

Decoy Effect In Search Interaction

Understanding User Behavior and Measuring System Vulnerability

NUO CHEN, Waseda University, Japan and The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, China

JIQUN LIU, The University of Oklahoma, USA

HANPEI FANG, Waseda University, Japan

YUANKAI LUO, Beihang University, China and The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, China

TETSUYA SAKAI, Waseda University, Japan

XIAO-MING WU, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, China

This study addresses (1) the underexplored influence of the *decoy effect*, a cognitive bias where the presence of an inferior item alters preferences between two options, on users' search interactions and (2) how to measure information retrieval systems' *vulnerability* to the decoy effect¹. From the perspective of user behavior, this study investigates the influence of the decoy effect in information retrieval (IR) by examining how decoy results affect users' interaction on search engine result pages (SERPs), particularly in terms of click-through likelihood, browsing dwell time, and perceived document usefulness. To assess the impact of identified decoy results on users' search behavior, we conducted an experiment based upon regression analysis on user interaction logs from three publicly available user study datasets which in total encompass 24 topics, 841 unique search sessions, and 2,685 queries. The findings indicate that decoys significantly increase the likelihood of document clicks and perceived usefulness. To investigate whether the influence of the decoy varies across different levels of task difficulty and user knowledge, we ran an additional round of experiments on one of the three datasets, which encompasses 6 topics, 166 search sessions and 652 queries. The result indicates that when the task is less challenging, users are more likely to click the target document, the time they spent on the target document is longer and the usefulness score they assign to the target document is higher; When users have lower knowledge levels about the topic, they tend to assign higher usefulness ratings to the target document.

Regarding IR system evaluation, this study provides empirical insights into measuring the vulnerability of text retrieval models to potential decoy effect. An evaluation metric, namely DEcoy Judgement and Assessment VUnerability (DEJA-VU), is proposed to evaluate the possibility of a retrieval model ranking results in a way that could trigger decoy biases. The experiments on the TREC 19 DL passage retrieval task and the TREC 20 DL passage retrieval task demonstrate that ColBERT and SPLADE show higher relevance-oriented retrieval effectiveness while also displaying lower vulnerability to decoy effect. This work advances the understanding of decoy effect, a well-established concept in cognitive psychology and behavioral economics, in a novel application field (i.e. IR), and also contribute to the modeling of *boundedly rational* users' search behavior under the impact of cognitive biases. Our experiments also integrate the knowledge of decoy effect with ranker evaluation and pave the path towards balanced, bias-aware IR evaluation.

CCS Concepts: • **Information systems** → **Users and interactive retrieval**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: cognitive bias, web search, search interaction, evaluation measure

¹This article is a follow-up study of the NTCIR EVIA paper of Chen *et al.* [15]. The Experiment 1 in this article is mainly based on the work of the EVIA paper, but the Experiment 1 in this article is conducted on one more new dataset (THUIR2018 [60]) in comparison to the EVIA paper. Experiment 2 and Experiment 3 in this article are entirely new and have not been reported bef.

Authors' addresses: **Nuo Chen**, pleviumtan@outlook.com, Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan and The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China; **Jiqun Liu**, The University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma, USA, jiqunliu@ou.edu; **Hanpei Fang**, Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan; **Yuankai Luo**, Beihang University, Beijing, China and The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China; **Tetsuya Sakai**, tetsuyasakai@acm.org, Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan; **Xiao-Ming Wu**, xiao-ming.wu@polyu.edu.hk, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China.

2024. Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

1

ACM Reference Format:

Nuo Chen, Jiqun Liu, Hanpei Fang, Yuankai Luo, Tetsuya Sakai, and Xiao-Ming Wu. 2024. Decoy Effect In Search Interaction: Understanding User Behavior and Measuring System Vulnerability. 1, 1 (March 2024), 32 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Characterizing the cognitive processes, behavioral patterns, and decision-making mechanisms that users exhibit while engaging with search systems constitutes a core research endeavor within the domain of interactive Information Retrieval (IR). In recent years, the exploration of *cognitive biases* and their impact on the information seeking and retrieval behaviors and outcomes has garnered increasing attention [2, 55]. A cognitive bias is a systematic pattern of deviations in thinking which may lead to irrational judgements and problematic decision-making [91, 93]. Contrary to the (over)simplified assumptions of globally rational users (*i.e.*, users will rationally and comprehensively weigh the benefits and costs incurred during the search process before making decisions such as clicking or re-querying.) that form the basis of various existing user models and evaluation metrics, users are frequently affected by a range of systematic cognitive biases, emotions, mental shortcuts and heuristics [1, 55, 56, 63]. As a result, predictions made by models based on the assumption of global rationality could show significant divergence from the actual decisions and retrospective assessments of users [55, 58, 107].

The *decoy effect*, which is one kind of cognitive biases, describes a situation in which individuals alter their preference between two initial choices when introduced to a third (*i.e.* the decoy), which is asymmetrically inferior to one of the initial choice [31]. Figure 1 illustrates an example of the decoy effect in shopping decision-making. In a shop, a customer who intends to buy a beverage might waver between a 500ml bottle of water (for \$1.19) and a bottle of soda with a similar size (for \$1.49). While the water is more affordable, the soda may offer a superior taste, making the decision challenging. The final choice may rest on the consumer's relative utility assessment of these options. Yet, with a 250ml bottle of water for \$1.09 presenting beside the 500ml water, the customer might lean towards the 500ml water, as they perceive a substantial relative gain from the comparison of the 500ml water and the 250ml water: spending an additional \$0.10 to purchase a 500ml bottle of water, compared to the 250ml one, evidently presents a highly economical deal. In the above example, the 250ml water serves as the *decoy* to the *target* 500ml water.

The investigation of decoy effects is of significant practical importance, as evidenced through both empirical studies and real-world applications. In the context of marketing and e-commerce, understanding how the introduction of decoy products influences consumer preferences can enable companies to craft more effective pricing and product positioning strategies, leading to altered consumer decision-making and increased profits [69, 89, 90, 102, 103]. In the field of IR, gaining insights into the decoy effect can enable researchers to gain a better understanding of the preferences and judgments of real-life users (as opposed to simulated agents) towards information objects, leading to more accurate predictions of their behavior. However, the decoy effect has not received significant attention from the IR community up to the present. Eickhoff [26] examined the impact of a decoy document on thresholds and strategies in crowdsourcing relevance judgments, showing that assessors could increase the relevance rating of target document when it is shown with the decoy document. Nevertheless, Eickhoff [26] only focuses on crowdsourcing assessors operating within the annotation interface and few researches currently addresses how the decoy effect influences user interactions on Search Engine Result Pages (SERPs).

To address the research gap mentioned above and take a step forward towards the vision of human-centered information retrieval, we seek to understand how decoy effect at the document level influences users' interaction



Fig. 1. An example of the decoy effect. A customer might waver between the 500ml water and the soda. Yet, with a bottle of 250ml water presenting beside the 500ml water, the customer might lean towards the 500ml water. The image is generated by DALL-E-3 and edited by the authors.

behaviors on SERPs, such as clicks, browsing dwell time, and usefulness judgments. Specifically, our work seeks to answer following **Research Questions (RQ)**:

- **RQ1:** How, and to what extent, the presence of a decoy influences the likelihood of a document being clicked, the browsing duration on it, and its perceived usefulness?
- **RQ2:** Does the extent to which the decoy effect influences user behavior vary according to the task difficulty? If so, how does the decoy effect influence user behavior differently across varying levels of task difficulty?
- **RQ3:** Does the impact of the decoy effect on user behavior relate to the user's level of prior knowledge scale about the search topic? If so, how does the decoy effect influence user behavior differently across varying levels of the user's prior knowledge scale?
- **RQ4:** How can we measure the vulnerability of rankers to decoy effect?

To empirically demonstrate the impact of the decoy effect on user-document interaction behavior, we conduct user log mining and analysis on three publicly available user behavior datasets (refer to Section 4). We utilize Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression for analysis to observe the influence of the presence of decoys on the likelihood of document clicks, browsing duration time, and perceived usefulness score (refer to Section 5). In addition, we investigate whether there are differences in the impact of the decoy effect on user behavior under different task difficulties and user prior knowledge levels (refer to Section 6). Finally, we address how to evaluate the system's vulnerability to the decoy effect. We select several commonly used text retrieval models based on sparse and dense vector representations and calculated the number of decoy pairs returned by these systems at different cutoffs, as well as the nDCG [33] scores and recall scores, on 97 topics from both the TREC 19 DL passage retrieval [23] and TREC 20 DL passage retrieval [22] tracks. Based on the observed results from the experiment, we propose a heuristic evaluation metric called **DEcoy Judgement and Assessment VULnerability (DEJA-VU)** for evaluating the vulnerability of text retrieval models to the decoy effect (refer to Section 7).

The experimental result demonstrates that: (1) While keeping other conditions constant, when a decoy is present, in comparison to when it is absent, there is an increase in the likelihood of a document being clicked and its perceived usefulness. (2) While keeping other conditions constant, when the search task is more difficult, users are less likely to click on documents having a decoy compared to situations where the search task is less difficult. They also spend less time on documents having a decoy and provide lower usefulness scores for such documents. (3) While keeping other conditions constant, when users have a lower level of prior knowledge about the retrieval topic, they tend to assign higher usefulness scores to the document having a decoy. (4) The vulnerability of text retrieval systems to the decoy effect cannot be simply measured by the number of decoy pairs. When evaluating the vulnerability of text retrieval models to the decoy effect, it is essential to consider various factors, including effectiveness, in a comprehensive manner. Based on the above points, we have developed a metric for measuring the vulnerability to the decoy effect. According to the metric scores, when the cutoff is small, TCT-ColBERT demonstrates higher effectiveness while exhibiting lower vulnerability to the decoy effect, followed by SPLADE++.

The main contribution of our paper are three-fold:

- This work extends the understanding of decoy effect, a well-established concept in cognitive psychology and behavioral economics, in a novel application field (i.e. interactive IR). By analyzing logs collected from real users, this study provides empirical evidence on how the presence of a decoy influences user interactions, such as click patterns, browsing durations, and perceived usefulness of documents, on SERPs. As far as we know, this is the first study to address the influence of the decoy effect on users' open domain information seeking behavior.
- The research uniquely contributes to the understanding of how the decoy effect shapes user behavior under different search task difficulties and the user's prior knowledge levels. It highlights how varying task complexities and users' prior knowledge levels can alter the impact of cognitive biases on interactive information search. This study enhances previous work on how tasks and search tasks influence users' information seeking and search behavior (e.g., [9, 10, 40, 57, 59]) from the perspective of cognitive bias.
- We propose a metric for evaluating the vulnerability of text retrieval systems to the decoy effect. This metric can be applied in both online and offline evaluation practices, guiding developers towards improving existing text retrieval systems by enhancing effectiveness while mitigating the vulnerability to the decoy effect. The findings of this study are instrumental in informing the design of search systems and the assessment of cognitive debiasing techniques. By adding new bias dimensions to current user modeling frameworks, it enhances the human-centered evaluation of search systems, particularly in how they can accommodate and mitigate cognitive biases in user interactions.

This study, through the perspective of behavioral economics, delves deeper into the behavioral patterns and decision-making processes of users interacting with search engines. The findings stand to encourage IR researchers to increase the explanatory power of formal search models from a realistic behavioral and psychological foundation.

The structure of the entire text is as follows: Section 2 introduces previous work in the areas of cognitive biases, behavioral economics, and interactive search; Section 3 presents our research questions; Section 4 provides an overview of the user study datasets used in the first two experiments and how we processed the datasets; Section 5 describes the methodology and experimental results of our first experiment; Section 6 outlines the methodology and experimental results of our second experiment; Section 7 details the methodology and experimental results of our third experiment. Section 8 summarizes our findings and discusses some open questions.

2 RELATED WORK

This section introduces the fundamental concepts and the interdisciplinary approaches underpinning our study.

2.1 Cognitive Biases in Interactive Information Seeking and Retrieval

Insights from cognitive psychology and behavioral economics suggest that, *cognitive biases* arise from one's limited cognitive ability when there are not enough resources to properly collect and process available information [45]. Due to cognitive biases, one's decisions under uncertainty can systematically deviate from what is expected given rational decision-making models [91–93].

Characterizing the cognitive processes, behavioral patterns, and decision-making mechanisms that users exhibit whilst engaging with search systems constitutes a core research endeavor within the domain of interactive Information Retrieval (IR). Contrary to the implicit assumptions prevalent in the majority of existing user models, users do not exhibit global rationality (e.g. always pursuing optimal utility, having full access to information for decision-making and unlimited cognitive resources for analyzing gains and costs). Instead, they are bounded rationality and are frequently affected by a range of systematic cognitive biases, emotions, mental shortcuts and heuristics [1, 55, 56, 63], which usually lead to significant divergence between the predictions made by models based on the assumption of global rationality and the actual decisions and retrospective assessments of users [55, 58, 107]. Previous studies in the field of interactive IR have demonstrated that, due to the inherent nature of cognitive biases, certain individuals are more susceptible or more likely to be influenced by biased judgments arising from interaction contexts (e.g., cognitive load, domain knowledge) [6, 49] and individual characteristics [74].

In search and recommendation contexts, interactions between individuals and systems could lead to the incorporation of behavioral signals, influenced by *cognitive biases*, into datasets used for training machine learning algorithms, thereby potentially magnifying existing system biases [2, 55]. Cognitive biases might also result in significant deviations in users' behaviors and judgements from optimal or desired outcomes. Consequently, this could give rise to unfair decisions and outcomes between users who are more susceptible to certain biases and contextual triggers and those who are not [56].

Therefore, with an increasing number of individuals turning to search and recommendation systems to access and utilize information for life decisions, the influence of cognitive biases on the information retrieval process is drawing heightened attention from IR researchers. Thus far, a lot of studies have explored the influence of cognitive biases such as the anchoring effect [85], the priming effect [11, 84], the ordering effect [5], and the reference dependence effect [58, 96] on document examination, relevance judgment, and evaluation of whole-session search satisfaction.

2.2 Decoy Effect

In this paper, we specifically shed light on one of the cognitive effects, the *decoy effect*. The *decoy effect*, which is one kind of cognitive biases, describes a situation in which individuals alter their preference between two initial choices when introduced to a third (i.e. the decoy), which is asymmetrically inferior to one of the initial choice [31]. Figure 1 illustrates an example of the decoy effect in shopping decision-making. In a shop, a customer who intends to buy a beverage might hesitate between a 500ml bottle of water (priced at \$1.19) and a similarly sized bottle of soda (priced at \$1.49). While the water is more affordable, the soda may offer a superior taste, making the decision challenging. The final choice may rest on the consumer's relative utility assessment of these options. However, when a 250ml bottle of water (priced at \$1.09) is displayed alongside the 500ml water, the customer may incline towards the 500ml water, discerning a notable relative advantage from the comparison of the 500ml water and the 250ml water: spending an

additional \$0.10 to purchase a 500ml bottle of water, compared to the 250ml one, evidently presents a highly economical deal. In the above example, the 250ml water serves as the *decoy* to the *target* 500ml water.

In the fields of marketing and e-commerce, there have been some studies exploring the impact of the decoy effect [69, 89, 90, 102, 103]. However, in the field of information retrieval, it is not clear how the decoy effect influences user interactions with and evaluations on Search Engine Result Pages. The work most closely related to ours in theme is that of Eickhoff [26], which shows that when a relevant item is presented alongside two non-relevant items, with one non-relevant item being distinctly inferior (i.e., the decoy), assessors tend to rate the superior non-relevant document as more relevant. Nevertheless, Eickhoff [26] only focuses on crowdsourcing assessors operating within the annotation interface and our study addresses how the decoy effect could influence user interactions on SERPs, which is a broader scenario.

2.3 Ranking Models in Information Retrieval

Traditional IR ranking models rely on exact lexical matching, such as Boolean retrieval, BM25 [77, 78], and statistical language models [46]. These retrieval models, also known as *Bag of Words* (BOW) models, are based on sparse vector representation and process queries by organizing documents into inverted indices, wherein each unique term is associated with an inverted list that stores information regarding the documents in which it appears. However, the token-based sparse representation of text cannot fully capture the semantic nuances of each term within the entire textual context. These retrieval models thus suffer from the problem of vocabulary mismatch or semantic mismatch (i.e., relevant documents may not contain terms that appear in the query).

One approach to deal with the vocabulary mismatch is to use *dense vectors*, which represent the text in a continuous vector space with predefined dimensions and the dimension is not dependent on the length of the text. The advantage of this approach is that text with similar semantics is typically represented by vectors that are close to each other in the vector space. Ranking models based on dense vectors is referred to as *dense retrieval* models. Dense retrieval models include Dense Passage Retriever (DPR) [39], Contriever [32], Approximate nearest neighbor Negative Contrastive Learning (ANCE) [105], ColBERT [41], Sentence-BERT (SBERT) [76], and so forth. Many dense retrieval models utilize BERT [25] for encoding queries and passages (e.g., [39, 41, 76, 105]) and utilize techniques such as contrastive learning (e.g., [39, 105]) or Siamese Network (e.g., [76]) during the training process, achieving better semantic matching effectiveness compared to BM25 algorithm on benchmarks such as MS MARCO ².

On the other hand, *sparse representations* based on pre-training language models (PLMs) have also garnered increasing interest because they inherently inherit desirable properties of lexical models in their design. For example, COntextualized Inverted List (COIL) [29] learns dense term-level representations to perform contextualized lexical matching; uniCOIL [50] further simplifies the approach by learning a single weight per term. SParse Lexical ANd Expansion (SPLADE) [28] directly learns high-dimensional sparse representations that are capable of jointly performing expansion and re-weighting with the help of the PLM’s masked language modeling head and sparse regularization. These sparse retrieval models also achieved better semantic matching ability compared to BM25 algorithm on benchmarks such as MS MARCO.

In this study, we do not focus on improving the specific structure of ranking algorithms. Instead, we are interested in whether different ranking models return document retrieval results with varying degrees of vulnerability to the decoy effect, and how to measure such vulnerability (refer to Section 7).

²<https://microsoft.github.io/msmarco/>

2.4 The Evaluation of Information Retrieval Systems

The Evaluation of information retrieval systems is one of the main research interests in the information retrieval community. Existing evaluation methods can be broadly divided into two classes, *user-based* (or online) evaluation and *test collection-based* (or offline) evaluation [94].

Online methods rely on users' implicit or explicit online signals (such as A/B tests, click models [20], time-based models [80, 87], machine learning based methods [16, 35, 67, 97], *etc.*) as feedback to measure the effectiveness of IR systems, which goes beyond the main scope of this article.

Offline evaluation is often built upon different assumptions and simulations regarding the process of a user interacting with a search system [54, 83]. A range of evaluation metrics involving explicit or implicit user behaviour models have been proposed and examined on test collections, including Discounted Cumulative Gain (DCG) [33] and its variants, Rank-Biased Precision (RBP) [71], Expected Reciprocal Rank (ERR) [12], INST [70], *etc.* As described in Section 2.1, most offline evaluation metrics treat users as globally rational decision makers when simulating interactions with search engines, but this assumption has been increasingly challenged recently. In recent years, with the growing knowledge about users' cognitive biases, some works in the field of IR system evaluation began to introduce cognitive biases into the construction and meta-evaluation of evaluation metrics [14, 17, 107]. However, there is few work that incorporates the decoy effect into the calculation of IR system evaluation metrics. To address this gap, in this study, we propose an offline evaluation metric to measure the potential vulnerability to the decoy effect of IR systems (refer to Section 7.4). Unlike most offline evaluation metrics mentioned earlier, the DEJA-VU score is not based on how users accumulate gains from relevant documents during the interaction with SERP. Instead, the DEJA-VU score considers the system's ability to return highly relevant documents (the higher the better) while also accounting for the presence of decoy pairs in the results (the lower the better). This is because the factors affecting the number of decoy pairs are complex, so we hope that the metric scores will prefer systems that return more highly relevant documents while returning fewer decoy pairs.

3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

To address the research gap mentioned above, in this study, we seek to understand how the decoy effect at the document level influences users' interaction behaviors on SERPs, such as clicks, browsing dwell time, and usefulness perceptions. Specifically, our work sought to answer following **Research Question** (RQ):

- **RQ1:** How, and to what extent, the presence of a decoy influences the likelihood of a document being clicked, the browsing duration on it, and its perceived usefulness?
- **RQ2:** To what extent does impact of decoy items on user behavior vary across tasks of varying difficulty?
- **RQ3:** How is the behavioral impact of decoy item associated with users' topic knowledge?
- **RQ4:** How should we measure the vulnerability of information retrieval systems to decoy effect?

The four questions presented are interconnected, forming the multi-layered research framework of this study. **RQ1** lays the groundwork by providing a fundamental understanding of the influence of the decoy effect on users' interaction and perception. **RQ2** and **RQ3** delve deeper into the complexity of the influence of the decoy effect from two distinct dimensions: task difficulty and users' prior knowledge, respectively. **RQ4** applies the insights from the first three RQs to practical system design, seeking a balance between improving effectiveness and mitigating the vulnerability to the decoy effect.

Furthermore, these four research questions aim to identify and understand human biases within information retrieval systems, and to measure such biases, for instance, the decoy effect in this study, to guide developers in formulating algorithms to mitigate these biases in practice. This approach is critical for enhancing the reliability and user-centered nature of information retrieval systems, ensuring that they not only return relevant results but also do so in a manner that is cognizant of and resilient to inherent human biases.

4 USER BEHAVIOR DATASETS AND DATA PROCESSING

4.1 Summary of the User Behavior Datasets

In this section, we introduce the user study datasets employed in our first two experiments. All these datasets are publicly available and the data are collected under the controlled laboratory setting. During the process of data collection, participants were instructed to execute a given intricate search tasks utilizing commercial search engines in Chinese, and the interaction behavior is trailed by a plugin on the browser. Figure 2 displays an example of the SERP returned by a commercial search engine in the user studies.

The THUIR2016 dataset [66] encompasses a total of 9 topics, 225 search sessions and 933 queries, along with the title and snippets on the SERP of each query. It also contains 4-level user self-rating usefulness scores for the items they clicked and 5-level graded relevance labels collected from external assessors.

The THU-KDD dataset [61] encompasses a total of 9 topics, 450 search sessions and around 1100 queries, along with the title and snippets on the SERP of each query. It also contains 4-level user self-rating usefulness scores for the items they clicked and 4-level graded relevance labels collected from external assessors.

The THUIR2018 dataset [60] encompasses a total of 6 topics, 166 search sessions and around 652 queries, along with the html file of the SERP of each query. It also contains 4-level user self-rating usefulness scores for the items they clicked and 4-level graded relevance labels collected from external assessors. Additionally, participants were requested to provide an evaluation of the task difficulty and knowledge in the task both before starting tasks and upon completing tasks, utilizing a scale ranging from 1 (low) to 5 (high).

Table 1 provides a summary of the three datasets.

Dataset	Language	#topics	#sessions	#queries	Usefulness Lv.	Rel. Lv.	#participants
THUIR2016 [66]	Chinese	9	225	933	4	5	25
THU-KDD [61]	Chinese	9	450	1,092	4	4	50
THUIR2018 [60]	Chinese	6	166	652	4	4	28

Table 1. Summary of datasets used in this study. *Rel.* stands for “relevance” and *Lv.* stands for “level”.

4.2 Data Processing Flow

To identify potential decoy instances in user logs, we first propose a definition of a decoy pair. A pair of documents, composed of the *target document* and the *decoy document* (t, d), constitutes a **decoy pair** if and only if the following conditions are met: (1) t and d share certain degree of similarity in content, albeit not identical, i.e., $S_{\min} \leq \text{similarity}(t, d) \leq S_{\max}$, where S_{\min} and S_{\max} respectively represent the minimum and maximum similarity thresholds; (2) d is inferior in quality to t , i.e., $\text{quality}(t) > \text{quality}(d)$; (3) the position of t and d within a SERP is close enough, i.e., $\text{quality}(t) > \text{quality}(d)$; (3) the position t and d within a SERP is close enough, i. e., $|\text{rank}(t) - \text{rank}(d)| \leq \Delta_{\text{rank}}$.



Fig. 2. An example of the SERP interfaces used for collecting user behavior in the user study datasets. Sourced from the THUIR2018 dataset [60].

In this study, we calculated the cosine similarity between each pair of documents under the same topic and designated S_{\min} as the 99th percentile of document similarity in each dataset. For S_{\max} , we set it as 0.95. In THUIR2016 dataset S_{\min} stands at 0.626; in THU-KDD dataset S_{\min} stands at 0.594, and in THUIR2018 dataset S_{\min} stands at 0.574. For the second condition, we employ the relevance scores given by external assessors as the measurement of document quality, mandating that $\text{relevance}(t) - \text{relevance}(d) \geq 2$ to ensure that the decoy is substantially inferior to the target. For the third condition, we require the absolute value of the difference of the rank between t and d is smaller than or equal to 5 ($\Delta_{\text{rank}} = 5$). We processed the top 10 documents in each SERP on all datasets adhering to the aforementioned three conditions, and we identified 982 records of decoy pairs involving 318 distinct target documents in the THUIR2016 dataset; 922 records of decoy pairs involving 376 distinct target documents in the THU-KDD dataset; and 413 records of

decoy pairs involving 98 distinct target documents in the THUIR2018 dataset. In the following discourse, we denote the set consisting of all target documents in a corpus as \mathcal{T} .

To investigate whether user interactions with documents are disparate when no decoy is present compared to situations with a decoy, we assign some documents not in \mathcal{T} to the control group (*i.e.*, *control documents*), adhering to the following condition: A document c which is not in the set of target documents (*i.e.*, $c \notin \mathcal{T}$) is considered a control document if and only if it matches a target document $t \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\text{similarity}(c, t) \geq S_{\text{control}}$ and $|\text{relevance}(c) - \text{relevance}(t)| \leq 2$. We denote the set of all such c as C , and the set of all t that can match with at least one c as \mathcal{T}' , where $\mathcal{T}' \subset \mathcal{T}$. As mentioned above, we calculated the cosine similarity between each pair of documents under the same topic and designated S_{control} to the 99.5th percentile of document similarity in each dataset. In THUIR2016 dataset S_{control} stands at 0.709; in THU-KDD dataset S_{control} stands at 0.676; and in THUIR2018 dataset, S_{control} stands at 0.621. According to the aforementioned condition, we have identified 741 qualifying control documents in the THUIR2016 dataset, 1790 in the THU-KDD dataset and 219 in the THU-KDD dataset.

We then extracted interaction records of all control documents in the three datasets, obtaining 1384 records from THUIR2016, 2770 records from THU-KDD and 548 records from THUIR2018. Subsequently, from the records of decoy pairs in the three datasets (with 982 records from THUIR2016, 922 from THU-KDD and 413 from THUIR2018 respectively), we filter out all records where $t \in \mathcal{T}'$, obtaining 768, 839 and 219 records respectively. Note that, for decoy pairs from the same SERP interaction i , there could be situations where the same target document corresponds to multiple decoy documents. In our filtering process, we ensure that for a given SERP interaction i and a given target document t , only one record is eventually extracted. We concatenate the interaction records of target documents and control documents, ultimately obtaining three document interaction record lists of lengths 2123 for THUIR2016, 3598 for THU-KDD and 767 for THUIR2018 respectively. The three lists of interactions will be employed for the subsequent data analysis. In the subsequent analysis, we process the interaction signals as follows: for documents that have not been clicked, their usefulness score is assigned a value of 0, and their browsing duration is also set to 0. Figure 3 provides a brief outline of our data processing workflow.

5 EXPERIMENT 1: THE IMPACT OF DECOY ON INTERACTION BEHAVIORS

In order to address **RQ1**, in this section, we introduce the experiment conducted to investigate whether the presence of a decoy influences the probability of a document being clicked, its duration of browsing, and its perceived usefulness when compared to the conditions where no decoy is present. In the following text, we refer to documents that can be associated with a decoy in the context of SERP as *target documents*, and documents that cannot be associated with a decoy are referred to as *control documents*. For the detailed definition, see Section 4.2.

5.1 Preliminary Analysis

Table 2 reports the clickthrough proportion as well as the mean value of browsing duration and usefulness score across THUIR2016, THU-KDD and THUIR2018. From Table 2 one can observe that, apart from the THUIR2018 dataset, the differences between the target group and control group in terms of click probability, browsing duration, and usefulness are not statistically significant under t-test. Nevertheless, we observed inconsistencies in the distribution of document rankings between the target group and control group, which could potentially affect the results presented in and Table 2. Figure 4 shows the distribution of rank for both the target group and control group across the THUIR2016, THU-KDD, and THUIR2018. From Figure 4 one can observe that, across both datasets, the distribution of target documents and control documents over ranks substantially diverges. Taking into account that the rank position might also influence




Fig. 3. Data processing flow on THUIR2016, THU-KDD and THUIR2018. (1) First, we filter out decoy pairs from the search results and identify the SERP numbers where these decoy pairs are located. (2) Next, we determine documents that are similar to the target documents in the decoy pairs but do not have a decoy, serving as the control group. (3) Finally, we extract user interactions with both the target documents and control documents for further analysis.




Fig. 4. The distribution of rank for both the target group and control group across THUIR2016 (left), THU-KDD (middle), and THUIR2018 (right).

the click-through rate, browsing duration, and usefulness evaluation of a document, the results presented in and Table 2 could be subject to rank position bias [24, 104]. Hence, it is necessary to factor out any latent effects stemming from position biases on our results.

5.2 Regression Analysis

To control the impact caused by *rank position*, we employ regression analysis to investigate the relationships between the presence of a decoy and the probability of clicks, browsing duration, and usefulness scores. We constructed three

	THUIR2016			THU-KDD			THUIR2018		
	Target	Control	Sig. Lv.	Target	Control	Sig. Lv.	Target	Control	Sig. Lv.
Clickthrough prob.	0.139	0.139	-	0.227	0.207	-	0.306	0.175	***
Browsing duration	5.323	4.677	-	8.181	6.744	-	79.403	28.200	***
Usefulness score	0.361	0.322	-	0.867	0.780	-	0.598	0.237	***
# Observations	982	741		922	1790		413	219	

Table 2. The clickthrough probability as well as the mean value of browsing duration and usefulness score across THUIR2016, THU-KDD and THUIR2018. *Sig. Lv.* stands for “Significance Level”. *** indicates $p < 0.001$ under t-test.

regression models, taking whether the document is clicked (`is_clicked`), browsing duration (`duration`), and usefulness score (`usefulness`) as dependent variables respectively, and the presence of a decoy (`has_decoy`), the document’s rank (`rank`), task ID (`task_id`), and user ID (`user_id`) as independent variables. For `is_clicked`, we employ Logistic regression, and for `duration` and `usefulness`, we resort to Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression. Equation 1 presents the structure of the regression equation we employed.

$$y = \beta + \alpha x_{\text{has_decoy}} + \sum_{r=2}^R w_r x_r + \sum_{t=2}^T w_t x_t + \sum_{s=2}^S w_s x_s \quad (1)$$

In Equation 1, β represents the intercept, while $x_{\text{has_decoy}}$ denotes `has_decoy` and α denotes the regression coefficient for `has_decoy`. The term R signifies the deepest document rank position, and in our experiments, we have $R = 10$. The variable x_r is a binary indicator, taking the value of 1 if the current document’s rank position is r , and 0 otherwise; w_r is the regression coefficient associated with x_r . T stands for the number of tasks. In the datasets THUIR2016, THU-KDD, and THUIR2018, T is respectively 9, 9, and 6. The variable x_t is another binary indicator, which is set to 1 if the current document originates from the t -th task, and 0 otherwise; w_t is the regression coefficient for x_t . S stands for the number of participants. For the datasets THUIR2016, THU-KDD, and THUIR2018, the values of S are 25, 50, and 28, respectively. The variable x_s is a binary indicator that takes the value of 1 if the behavioral signals for the current document were collected from the s -th participant, and 0 otherwise; and w_s is its associated regression coefficient. In the regression equation, the values for r , t , and s start from 2 to circumvent the issue of multicollinearity. Finally, y represents the dependent variable in the regression equation. For the click behavior, given that we employed Logistic regression, the relation is given by $y = 1/(1 + \exp^{-\text{is_clicked}})$; for browsing duration and usefulness assessment, y is equated to `duration` and `usefulness` respectively.

Note that unlike common practices in computer science, in econometrics, regression models are predominantly employed for interpretation rather than for prediction. In a multiple regression model, each coefficient tells people the impact on the dependent variable of a one-unit change in that independent variable, holding all other independent variables constant [86]. In this study, we focus on elucidating how, and to what extent, the presence of a *decoy* influences the likelihood of a document being clicked, the browsing duration on it, and its perceived usefulness. Hence, we do not partition the dataset into training and test subsets; instead, we perform regression on the entirety of the data. Including `rank`, `task_id`, and `user_id` as independent variables serves to use them as *control variables* to mitigate the potential influences from rank position, task type, and individual characteristics on the outcomes, thus better elucidating how variations in `has_decoy` would affect the values of `is_clicked`, `duration`, and `usefulness`.

	THUIR2016	THU-KDD	THUIR2018
is_clicked	0.363*	0.217*	0.879***
duration	1.916	1.913	51.521***
usefulness	0.136 **	0.156 **	0.358***
# Observations	2123	3598	767

Table 3. The regression coefficient (α) of the independent variable `has_decoy` with the dependent variables `is_clicked`, `duration`, and `usefulness` on THUIR2016, THU-KDD and THUIR2018. *, ** and *** respectively indicate $p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$, and $p < 0.001$.

Table 3 shows the regression coefficient (α) of the independent variable `has_decoy` (h) with the dependent variables `is_clicked`, `duration` and `usefulness`. As previously stated, our focus in this research is to elucidate in what manner and to what extent the presence of a decoy impacts whether a document is clicked, the browsing duration, and the usefulness scores, and `rank`, `task_id`, and `user_id` are included merely to control for the effects brought by rank position, task, and individual characteristic respectively. Therefore, we opt to omit the reporting of the constant as well as the regression coefficients of `rank`, `task_id`, and `user_id` in the tables.

From Table 3, one can observe that: across all datasets, the presence of a *decoy* could exert a positive influence on the likelihood of being clicked (coefficient = 0.363, 0.217 and 0.879 respectively) and on the usefulness score (coefficient = 0.136, 0.156 and 0.358 respectively), all with a statistical significance at the level of $p < 0.05$. The existence of a *decoy* also seems to exert a positive impact on duration (coefficient = 1.916, 1.913 and 51.521 respectively), but this result is only statistically significant in the THUIR2018 dataset. This result indicates that, given the document rank, type of task, and individual characteristics, when a *decoy* is present, in comparison to the case when the decoy is absent, the likelihood of a document (the **target**) being clicked would increase; the usefulness score of the target perceived by the user would be elevated.

6 EXPERIMENT 2: THE IMPACT OF TASK DIFFICULTY AND USER KNOWLEDGE ON DECOY EFFECT

Through Experiment 1, we found that, when a document has a decoy, users are more likely to click on the document and tend to give it a higher usefulness score. This indicates the potential impact of cognitive biases on user interaction behavior. Additionally, previous studies in the field of interactive IR have demonstrated that, the nature of a user’s task could impact on their information-seeking behaviors [42, 59]. In more specific terms, specific task natures such as task type, task complexity and difficulty, as well as the stage of the task, have been identified as influential factors affecting users’ assessments of usefulness and relevance [7, 8, 57, 100]. On the other hand, previous empirical studies in interactive IR have shown that users’ prior knowledge of the topic may influence their search behavior, such as the dwell time during searches [57, 59, 65], or decisions on what results to click or skip [72, 82]. Previous work has also shown that, due to the inherent nature of cognitive biases, certain individuals are more susceptible or more likely to be influenced by biased judgments arising from interaction contexts (*e.g.*, cognitive load, domain knowledge) [6, 49] and individual characteristics [74]. Consequently, building upon Experiment 1 and previous work, we propose two additional research questions:

- Does the extent to which the decoy effect influences user behavior vary according to the nature of the task, such as its difficulty? If so, how does the decoy effect influence user behavior differently across varying levels of task difficulty (**RQ2**)?




Fig. 5. The distribution of task difficulty and prior knowledge scale reported by users across different topics in the THUIR2018 dataset. The red line represents the median.

- Does the impact of the decoy effect on user behavior relate to the user’s existing level of knowledge about the search topic? If so, does the influence of the decoy effect on user behavior vary at different levels of existing knowledge (**RQ3**)?

To address **RQ2** and **RQ3**, we conducted an additional analysis on the THUIR2018 dataset. As described in Section 4.1, the THUIR2018 dataset includes user-reported levels of task difficulty and prior knowledge about the task, both before starting and after completing the task. Figure 5 shows the distribution of task difficulty and prior knowledge scale scores across different topics and Table 4 presents the mean values of user-reported post-task difficulties for each task. We designate the three tasks with the highest average post-task difficulty as “high difficulty”. According to this criterion, a total of 315 records out of 767 records in the THUIR2018 dataset are from tasks of high difficulty, accounting for approximately 41.07% of the total.

Subsequently, based on Equation 1, we introduced the following new variables: *Is_High_Difficulty* (IHD), *Has_Decoy_is_High_Difficulty* (HDHD), *Is_Low_Knowledge* (ILK), *Has_Decoy_is_Low Knowledge* (HDLK).

These variables are all binary variable. IHD is set to 1 if the document is from a task designated as “high difficulty”, otherwise it is set to 0. HDHD is an interaction term of *has_decoy* and IHD. If a document has a decoy AND is from a task designated as “high difficulty”, then HDHD is set to 1; otherwise, it is set to 0. ILK is set to 1 if the document is from a task designated as “low knowledge”, otherwise it is set to 0. HDLK is an interaction term of *has_decoy* and ILK. If a document has a decoy AND is from a task designated as “low knowledge”, then HDLK is set to 1; otherwise, it is set to 0. The new regression model is presented as follows.

$$y = \beta + \alpha_{\text{has_decoy}}x_{\text{has_decoy}} + \alpha_{\text{HDHD}}x_{\text{HDHD}} + \alpha_{\text{ILK}}x_{\text{ILK}} + \alpha_{\text{HDLK}}x_{\text{HDLK}} + \sum_{r=2}^R w_r x_r + \sum_{t=2}^T w_t x_t + \sum_{s=2}^S w_s x_s \quad (2)$$

In Equation 2, $x_{\text{has_decoy}}$ represents *has_decoy* and $\alpha_{\text{has_decoy}}$ represents the regression coefficient for it; x_{HDHD} represents HDHD and α_{HDHD} represents the regression coefficient for it; x_{ILK} represents ILK and α_{ILK} represents the regression coefficient for it; x_{HDLK} represents HDLK and α_{HDLK} represents the regression coefficient for it. The definition of other symbols is consistent with Equation 1. Note that the variable IHD was not included in the regression model to avoid the issue of multicollinearity, as IHD can be obtained through a linear combination of x_t .

Table 5 shows the regression coefficients α_1 and α_2 with the dependent variables *is_clicked*, *duration* and *usefulness*. From Table 5 it can be observed that: (1) Under the condition that other variables are held constant, when the task difficulty is relatively low (*is_high_difficulty* = 0), compared to the absence of a decoy (*has_decoy* = 0), the presence of a decoy (*has_decoy_high_difficulty* = 0, *has_decoy* = 1) results in a substantial increase in the likelihood of the target document being clicked (coefficient = 1.304, $p < 0.001$), the time spent on the target document (coefficient = 89.96, $p < 0.001$), and the usefulness rating (coefficient = 0.59, $p < 0.001$). (2) Conversely, under the condition that other variables are held constant, when the task difficulty is relatively high (*is_high_difficulty* = 1), compared to the absence of a decoy (*has_decoy* = 0), the presence of a decoy (*has_decoy_high_difficulty* = 1, *has_decoy* = 1) only results in a 12.0% increase in the likelihood of the target document being clicked, a 6.5 seconds increase in the time spent on the target document, and a 0.085 increase in the usefulness rating for the target document. In other words, considering the presence of a decoy, compared to scenarios with low task difficulty, when the task difficulty is relatively high, the likelihood of the target document being clicked has a substantial decrease (coefficient = 118.4%, $p < 0.001$); the duration spent on the target document (coefficient = 83.5, $p < 0.001$) and the usefulness rating for the target document also substantially decreases (coefficient = 0.505, $p < 0.001$). (3) Under the condition of keeping other factors constant, when users have lower prior knowledge of the search topic, compared to the scenario without decoys, users tend to assign higher usefulness scores to a document when it contains decoys (coefficient = 0.275, $p < 0.05$).

For **RQ2** and **RQ3**, our result suggests that the impact of the decoy effect on user behavior varies under different task difficulties and different prior knowledge levels. In summary, when the task difficulty is lower or the user’s prior knowledge level is lower, the decoy effect tends to have a greater impact on user interaction behaviors, such as clicks, browsing duration, and usefulness evaluations. Compared to more challenging tasks, the decoy effect exerts a greater influence in simpler search tasks, manifesting as users being more likely to click on target documents, spending more time on target documents, and potentially assigning higher usefulness ratings to target documents. The impact of the decoy effect on user behavior is relatively small when the search task is of high difficulty. When users have a lower level

of prior knowledge, the decoy effect tends to have a greater impact on their behavior, manifesting as the assignment of higher usefulness scores to a document that includes decoys.

A possible explanation for this observation can be drawn from the theory of two conceptual systems proposed by Kahneman [38]. Based on the theory of two conceptual systems by Kahneman [38], there are two conceptual systems within the human brain: System 1, which is automatic, fast, and intuitive; and System 2, which is conscious, slow, and analytical. When System 1 dominates thinking, it can lead to faster decision-making, albeit potentially error-prone. In contrast, when System 2 thinking is engaged, it is typically more reliable but requires more cognitive effort. Thus, a possible explanation for what we observed in Experiment 2 is that: (1) When individuals are tasked with more challenging search tasks, users may need to expend more cognitive effort to memorize, understand and analyze information from search results [9, 10, 40], which requires them to engage more intensively with System 2 cognitive processes. Therefore, they tend to utilize System 2, subsequently mitigating the impact of the decoy effect; (2) When users have a lower level of prior knowledge (i.e., they are less familiar with the search topic), users may tend to take cognitive shortcuts and rely more on System 1 in scenarios where they need to process a large amount of information quickly to make decisions.

Task ID	1	2	3	4	5	6
Average Post-task Difficulty	3.0	2.52	2.68	2.04	3.04	2.89

Table 4. Average post-task difficulty for each task on the THUIR2018 dataset. Bold font indicates a task that is classified as “high difficulty”.

	α_{HD}	α_{HDHD}	α_{HDLK}
is_clicked	1.064**	-1.156*	0.698
duration	78.890***	-84.899***	31.535
usefulness	0.494 ***	-0.519 ***	0.275*
# Observations	767		

Table 5. The regression coefficients of the independent variable has_decoy (α_{HD}), has_decoy_high_difficulty (α_{HDHD}), and has_decoy_low_knowledge (α_{HDLK}) with the dependent variables is_clicked, duration, and usefulness on THUIR2018. *, ** and *** respectively indicate $p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$, and $p < 0.001$.

7 EXPERIMENT 3: VULNERABILITY OF RETRIEVAL MODELS TO DECOY EFFECT IN RANKING

With the widespread adoption of search systems, people have increasingly come to rely on information retrieved from search systems for making decisions, including important life decisions such as medical, political and financial choices. However, as previously discussed, users are often influenced by various cognitive biases (*e. g.*, the decoy effect) when interacting with search systems, leading to decisions that deviate from optimal outcomes. In critical contexts such as medical diagnosis, criminal judgments or information consumption, cognitive biases can even result in dangerous decisions and have negative societal consequences. The results returned by search systems have the potential to magnify and exacerbate users’ cognitive biases [3, 19]. It is natural to come up with the following research question (**RQ4**): How to measure the vulnerability of information retrieval systems to the decoy effect? In commonly used sparse and dense retrieval models, which models can achieve higher effectiveness while having lower vulnerability to the decoy effect?

In this section, we utilize the Microsoft Machine Reading Comprehension (MS MARCO) [4] dataset to investigate the effectiveness of various retrievers and their vulnerability to the decoy effect at different cutoff depths k . We investigate these aspects across 97 topics of the passage retrieval task from the Text REtrieval Conference (TREC) 2019 Deep Learning (DL) Track collection [23] and the TREC 2020 DL Track collection [22]. To measure the effectiveness of a retrieval model, we use $nDCG@k$ and $Recall@k$ as the evaluation metrics. To measure a retriever’s vulnerability to the decoy effect, we first analyze the relationship between effectiveness and the number of decoy pairs, followed by introducing a heuristic metric for measuring the vulnerability of retrieval models to decoy effect in result presentation.

7.1 Summary of The Dataset and Collections

MS MARCO [4] comprises an extensive dataset collection tailored for deep learning applications in the realm of information retrieval. In our experiment, we use MS MARCO Version 1. The dataset consists of 1,010,916 anonymized questions obtained from Bing’s search query logs, 8,841,823 passages extracted from 3,563,535 web documents retrieved by Microsoft Bing.

The TREC DL Track aims to investigate information retrieval in the context of large-scale training data, with the objective to make large-scale datasets publicly available for deep learning-based information retrieval methods and to provide a standardized grounding for comparing various information retrieval approaches. In our experiment, we selected 43 and 54 topics respectively from the passage retrieval tasks of the TREC 19 DL and TREC 20 DL tracks, all of which are accompanied by relevance (qrel) annotations. Passages were evaluated using a four-point relevance scale: Not Relevant (0), Related (1), Highly Relevant (2), and Perfect (3). It is important to note that the “Related” rating, despite its name, indicates that while a passage pertains to the same general topic, it fails to directly answer the question.

7.2 Experimental Setting

Our experiment adopted several retrievers based on sparse or dense vector representations for comparison: (1) BM25 [78], (2) SPLADE++ [27], (3) uniCOIL [50], (4) ANCE [105], (5) TCT-ColBERT [52], (6) SBERT [76]. The main rationale for selecting the above retrievers is that they are either commonly used text retrieval models (e.g., BM25, ANCE and SBERT) or variants of commonly used text retrieval models (e.g., SPLADE [28], COIL [29], ColBERT [52]). Another reason for selecting the above retrievers is that `pyserini` [51] toolkit offers pre-built indexes of them on MS MARCO v1 with predefined parameters or weights, which facilitates the comparison of our experimental result with those of previous work (e.g., [50, 52]). Since the focus of our work is on evaluating the results returned by these retrievers rather than improving the rankers themselves, we offer a brief overview of these models in the following part. For detailed information about the models, please refer to the original papers.

- **BM25** [78]: BM25 is a probabilistic information retrieval model based on sparse vector representation. It computes the document scores by considering the *term frequency* (TF) and *inverse document frequency* (IDF) of each term. Specifically, BM25 adjusts the importance of each term during the computation process, controlling the impact of term frequency and document length through parameters such as k_1 , k_2 , and b .
- **SPLADE++** [27]: The SPLADE model [28] is a retrieval approach that employs high-dimensional sparse vector representation. It integrates the Masked Language Modeling (MLM) head of a pre-trained language model (PLM) with sparse regularization, enabling joint term expansion and re-weighting. In our experiments, we utilized the enhanced version of SPLADE, named SPLADE++, which incorporates modifications to the pooling mechanism and introduces models trained with distillation.




Fig. 6. A case where a target document can correspond to multiple potential decoy documents. For example, both 1220759 and 1333480 can be considered as decoys for 1414114, and they can also be considered as decoys for 1034183. Therefore, there can be up to 4 potential decoy pairs. But when calculating, we only consider one decoy pair for each target document under each topic. The document with the highest similarity to the target document is considered a decoy. Therefore, in this example, there are only two decoy pairs, (1034183, 1220759) and (1414114, 1333480), respectively, will be identified.

- **uniCOIL** [50]: Contextualized Lexical Retriever (COIL) [29] is a retrieval approach based on sparse vector representation. The scoring of COIL is based on vector similarities between query-document overlapping term contextualized representations. UniCOIL [50] is a variant of COIL that reduces the token dimension of COIL to 1 and is directly compatible with inverted indexes.
- **ANCE** [105]: ANCE is a method applicable for training dense retrieval model. It leverages asynchronous updates of Approximate Nearest Neighbor (ANN) [36] indices to globally select hard negatives from the entire corpus for training, which is concurrently updated with the learning process to select more representative negative training instances.
- **TCT-ColBERT** [52]: ColBERT [41] is a multi-vector dense retriever which uses the delayed interaction approach with a dual-encoder design. It encodes queries and documents separately with BERT [25] and efficiently calculating their similarity. This allows it to leverage the outstanding natural language understanding ability of deep language models while speeding up query processing. Tightly-Coupled Teacher ColBERT (TCT-ColBERT) [52] employs knowledge distillation to accelerate the ColBERT retriever and is claimed to approach the performance of ColBERT while significantly improving speed by several orders of magnitude.
- **SBERT** [76]: Sentence-BERT (SBERT) is a modification of the BERT network. It utilizes siamese and triplet network structures to generate semantically meaningful sentence embeddings in fixed-sized vectors for input sentences, enabling the sentence to be compared using cosine similarity. The retriever based on SBERT maintains the accuracy of BERT in determining text similarity while having an improved computing efficiency.

In our experiments, we utilize the pre-built indexes provided by the `pyserini` toolkit to evaluate the above-mentioned retrievers (without extra expansions) on a total of 86 topics, consisting of 43 from the TREC 2019 DL and 54 from the TREC 2020 DL passage retrieval tasks³. For each topic, the retrievers return a ranked list of the top 1000 passages.

Similar to the setup in Section 4.2, we define that a pair of documents (passages)⁴, composed of the target document and the decoy document (t, d), constitutes a decoy pair if and only if the following conditions are met: (1) The similarity between target document t and decoy document d measured by cosine similarity is greater than or equal to 0.6 and less than 0.95; (2) The qrel score for t is greater than or equal to 2, and the qrel score for d is less than or equal to 1. (3) The absolute value of the rank distance between t and d is less than or equal to 5. Note that here condition (2) differs slightly from Section 4.2. The rationale for it is as follows: since TREC 19 DL and TREC 20 DL provide more detailed relevance annotation standards for each qrel level, it can be considered that there is a substantial difference in quality between passages with qrel scores of 0 or 1 and passages with qrel scores of 2 or 3. Furthermore, as shown in Figure 6, when calculating decoy pairs for each topic, there may be cases where one target document corresponds to multiple potential decoy documents. In our calculation, we consider only the document with the highest similarity to the target document as the decoy. Therefore, there is only one decoy pair for each target document under each topic.

Following the methodology mentioned above, we calculate (1) the average number of decoy pairs, (2) the recall score and (3) the nDCG score for each retriever’s output on each topic, with the cutoff (k) ranging from 10 to 1000 incrementally by 10.

7.3 Experimental Result and Analysis

Figure 7 shows the average numbers of the decoy pairs on each topic, the nDCG scores, and the recall scores for 6 retrievers at different depths in the TREC 19 DL and TREC 20 DL tasks. From Figure 7 it can be firstly observed that, similar to recall, the number of decoy pairs increase as the cutoff becomes large. This observation is intuitive. Since our definition of decoy pairs involves relevance (refer to Section 7.2), similar to recall, the number of decoy pairs increases as more documents are retrieved. Based on the previous definition of decoy pairs, when the cutoff depth increases, existing decoy pairs remain unchanged; At the same time, newly retrieved documents may become either target documents or decoy documents, thus increasing the number of decoy pairs.

Another observed result is that, compared to recall and nDCG, the system ranking measured by the number of decoy pairs is volatile and changes with the variation in cutoff depth. From Figure 7, we can see that in TREC 19 DL, except for the swapping of ranks between ANCE and uniCOIL, the ranking of other systems remained almost unchanged. Similarly, in TREC 20 DL, apart from a rank exchange between ANCE and SBERT, the rankings of the other systems also showed little to no change. The system rankings measured by recall are also similar to those measured by nDCG. After excluding BM25, the relative rankings of the five systems in both tracks showed almost no change. This observation reflects the complexity of the decoy effect mechanism. According to our definition, the identification of a decoy pair depends not only on the relative quality between the document pair but also on factors like their similarity and ranking.

As previously mentioned, the factors influencing the number of decoy pairs are complex. Therefore, relying solely on the number of decoy pairs as a metric may not effectively reflect the vulnerability of retrieval systems to decoy results and lead to biased judgments. Consider the example of SPLADE++. As shown in Figure 7, on TREC 20 DL, it returned the most decoy pairs. However, as Figure 8 shows, if we investigate the distribution of document proportions for different

³Regarding the parameter settings for each retriever, please refer to: <https://castorini.github.io/pyserini/2cr/msmarco-v1-passage.html>

⁴Due to convention, we still use the term “document” here, but to be more precise, the text passages used in this experiment should be referred to as “passages”. Unless specifically distinguished, within this section, we consider “document” and “passage” as synonyms.




Fig. 7. The number of average decoy pairs on each topic (left), the score of nDCG (middle), and the score of recall (right) for BM25, SPLADE++, uniCOIL, ANCE, TCT-CoBERT, and SBERT across the TREC 19 DL collection (top) and TREC 20 DL collection (bottom).

relevance scores on TREC 19 DL and TREC 20 DL, we find that TREC 20 DL has nearly 90% of its documents with relevance scores of 0 or 1, with only a few documents having a relevance score of 2 or 3 (highly relevant). Therefore, the reason for this result might be because SPLADE++ returned more highly relevant documents than other systems, thereby leading to more decoy pairs. Consider another example of BM25, the number of decoy pairs returned by BM25 is the least in two tracks when the cutoff is less than 100. Nonetheless, this outcome may be attributed to the fact that, in comparison with other systems, BM25 retrieves a smaller quantity of (highly) relevant documents, as illustrated in Figure 7.

Consider a more extreme example, where a system returns only irrelevant documents to the topic. According to our previous definition, the number of decoy pairs returned by this system is undoubtedly 0. Nevertheless, such a system is fundamentally incapable of providing users with any helpful documents to address their information needs and therefore should definitely not be preferred in information retrieval system evaluation practice like TREC. In other words, discussing the vulnerability of a information retrieval system to the decoy effect is meaningless without considering its effectiveness.




Fig. 8. The proportion of documents for each relevance score in TREC 19 DL and TREC 20 DL.




Fig. 9. Example of DEJA-VU (more precisely, DEJAVU@5) scores. In the example, SERP 1 contains 2 highly relevant documents and 2 pairs of decoy documents, resulting in a DEJA-VU score of 0; SERP 2 contains 3 highly relevant documents and 2 pairs of decoy documents, resulting in a DEJA-VU score of 0.632; SERP 3 contains 2 highly relevant documents and 1 pair of decoy documents, resulting in a DEJA-VU score of 0.632; SERP 4 contains no highly relevant documents, therefore, no decoy pairs exist, resulting in a DEJA-VU score of 0. Solid circles represent highly relevant documents, while hollow circles represent non-highly relevant documents.

7.4 A Heuristic Metric to Measure the Vulnerability to the Decoy Effect

Inspired by the above discussion, we hope to design a metric that rewards systems which return more highly relevant results while yielding fewer decoy pairs; and penalizes systems that return fewer highly relevant results while producing more decoy pairs. In this subsection, we propose a heuristic metric, namely **DEcoy Judgement and Assessment Vulnerability (DEJA-VU)**, to measure a system's vulnerability to the decoy effect while trying to balance the relevance scores.

The calculation for DEJA-VU when the cutoff is k (DEJA-VU@ k) is as follows:

$$\text{DEJA-VU}@k = 1 - \exp(d - r) \quad (3)$$

Where d is the number of decoy pairs at the cutoff k and r is the number of highly relevant documents (in this experiment is the documents whose relevance score is 2 or 3) at the cutoff k . DEJA-VU possesses the following properties:

- A system with a higher DEJA-VU score shall be preferred. When the number of highly relevant documents returned (*i.e.*, r) is the same, systems that return fewer decoy pairs (*i.e.*, d) have higher DEJA-VU scores. Conversely, when the number of returned decoy pairs is the same, systems that return more highly relevant documents have higher DEJA-VU scores.
- The range of DEJA-VU score is within $[0, 1)$. According to the conditions in Section 7.2, a highly relevant document is paired with only one decoy, hence $d \leq r$ always holds. When $d = r$, the DEJA-VU score is 0. This includes the case of $r = 0$ (*i.e.*, when a system fails to return any highly relevant documents). Therefore, DEJA-VU penalizes systems that can only return very few or no highly relevant documents. According to the properties of the exponential function, $\exp(d - r)$ is always greater than 0. Therefore, the DEJA-VU score is always less than 1.

Figure 9 gives an example of the computation of DEJA-VU. In the example, SERP 1 contains 2 highly relevant documents and 2 pairs of decoy documents, resulting in a DEJA-VU score of $1 - \exp(2 - 2) = 0$. SERP 2 contains 3 highly relevant documents and 2 pairs of decoy documents, resulting in a DEJA-VU score of $1 - \exp(2 - 3) \approx 0.632$; SERP 3 contains 2 highly relevant documents and 1 pair of decoy documents, resulting in a DEJA-VU score of $1 - \exp(1 - 2) \approx 0.632$; SERP 4 contains no highly relevant documents, therefore, no decoy pairs exist, resulting in a DEJA-VU score of $1 - \exp(0 - 0) = 0$. It should be noted that, unlike most offline evaluation metrics mentioned earlier, the DEJA-VU score does not focus on how users accumulate gains from relevant documents during interaction with search pages. Instead, the DEJA-VU score considers the system’s ability to return highly relevant documents while also accounting for the presence of decoy pairs in the results. Therefore, for some SERP pairs, DEJA-VU preferences may differ from metrics based on user utility models (*e.g.*, DCG [33], RBP [71], ERR [12]). For example, in the above example, metrics like DCG based on user utility models may assign a higher score to SERP 1 compared to SERP 4 as SERP 1 returned more highly relevant documents. However, according to the scores provided by DEJA-VU, both are 0 as DEJA-VU penalizes SERP 1 for returning a high proportion of decoy pairs. In the evaluation practice of search systems, it may be worth considering integrating DEJA-VU scores with existing user utility-based metrics in some way. We leave this issue for future research.

It should also be noted that DEJA-VU is merely a heuristic metric, primarily designed to balance the relationship between the number of highly relevant documents and the number of decoy pairs when computing the system score for ranking IR systems, rather than providing an entirely accurate measure of a system’s vulnerability to the decoy effect. We leave the research question of how to construct a precise measure of the vulnerability of IR systems to the decoy effect for future studies.

Figure 10 displays the DEJA-VU scores of retrievers on the TREC 19 DL track and TREC 20 DL track. It can be observed that as the cutoff becomes very large, the DEJA-VU scores of different systems become very close, which is determined by the nature of the exponential function. From here, it can be seen that when the cutoff becomes very large, DEJA-VU cannot effectively differentiate between various systems. We will leave the research question of designing a “better” decoy vulnerability evaluation metric for future studies.

Considering that in real-life scenarios, most users do not go beyond the first 10 or 20 results when browsing a SERP [101], discussing DEJA-VU@10 or DEJA-VU@20 is more meaningful. Table 6 and Table 7 further present the




Fig. 10. Average DEJA-VU scores of the retrievers on TREC 19 DL (left) and TREC 20 DL (right) respectively.

DEJA-VU, nDCG, and recall scores for various retrievers on TRDL19 and TRDL20, with cutoffs set at 10 and 20, respectively. From Table 6 and Table 7, it can be observed that regardless of whether the cutoff is 10 or 20, TCT-ColBERT consistently has the highest DEJA-VU score among retrievers. Following it closely is SPLADE++. On the TREC 20 DL track, SPLADE++ and TCT-ColBERT have only a marginal difference in their rankings. BM25, on the other hand, ranks last in both tracks.

Additionally, from Table 6 and Table 7, we observe that when the cutoff is set at 10 or 20, the system rankings provided by DEJA-VU scores and those provided by nDCG scores exhibit a certain degree of similarity. In Figure 10, TCT-ColBERT and SPLADE++ form the best-performing cluster, while COIL, SBERT, and ANCE constitute the intermediate cluster, with BM25 performing the worst. This conclusion aligns to some extent with the findings obtained from nDCG scores in Figure 7. Issues regarding the correlation between DEJA-VU scores and commonly used offline evaluation metrics (e.g., DCG [33], nDCG [33], RBP [71], ERR [12]), as well as the consistency of the system rankings provided, will be left for future research. A series of meta-evaluations around DEJA-VU, such as whether its ranking of systems aligns with the preferences of real users and to what extent it can statistically discriminate between system pairs [79], will also need to be addressed in future research.

In summary, in this section, we first analyzed the relationship between the number of decoy pairs in the results returned by various retrievers and the number of highly relevant documents. We found that the vulnerability of text retrieval systems to the decoy effect cannot be simply measured by the number of decoy pairs. We then introduced a heuristic metric, namely DEJA-VU, to assess the system's performance in terms of having a lower vulnerability to the decoy effect while achieving higher effectiveness. Based on the rankings provided by DEJA-VU scores, we can answer the **RQ4**: when the cutoff is small, TCT-ColBERT can achieve higher effectiveness while having a lower vulnerability to the decoy effect, followed by SPLADE++.

Run (Retriever)	Cutoff = 10			Cutoff = 20		
	DEJA-VU	nDCG	Recall	DEJA-VU	nDCG	Recall
ANCE	0.947	0.645	0.145	0.939	0.616	0.240
BM25	0.885	0.506	0.129	0.926	0.491	0.201
SBERT	0.940	0.693	0.148	0.956	0.656	0.232
SPLADE++	<u>0.948</u>	0.731	0.172	<u>0.974</u>	0.717	0.289
TCT-ColBERT	0.974	<u>0.720</u>	<u>0.167</u>	0.981	<u>0.680</u>	<u>0.261</u>
uniCOIL	0.914	0.643	0.162	0.966	0.614	0.247

Table 6. Scores of DEJA-VU, nDCG, and Recall for the six runs on TRDL 19 at cutoffs of 10 and 20 respectively. Bold indicates the highest score for a run, while underscore denotes the second highest score.

Run (Retriever)	Cutoff = 10			Cutoff = 20		
	DEJA-VU	nDCG	Recall	DEJA-VU	nDCG	Recall
ANCE	0.846	0.646	0.206	0.909	0.607	0.287
BM25	0.756	0.480	0.164	0.843	0.472	0.248
SBERT	0.846	0.634	0.202	0.888	0.603	0.291
SPLADE++	<u>0.910</u>	0.720	0.245	<u>0.966</u>	0.702	0.360
TCT-ColBERT	0.914	<u>0.688</u>	<u>0.228</u>	0.969	<u>0.659</u>	<u>0.329</u>
uniCOIL	0.834	0.652	0.224	0.897	0.611	0.311

Table 7. Scores of DEJA-VU, nDCG, and Recall for the six runs on TRDL 20 at cutoffs of 10 and 20 respectively. Bold indicates the highest score for a run, while underscore denotes the second highest score.

8 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Contrary to the implicit assumptions underlying various formal models of information seeking, it is posited that users exhibit bounded rationality, and typically do not base their search decisions on precise estimations of search gains and costs [2, 55]. Despite the increasing attention paid to data biases and algorithm biases in the field of computing [13, 44, 47], only a few studies have focused on the issue of properly recognizing and effectively mitigating the negative effects of biases on human decision-making processes. Within the realm of cognitive biases influencing decision-making, the decoy effect reflects how users alter their in-situ preferences and judgments on presented options. Although prior research has examined the impact of the decoy effect on relevance judgments under the crowdsourcing scenario [26], how decoy results presented on SERPs influence users' interaction behaviors, and how this effect interacts with search contextual factors such as users' prior topical knowledge, the difficulty of the search task, remains unclear.

To address this gap and advance towards the vision of human-centered information retrieval, in this study, we proposed 4 research questions (see Section 3) and seek to comprehend: (1) How the *decoy effect* at the document level impacts users' interaction behaviors on SERPs, such as clicks, dwell time, and usefulness perceptions (**RQ1**); (2) How the decoy effect influences user behavior differently across varying levels of task difficulty and the user's knowledge scale (**RQ2 and RQ3**); (3) How to assess the vulnerability of different text retrieval models to the decoy effect (**RQ4**). To answer the above research questions, we conducted data analysis and experiments on several publicly available user behavior datasets and test collections.

The results of this study empirically confirm the insights from behavioral economic theories in a novel context, and also shed light on innovative ways for developing computational models to explain boundedly rational user search behaviors and assess user-centric search systems. As far as we know, we are the first to address how the decoy effect influences user interactions on SERPs. This work extends the endeavors of the IR community in exploring how

cognitive biases impact user behaviors in document examining and relevance judgment, providing evidence from the perspective of the decoy effect. This study also contributes to human-centric evaluation practice in information retrieval by introducing a novel metric for assessing systems' vulnerability to the decoy effect.

8.1 Main Findings and Implications

The following are the main findings of this study, which address our research questions.

8.1.1 RQ1: Influence of a Decoy on Users' Interaction Behavior. From the result of the first experiment, it can be observed that, when a decoy is present, in comparison to when it is absent, there is an increase in the likelihood of a document being clicked and its perceived usefulness, given conditions such as the ranking of the document, the type of the task and the individual characteristics unchanged.

Going beyond document assessment experiments that isolated search factors (e.g., [26, 84]), this study identified the impact of decoy options on users' click behavior and perceived usefulness by analysing user interaction logs collected under laboratory-based environment. This study provides empirical insights into the debiasing of human biases in IR algorithms and developing user-centered IR systems. The finding of this study suggests that, when designing algorithms, it is important not only to consider document relevance and quality but also to take into account the influence of cognitive biases, such as the decoy effect, that users may experience. This implies that algorithms may need to incorporate the understanding of boundedly rational users' behavior patterns in order to help users achieve the globally optimal search outcome [56].

8.1.2 RQ2 and RQ3: The Variance of the Impact of Decoy Effect Across Task Difficulties and Users' Prior Knowledge Levels. The result of the second experiment indicates that the extent to which the decoy effect distorts user-document interaction behavior is influenced by both task difficulty and the user's level of prior knowledge. More specifically, when the search task is more difficult, users are less likely to click on documents having a decoy compared to situations where the search task is less difficult. They also spend less time on documents having a decoy and assign lower usefulness scores for such documents. When users have a lower level of prior knowledge about the search topic, they tend to assign higher usefulness scores to the documents who has a decoy.

Previous research has shown associations between the difficulty of search tasks and the level of users' domain knowledge with certain behavioral signals exhibited by users during the search process [21, 57, 59, 66]. However, only a limited number of studies have examined how cognitive biases interact with varying task difficulties and users with different levels of domain knowledge, thus influencing search behavior. This study addresses this gap by empirically demonstrating how the influence of the decoy effect on user search behavior varies across different levels of task difficulty and user knowledge levels. The finding in this study expands the understanding of the IR community regarding how tasks, domain knowledge, and cognitive biases influence users' behavior during the search process. It also provides a new perspective for the design of task-oriented information retrieval systems. For instance, in a multi-query search session, the system can adaptively adjust algorithms and page layouts based on different task states and user types predicted from various online signals [21, 95], thus mitigating the impact of the decoy effect.

8.1.3 RQ4: Measuring IR System Vulnerability to Decoy Effect. The result of the third experiment indicates that, the vulnerability of text retrieval systems to the decoy effect cannot be simply measured by the number of decoy pairs. When evaluating the vulnerability of text retrieval models to the decoy effect, it is essential to consider various factors, including effectiveness, in a comprehensive manner. Based on the above points, we have developed a metric for

measuring the vulnerability to the decoy effect. According to the metric scores, when the cutoff is small, TCT-ColBERT demonstrates higher effectiveness while exhibiting lower vulnerability to the decoy effect, followed by SPLADE++.

Traditional evaluation methods for IR systems are based on the assumption of globally rational users, which may not fully capture the complexity of the boundedly rational users' behavior under the influence of cognitive biases. Therefore, there is a need to develop new evaluation metrics to more accurately measure system performance and ensure they reflect users' actual experiences and preferences. Although some recent efforts have incorporated cognitive biases into the calculation of IR system evaluation metrics [14, 17, 107], they have not considered the decoy effect. The introduction of DEJA-VU expands the work on IR system evaluation by considering the vulnerability of IR systems to the decoy effect. By integrating the DEJA-VU metric with other evaluation metrics, researchers can fine-tune and improve search algorithms to enhance the effectiveness of search systems while mitigating the negative impact of the decoy effect on user decisions. Alternatively, they can design personalized reranking algorithms capable of adapting to changes in user behavior.

8.2 Open Questions

As mentioned earlier, in the experiment of this study, we found through regression analysis that the presence of a decoy document can influence users' behavior when browsing the target document, specifically showing a positive correlation between the presence of a decoy document and clickthrough likelihood, browsing dwell time, and usefulness score. However, whether such correlations represent causal relationships remains unknown. Although causal bias correction has received attention in many literature related to search and recommendation systems, past research has focused on biases in the data, such as popularity bias [98, 99], exposure bias [53, 106], *etc.* Nevertheless, researchers still have a limited understanding of how cognitive biases of users affect data through explicit or implicit feedback, further amplify system bias, and thus lead to the loop of bias.

8.3 Future Work

Although we sought to address the challenge of how the decoy effect influences user interactions on SERPs and how to measure the vulnerability of IR systems to the decoy effect in this study, our study is still in a preliminary stage toward the vision of human-bias-aware IR modeling, with numerous aspects awaiting further exploration. The metric DEJA-VU for measuring systems' vulnerability to the decoy effect is essentially a heuristic metric. Further meta-evaluation (*e.g.*, [18, 81]) is required to understand whether the scores it provides align with users' actual preferences and to what extent it can statistically significantly differentiate retrieval systems in reproducible offline evaluation [54]. Moreover, although there are existing studies (*e.g.*, [14, 17, 107], *etc.*) that have integrated cognitive biases into the score computation of evaluation metrics, there is still a need for a broader theoretical framework to integrate them together.

In recent years, generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) such as Large Language Models (LLMs) [68, 73] have garnered widespread attention from the computing community. Many efforts in the fields of search and recommendation have attempted to incorporate LLMs into traditional pipelines (such as using LLMs as content encoder [30, 62], directly using LLMs to return search or recommendation results [64, 75, 88], *etc.*) or to build new pipelines using LLMs (*e.g.*, using LLMs for generative retrieval or recommendation [34, 48]). Recent studies have found that LLMs can be influenced by context when generating outputs, leading to biases resembling human cognitive biases (*e.g.*, the recency effect [108], the framing effect [37], the bandwagon effect [43]). By using techniques like prompt engineering to trigger LLMs to generate biased results, could this lead to suboptimal search and recommendation outcomes, thus reducing overall user utility? Would biases in the generation process of LLMs interact with users' cognitive biases in online information

seeking behaviors, resulting in a loop of biases? These are all questions that need to be addressed. Considering that individuals from diverse backgrounds may have different triggers for cognitive biases, it is also worthwhile to investigate how to personalize the outputs of LLMs in search and recommendation ranking based on user profiles, in order to reduce the negative impact of cognitive biases on individual decision-making.

REFERENCES

- [1] Denise E. Agosto. 2002. Bounded rationality and satisficing in young people's Web-based decision making. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 53, 1 (2002), 16–27. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.10024> arXiv:<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/asi.10024>
- [2] Leif Azzopardi. 2021. Cognitive Biases in Search: A Review and Reflection of Cognitive Biases in Information Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval* (Canberra ACT, Australia) (CHIIR '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 27–37. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3406522.3446023>
- [3] Ricardo Baeza-Yates. 2018. Bias on the web. *Commun. ACM* 61, 6 (may 2018), 54–61. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3209581>
- [4] Payal Bajaj, Daniel Campos, Nick Craswell, Li Deng, Jianfeng Gao, Xiaodong Liu, Rangan Majumder, Andrew McNameara, Bhaskar Mitra, Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Alina Stoica, Saurabh Tiwary, and Tong Wang. 2018. MS MARCO: A Human Generated MACHine Reading COMprehension Dataset. arXiv:1611.09268 [cs.CL]
- [5] Nick Bansback, Linda C. Li, Larry Lynd, and Stirling Bryan. 2014. Exploiting order effects to improve the quality of decisions. *Patient Education and Counseling* 96, 2 (2014), 197–203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2014.05.021>
- [6] Nattapat Boonprakong, Xiuge Chen, Catherine Davey, Benjamin Tag, and Tilman Dinger. 2023. Bias-Aware Systems: Exploring Indicators for the Occurrences of Cognitive Biases when Facing Different Opinions. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (, Hamburg, Germany,) (CHI '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 27, 19 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3580917>
- [7] Katriina Byström. 2002. Information and information sources in tasks of varying complexity. *Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology* 53, 7 (2002), 581–591.
- [8] Katriina Byström and Kalervo Järvelin. 1995. Task complexity affects information seeking and use. *Information processing & management* 31, 2 (1995), 191–213.
- [9] Donald J. Campbell. 1988. Task Complexity: A Review and Analysis. *The Academy of Management Review* 13, 1 (1988), 40–52. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/258353>
- [10] Rob Capra, Jaime Arguello, and Yinglong Zhang. 2017. The Effects of Search Task Determinability on Search Behavior. In *Advances in Information Retrieval*, Joemon M Jose, Claudia Hauff, Ismail Sengor Altungovde, Dawei Song, Dyaa Albakour, Stuart Watt, and John Tait (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 108–121.
- [11] Praveen Chandar and Ben Carterette. 2012. Using Preference Judgments for Novel Document Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 35th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Portland, Oregon, USA) (SIGIR '12). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 861–870. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2348283.2348398>
- [12] Olivier Chapelle, Donald Metzler, Ya Zhang, and Pierre Grinspan. 2009. Expected Reciprocal Rank for Graded Relevance. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Information and Knowledge Management* (Hong Kong, China) (CIKM '09). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 621–630. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1645953.1646033>
- [13] Jiawei Chen, Hande Dong, Xiang Wang, Fuli Feng, Meng Wang, and Xiangnan He. 2023. Bias and Debias in Recommender System: A Survey and Future Directions. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 41, 3, Article 67 (feb 2023), 39 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3564284>
- [14] Nuo Chen, Jiqun Liu, and Tetsuya Sakai. 2023. A Reference-Dependent Model for Web Search Evaluation: Understanding and Measuring the Experience of Boundedly Rational Users. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023* (Austin, TX, USA) (WWW '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 3396–3405. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3543507.3583551>
- [15] Nuo Chen, Jiqun Liu, Tetsuya Sakai, and Xiao-Ming Wu. 2023. Decoy Effect in Search Interaction: A Pilot Study. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Workshop on Evaluating Information Access (EVIA 2023)*. Tokyo, Japan, 14–19.
- [16] Nuo Chen, Donghyun Park, Hyungae Park, Kijun Choi, Tetsuya Sakai, and Jinyoung Kim. 2023. Practice and Challenges in Building a Business-oriented Search Engine Quality Metric. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Taipei, Taiwan) (SIGIR '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 3295–3299. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3539618.3591841>
- [17] Nuo Chen, Fan Zhang, and Tetsuya Sakai. 2022. Constructing Better Evaluation Metrics by Incorporating the Anchoring Effect into the User Model. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Madrid, Spain) (SIGIR '22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2709–2714. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477495.3531953>
- [18] Ye Chen, Ke Zhou, Yiqun Liu, Min Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2017. Meta-evaluation of Online and Offline Web Search Evaluation Metrics. In *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Shinjuku, Tokyo, Japan) (SIGIR '17). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 15–24. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3077136.3080804>

- [19] Junghoo Cho and Sourashis Roy. 2004. Impact of search engines on page popularity. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on World Wide Web* (New York, NY, USA) (*WWW '04*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 20–29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/988672.988676>
- [20] Aleksandr Chuklin, Pavel Serdyukov, and Maarten de Rijke. 2013. Click Model-Based Information Retrieval Metrics. In *Proceedings of the 36th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Dublin, Ireland) (*SIGIR '13*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 493–502. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2484028.2484071>
- [21] Michael J. Cole, Chathra Hendahewa, Nicholas J. Belkin, and Chirag Shah. 2015. User Activity Patterns During Information Search. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 33, 1, Article 1 (mar 2015), 39 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2699656>
- [22] Nick Craswell, Bhaskar Mitra, Emine Yilmaz, and Daniel Campos. 2021. Overview of the TREC 2020 deep learning track. arXiv:2102.07662 [cs.IR]
- [23] Nick Craswell, Bhaskar Mitra, Emine Yilmaz, Daniel Campos, and Ellen M. Voorhees. 2020. Overview of the TREC 2019 deep learning track. arXiv:2003.07820 [cs.IR]
- [24] Nick Craswell, Onno Zoeter, Michael Taylor, and Bill Ramsey. 2008. An Experimental Comparison of Click Position-Bias Models. In *Proceedings of the 2008 International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining* (Palo Alto, California, USA) (*WSDM '08*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 87–94. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1341531.1341545>
- [25] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 4171–4186. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1423>
- [26] Carsten Eickhoff. 2018. Cognitive Biases in Crowdsourcing. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining* (Marina Del Rey, CA, USA) (*WSDM '18*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 162–170. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3159652.3159654>
- [27] Thibault Formal, Carlos Lassance, Benjamin Piwowarski, and Stéphane Clinchant. 2022. From Distillation to Hard Negative Sampling: Making Sparse Neural IR Models More Effective. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (, Madrid, Spain.) (*SIGIR '22*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2353–2359. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477495.3531857>
- [28] Thibault Formal, Benjamin Piwowarski, and Stéphane Clinchant. 2021. SPLADE: Sparse Lexical and Expansion Model for First Stage Ranking. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (*SIGIR '21*). ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3404835.3463098>
- [29] Luyu Gao, Zhuyun Dai, and Jamie Callan. 2021. COIL: Revisit Exact Lexical Match in Information Retrieval with Contextualized Inverted List. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, Kristina Toutanova, Anna Rumshisky, Luke Zettlemoyer, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, Iz Beltagy, Steven Bethard, Ryan Cotterell, Tanmoy Chakraborty, and Yichao Zhou (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 3030–3042. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.241>
- [30] Jesse Harte, Wouter Zorgdrager, Panos Louridas, Asterios Katsifodimos, Dietmar Jannach, and Marios Fragkoulis. 2023. Leveraging Large Language Models for Sequential Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems* (Singapore, Singapore) (*RecSys '23*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1096–1102. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3604915.3610639>
- [31] Joel Huber, John W. Payne, and Christopher Puto. 1982. Adding Asymmetrically Dominated Alternatives: Violations of Regularity and the Similarity Hypothesis. *Journal of Consumer Research* 9, 1 (1982), 90–98. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2488940>
- [32] Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Edouard Grave. 2021. Unsupervised Dense Information Retrieval with Contrastive Learning. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2112.09118>
- [33] Kalervo Järvelin and Jaana Kekäläinen. 2002. Cumulated Gain-Based Evaluation of IR Techniques. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 20, 4 (oct 2002), 422–446. <https://doi.org/10.1145/582415.582418>
- [34] Jianchao Ji, Zelong Li, Shuyuan Xu, Wenyue Hua, Yingqiang Ge, Juntao Tan, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2023. GenRec: Large Language Model for Generative Recommendation. arXiv:2307.00457 [cs.IR]
- [35] Jiepu Jiang, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, Xiaolin Shi, and Ryen W. White. 2015. Understanding and Predicting Graded Search Satisfaction. In *Proceedings of the Eighth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining* (Shanghai, China) (*WSDM '15*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 57–66. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2684822.2685319>
- [36] Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Herve Jegou. 2021. Billion-Scale Similarity Search with GPUs. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* 7, 03 (jul 2021), 535–547. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TBDDATA.2019.2921572>
- [37] Erik Jones and Jacob Steinhardt. 2022. Capturing failures of large language models via human cognitive biases. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 11785–11799.
- [38] Daniel Kahneman. 2011. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York.
- [39] Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. Dense Passage Retrieval for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, Bonnie Webber, Trevor Cohn, Wulan He, and Yang Liu (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 6769–6781. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.550>
- [40] Diane Kelly, Jaime Arguello, Ashlee Edwards, and Wan-ching Wu. 2015. Development and Evaluation of Search Tasks for IIR Experiments using a Cognitive Complexity Framework. In *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on The Theory of Information Retrieval* (Northampton, Massachusetts, USA) (*ICTIR '15*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 101–110. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2808194.2809465>

- [41] Omar Khattab and Matei Zaharia. 2020. ColBERT: Efficient and Effective Passage Search via Contextualized Late Interaction over BERT. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Virtual Event, China) (SIGIR '20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 39–48. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397271.3401075>
- [42] Jeonghyun Kim. 2005. Task Difficulty in Information Searching Behavior: Expected Difficulty and Experienced Difficulty. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM/IEEE-CS Joint Conference on Digital Libraries* (Denver, CO, USA) (JCDL '05). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 383. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1065385.1065486>
- [43] Ryan Koo, Minhwa Lee, Vipul Raheja, Jong Inn Park, Zae Myung Kim, and Dongyeop Kang. 2023. Benchmarking Cognitive Biases in Large Language Models as Evaluators. arXiv:2309.17012 [cs.CL]
- [44] Nima Kordzadeh and Maryam Ghasemaghaei. 2022. Algorithmic bias: review, synthesis, and future research directions. *European Journal of Information Systems* 31, 3 (2022), 388–409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2021.1927212> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2021.1927212>
- [45] Arie W. Kruglanski and Icek Ajzen. 1983. Bias and error in human judgment. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 13, 1 (1983), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420130102> arXiv:<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/ejsp.2420130102>
- [46] John Lafferty and Chengxiang Zhai. 2001. Document language models, query models, and risk minimization for information retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (New Orleans, Louisiana, USA) (SIGIR '01). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 111–119. <https://doi.org/10.1145/383952.383970>
- [47] John P. Lalor, Ahmed Abbasi, Kezia Oketch, Yi Yang, and Nicole Forsgren. 2024. Should Fairness be a Metric or a Model? A Model-based Framework for Assessing Bias in Machine Learning Pipelines. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* (jan 2024). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3641276> Just Accepted.
- [48] Lei Li, Yongfeng Zhang, Dugang Liu, and Li Chen. 2023. Large Language Models for Generative Recommendation: A Survey and Visionary Discussions. arXiv:2309.01157 [cs.IR]
- [49] Q. Vera Liao and Wai-Tat Fu. 2013. Beyond the filter bubble: interactive effects of perceived threat and topic involvement on selective exposure to information. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Paris, France) (CHI '13). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2359–2368. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2470654.2481326>
- [50] Jimmy Lin and Xueguang Ma. 2021. A Few Brief Notes on DeepImpact, COIL, and a Conceptual Framework for Information Retrieval Techniques. arXiv:2106.14807 [cs.IR]
- [51] Jimmy Lin, Xueguang Ma, Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, Ronak Pradeep, and Rodrigo Nogueira. 2021. Pyserini: A Python Toolkit for Reproducible Information Retrieval Research with Sparse and Dense Representations. In *Proceedings of the 44th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (SIGIR 2021). 2356–2362.
- [52] Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, and Jimmy Lin. 2021. In-Batch Negatives for Knowledge Distillation with Tightly-Coupled Teachers for Dense Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP (Repl4NLP-2021)*, Anna Rogers, Iacer Calixto, Ivan Vulić, Naomi Saphra, Nora Kassner, Oana-Maria Camburu, Trapit Bansal, and Vered Shwartz (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 163–173. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.repl4nlp-1.17>
- [53] Dugang Liu, Pengxiang Cheng, Hong Zhu, Zhenhua Dong, Xiuqiang He, Weike Pan, and Zhong Ming. 2021. Mitigating Confounding Bias in Recommendation via Information Bottleneck. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems* (Amsterdam, Netherlands) (RecSys '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 351–360. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460231.3474263>
- [54] Jiqun Liu. 2022. Toward Cranfield-inspired reusability assessment in interactive information retrieval evaluation. *Information Processing & Management* 59, 5 (2022), 103007.
- [55] Jiqun Liu. 2023. *A Behavioral Economics Approach to Interactive Information Retrieval: Understanding and Supporting Boundedly Rational Users*. Vol. 48. Springer Nature.
- [56] Jiqun Liu. 2023. Toward A Two-Sided Fairness Framework in Search and Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval* (Austin, TX, USA) (CHIIR '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 236–246. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3576840.3578332>
- [57] Jingjing Liu, Michael J. Cole, Chang Liu, Ralf Bierig, Jacek Gwizdka, Nicholas J. Belkin, Jun Zhang, and Xiangmin Zhang. 2010. Search behaviors in different task types. In *Proceedings of the 10th Annual Joint Conference on Digital Libraries* (Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia) (JCDL '10). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 69–78. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1816123.1816134>
- [58] Jiqun Liu and Fangyuan Han. 2020. Investigating Reference Dependence Effects on User Search Interaction and Satisfaction: A Behavioral Economics Perspective. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Virtual Event, China) (SIGIR '20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1141–1150. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397271.3401085>
- [59] Jingjing Liu, Chang Liu, Jacek Gwizdka, and Nicholas J. Belkin. 2010. Can Search Systems Detect Users' Task Difficulty? Some Behavioral Signals. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Geneva, Switzerland) (SIGIR '10). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 845–846. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1835449.1835645>
- [60] Mengyang Liu, Yiqun Liu, Jiaxin Mao, Cheng Luo, Min Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2018. "Satisfaction with Failure" or "Unsatisfied Success": Investigating the Relationship between Search Success and User Satisfaction. In *Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference on World Wide Web, WWW 2018, Lyon, France, April 23-27, 2018*. 1533–1542. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3178876.3186065>
- [61] Mengyang Liu, Jiaxin Mao, Yiqun Liu, Min Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2019. Investigating Cognitive Effects in Session-Level Search User Satisfaction. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining* (Anchorage, AK, USA) (KDD '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 923–931. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3292500.3330981>

- [62] Qijiong Liu, Nuo Chen, Tetsuya Sakai, and Xiao-Ming Wu. 2024. ONCE: Boosting Content-based Recommendation with Both Open- and Closed-source Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (Merida, Mexico) (WSDM '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 452–461. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3616855.3635845>
- [63] Irene Lopatovska. 2014. Toward a model of emotions and mood in the online information search process. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 65, 9 (2014), 1775–1793. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23078> arXiv:<https://asistdl.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/asi.23078>
- [64] Xueguang Ma, Xinyu Zhang, Ronak Pradeep, and Jimmy Lin. 2023. Zero-Shot Listwise Document Reranking with a Large Language Model. arXiv:2305.02156 [cs.IR]
- [65] Jiaxin Mao, Yiqun Liu, Noriko Kando, Min Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2018. How Does Domain Expertise Affect Users' Search Interaction and Outcome in Exploratory Search? *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 36, 4, Article 42 (jul 2018), 30 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3223045>
- [66] Jiaxin Mao, Yiqun Liu, Ke Zhou, Jian-Yun Nie, Jingtao Song, Min Zhang, Shaoping Ma, Jiashen Sun, and Hengliang Luo. 2016. When Does Relevance Mean Usefulness and User Satisfaction in Web Search?. In *Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (Pisa, Italy) (SIGIR '16)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 463–472. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2911451.2911507>
- [67] Rishabh Mehrotra, Imed Zitouni, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, Ahmed El Kholly, and Madian Khabsa. 2017. User Interaction Sequences for Search Satisfaction Prediction. In *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (Shinjuku, Tokyo, Japan) (SIGIR '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 165–174. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3077136.3080833>
- [68] Meta. 2023. LLaMA: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models. arXiv:2302.13971 [cs.CL]
- [69] Fan Mo, Tsuneo Matsumoto, Nao Fukushima, Fuyuko Kido, and Hayato Yamana. 2022. Decoy Effect of Recommendation Systems on Real E-commerce Websites. In *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, Vol. 3222. CEUR-WS, 151–163.
- [70] Alistair Moffat, Peter Bailey, Falk Scholer, and Paul Thomas. 2017. Incorporating User Expectations and Behavior into the Measurement of Search Effectiveness. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 35, 3, Article 24 (jun 2017), 38 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3052768>
- [71] Alistair Moffat and Justin Zobel. 2008. Rank-Biased Precision for Measurement of Retrieval Effectiveness. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 27, 1, Article 2 (dec 2008), 27 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1416950.1416952>
- [72] Sophie Monchaux, Franck Amadieu, Aline Chevalier, and Claudette Mariné. 2015. Query strategies during information searching. *Inf. Process. Manage.* 51, 5 (sep 2015), 557–569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2015.05.004>
- [73] OpenAI. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin (Eds.), Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 1877–1901. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf
- [74] Gordon Pennycook and David G. Rand. 2019. Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning. *Cognition* 188 (2019), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.06.011> The Cognitive Science of Political Thought.
- [75] Zhen Qin, Rolf Jagerman, Kai Hui, Honglei Zhuang, Junru Wu, Jiaming Shen, Tianqi Liu, Jialu Liu, Donald Metzler, Xuanhui Wang, and Michael Bendersky. 2023. Large Language Models are Effective Text Rankers with Pairwise Ranking Prompting. arXiv:2306.17563 [cs.IR]
- [76] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, Kentaro Inui, Jing Jiang, Vincent Ng, and Xiaojun Wan (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Hong Kong, China, 3982–3992. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1410>
- [77] Stephen Robertson and Hugo Zaragoza. 2009. The Probabilistic Relevance Framework: BM25 and Beyond. *Found. Trends Inf. Retr.* 3, 4 (apr 2009), 333–389. <https://doi.org/10.1561/15000000019>
- [78] S. E. Robertson and S. Walker. 1994. Some simple effective approximations to the 2-Poisson model for probabilistic weighted retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 17th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (Dublin, Ireland) (SIGIR '94)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 232–241.
- [79] Tetsuya Sakai. 2006. Evaluating evaluation metrics based on the bootstrap. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (Seattle, Washington, USA) (SIGIR '06)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 525–532. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1148170.1148261>
- [80] Tetsuya Sakai and Zhicheng Dou. 2013. Summaries, Ranked Retrieval and Sessions: A Unified Framework for Information Access Evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 36th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (Dublin, Ireland) (SIGIR '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 473–482. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2484028.2484031>
- [81] Tetsuya Sakai and Zhaohao Zeng. 2021. Retrieval Evaluation Measures that Agree with Users' SERP Preferences: Traditional, Preference-based, and Diversity Measures. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 39, 2, Article 14 (dec 2021), 35 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3431813>
- [82] M. Sanchiz, A. Chevalier, and F. Amadieu. 2017. How do older and young adults start searching for information? Impact of age, domain knowledge and problem complexity on the different steps of information searching. *Comput. Hum. Behav.* 72, C (jul 2017), 67–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.02.038>
- [83] Mark Sanderson. 2010. Test Collection Based Evaluation of Information Retrieval Systems. *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval* 4 (01 2010), 247–375. <https://doi.org/10.1561/1500000009>
- [84] Falk Scholer, Diane Kelly, Wan-Ching Wu, Hanseul S. Lee, and William Webber. 2013. The Effect of Threshold Priming and Need for Cognition on Relevance Calibration and Assessment. In *Proceedings of the 36th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information*

- Retrieval (Dublin, Ireland) (*SIGIR '13*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 623–632. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2484028.2484090>
- [85] Milad Shokouhi, Ryen White, and Emine Yilmaz. 2015. Anchoring and Adjustment in Relevance Estimation. In *Proceedings of the 38th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Santiago, Chile) (*SIGIR '15*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 963–966. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2766462.2767841>
- [86] Gary Smith. 2012. Chapter 10 - Multiple Regression. In *Essential Statistics, Regression, and Econometrics*, Gary Smith (Ed.). Academic Press, Boston, 297–331. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-382221-5.00010-6>
- [87] Mark D. Smucker and Charles L.A. Clarke. 2012. Time-Based Calibration of Effectiveness Measures. In *Proceedings of the 35th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Portland, Oregon, USA) (*SIGIR '12*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 95–104. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2348283.2348300>
- [88] Weiwei Sun, Lingyong Yan, Xinyu Ma, Shuaiqiang Wang, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Dawei Yin, and Zhaochun Ren. 2023. Is ChatGPT Good at Search? Investigating Large Language Models as Re-Ranking Agents. arXiv:2304.09542 [cs.CL]
- [89] Erich Christian Teppan, Gerhard Friedrich, and Alexander Felfernig. 2010. Impacts of Decoy Effects on the Decision Making Ability. In *2010 IEEE 12th Conference on Commerce and Enterprise Computing*, 112–119. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CEC.2010.30>
- [90] Erich Christian Teppan and Markus Zanker. 2015. Decision Biases in Recommender Systems. *Journal of Internet Commerce* 14, 2 (2015), 255–275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332861.2015.1018703> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1080/15332861.2015.1018703>
- [91] Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman. 1974. Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science* 185, 4157 (1974), 1124–1131. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.185.4157.1124> arXiv:<https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.185.4157.1124>
- [92] Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman. 1991. Loss Aversion in Riskless Choice: A Reference-Dependent Model. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 106 (1991), 1039–1061.
- [93] Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman. 1992. Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 5 (1992), 297–323.
- [94] Ellen M. Voorhees. 2002. The Philosophy of Information Retrieval Evaluation. In *Evaluation of Cross-Language Information Retrieval Systems*, Carol Peters, Martin Braschler, Julio Gonzalo, and Michael Kluck (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 355–370.
- [95] Ben Wang and Jiquan Liu. 2023. Characterizing and Early Predicting User Performance for Adaptive Search Path Recommendation. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 60, 1 (2023), 408–420. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.799> arXiv:<https://asistdl.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/pra2.799>
- [96] Ben Wang and Jiquan Liu. 2023. Investigating the role of in-situ user expectations in Web search. *Information Processing & Management* 60, 3 (2023), 103300.
- [97] Hongning Wang, Yang Song, Ming-Wei Chang, Xiaodong He, Ahmed Hassan, and Ryen W. White. 2014. Modeling action-level satisfaction for search task satisfaction prediction. In *Proceedings of the 37th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval* (Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia) (*SIGIR '14*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2600428.2609607>
- [98] Wenjie Wang, Fuli Feng, Xiangnan He, Xiang Wang, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2021. Deconfounded Recommendation for Alleviating Bias Amplification. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining* (Virtual Event, Singapore) (*KDD '21*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1717–1725. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3447548.3467249>
- [99] Tianxin Wei, Fuli Feng, Jiawei Chen, Ziwei Wu, Jinfeng Yi, and Xiangnan He. 2021. Model-Agnostic Counterfactual Reasoning for Eliminating Popularity Bias in Recommender System. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining* (Virtual Event, Singapore) (*KDD '21*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1791–1800. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3447548.3467289>
- [100] Ryen W. White and Diane Kelly. 2006. A Study on the Effects of Personalization and Task Information on Implicit Feedback Performance. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management* (Arlington, Virginia, USA) (*CIKM '06*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 297–306. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1183614.1183659>
- [101] Alfian Farizki Wicaksono and Alistair Moffat. 2018. Empirical Evidence for Search Effectiveness Models. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management* (Torino, Italy) (*CIKM '18*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1571–1574. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3269206.3269242>
- [102] Chunhua Wu and Koray Cosguner. 2020. Profiting from the Decoy Effect: A Case Study of an Online Diamond Retailer. *Marketing Science* 39, 5 (2020), 974–995. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.2020.1231> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.2020.1231>
- [103] Linhai Wu, Pingping Liu, Xiujuan Chen, Wuyang Hu, Xuesen Fan, and Yuhuan Chen. 2020. Decoy effect in food appearance, traceability, and price: Case of consumer preference for pork hindquarters. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* 87 (2020), 101553.
- [104] Mingda Wu, Shan Jiang, and Yan Zhang. 2012. Serial Position Effects of Clicking Behavior on Result Pages Returned by Search Engines. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management* (Maui, Hawaii, USA) (*CIKM '12*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2411–2414. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2396761.2398654>
- [105] Lee Xiong, Chenyan Xiong, Ye Li, Kwok-Fung Tang, Jialin Liu, Paul N. Bennett, Junaid Ahmed, and Arnold Overwijk. 2021. Approximate Nearest Neighbor Negative Contrastive Learning for Dense Text Retrieval. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=zeFrgyZln>
- [106] Shuyuan Xu, Juntao Tan, Shelby Heinecke, Vena Jia Li, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2023. Deconfounded Causal Collaborative Filtering. *ACM Trans. Recomm. Syst.* 1, 4, Article 17 (oct 2023), 25 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3606035>

- [107] Fan Zhang, Jiaxin Mao, Yiqun Liu, Weizhi Ma, Min Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2020. Cascade or Recency: Constructing Better Evaluation Metrics for Session Search. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (Virtual Event, China) (SIGIR '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 389–398. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397271.3401163>
- [108] Zihao Zhao, Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Dan Klein, and Sameer Singh. 2021. Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 12697–12706.