Disentangling Attention and Utility Channels in Recommendations

Paul Cheung and Yusufcan Masatlioglu UT Dallas and University of Maryland

FUR at University of Queensland

July 6, 2024





- "Amazon's Choice"
- "Superhost"
- "Etsy's picks"
- "Best Seller"
- "Editor's pick"
- ...



- Recommending a product often increases the sales of recommended products
 - Senecal and Nantel (2004): Wine/Calculators
 - Gupta and Harris (2010): Computer
 - Adomavicius et al (2018): Digital Music
 - Kawaguchi et al. (2019): Vending machine
 - Farronato et al. (2020): Home services
 - Rietveld et al. (2021): Microloans
 - Bairathi et al. (2022): Freelance
 - ...

- Recommending a product often increases the sales of recommended products
 - Senecal and Nantel (2004): Wine/Calculators
 - Gupta and Harris (2010): Computer
 - Adomavicius et al (2018): Digital Music
 - Kawaguchi et al. (2019): Vending machine
 - Farronato et al. (2020): Home services
 - Rietveld et al. (2021): Microloans
 - Bairathi et al. (2022): Freelance
 - ...
- But HOW?

- Recommendation influences the awareness set of consumer
 - Recommendation signage: Best Seller, Award Winner (e.g. Goodman et al, 2013)
 - (electronic) Word-of-mouth (e.g. Gupta and Harris, 2010)
 - Uninformative advertising (e.g. Mayzlin and Shin, 2011)
- Recommendation affects consumer's valuation
 - Consumer's Rating (Cosley et al, 2003)
 - Willingness to Pay (Adomavicius et al, 2018)
 - Consumer's utility (Kawaguchi et al, 2021)

- Recommendation influences the awareness set of consumer
 - Recommendation signage: Best Seller, Award Winner (e.g. Goodman et al, 2013)
 - (electronic) Word-of-mouth (e.g. Gupta and Harris, 2010)
 - Uninformative advertising (e.g. Mayzlin and Shin, 2011)
- Recommendation affects consumer's valuation
 - Consumer's Rating (Cosley et al, 2003)
 - Willingness to Pay (Adomavicius et al, 2018)
 - Consumer's utility (Kawaguchi et al, 2021)

How does recommendation affect choices through attention and utility?

- Two channels in one model
- Accommodating observed phenomena
- Behaviorally distinguishing channels
- Full characterization (skipped)
- Evaluating recommendation (skipped)
- Auctioning recommendation (skipped)

Decision Problem





- X: Grand set of alternatives
- $S \subseteq X$: Set of available alternatives
- $R \subseteq S$: Recommended set of alternatives



- X: Grand set of alternatives
- $S \subseteq X$: Set of available alternatives
- $R \subseteq S$: Recommended set of alternatives
- $\rho_S(x, R)$: Stochastic choice data



- X: Grand set of alternatives
- $S \subseteq X$: Set of available alternatives
- $R \subseteq S$: Recommended set of alternatives
- $\rho_S(x, R)$: Stochastic choice data
 - The probability that x is chosen when R is recommended in the set S
 - $\sum_{x \in S \cup \{o^*\}} \rho_S(x, R) = 1$, where o^* is a default/outside option.
- Domain of choice problem (skipped)

• Each alternative $x \in X$ has four parameters

$$u_R(x) = \begin{cases} u'(x) & \text{if } x \in R \\ u(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \qquad \gamma_R(x) = \begin{cases} \gamma'(x) & \text{if } x \in R \\ \gamma(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- $u_R(x) \in (0,\infty)$: The utility of x given recommended set R
- $\gamma_R(x) \in (0,1)$: The likelihood to consider x given recommended set R

Suppose a set $R \subseteq S$ is recommended,

1. Within the choice set S, a consideration set $A \subseteq S$ emerges with probability (Manzini and Mariotti, 2014),

$$\prod_{y \in A} \gamma_R(y) \prod_{z \in S \setminus A} (1 - \gamma_R(z))$$

2. Within the consideration set A, the DM chooses an alternative x with probability (Luce 1959)

$$\frac{u_R(x)}{u_R(A)}$$

• The attention and utility parameters

$$u_R(x) = \begin{cases} u'(x) & \text{if } x \in R \\ u(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \qquad \gamma_R(x) = \begin{cases} \gamma'(x) & \text{if } x \in R \\ \gamma(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Definition

A probabilistic choice rule $\{\rho_S\}$ has a parametric recommendation representation if there exists functions $u_R: X \to \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $\gamma_R: X \to (0, 1)$ such that for $x \in X$,

$$\rho_{S}(x,R) = \sum_{x \in A \subseteq S} \underbrace{\left[\prod_{y \in A} \gamma_{R}(y) \prod_{z \in S \setminus A} (1 - \gamma_{R}(z))\right]}_{\substack{\text{Prob. of } A \text{ being} \\ \text{the consideration set}}} \underbrace{\frac{u_{R}(x)}{u_{R}(A)}}_{\text{Prob. of } x \text{ being}}$$

• Manzini and Mariotti (2014) and Luce (1959)

Accommodating Observed Behaviors



The zero-choice-effect curve



The zero-choice-effect curve

• Positive choice effect (coined by Kawaguchi et al., 2021): e.g. Goodman et al. (2013), Häubl and Trifts (2000), Rowley (2000), Senecal and Nantel (2004), and Vijayasarathy and Jones (2000, 2001)



The zero-choice-effect curve

- Positive choice effect (coined by Kawaguchi et al., 2021): e.g. Goodman et al. (2013), Häubl and Trifts (2000), Rowley (2000), Senecal and Nantel (2004), and Vijayasarathy and Jones (2000, 2001)
- Negative choice effect(?)

Positive Effect of Negative Publicity



- Negative utility but positive attention effect
 - e.g. Allard et al. (2020), Berger et al. (2010), and Huang et al. (2023)

Spillover Effect



- Recommending x also makes other products more likely to be chosen
 - e.g. Bairathi et al. (2022) and Kawaguchi et al. (2021)



- Supposing positive attention and utility effect for \boldsymbol{y}
- A possible theoretical prediction

Behaviorally Distinguishing Channels

An Axiom

Increasing Recommendation Return to Size.

For
$$x \in R \subseteq S \subseteq L$$
,

$$\frac{\rho_L(x,R)}{\rho_L(x,R\setminus x)} \ge \frac{\rho_S(x,R)}{\rho_S(x,R\setminus x)}$$

Increasing Recommendation Return to Size.

For
$$x \in R \subseteq S \subseteq L$$

$$\frac{\rho_L(x,R)}{\rho_L(x,R\setminus x)} \ge \frac{\rho_S(x,R)}{\rho_S(x,R\setminus x)}$$

Interpretations:

• Recommendation Return (Hence the name)

$$\frac{\rho_L(x,R) - \rho_L(x,R \setminus x)}{\rho_L(x,R \setminus x)} \ge \frac{\rho_S(x,R) - \rho_S(x,R \setminus x)}{\rho_S(x,R \setminus x)}$$

Increasing Recommendation Return to Size.

For
$$x \in R \subseteq S \subseteq L$$
,

$$\frac{\rho_L(x,R)}{\rho_L(x,R\setminus x)} \ge \frac{\rho_S(x,R)}{\rho_S(x,R\setminus x)}$$

Interpretations:

• Recommendation Return (Hence the name)

$$\frac{\rho_L(x,R) - \rho_L(x,R \setminus x)}{\rho_L(x,R \setminus x)} \ge \frac{\rho_S(x,R) - \rho_S(x,R \setminus x)}{\rho_S(x,R \setminus x)}$$

• Regularity Comparison

$$\frac{\rho_L(x,R)}{\rho_S(x,R)} \ge \frac{\rho_L(x,R \setminus x)}{\rho_S(x,R \setminus x)}$$

where both $\frac{\rho_L(x,R)}{\rho_S(x,R)}$ and $\frac{\rho_L(x,R\setminus x)}{\rho_S(x,R\setminus x)} \leq 1$ by regularity.

Increasing Recommendation Return to Size. For $x \in R \subseteq S \subseteq L$,

$$\frac{\rho_L(x,R)}{\rho_L(x,R\setminus x)} \ge \frac{\rho_S(x,R)}{\rho_S(x,R\setminus x)}$$

Let (u_R, γ_R) be a parametric recommendation representation of $\{\rho_S\}$. Then, $u'(x) \ge u(x)$ for all x if and only if $\{\rho_S\}$ satisfies Increasing Recommendation Return to Size.

Positive Choice Effect at Singleton. For all $x, \rho_x(x, x) \ge \rho_x(x, \emptyset)$.

Theorem

Let (u_R, γ_R) be a parametric recommendation representation of $\{\rho_S\}$. Then, $\gamma'(x) \ge \gamma(x)$ for all x if and only if $\{\rho_S\}$ satisfies **Positive Choice Effect at Singleton**.

Within the model....

 $\Delta_{\gamma} \ge 0$ and $\Delta_u \ge 0$ imply positive choice effect

Within the model....

 $\Delta_{\gamma} \ge 0$ and $\Delta_u \ge 0$ imply positive choice effect

Not assuming the model....

Remark

For any choice probabilities $\{\rho_S\}$, **Increasing Recommendation Return to Size** and **Positive Choice Effect at Singleton** imply a positive choice effect (singleton recommendation). Within the model....

 $\Delta_{\gamma} \geq 0$ and $\Delta_{u} \geq 0$ imply positive choice effect

Not assuming the model....

\mathbf{Remark}

For any choice probabilities $\{\rho_S\}$, **Increasing Recommendation Return to Size** and **Positive Choice Effect at Singleton** imply a positive choice effect (singleton recommendation).

• Idea:

$$\frac{\rho_L(x,x)}{\rho_L(x,\emptyset)} \ge \frac{\rho_S(x,x)}{\rho_S(x,\emptyset)} \ge \dots \ge \frac{\rho_x(x,x)}{\rho_x(x,\emptyset)} \ge 1$$

 $\Rightarrow \rho_S(x,x) \ge \rho_S(x,\emptyset)$

Theorem

Suppose (u_R^1, γ_R^1) and (u_R^2, γ_R^2) are two parametric recommendation representations of the same choice probabilities, then $\gamma_R^1 = \gamma_R^2$ and $u_R^1 = \alpha u_R^2$ for some scalar $\alpha > 0$.

- Attention parameters are uniquely identified.
- Utility parameters are identified up to a positive scalar multiplication.

- Two channels in one model
- Accommodating observed phenomena
- Behaviorally distinguishing channels
- Full characterization (skipped)
- Evaluating recommendation (skipped)
- Auctioning recommendation (skipped)

Thank you for your attention!!!