BYOB of wine, but which one? Unveiling new boundary conditions and moderating effects for Restaurant Patrons' consideration set formation.

Journal:	*British Food Journal*
Manuscript ID	BFJ-01-2023-0055.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	BYOB wine restaurants, Wine, Involvement, consideration set, personal consumption, gift giving

BYOB of wine, but which one? Unveiling new boundary conditions and moderating effects for Restaurant Patrons' consideration set formation.

Abstract

Purpose – Departing from conflicting findings on the role of involvement in the formation of the consideration set, the authors seek to shed light to the wine consumer behaviour and expand previous findings in the Bring Your own Bottle (BYOB) of wine restaurant industry. The authors seek to determine the contradictory effect of involvement on the consideration set size and variety.

Design/methodology/approach – Three empirical studies were conducted. In Study 1, the relationships were tested in a personal consumption situation and in Study 2 in a gift-giving context. Finally, in Study 3, inconsistencies in the intensity of the hypothesized relationships were explored by testing the triple interaction among the three variables (i.e. involvement, decision-making context, decision domain).

Findings – According to our findings BYOB of wine consumers form larger considerations sets in memory-based decision contexts. Involvement's effect on wine consideration set size is stronger in memory-based decisions. BYOB restaurant patrons form smaller sets of alternatives for personal consumption. BYOB restaurant patrons form more heterogeneous sets of alternatives in wine gift-giving. BYOB of wine restaurants should facilitate consumers wine selection process

Originality/value –The authors make an effort to explain and determine the up-to-date contradictory effect of restaurant patrons' involvement on the BYOB of wine consideration set size and the amount of variety contained therein. The study offers new insights, by unfolding the moderating effect of decision-making contexts (i.e. memory-based versus stimuli-based) and decision domains (i.e. personal consumption versus gift giving) on this effect of involvement on the properties of consideration sets.

Keywords – BYOB wine restaurants; wine; involvement; consideration set; gift giving; personal consumption

1. Introduction

Restaurant on-premise wine consumption has appeared to plateau amid Covid-19 pandemic (Nielsen, 2020), but according to forecasts volume is expected to rise again in 2023, especially in some sub-categories where both on-premise and off premise sales growth has been overwhelming during the past years. While wine tourism continues to draw the attention of academics (Alonso and Kok, 2020) and the restaurant industry is expected to remain principal tourist attraction (Namkung and Jang, 2008; Pezenka and Weismayer, 2020; Li et al., 2019), bring-your-own-bottle (BYOB) of wine restaurants are vastly emerging in many countries (e.g. US, Australia, UK) as BYOB phenomenon is particularly linked to wine consumption (Varley, 2004; Bruwer and Rawbone-Viljoen, 2013). The surge of such type of service establishments has provided consumers with the option of purchasing or bringing their own bottle of wine before visiting a restaurant. Evidently, patrons are welcome to purchase the bottle of wine of their choice and experience it in a restaurant, with a significant number of BYOB establishments not even charging a fee for serving wine brought by the customer (Taylor & Barber, 2014). Whilst BYOB of wine offers apparent flexibility to restaurant customers, their purchase decisions remain obscure as many of them are confused and bewildered when attempting to select wine (Borchgrevink and Sherwin, 2017). This is not surprising given the multitude of choices of wine brands, varieties and packages (Howard et al., 2012) and the perceived risk in wine consumption due to social pressures to match wine with food and an elevated risk to impress others with the wine choice (Lacey et al., 2009). What's more, individuals are often required to choose wine in different domains (i.e. personal consumption, gift giving) and on different occasions (e.g. dinner with a friend, a special occasion), which further complicates their decision making (Boncinelli et al., 2019; Hall et al., 2001; Gillison and Reynolds, 2016).

A common strategy that consumers follow to minimize their uncertainty and anxiety during a purchase is to reduce their choices via a more manageable consideration set. A consider-then-choose process simplifies their decision-making by first identifying a set of alternatives for further evaluation and then choosing from this set (e.g. Oscarsson & Rosema, 2019). This reduced set of options (consideration set) derives from all the possible alternatives that the decision makers are aware of (awareness set) and is fundamentally determined by consumers' involvement in the decision-making process (e.g. Festinger, 1957; Petty, Cacioppo, & Goldman, 1981). Involvement is particularly relevant to wine selection given the broadness of tangible and intangible attributes (Reynolds et al., 2018) being utilised in wine purchase decisions (Lockshin et al., 2006; Hollebeek et al, 2007). Although there is a consensus among scholars about the importance of involvement in the choice process, findings are not consistent regarding the magnitude and the direction of this effect. What's more, less emphasis has been placed on its role in the formation of consideration sets. While most of the studies have explored the influence of involvement on decisions that lead to personal consumption (Paulssen & Bagozzi, 2005) and decisions made in stimuli-based choice contexts (Kardes et al., 2004; Lee, 2002). In fact, to our knowledge, very few studies investigate the formation of consideration sets in memory-based contexts (Posavac, Sanbonmatsu, Cronley, & Kardes, 2001) and even fewer on decisions other than the personal consumption domain, e.g. in gift-giving situations (e.g. Chowdhury, Ratneshwar & Desai, 2004).

In the present study, we aim to illuminate the existing inconsistencies in the literature and offer new knowledge in the BYOB of wine restaurant industry. Specifically, our research aim is twofold: a) to explore the impact of involvement on the descriptive properties of wine consideration sets (size and variety) in two different decision contexts (memory-based and

stimuli-based) and two different purchase domains (personal consumption and gift giving) and b) to further inform the extant knowledge by testing the ways in which these variables contexts and domains interact to determine the process by which consideration sets of alternative wines are formed.

2. Gift-giving Versus Personal Consumption

Early research has shown that the decision-making process differs depending on whether the final choice concerns personal use or giving to others (e.g. Heeler et al., 1979). Decisions in these two circumstances differ explicitly in terms of the motivations and the benefits sought. In personal consumption, the individual reaps the benefits (and asserts motivation) from the actual purchased product, whereas in gift giving and charitable donations, the benefits are of an immaterial nature. Gift giving is defined as the selection, transfer, and evaluation of tangible and intangible objects in fulfillment of an obligation or in a spontaneous mode (Macklin & Walker, 1988; Park, 1998). There are many different types of gift-giving situations, for example business gift giving (Choi, Park & Yoon, 2018) or cherished possession transfers (Curasi, 1999), in which the buyer/gift giver is also very different from the recipient/benefactor of the gift. Most of these gift-giving situations, unlike personal consumption purchases, are associated with a social exchange function (Belk, 1979, 1982; Komter, 2007) and the reciprocity effect (Houston & Gassenheimer, 1987; Fehr & Gächter, 2000; Goodwin, Smith & Spriggle, 1990; Komter, 2007). In wine consumption, evidence suggests that consumers will evaluate prior attitudes, product image or packaging differently depending on a gift-giving or personal consumption scenario (Yang and Paladino, 2015). Due to the increased importance of gift-giving decisions for consumers, recent studies have highlighted the particular importance for marketers of influencing the formation of the consideration set for gift-giving consumers (Holiday et al., 2018; Hwang and Chu, 2019). Nevertheless, research on how exactly the involvement of individuals is related to the formation of their consideration set in gift-giving decisions remains limited.

3. The Size and Variety of the Consideration Set

The formation of a consideration set is generally deemed to be an essential element in decision-making across several disciplines (e.g. Barone, Fedorikhin & Hansen, 2017; Tversky, 1972). The properties of each consideration set serve as indicators of competition in the consideration stage and significantly enhance the understanding of choice (e.g. Crowley & Williams, 1991; Desai & Hoyer, 2000; Aurier, Jean, & Zaichkowsky, 2000). Size has been conceptualised as the number of items in a consideration set and has been introduced as a function of brand loyalty, commitment (Desai & Raju, 2007; Raju & Unnava, 2005; Reilly & Rarkinson, 1985), expertise, familiarity with a product category (Alba & Hutchinson, 1987; Punj & Srinivasan, 1989), affect (Barone, Fedorikhin & Hansen, 2017), awareness set size (e.g. Crowley & Williams, 1991), compromise effect (Yoo, Park & Kim, 2018) and price sensitivity (Mitra & Lynch, 1995). Variety, on the other hand, has been denoted as the degree to which items included in a consideration set are distinct in terms of the usage situation or the goals they satisfy (Desai & Hoyer, 2000). This descriptive property of the consideration set is significantly influenced by experience (Johnson & Lehmann, 1997), familiarity with the decision occasion and an individual's concern about neglecting the optimal choice (DeSarbo et al., 2008; Chakravarti & Janiszewski, 2003).

4. Involvement and the properties of Consideration Sets

In decision-making, while various types of involvement exist (e.g. Mitchell, 1980; Rothchild, 1979), most agree that the two pivotal types of involvement are *enduring involvement* and *situational involvement*. Enduring involvement (also known as *value-relevant involvement*) refers to the importance, perceived by individuals, of and personal interest in an object or product category and it is considered to be a stable state. This conceptualisation of involvement is relevant to important social aspects of the lives and values of individuals and is also referred to as *value-relevant involvement.* In contrast, situational involvement is considered to be a temporary, decision-specific state (e.g. Zaichkowsky, 1985) and is based on Petty and Cacioppo (1979) definition of involvement which focuses on the recognition of the importance and the expected outcome of an issue (thus it is also referred to as *outcome-relevant involvement)*. A critical review of the relevant literature reveals evidence of the positive effect of involvement on the consideration set size and variety. For example, in high involvement conditions, individuals tend to maximise the benefits sought from their decision and, thus, employ extended information processing, which successively leads to larger and more heterogeneous sets as individuals are willing to put in more effort and process more information, (Zhang & Markman, 2001). Concurrently, in high involvement conditions, decision-makers are willing to accept a higher price in order to get a better performing product (Divine, 1995). This effect offsets the negative effect of latitude of acceptance for attributes (Sherif & Hovland, 1961) and normally leads to larger sets of alternatives. Likewise, high involvement conditions typically induce high levels of shopping enthusiasm contributing to a positive relationship between involvement and the size of a consideration set. Equally, Lapersonne et al. (1995) suggest that in important decisions, individuals are more concerned about avoiding the negative consequences of a bad choice (Celsi & Olson, 1988) and, thus, tend to process a larger number of alternatives (Kapferer & Laurent, 1993). By including diverse items in the consideration set, highly involved individuals minimise the risk of committing such errors (Chakravati & Janiszwesky, 2003). Finally, along with the direct effect of involvement on consideration set size, researchers suggest a positive indirect effect via the awareness set size. The awareness set is larger in high involvement conditions as opposed to low involvement conditions, due to higher knowledge of the product category/ situation (e.g. Zaichkowsky, 1985).

Based on the above discussion, we hypothesise:

H1a: *Involvement has a positive effect on consideration set size.*
H1b: *Involvement has a positive effect on consideration set variety.*

5. Stimuli-based Versus Memory-based Decisions and Consideration Set Properties

Following the work of Kahneman and Frederick (2002), Rottenstreich, Sood and Brenner (2007) posit that decision makers tend to be more automatic, associative and rapid (system 1 mode of thought) when forming their memory-based consideration sets, whereas they tend to employ slow, deliberate and deductive thinking (system 2 mode of thought) in the formation of stimuli-based consideration sets. In other words, for memory-based choices, individuals engage in a process of retrieving alternatives directly from long-term memory; this requires more effort and more mental resources than stimuli-based choices, where alternatives are available in the external environment (e.g. Kahneman & Frederick, 2002). Hence, individuals who form stimuli-based consideration sets can process and include more alternatives in their sets given the increased availability of mental resources. As a result, stimuli-based

consideration sets tend to be broader than memory-based consideration sets (Crowley & Williams, 1991). In the context of consuming wine, the effect to which individuals draw from a memory-based consideration set may depend on their subjective knowledge, which has been found to affect consideration set formation during wine consumption (Viot, 2012).

Similarly, stimuli-based consideration sets tend to be more heterogeneous than memory-based consideration sets (Crowley & Williams, 1991). The existing literature supports this notion on the premise that memory-based choices are essentially associative (Rottenstreich et al., 2007) and grounded in serial recall inferences (i.e. the retrieval of an alternative based on other similar alternatives which have been recalled; Alba & Chattopadhyay, 1985). As a result, in memory-based consideration sets, individuals tend to retrieve similar alternatives from their memory. Conversely, in memory-based choices where alternatives need to be maintained in working memory while they are being evaluated, individuals have limited capacity to process heterogeneous consideration sets (e.g. Miller, 1956), as the latter usually requires extensive comparison of alternatives with dissimilar attributes. Thus, in memory-based decisions, individuals consider similar alternatives for a particular choice, while in stimuli-based decisions, consumers form consideration sets which encompass greater variety.

Based on the above discussion, we posit:

H2a: *There is a significant interaction between involvement and the decision-making context. The effect of involvement on consideration set size is stronger in memory-based as opposed to stimuli-based choices.*

H2b: *There is a significant interaction between involvement and the decision-making context. The effect of involvement on consideration set variety is stronger in memory-based as opposed to stimuli-based choices.*

Likewise, for memory-based decisions, consideration set variety is more strongly linked to awareness set variety than for stimuli-based decisions due to the associative nature of recall (e.g. Kahneman & Frederick, 2002). In memory-based decisions, the effect of involvement on consideration set variety can be expected to be intensified by the stronger relationship of awareness set variety with consideration set variety as the formation of both is solely based on serial recall inferences and associative cues. Therefore, the interaction between the decision-making context and involvement is not expected to be consistent in gift-giving and personal consumption situations. Thus, we hypothesise that:

H3a: *There is a significant triple interaction between involvement, decision context and decision domain in terms of the effect on consideration set size.*

H3b: *There is a significant triple interaction between involvement, decision context and decision domain in terms of the effect on consideration set variety.*

6. Overview of the Current Research

To test our hypotheses in a BYOB of wine setting and explore the effect of involvement on consideration set size and variety, as well as the possible moderating effects of the decision-making context and the decision domain, three empirical studies were conducted. In Study 1, the relationships were tested in a personal consumption situation and in Study 2, they were tested in a gift-giving context. Finally, in Study 3, inconsistencies in the intensity of the

hypothesized relationships were explored by testing the triple interaction among the three variables (i.e. involvement, decision-making context, decision domain). In the current research, we focused on situational involvement which is, for the most part, extrinsically induced and can thus be manipulated by external stimuli. Given that knowledge in social sciences is context-bound and domain-specific (Cronbach, 1986), we have conceptualised and operationalised involvement consistently across the three studies using the situational involvement paradigm. This is in an attempt to avoid any variations in the effects of involvement in the two decision contexts and decision domains due to different conceptualisations and operationalisations of the concept. In all studies, we report all sample sizes, measures, manipulations and exclusions.

6.1 Study 1

In Study 1, the effect of involvement on the size and the variety of consideration sets was explored in a within category, personal consumption decision. This effect was tested across stimuli-based and memory-based decision-making contexts, as consumers are reported to have significantly different preference judgments, even for the same products, across different contexts (Bettman et al., 1998). Moreover, surprisingly, memory-based consideration sets in relation to involvement have been overlooked in literature and, thus, this study offers new evidence to inform discussion. Likewise, Study 1 contributes to theory in terms of the way involvement is analysed and manipulated. Given that personal consumption is an idiosyncratic psychological process (Converse, 1986), decision makers are both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated, thus, both enduring and situational involvements were considered. A moderately enduring involvement product category was used for the experimental stimuli (Lastovicka & Gardner, 1979; Bauer et al., 2006) to control any possible effects of enduring involvement on the explored relationships.

Method

Participants and experimental design. A total of 98 individuals (46 men and 52 women, M_{age}=21.40, *SD* = 2.46) were randomly assigned to the four conditions for the following between-subjects experimental design: 2 (situational involvement: high or low) x 2 (decision context: memory-based or stimuli-based).

Product selection. In an attempt to control for other variables that have been found to influence the properties of a consideration set, such as enduring involvement, consumers' prior experience with the product category and consumers' awareness set, we decided to use a fictional, moderate involvement wine category in the study. Moreover, we decided that the level of enduring involvement needed to be the same (moderate) regardless of whether if the product was to be used for personal consumption or as a gift, so that it could be used consistently for the study 2 which was to follow on gift giving. In order to determine the most suitable wine category, a preliminary study was conducted. Eight fictitious wine categories (e.g., organic, luxury, local country of origin, own label etc.) were tested for the enduring involvement that they evoked among the participants in two decision domains (personal consumption, gift giving) using a scale which had four 7-point Likert-type items (Park & Hastak, 1994; *Cronbach's* $\alpha_{personal}$ = .78, α_{gift} = .86). The results of the preliminary study indicated that the most appropriate product category was *Organic Wine* which was found to be a type of wine with moderate enduring involvement for both personal consumption (M = 4.23) and gift giving (M = 4.18).

Procedure. Participants were informed that they were taking part in a survey to examine the consumers decision making process. Then, each participant was given a self-administered, paper and pencil questionnaire, comprising three sections. In the first section, the fictitious wine brand was presented (i.e. attributes and representative picture for each product). In the second section, participants were given a filler task to complete for 30 minutes. Once the filler task had been completed, participants proceeded to the third section of the questionnaire, where they were asked to form their consideration set for the specific product category (organic wine). The consideration set for both product categories was formed based on the following question: "Given that you want to select a bottle of organic wine for yourself to consume in a Bring Your Own Wine restaurant, which brands would you seriously consider purchasing?" In the fourth and final section of this questionnaire, participants completed the manipulation check scale and then they were debriefed by the researchers and released.

Manipulations. Similar to previous relevant studies, situational involvement was manipulated through the stated sample size (e.g. Chakravarti & Janiszewski, 2003; Lee, 2009). Specifically, in the high involvement condition, participants were told they were part of a small sample (50 people) and that the conclusions of the study would be drawn from this group, whereas in the low involvement condition, participants were told that their responses would be aggregated with the responses of a study sample of 1,000 other individuals from various countries. Regarding the decision context, participants in the memory-based condition, formed their consideration set on the basis of unaided recall. Alternatives were recalled and processed directly from participants' memories. In the stimuli-based condition, participants were given an identical catalogue that presented "all available brands" in the market and formed their consideration set on the basis of all the available information.

Manipulation checks and measurement of dependent variables. The mean of four 7-point scales was used to check the success of the situational involvement manipulation (*Cronbach's* $\alpha = .84$). The scales measured: (a) personal relevance, (b) personal importance in making the right decision, (c) personal interest in judging the quality, (d) cautiousness with which the consideration sets were formed (Park & Hastak, 1994). The dependent variables of the study were the size and the variety of the consideration set. The size was operationalised as the number of brands included in the set. In terms of the variety of the brands for each product category, they were sorted into distinct groups by two independent judges on the basis of similarity in the nature and the positioning of the brands. The variety of the set was determined by counting the number of groups from which the set items were drawn (Desai & Hoyer, 2000).

Results and Discussion. The results indicate that the manipulation of situational involvement (M_{high} =5.07, M_{low}= 4.23, t (96) = 3.182, p< .01) was successful. Moreover, consistent with prior research, situational involvement had a significant positive effect on both the variety ($M_{\text{low}} = 2.38$, $M_{\text{high}} = 2.91$, $F(1,94) = 14.27$, $p < .01$) and the size of the set ($M_{\text{low}} = 3.27$, $M_{\text{high}} = 4.03$, $F(1,94) = 11.67$, $p < .01$), confirming H1a and H1b in the personal consumption domain. The results also showed a significant main effect of the decision-making context on the variety (M_{memory} =2.29, M_{stimuli} =2.99 , F (1,94) = 14.27, $p < .01$) and the size of the consideration set ($M_{\text{memory}} = 3.14$, $M_{\text{stimuli}} = 4.16$, F (1, 94) = 20.97, $p < .001$). Finally, the interaction of the involvement and decision context was found to be significant for both consideration set variety (F (1,94)=4.00, $p < .05$) and size (F (1,94)=7.75, $p < .01$). Therefore, H2a and H2b are also confirmed for personal consumption decisions. Exploring further the nature of this interaction, for memory-based decisions, significant differences were found between low and high involvement situations in terms of both variety (M_{high} =2.75, M_{low}= 1.85,

t (48) = 3.80, $p < .001$) and size (M_{high}= 3.83, M_{low}= 2.46, t (48) = 4.86, $p < .001$). In contrast, for stimuli-based decisions, these differences were not found to be significant for either properties of the consideration set ($p > .05$).

In summary, the results of Study 1 indicate that for personal consumption purchases in high situational involvement conditions, consumers consider a greater number of distinct brands of wine for purchase. However, this seems to be significant only in memory-based decisions and not stimuli-based ones. In Study 2, we will seek to replicate Study 1 for gift-giving situations to explore whether the results are similar.

6.2 Study 2

In contrast to Study 1, Study 2 examined the influence of involvement on the consideration set size and variety in gift-giving situations. Decision makers in gift-giving situations are extrinsically motivated (Richins & Bloch, 1986) and they are not known to be enduringly involved. Their decision-making is linked to the achievement of goals and they are not in search of hedonic benefits (Evans, Over & Manktelow, 1993; Hoffman & Novak, 1996). Finally, involvement in gift giving is known to act as a motivator for decision-making (e.g. Petty & Cacioppo, 1986, 1990). Therefore, in Study 2 we also employed situational involvement and manipulated the motivational value of the choice in a similar way to Study 1 to reflect decision importance.

Method

Participants. Ninety-five individuals participated in the study (45 male and 50 female, M_{age}=21.5, SD = 1.34). The participants were randomly assigned to the four conditions of the following between-subjects experimental design: 2 (situational involvement: high or low) x 2 (decision context: memory-based or stimuli-based).

Procedure and manipulations. The process and manipulations followed were identical to those in Study 1. However, in this study, participants were asked to form their decisions in a gift-giving context. Specifically, they were told that they are choosing a bottle of organic wine as a gift to a friend that has invited them to dine in a BYOB of wine restaurant.

Manipulation check and measures of dependent variables. As in Study 1, the mean of four 7-point items was used to check the success of the situational involvement manipulation (Park & Hastak, 1994). The scale was found to be reliable *(Cronbach's* α = .78). Consideration set and variety set were the dependent variables and were operationalised in the same way as in Study 1.

Results and Discussion. In Study 2, the manipulation of situational involvement was again successful (M_{high} = *5.45*, M_{low} = 4.77, t (93) = 2.59, p< .05). Regarding the results of the main experiment, similarly to Study 1, the main effect of situational involvement was significant for both consideration set variety (M_{low} = 3.00, M_{high} = 3.58, F(1,91) = 5.61 , $p < .05$) and size (M_{low} = 4.17 , M_{high} = 4.90§, F(1,91) = 4.63, $p < .01$), thus confirming H1a and H1b in the gift-giving domain as well. In addition, the decision-making context was found to have a significant main effect on both variety *(*M_{memory} = 3.04, M_{stimuli} = 3.54, F (1,91) = 4.24 , $p < .05$) and size *(*M_{memory} = 3.87, M_{stimuli} = 5.19 , F (1, 91) = 15.21 , $p < .001$). In contrast to Study 1, in our second experiment, the interaction of involvement and decision context was not found to be

significant for either the variety or the size of the consideration set. Hence, in this decision domain, H2a and H2b are not confirmed. In other words, the main effect of involvement on consideration set size and variety was consistent across decision-making contexts.

6.3 Study 3

In order to further explore the validity of H3 and test the inconsistency of our findings regarding H2 between personal consumption and gift-giving, a third study was conducted which included a new variable that reflected the personal consumption versus gift giving situation (i.e. decision domain). Similar to Studies 1 and 2, Study 3 explored the effect of involvement on the two properties of the consideration set in a within-category decision, across memory-based and stimuli-based contexts and across the two different decision domains.

Method

Participants. One hundred and seventy-three individuals participated in our third study (81 male and 92 female, M_{age}=20.9, SD = 0.74). The participants were randomly assigned to eight conditions of a between-subjects experimental design with the following structure: 2 (situational involvement: high or low) x 2 (decision context: memory-based or stimuli-based) x 2 (decision domain: personal consumption or gift giving).

Procedure and manipulations. The experimental procedure and manipulations were the same as for Studies 1 and 2. Participants in the personal consumption condition were told that they were choosing organic wine for themselves to consume in a BYOB of wine restaurant while the participants in the gift-giving condition were told that they were choosing an organic wine as a gift to a friend that has invited them to dine in a BYOB of wine restaurant.

Manipulation check and measures of dependent variables. Situational involvement manipulation, as well as the size and variety of the consideration set were operationalised in the same way as for the first two studies. The scale for situational involvement was found to be reliable *(Cronbach's* α = .83*)*.

Results and Discussion. In a similar way to the first two studies, the manipulation of situational involvement was successful (M_{high} = *5.04*, M_{low} = 4.22*,* t (171) = 3.98, p < .05). The main effects of our three independent variables for both consideration set properties were found to be significant. Specifically, the main effect of situational involvement was positive and significant for consideration set variety (M_{low} = 2.82, M_{high} = 3.23, F(1,165) = 7.00 , p < .01) and size (M_{low} = 3.78 , M_{high} = 4.75, F(1,165) = 19.04, p < .01). Therefore, our results for this experiment also confirm H1a and H1b. Likewise, the decision-making context had a significant main effect on both consideration set variety (M_{memory} = 2.81, $M_{stimuli}$ = 3.24, F (1,65) = 7.48 , p < .01) and size (M_{memory} = 3.99, $M_{stimuli}$ = 4.54 , F (1, 165) = 6.02 , p < .05). Similarly, the main effect of the decision domain was also significant for both consideration set variety ($M_{Personal}$ = 2.75, M_{Gift} = 3.31 , F (1, 165) = 12.67 , p < .001) and size ($M_{Personal}$ = 3.90, M_{Gift} = 4.63 , F (1, 165) = 10.77 , p < .01). In study 3, all two-way interactions, including the interaction between the involvement and decision-making contexts, were found not to be significant for either consideration set variety or size. Hence, H2a and H2b are not confirmed across decision domains.

Regarding the variety of consideration sets, the triple interaction among the independent variables, namely involvement, decision-making context and decision domain, was found to

be marginally insignificant (F (1, 165) = 3.22, p = 0.075). Therefore, H3b is not confirmed. In contrast, H3a is confirmed as the triple interaction for consideration set size was found to be significant (F (1, 165) = 4.07, $p < 0.05$). Specifically, for personal consumption decisions, the effect of involvement is significant only in a memory-based context (M_{low} = 3.09, M_{high} = 4.14, t (41) = 2.75, $p < .01$) and not in a stimuli-based context (p > 0.05). In contrast, for gift-giving decisions, the effect of involvement is significant both for a stimuli-based context (M_{low} = 4.00, M_{high} = 5.77, t (39) = 3.69, $p < .01$) and in a memory-based context (M_{low} = 3.86, M_{high} = 4.87, t (43) = 2.24, $p < .01$). Therefore, we can conclude that the decision domain alters the nature of the interaction between involvement and the context.

7. General Discussion and Managerial Implications

This research explores how involvement influences the size and variety of a consideration set in a BYOB of wine purchase decision context, as confound results in the existing literature were an impediment to the interpretation of this process (Bauer et al., 2006; Pieters & Verplanken, 1995). First, we offer new theoretical insights by signifying that the intensity of involvement effect varies across different decision domains (i.e., personal decisions vs. gift giving), and across memory-based and stimuli-based decisions. Then, our results from the BYOB of wine restaurant industry confirm the positive effect of involvement on both the variety and the size of the consideration set, in accordance with a wide stream of studies (e.g. Chakravati & Janiszwesky, 2003). Most importantly, our study adds to the understanding of BYOB of wine restaurant patrons, by unfolding the moderating roles of decision-making contexts (i.e., memory- versus stimuli-based) and decision domains (i.e., personal consumption versus gift giving) on the relationship between involvement effect and the properties of consideration sets.

In particular, memory – based choices are considered associative in nature (e.g., Kahneman & Frederick, 2002), and thus, in the context of such choices, awareness set and consideration set are believed to be quite similar, as they are based on the same recall cues (e.g. Alba & Chattopadhyay, 1985). Practically, this means that wine consumers are expected to form larger considerations sets in memory-based decision contexts (e.g. supermakets) as opposed to consumers in stimuli-based contexts (e.g. restaurant wine list). In high involvement conditions, awareness sets are even larger and more heterogenous and they are, thus, expected to frame similar consideration sets (Crowley & Williams, 1991), as opposed to stimuli-based consideration sets where the filtering of alternatives prior to choice is usually based on evaluation criteria and not on recall cues.

If BYOB of wine restaurants, especially the ones that are not allowed to sell alcohol, wish to become more competitive it would seem wise to assist wine consumers that face a “galaxy of choices” (Veseth, 2013) when visiting large supermarkets carrying occasionally up to 800 different varieties (Borchgrevink, & Sherwin, 2017). Just as restaurants invest time, effort, and money into putting together a brilliant wine list consumers are equally trying to make selections that complement their preferences; offering suggestions of wines that work well on different occasions or with different dishes could smooth the way towards an untroubled decision making and provide a competitive advantage for BYOB of wine restaurants. As such, BYOB of wine restaurants could contribute to a unique customer experience, consistent with findings in the servicescape research (Kaminakis et al. 2019).

Likewise, our findings suggest that in gift-giving (as opposed to personal consumption), individuals considered larger and more heterogeneous sets of alternative wines before making their final choice, which is in line with the gift-giving literature (e.g. Belk, 1982;; Boncinelli, Dominici, Gerini, & Marone, 2019). For restaurants offering BYOB of wine in their establishment it's pivotal to understand the amount of time and effort customers devote before bringing their own wine as a gift or on a special occasion (e.g. anniversary). Making the wine list and corkage policy readily available on the website would also help patrons form their set of alternatives by avoiding the wines already in the restaurant list. Bringing a wine already in the list would be upsetting or even humiliating as it implies one's trying to avoid paying the restaurant's mark-up. For BYOB of wine restaurants with no corkage fees it is, also, critical to realise that customers may get lost while trying to consider alternatives before making a choice that would please the recipients of their gift; restaurants could, therefore, facilitate this process by suggesting types of wine that work with the restaurant's cuisine or atmosphere. They could also make sure they honour the patrons' selection and set a good tone by offering taste suggestions as a complimentary service to match their choice. After all, in many instances where customers BYOB of wine, they do so because they believe the restaurant wine list is inadequate, according to research (Bruwer and Nam, 2010). Retailers can work closely with BYOB of wine restaurants to preserve or instil appropriate corkage policies and secure for customers' seamless experience. Since, realistically, people rely on both memory and environmental cues when processing alternatives, decision-making models should analyse the motivational configuration of individuals' choices in greater detail to reveal the nuances of such processes.

In terms of the limitations, the study could use a larger sample to test the hypotheses. Moreover, the scope of the study is focused only on certain decisions. Future research could explore involvement effects on the properties of consideration sets in other decision domains. Whilst decision-making research has explored ambiguous decisions in several service and product domains (Rizomyliotis et al., 2017), self-gifting situations that have attracted recent research attention (Weisfeld-Spolter, Rippe & Gould, 2015) could also be included as an additional decision domain. Similarly, individual differences could also moderate the relationship between involvement and consideration set properties.

References

Alba, J.W., & Hutchinson, J.W. (1987). Dimensions of consumer expertise. *Journal of Consumer Research* ***13*****(**4), 411-54.

Alonso, A. D., & Kok, S. K. (2020). How could future professionals excel in wine tourism delivery? Evidence from wine regions in emerging economies. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management.

Antil J. (1984). Conceptualization & operationalization of involvement. *Advances in ConsumerResearch* ***11***(1), 203-209.

Arora, R. 1982. Validation of an SOR model for situation, enduring, and response components of involvement. *Journal of Marketing Research*, ***19***(4), 505-516.

Aurier, P., Jean, S. & Zaichkowsky, J.L. (2000). Consideration set size and familiarity with usage context. *Advances in Consumer Research* **27**(1), 307-314.

Barone, M.J., Fedorikhin, A., & Hansen, D.E. (2017). The influence of positive affect on consideration set formation in memory-based choice. *Marketing Letters*, ***28***(1), 59-69.

Bauer, H.H., Sauer, N.E. & Becker, C. (2006). Investigating the relationship between product involvement and consumer decision-making styles. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour* ***5***, 342-354. doi: 10.1002/cb.185.

Belk, R. (1979). The effects of product involvement task definition on anticipated consumer effort. *Advances in Consumer Research* ***6***(1), 313-318.

Belk, R. W. (1982). Effects of gift-giving involvement on gift selection strategies. *Advances in Consumer Research* ***9***(1), 408-412.

Belonax, J.J., & Javalgi, R.G. (1989). The Influence of involvement and product class quality on consumer choice sets. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science,* ***17***(3), 209-216.

Bettman, J.R., Luce, M.F., & Payne, J.W. (1998). Constructive consumer choice processes. *Journal of Consumer Research*, ***25***(3), 187-217.

Boncinelli, F., Dominici, A., Gerini, F., & Marone, E. (2019). Consumers wine preferences according to purchase occasion: Personal consumption and gift-giving. *Food Quality and Preference*, ***71***, 270-278.

Borchgrevink, C. P., & Sherwin, A. L. (2017). Predicting wine preference: Testing the premises of the vinotype theory. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*.

Bremer, L., Heitmann, M., & Schreiner, T.F. (2017). When and how to infer heuristic consideration set rules of consumers. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, ***34***(2), 516-535.

Brisoux, J.E., & Cheron, E.J. (1990). Brand categorization and product involvement. In M.E. Goldberg, & G. Gorn (Eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research*, Volume **17** (pp.101-109). Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.

Bruwer, J., & Nam, K. H. (2010). The BYOB of wine phenomenon of consumers in the Australian licensed on-premise foodservice sector. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 83-91.

Bruwer, J., & Rawbone-Viljoen, C. (2013). BYOB as a risk-reduction strategy (RRS) for wine consumers in the Australian on-premise foodservice sector: Exploratory insights. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *32*, 21-30.

Desai, K. K., & Hoyer, W. D. (2000). Descriptive characteristics of memory-based consideration sets: influence of usage occasion frequency and usage location familiarity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27(3), 309-323.

Goldstein, D.G., & Gigerenzer, G. (2002). Models of ecological rationality: The recognition heuristic. *Psychological review*, ***109***(1), 75.

Goldstein, D.G., & Gigerenzer, G. (2011). The beauty of simple models: Themes in recognition heuristic research. *Judgment and Decision Making*, ***6***(5), 392.

Gollwitzer, P.M. (1993). Goal achievement: The role of intentions. *European Review of Social Psychology*, ***4***(1), 141-185.

Goodwin, C., Smith, K., & Spriggle, S. (1990). Gift giving: consumer motivation and the gift purchase process. *Advances in Consumer Research*, ***17*** (1), 690-698.

Gronhaug, K. (1973). Some factors influencing the size of the buyer's evoked set. *European Journal of Marketing* ***8***(3), 232-41.

Hall, J., Lockshin, L., & O'Mahony, G. B. (2001). Exploring the links between wine choice and dining occasions: Factors of influence. *International journal of wine marketing.*

Heath, M.T., Tynan, C. & Ennew, C.T. (2011). Self-gift giving: Understanding consumers and exploring brand messages. *Journal of Marketing Communications* ***17*** (2), 127-144. doi: 10.1080/13527260903236898.

Heeler, R. Francis, J., Okechuku, C. & Reid. S. (1979). Gift versus personal use brand selection. *Advances in Consumer Research* **6**, 325-328.

Heslin, R. & Johnson, B.T. (1992). Prior involvement and incentives to pay attention to information. *Psychology & Marketing*, ***9***(3), 209-219.

Hoffman, D.L., & Novak, T.P. (1996). Marketing in hypermedia computer-mediated environments: Conceptual foundations. *The Journal of Marketing*, **60** (3), 50-68.

Hollebeek, L. D., Jaeger, S. R., Brodie, R. J., & Balemi, A. (2007). The influence of involvement on purchase intention for new world wine. *Food Quality and Preference*, *18*(8), 1033–1049.

Houston, F.S. & Gassenheimer, J.B. (1987). Marketing and exchange. *Journal of Marketing* ***51***(4), 3-18. doi: 10.2307/1251244.

Johnson, M.D. & Lehmann, D.R. (1997). Consumer experience and consideration sets for brands and product categories. *Advances in Consumer Research* ***24*** (1), 295-300.

Kahneman, D., & Frederick, S. (2002). Representativeness revisited: Attribute substitution in intuitive judgment. In T. Gilovich, D. Griffin, & D. Kahneman (Eds.), *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgement* (pp. 49-81). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kaminakis, K., Karantinou, K., Koritos, C., & Gounaris, S. (2019). Hospitality servicescape effects on customer-employee interactions: A multilevel study. *Tourism Management,* 72, 130-144.

Kapferer, J.N., & Laurent, G. (1993). Further evidence on the consumer involvement profile: Five antecedents of involvement. *Psychology & Marketing*, ***10***(4), 347-355.

Kardes, F., Kalyanaram, C., Chandrashekaran, M. & Dornoff, R. (1993). Brand retrieval, consideration set composition, consumer choice, and the pioneering advantage. *Journal of Consumer Research* ***20***(1), 62-75. doi: 10.1086/209333.

Kardes, F.R., Posavac, S.S., & Cronley, M.L. (2004). Consumer inference: A review of processes, bases, and judgment contexts. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, ***14***(3), 230-256.

Komter, A. (2007). Gifts and social relations: The mechanisms of reciprocity. *International Sociology*, ***22***(1), 93-107.

Lacey, S., Bruwer, J., & Li, E. (2009). The role of perceived risk in wine purchase decisions in restaurants. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, *21*(2), 99–117. https://doi.org/10.1108/17511060910967962

Lapersonne, E., Laurent, G., & Le Goff, J.J. (1995). Consideration sets of size one: An empirical investigation of automobile industry. *International Journal of Research in Marketing,* ***12***(1), 55-66.

Lastovicka, J.L., & Gardner, D.M. (1979). Components of involvement. In J. Maloney, & B. Silverman (Eds.), *Attitude research plays for high stakes* (pp. 53-73). Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association.

Lee, A.Y. (2002). Effects of implicit memory on memory-based versus stimulus-based brand choice. *Journal of Marketing Research, **39***(4), 440-454.

Lee, Z., & Sargeant, A. (2011). Dealing with social desirability bias: An application to charitable giving. *European Journal of Marketing*, ***45***(5), 703-719.

Li, H., Zhang, Z., Meng, F. and Zhang, Z. (2019), "When you write review' matters: the interactive effect of prior online reviews and review temporal distance on consumers' restaurant evaluation", International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 1273-1291.

Lockshin, L., Jarvis, W., d'Hauteville, F., & Perrouty, J.-P. (2006). Using simulations from discrete choice experiments to measure consumer sensitivity to brand, region, price, and awards in wine choice. *Food Quality and Preference*, *17*(3–4), 166–178.

Macklin, M., & Walker, M. (1988). The joy and irritation of gift giving. *Developments in Marketing Science* ***11***, 28–32.

Martin, I.M., & Steward, D.W. (2001). The differential impact of goal congruency on attitudes, intentions, and the transfer of brand equity. *Journal of Marketing Research* ***38*** (4), 471-493. doi: 10.1509/jmkr.38.4.471.18912.

Medin, D.L., Goldstone, R.L., & Markman, A.B. (1995). Comparison and Choice: Relations between Similarity Processes and Decision Processes, Psychonomic Bulletin and Review, ***2*** (1), 1-19.

Miller, G.A. (1956). The magic number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits in our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review,* ***63***, 81-97.

Mitchell, A.A. (1980). The Use of an Information Processing Approach to Understand Advertising Effects, *Advances in Consumer Research, 7*, 171-177.

Mitra, A. & Lynch, Jr. J.G. (1995). Toward a reconciliation of market power and information theories of advertising effects on price elasticity. *Journal of Consumer Research* **21** (4), 644-59. doi: 10.1086/209425.

Namkung, Y. and Jang, S. (2008), "Are highly satisfied restaurant customers really different? A quality perception perspective", International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 142-155.

Nedungadi, P. (1990). Recall & consumer consideration sets: influencing choice without altering brand evaluations. *Journal of Consumer Research* **17** (3), 263-276. doi: 10.1086/208556.

NFG (Network for Good). 2006. Impulse on the Internet: How Crisis Compels Donors to Give Online. [Online]. Accessed 1st August 2020 from: www.networkforgood.org

Oscarsson, H., & Rosema, M. (2019). Consideration set models of electoral choice: Theory, method, and application. *Electoral studies*, ***57***, 256-262.

Ostrom, T.M., & Brock, T.C. (1968). A cognitive model of attitudinal involvement. In R.P. Abelson, E. Aronson, W.J. MeGuire, T.M. Newcomb, M.J. Rosenberg, & E.H. Tannenbaum (Eds.), *Theories of cognitive consistency: A sourcebook* (pp. 373-383). Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Park, C.W., & Moon, B.J. (2003). The relationship between product involvement and product knowledge: Moderating roles of product type and product knowledge type. *Psychology & Marketing*, ***20***(11), 977-997.

Park, S.-Y. (1998). A comparison of Korean and American gift-giving behaviors. *Psychology & Marketing* **15** (6), 577-593. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1520-6793(199809)15:6<577::AID-MAR6>3.3.CO;2-N.

Paulssen, M., & Bagozzi, R.P. (2005). A self-regulatory model of consideration set formation. *Psychology & Marketing*, ***22***(10), 785-812.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1958). The Measurement and Correlates of Category Width as a Cognitive Variable. *Journal of Personality*, ***26***(4), 532-544.

Petty, R.E., & Cacioppo, J.T (1979). Effects of forewarning of persuasive intent and involvement on cognitive responses and persuasion. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* **5**(2), 173-176.

Petty, R.E., & Cacioppo, J.T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Volume **19** (pp. 123-205). Orlando, Fl: Academy Press.

Petty, R.E., & Cacioppo, J.T. (1990). Involvement and persuasion: Tradition versus integration. *Psychological Bulletin, **107*** (1), 367-374.

Petty, R.E., Cacioppo, J.T., & Goldman, R. (1981). Personal involvement as a determinant of argument-based persuasion. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, ***41***(5), 847.

Pezenka, I., & Weismayer, C. (2020). Which factors influence locals' and visitors' overall restaurant evaluations?. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management.

Pieters, R.G., & Verplanken, B. (1995). Intention-behaviour consistency: Effects of consideration set size, involvement and need for cognition. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, ***25***(5), 531-543.

Punj, G. & Srinivasan, N. (1989). Influence of expertise and purchase experience on the formation of evoked sets. *Advances in consumer research* **16** (1), 507-14.

Raju, S. & Unnava, H.R. (2005). Brand commitment and the size of the consideration set. *Advances in Consumer Research*, **32** (1), 151-52.

Reilly, M. & Parkinson, T.L. (1985). Individual and product correlates of evoked set size for consumer package goods. *Advances in Consumer Research* **12** (1), 492-7.

Reynolds, D., Rahman, I., Bernard, S., & Holbrook, A. (2018). What effect does wine bottle closure type have on perceptions of wine attributes?. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 75, 171-178.

Richins, M.L., & Bloch, P.H. (1986). After the new wears off: The temporal context of product involvement. *Journal of Consumer Research, **13***(2), 280-285.

Rizomyliotis, I., Konstantoulaki, K., Kostopoulos, G., & Poulis, A. (2017). Reassessing the influence of mental intangibility on consumer decision-making. *International Journal of Market Research*, ***59***(4), 409-421.

Rothschild, M.L. (1979). Advertising Strategies for High and Low Involvement Situations. In J.C. Maloney and B. Silverman (Eds.) *Attitude Research Plays for High Stakes* (pp.74-93). Chicago: American Marketing Association.

Rottenstreich, Y., Sood, S., & Brenner, L. (2007). Feeling and thinking in memory-based versus stimulus-based choice. *Journal of Consumer Research* **33** (4), 461-469. doi: 10.1086/510219.

Sanbonmatsu, D.M., & Fazio, R.H. (1990). The role of attitudes in memory-based decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* ***59***(4), 614-622.

Schamp, C., Heitmann, M., & Katzenstein, R. (2019). Consideration of ethical attributes along the consumer decision-making journey. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, ***47***(2), 328-348.

Sherif, C.W., Sherif, M., & Nebergall, R.E. (1965). *Attitude and attitude change: The social judgment-involvement approach*. Philadelphia: Saunders.

Sherif, M., & C.L. Hovland. (1961). *Social Judgment. Assimilation and Contrasts Effects in Communication and Attitude Change.* New Haven: 'Yale University Press.

Sherry Jr, J.F. (1983). Gift giving in anthropological perspective. *Journal of consumer research*, ***10***(2), 157-168.

Tauber, E.M. (1972). Why Do People Shop? *Journal of Marketing,* ***36***(4), 46-49.

Terech, A., Bucklin, R.E., & Morrison, D.G. (2009). Consideration, choice, and classifying loyalty. *Marketing letters*, ***20***(3), 209.

Traylor, M.B., & Joseph, B.M. (1984). Measuring consumer involvement in products: Developing a general scale. *Psychology & Marketing* **1** (2), 65-77. doi: 10.1002/mar.4220010207.

Troye, S.V. (1984). Evoked Set Formation as a Categorization Process. In T.C. Kinnear (Ed.), *Advances in consumer research*, Volume **11** (pp. 180-186). Provo UT: Association for Consumer Research.

Tulving, E. (1983). *Elements of episodic memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tversky, A. (1972). Elimination by aspects: A theory of choice *Psychological Review*, **79** (4), 281-299.

Tversky, A. Simonson, I. (1993). Context-dependent preferences. *Management Science*, **39** (October), 1179-1189.

Veseth, M. (2013, January 8). *How Much Choice Do Wine Drinkers Really Have?* The Wine Economist. https://wineeconomist.com/2013/01/08/how-much-choice/

Viot, C. (2012). Subjective knowledge, product attributes and consideration set: A wine application. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*.

Weisfeld-Spolter, S., Rippé, C.B., & Gould, S. (2015). Impact of giving on self and impact of self on giving. *Psychology & Marketing*, ***32***(1), 1-14.

Wu, J. & Rangaswamy, A. (2003). A fuzzy set model of search and consideration with an application to an online market. *Marketing Science*, **22** (Summer), 411-434.

Yang, Y., & Paladino, A. (2015). The case of wine: Understanding Chinese gift-giving behavior. *Marketing Letters*, *26*(3), 335–361. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-015-9355-0

Yoo, J., Park, H., & Kim, W. (2018). Compromise effect and consideration set size in consumer decision-making. *Applied Economics Letters*, ***25***(8), 513-517.

Zaichkowsky, J.L. (1985). Measuring the involvement construct. *Journal of Consumer Research,* ***12***(3), 341-352.

Zhang, S. & A.B. Markman (2001). Processing Product Unique Features: Alignability and Involvement in Preference Construction. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, **11**(1), 13-27.

BYOB of wine, but which one? Unveiling new boundary conditions and moderating effects for Restaurant Patrons' consideration set formation.

Abstract

Purpose – Departing from conflicting findings on the role of involvement in the formation of the consideration set, the authors seek to shed light to the wine consumer behaviour and expand previous findings in the Bring Your own Bottle (BYOB) of wine restaurant industry. The authors seek to determine the contradictory effect of involvement on the consideration set size and variety.

Design/methodology/approach – Three empirical studies were conducted. In Study 1, the relationships were tested in a personal consumption situation and in Study 2 in a gift-giving context. Finally, in Study 3, inconsistencies in the intensity of the hypothesized relationships were explored by testing the triple interaction among the three variables (i.e. involvement, decision-making context, decision domain).

Findings – According to our findings BYOB of wine consumers form larger considerations sets in memory-based decision contexts. Involvement's effect on wine consideration set size is stronger in memory-based decisions. BYOB restaurant patrons form smaller sets of alternatives for personal consumption. BYOB restaurant patrons form more heterogeneous sets of alternatives in wine gift-giving. BYOB of wine restaurants should facilitate consumers wine selection process

Originality/value –The authors make an effort to explain and determine the up-to-date contradictory effect of restaurant patrons' involvement on the BYOB of wine consideration set size and the amount of variety contained therein. The study offers new insights, by unfolding the moderating effect of decision-making contexts (i.e. memory-based versus stimuli-based) and decision domains (i.e. personal consumption versus gift giving) on this effect of involvement on the properties of consideration sets.

Keywords – BYOB wine restaurants; wine; involvement; consideration set; gift giving; personal consumption

1. Introduction

Restaurant on-premise wine consumption has appeared to plateau amid Covid-19 pandemic (Nielsen, 2020), but according to forecasts volume is expected to rise again in ~~2022~~ 2023, especially in some sub-categories where both on-premise and off premise sales growth has been overwhelming during the past years. While wine tourism continues to draw the attention of academics (Alonso and Kok, 2020) and the restaurant industry is expected to remain principal tourist attraction (Namkung and Jang, 2008; Pezenka and Weismayer, 2020; Li et al., 2019), bring-your-own-bottle (BYOB) of wine restaurants are vastly emerging in many countries (e.g. US, Australia, UK) as BYOB phenomenon is particularly linked to wine consumption (Varley, 2004; Bruwer and Rawbone-Viljoen, 2013). The surge of such type of service establishments has provided consumers with the option of purchasing or bringing their own bottle of wine before visiting a restaurant. Evidently, patrons are welcome to purchase the bottle of wine of their choice and experience it in a restaurant, with a significant number of BYOB establishments not even charging a fee for serving wine brought by the customer (Taylor & Barber, 2014). Whilst BYOB of wine offers apparent flexibility to restaurant customers, their purchase decisions remain obscure as many of them are confused and bewildered when attempting to select wine (Borchgrevink and Sherwin, 2017). This is not surprising given the multitude of choices of wine brands, varieties and packages (Howard et al., 2012) and the perceived risk in wine consumption due to social pressures to match wine with food and an elevated risk to impress others with the wine choice (Lacey et al., 2009). What's more, individuals are often required to choose wine in different domains (i.e. personal consumption, gift giving) and on different occasions (e.g. dinner with a friend, a special occasion), which further complicates their decision making (Boncinelli et al., 2019; Hall et al., 2001; Gillison and Reynolds, 2016).

~~A common strategy that consumers follow to minimize their uncertainty and anxiety during a purchase is to reduce their choices via a more manageable consideration set. A consider-then-choose process simplifies their decision-making by first identifying a set of alternatives for further evaluation and then choosing from this set (e.g. Oscarsson & Rosema, 2019). This reduced set of options (consideration set) derives from all the possible alternatives that the decision makers are aware of (awareness set) and is fundamentally determined by consumers' involvement in the decision-making process (e.g. Festinger, 1957; Petty, Cacioppo, & Goldman, 1981). Involvement is particularly relevant to wine selection given the broadness of tangible and intangible attributes (Reynolds et al., 2018) being utilised in wine purchase decisions (Lockshin et al., 2006; Hollebeek et al, 2007). Although there is a consensus among scholars about the importance of involvement in the choice process, findings are not consistent regarding the magnitude and the direction of this effect. What's more, less emphasis has been placed on its role in the formation of consideration sets. While most of the studies have explored the influence of involvement on decisions that lead to personal consumption (Paulssen & Bagozzi, 2005) and decisions made in stimuli-based choice contexts (Kardes et al., 2004; Lee, 2002). In fact, to our knowledge, very few studies investigate the formation of consideration sets in memory-based contexts (Posavac, Sanbonmatsu, Cronley, & Kardes, 2001) and even fewer on decisions other than the personal consumption domain, e.g. in gift-giving situations (e.g. Chowdhury, Ratneshwar & Desai, 2004).~~

A common strategy that consumers follow to minimize their uncertainty and anxiety during a purchase is to reduce their choices via a more manageable consideration set. A consider-then-choose process simplifies their decision-making by first identifying a set of alternatives for further evaluation and then choosing from this set (e.g. Oscarsson & Rosema, 2019). This reduced set of options (consideration set) derives from all the possible alternatives that the

decision makers are aware of (awareness set) and is fundamentally determined by consumers' involvement in the decision-making process (e.g. Festinger, 1957; Petty, Cacioppo, & Goldman, 1981). Involvement is particularly relevant to wine selection given the broadness of tangible and intangible attributes (Reynolds et al., 2018) being utilised in wine purchase decisions (Lockshin et al., 2006; Hollebeek et al, 2007). Although there is a consensus among scholars about the importance of involvement in the choice process, findings are not consistent regarding the magnitude and the direction of this effect. What's more, less emphasis has been placed on its role in the formation of consideration sets. While most of the studies have explored the influence of involvement on decisions that lead to personal consumption (Paulssen & Bagozzi, 2005) and decisions made in stimuli-based choice contexts (Kardes et al., 2004; Lee, 2002). In fact, to our knowledge, very few studies investigate the formation of consideration sets in memory-based contexts (Posavac, Sanbonmatsu, Cronley, & Kardes, 2001) and even fewer on decisions other than the personal consumption domain, e.g. in gift-giving situations (e.g. Chowdhury, Ratneshwar & Desai, 2004).

In the present study, we aim to illuminate the existing inconsistencies in the literature and offer new knowledge in the BYOB of wine restaurant industry. Specifically, our research aim is twofold: a) to explore the impact of involvement on the descriptive properties of wine consideration sets (size and variety) in two different decision contexts (memory-based and stimuli-based) and two different purchase domains (personal consumption and gift giving) and b) to further inform the extant knowledge by testing the ways in which these variables contexts and domains interact to determine the process by which consideration sets of alternative wines are formed.

2. Gift-giving Versus Personal Consumption

Early research has shown that the decision-making process differs depending on whether the final choice concerns personal use or giving to others (e.g. Heeler et al., 1979). Decisions in these two circumstances differ explicitly in terms of the motivations and the benefits sought. In personal consumption, the individual reaps the benefits (and asserts motivation) from the actual purchased product, whereas in gift giving and charitable donations, the benefits are of an immaterial nature. Gift giving is defined as the selection, transfer, and evaluation of tangible and intangible objects in fulfillment of an obligation or in a spontaneous mode (Macklin & Walker, 1988; Park, 1998). There are many different types of gift-giving situations, for example business gift giving (Choi, Park & Yoon, 2018) or cherished possession transfers (Curasi, 1999), in which the buyer/gift giver is also very different from the recipient/benefactor of the gift. Most of these gift-giving situations, unlike personal consumption purchases, are associated with a social exchange function (Belk, 1979, 1982; Komter, 2007) and the reciprocity effect (Houston & Gassenheimer, 1987; Fehr & Gächter, 2000; Goodwin, Smith & Spriggle, 1990; Komter, 2007). In wine consumption, evidence suggests that consumers will evaluate prior attitudes, product image or packaging differently depending on a gift-giving or personal consumption scenario (Yang and Paladino, 2015). Due to the increased importance of gift-giving decisions for consumers, recent studies have highlighted the particular importance for marketers of influencing the formation of the consideration set for gift-giving consumers (Holiday et al., 2018; Hwang and Chu, 2019). Nevertheless, research on how exactly the involvement of individuals is related to the formation of their consideration set in gift-giving decisions remains limited.

3. The Size and Variety of the Consideration Set

The formation of a consideration set is generally deemed to be an essential element in decision-making across several disciplines (e.g. ~~, Paulssen & Bagozzi, 2005;~~ Barone, Fedorikhin & Hansen, 2017; Tversky, 1972). The properties of each consideration set serve as indicators of competition in the consideration stage and significantly enhance the understanding of choice (e.g. Crowley & Williams, 1991; Desai & Hoyer, 2000; Aurier, Jean, & Zaichkowsky, 2000). Size has been conceptualised as the number of items in a consideration set and has been introduced as a function of brand loyalty, commitment (Desai & Raju, 2007; Raju & Unnava, 2005; Reilly & Rarkinson, 1985), expertise, familiarity with a product category (Alba & Hutchinson, 1987~~; Aurier et al., 2000~~; ~~Johnson & Lehmann 1997;~~ Punj & Srinivasan, 1989), affect (Barone, Fedorikhin & Hansen, 2017), awareness set size (e.g. Crowley & Williams, 1991), compromise effect (Yoo, Park & Kim, 2018) and price sensitivity (Mitra & Lynch, 1995). Variety, on the other hand, has been denoted as the degree to which items included in a consideration set are distinct in terms of the usage situation or the goals they satisfy (Desai & Hoyer, 2000). ~~For example, in a decision about how to spend one's weekend, a consideration set containing downhill skiing and trekking has less variety than a set which includes downhill skiing and organising a party at home; in the first set, the alternatives are similar and satisfy similar needs (e.g., adventure and sports).~~ This descriptive property of the consideration set is significantly influenced by experience (Johnson & Lehmann, 1997), familiarity with the decision occasion and an individual's concern about neglecting the optimal choice (DeSarbo et al., 2008; Chakravarti & Janiszewski, 2003).

4. Involvement and the properties of Consideration Sets

In decision-making, while various types of involvement exist (e.g. Mitchell, 1980; Rothchild, 1979), most agree that the two pivotal types of involvement are *enduring involvement* and *situational involvement* ~~(Zaichkowsky, 1985)~~. Enduring involvement (also known as *value-relevant involvement*) refers to the importance, perceived by individuals, of and personal interest in an object or product category and it is considered to be a stable state. This conceptualisation of involvement is relevant to important social aspects of the lives and values of individuals and is also referred to as *value-relevant involvement.* In contrast, situational involvement is considered to be a temporary, decision-specific state (e.g. Zaichkowsky, 1985) and is based on Petty and Cacioppo (1979) definition of involvement which focuses on the recognition of the importance and the expected outcome of an issue (thus it is also referred to as *outcome-relevant involvement)*. ~~.~~ A critical review of the relevant literature reveals evidence of the positive effect of involvement on the consideration set size and variety. For example, in high involvement conditions, individuals tend to maximise the benefits sought from their decision and, thus, employ extended information processing, which successively leads to larger and more heterogeneous sets as individuals are willing to put in more effort and process more information, (Zhang & Markman, 2001). Concurrently, in high involvement conditions, decision-makers are willing to accept a higher price in order to get a better performing product (Divine, 1995). This effect offsets the negative effect of latitude of acceptance for attributes (Sherif & Hovland, 1961) and normally leads to larger sets of alternatives. Likewise, high involvement conditions typically induce high levels of shopping enthusiasm contributing to a positive relationship between involvement and the size of a consideration set. Equally, Lapersonne et al. (1995) suggest that in important decisions, individuals are more concerned about avoiding the negative consequences of a bad choice (Celsi & Olson, 1988) and, thus, tend to process a larger number of alternatives (Kapferer & Laurent, 1993). By including diverse items in the consideration set, highly involved individuals minimise the risk of

committing such errors (Chakravati & Janiszwesky, 2003). Finally, along with the direct effect of involvement on consideration set size, researchers suggest a positive indirect effect via the awareness set size. The awareness set is larger in high involvement conditions as opposed to low involvement conditions, due to higher knowledge of the product category/ situation (e.g. Zaichkowsky, 1985).~~The two types of involvement have different antecedents but share similar behaviour consequences for decision-making, in terms of effort, processing, selectivity of alternatives etc. (e.g. Zaichkowsky, 1985).~~

Based on the above discussion, we hypothesise:

H1a: *Involvement has a positive effect on consideration set size.*
H1b: *Involvement has a positive effect on consideration set variety.*

5. Stimuli-based Versus Memory-based Decisions and Consideration Set Properties

Following the work of Kahneman and Frederick (2002), Rottenstreich, Sood and Brenner (2007) posit that decision makers tend to be more automatic, associative and rapid (system 1 mode of thought) when forming their memory-based consideration sets, whereas they tend to employ slow, deliberate and deductive thinking (system 2 mode of thought) in the formation of stimuli-based consideration sets. In other words, for memory-based choices, individuals engage in a process of retrieving alternatives directly from long-term memory; this requires more effort and more mental resources than stimuli-based choices, where alternatives are available in the external environment (e.g. ~~Rottenstreich et al., 2007;~~ Kahneman & Frederick, 2002). Hence, individuals who form stimuli-based consideration sets can process and include more alternatives in their sets given the increased availability of mental resources. As a result, stimuli-based consideration sets tend to be broader than memory-based consideration sets (Crowley & Williams, 1991). In the context of consuming wine, the effect to which individuals draw from a memory-based consideration set may depend on their subjective knowledge, which has been found to affect consideration set formation during wine consumption (Viot, 2012).

Similarly, stimuli-based consideration sets tend to be more heterogeneous than memory-based consideration sets (Crowley & Williams, 1991). The existing literature supports this notion on the premise that memory-based choices are essentially associative (~~Kahneman & Frederick, 2002;~~ Rottenstreich et al., 2007) and grounded in serial recall inferences (i.e. the retrieval of an alternative based on other similar alternatives which have been recalled; Alba & Chattopadhyay, 1985). As a result, in memory-based consideration sets, individuals tend to retrieve similar alternatives from their memory. Conversely, in memory-based choices where alternatives need to be maintained in working memory while they are being evaluated, individuals have limited capacity to process heterogeneous consideration sets (e.g. Miller, 1956), as the latter usually requires extensive comparison of alternatives with dissimilar attributes. Thus, in memory-based decisions, individuals consider similar alternatives for a particular choice, while in stimuli-based decisions, consumers form consideration sets which encompass greater variety.

Based on the above discussion, we posit:

H2a: *There is a significant interaction between involvement and the decision-making context. The effect of involvement on consideration set size is stronger in memory-based as opposed to stimuli-based choices.*

H2b: *There is a significant interaction between involvement and the decision-making context. The effect of involvement on consideration set variety is stronger in memory-based as opposed to stimuli-based choices.*

Likewise, for memory-based decisions, consideration set variety is more strongly linked to awareness set variety than for stimuli-based decisions due to the associative nature of recall (e.g. Kahneman & Frederick, 2002~~; Rottenstreich et al., 2007~~). In memory-based decisions, the effect of involvement on consideration set variety can be expected to be intensified by the stronger relationship of awareness set variety with consideration set variety as the formation of both is solely based on serial recall inferences and associative cues. Therefore, the interaction between the decision-making context and involvement is not expected to be consistent in gift-giving and personal consumption situations. Thus, we hypothesise that:

H3a: *There is a significant triple interaction between involvement, decision context and decision domain in terms of the effect on consideration set size.*

H3b: *There is a significant triple interaction between involvement, decision context and decision domain in terms of the effect on consideration set variety.*

6. Overview of the Current Research

To test our hypotheses in a BYOB of wine setting and explore the effect of involvement on consideration set size and variety, as well as the possible moderating effects of the decision-making context and the decision domain, three empirical studies were conducted. In Study 1, the relationships were tested in a personal consumption situation and in Study 2, they were tested in a gift-giving context. Finally, in Study 3, inconsistencies in the intensity of the hypothesized relationships were explored by testing the triple interaction among the three variables (i.e. involvement, decision-making context, decision domain). ~~Involvement has been previously theorized in various ways, which might partly explain the inconsistencies in the findings for the relationship of involvement with consideration set properties (e.g. Divine, 1995; Divine and Page, 1994). In the consideration set literature, researchers have mostly used either enduring or situational involvement. The two types of involvement (i.e. enduring and situational) are strongly correlated (e.g. Arora, 1982) and share similar behavioural consequences in relation to the decision-making process (e.g. Zaichkowsky, 1985). Therefore, we expect them to have similar relationship patterns to the two properties of the consideration set.~~ In the current research, we focused on situational involvement which is, for the most part, extrinsically induced and can thus be manipulated by external stimuli. Given that knowledge in social sciences is context-bound and domain-specific (Cronbach, 1986), we have conceptualised and operationalised involvement consistently across the three studies using the situational involvement paradigm. This is in an attempt to avoid any variations in the effects of involvement in the two decision contexts and decision domains due to different conceptualisations and operationalisations of the concept. In all studies, we report all sample sizes, measures, manipulations and exclusions.

6.1 Study 1

In Study 1, the effect of involvement on the size and the variety of consideration sets was explored in a within category, personal consumption decision. This effect was tested across

stimuli-based and memory-based decision-making contexts, as consumers are reported to have significantly different preference judgments, even for the same products, across different contexts (Bettman et al., 1998). Moreover, surprisingly, memory-based consideration sets in relation to involvement have been overlooked in literature and, thus, this study offers new evidence to inform discussion. Likewise, Study 1 contributes to theory in terms of the way involvement is analysed and manipulated. Given that personal consumption is an idiosyncratic psychological process (Converse, 1986), decision makers are both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated, thus, both enduring and situational involvements were considered. A moderately enduring involvement product category was used for the experimental stimuli (Lastovicka & Gardner, 1979; Bauer et al., 2006) to control any possible effects of enduring involvement on the explored relationships.

Method

Participants and experimental design. A total of 98 individuals (46 men and 52 women, M_{age}=21.40, *SD* = 2.46) were randomly assigned to the four conditions for the following between-subjects experimental design: 2 (situational involvement: high or low) x 2 (decision context: memory-based or stimuli-based).

Product selection. In an attempt to control for other variables that have been found to influence the properties of a consideration set, such as enduring involvement, consumers' prior experience with the product category and consumers' awareness set, we decided to use a fictional, moderate involvement wine category in the study. Moreover, we decided that the level of enduring involvement needed to be the same (moderate) regardless of whether if the product was to be used for personal consumption or as a gift, so that it could be used consistently for the study 2 which was to follow on gift giving. In order to determine the most suitable wine category, a preliminary study was conducted. Eight fictitious wine categories (e.g., organic, luxury, local country of origin, own label etc.) were tested for the enduring involvement that they evoked among the participants in two decision domains (personal consumption, gift giving) using a scale which had four 7-point Likert-type items (Park & Hastak, 1994; *Cronbach's* $\alpha_{personal}$ = .78, α_{gift} = .86). The results of the preliminary study indicated that the most appropriate product category was *Organic Wine* which was found to be a type of wine with moderate enduring involvement for both personal consumption (M = 4.23) and gift giving (M = 4.18).

Procedure. Participants were informed that they were taking part in a survey to examine the consumers decision making process. Then, each participant was given a self-administered, paper and pencil questionnaire, comprising three sections. In the first section, the fictitious wine brand was presented (i.e. attributes and representative picture for each product). In the second section, participants were given a filler task to complete for 30 minutes. Once the filler task had been completed, participants proceeded to the third section of the questionnaire, where they were asked to form their consideration set for the specific product category (organic wine). The consideration set for both product categories was formed based on the following question: "Given that you want to select a bottle of organic wine for yourself to consume in a Bring Your Own Wine restaurant, which brands would you seriously consider purchasing?" In the fourth and final section of this questionnaire, participants completed the manipulation check scale and then they were debriefed by the researchers and released.

Manipulations. Similar to previous relevant studies, situational involvement was manipulated through the stated sample size (e.g. Chakravarti & Janiszewski, 2003; Lee, 2009). Specifically, in the high involvement condition, participants were told they were part of a small sample (50 people) and that the conclusions of the study would be drawn from this group, whereas in the low involvement condition, participants were told that their responses would be aggregated with the responses of a study sample of 1,000 other individuals from various countries. Regarding the decision context, participants in the memory-based condition, formed their consideration set on the basis of unaided recall. Alternatives were recalled and processed directly from participants' memories. In the stimuli-based condition, participants were given an identical catalogue that presented "all available brands" in the market and formed their consideration set on the basis of all the available information.

Manipulation checks and measurement of dependent variables. The mean of four 7-point scales was used to check the success of the situational involvement manipulation (*Cronbach's* $\alpha = .84$). The scales measured: (a) personal relevance, (b) personal importance in making the right decision, (c) personal interest in judging the quality, (d) cautiousness with which the consideration sets were formed (Park & Hastak, 1994). The dependent variables of the study were the size and the variety of the consideration set. The size was operationalised as the number of brands included in the set. In terms of the variety of the brands for each product category, they were sorted into distinct groups by two independent judges on the basis of similarity in the nature and the positioning of the brands. The variety of the set was determined by counting the number of groups from which the set items were drawn (Desai & Hoyer, 2000).

Results and Discussion. The results indicate that the manipulation of situational involvement (M_{high} =5.07, M_{low}= 4.23, t (96) = 3.182, p< .01) was successful. Moreover, consistent with prior research, situational involvement had a significant positive effect on both the variety ($M_{\text{low}} = 2.38$, $M_{\text{high}} = 2.91$, $F(1,94) = 14.27$, $p < .01$) and the size of the set ($M_{\text{low}} = 3.27$, $M_{\text{high}} = 4.03$, $F(1,94) = 11.67$, $p < .01$), confirming H1a and H1b in the personal consumption domain. The results also showed a significant main effect of the decision-making context on the variety (M_{memory} =2.29, M_{stimuli} =2.99 , F (1,94) = 14.27, $p < .01$) and the size of the consideration set ($M_{\text{memory}} = 3.14$, $M_{\text{stimuli}} = 4.16$, F (1, 94) = 20.97, $p < .001$). Finally, the interaction of the involvement and decision context was found to be significant for both consideration set variety (F (1,94)=4.00, $p < .05$) and size (F (1,94)=7.75, $p < .01$). Therefore, H2a and H2b are also confirmed for personal consumption decisions. Exploring further the nature of this interaction, for memory-based decisions, significant differences were found between low and high involvement situations in terms of both variety (M_{high} =2.75, M_{low}= 1.85, t (48) = 3.80, $p < .001$) and size (M_{high}= 3.83, M_{low}= 2.46, t (48) = 4.86, $p < .001$). In contrast, for stimuli-based decisions, these differences were not found to be significant for either properties of the consideration set ($p > .05$).

In summary, the results of Study 1 indicate that for personal consumption purchases in high situational involvement conditions, consumers consider a greater number of distinct brands of wine for purchase. However, this seems to be significant only in memory-based decisions and not stimuli-based ones. In Study 2, we will seek to replicate Study 1 for gift-giving situations to explore whether the results are similar.

6.2 Study 2

In contrast to Study 1, Study 2 examined the influence of involvement on the consideration set size and variety in gift-giving situations. Decision makers in gift-giving situations are extrinsically motivated (~~Houston & Rothschild, 1978;~~ Richins & Bloch, 1986) and they are not known to be enduringly involved. Their decision-making is linked to the achievement of goals and they are not in search of hedonic benefits (Evans, Over & Manktelow, 1993; Hoffman & Novak, 1996). Finally, involvement in gift giving is known to act as a motivator for decision-making (e.g. Petty & Cacioppo, 1986~~1~~, 1990~~86~~). Therefore, in Study 2 we also employed situational involvement and manipulated the motivational value of the choice in a similar way to Study 1 to reflect decision importance.

Method

Participants. Ninety-five individuals participated in the study (45 male and 50 female, M_{age}=21.5, *SD* = 1.34). The participants were randomly assigned to the four conditions of the following between-subjects experimental design: 2 (situational involvement: high or low) x 2 (decision context: memory-based or stimuli-based).

Procedure and manipulations. The process and manipulations followed were identical to those in Study 1. However, in this study, participants were asked to form their decisions in a gift-giving context. Specifically, they were told that they are choosing a bottle of organic wine as a gift to a friend that has invited them to dine in a BYOB of wine restaurant.

Manipulation check and measures of dependent variables. As in Study 1, the mean of four 7-point items was used to check the success of the situational involvement manipulation (Park & Hastak, 1994). The scale was found to be reliable *(Cronbach's* α = .78). Consideration set and variety set were the dependent variables and were operationalised in the same way as in Study 1.

Results and Discussion. In Study 2, the manipulation of situational involvement was again successful (M_{high} = *5.45*, M_{low} = 4.77*, t* (93) = 2.59, p< .05). Regarding the results of the main experiment, similarly to Study 1, the main effect of situational involvement was significant for both consideration set variety (M_{low} = 3.00, M_{high} = 3.58, F(1,91) = 5.61 , p < .05) and size (M_{low} = 4.17 , M_{high} = 4.90§, F(1,91) = 4.63, p < .01), thus confirming H1a and H1b in the gift-giving domain as well. In addition, the decision-making context was found to have a significant main effect on both variety *(*M_{memory} = 3.04, $M_{stimuli}$ = 3.54, F (1,91) = 4.24 , p < .05) and size *(*M_{memory} = 3.87, $M_{stimuli}$ = 5.19 , F (1, 91) = 15.21 , p < .001). In contrast to Study 1, in our second experiment, the interaction of involvement and decision context was not found to be significant for either the variety or the size of the consideration set. Hence, in this decision domain, H2a and H2b are not confirmed. In other words, the main effect of involvement on consideration set size and variety was consistent across decision-making contexts.

6.3 Study 3

In order to further explore the validity of H3 and test the inconsistency of our findings regarding H2 between personal consumption and gift-giving, a third study was conducted which included a new variable that reflected the personal consumption versus gift giving situation (i.e. decision domain). Similar to Studies 1 and 2, Study 3 explored the effect of involvement on the two properties of the consideration set in a within-category decision, across memory-based and stimuli-based contexts and across the two different decision domains.

Method

Participants. One hundred and seventy-three individuals participated in our third study (81 male and 92 female, M_{age}=20.9, SD = 0.74). The participants were randomly assigned to eight conditions of a between-subjects experimental design with the following structure: 2 (situational involvement: high or low) x 2 (decision context: memory-based or stimuli-based) x 2 (decision domain: personal consumption or gift giving).

Procedure and manipulations. The experimental procedure and manipulations were the same as for Studies 1 and 2. Participants in the personal consumption condition were told that they were choosing organic wine for themselves to consume in a BYOB of wine restaurant while the participants in the gift-giving condition were told that they were choosing an organic wine as a gift to a friend that has invited them to dine in a BYOB of wine restaurant.

Manipulation check and measures of dependent variables. Situational involvement manipulation, as well as the size and variety of the consideration set were operationalised in the same way as for the first two studies. The scale for situational involvement was found to be reliable *(Cronbach's* α = .83*)*.

Results and Discussion. In a similar way to the first two studies, the manipulation of situational involvement was successful (M_{high} = *5.04*, M_{low} = 4.22*,* t (171) = 3.98, p < .05). The main effects of our three independent variables for both consideration set properties were found to be significant. Specifically, the main effect of situational involvement was positive and significant for consideration set variety (M_{low} = 2.82, M_{high} = 3.23, F(1,165) = 7.00 , p < .01) and size (M_{low} = 3.78 , M_{high} = 4.75, F(1,165) = 19.04, p < .01). Therefore, our results for this experiment also confirm H1a and H1b. Likewise, the decision-making context had a significant main effect on both consideration set variety (M_{memory} = 2.81, $M_{stimuli}$ = 3.24, F (1,65) = 7.48 , p < .01) and size (M_{memory} = 3.99, $M_{stimuli}$ = 4.54 , F (1, 165) = 6.02 , p < .05). Similarly, the main effect of the decision domain was also significant for both consideration set variety ($M_{Personal}$ = 2.75, M_{Gift} = 3.31 , F (1, 165) = 12.67 , p < .001) and size ($M_{Personal}$ = 3.90, M_{Gift} = 4.63 , F (1, 165) = 10.77 , p < .01). In study 3, all two-way interactions, including the interaction between the involvement and decision-making contexts, were found not to be significant for either consideration set variety or size. Hence, H2a and H2b are not confirmed across decision domains.

Regarding the variety of consideration sets, the triple interaction among the independent variables, namely involvement, decision-making context and decision domain, was found to be marginally insignificant (F (1, 165) = 3.22, p = 0.075). Therefore, H3b is not confirmed. In contrast, H3a is confirmed as the triple interaction for consideration set size was found to be significant (F (1, 165) = 4.07, p < 0.05). Specifically, for personal consumption decisions, the effect of involvement is significant only in a memory-based context (M_{low} = 3.09, M_{high} = 4.14*,* t (41) = 2.75, p < .01) and not in a stimuli-based context (p > 0.05). In contrast, for gift-giving decisions, the effect of involvement is significant both for a stimuli-based context (M_{low} = 4.00, M_{high} = 5.77*,* t (39) = 3.69, p < .01) and in a memory-based context (M_{low} = 3.86, M_{high} = 4.87*,* t (43) = 2.24, p < .01). Therefore, we can conclude that the decision domain alters the nature of the interaction between involvement and the context.

7. General Discussion and Managerial Implications

This research explores how involvement influences the size and variety of a consideration set in a BYOB of wine purchase decision context, as confound results in the existing literature were an impediment to the interpretation of this process (Bauer et al., 2006; Pieters & Verplanken, 1995). First, we offer new theoretical insights by signifying that the intensity of involvement effect varies across different decision domains (i.e., personal decisions vs. gift giving), and across memory-based and stimuli-based decisions. Then, our results from the BYOB of wine restaurant industry confirm the positive effect of involvement on both the variety and the size of the consideration set, in accordance with a wide stream of studies (e.g. ~~Divine, 1995;~~ Chakravati & Janiszwesky, 2003). Most importantly, our study adds to the understanding of BYOB of wine restaurant patrons, by unfolding the moderating roles of decision-making contexts (i.e., memory- versus stimuli-based) and decision domains (i.e., personal consumption versus gift giving) on the relationship between involvement effect and the properties of consideration sets. ~~Managers that hold a deeper understanding of how people commit cognitive resources in certain situations (e.g. memory-based decisions, gift-giving decisions) while they are highly (or low) motivated to make choices, would interpret customers decision-making process more effectively.~~

In particular, ~~it has been found that in personal consumption the positive effect of involvement on consideration set properties is stronger in memory-based decisions (in contrast to stimuli-based ones).~~ m~~M~~emory – based choices are considered associative in nature (e.g., Kahneman & Frederick, 2002~~; Rottenstreich et al., 2007~~), and thus, in the context of such choices, awareness set and consideration set are believed to be quite similar, as they are based on the same recall cues (e.g. Alba & Chattopadhyay, 1985). Practically, this means that wine consumers are expected to form larger considerations sets in memory-based decision contexts (e.g. supermakets) as opposed to consumers in stimuli-based contexts (e.g. restaurant wine list). In high involvement conditions, awareness sets are even larger and more heterogenous and they are, thus, expected to frame similar consideration sets (Crowley & Williams, 1991), as opposed to stimuli-based consideration sets where the filtering of alternatives prior to choice is usually based on evaluation criteria and not on recall cues.

If BYOB of wine restaurants, especially the ones that are not allowed to sell alcohol, wish to become more competitive it would seem wise to assist wine consumers that face a "galaxy of choices" (Veseth, 2013) when visiting large supermarkets carrying occasionally up to 800 different varieties (Borchgrevink, & Sherwin, 2017). Just as restaurants invest time, effort, and money into putting together a brilliant wine list consumers are equally trying to make selections that complement their preferences; offering suggestions of wines that work well on different occasions or with different dishes could smooth the way towards an untroubled decision making and provide a competitive advantage for BYOB of wine restaurants. As such, BYOB of wine restaurants could contribute to a unique customer experience, consistent with findings in the servicescape research (Kaminakis et al. 2019).

~~If BYOB of wine restaurants, especially the ones that are not allowed to sell alcohol, wish to become more competitive it would seem wise to assist wine consumers that face a "galaxy of choices" (Veseth, 2013) when visiting large supermarkets carrying occasionally up to 800 different varieties (Borchgrevink, & Sherwin, 2017). Just as restaurants invest time, effort, and money into putting together a brilliant wine list consumers are equally trying to make selections that complement their preferences; offering suggestions of wines that work well on different occasions or with different dishes could smooth the way towards an untroubled decision making and provide a competitive advantage for BYOB of wine restaurants. As such, BYOB of wine restaurants could contribute to a unique customer experience, consistent with findings in the servicescape research (Kaminakis et al. 2019).~~

Likewise, our findings suggest that in gift-giving (as opposed to personal consumption), individuals considered larger and more heterogeneous sets of alternative wines before making their final choice, which is in line with the gift-giving literature (e.g. ~~,~~ Belk, ~~1979,~~ 1982; ~~Shapiro, 1975~~; Boncinelli, Dominici, Gerini, & Marone, 2019). For restaurants offering BYOB of wine in their establishment it's pivotal to understand the amount of time and effort customers devote before bringing their own wine as a gift or on a special occasion (e.g. anniversary). Making the wine list and corkage policy readily available on the website would also help patrons form their set of alternatives by avoiding the wines already in the restaurant list. Bringing a wine already in the list would be upsetting or even humiliating as it implies one's trying to avoid paying the restaurant's mark-up. For BYOB of wine restaurants with no corkage fees it is, also, critical to realise that customers may get lost while trying to consider alternatives before making a choice that would please the recipients of their gift; restaurants could, therefore, facilitate this process by suggesting types of wine that work with the restaurant's cuisine or atmosphere. They could also make sure they honour the patrons' selection and set a good tone by offering taste suggestions as a complimentary service to match their choice. After all, in many instances where customers BYOB of wine, they do so because they believe the restaurant wine list is inadequate, according to research (Bruwer and Nam, 2010).

~~In all, criticality in an individual's approach to the set formation process is deemed seminal.~~ Retailers can work closely with BYOB of wine restaurants to preserve or instil appropriate corkage policies and secure for customers' seamless experience. Since, realistically, people rely on both memory and environmental cues when processing alternatives, decision-making models should analyse the motivational configuration of individuals' choices in greater detail to reveal the nuances of such processes.

In terms of the limitations, the study could use a larger sample to test the hypotheses. Moreover, the scope of the study is focused only on certain decisions. Future research could explore involvement effects on the properties of consideration sets in other decision domains. Whilst decision-making research has explored ambiguous decisions in several service and product domains (Rizomyliotis et al., 2017), self-gifting situations that have attracted recent research attention (Weisfeld-Spolter, Rippe & Gould, 2015) could also be included as an additional decision domain. Similarly, individual differences could also moderate the relationship between involvement and consideration set properties.

References

Alba, J.W., & Hutchinson, J.W. (1987). Dimensions of consumer expertise. *Journal of Consumer Research* ***13*****(**4), 411-54.

Alonso, A. D., & Kok, S. K. (2020). How could future professionals excel in wine tourism delivery? Evidence from wine regions in emerging economies. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management.

Antil J. (1984). Conceptualization & operationalization of involvement. *Advances in ConsumerResearch* ***11***(1), 203-209.

Arora, R. 1982. Validation of an SOR model for situation, enduring, and response components of involvement. *Journal of Marketing Research*, ***19***(4), 505-516.

Aurier, P., Jean, S. & Zaichkowsky, J.L. (2000). Consideration set size and familiarity with usage context. *Advances in Consumer Research* **27**(1), 307-314.

Barone, M.J., Fedorikhin, A., & Hansen, D.E. (2017). The influence of positive affect on consideration set formation in memory-based choice. *Marketing Letters*, ***28***(1), 59-69.

Bauer, H.H., Sauer, N.E. & Becker, C. (2006). Investigating the relationship between product involvement and consumer decision-making styles. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour* ***5***, 342-354. doi: 10.1002/cb.185.

Belk, R. (1979). The effects of product involvement task definition on anticipated consumer effort. *Advances in Consumer Research* ***6***(1), 313-318.

Belk, R. W. (1982). Effects of gift-giving involvement on gift selection strategies. *Advances in Consumer Research* ***9***(1), 408-412.

~~Belk, R.(1979). Gift-giving Behavior. In J. Sheth (Ed.), *Research in Marketing*, Volume 2 (pp. 95-126). Greenwich, CT: JAI_ Press.~~

Belonax, J.J., & Javalgi, R.G. (1989). The Influence of involvement and product class quality on consumer choice sets. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science,* ***17***(3), 209-216.

Bettman, J.R., Luce, M.F., & Payne, J.W. (1998). Constructive consumer choice processes. *Journal of Consumer Research*, ***25***(3), 187-217.

Boncinelli, F., Dominici, A., Gerini, F., & Marone, E. (2019). Consumers wine preferences according to purchase occasion: Personal consumption and gift-giving. *Food Quality and Preference*, ***71***, 270-278.

Borchgrevink, C. P., & Sherwin, A. L. (2017). Predicting wine preference: Testing the premises of the vinotype theory. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*.

Bremer, L., Heitmann, M., & Schreiner, T.F. (2017). When and how to infer heuristic consideration set rules of consumers. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, ***34***(2), 516-535.

Brisoux, J.E., & Cheron, E.J. (1990). Brand categorization and product involvement. In M.E. Goldberg, & G. Gorn (Eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research*, Volume **17** (pp.101-109). Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.

Bruwer, J., & Nam, K. H. (2010). The BYOB of wine phenomenon of consumers in the Australian licensed on-premise foodservice sector. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 83-91.

Bruwer, J., & Rawbone-Viljoen, C. (2013). BYOB as a risk-reduction strategy (RRS) for wine consumers in the Australian on-premise foodservice sector: Exploratory insights. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *32*, 21-30.

Desai, K. K., & Hoyer, W. D. (2000). Descriptive characteristics of memory-based consideration sets: influence of usage occasion frequency and usage location familiarity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27(3), 309-323.

~~Desai, K. K., & Hoyer, W. D. (2000). Descriptive characteristics of memory-based consideration sets: influence of usage occasion frequency and usage location familiarity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27(3), 309-323.~~

Goldstein, D.G., & Gigerenzer, G. (2002). Models of ecological rationality: The recognition heuristic. *Psychological review*, ***109***(1), 75.

Goldstein, D.G., & Gigerenzer, G. (2011). The beauty of simple models: Themes in recognition heuristic research. *Judgment and Decision Making*, ***6***(5), 392.

Gollwitzer, P.M. (1993). Goal achievement: The role of intentions. *European Review of Social Psychology*, ***4***(1), 141-185.

Goodwin, C., Smith, K., & Spriggle, S. (1990). Gift giving: consumer motivation and the gift purchase process. *Advances in Consumer Research*, ***17*** (1), 690-698.

Gronhaug, K. (1973). Some factors influencing the size of the buyer's evoked set. *European Journal of Marketing* ***8***(3), 232-41.

Hall, J., Lockshin, L., & O'Mahony, G. B. (2001). Exploring the links between wine choice and dining occasions: Factors of influence. *International journal of wine marketing.*

Heath, M.T., Tynan, C. & Ennew, C.T. (2011). Self-gift giving: Understanding consumers and exploring brand messages. *Journal of Marketing Communications* ***17*** (2), 127-144. doi: 10.1080/13527260903236898.

Heeler, R. Francis, J., Okechuku, C. & Reid. S. (1979). Gift versus personal use brand selection. *Advances in Consumer Research* **6**, 325-328.

Heslin, R. & Johnson, B.T. (1992). Prior involvement and incentives to pay attention to information. *Psychology & Marketing*, ***9***(3), 209-219.

Hoffman, D.L., & Novak, T.P. (1996). Marketing in hypermedia computer-mediated environments: Conceptual foundations. *The Journal of Marketing*, **60** (3), 50-68.

Hollebeek, L. D., Jaeger, S. R., Brodie, R. J., & Balemi, A. (2007). The influence of involvement on purchase intention for new world wine. *Food Quality and Preference*, *18*(8), 1033–1049.

Houston, F.S. & Gassenheimer, J.B. (1987). Marketing and exchange. *Journal of Marketing* ***51***(4), 3-18. doi: 10.2307/1251244.

~~Houston, M.J., & Rothschild, M.L. (1978). Conceptual and methodological perspectives on involvement. In S. Jain (Ed.), *Research frontiers in marketing: Dialogues and directions* (pp. 184-287). Chicago: American Marketing Association.~~

~~Jarvis, L.P., & Wilcox, J.B. (1973). Evoked set size - some theoretical foundations and empirical evidence. In T.V. Greer (Ed.), *Combined proceedings of the fall conference of the American Marketing Association*, Volume **35** (pp. 236-40). Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association.~~

Johnson, M.D. & Lehmann, D.R. (1997). Consumer experience and consideration sets for brands and product categories. *Advances in Consumer Research* ***24*** (1), 295-300.

Kahneman, D., & Frederick, S. (2002). Representativeness revisited: Attribute substitution in intuitive judgment. In T. Gilovich, D. Griffin, & D. Kahneman (Eds.), *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgement* (pp. 49-81). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kaminakis, K., Karantinou, K., Koritos, C., & Gounaris, S. (2019). Hospitality servicescape effects on customer-employee interactions: A multilevel study. *Tourism Management,* 72, 130-144.

Kapferer, J.N., & Laurent, G. (1993). Further evidence on the consumer involvement profile: Five antecedents of involvement. *Psychology & Marketing*, ***10***(4), 347-355.

Kardes, F., Kalyanaram, C., Chandrashekaran, M. & Dornoff, R. (1993). Brand retrieval, consideration set composition, consumer choice, and the pioneering advantage. *Journal of Consumer Research* ***20***(1), 62-75. doi: 10.1086/209333.

Kardes, F.R., Posavac, S.S., & Cronley, M.L. (2004). Consumer inference: A review of processes, bases, and judgment contexts. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, ***14***(3), 230-256.

Komter, A. (2007). Gifts and social relations: The mechanisms of reciprocity. *International Sociology*, ***22***(1), 93-107.

Lacey, S., Bruwer, J., & Li, E. (2009). The role of perceived risk in wine purchase decisions in restaurants. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, *21*(2), 99–117. https://doi.org/10.1108/17511060910967962

Lapersonne, E., Laurent, G., & Le Goff, J.J. (1995). Consideration sets of size one: An empirical investigation of automobile industry. *International Journal of Research in Marketing,* ***12***(1), 55-66.

Lastovicka, J.L., & Gardner, D.M. (1979). Components of involvement. In J. Maloney, & B. Silverman (Eds.), *Attitude research plays for high stakes* (pp. 53-73). Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association.

Lee, A.Y. (2002). Effects of implicit memory on memory-based versus stimulus-based brand choice. *Journal of Marketing Research, **39***(4), 440-454.

Lee, Z., & Sargeant, A. (2011). Dealing with social desirability bias: An application to charitable giving. *European Journal of Marketing*, ***45***(5), 703-719.

Li, H., Zhang, Z., Meng, F. and Zhang, Z. (2019), "When you write review' matters: the interactive effect of prior online reviews and review temporal distance on consumers' restaurant evaluation", International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 1273-1291.

Lockshin, L., Jarvis, W., d'Hauteville, F., & Perrouty, J.-P. (2006). Using simulations from discrete choice experiments to measure consumer sensitivity to brand, region, price, and awards in wine choice. *Food Quality and Preference*, *17*(3–4), 166–178.

Macklin, M., & Walker, M. (1988). The joy and irritation of gift giving. *Developments in Marketing Science **11***, 28–32.

Martin, I.M., & Steward, D.W. (2001). The differential impact of goal congruency on attitudes, intentions, and the transfer of brand equity. *Journal of Marketing Research **38*** (4), 471-493. doi: 10.1509/jmkr.38.4.471.18912.

Medin, D.L., Goldstone, R.L., & Markman, A.B. (1995). Comparison and Choice: Relations between Similarity Processes and Decision Processes, Psychonomic Bulletin and Review, ***2*** (1), 1-19.

Miller, G.A. (1956). The magic number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits in our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review, **63***, 81-97.

Mitchell, A.A. (1980). The Use of an Information Processing Approach to Understand Advertising Effects, *Advances in Consumer Research, 7*, 171-177.

Mitra, A. & Lynch, Jr. J.G. (1995). Toward a reconciliation of market power and information theories of advertising effects on price elasticity. *Journal of Consumer Research* **21** (4), 644-59. doi: 10.1086/209425.

Namkung, Y. and Jang, S. (2008), "Are highly satisfied restaurant customers really different? A quality perception perspective", International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 142-155.

Nedungadi, P. (1990). Recall & consumer consideration sets: influencing choice without altering brand evaluations. *Journal of Consumer Research* **17** (3), 263-276. doi: 10.1086/208556.

NFG (Network for Good). 2006. Impulse on the Internet: How Crisis Compels Donors to Give Online. [Online]. Accessed 1st August 2020 from: www.networkforgood.org

Oscarsson, H., & Rosema, M. (2019). Consideration set models of electoral choice: Theory, method, and application. *Electoral studies*, ***57***, 256-262.

Ostrom, T.M., & Brock, T.C. (1968). A cognitive model of attitudinal involvement. In R.P. Abelson, E. Aronson, W.J. MeGuire, T.M. Newcomb, M.J. Rosenberg, & E.H. Tannenbaum (Eds.), *Theories of cognitive consistency: A sourcebook* (pp. 373-383). Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Park, C.W., & Moon, B.J. (2003). The relationship between product involvement and product knowledge: Moderating roles of product type and product knowledge type. *Psychology & Marketing*, ***20***(11), 977-997.

Park, S.-Y. (1998). A comparison of Korean and American gift-giving behaviors. *Psychology & Marketing* **15** (6), 577-593. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1520-6793(199809)15:6<577::AID-MAR6>3.3.CO;2-N.

Paulssen, M., & Bagozzi, R.P. (2005). A self-regulatory model of consideration set formation. *Psychology & Marketing*, ***22***(10), 785-812.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1958). The Measurement and Correlates of Category Width as a Cognitive Variable. *Journal of Personality*, ***26***(4), 532-544.

Petty, R.E., & Cacioppo, J.T (1979). Effects of forewarning of persuasive intent and involvement on cognitive responses and persuasion. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* **5**(2), 173-176.

~~Petty, R.E., & Cacioppo, J.T. (1981). Issue involvement as a moderator of the effects on attitude of advertising content and context. *Advances in Consumer Research,* ***8***(1), 20-24.~~

Petty, R.E., & Cacioppo, J.T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Volume **19** (pp. 123-205). Orlando, Fl: Academy Press.

Petty, R.E., & Cacioppo, J.T. (1990). Involvement and persuasion: Tradition versus integration. *Psychological Bulletin,* ***107*** (1), 367-374.

Petty, R.E., Cacioppo, J.T., & Goldman, R. (1981). Personal involvement as a determinant of argument-based persuasion. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, ***41***(5), 847.

Pezenka, I., & Weismayer, C. (2020). Which factors influence locals' and visitors' overall restaurant evaluations?. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management.

Pieters, R.G., & Verplanken, B. (1995). Intention-behaviour consistency: Effects of consideration set size, involvement and need for cognition. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, ***25***(5), 531-543.

Punj, G. & Srinivasan, N. (1989). Influence of expertise and purchase experience on the formation of evoked sets. *Advances in consumer research* **16** (1), 507-14.

Raju, S. & Unnava, H.R. (2005). Brand commitment and the size of the consideration set. *Advances in Consumer Research*, **32** (1), 151-52.

Reilly, M. & Parkinson, T.L. (1985). Individual and product correlates of evoked set size for consumer package goods. *Advances in Consumer Research* **12** (1), 492-7.

Reynolds, D., Rahman, I., Bernard, S., & Holbrook, A. (2018). What effect does wine bottle closure type have on perceptions of wine attributes?. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 75, 171-178.

Richins, M.L., & Bloch, P.H. (1986). After the new wears off: The temporal context of product involvement. *Journal of Consumer Research, **13***(2), 280-285.

Rizomyliotis, I., Konstantoulaki, K., Kostopoulos, G., & Poulis, A. (2017). Reassessing the influence of mental intangibility on consumer decision-making. *International Journal of Market Research*, ***59***(4), 409-421.

Rothschild, M.L. (1979). Advertising Strategies for High and Low Involvement Situations. In J.C. Maloney and B. Silverman (Eds.) *Attitude Research Plays for High Stakes* (pp.74-93). Chicago: American Marketing Association.

Rottenstreich, Y., Sood, S., & Brenner, L. (2007). Feeling and thinking in memory-based versus stimulus-based choice. *Journal of Consumer Research* **33** (4), 461-469. doi: 10.1086/510219.

Sanbonmatsu, D.M., & Fazio, R.H. (1990). The role of attitudes in memory-based decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, **59***(4), 614-622.

Schamp, C., Heitmann, M., & Katzenstein, R. (2019). Consideration of ethical attributes along the consumer decision-making journey. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, ***47***(2), 328-348.

Sherif, C.W., Sherif, M., & Nebergall, R.E. (1965). *Attitude and attitude change: The social judgment-involvement approach*. Philadelphia: Saunders.

Sherif, M., & C.L. Hovland. (1961). *Social Judgment. Assimilation and Contrasts Effects in Communication and Attitude Change.* New Haven: 'Yale University Press.

Sherry Jr, J.F. (1983). Gift giving in anthropological perspective. *Journal of consumer research*, ***10***(2), 157-168.

Tauber, E.M. (1972). Why Do People Shop? *Journal of Marketing, **36***(4), 46-49.

Terech, A., Bucklin, R.E., & Morrison, D.G. (2009). Consideration, choice, and classifying loyalty. *Marketing letters*, ***20***(3), 209.

Traylor, M.B., & Joseph, B.M. (1984). Measuring consumer involvement in products: Developing a general scale. *Psychology & Marketing* **1** (2), 65-77. doi: 10.1002/mar.4220010207.

Troye, S.V. (1984). Evoked Set Formation as a Categorization Process. In T.C. Kinnear (Ed.), *Advances in consumer research*, Volume **11** (pp. 180-186). Provo UT: Association for Consumer Research.

Tulving, E. (1983). *Elements of episodic memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tversky, A. (1972). Elimination by aspects: A theory of choice *Psychological Review*, **79** (4), 281-299.

Tversky, A. Simonson, I. (1993). Context-dependent preferences. *Management Science*, **39** (October), 1179-1189.

Veseth, M. (2013, January 8). *How Much Choice Do Wine Drinkers Really Have?* The Wine Economist. https://wineeconomist.com/2013/01/08/how-much-choice/

Viot, C. (2012). Subjective knowledge, product attributes and consideration set: A wine application. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*.

Weisfeld-Spolter, S., Rippé, C.B., & Gould, S. (2015). Impact of giving on self and impact of self on giving. *Psychology & Marketing*, ***32***(1), 1-14.

Wu, J. & Rangaswamy, A. (2003). A fuzzy set model of search and consideration with an application to an online market. *Marketing Science*, **22** (Summer), 411-434.

Yang, Y., & Paladino, A. (2015). The case of wine: Understanding Chinese gift-giving behavior. *Marketing Letters*, *26*(3), 335–361. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-015-9355-0

Yoo, J., Park, H., & Kim, W. (2018). Compromise effect and consideration set size in consumer decision-making. *Applied Economics Letters*, ***25***(8), 513-517.

Zaichkowsky, J.L. (1985). Measuring the involvement construct. *Journal of Consumer Research, **12***(3), 341-352.

Zhang, S. & A.B. Markman (2001). Processing Product Unique Features: Alignability and Involvement in Preference Construction. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, **11**(1), 13-27.