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

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

Strategy-Goal Model

Table: Outcomes and expected relations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Expected Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time in search</td>
<td>Maximizers &gt; Satisficers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count of information searched</td>
<td>Maximizers &gt; Satisficers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of information searched</td>
<td>Maximizers &gt; Satisficers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of options for which at least one dimension was searched</td>
<td>Maximizers &gt; Satisficers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dimensions for which at least one options was searched</td>
<td>Maximizers &gt; Satisficers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching all of one dimension</td>
<td>Maximizers &gt; Satisficers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching all of one option</td>
<td>Maximizers &gt; Satisficers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search variability</td>
<td>Maximizers &lt; Satisficers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of times shifted across dimensions and options</td>
<td>Maximizers &gt; Satisficers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing a strategic search</td>
<td>Maximizers &gt; Satisficers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking to see more options</td>
<td>Maximizers &gt; Satisficers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switching from an initial decision</td>
<td>Maximizers &gt; Satisficers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total time to make a decision</td>
<td>Maximizers &gt; Satisficers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecisiveness</td>
<td>Maximizers &gt; Satisficers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study 2: Test of Proposition

Item Development and Refinement
- Construct definition: “Alternative Search is the tendency to search for alternative options to form a decision set, and/or to collect information about the options in the decision set.”
- Eight individuals wrote an initial 32 items.
- Subject Matter Experts (N = 14, Mean Age = 37.71 years; SD = 9.29 years) were asked rate match of 32 items to construct definition.
- Items with a mean rating of 4 or less were removed from the scale.
- Twenty items remained for further evaluations.

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

Study 2: Scale Development
- University students (N = 253, Mean Age = 19.04 years; SD = 2.36 years)
- Participants self-reported maximizing tendency (MTS), the new alternative search measure, and outcomes (Table 1).

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

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