooted in information asymmetry.

2.2 Overview and Meta-Analysis of Studies

The present research reports on a total of 17 studies, each with a fairly similar experimental procedure and paradigm. These studies were designed to a) test the first hypothesis using a variety of boundary conditions, b) study the role of transparency (hypotheses 2 and 3), and c) to test and rule out alternate explanations for the effects. In all studies, participants were assigned to either the role of a service provider or a client. They read a specific and a general description of less relevant work experience and indicated their relative preference by making a choice. Studies were conducted either in the laboratory or using an online panel (Amazon’s Mechanical Turk). All manipulations and measures are reported in each study following a recommended guideline (Simmons, Nelson, & Simonsohn, 2011). No sample was excluded in studies. For laboratory studies, the sample size was arrived at by posting a predetermined duration that the study would run for. One online study had to be run in two waves. However, the data were not analyzed until all data collection had been completed. For online panels, sample sizes were determined either by a predetermined duration or by budget constraints that implied an upper bound on the total sample size. Table 2.1 provides a summary of all 17 studies.
For the ease of exposition, this section first presents a meta-analysis across 17 studies and then reports four key studies in detail. Although the total sample size across these was 3,471, the analysis included data from 3,302 participants who were either in the baseline service provider or baseline client roles. Some studies (Studies X and XI from table 2.1), included additional role conditions and did not aggregate the data from 169 participants who were in these conditions. The objective was to summarize the difference between service providers and clients in the proportion of preference for the specific description over a general one. Since the main variable is a dichotomous choice, the effect size was calculated using an odds ratio (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001). For each study, the odds ratio was calculated by dividing the odds of choosing the specific option among service providers by the odds of choosing the specific description among clients. If members of the two groups are equally likely to choose the specific option over the general option, the odds ratio would be 1, indicating no difference between the two groups. A higher odds ratio indicates that service providers are more likely to choose the specific option than are clients. The first hypothesis predicts that the odds ratio would be greater than 1. The prediction made in the first hypothesis was supported in 16 out of the 17 studies, with one study showing no significant effects.

The mean of the log-transformed odds ratios in 17 studies was 1.57 ($SE = .08$, mean odds ratio after antilogarithm = 4.59), indicating that service providers were more likely to choose a specific description over a general description than clients were ($Z = 19.13, p < .001$, CIs [1.36, 1.68]). The homogeneity test rejected the null hypothesis of homogeneity in effect sizes across studies ($Q = 30.71, p < .001$). Due to the heterogeneity, a meta-analysis using the DerSimonian and Laird method was performed additionally (DerSimonian & Laird, 1986), which revealed a similar result (mean odds ratio = 1.54, $SE = .11$, $Z = 13.15, p < .001$, CIs [1.31, 1.77]). Figure 2.3
captures the basic findings of the meta-analysis. Details of the meta-analysis procedure and results of individual studies are available in the appendix.

The next section describes four main studies. Study 1 shows the basic effect that service providers chose the specific description more than clients did. Study 2 provides support to the second hypothesis: that service providers judged the specific description to be transparent while clients did not. Study 2 also tests that the mechanism is not driven by two possible alternative explanations. Study 3 tests whether a client’s likelihood of choosing a specific description increases when they know about the service providers’ counterfactual presentation format as service providers know. Lastly, Study 4 tests the effect in a situation where participants were real service providers and clients.

2.3 Study 1

2.3.1 Method

The objective of Study 1 was to show the basic effect that service providers and clients differ in choosing a specific description over a general description. One hundred and sixty participants (mean age = 33.8, male = 55%) were recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) and completed a set of two questionnaires in exchange for $.50. They were randomly assigned to either a service provider or client role and to choose between a specific and a general description of past survey experience. To make the choice situation realistic, service providers were asked to present their survey experience to be hired as a participant in a future survey while clients were asked to evaluate and recommend applicants interested in the survey. All participants completed an unrelated survey first and then saw an advertisement for recruiting participants for a future survey. Participants were told that the researcher was planning to run a survey on image categorization in the future and was looking for participants interested in this future study. The
advertisement had an example explaining the image categorization task which is to identify the object in an image. The advertisement also explained another type of categorization task, verbal categorization task, which was to identify the category the presented object belongs to (e.g., “What type of business is Bank of America? Financial institute, retailer, or other?”). While the advertisement explained two different tasks, it clearly mentioned that the researcher was looking for participants who would do four daily surveys containing image categorization questions. Notably, image categorization and verbal categorization tasks are commonly posted and done on the MTurk platform.

Participants in the service provider condition were told that they could indicate their interest for the advertised study and asked to briefly report the number of image categorization surveys and the number of verbal categorization surveys they have done. On the next page, participants saw two profiles describing their survey experiences using HIT as a unit indicating the amount of survey experience. The HIT in the instruction stands for Human Intelligence Task, and it is frequently used to mention the task posted on the MTurk platform. The first profile said “Completed about [X] image categorization HITs and [Y] HITs of another kind of categorization task,” which described the less relevant experience with a general description. The second profile said “Completed about [X] image categorization HITs and [Y] HITs of verbal categorization task,” specifying the less relevant experience. The numbers in the brackets were carried over from what each participant reported on the previous page. Participants were asked to choose one template they wanted to use to describe their past surveys to the researcher.

Participants in the client condition did not see questions asking about their past experience. After the basic information about the survey, they were asked to recommend one among two candidate workers to the researcher. Then they saw two profiles, one general and
another specific. Both profiles said that the workers completed 100 HITs of image categorization task and 500 HITs of another kind of [verbal] categorization task. Participants were told that they would receive a bonus if the worker they recommended outperformed. After making a choice, all participants provided their age and gender.

2.3.2 Results and Discussion

To examine whether the likelihood of choosing a description that specified less relevant experience differs between service providers and clients, a chi-square test was conducted using the choice variable as the dependent variable. Consistent with the first hypothesis, the percentage of participants who chose the specific description (“completed (...) verbal categorization task”) over the general description (“completed (...) another kind of categorization task”) was much higher among service providers (61.8%) than clients (42.2%), $\chi^2(159) = 6.14, p = .01$.

In conjunction with the meta-analysis, Study 1 supports the first hypothesis that there is a mismatch between service providers and clients in preferred information formats in a way that service providers choose a specific description more than clients do. The asymmetry suggests that service providers’ efforts to provide specific information about their less relevant experience does not lead to favorable impressions from clients. The current experiment rules out several alternative explanations as well. First, it is not the case that clients preferred the diverse experience inferred from a general description. The general format describes the less relevant work experience (experience in verbal categorization task) as another experience, controlling the number of extraneous experiences between the specific and general descriptions. Secondly, clients’ rosy expectations for unspecified experience is unlikely to explain the current gap between service providers and clients. One difference between service providers and clients is that the experience in the general description is known for service providers but unknown for
clients. Service providers know that the experience refers to the experience in verbal categorization while clients do not know what exactly it is. From this fact, some may argue that clients can imagine a whole range of categorization tasks that might be highly relevant to image categorization tasks when perusing the general description. This is unlikely the case, since image and verbal categorization tasks are the most frequent tasks, and other kinds of categorization tasks almost do not exist on the MTurk platform. Also, a subsequent study in the appendix replicated the finding in a more controlled setting where there are only two kinds of experience; thus the readers could infer what exactly the unspecified experience is (e.g., residential and commercial real estate experience under the real estate experience category). However, Study 1 does not reveal much about the underlying mechanism for effect. Studies 2 and 3 were conducted to explore why service providers and clients choose differently.

2.4 Study 2

Study 2 tests the hypothesis that the different perceptions about transparency implied in presenting the specific description account for the differences in choices made by service providers and clients. Also, it tested an alternative explanation involving diluted expertise. Some may argue that there is a possibility that service providers chose the specific description more than clients did because service providers believed they could be good at both jobs while clients thought the service providers would be good at only one of two jobs. There is a tendency to judge the self as multifaceted while viewing others as simple entities (Sande, Goethals, & Radloff, 1988). In other words, people believe that they can have two distinct qualities at the same time (e.g., both serious and carefree), but others have only one quality (e.g., either serious or carefree). For example, specifying the mortgage experience creates two distinct identities, one as a fund manager and another as a mortgage officer. If clients view the service provider as a
simple entity who is good at either fund management or mortgage loans but not at both, the identity of a mortgage loan officer could dilute the identity of a fund manager (Meyvis & Janiszewski, 2002; Nisbett, Zukier, & Lemley, 1981). Study 2 tests the alternative theory about whether specifying the less relevant experience had a different impact on the expertise perceived by service providers and clients.

2.4.1 Method

One hundred and fifty-one MTurk participants (mean age = 35.6, male = 58.9%) completed a survey playing a role of a fund manager looking for a client or a client looking for a fund manager. Participants in the service provider role were asked to imagine that they were a fund manager and were meeting a client who seeks advice. They then read that “you have four years of experience in fund management and nine years of experience as a mortgage lending officer. How would you like to introduce yourself to the client who may ask advice on fund management from you?” Clients were told to imagine that they were interested in investing in mutual funds and were looking for an advisor. All participants then made a choice between two descriptions, a general description (“a fund manager with four years experience in fund management and nine years of experience in the finance industry”) and a specific description (“a fund manager with four years in fund management and nine years of experience as a mortgage lending officer”).

Afterward, participants rated the service provider who provided a general description regarding her transparency of the agent (“honest” and “trustworthy” on 7-point Likert scales, 1 = disagree, 7 = agree). The item included honesty and trustworthy as lack of deception determines the transparency (Wojdynski, Evans, & Hoy, 2017). Next, participants rated the expertise in the focal domain (“specialized in fund management,” “an expert in fund management,” and “has
expertise in fund management” on 7-point Likert scales, 1 = disagree, 7 = agree). Then participants answered the same questions about the service provider who presented a specific description of the less relevant experience.

2.4.2 Results and Discussion

Choice. Consistent with the previous study, service providers chose the specific description more often than the clients did ($M_{\text{service provider}} = 50\%$ vs. $M_{\text{client}} = 15\%$, $\chi^2(151) = 21.05, p < .001, \varphi = -.37$). To explore whether the perceived transparency or expertise inferred from each description was leading the effect, transparency ($\alpha_{\text{general}} = .93$, $\alpha_{\text{specific}} = .96$) and expertise ($\alpha_{\text{general}} = .88$, $\alpha_{\text{specific}} = .93$), indices were computed by averaging across the two and three items respectively used to measure these judgments.

Perceived Transparency and Expertise. To test whether service providers’ transparency inferred from each description was leading the effect, a 2 (Role, between participants) × 2 (Specificity of the description, within participants) mixed ANOVA was conducted on transparency. Not surprisingly, transparency was rated highly among service providers who rated their own transparency relative to clients who rated someone else ($M_{\text{service provider}} = 5.23$, $SD_{\text{service provider}} = 1.14$ vs. $M_{\text{client}} = 4.73$, $SD_{\text{client}} = 1.14$, $F(1, 149) = 7.45,$ $p = .007$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$). Besides the main effect, there was an interaction between two factors, $F(1, 149) = 12.12, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .07$. As figure 2.6 shows, service providers rated the specific description as more transparent than clients did ($M_{\text{service provider, specific}} = 5.44$, $SD_{\text{service provider, specific}} = 1.32$ vs. $M_{\text{client, specific}} = 4.58$, $SD_{\text{client, specific}} = 1.43$, $F(1, 149) = 14.58, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .08$). For the general description, there was no difference between service providers and clients ($p = .4$). There was also no main effect of the description ($p = .5$). Also, service providers considered the specific description more transparent than the general description ($M_{\text{service provider, specific}} = 5.44$, $SD_{\text{service provider, specific}} = 1.32$ vs. $M_{\text{service}}$
provider, general = 5.03, SD_{service provider, general} = 1.19, F(1, 149) = 7.78, p = .006, \eta^2_p = .05).

Incidentally, clients rated the general description as more transparent than the specific
description (M_{client, specific} = 4.58, SD_{client, specific} = 1.43 vs. M_{client, general} = 4.88, SD_{client, general} = 1.22,
F(1, 149) = 4.50, p = .03, \eta^2_p = .02). This difference in clients’ evaluation of two descriptions
was not replicated in subsequent studies; thus, the pattern seems to have emerged due to a
random error.

Additional analyses were conducted to test whether service providers and clients
differently perceive the expertise from a specific description. In a mixed ANOVA on the
perceived expertise of the service provider, service providers and clients showed no difference in
how they rated expertise (F(1, 149) = 1.52, p = .21); however, there was a main effect of
specificity (F(1, 149) = 8.64, p = .004, \eta^2_p = .05). Regardless of the assigned role, participants
rated the service provider’s expertise lower when the service provider presented a specific
description (M_{specific} = 4.89, SD_{specific} = 1.35) than when the service provider presented a general
description (M_{general} = 5.18, SD_{general} = 1.16). The interaction was not significant (F(1, 149) =
1.42, p = .23). The specific description of the less relevant experience diluted perceptions of the
service provider’s expertise in the focal domain, fund management. The findings imply that the
perceived expertise cannot mediate the relationship between the role and choice.

**Mediation of Transparency.** To test whether the service provider’s choice was driven by
the transparency inferred from the specific description, a mediation analysis was performed
following the PROCESS procedure (Hayes, 2013). The mediator was the transparency index of
the service provider who presented the specific description of her less relevant experience. The
model explained about 8% of the variance (R^2 = .08, F(1, 149) = 14.58, p < .001). The indirect
effect of perceived transparency from the specific description was significant (CIs $[-.86, -.16]$, Sobel $z = -3.52$, $p < .001$) next to the direct effect of role on choice (CIs $[-2.24, -.64]$).

**Alternative Mediation Models.** In addition to the proposed mediation model, the study tested four alternative mediation models. The first alternative mediation model included two transparency ratings, one inferred from the general description and another inferred from the specific description. The indirect effect via the specific service provider’s transparency remained significant (CIs $[-2.17, -.44]$), while the indirect effect via the general service provider’s transparency was not significant (CIs $[-.34, .88]$). The second alternative model included the transparency and perceived expertise of the specific service provider, to explore whether different mediators explain service providers’ and clients’ choices. However, the indirect effect via the specific service provider’s expertise was not significant (CIs $[-.35, .01]$), while the specific service provider’s transparency was significant (CIs $[-.77, -.10]$). The third alternative model included all four ratings: transparency and perceived expertise for a specific and a general service provider. Again, among four indirect effects, only the indirect effect via the specific service provider’s transparency was significant (CIs $[-1.52, -.25]$, all other CIs included 0).

Lastly, the fourth model tested whether service providers and clients have different mediators. The last model tested whether transparency is influential to service providers’ choices but not to clients, while perceived expertise is influential to clients but not to service providers. This account suggests that the type of role moderates the link between the mediator (transparency or perceived expertise) and the choice. The model tested this possibility with the PROCESS procedure (model 74), entering the choice as the dependent variable, role as the independent variable, and transparency and perceived expertise ratings as mediators. Similar to the third alternative model, the only significant effect was the indirect effect via transparency of
the specific service provider (CIs \([-1.55, -0.16]\)). All other indirect effects included zero in their confidence intervals (transparency of general service provider: CIs \([-0.41, 0.94]\), the expertise of the general service provider: CIs \([-0.90, 2.69]\), the expertise of the specific service provider: CIs \([-3.31, 0.24]\)). More importantly, the level of indirect effect via the transparency of specific service provider did not vary by role \((p = .82)\). Besides the transparency of a specific service provider, the role did not moderate indirect effects via expertise inferred from a specific description \((p = .85)\), transparency inferred from a general description \((p = .68)\), nor expertise inferred from a general description \((p = .46)\) The finding suggests that the transparency has equal impact for service providers and clients in making a choice, but there is a difference in the perceiving transparency of a service provider who specifies.

In addition to providing further support for the first hypothesis, this study provided support for the second hypothesis and also ruled out the alternative explanations. Consistent with the transparency account, a differing perception about transparency in the specific description explained the relationship between the assigned role and the choice. The mediation analysis showed that the difference in perceived transparency explained why the two groups differed in the likelihood of choosing a specific description. Furthermore, Study 2 showed that the underlying mechanism was not driven by an alternative process involving diluted expertise. Both clients and service providers thought the service provider had less expertise in the focal domain if the service provider specified the less relevant experience. Giving details for the less relevant domain highlighted the service provider’s identity in the less relevant domain, diluting the service provider’s expertise in the focal domain. The diluted expertise can partly explain why participants chose the general description over the specific description. However, the dilution account can’t explain why service providers chose the specific description more than clients did,
as service providers also knew that the specific description could weaken their image as an expert in the focal domain. In other words, the current phenomenon is not because service providers and clients have different perceptions of whether the service provider is multifaceted and can be good at both domains. The fact that service providers knew the specific description of less relevant experience would dilute their expertise in the relevant domain strengthens the proposed mechanism via transparency.

Study 2 discounted another alternative process driven by the low transparency of service providers who present general descriptions. If this alternative mechanism were to be driving the effect, service providers should judge the service provider presenting the general description as less transparent than clients judge. However, there was no difference between service providers and clients when rating the transparency of the service provider not specifying the less relevant experience. This suggests that any potential low transparency inferred from the general and vague description cannot explain the phenomenon.

2.5 Study 3
Study 3 further investigates why service providers and clients differently judge the transparency of a service provider specifying the less relevant experience. The current framework posits that knowing (vs. not knowing) that the service provider could have chosen a less transparent description makes the specific description even more transparent. The knowledge produces the asymmetry because it is highly accessible to service providers only. Study 3 examined if increasing the knowledge about a counterfactual choice among clients would alter clients’ attitudes toward specific descriptions.
Study 3 had two new client conditions to the baseline service provider and client conditions. In the first variant client condition, clients were asked to judge two different descriptions of the same individual. This setting is rare in the real world, but it was included in the study to see if the difference between the service providers and clients are eliminated when clients are made aware of that the service provider could have chosen the less transparent description. If the gap between service providers and clients is purely driven by evaluating the self or another individual, the difference should remain, as clients are still evaluating another person. If the gap reduces, it suggests that the effect is more due to the difference in accessibility of choice and the perception of transparency. In the second variant condition, clients rated two different service providers; however, they were informed that each service provider’s experience could be described differently. While the first modified client condition directly presented two alternative descriptions of one service provider, the second modified client condition subtly led the clients to imagine the unpresented alternative description. The two modified client conditions enabled clients to jointly compare the specific description with a less transparent general description of the same individual, regardless of whether the less transparent counterpart was physically presented or the client was merely encouraged to imagine such.

2.5.1 Method

Two hundred and eighty-three MTurkers (mean age = 35.7, male = 49.8%) were randomly assigned to one of four conditions (Role: service provider vs. client vs. client-single agent vs. client-informed). The design and procedure were similar to previous studies except that a new travel agent scenario was used. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two roles: a travel agent (service provider) or a client looking for a travel agent to arrange a trip to Turkey.
Participants chose between two descriptions, one general (“A travel agent who has three years’ experience in Turkey travel and eight years’ experience in travel in an East Asian country”) and one specific (“A travel agent who has three years’ experience in Turkey travel and eight years’ experience in South Korea travel”). Note that the less relevant experience in the travel scenario addresses potential problems in the less relevant experience in the fund manager scenario. First, when perusing the general description in Study 2 (e.g., “another job in the finance industry”), the readers can imagine a whole range of jobs that might vary in their relevance to fund management. In Study 3, experience with an East Asian country is as irrelevant to travel in Turkey as experience with South Korea. Second, in Study 2, participants can imagine the unspecified job to be a more prestigious occupation in finance than the job in the specific description, while Study 3 eliminates this possibility.

In the client-single agent condition, participants saw two descriptions and were told that these were two different versions of the work summary of the same agent they would be interviewing. In the client-informed condition, the basic procedure was the same as that in the baseline client condition except participants were additionally told: “Travel Agent X chose to describe his experience in another country in a general manner, while Travel Agent Y chose to describe his experience in another country in a specific manner.” Then, participants were asked to choose the one they preferred. After the choice was made, participants also rated perceived transparency based on the same two items used in Study 2 (honesty and trustworthiness of the agent inferred from each description). In this study, 77 participants were recruited in August 2016, and 206 participants were recruited in October 2016 (both planned sessions). In August 2016, the study included another factor which manipulated the number of less relevant
experience (one vs. multiple) to test the boundary condition. Unfortunately, the additional condition had a confounding factor; thus, it was dropped.

2.5.2 Results and Discussion

Choice. Fewer clients chose the specific description compared to service providers, clients informed of a counterfactual choice, and those evaluating the same individual did \( M_{\text{service provider}} = 50.7\% \) vs. \( M_{\text{client, baseline}} = 18.2\% \) vs. \( M_{\text{client, single agent}} = 52.9\% \), vs. \( M_{\text{client informed}} = 73.80\% \), \( \chi^2(283) = 45.70, p < .001, \phi = .40 \). It rules out the alternative account that the asymmetry is due to evaluating another person differently from oneself; participants in two modified client conditions evaluated another person but their choices differed from the choice in the baseline client condition.

Perceived Transparency. A one-way ANOVA was conducted on the transparency index to investigate whether the awareness of a counterfactual choice changed how clients viewed the specific description. The transparency index was computed by averaging two items measuring honesty and trustworthiness of the travel agent (\( \alpha = .97 \)). The perceived transparency inferred from the specific description differed by condition \( (F(3, 279) = 9.72, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .10) \). Among clients, baseline clients \( (M_{\text{client, baseline}} = 4.87, SD_{\text{client, baseline}} = 1.12) \) rated the transparency lower than did the clients who evaluated a single agent \( (M_{\text{client, single agent}} = 5.27, SD_{\text{client, single agent}} = 1.33, t(279) = -2.05, p = .04, \text{Cohen’s } d = .31) \) or were informed \( (M_{\text{client informed}} = 5.40, SD_{\text{client, informed}} = .93, t(279) = -2.67, p = .008, \text{Cohen’s } d = .50) \). Clients in the two modified conditions didn’t differ from each other \( (p = .52) \). Not surprisingly, service providers \( (M_{\text{service provider}} = 5.90, SD_{\text{service provider}} = 1.20) \) rated their transparency higher than all three other conditions: baseline client \( (t(279) = 5.35, p < .001, \text{Cohen’s } d = .87) \), clients who rated a single agent \( (t(279) = 3.21, \text{Cohen’s } d = .61) \),
Mediation of Transparency. A series of mediation analyses was performed to determine if the difference between service providers and clients was due to a different perception about the agent’s transparency. The model followed the PROCESS procedure (model = 4), entering the choice as a dependent variable (1 = choice of the specific description, 0 = choice of the general description), role as the independent variable (service providers = 1, baseline clients = 0), and transparency index as the mediator. If service providers chose the specific description to be transparent, then that choice should be mediated by the transparency implied by a specific description. Indeed, the significant indirect effect of the transparency index supported this argument (CIs [.12, 1.16]). The direct effect of role on choice was also significant (p = .009).

Furthermore, if the difference between the service providers and clients was driven by whether one was concerned that the service provider could have described the same experience in an alternative way, showing clients what the service provider could have done would eliminate the effect, although a setting where clients view two different descriptions for an agent would be unnatural. To test this possibility, the study tested the same mediation analysis comparing two groups: baseline clients (coded as 0) and clients who were told that the different descriptions referred to the same job experience (coded as 1). As in the first model that compared service providers and baseline clients, the transparency mediated the relationship between the role and the choice (CIs [.00, .50]). The direct effect of the role was also significant (p < .001).

Next, the study tested if informing clients of a rejected alternative description would lead them to perceive a specific description to be transparent and eventually alter their attitude toward
The third mediation analysis compared two groups: baseline clients (coded as 0) and clients who were informed of the agent’s choice to disclose (coded as 1). Consistent with the first and second models, the perception of transparency mediated the relationship between the role and the choice (CIs [.07, .69]). Although not central to the hypothesis, the direct effect of role on choice remained significant ($p < .001$). The fourth mediation analysis compared the baseline client group (coded as 0) with the three other groups combined (coded as 1) and obtained the indirect effect of transparency on choice (CIs [.06, .47]).

Study 3 shows that clients chose in the same way as service providers when they know the counterfactual description format the service provider could have chosen. The results show that the gap in the choice between the two groups is explained by whether certain information is readily accessible. Also, they suggest that the effect is not because clients rate others differently from the self.

Previous studies did not have a manipulation check item ensuring that the two descriptions differed in the level of specificity in fund manager and travel scenarios. Hence a post-test was conducted (N = 67) using a separate sample. University students read four descriptions and were asked to rate how specific each description was using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = general, 7 = specific). A series of one-sample t-tests showed that the general descriptions in the fund manager scenario ($M = 3.4, SD = 1.4, t(66) = -3.48, p < .001$) and travel scenario ($M = 3.15, SD = 1.41, t(66) = -4.91, p < .001$) were viewed as general. Specific descriptions in the fund manager scenario ($M = 5.91, SD = 1.12, t(66) = 13.90, p < .001$) and travel scenario ($M = 5.99, SD = 1.3, t(66) = 12.41, p < .001$) were considered specific.
2.6 Study 4

2.6.1 Method

Findings in prior studies have limited generalizability since the choice is made in a situation where participants were not real service providers and clients. In Studies 2 and 3, participants made choices imagining a situation where they need to present or evaluate fictitious work experience. The situation was realistic in Study 1 where participants presented and evaluated survey participation experience, but they had no strong incentive to choose carefully because there were no real consequences from the choice. Study 4 tested the effect in a setting where participants had a real motivation to present and evaluate experience. In this study, the service providers were MTurk workers who had to present a summary of their survey experience to a fellow survey participant and received a bonus if their profile was chosen by the paired participant. Clients were a separate group of MTurk workers who viewed the two profiles varying in specificity and recommended one to the researcher. Clients had an incentive to choose carefully as they received a real monetary bonus if the worker of their choice performed better than the average performance of all workers.

Participants were recruited through an advertisement which was included at the end of an unrelated MTurk survey. As in Study 1, participants were told that the researcher was planning a future survey about image categorization task and looking for participants. The advertisement showed an example of an image categorization task and a verbal categorization task from Study 1 and had details about compensation and follow-up surveys. The advertisement said that the researcher was looking for participants who will be randomly assigned to workers and managers. The worker’s job was to complete a follow-up survey where they need to present a summary of their past survey experience to a partner manager and complete five image categorization
questions. Participants were told that workers would receive $1.5 for completing the follow-up survey and a $0.5 bonus if their choice of a profile was selected by their partner manager with whom would be randomly paired. The manager’s job was to complete a follow-up survey where they viewed two profiles of partner workers and choose one whom they though performed well. A manager’s compensation included a base payment of $1.5 for completing the follow-up survey and $0.5 if they chose a worker who performed better than the average workers in the image categorization task.

Among 200 participants who saw the advertisement, 140 indicated their interest in the survey and answered three additional questions asking non-sensitive information. Particularly, participants were asked to generate a three-digit code using the alphabet and numbers, provide the state they live in, and write their favorite animal. They were told that they would exchange their information with their partners. Those who completed the recruiting survey were randomly assigned as either a worker or a manager and paired with another participant. In this presentation setting, workers first choose what format to use when presenting their work experience, and then managers evaluate what workers chose. Therefore, the follow-up survey was sequentially given first to workers and then to managers.

In the follow-up survey, workers first reported how many past image and verbal categorization surveys they had done. After answering these, they saw two templates summarizing their experience and chose one. The general [specific] profile said that the worker completed X number of image categorization tasks and Y number of another kind of [verbal] categorization task. The numbers in the profiles, X and Y, were the same as what they entered. Before making a choice, participants were reminded that they can receive a bonus if their profile appeals to the partner manager. Also, to strengthen the feeling they are interacting with a real
person, participants saw the non-sensitive individual information about the partner, the code, the state the partner lives in, and the favorite animal. Workers completed five image categorization tasks after choosing a profile. Workers had 24 hours to complete the follow-up survey.

Next, managers completed their follow-up survey. Managers saw the same two descriptions, one general and one specific, and chose one. They were told that the profiles are provided by their partner workers, and they would receive a bonus if the worker they chose performed better than the average. Managers did not know that they were paired with only one worker, and two profiles were actually from the same worker. The numbers of completed surveys in profiles were what their partner work entered; if their partner worker entered 10 for image categorization task and 5 for the verbal task, managers saw the same numbers. As a consequence, the amount of survey experience differed among clients according to what their partners entered. Before making choices, managers also saw three pieces of information about their partner and were told that the information was from one of two workers who generated profiles. All participants received a bonus if they qualified.

2.6.2 Results and Discussion

Eighty-one participants (mean age = 37, male = 43.9%, N of service providers = 35) completed the follow-up survey. A chi-square test showed that 74.3% of workers (service providers) chose the format that specified the less relevant survey experience while only 39.1% of managers (clients) chose the specific format ($\chi^2(81) = 9.90, p = .002$). The results show the effect existed in real situations. First, there were real consequences for their choice: service providers and clients received a bonus if a service provider’s chosen profile was selected and if clients chose a high performer. Secondly, the set of experiences were not artificially generated by researchers. The presented and evaluated work experiences were real experiences generated by participants.
Another contribution of Study 4 is that work descriptions included the case where the service provider had dominant experience in the relevant domain. In previous studies, service providers had longer experience in the less relevant domain; thus, it was unclear if the dominance of the secondary experience is necessary to observe the phenomenon. The dominance did not moderate the effect. This question is directly tested in two studies reported in the appendix and the effect is replicated regardless of the dominance of less-relevant experience (Studies III and IV). Overall, the findings in Study 4 confirm the generalizability of the effect.

2.7 Studies That Test Alternative Explanations

Additional studies were conducted to test other alternative mechanisms that could explain the results; namely thinking style (Study XII), construal level (Study XIII), and identity complexity (Studies XIV and XV). This section briefly summarizes three alternative accounts and the results.

The thinking-style account is based on previous research suggesting that service providers and clients might engage in different thinking processes (Weaver, Garcia, & Schwarz, 2012). Service providers might engage in the piecemeal processing in which they consider the value of each item separately and aggregate the value across all items, whereas clients might be engaging in holistic processing where they form a global impression of the information bundle and then evaluate the value of the bundle. Therefore, service providers choose the specific description because they recognize the value of additional detail while clients do not. Study XII manipulated the thinking style by using a procedure from Weaver, Garcia and Schwarz (2012). In the piecemeal condition, participants were asked to remember the individual components of each work description carefully before they made their choice. In the holistic-thinking condition, they were simply told to form a general impression of each work description. In Study XII,
thinking style (as well as perspective-taking manipulations) were fully crossed with roles and had no effect on the basic pattern of results.

The second alternative account is based on differences in construal levels of service providers and clients (Trope & Liberman, 2010). Service providers’ psychological distance to their experience is near whereas clients’ psychological distance is large. These differences in construal could explain differences in their preference for specific versus general descriptions. To test this, the study explored if the basic effect diminishes when service providers adopt the clients’ default construal (high-level construal) or when clients adopt the service providers’ default construal (low-level construal). Construal level was manipulated by using the category-exemplar task from Fujita et al. (2006). Before reading the main scenario, service providers in the treatment condition went through a concept-generation exercise that asked them to write a superordinate category for 20 words (e.g., if the given word is “soda,” they could respond with “beverage”). The task was designed to induce higher-level construal. Clients in the treatment condition did a similar exercise that required them to generate an exemplar of the same words (e.g., if the given word is “soda,” response would be “Pepsi”). The latter task was designed to induce lower-level construal. In Study XIII, manipulating the construal level did not eliminate the effect.

Lastly, two studies tested whether the effect is due to the fact that the service providers think they have a complex and multifaceted identity so they can be an expert in both the target domain and less relevant domain. In contrast, clients may think service providers have simple identities and thus cannot be an expert in two different domains (Sande et al., 1988). Studies XIV and XV examined if the effect disappears if service providers view themselves as a simple entity or clients view service providers as a multifaceted entity. Study XIV manipulated the view on the complexity of one’s identity by inserting a paragraph that fosters the view that individuals have
either a multifaceted or simple identity. In Study XV, participants read the same paragraph explaining the identity complexity. Then they were asked to think of themselves and another person they met recently and write characteristics that support either the multifaceted view or simple identity view. In both studies, the belief on the complexity of identity did not influence the basic effect.

### 2.8 General Discussion

Along with the four studies, meta-analysis of 17 studies supported the hypothesis that service providers are more likely to choose a specific self-description than clients do. When deciding how to present self-description, the alternative to present the information less transparently in a general format is more accessible to the service providers. The fact that they forgo this option and instead present the information in a specific way made the specific description appear more transparent (Study 2). Clients, compared to service providers, are less likely to know the service provider’s counterfactual choice and compare the presented description with the counterfactual choice; hence clients do not view the specific description as transparent. When being explicitly informed of the fact that the same work experience could have been described differently in a less transparent way, clients viewed a specific self-description as transparent and chose this type of description (Study 3). This implies that judging one’s transparency from what the actor presented depends on reflection of what the actor could have done instead. The effect is not fully explained by different perceptions of the perceived expertise of the agent, low transparency inferred from the general description, different importance put on transparency, thinking styles, construal level, or identity complexity.

The form of communications in this research is a very large and voluminous part of marketing communications. Business consultants, fitness advisors, dentists, home renovators, job
seekers, tax advisors, and a myriad of other experts and service providers are always looking to attract new clients or seek new jobs every day! A back-of-the-envelope calculation suggests that in North America alone there are upwards of a billion sales calls and over five million résumés sent out every single day, with service providers providing information about their expertise and experience to clients who need to decide whether to hire them. Despite the prevalence of this form of communication, research that studies the choices that service providers make in how to communicate is limited. In particular, it is difficult to find any other research that explicitly studies the decision to choose between a specific or a general description of past experience.

At first blush, the theoretical framework proposed in this research seems related to research by Chris Hsee (i.e., Hsee, 1996, 2000; Hsee and Leclerc, 1998) on differences between joint and separate evaluations of alternatives. That stream of research shows that when options are compared side by side, certain attributes loom larger because the context allows for a more meaningful interpretation of that attribute. In the current research, service providers implicitly compared a specific and a general description of the same experience (implying a joint evaluation scenario), and it could be argued that transparency from a specific description loomed larger. The side-by-side comparison makes it easy to realize that the specific description discloses more about the individual. In the paradigm, clients also made a choice side by side (seemingly a joint evaluation), but clients were seeing descriptions of two separate individuals. Therefore, the clients’ situations do not neatly fit into Hsee’s paradigm because they were neither in a purely joint nor a purely separate evaluation model. In sum, while there are numerous parallels, the paradigm and focus in this research is different from the joint-separate evaluation framework.

Contribution
The current research contributes to the literature on the self-other difference. When making a judgment about a person, judgments generated by the self and others may differ due to various reasons such as different psychological distance to the person, construal levels, and differences in available information about the person. Consistent with the literature, the present work illustrates that the difference between service providers and clients in their evaluations of a self-description is partly due to differences in the accessibility to how the individual could have described the self (Krüger et al., 2014; Pronin, 2008). An individual’s situations, internal feelings, and self-relevant information are easily accessible to the self but difficult for others to know. In the research, what the service providers could have done is available to service providers (self) but not clients (others) who merely observe the final choice of the service providers. The finding advances the literature by identifying the differences in knowledge of one’s counterfactual choice as another explanation of self-other differences.

The current research also shows that active reflection on the actor’s unchosen action influences moral judgment. The literature found that reflecting that one could have done less-virtuous action increases the perceived virtuousness of what one did (Mandelbaum, 2014). While most of the past research documented the effect of the counterfactual in either judging their own behavior or others’ behavior, there has been no research that examined the counterfactual thinking to explain the judgment by the self and that by others. Furthermore, the findings add to growing evidence which questions the idea that the evaluation of honesty is independent of context (Ariely, 2013). Additionally, the research extends the literature on precision by developing a conceptualization for specificity in information of non-numerical attributes. It fills a hole in the literature where most of the research focused on precise representation for numerical information (Sarabando & Dias, 2010; Thomas & Morwitz, 2005; Zhang & Schwarz,
The essay conceptualizes specificity as a function of level in a hierarchical category structure, which can be applied for future research on precision for non-numerical attributes.

**Future Research**

Meanwhile, there are remaining questions due to limitation of current findings. First, would specifying the details produce the same result if the provider specifies information of external objects instead of the self? Since the conceptual development in this thesis was based on assessments of transparency, specifying details about external objects such as product may have different consequences. When one specifies details about an object, it gives an impression that the individual is knowledgeable and willing to share the knowledge. If the object is the self, a specific description gives an impression that the individual is willing to disclose. However, if the object is an external object, sharing specific details may be attributed to the individual’s knowledge of the object rather than the transparency.

Three additional studies tested the generalizability of the effect using product descriptions (Studies XVIII, XIX, and XX in table 2.2). Participants were randomly assigned to a service provider or a consumer. For example, in the used phone scenario, providers were told that they were selling their used phone on classified websites to buyers who put greater importance in functionality (relevant attribute) than cosmetic condition (less relevant attribute). Then they were told that their phone was in a great working condition but had a minor scratch. Next, they chose between a general description (“A fully working phone (…) with a normal wear and tear”) and a specific description (“A fully working phone (…) with a small scratch in an unnoticeable place, near the earphone jack hole”). Consumers were asked to focus on the working condition more than the cosmetic condition and chose one product description. The results revealed that two groups are not different in their choice for products. Based on these
studies, it seems that specific product descriptions do not lead to greater perceived transparency as self-descriptions.

Secondly, the role of counterfactual thinking in self-other judgment is worth investigating further. As shown in the current research, one’s counterfactual choice is naturally easy for the actor himself than it is for observers, and this difference may explain other asymmetries between the two groups. Also, factors which will nudge observers to consider the actor’s counterfactual choice would be worth investigating as it can reduce the gap between two groups. For example, when an actor shares a sensitive piece of information which is normally not shared, this very act of sharing may automatically trigger the counterfactual case in which the actor does not disclose such information. The triggered counterfactual case would let the observers consider the counterfactual choice and view the actor as transparent. In other words, the gap between actors and observers would be weakened if some cues nudge observers to actively seek and imagine what the actor could have done. This represents another avenue for future research to explore.

Our research takes the first step in identifying a previously undocumented asymmetry between service providers and clients. While there is clearly a lot more work to be done in unpacking these effects and understanding the generalizability of the underlying mechanisms across different communication contexts, the point is simple – there is an empathy gap between service providers and clients!
3 Chapter 3: Essay 2

An Implemental Mindset Affects the Evaluation of Deep Experience

Suppose there is a travel planner who has extensive experience in travel planning only in a city. The planner deals with clients who want to know what to do in the city and other clients who need someone to arrange bookings for accommodations and transportations to destinations. Would the planner’s narrow-but-deep experience equally appeal to two client groups? The current essay identifies these two types of experience, deep and broad, and examines whether and when deep experience is evaluated more favorably. When we look for a service provider, we frequently look for their past work experience to base our decision. At the same time, service providers also constantly give information about their experience when advertising their service. Sometimes, service providers highlight the breadth of their experiences; for example, a law firm website introduces the firm as a legal firm with broad experience in all major areas while another law firm states it has deep experience in providing legal services. Although emphasizing service providers’ breadth or depth of experience is prevalent, it is unclear whether and when they would matter when clients choose a service provider.

In particular, the current research tests whether focusing on implementation influences evaluation of deep experience. Two client groups in the example are different as the former group focuses on deciding what to do while the latter group focuses on implementation steps for determined destinations. As illustrated in the example, clients go through different phases when they seek what action to take and how to implement the action for their goal while looking for a service provider to fulfill their consumption goal. According to the mindset literature, focus on implementation leads one to have an implemental mindset which affects information processing, judgment, and behavior. Drawing from the literature that an implemental mindset is associated with a narrow focus when processing verbal or visual information, the present research proposes
that an implemental mindset increases evaluation for deep experience from the narrowly defined field. Specifically, four studies show that clients evaluate deep experience favorably when they seek a service for implementation (vs. consultation), when they need a service in the near future, and when they construe the service focusing on implemental steps.

The research questions in the present research advance the literature on service and mindset. First, do the breadth and depth of experience matter when choosing a service provider? Knowing whether two dimensions of experience matter is important because the findings may guide the service providers to develop their resources and advertise their expertise in a more efficient manner by focusing on the most important dimension. Secondly, how does an implemental mindset affect choice of a service provider? The present research suggests that mindset is a useful factor for explaining client decision-making in the service context. In many cases, clients need a service provider, either to know what action will solve the problem (consultation service) or to delegate implementation of the action (implementation service); thus the mindset theory is a useful tool for understanding why clients behave differently. Thirdly, the findings contribute to the mindset literature by showing a relationship between an implemental mindset and increased selectivity in one’s response.

3.1 Conceptual Framework

Work Experience of Service Providers

Over the past decades, there has been a dramatic growth in the service industry. The majority of the North American population is employed in services, and choosing a service is an everyday consumption problem. However, choosing a service is not an easy task, as services have fewer tangible and observable properties, unlike manufactured goods (Levitt, 1981).
Among various cues, information of service providers’ experience is a cue that clients frequently rely on when making decisions. It is easy to find professional profiles, company websites, and cover letters mentioning the length, breadth, or contents of one’s experience. Because one’s time and ability are limited to have experience both high in breadth and depth, clients usually encounter two types of experience sets: 1) a deep experience set that consists of experiences belonging to a specific experience category; and 2) a broad experience set that includes various experiences belonging to a broadly defined experience category. For example, a lawyer with six years of experience exclusively in family law has deep experience in family law. In contrast, a lawyer with experience in family, real estate, and immigration law for two years each has broad experience in law. Note that an experience can be neither broad nor deep if the total experience is too short (e.g., a month of experience in one field). Although rare, one can have experience both broad and deep. Also, a set of experiences can be put as broad or deep experience by varying the number of categories for job-relevant experience, varying the number of categories for irrelevant experience, or labeling it as broad or deep.

Previous researchers have found that clients do distinguish and appreciate both types of experience (Alba & Hutchinson, 2000) and often prefer one type of experience (Clarkson et al. 2013; Sela, Morgan, and Maimaran, working). For example, Clarkson et al. (2013) investigated preferences between a choice to broaden one’s knowledge in a product category (i.e., try songs in different genres) and a choice to deepen one’s knowledge in a narrow product category (i.e., try songs in a specific genre) and found that novices are more likely to choose the option to broaden their knowledge and were persuaded more by the advertisement highlighting the breadth. However, most studies in the field have focused on which type of experience consumers want to have; thus much uncertainty still exists about which type of experience clients would want to
outsource from service providers. Besides, the literature has been quiet about other moderators affecting the evaluation of broad and deep experience beyond the level of expertise.

**Pilot Studies**

A series of exploratory studies prior to the present research showed that clients distinguish two types of experience when choosing a service provider based on the information of their experience. In pilot studies, participants chose an expert who could give advice on various problems in a situation where the decision-making environment was either rapidly changing or stable (Appendix B). For example, the stable condition of the new product development scenario described that the recent trend in the industry is not different from the past and the market environment is stable. In the dynamic condition, the scenario stated that the trend is very different from the past and the market is changing rapidly. Participants chose between two experts with equal lengths of total experience, one with an exclusive experience in one sub-domain and another with experience in five different sub-domains.

All data were collected online via the Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) website in the summer of 2016, and all participants were randomly assigned to a condition. The findings from three studies did not show any effect of dynamism on preference between deep and broad experience, but they showed the choice between two experiences was not random. In eight scenarios from three pilot studies, the likelihood of choosing the expert with broad experience ranged from 61.4% to 93.1% except for one study which was not replicated in the second trial (table 3.1). A meta-analysis for proportion using MedCalc (version 18.2) showed that the pooled proportion is 69.04% and its confidence interval was from 63.54 to 74.17, indicating the proportion of participants choosing the broad experience is different from the middle point (50%, $z = -9.38, p < .001$). The findings show that clients differently treat broad and deep experience.
and generally prefer the broad experience; however, there are remaining questions on under what circumstances. The present research intends to investigate whether the mindset moderates the liking of deep experience.

Deliberative vs. Implementation Mindsets

Drawing upon from the mindset theory, this research suggests the type of mindset as another factor affecting the evaluation of deep experience. The mindset refers to a frame of mind that affects information processing, evaluations, and actions (Gollwitzer & Bayer, 1999; Rucker & Galinsky, 2016). According to the mindset theory of action phases, there are two types of cognitive orientations that differ in their way of processing information and controlling actions to solve the task at hand (Gollwitzer & Bayer, 1999). Among different kinds of mindsets, the mindset theory of action phases identifies deliberative and implemental mindsets, which are activated by one’s standing in goal pursuit. The two phases include a pre-decisional phase where people deliberately think about what action to take to achieve the goal and a post-decisional phase where individuals decide the action and prepare a plan for implementing it. In the pre-decisional phase, individuals have a deliberative mindset that is characterized by exploring possible options and deliberating between the pros and cons of each option. Once individuals decide and enter the post-decisional phase, they are oriented to implementing the chosen option rather than reexamining unchosen options.

In addition to the natural progression from pre- to post-decision stage, the mindset literature has shown that there are different ways to activate two types of mindsets, and the effect of a mindset can carry over to unrelated subsequent tasks. Early research on the mindset theory of action phases has revealed that one factor determining one’s mindset is whether a client has made a decision regarding the problem (Gollwitzer & Keller, 2016). The mindset shifts from
deliberative to implemental after making the decision for what goal or action to take. Having an unresolved personal decision problem induces the deliberative mindset while finishing a decision because the problem activates an implemental mindset (Gollwitzer, Heckhausen, & Steller, 1990).

Besides passing a certain decision point, literature reported other factors which activate mindsets. One factor is perceived proximity to the end in one’s goal. For example, individuals who passed a certain physical boundary while waiting in a line were more likely to persist in the waiting task than the individuals whose position in the line was the same but did not have a boundary indicating their proximity to the goal (Zhao, Lee, & Soman, 2012). Framing a due date as an event occurring in the near (vs. distant) future also activated an implemental mindset and changed one’s intention to initiate a task (Tu & Soman, 2014). This research shows that markers signaling that the endpoint is physically or temporally near results in an implemental mindset. The literature also has revealed that mental exercises change one’s mindset as well. Pondering what to choose develops a deliberative mindset, whereas deciding and listing implemental steps for one’s goal activates an implemental mindset (Armor & Taylor, 2003; Brandstätter & Frank, 2002). Engaging in thoughts that are consistent with a specific mindset has been widely used to manipulate the various types of mindsets beyond deliberative and implemental mindsets (Ma & Roese, 2014; Smallman & Roese, 2009; Xu & Wyer, 2008).

**Consequences of Deliberative and Implementation Mindsets**

Once activated, mindset influences the preferred type of information, subsequent actions relevant to the focal goal pursuit, and even preferences in the unrelated subsequent tasks. In the post-decisional phase where individuals decide what to do and have an implemental mindset, they pay greater attention to implementation (Cheema & Patrick, 2008). For example, in a study
where participants read and took a recall test, participants who had not made the decision for their personal problem recalled the deliberative thoughts well, whereas participants who were in the post-decisional phase recalled the implemental information better (Gollwitzer et al., 1990). Greater focus on implementation in the post-decisional phase also resulted in biased judgment about their own control over a task. Individuals with an implemental mindset were less objective and made optimistic judgments about their control (Brandstätter et al., 2015; Gollwitzer & Kinney, 1989; Keller & Gollwitzer, 2017) and were more defensive about their goal (Nenkov & Gollwitzer, 2012). Indeed, the implemental mindset helped implementation and led to greater persistence in the task (Zhao et al., 2012) and better task performance (Armor & Taylor, 2003).

One key difference between the deliberative and implemental mindset is selective processing since an implemental mindset leads to greater attention on information that supports the chosen (Henderson, De Liver, & Gollwitzer, 2008). Greater focus on a chosen task often involves a low openness to the unchosen task; thus, individuals with implemental mindsets are less open compared to the individuals with deliberative mindsets. Once individuals choose an option for their goal, they are likely to attend to the information supporting the chosen option, paying less attention to opposing thoughts (Taylor & Gollwitzer, 1995) or external influences. As an example, shoppers with concrete shopping goals were less likely to be influenced by promotions which create a spending goal and offer a discount for spending over the goal amount (Lee & Ariely, 2006). It shows that individuals with an implemental mindset were less receptive to external or task irrelevant stimuli.

**Selective Attention under Implemental Mindset**

Directly relevant to the current research, there have been researchers who determined that an implemental mindset impacts the range of the information people attend to. In addition to less
attention on thoughts against the focal goal, an implemental mindset reduced processing of stimuli irrelevant and was neutral to the focal goal (Fujita, Gollwitzer, & Oettingen, 2007). In Fujita et al. (2007), participants were exposed to irrelevant words when doing a series of string identification tasks and were given the task of identifying certain letters in target strings. They saw words that were irrelevant to the target string between viewings of each string. After the task, participants completed a recognition test on irrelevant words. The researchers showed that participants who had implemental mindsets before the task recognized a fewer number of incidental words compared to the participants with deliberative mindsets, suggesting that an implemental mindset leads to selective, narrow-range attention.

A recent article tested the idea with visual attention and showed that implemental mindset narrows the breadth of visual attention with eye-tracking data (Büttner et al., 2014; Rahn, Jaudas, & Achtziger, 2016). These researchers induced implemental or deliberative mindsets and tracked the eye movements of participants viewing pictures. Results showed that participants who had the implemental mindset focused on the foreground objects in the pictures more than those who had the deliberative mindset. Relative to the participants with deliberative mindsets who widely focused on the foreground and background objects, participants with the implemental mindsets had a narrow range of attention.

**Hypothesis Development**

Adding to the literature on a relationship between mindset and selective information processing, Essay 2 posits that clients would evaluate deep experience in a more positive way when they have an implemental (vs. deliberative) mindset. According to the mindset theory, consumers are less open to exploring new ideas at the post-decisional phase, because deciding what action to take to solve the problem reduces further exploration. Exploring other options can
be distracting and impair the implementation of the chosen option; thus, consumers selectively pay attention and process information (Büttner et al., 2014). As an implemental mindset lowers processing of objects not directly relevant to the focal goal (Fujita et al., 2007), looking for a service provider for implementing a task will lead clients to focus on a narrow set of experiences directly related to the focal task. Therefore, clients will evaluate a deep experience that is comprised of a narrow range of closely relevant experiences in a more favorable manner when they have an implemental (vs. deliberative) mindset. For a broad experience, there could be multiple possibilities. On one hand, we may expect that clients will evaluate the broad experience more favorably under a deliberative (vs. implemental) mindset. On the other hand, the evaluation of broad experience would be stable in pre and post-decisional phases because diversity in the broad experience makes it useful in different situations. Due to its ability to serve multiple functions at pre-decisional and post-decisional phases, it is difficult to expect the mindset to moderate the evaluation of a broad experience (figure 3.1).

Hypothesis: A deep experience consisting of a narrow range of experiences directly related to the client’s focal goal will be evaluated more highly when one has an implemental mindset. On the other hand, evaluation of a broad experience will not be moderated by the mindset.

Overview of Studies

The research tests the hypothesis using three different methods for activating the implementation mindset among clients: 1) type of service they need (consultation service vs. implementation service); 2) how immediate the service needs to be delivered; and 3) by listing implemental steps for a goal. The current research identifies consultation and implementation service and posits the former is more popular at the pre-decisional phase whereas the latter is
preferred at the post-decisional phase. Consultation service refers to service provides knowledge and solution for clients’ problems, and implementation service refers to a service that offers labor for implementing the solution. At the early stage, consumers are less likely to have a concrete action plan for their consumption goal or an implemental mindset (Lee & Ariely, 2006). In the service seeking context, clients who know little of what action will solve their problem would seek a consultation service. Once they know what action will solve the problem but just want to delegate the work and outsource the labor, their interest may shift from consultation to implementation service. To illustrate, when a client does not know what treatment will cure his or her pet, he or she needs a consultation-type service. If he or she knows a particular surgery will cure his or her pet but needs a vet who can implement the surgery, then he or she needs an implementation-type service. Note that the second case can be viewed as a post-decisional phase because the client made a decision on what action to implement to solve his or her problem. Clients will be more concerned about the implementation in the latter case. Also, even when clients know what action to take, they will have an implemental mindset when they need a service provider to deliver a specific action immediately or list implemental steps. The current research manipulated the mindset by the service type in Studies 1 and 2.

Since service type is a novel method to induce a mindset, the latter two studies manipulated two mindsets following the method used in prior research. Drawing on prior research that temporal proximity prompts an implemental mindset (Tu & Soman, 2014), Study 3 manipulated implemental mindset by urgency. Lastly, Study 4 manipulated an implemental mindset by a mental exercise listing why one should pursue a goal (Brandstätter & Frank, 2002). The criteria for data collection were to collect at least 40 samples per condition and determine the sample size and collection window by the amount of available funds at that moment. All participants were randomly assigned to each condition.
3.2 Study 1

3.2.1 Method

The objective of the study was to examine whether the liking for broad vs. deep experience differ by the type of service that clients are looking for. Participants were told the study was about service providers. The study had a 2 (Mindset: deliberative vs. implemental, within-subject) x 2 (Experience Type: broad vs. deep, within-subject) design, and all participants rated a service provider in four situations where they needed an expert to fix their electronics. The two mindsets were manipulated by the service type. In the deliberative mindset scenario, participants imagined a situation where they needed a technician to identify the solution to a hardware problem (consultation service). In the remaining implemental mindset scenario, participants needed a technician who could perform the repair service (implementation service).

The perceived breadth of the technician’s experience was manipulated by varying the scope of service the clients needed while controlling the actual experience of the agent. In all scenarios, participants rated whether they were interested in meeting a hardware technician who had experience in five different Apple computer models, including Mac, MacBook, Mac Pro, iBook, and old Mac. In half of the scenarios, participants were told their Apple computer had technical issues. Thus, the experience of fixing five different Apple computer models was perceived as a deep experience because each was a kind of experience of fixing an Apple computer. In other scenarios, participants were told that they had a problem with their Mac. In this case, the experience in Mac, MacBook, and other models would be viewed as a broad experience because some experiences are outside of the focal goal, which is fixing a Mac. The order of the four scenarios was random.
3.2.2 Results and Discussion

One hundred and sixty-eight MTurkers (male = 42%, mean age = 37.7) participated in the study and received $1.50. A 2 × 2 within-subject ANOVA was conducted to test whether the mindset (operationalized by the service type) and breadth of the experience mattered when rating a service provider. Only the interaction of the two variables was significant, $F(1, 167) = 4.09, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .02$. Planned contrasts revealed that evaluation of broad experience did not vary by mindset ($M_{\text{deliberative,broad}} = 6.10, SD_{\text{deliberative,broad}} = 1.19, M_{\text{implemental,broad}} = 6.11, SD_{\text{implemental,broad}} = 1.11, F(1, 167) = .02, p > .8$, figure 3.2). However, the evaluation for deep experience was moderated by the mindset. Participants evaluated deep experience highly when they adopted the implemental mindset ($M_{\text{deliberative,deep}} = 5.99, SD_{\text{deliberative,deep}} = 1.14, M_{\text{implemental,deep}} = 6.19, SD_{\text{implemental,deep}} = 1.08, F(1, 167) = 7.19, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .04$). There was no support for preferring one type of experience over another type under the implemental mindset ($F(1, 167) = 1.29, p > .2$) or under the deliberative mindset ($F(1, 167) = 2.40, p > .1$).

Study 1 provides evidence for the hypothesis that an implemental mindset increases the evaluation. Also, the results show that whether a client needs a consultation or an implementation service and the breadth of service providers jointly explain the phenomenon. The depth had an impact even when the actual experience of the service provider was the same in a broad and deep experience. The service provider had experience in fixing five different types of Apple computers, and this experience was perceived as a broad experience when the client’s problem was narrowly defined as “fixing a Mac.” Broadly defining the problem (fixing an Apple computer) made the same experience much deeper and affected how clients evaluated the experience.
3.3 Study 2

3.3.1 Method

Study 2 differed from Study 1 in two ways. First, the mindset (service type) was manipulated in a between-subject design to replicate the effect in a situation where clients face one type of service. Second, a choice between two service providers was added: a service provider with broad experience and another with deep experience. The breadth of experience was manipulated by varying the number of different types of experiences in a field. Participants were told they were looking for a home interior designer because their home had issues with flooring and lack of space. In the deliberative mindset (consultation service) condition, participants were told they did not know what kind of repair and furniture would solve their problem. In the implemental mindset (implementation service) condition, participants were told they knew what kind of repair and new furniture would solve their problem, but they needed someone to do flooring and other repairs. Then they saw two interior designers, one with 20 years of experience exclusively with in-home interior design and another with 20 years of experience in interior design, including home and commercial interior. They first made a choice between two designers and indicated the extent to which they were interested in meeting each designer (1 = not at all interested, 7 = very interested).

3.3.2 Results and Discussion

One hundred and twenty-nine MTurkers (male = 53%, mean age = 32.8) participated in the study. As in Study 1, a 2 (Mindset: deliberative vs. implemental, between-subject) x 2 (Experience: broad vs. deep, within-subject) mixed ANOVA was conducted on ratings for service providers. Again, only the interaction effect between the two variables was significant,
\( F(1, 128) = 6.71, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .05 \). The main effect of mindset \((F(1, 128) = .06, p > .7)\) and the effect of experience was not significant \((F(1, 129) = 2.02, p > .2)\). The service provider with deep experience was evaluated more favorably when participants needed an implementation service \((M = 5.86, SD = 1.26)\) rather than a consultation service \((M = 5.35, SD = 1.22, F(1, 128) = 4.79, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .03, \) figure 3.3). Alternatively, participants rated the service provider with broad experience more favorably when they wanted a consultation service \((M = 5.63, SD = 1.31)\) rather than an implementation service \((M = 5.20, SD = 1.37)\), but the difference did not reach the 95% confidence level \((p = .09)\). Participants preferred the deep experience over the broad one when having an implemental mindset \((M = 5.86, SD = 1.26 vs. M = 5.20, SD = 1.37, F(1, 128) = 4.95, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .03)\). There was no difference between the two experiences when participants had a deliberative mindset \((M_{\text{broad}} = 5.63 vs. M_{\text{deep}} = 5.35, F(1, 128) = .2, p > .18)\). Next, a chi-square test was conducted to examine whether the choice between two service providers differed by the type of the mindset. Consistent with the pattern described above, participants were more likely to choose deep experience when they had the implemental mindset \((62\% vs. 39\%), \chi^2(130) = 6.49, p < .01)\.

As in Study 1, Study 2 supports the hypothesis that an implemental mindset increases the evaluation of deep experience. The pattern was replicated in the new scenario where participants needed a service from a different domain (interior design). The evaluation for broad experience is interesting as well. In Study 2, the broad experience included the experience in commercial interior design which may be less useful for clients looking for a home interior service. Still, 61\% of participants liked the broad experience, including the above experience, when they had a deliberative mindset. Although the findings support the hypothesis that an implemental mindset increases the rating for deep experience, some may wonder if the service provider with deep experience is perceived as more expert and the findings indicate that an implemental mindset
increases ratings for expertise in general. However, if the service provider with deep experience is perceived as more expert, then we would expect to see a main effect of experience type for clients would prefer the expert regardless of the mindset. The absence of the main effect of experience type weakens the possibility that an implemental mindset increases general liking for expertise.

3.4 Study 3
The purpose of Studies 3 and 4 was to manipulate the mindset in a different way, that is, by manipulating how clients construe the service they need. When we think of a service, we can think of it in a more or less implementation-oriented way. For example, we can think about a renovation project while focusing on non-implemental features such as spacious space or relaxing ambience. Alternatively, home renovation can also be mentally represented with implemental features such as removing the old sofa or adding a light fixture to a living room ceiling. Because the latter representation involves the thoughts about implementation steps, clients would adopt an implemental mindset. Thus, clients would evaluate deep experience highly when they construed the target service focusing on its implementation. In Study 3, the implemental mindset was manipulated by varying whether the service should be done immediately or in the future (Tu & Soman, 2014). Participants would construe the service focusing on its implementation when they wanted the service to be delivered sooner rather than later. In Study 4, the mindset was manipulated by a series of questions asking implemental or non-implemental features of participants’ own goals (Brandstätter & Frank, 2002).
3.4.1 Method

Eighty-one MTurkers (male = 43%, mean age = 33.6) were randomly assigned to one of two conditions (Mindset: deliberative vs. implemental) and completed the survey for $.30. The cover story asked them to imagine they needed a veterinarian who could perform a heart surgery for their pet. The study manipulated the mindset by varying the urgency in need of performing the surgery. The previous article showed that an implemental mindset is activated when an action item is scheduled in the immediate future (e.g., this month) rather than in the future (Tu & Soman, 2014). In the implemental condition, participants were told the surgery should be done that week. In the deliberative condition, the surgery was scheduled four months from that time point. Next, participants saw a profile of two veterinarians: one with broad experience and another with deep experience. The veterinarian with deep experience had work experience in pet heart surgery only, whereas the veterinarian with broad experience had experiences in three domains: pet heart surgery, joint replacement, and eye surgery. The total length of work experience was the same for the two veterinarians. The survey included manipulation check items asking whether they viewed each experience as a broad and deep experience for each veterinarian (1 = broad experience, 7 = deep experience). Lastly, an additional item was included to test an alternative mechanism based on the construal level. Some may argue that the current manipulation is associated with low-level construal and that low-level construal explains the effect. The alternative theory would predict that a low level of construal highlights dissimilarities among three sub-domains, makes the two other sub-domains seem less useful, and increases the ratings for deep experience. To explore the possibility that the choice is explained by the perceived similarity instead of the mindset, an item was added to measure the perceived similarities among three subfields (“The knowledge needed for pet joint replacement and pet eye
surgery closely overlaps with the knowledge needed for pet heart surgery,” 1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree).

3.4.2 Results

Choice. A chi-square test was conducted using the mindset as the independent variable and veterinarian choice as the dependent variable. The framework predicts that the veterinarian with deep experience would be preferred when the surgery needed to be done in the near future because the surgery service would be more likely to be represented with implemental steps. Consistent with the prediction, participants were more likely to choose deep experience when the service was scheduled in the near future (88%) than when scheduled far from that time (50%, χ²(82) = 14.04, p < .001, figure 3.4).

Manipulation and confound check. To determine whether the manipulation of experience was successful, a 2 (Experience: broad vs. deep) x 2 (Mindset: deliberative vs. implemental) was conducted on manipulation check items. The experience in heart surgery was viewed as deep experience (M = 5.41, SD = 1.61) compared to the experience in three domains (M = 1.79, SD = 1.74, F(1, 80) = 143.52, p < .001). The ratings did not differ by mindset manipulation (F(1, 79) = .13, p > .7) or the interaction between two factors (F(1, 79) = 0.008, p > .9). The last analysis checked whether the current manipulation changed a possible confounding factor, which was the perceived similarity among three subfields (heart surgery, joint replacement, and eye surgery). However, it did not display a substantial difference between the deliberative (M = 3.21, SD = 1.22) and the implemental (M = 3.41, SD = 1.55, F(1, 79) = .40, p > .5) conditions.

In addition to replicating the effect in a different context, Study 3 also rules out two alternative accounts due to clients’ expertise or perceived similarity among subfields. Some may
argue that clients who seek consultation services would be more likely to be novices than the clients who seek implementation services because the latter (unlike the former) knows what action would solve their problem. This alternative account would argue that the difference in the knowledge level, not the implemental mindset, explains the phenomenon because novices tend to prefer diversity (Clarkson et al., 2013). In Study 3, the new manipulation does not change the client’s current knowledge level; hence, his or her expertise cannot account for these results. Another alternative account would explain that the implemental mindset leads to a more positive evaluation for deep experience because the implemental mindset (or the distance manipulation in Study 3) highlights the difference or irrelevance among subfields. Because the similarity among three subfields did not differ by the manipulation, this alternative account cannot explain the effect either.

3.5 Study 4

3.5.1 Method

There were two objectives in Study 4. The first one was to test the effect with a choice related to the goal generated by participants instead of goals artificially assigned by the researcher. Secondly, the mindset was manipulated by a mental exercise to control other confounding factors. In this study, participants wrote down their real New Year’s resolution related to health and then chose an expert they would like to meet. Seventy-eight MTurkers completed the study for $.30. Half of the participants completed the mental exercise that prevented them from thinking about concrete implemental steps by asking reasons for pursuing the goal, since a deliberative mindset is associated with thinking abstractly and a high-level value of the goal (Freitas, Gollwitzer, & Trope, 2004). After writing a goal, participants were asked to
write why they pursued the goal. Then, the second question asked them to write why they pursued the goal they included for the first question. The last question again asked them to write the reason for pursuing the answer to the second question. In the implemental condition, participants were told that researchers were interested in a New Year’s resolution and how people planned for their goal. Participants completed a series of question asking how they would complete the goal or the steps they wrote in the previous question. After the exercise, they saw two doctors who could provide a short consultation for their health goal and indicated their preference between two doctors (1 = prefer the expert with deep experience, 9 = prefer the expert with broad experience).

3.5.2 Results
A one-way ANOVA was conducted entering the mindset as the independent variable and the preference as the dependent variable. The same pattern emerged, but the difference between two mindset conditions was not significant at the confidence level of 95%. Participants who went through implementation steps for their self-generated goal leaned more toward deep experience ($M = 2.18, SD = 1.41$) than participants in the deliberative condition ($M = 3, SD = 2.36$), $F(1, 76) = 3.37, p < .08$, figure 3.5).

The findings in Study 4 rule out two alternative accounts based on the clients’ expertise or psychological distance. The mental exercise in Study 4 did not change the participants’ expertise in the topic or the temporal distance to the service delivery time; thus, the two factors cannot explain the phenomenon. More importantly, the effect is tested in a more realistic manner by asking for a real goal that participants wanted to pursue in their lives. In Studies 1–3, participants imagined a situation where they needed a service for a goal assigned by researchers.
and not by themselves. Study 4 shows that the effect exists even when the goals are self-generated.

3.6 General Discussion

In sum, three pilot and four standard studies in the present research show clients are different in their evaluation of deep and broad experience. Four studies showed that an implemental mindset increases the evaluation of deep experience. Clients evaluated service providers who have deep experience in a field more favorably when they needed the service provider to implement a certain action than when they needed the service provider to consult for a solution for their problem (Studies 1 and 2). These two studies also show that clients distinguish two types of experiences (broad and deep experience) and two types of services they need (consultation and implementation). The finding was replicated when the deep and broad experiences were comprised of different experiences in the subfields (Study 2) and when the composition of two sets of experiences was actually the same (Study 1). Moreover, evaluation of deep experience was higher when clients construed the service focusing on the implementation of the service (Studies 3 and 4). In Study 3, the mindset was manipulated by varying how urgently clients needed the service and found the same effect. The implemental mindset increased the evaluation of deep experience when clients listed steps to implement their personal goal (Study 4). The evaluation of the service provider with broad experience did not yield a consistent pattern throughout the study.

Contribution
The current research makes theoretical contributions to service and mindset literature. To the service literature, present research shows that depth or breadth of an experience matters when clients choose a service provider. Relevant to breadth seeking, there has been work on variety seeking when choosing nonservice goods or choosing whether to take the opportunity to broaden one’s experience. However, literature looked at clients’ choice to broaden their own experience; thus, it is unclear how clients would evaluate others’ deep or broad experience when delegating a task to a service provider. The findings show clients consider the depth of experience even when their choice does not necessarily result in broadening or strengthening of their own experience.

Secondly, the results reveal factors impacting evaluation for deep experience. There has been little work on factors affecting the evaluation for broad and deep experience, and they focused on how individual differences such as one’s expertise influence the evaluation for two types of experience (Clarkson et al., 2013; Sela et al., working). The mindset activated by type of service, urgency, and thoughts on implemental steps in the current research predicted how clients evaluate deep experience, regardless of their individual differences.

Further, these findings make contributions to the mindset literature by bolstering evidence for the link between an implemental mindset and selectivity in behavior. There have been many pieces of evidence for how an implemental mindset changes the breadth of attention and information processing, but little research has been done on the evaluation of complex objects comprising diverse or homogeneous elements. The findings show that a set comprised of elements closely related to the focal goal is not only retrieved easily but also liked more when one focuses on implemental actions for the goal. In addition, the current research connects the literature to the service literature. Considering the size of the service industry and services for pre-decisional and post-decisional phases, it would be worth investigating the activation and consequences of a mindset in the service choice. For example, a deliberative mindset would
better explain the behavior of clients looking for a consultation service to know what action to take for the current problem. Implemental mindset may be a more useful concept when clients know what action to take but just want someone to file the tax report, paint the wall, or deliver their takeout food.

**Future Research**

Because the research concentrated on the choice between relying on a broad experience versus a deep experience, it raises new questions related to the breadth, service, and mindset. First, a need for empirical evidence for the underlying process calls for future research. It is unclear whether new manipulation methods in studies induced mindset and what exactly explains the relationship between mindset and evaluation of deep experience. Another remaining question is why mindset affected the evaluation of deep experience but not broad experience. One possible reason for the difference would be that it is easier for broad experience to find its usefulness in various situations, whereas the usefulness of deep experience highly depends on situations. Researchers in subsequent work may further investigate this remaining problem. Second, the present research manipulated the breadth just by varying the number of sub-domains of work experience although there are many ways to manipulate. For example, varying the number of job-irrelevant experience such as a variety of volunteer experience or work location creates an impression of broad experience. Even more, labeling the same experience as broad or deep can change how the experience is perceived. Testing effectiveness of two additional methods would have practical implications as they are easier way to manipulate breadth of experience. Thirdly, future research may investigate whether the mindset activated by an unrelated prior task would affect clients’ choice to deepen their knowledge. This can be an interesting and important question because it shows that mindset may affect how we use one of
the most precious resources, which is time. Lastly, the findings introduce questions about how focusing on how implementation changes subsequent choices. Increased selectivity in attention, attitude, and action may be adaptive when there is a pressing need to implement an action because scattered attention may result in a delayed response. Drawing upon the relationship between mindset and selectivity, future work may look at whether the implemental mindset results in less openness to outgroup members or low willingness to accept a new option.
Chapter 4: Conclusion

The two essays in the current thesis showed what factors affect clients’ choices of service providers. I identified multiple ways to describe a service provider’s prior experience and examined effective ways to communicate the experience. In the first essay, I found that clients and service providers are different in their evaluation of a service provider who specifies his/her work experience which is less relevant to the client’s interest. The service providers chose to specify such experiences more than clients would want to see. The effect was because that service providers believed such specific descriptions signal their transparency more than clients infer it from the specific descriptions (Study 2 in Essay 1). Furthermore, service providers held such belief because the fact that they could have chosen the less transparent description was more accessible to service providers. Given that the service provider specified even he/she could have chosen the less transparent choice increased the perceived transparency of the service provider (Study 3 in Essay 1). The effect was replicated in a study where participants had a real incentive to choose accurately (Study 4 in Essay 1).

While the first essay focused on the specificity of the information in a less relevant domain and the preference discrepancy between clients and service providers, the second essay focused on how mindset and the breadth of work experience of service providers affect the client choice. Drawing upon the previous work on the relationship between an implemental mindset and selective information processing, the current research tested if the implemental mindset increases the evaluation of deep experience which consists of experiences from a narrowly defined field. The evaluation of a service provider with deep experience increased as clients adopted an implemental mindset which is triggered by the nature of the delegated service
(Studies 1–2 in Essay 2), urgency (Study 3 in Essay 2), or a mental exercise listing implemental thoughts (Study 4 in Essay 2).

The two essays are similar in the sense that they address a communication problem arising from having diverse prior experience including some experience less relevant to the client’s interest. The first essay questions whether it is beneficial to specify less relevant experience, focusing on the specificity in framing the information. The second essay investigates the case where types of less relevant experiences are many and listing them can signal the breadth of the experience. Since the broad experience in Essay 2 specified experiences from other sub-domains, it partly overlaps with the specific description in Essay 1. However, they are different in that the specific description does not involve a trade-off between lengths of experience in the relevant and less relevant domain. The lengths of experience in the relevant and less relevant domain were the same in general and specific descriptions in Essay 1; thus, comparison of the two does not provide insights for the trade-off between breadth and depth. In contrast, the less relevant experience in Essay 2 shortens the length of experience in the relevant domain and Essay 2 questions when having less relevant experiences despite the trade-off can be attractive.

**Theoretical Contribution**

Together, the findings make the following contributions to the information format and service literature. I summarize essay-specific contributions in the general discussion of each essay and discuss overlapping contributions in this section. First, the two essays contribute to the literature by examining how information formats highlighting specificity and breadth influence of the choice. There has been research on how the way that choice options are presented changes
the choice – presenting the same information varying the gain/loss frame, presentation order, and numerical units affects the choice (Kahneman & Tversky, 2013; Monga & Bagchi, 2012; Wadhwa & Zhang, 2015; Zhang & Schwarz, 2012). While some of the previous work studied the specificity of information (Masicampo & Baumeister, 2012) and breadth among elements in a set (Clarkson et al., 2013) in marketing context, these two topics are under-researched despite the ease and prevalence of manipulating these factors. The findings give a guide for setting appropriate level of specificity of information and breadth when communicating one’s experience. Secondly, I show that the effectiveness of information format is moderated by the viewer’s role (Essay 1) and the mindset (Essay 2). Whether the format liked by service providers matches to the format liked by clients is important to ensure the effectiveness of information exchange, but the topic has not received much attention. It would be worthy to investigate the topic further because studying choices solely from one side (either providers or clients) may not fully explain the results of communication between two groups.

The two essays also contribute to the service literature by showing the type of experience as a factor affecting service choice. One distinctive feature distinguishing service from other products is the lack of tangible properties (Lovelock, 1983; Zeithaml et al., 1985). The intangibility reduces the amount of visible information clients can rely on and makes it difficult to evaluate the service quality (Bebko, 2000; Levitt, 1981). Due to the intangibility, clients often use tangible attributes from peripheral environmental cues (e.g., office décor) and intangible attributes of service (e.g., brand image) when evaluating services (Ding & Keh, 2017; Zeithaml et al., 1993). Considering that tangible attributes often have low diagnostic value (e.g., office décor), it is important to look at how different intangible attributes affect the choice. Among many attributes, a service provider’s experience is an interesting topic for the following reasons.
First, experience is one of the most easily obtainable and sought-out information when choosing a service provider. Next, experience involves unique characteristics such as intangibility, a limit in its capacity, and relevance to one’s identity which distinguish the experience from other tangible and intangible attributes. The current research advances the literature by showing that clients differently evaluate deep and broad experiences.

Future Research Directions

However, there are several limitations and remaining questions which require further research. While the two essays study a question about effective way to present a set consisting of parts relevant or less relevant to a client’s interest, factors studied in each essay are different. Future research may examine interactions between factors. For example, specific descriptions in Essay 1 and broad experience in Essay 2 are similar in that both specify experience less relevant to the client’s interest. Hence, a natural question is whether evaluations for deep vs. broad experience would differ between service providers and clients, as the role moderated preference between specific vs. general descriptions. Conversely, future research may look at whether an implemental mindset would influence evaluations for specific and general descriptions.

Another topic for the future research include factors determining an ideal level of specificity in different contexts. Providing a sufficient yet succinct amount of information is crucial for successful conversation and cooperation (Grice, 1975). For example, when a professor is asked what he/she does, specifying one’s occupation as a “professor in marketing” would be appropriate when talking with another professor but could be too much information when with a person outside academia. However, as documented in Essay 1, the preferred level of specificity was different between speakers and recipients. The preferred level of specificity was determined by a tendency to infer transparency from specificity and was not explained by
perceived relevance of secondary experience or different inference of one’s expertise. Identifying other factors determining the ideal level of specificity would contribute to successful communication.

Another important factor to look at is the type of advisor. Owing to the rapid development of technologies, consumers receive advice from machine advisors as well as traditional human advisors. Regardless of the content and actual accuracy of advice, consumers respond differently to advice coming from machine and human advisors (Yeomans et al., working). How having different assumptions for human and machine advisors further bias judgment on advice is an interesting topic for future research. For example, deep and broad experience in the current research have a trade-off due to an assumption that humans have a limited capacity to have skills both high in their breadth and depth. Since such an assumption does not hold for an algorithm generating recommendations, consumers would make less compensatory inferences for a machine advisor used in broad or selective fields. That means, having a broad range of skills would be less likely to form a low expectation for the depth of each skill and vice versa. Therefore, the depth of experience would have little effect for machine advisors. Also, the types of advisor may moderate the effect of the mindset as well as the effect of type of experience. When consumers have an implemental mindset, they may prefer a machine advisor over a human advisor because humans are more prone to making errors during the implementation of a task.

Lastly, while the focus of my essays is on service and experiences, would the effect apply to products? That is, would marketers prefer a specific description of their products more than consumers do? Would consumers evaluate a specialized product with few essential functions favorably when they have an implemental mindset? Although the follow-up studies in Essay 1 showed that the asymmetry between marketers and consumers was not replicated for product
descriptions, it could be that the specified information is about product defect. Given the important role of product communication between companies and consumers, understanding how framing of the product information in a specific vs. general (deep vs. broad) manner while descripting the product attribute is worthwhile.

Overall, the current research advances the field by making novel connections between different streams of literature, adding findings to under-researched areas, and opening a new venue for future research. In addition to these contributions in the information format and service literature, the first essay makes contributions to the self-other difference and moral judgment literature whereas the second essay contributes to the mindset literature.
5 References


Brandstätter, V., & Frank, E. (2002). Effects of Deliberative and Implemental Mindsets on


Rahn, J., Jaudas, A., & Achtziger, A. (2016). To plan or not to plan—mindset effects on visual attention in decision making. *Journal of Neuroscience, Psychology, and Economics, 9*(2), 109–120.


6 Appendices

6.1 Table 2.1: Summary of All Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Design [Sample Size]</th>
<th>P%</th>
<th>E%</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Effect Size [SE]</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2 (Role) [n=202]</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2.5[0.4]</td>
<td>Demonstration of the effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>2 (Role) [n=175]</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.1[0.5]</td>
<td>Replication in a lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>2 (Role)×2 (Duration) [n=240]</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2[0.3]</td>
<td>Duration of less relevant information does not moderate (p&gt;.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2 (Role)×2 (Duration) [n=205]</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.3[0.4]</td>
<td>Duration of less relevant information does not moderate (p&gt;.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>2 (Role)×3 (Relevance) [n=304]</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.2[0.2]</td>
<td>The absolute relevance of the less relevant experience does not moderate (p&gt;.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>2 (Role) [n=39]</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.1[0.7]</td>
<td>Unsuccessful replication (no effect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>2 (Role)×2 (Order) [n=150]</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.4[0.3]</td>
<td>Effect replicated (p&lt;.05), order does not moderate (p&gt;.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>3 (Role: service provider, client, employer) ×2 (Level) [n=201]</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.2[0.3]</td>
<td>The number of specificity level does not moderate (p&gt;.2). Employers’ choice is between service providers and clients (p&lt;.01); however, employers are still different from the service providers (p&lt;.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Design [Sample Size]</th>
<th>P%</th>
<th>E%</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Effect Size [SE]</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>2 (Role) [n=151]</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.7[0.4]</td>
<td>Transparency mediates effect of role on choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>3 (Role: service provider, client, informed client) [n=68]</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.6[0.6]</td>
<td>Transparency mediates, informed clients behave differently from baseline clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>4 (Role: service provider, client, client-single, informed client) [n=148]</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.5[0.4]</td>
<td>Transparency mediates, treated clients behave differently from baseline clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Studies that test alternative explanations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>2 (Role)×5 (Thinking Style) [n=513]</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.4[0.2]</td>
<td>Perspective taking (p&gt;.2) nor thinking style eliminate the effect (p&gt;.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>2 (Role)×2 (Construal) [n=199]</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.9[0.3]</td>
<td>Adopting a different construal did not eliminate the effect (p&gt;.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>2 (Role)×3 (Complexity) [n=303]</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.7[0.3]</td>
<td>Manipulating the belief on identity complexity did not eliminate the effect (p&gt;.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>2 (Role)×3 (Complexity) [n=164]</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.1[0.3]</td>
<td>Manipulating the belief on identity complexity did not eliminate the effect (p&gt;.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI [1]</td>
<td>2 (Role) [n=159]</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.8[0.3]</td>
<td>Replication in a realistic setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII [4]</td>
<td>2 (Role) [n=81]</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.5[0.4]</td>
<td>Replication in a realistic setting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
- **Role**: Role of participants, either a service provider or a client.
- **Duration**: Whether the duration of less relevant experience is longer (vs. shorter) than the duration of relevant experience.
- **Relevance**: Whether the less relevant experience is explicitly mentioned to be relevant (vs. irrelevant vs. no mention) to the job position.
- **Level**: Specificity levels of descriptions, either two levels (a specific vs. a general description) or three levels (the most specific vs. a moderately specific vs. a general description).
- **Thinking Style**: Whether participants were induced to take a perspective of another role or think in a specific style; five conditions include control, weak perspective taking, strong perspective taking, holistic thinking, and piecemeal thinking.
- **Construal**: Whether participants were induced to take a different construal; conditions include baseline service provider, baseline client, service providers under a high-level construal, and clients under a low-level construal.
- **Order**: Whether the specific description was presented as the first (vs. second) choice in the set.
- **Complexity**: Whether participants were induced to view others as a simple entity who cannot have two different traits at the same time or a multifaceted entity who can have.
- **Sample Size**: Number of study samples used in the meta-analysis. In Studies X and XI, 34 and 135 samples in the modified client conditions were not included in the meta-analysis, respectively.
- **P%**: Percentage of baseline service providers choosing a specific description over a general description.
- **E%**: Percentage of baseline clients choosing a specific description over a general description.
- **OR**: Odds ratio.
- **Effect Size and SE**: Effect size (log-transformed odds ratio) and its SE.
### 6.2 Table 2.2: Exploratory Studies with Product Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design [Sample Size]</th>
<th>Stimuli</th>
<th>P%</th>
<th>E%</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>2 (Role) × 2 (Scenario) [n=201]</td>
<td>Used Phone</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>No replication (p &gt; .29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Replication (p &lt; .001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>2 (Role) × 2 (Scenario) [n=83]</td>
<td>Used Phone</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No replication (p &gt; .9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Replication (p &lt; .05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>2 (Role) × 4 (Scenario) [n=140]</td>
<td>Used Phone</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>No replication (p &gt; .7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Camera</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>No replication (p &gt; .3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toothpaste</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>No replication, reversed pattern (p &lt; .01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Real estate agent</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Replication (p &lt; .001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.3 Table 3.1: Summary of Pilot Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Breadth (All)</th>
<th>p-value (One Sample)</th>
<th>% Breadth (Stable)</th>
<th>% Breadth (Dynamic)</th>
<th>p-value (ANOVA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot 3.1</td>
<td>Product Development Advice</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career Advice</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel Advice</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product Development Advice</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Management</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel Advice</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Three pilot studies above were conducted to test whether clients prefer a service provider with broad experience over a service provider with deep experience when the environment is unpredictably dynamic (vs. stable). The stability of the environment was the main independent variable in all studies and the choice was the main dependent variable. However, instead of finding evidence for the original hypothesis, the results revealed a general preference for the broad experience, as indicated by the number of participants who chose the broad experience is above the middle point (50%) in the most scenarios.

**Notes**
- **Service:** The type of service clients wanted.
- **N:** Number of participants in each study.
- **% Breadth:** % participants who chose the service provider with a broad experience over the service provider with a deep experience.
- **p-value (One Sample):** p-value from a one-sample t-test for % Breadth (test value: .5).
- **% Breadth (Stable):** % participants who chose the broad experience in the stable environment condition.
- **% Breadth (Dynamic):** % participants who chose the broad experience in the dynamic environment condition.
- **p-value (ANOVA):** p-value from a 2(Environment: Stable vs. Dynamic) ANOVA.
6.4 Figure 2.1: A Category Structure

Corporate Jobs

Financial Service Industry Jobs

Banking
- Loan
- Wealth Manager
- Underwriter
- Claiming Officer

Insurance

Media Industry Jobs

Production
- TV
- Radio
- Broadcast
- Online

Media Planning
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- Service Providers
- Information (Experience)
- Clients
- Highly Relevant Information
- Less Relevant Information
- Specific Description [Promotes Transparency]
- General Description [Reduces Fear of Dilution]
6.6 Figure 2.3: Forest Plot (Essay 1)

Odds ratio for choosing specific description [service providers / clients]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>OR (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study XVII</td>
<td>4.5 (1.7, 11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study XVI</td>
<td>2.2 (1.2, 4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study XV</td>
<td>3 (1.6, 5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study XIV</td>
<td>5.3 (3.2, 8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study XIII</td>
<td>6.6 (3.4, 12.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study XII</td>
<td>4.2 (2.9, 6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study XI</td>
<td>4.6 (2.2, 9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study X</td>
<td>5 (1.6, 15.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study IX</td>
<td>5.6 (2.6, 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study VIII</td>
<td>3.3 (1.8, 6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study VII</td>
<td>4.2 (2.1, 8.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study VI</td>
<td>1.1 (0.3, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study V</td>
<td>3.2 (2, 5.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study IV</td>
<td>9.7 (4.7, 19.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study III</td>
<td>7.1 (4, 12.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study II</td>
<td>8.6 (3.5, 20.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study I</td>
<td>12.2 (5.6, 26.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Odds Ratio (plotted on a natural logarithmic scale)
6.7 Figure 2.4: Choice of Specific Description (Essay 1, Study 1)
6.8 Figure 2.5: Choice of Specific Description (Essay 1, Study 2)
Figure 2.6: Perceived Transparency (Essay 1, Study 2)
6.10 Figure 2.7: Choice of Specific Description (Essay 1, Study 3)
6.11 Figure 2.8: Choice of Specific Description (Essay 1, Study 4)
6.12 Figure 3.1: Framework (Essay 2)

- **Deliberative**
  - Activated when
  - consultation services are needed
  - immediate delivery is not required
  - consumers engage in deliberative thoughts

- **Implemental**
  - Activated when
  - implementation services are needed
  - immediate delivery is needed
  - consumers engage in implemental thoughts

- **Neutral evaluation for service providers with deep experience**

- **Higher evaluation for service providers with deep experience**
6.13 Figure 3.2: Evaluation of Experience (Essay 2, Study 1)
6.14 Figure 3.3 Evaluation of Experience (Essay 2, Study 2)
6.15 Figure 3.4 Choice of Deep Experience (Essay 2, Study 3)

![Bar Chart]

- **Deliberative**: 50%
- **Implemental**: 88%
6.16 Figure 3.5 Preference between Two Experiences (Essay 2, Study 4)

Note: Lower number indicates higher preference for deep experience.
6.17 Meta-Analysis Details in Essay 1

The section illustrates details for the meta-analysis in the main study. Specifically, we note how the odds ratio, the mean odds ratio, standard error of the mean odds ratio, and the 95% confidence intervals were calculated.

1. Odds ratio: \[
\frac{\text{(n) exposed cases}}{\text{(n) exposed non-cases}} \div \frac{\text{(n) unexposed cases}}{\text{(n) unexposed non-cases}} = \frac{a_i + c_i}{b_i + d_i} = \frac{(n) \text{ choice of the precise option among presenters}}{(n) \text{ choice of the general option among presenters}} \div \frac{(n) \text{ choice of the precise option among evaluators}}{(n) \text{ choice of the general option among evaluators}}
\]

2. Mean \[ES_{LOR} = \frac{\sum(w_i*ES_i)}{\sum w_i}, \text{ Where weight } w_i = \frac{1}{se_i^2} = \frac{1}{(\frac{1}{a_i} + \frac{1}{b_i} + \frac{1}{c_i} + \frac{1}{d_i})^2} = \frac{a_ib_i+c_id_i}{a_ib_i(c_i+d_i)+c_id_i(a_i+b_i)} \text{ and } ES_i = log_e(OR_i) = log_e \left( \frac{a_id_i}{b_ic_i} \right)\]

3. The Standard Error of the Mean Odds Ratio: \[se_{ES} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\sum w_i}}\]

4. 95% Confidence Interval: \[ES \pm 1.96(se_{ES})\]

5. \[z = \frac{|ES|}{se_{ES}}\]

6. Homogeneity Statistic (Q): \[\sum \left(w_i \times ES_i^2\right) = \frac{\left(\sum w_i^*ES_i\right)^2}{\sum w_i} \]

7. Random Effects Variance Component: \[\hat{\theta} = \frac{Q-k-1}{\sum w_i - (\sum w_i^2) / \sum w_i}\]

8. Weight for the Random Effects Model: \[w_i^* = \frac{1}{\hat{\theta} + \frac{1}{w_i}}\]
6.18 Appendix A: Study Stimuli for Essay 1

STUDY 1 MATERIAL

Service Provider Condition

Help the Researcher: Image Categorization Survey

The researcher is planning to run a series of image categorization surveys. An example of an image categorization survey:

(a sample image categorization question)

Note that the image classification survey is related but still different from verbal categorization which is like:

(a sample verbal categorization question)

Workers will be required to complete a daily survey for four times. Each survey will have 20 image categorization questions similar to the above and pay $5 (total $20). There are several candidates and your job is to recommend a participant whom you think works better. If the agent you recommended outperforms, you will receive a bonus as well.

(1) Candidate 1: Completed about 100 image categorization HITs and 500 HITs of another kind of categorization task. 97% of approval rate.

(2) Candidate 2: Completed about 100 image categorization HITs and 500 HITs of verbal categorization task. 97% of approval rate.

Client Condition

Panel Participants Needed: Image Categorization Survey

The researcher is planning to run a series of image categorization surveys. An example of image categorization survey:

(a sample image categorization question)
Note that the image classification survey is related but still different from verbal categorization which is like:

(a sample verbal categorization question)

Your job will be to complete a daily survey four times. Each survey will have 20 image categorization questions similar to the above and pay $5 (total $20).

If you are interested in participating in this image categorization survey, please briefly indicate your experience with the image/verbal categorization survey, following the format below:

Template 1: Completed about [approx. numbers of HITs you did] image categorization HITs and [XX] HITs of another kind of categorization task.

Template 2: Completed about [approx. numbers of HITs you did] image categorization HITs and [XX] HITs of verbal categorization task.

Number of image categorization HITs you have done: ____________
Number of verbal categorization HITs you have done: ____________

If you are interested in the panel study, how would you summarize your experience?

(1) Completed about [the Value Entered by the Participant] image categorization HITs and [the Value Entered by the Participant] HITs of another kind of categorization task.

(2) Completed about (the Value Entered by the Participant) image categorization HITs and (the Value Entered by the Participant) HITs of verbal categorization task.

**Sample Image Categorization Question**

Which group does this object belong to?

(a) Wolf  (b) Cat  (c) Dog  (d) Teddy bear

(b)
Sample Verbal Categorization Question

What type of business is this?

Pizza Hut

(a) Financial Institute  (b) Retailer  (c) Restaurant  (d) Other

STUDY 2 MATERIAL

Client Condition

You are interested in buying mutual funds and now you are looking for an agent whom you can consult about fund management. You will ask for information about the promising investment options and funds for long-term gains, but you will do most of the transaction by yourself.

There are two fund managers who contacted to you, but you have to select one between two fund managers. Between two, whom would you like to choose?

Service Provider Condition

You are a fund manager and now you are meeting a client who is interested in fund management and may ask advice on fund management from you. You will give information about promising investment options and funds for long-term gains, but the client will do most of the transaction.

By now, you have 4 years of experience in fund management and 9 years of experience as a mortgage lending officer. You have two versions of a résumé which are for introducing yourself to the potential client. However, you need to choose one version of the résumé. Which one would you want to keep?

Please tell us which one you would choose if you were the fund manager [client] in the scenario.

- A fund manager with 4 years in fund management and 9 years of experience in another finance industry job
- A fund manager with 4 years in fund management and 9 years of experience as a mortgage lending officer

Please evaluate the fund manager below based on the description.

A fund manager, 4 years in fund management and 9 years of experience in another financial industry job

- Specialized in fund management | (disagree) 1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6 – 7 (agree)
- An expert in fund management | (disagree) 1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6 – 7 (agree)
- Has expertise in fund management | (disagree) 1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6 – 7 (agree)
Please evaluate the fund manager below based on the description.
A fund manager, 4 years in fund management and 9 years of experience as a mortgage lending officer
(same five items used in above question)

**STUDY 3 MATERIAL**

**Service Provider**
You are a travel agent and now you are meeting a client who is specifically interested in Turkey travel and may delegate the entire planning work to you. You will gather information about tourist attractions, accommodations, restaurants, and local transportation and do most of the planning. By now, you have 3 years of experience in Turkey travel and 8 years of experience in South Korea travel. You have two versions of a résumé describing your work experience.

**Résumé X:** A travel agent who has 3 years of experience in Turkey travel and 8-year experience in travel in an East Asian country

**Résumé Y:** A travel agent who has 3 years of experience in Turkey travel and 8 years of experience in South Korea travel

Between two versions of the résumé, you have to choose one to present yourself to the client. Which one would you choose?

**Baseline Client**
You are specifically interested in traveling to Turkey and now you are looking for a travel agent whom you can delegate planning work. You will ask for information about tourist attractions, accommodations, restaurants, and local transportation and ask the agent to do most of the planning. There are two travel agents with 11 years of experience.

**Agent X:** A travel agent who has 3 years of experience in Turkey travel and 8 years of experience in travel in an East Asian country

**Agent Y:** A travel agent who has 3 years of experience in Turkey travel and 8 years of experience in South Korea travel

Between two travel agents, whom would you choose?

**Client Evaluating Single Agent**
You are specifically interested in traveling to Turkey and now you are looking for a travel agent whom you can delegate planning work. You will ask for information about tourist attractions, accommodations, restaurants, and local transportation and ask the agent to do most of the planning. By now, you are interviewing a travel agent who has 3 years of experience in Turkey travel and 8 years of experience in South Korea travel. There are two versions of a résumé describing the same agent's experience.

Résumé X: A travel agent who has 3 years of experience in Turkey travel and 8 years of experience in travel in an East Asian country

Résumé Y: A travel agent who has 3 years of experience in Turkey travel and 8 years of experience in South Korea travel

Between two versions of résumé of the same travel agent, which résumé would you prefer?

**Informed Client**

You are specifically interested in traveling to Turkey and now you are looking for a travel agent whom you can delegate planning work. You will ask for information about tourist attractions, accommodations, restaurants, and local transportation and ask the agent to do most of the planning. There are two travel agents with 11 years of experience.

Agent X: A travel agent who has 3 years of experience in Turkey travel and 8 years of experience in travel in an East Asian country

Agent Y: A travel agent who has 3 years of experience in Turkey travel and 8 years of experience in South Korea travel

However, Agent X chose to describe his experience in another country in an abstract manner while Agent Y chose to precisely describe his experience in another country. Between two travel agents, whom would you choose?

Between two travel agents, whom would you choose?

**Choice**

(1) A travel agent who has 3 years of experience in Turkey travel and 8 years of experience in travel in an East Asian country

(2) A travel agent who has 3 years of experience in Turkey travel and 8 years of experience in South Korea travel

(Items for expertise / transparency were the same as in Study 2)

**STUDY 4 MATERIAL**
Introductory Survey

PANEL STUDY RECRUITMENT
Help the Researcher: Image Categorization Survey

The researcher is planning to run a series of image categorization surveys. An example of image categorization survey:

(a sample image categorization question)

Note that the image categorization survey is related but still different from verbal categorization which is like:

(a sample verbal categorization question)

If you participate, you will be randomly paired with other participants and be assigned as a worker or a manager. You will receive $1.5 (up to $2) for completing a survey which contains 6-8 simple multiple-choice questions.

Workers
- Task: (1) create a profile summarizing your survey experience which will be presented to your partner manager and (2) complete 5 visual categorization questions.
- Compensation: $1.5 for completing the survey and $0.5 bonus if your profile description matches what the partner manager chooses.

Managers
- Task: based on profiles of two workers, choose one whom you think does the visual categorization task well.
- Compensation: $1.5 for completing the survey and $0.5 bonus if your chosen worker performs the visual categorization task well.

The follow-up survey will be sent on August 23 or 24 and you need to complete in 24 hours. On August 22, you will receive a message about the details.

As you know, sometimes participants drop out or are otherwise unavailable during the study. If you partner is unavailable, you will be matched with another partner.

Are you interested in participating in the survey above? (1) Yes (2) No
If they selected “Yes”
1. Thank you for your interest. First, please write your email as we will contact you via email: ___
2. In this survey, participants will be paired and exchange basic, non-sensitive information with their partners. Specifically, you will tell your partner your ID, state, and your favorite animal and see your partner’s. First, please generate your 4-letter ID using one alphabet and two numbers (e.g., A10).
3. Please choose the state you live in.
4. Please write down your favorite animal.

**Survey for Workers (Service Providers)**

Image Categorization Survey

You are assigned as a WORKER. You are paired with another participant who is a MANAGER.

**Workers**

- **Task:** (1) create a profile summarizing your survey experience which will be presented to your partner manager. In particular, you will need to choose one of two ways of describing your experience. (2) complete 5 image categorization questions.
- **Compensation:** $1.5 for completing the survey and $0.5 bonus if your profile description matches what the partner manager chooses.

In a case where participants do not complete the follow-up survey, you will be matched with other participants who did the follow-up survey.

First, please briefly tell about your experience in visual and verbal categorization tasks.

1. Number of image categorization HITs you have done (numbers only): _____
2. Number of verbal categorization HITs you have done (numbers only): _____

Now, please choose how you want to describe your experience to your partner.

For your information, your partner's ID is {information obtained from the partner participant} and he/she lives in {information obtained from the partner participant} His/her favorite animal is {information obtained from the partner participant}

You can summarize your experience using one of two templates:

- **Template 1:** Completed about [approx. numbers of HITs you did] image categorization HITs and [XX] HITs of another kind of categorization task.
- **Template 2:** Completed about [approx. numbers of HITs you did] image categorization HITs and [XX] HITs of verbal categorization task.

Which template would you use when summarizing your experience to your partner?
• Completed about {value entered by participants in prior questions} image categorization HITs and {value entered by participants in prior questions} HITs of another kind of categorization task.
• Completed about {value entered by participants in prior questions} image categorization HITs and {value entered by participants in prior questions} HITs of verbal categorization task.

Survey for Manager (Clients)

Image Categorization Survey

You are assigned as a MANAGER. You are paired with another participant who is a WORKER.

Managers

• Task: based on profiles of two workers, choose one whom you think does the visual categorization task well.
• Compensation: You will receive $1.5 for completing the survey and $0.5 bonus if your chosen worker performs the visual categorization task well (accuracy/speed is above the average of all workers).

In a case where participants do not complete the follow-up survey, you will be matched with other participants who did the follow-up survey.

For your information, one of your partners' ID is {information obtained from the partner participant} and he/she lives in {information obtained from the partner participant}. His/her favorite animal is {information obtained from the partner participant}.

There are two candidates, and your job is to recommend a worker whom you think works better. If the worker you recommended performs well, you will receive a bonus.

• Worker 1: Completed about {information obtained from the partner participant} image categorization HITs and {information obtained from the partner participant} HITs of another kind of categorization task.
• Worker 2: Completed about {information obtained from the partner participant} image categorization HITs and {information obtained from the partner participant} HITs of verbal categorization task.
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STUDY 1 MATERIAL

Deliberative Mindset (Consultation Service), Broad Experience [Deep Experience]
You have an Apple Mac [an Apple computer] and your computer has an issue with freezing, blinking screens, and poor wireless connectivity. You know what caused these problems and what kind of hardware parts can fix your problem. However, you don't know which specific products to buy to fix the problem. Your main reason for meeting a hardware technician is to know available hardware parts.

Implemental Mindset (Implementation Service, Broad Experience) [Deep Experience]
You have an Apple computer [an Apple computer] and your computer has an issue with freezing, blinking screens, and poor wireless connectivity. You know what caused these problems and what kind of solution can fix your problem. You know which specific hardware parts to buy to fix. You can try replacement by yourself; however, you don't have the professional skills and tools to replace the parts in a sophisticated way. Your main reason for meeting a hardware technician is to delegate implementation of your replacement plan for a professional quality.

Question
How much are you interested in meeting the hardware technician below?
A hardware technician who has 5 years of experience in fixing five different Apple computer models (Mac, MacBook, Mac Pro, Old Mac, iBook)

STUDY 2 MATERIAL

Deliberative Mindset
Please imagine that you are looking for a home interior designer for house renovation. Your house has an issue with flooring, cracks in walls, and inefficient space use, and you know what kind of products will fix your problem; however, you don't know which specific flooring material and furniture to buy. Your main reason for meeting an interior designer is to know available options to make your renovation plan a success.

Implemental Mindset
Please imagine that you are looking for a home interior designer for house renovation. Your house has an issue with flooring, cracks in walls, and inefficient space use, and you know what solution can fix your problem and which specific flooring material and furniture to buy. However, you don't have enough skills to change floors, walls, and furniture to the professional quality you want to. Your main reason for
meeting an interior designer is to delegate implementation of your renovation plan for a professional result.

**Question**

Which interior designer would you meet?

- Expert A who has 10 years of experience in five different interior design jobs, including home interior design
- Expert B who has 10 years of experience of in-home interior design

How much are you interested in meeting each expert? (1 = Not interested in meeting this expert, 7 = Very interested in meeting this expert)

**STUDY 3 MATERIAL**

**Deliberative Mindset Condition**

Please imagine that you are looking for a vet to treat your pet's health problem. Your pet has been less playful, coughing, and restless at night. You learned that these symptoms are signs of a heart disease and you want to see a vet who can perform a pet heart surgery around May.

**Implemental Mindset Condition**

Please imagine that you are looking for a vet to treat your pet's health problem. Your pet has been less playful, coughing, and restless at night. You learned that these symptoms are signs of a heart disease and you want to see a vet who can perform a pet heart surgery this week.

**Question**

There are two vets who can do a pet heart surgery for your pet [in May / this week]. Whom would you meet?

- Vet A who has 10 years of experience with three different kinds of pet surgery, including heart surgery, joint replacement, and eye surgery.
- Vet B who has 10 years of experience in pet heart surgery.

**Manipulation Check**

Please indicate how you would classify each work experience as a broad experience or a specialized experience. (1=Specialized, 7=Broad)
Covariate
Please indicate the extent which you agree with each statement.
Knowledge needed for pet joint replacement and pet eye surgery closely overlaps with the knowledge needed for pet heart surgery. (1=Strongly disagree, 7=Strongly agree)

STUDY 4 MATERIAL

Introduction
New Year's resolution: Please think about one health goal for this year. Please write your goal in the text box below. Example: go to a gym three times a week.

Implemental Mindset
Health Goal: {goal entered by the participant}
Now, please think of how to attain the goal above step by step.
For example, if your goal is "go to a gym three times a week;"
A) How do you execute the health goal above? [I will leave my work at 5 p.m. to go to the gym]
B) How do you execute the step you wrote in (A)? [I will go to my workplace one hour earlier]
C) How do you execute the step you wrote in (B)? [I will get up one hour earlier]

Deliberative Mindset
Health Goal: {goal entered by the participant}
Now, please think of the reason for setting the goal above step by step.
For example, if your goal is "go to a gym three times a week;"
A) Why do you pursue the health goal above? [I want to lose fat]
B) Why do you pursue the reason you wrote in (A)? [Because I can lower the risk of diseases]
C) Why do you pursue the reason you wrote in (B)? [Because I want to be happy]

Question
Suppose that you can meet a doctor who can give you a consultation for your resolution. There are two doctors with 10 years of work experience. Whom would you meet? (1=Meet doctor A who has 10 years of work experience as a medical specialist and as a photographer, 9=Meet doctor B who has 10 years of work experience as a medical specialist)
6.20 Appendix C: Additional Studies (Essay 1)

Study I

Method. Two hundred and two participants (mean age = 36.2, male 47.4%) were recruited from Amazon MTurk and responded to a survey in exchange for $.20. They were randomly assigned to either a service provider or a client role, then asked to imagine a situation described in a scenario and to make a choice between two descriptions. They completed a fund manager scenario which was used in Study 2 in the main manuscript.

Results. Consistent with the first hypothesis, the percentage of participants who chose the specific description (“experience as a mortgage loan officer”) over the general description (“experience in another job in the finance industry”) was much higher among service providers (55 out of 101, 54%) than clients (9 out of 101, 9%), $\chi^2(202) = 48.39, p < .001$.

Study II

Rationale. The objective of the study was to replicate these results with participants in a laboratory setting.

Method. Participants completed the travel agent scenario (same as in Study 3) first and then the fund manager scenario.

Results. One hundred and seventy-five university students (mean age = 18.9, male = 30.3%) participated in the study for course credit. Consistent with the first hypothesis, the percentage of participants who chose the specific description over the general description was much higher among service providers than clients in the travel scenario ($M_{service\ provider} = 41.7\%$ vs. $M_{client} = 7.7\%$, $\chi^2(175) = 27.64, p < .001, \varphi = -.39$) and in the fund manager scenario ($M_{service\ provider} = 73.8\%$ vs. $M_{client} = 41.8\%$, $\chi^2(175) = 21.05, p < .001, \varphi = -.32$). More than half of the service providers chose the specific description in the fund manager scenario, suggesting that the service providers’ choice between the two descriptions is not random.

Studies III and IV

Rationale. In the main studies, the duration of the less relevant experience was always longer than the duration of the relevant experience. Studies III and IV varied the relative duration of the less relevant experience to explore whether the effect holds for different lengths of durations.

Method. MTurkers participated in the survey in Study III ($N = 205$, mean age = 33.2, male = 58.5%) and Study IV ($N = 240$, mean age = 37.5, male = 46.2%). In both studies, participants were assigned to one of four conditions from a 2 (Role: service provider vs. client) × 2 (Relative duration of less relevant experience: dominant vs. trivial) design. The same fund manager scenario was used. In
Study III, the fund manager had four years of relevant experience (fund management) and had either nine years (dominant) or six months (trivial) of experience in the less relevant job (a mortgage lending officer). In Study IV, the fund manager had three years of relevant experience, and the amount of the less relevant experience was either seven years (dominant) or one year (trivial).

Results. A logistic regression of the choice on role and duration was used to examine the interaction between the two factors. In Study III, only the main effect of role was significant ($B = -2.46$, Wald = 17.57, $p < .001$, Exp (B) = .08). The other effects were not significant, $ps > .1$. Similarly, only the main effect of role was found in Study IV ($B = -1.85$, Wald = 20.11, $p < .001$, Exp (B) = .15). The other effects were not significant, $ps > .4$.

Study V

Rationale. The study tested whether the basic effect is because service providers and clients perceive the relevance of the secondary experience differently. While service providers and clients would agree that the less relevant experience is relatively less relevant, they might differ in the absolute relevance. Service providers may believe that the less relevant experience is still relevant to the focal work while clients view less relevant experience as irrelevant to the focal work. The study explores if affirming the absolute relevance (or irrelevance) of the less relevant experience moderates the strength of the effect.

Method. Three hundred and four participants (mean age = 33.9, male = 58.2%) from MTurk were assigned to one of six conditions in a 2 (role: service provider vs. client) × 3 (relevance: baseline vs. related vs. unrelated) design. This study used the same fund manager scenario as in previous studies except for the inclusion of an additional statement explicitly mentioning the absolute relevance of less relevant experience to the focal work domain. In the related [unrelated] condition, participants saw: “Note that a mortgage loan officer position develops skills for reviewing creditworthiness of an individual, which is related [unrelated] to a fund management job.” This additional sentence didn’t appear in the baseline condition.

Results. The choice of the description including a specific description of the less relevant domain over a general description was different across the six conditions, $\chi^2(304) = 46.27, p < .001, \phi = .39$. Again, service providers (57.4%) chose the specific description more often compared to clients (29.5%), $\chi^2(304) = 24.01, p < .001, \phi = -.28$. Overall, the specific description was chosen more when the less relevant experience was relevant to the focal work (61.4%) than when it was unrelated (34.6%) or when there was no information (35.4%), $\chi^2(304) = 19.12, p < .001, \phi = .25$. To explore the interaction between the two (role and relevance), a logistic regression was conducted, entering the choice as the dependent variable, and role and relevance as categorical independent variables. Consistent with the chi-square test,
the main effect of role was significant ($B = −.93$, Wald = 4.679, $p < .05$, Exp (B) = .39). In addition to this effect, there was a main effect of relevance (Wald = 9.10, $p < .05$). However, the interaction between the two factors was not significant, $ps > .2$.

**Study VI**

*Rationale.* The objective of the study was to replicate the effect in a lab setting.

*Method.* Thirty-nine university students (mean age = 19.3, male = 51.3%) took either a service provider or a client role and completed the same fund manager scenario.

*Results.* A chi-square test showed that there was no difference between service providers (36%) and clients (35%) in the choice of the specific description, ($p > .9$)

**Study VII**

*Rationale.* In the main studies, general descriptions always appeared first. The order of two descriptions was counterbalanced in this study.

*Method.* One hundred and fifty MTurkers (mean age = 34.7, male = 50%) were assigned to one of four conditions, 2 (Role: service provider vs. client) × 2 (Order: general description is presented first vs. specific description is presented first) and completed the fund manager scenario.

*Results.* The logistic regression replicated the effect of role ($B = −1.33$, Wald = 6.47, $p < .01$, Exp (B) = .26). There was no main effect of order ($p > .9$) nor the interaction between two factors ($p > .7$). The results indicate that the order of presentation does not moderate the effect.

**Study VIII**

*Rationale.* Study VIII tests whether the level of client’s involvement influences the effect.

*Method.* One hundred and four MTurkers (mean age = 36.4, male = 42.3%) participated in the study and were randomly assigned to one of three conditions, service provider, baseline client, and the highly involved client (employer). Participants saw the travel agent scenario. In the baseline client condition, participants were asked to imagine looking for a travel agent whom they can delegate travel planning work. In the highly involved client (employer) condition, participants were told that they are looking for a travel agent as an employer: “You are running a travel agency, and now you are looking for a travel agent whom you can hire and delegate planning work. Customers will ask for information about tourist attractions, accommodations, restaurants, and local transportation and delegate most of the work to the agent.” Unlike the baseline clients, highly involved clients needed to do more thorough review and evaluation as the hiring contract is not a one-shot interaction.
Results. The choice of the specific description differed by conditions, $F(1, 103) = 11.28, p < .001$. Again, the contrast showed that 69% of service providers chose the specific description and the percentage was significantly higher than that among baseline clients (17%, $t(101) = 4.74, p < .001$) and that among highly involved clients (41%, $t(101) = 2.51, p < .01$). Interestingly, highly involved clients chose the specific description more than the baseline client did ($t(101) = -2.51, p < .05$). The results replicate the basic gap between service providers and clients seen in previous studies, but also found that the clients’ preference toward a specific description increases when they need to do a more careful evaluation. The need for a careful evaluation may push clients to think that two service providers could have presented differently, realize the specific description could have been less transparent, and appreciate the disclosure in the specific description. While this study does not directly show that the changes in clients’ behavior is due to perceived transparency, it tested a realistic moderator (different type of client).

Study X

Rationale. The purpose of this study was to examine the role of transparency.

Method. There were three conditions; service providers ($N = 32$), clients ($N = 36$), and clients informed of the service provider’s choice for the self-description as in Study 3 ($N = 34$). One hundred and two participants (mean age = 34.4, male = 48%) completed the travel and fund management scenarios.

Results. A chi-square test showed that service providers (50%) and informed clients (61.8%) chose the specific description more than the baseline clients did (16.7%; $\chi^2(102) = 15.76, p < .001$). The same pattern was observed for the fund manager choice. Service providers (71.9%) and informed clients (44.1%) chose the specific description more, while baseline clients did less (13.9%; $\chi^2(102) = 23.44, p < .001$). Because the informed clients behave differently from the baseline clients, the informed clients were not included as clients when conducting the meta-analysis. Also, the meta-analysis included the numbers in the travel scenario only in the meta-analysis to avoid using the sample twice. Replacing the numbers with the numbers in the fund scenario does not change the overall results.

Study XII

Rationale. The objective of the study was twofold: testing whether perspective taking eliminates the effect and testing an alternative mechanism by different thinking style. Previous work showed that service providers and clients engage in a different thinking process (Weaver et al., 2012). The thinking style literature posits that service providers engage in piecemeal processing, counting the value of each individual item separately, whereas clients engage in holistic processing, forming a global impression of
the bundle. The study tested whether the effect is eliminated when service providers and clients engage in the same thinking style.

**Method.** Five hundred and thirteen MTurkers participated in the survey (mean age = 34.48, male = 55%). They were randomly assigned to one of ten conditions, 2 (role: service provider vs. client) × 5 (treatment: baseline vs. perspective-taking instruction vs. direct perspective taking vs. piecemeal thinking vs. holistic thinking). The fund manager scenario was used. In the two perspective-taking conditions, participants were encouraged to consider the perspective of their counterpart. In the perspective-taking instruction condition, participants first read the scenario about their roles and then were asked to choose between two work descriptions with an instruction to think about what their counterpart would choose before making their own choice. Service providers [Clients] were asked to consider which work description would be chosen by clients [service providers]. In the direct perspective-taking condition, participants experienced another role before the main fund manager scenario. The travel agent scenario preceded the fund manager scenario. Clients in the main scenario were assigned to the service provider role (travel agent) in the travel scenario, and service providers in the main scenario were assigned to the client role (a client looking for a travel agent). After making a choice in the travel scenario, this set of participants did the main fund manager scenario. The travel scenario appeared in the direct perspective-taking condition only.

The procedure for the two thinking-style conditions was similar to the perspective-taking instruction condition, except that the instruction for the perspective taking was replaced by an instruction for either piecemeal or holistic processing. Adapted from the literature (Weaver et al., 2012), this procedure required participants to think of individual components or an overall impression of a set of experiences. In the piecemeal condition, the statement read as follows: “Before making your choice, please remember the individual components of each work description carefully because you will be asked to recall them later.” In the holistic-thinking condition, the instruction was replaced with “Before making your choice, please form an overall impression of each work description.” Participants chose one option and answered demographic questions at the end. In the piecemeal condition, they were additionally told at the end of the survey that they did not need to recall the individual components.

**Results.** A logistic regression was conducted with role and treatment (five levels) as independent variables to examine if any of the four treatments reduced the gap between the two groups. The logistic regression showed the main effect of assigned role only (B = −1.74, Wald = 14.01, p < .001, Exp (B) = .17, other ps > .17). Consistent with previous studies, there was a gap between the two groups at the baseline condition in their likelihood of choosing a specific description (M_{baseline, service provider} = 56.9% vs. M_{baseline, client} = 18.8%, χ²(99) = 15.18, p < .001, φ = −.39). The gap still existed in other conditions regardless of treatment type. A series of logistic regressions were conducted, one focusing on perspective
taking, 2 (Role) × 3 (Perspective Taking: baseline, perspective-taking instruction, and direct perspective taking) and another focusing one thinking style, 2 (Role) × 3 (Thinking Style: baseline, piecemeal processing, and holistic processing). However, each treatment did not eliminate the basic effect ($p > .2$ for perspective taking and $p > .5$ for thinking style).

The study replicated the basic effect and provided further evidence. First, perspective taking is not effective enough to change the service providers’ and clients’ choices. Second, a difference in processing style does not explain the phenomenon. Although the processing styles did not explain the difference between the service providers and clients in the current research, the results do not necessarily conflict with the earlier work by Weaver et al. (2012), which focused on the comparison between a set and a single product. In the current study, a description of a set of experiences is not compared with a single experience but compared with an alternative description of the same set of experiences. Thus, the null effect of processing styles in this study should be carefully interpreted considering the difference in evaluated objects.

**Study XIII**

**Rationale.** The purpose of this study was to test for the role of different construal levels in explaining the effect. As service providers evaluate their self-descriptions, their psychological distances to the evaluated descriptions are relatively near, while the distances are far for clients who view descriptions of others. The study tested if basic effect diminishes when service providers adopt the clients’ default construal (high-level construal) or when clients adopt the service providers’ default construal (low-level construal).

**Method.** One hundred and ninety-nine MTurkers (mean age = 34.7, male = 50.3%) were randomly assigned to four conditions, 2 (Role: service provider vs. client) × 2 (Condition: baseline vs. construal-level treatment) and completed the fund manager scenario. Before the scenario, service providers in the treatment condition went through a concept-generation exercise (Fujita et al., 2006) that asked participants to write a superordinate category for 20 words (e.g., if the given word is “soda,” a solution concept would be “beverage”). The task was designed to induce higher-level construal. Clients in the treatment condition did a similar exercise that required them to generate an exemplar of the same words (e.g., if the given word is “soda,” a solution would be “Pepsi”). The latter task was designed to induce lower-level construal. Participants in two baseline conditions did not receive any additional task.

**Results.** The choice of specific description was different across the four conditions, $\chi^2 (199) = 37.20, p < .001, \phi = .45$. In the baseline, 64% of service providers and 19% of clients chose the specific description. The gap did not change much after the construal-level treatment, as 50% of service providers and 14% of clients chose the specific description. In a logistic regression, only the main effect of role was
significant ($B = -1.98$, Wald = 18.68, $p < .001$, Exp ($B$) = .13). The main effect of treatment ($p > .16$) and the interaction ($p > .8$) were not significant.

**Studies XIV and XV**

*Rationale.* Two studies were conducted to explore whether the effect is because the service providers think they can be an expert in both the target domain and less relevant domain, while clients think others cannot be an expert in two different domains.

*Method.* MTurkers participated in Study XIV (N = 303, mean age = 33.1, male = 46.9%) and Study XV (N = 164, mean age = 35.6, male = 36%). The fund manager scenario was used. In these two studies, the belief on the complexity of one’s identity was manipulated; participants were assigned to one of six conditions, 2 (Role: service provider vs. client) × 3 (Lay belief: control vs. simple vs. multifaceted). In the simple identity condition, participants read an article that qualities constituting one’s identity is coherent, and people do not have two different qualities at the same time. In the multifaceted condition, participants read that one’s identity is multifaceted and people have different qualities at the same time. In Study XIV, the belief was manipulated by reading a paragraph that fosters the view that the evaluated service provider(s) are either multifaceted or simple. They read, “One has a multifaceted self when she/he has a lot of different traits, roles, experiences at the same time and when all different characteristics reflect one’s true self. On the other hand, one has an unmixed self when one has similar traits, roles, and experiences or when few dominant characteristics but not all different characteristics reflect one’s true self.” Next, they were explicitly told that the evaluated service provider(s) have a multifaceted or unmixed self. As the manipulation is not based on the previous work, another study was conducted with a different manipulation method. In Study XV, participants read the similar paragraph explaining the identity complexity. Then they were asked to think of themselves and another person they met recently and write characteristics that supports either the multifaceted view or simple identity view.

*Results.* In Study XIV, there was no moderation by the belief type ($p > .8$) nor any main effect of the belief type ($p > .9$) in the logistic regression. Only the main effect of role was significant ($B = -1.63$, Wald = 13.33, $p < .001$, Exp ($B$) = .19). In Study XV, all effects were not significant ($ps > .7$), while the direction of the main effect of role was consistent with other studies ($B = -1.20$, $p > .17$).

**Studies XVIII, XIX, and XX**

*Rationale.* The first 17 studied a choice between two descriptions of service providers’ experience. Three studies tested the generalizability of the effect with product descriptions.

*Method.* Studies had two factors, role (provider vs. client, between-participant) and choice scenario (within-participant). There were two scenarios involving descriptions of experience (travel agent
and real estate agent) and three scenarios testing product descriptions (used phone, camera, and toothpaste). Studies XVIII and XIX had the used phone scenario and travel agent scenario while Study XX had four scenarios (used phone, camera, toothpaste, and real estate agent). A used product scenario was developed to control the participants’ familiarity with the role; making a choice as a consumer or a used good seller is familiar to the participants while making a choice as a specific service provider is not. Two hundred and one (male = 56.7%, mean age = 32.8) and one hundred and forty MTurkers (male = 50%, mean age = 35.8) participated in study X and XX respectively. Eighty-three university students participated in the Study XIX in a lab setting (male = 32.5%, mean age = 19.8).

**Stimuli.** In the used phone scenario, providers were told that they are selling their used phone in classified websites to buyers who put greater importance in functionality (relevant attribute) than cosmetic condition (less relevant attribute). Then they were told that their phone is in a great working condition but has a minor scratch. Next, they chose between two descriptions, a general description (“A fully working phone used for six months and in a fair condition with a normal wear and tear”) and a specific description (“A fully working (...) condition with a small scratch in an unnoticeable place, near the earphone jack hole”). Clients were asked to imagine that they want to buy a used phone, focusing on the working condition more than the cosmetic condition, and choose between two phones from two sellers. In the camera scenario, providers and clients were asked to imagine that they are sellers and buyers of a camera good for wedding and pet photography. Also, providers [clients] were told that the target buyers [they] are more interested in the wedding photography than the pet photography. Then participants chose between a general description (“A camera with outstanding color depth (24 bits) which is great for taking wedding and pet photography”) and a specific description (“A camera (...) wedding photography and photos of pets in dynamic movements”). The toothpaste scenario briefly listed two health-related benefits (cavity prevention gum disease prevention) and two health-unrelated benefits (teeth whitening and bad breath prevention) of using the product. Participants were asked to focus on the teeth whitening and choose between a general description of a toothpaste (“Toothpaste which whitens teeth by removing up to 70% of surface stains and has strengthened cavity protection”) and a specific description (“Toothpaste (...) cavity protection with sugar-acid neutralizer and Fluoride”). As manipulation checks for relative relevance of features, items asking the importance of features were added at the end of the survey (1 = not at all important, 7 = very much important).

In the real estate agent scenario, providers played a role of real estate agent introducing their experience to clients interested in buying a house while clients played a role of the client choosing a real estate agent. The less relevant experience was the experience in non-residential properties, and it was described either generally (“experience in another estate appraisal job”) or specifically (“experience in
commercial estate appraisal”). The travel agent scenario was the same as in the main studies. In Study XX, participants also completed the transparency judgment.

**Results.** Among five stimuli, the basic effect was replicated in the travel agent scenario in Study XVIII (\(M_{\text{provider}} = 72\% \text{ vs. } M_{\text{client}} = 28\%\), \(\chi^2(201) = 39.40, p < .001, \varphi = -.44\)) and Study XIX (\(M_{\text{provider}} = 46\% \text{ vs. } M_{\text{client}} = 24\%\), \(\chi^2(83) = 4.63, p < .05, \varphi = -.23\)). The effect was replicated in the real estate agent scenario as well (\(M_{\text{provider}} = 69\% \text{ vs. } M_{\text{client}} = 40\%\), \(\chi^2(140) = 11.75, p < .001, \varphi = -.28\)). In three product scenarios, participants rated the less relevant features to be less important than relevant features (\(M_{\text{phone, less relevant}} = 4.61 \text{ vs. } M_{\text{phone, relevant}} = 6.12\), \(t(139) = -8.10, p < .001\); \(M_{\text{camera, less relevant}} = 3.71 \text{ vs. } M_{\text{camera, relevant}} = 6.01, t(139) = -10, p < .001\); \(M_{\text{toothpaste, less relevant}} = 4.94 \text{ vs. } M_{\text{toothpaste, relevant}} = 5.92, t(139) = -4.93, p < .001\)), confirming the manipulation was successful. However, there was no difference between providers and clients in choice in the used phone (\(p s > .2\)) and camera (\(p > .3\)) scenarios. Interestingly, clients chose the specific description more than providers did in the toothpaste scenario, showing the opposite pattern (\(M_{\text{provider}} = 52\% \text{ vs. } M_{\text{client}} = 72\%\), \(\chi^2(1, N = 140) = 6.20, p < .01, \varphi = -.21\)). To examine the perceived transparency, a 2 (Role) × 4 (Scenario) mixed ANOVA was conducted on the transparency index for a specific provider in Study XX. There was no significant difference between roles in perceived transparency, however, providers viewed a specific provider as transparent more than clients did across all scenarios (\(M_{\text{providers}} = 5.67, M_{\text{clients}} = 5.39, F(1, 138) = 2.2, p > .1\)). The findings show that service providers and clients do not differ in their choice of specific description when it is about a product, not the service provider’s own experience.
6.21 Appendix D: Pilot Studies for the Second Essay

**Pilot 3.1**

*Method.* The purpose of the pilot study was to examine whether the preference for breadth is moderated by the stability of the advice-seeking situation. One hundred and two participants (male = 58%, mean age = 34.6) from the Amazon MTurk participated in the survey for $.40. Participants were told that the survey was about advice taking and asked to choose between two experts, one expert with a broad experience and another with a specialized experience. Specifically, they were told that they are looking for an advice from an expert regarding new product development in an automotive company. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions varying in the stability of the situation. In the stable (dynamic) condition, participants were told that the automotive market has been stable (dynamic) for years and it is not difficult (difficult) to predict what feature and style will be popular in next years. Then they chose between an automotive expert who worked in the same company for 20 years and another automotive expert who worked in different companies for 20 years.

*Results.* When the advice-seeking environment is unstable and unpredictable, 80% of participants (40 out of 50) chose the expert with broad work experience whereas 71% of participants (37 out of 52) chose the expert ($p > .2$). On average, 75% of all participants preferred the broad experience and one-sample t-test showed that the value is different against the middle point (against 0.5, $t(101) = 5.95, p < .001$). The likelihood of choosing the broad experience differed from the middle point in each condition as well.

**Pilot 3.2**

*Method.* The objective of the study was to examine the choice between two types of experience in various fields, as the scenario in Pilot 3.1 only dealt the new product development in automotive industry. One hundred and one MTurkers (male = 48.5% mean age = 34.8) participated in the survey for $.90. Participants were randomly assigned to either stable or dynamic market condition. Along with the new product development scenario used Pilot 3.1, there were five additional scenarios. The second scenario was about hiring a private wealth manager to consult about financial management and the breadth of experience was manipulated by the number of different client groups the expert worked for. The third scenario was about hiring a travel planner between two planners varying in the number of jobs prior to the travel career. The last scenario was about a family relationship expert and two experts differed in the number of different client groups they worked with (specialized in the relationship with kids vs. have experience in
relationship with kids, couples, and parents). After their choice, participants read the market description used in the real estate and career scenario and rated the stability of the environment. The item served as a manipulation check for the stability of the environment. The order of six scenarios was the same for all participants.

Results. A mixed ANOVA was conducted entering environment (stable vs. dynamic, between variable) and scenario (six fields, within) to observe any interaction between two factors. The choice did not differ by the stability of the environment ($F < 1$, $p > .8$) and the effect was not moderated by the type of the scenario ($p > .1$). There was the main effect of the field ($t(5, 495) = 4.52, p < .001$). A series of chi-square test for each scenario showed that the stability did not change the preference for five scenarios on new product development ($p > .2$), finance management ($p > .5$), real estate ($p > .3$), career advice ($p > .7$), and relationship advice ($p > .2$). In the travel scenario, the difference between two conditions was not significant at 95% confidence level (19.6% vs. 36%, $\chi^2(101) = 3.38, p < .06$). The likelihood of choosing the broad experience in each scenario ranged from 61% (finance management) to 93% (relationship advice), and all five values were different from the middle point ($ps < .02$). The pattern was different in the travel scenario where 28% of participants preferred the broad experience ($t(1, 100) = -4.97, p < .001$).

Pilot 3.3

Method. The design was similar to Pilot 3.1 except for two changes. First, the third condition where the environment is dynamic but predictable was added. The dynamic market environment is different from the stable market in terms of fluctuation and predictability. The third condition helps to distinguish the effect of stability and predictability. Participants chose a travel planner as in Pilot 3.2. The breadth was manipulated by the number of different kinds of jobs one had before the travel planning career (one versus five). One hundred and one participants (male = 53%, mean age = 38.5) from Amazon MTurk participated for $.60 and completed the simple choice survey. Again, participants were randomly assigned to one condition and choose between two types of agents.

Results. One hundred and one participants were assigned to basic two conditions and 49 participants were assigned to the predictably dynamic condition. An ANOVA on choice revealed that there was no difference across conditions ($M_{stable} = 62\%, M_{unpredictably dynamic} = 73\%, M_{predictably dynamic} = 78\%, p > .2$). The planned contrast of two basic conditions showed that the two conditions did not differ from each other ($p > .2$). Again, the average likelihood of choosing the broad experience in the two basic conditions differed from the middle point, $t(100) = 3.69, p < .001$. The likelihood was higher than 50% even when the number was pooled from all three conditions (70%, $t(149) = 5.54, p < .001$).