# An Empirical Study of Customer Spillover Learning about Service Quality

Andrés Musalem

Industrial Engineering Department, University of Chile; amusalem@dii.uchile.cl

Yan Shang Facebook, Inc.; yanshang@fb.com

Jing-Sheng Song Fuqua School of Business, Duke University; jingsheng.song@duke.edu

"Spillover" learning is defined as customers' learning about the quality of a service (or product) from their previous experiences with similar yet not identical services. In this paper, we propose a novel, parsimonious and general Bayesian hierarchical learning framework for estimating customers' spillover learning. We apply our model to a one-year shipping/sales historical data provided by a world-leading third party logistics company and study how customers' experiences from shipping on a particular route affect their future decisions about shipping not only on that route, but also on other routes serviced by the same logistics company. Our empirical results are consistent with information spillovers driving customer choices. Customers also display an asymmetric response such that they are more sensitive to delays than early deliveries. In addition, we find that customers are risk averse being more sensitive to their uncertainty about the mean service quality than to the intrinsic variability of the service. Finally, we develop policy simulation studies to show the importance of accounting for customer learning when a firm considers service quality improvement decisions.

*Key words*: service operations management, customer learning, Bayesian hierarchical models, structural estimation, air cargo logistics.

History: This paper was first submitted on July 18, 2016.

# 1. Introduction

A central goal of service firms is to offer high levels of customer satisfaction while maintaining a low cost. To contribute to the achievement of this goal, the service operations management literature has focused on developing normative models to minimize operational (such as staffing and inventory) costs to attain a given service level. However, there is relatively scant research on how to choose an appropriate target service level. Indeed, the choice of service levels can be seen as a balancing act: higher service levels improve customer satisfaction and demand, but they are also likely to increase service costs and therefore negatively impact demand. Determining the effect of service levels on customer utility and service costs requires measuring the value that customers assign to an objective service level improvement and how this additional value translates into incremental revenues and profits. In this regard, empirical research focused on how customer purchasing behavior is affected by a firm's service levels is particularly valuable. Accordingly, the focus of this paper is to develop a structural model to enable such measurement in a context where customers learn about the quality of service through repeated encounters with a service provider in a business-to-business (B2B) setting.

Our modeling framework is motivated by and built on a one-year international cargo shipping and sales data from individual customers of a world-leading third-party logistics company. The dataset contains information about the quality of the service (e.g., delivery times and lengths of delays) received by customers each time they interacted with this provider. Air transport delivers goods that are time-sensitive, expensive, perishable or used in just-in-time supply networks, at competitive prices to customers worldwide. As such, delivery time and reliability is a critical measure of service quality. According to a 2010 report of Infosys, "carrier delays and non-performance on delivery" is ranked as the leading risk in the logistics industry. In a 2014 survey conducted by the International Air Transport Association (IATA) to major freight forwarders and their customers, low reliability is perceived as the second most important factor (next to transportation cost) driving the transport model shift from air to sea.

Modeling the value of service quality to customers introduces several challenges. By leveraging our dataset, we are able to overcome each of the ones described next. First, the quality of service can only be fully observed by the customer when the service is finished. For instance, in our air cargo shipping context, when choosing a service provider customers do not know whether their cargo will be delivered to the destination on time because the actual delivery performance can only be assessed after the cargo has been delivered. This uncertainty makes the standard random utility framework unsuitable because it typically assumes that customers know the attributes of all alternatives perfectly before making a choice, such as in Aksin et al. (2013). In contrast, a learning model is more suitable to our context (e.g., Ching et al. 2013), because they allow customers to have incomplete information about product attributes. Specifically, customers form expectations about these attributes from one or several information sources such as past experiences with the product, word of mouth and advertisements, and then use their beliefs about service performance in their purchase decisions. In this paper, we follow this approach and study customers' learning process about air cargo shipping service quality (i.e., on-time delivery). Our data set has an advantage over most quality learning models in the empirical literature, where service quality for each experience is not observed and hence is treated as a latent construct (e.g., Erdem 1998).

Second, most studies using learning models assume that the information about a certain product comes exclusively from experiences with the same product. Such assumption works well when a consumer has had multiple and frequent experiences with each product. When this is not the case, consumers might learn from multiple experiences with similar, but not necessarily identical products. We refer to this belief updating mechanism as "spillover" learning. In our application, assume for example that a customer has ordered cargo shipping services several times from a logistics company on a route from airport A to airport B and that the flights have often been either delayed at the departure or the cargo has failed to be loaded onto the flight.<sup>1</sup> Then, when the customer considers sending a new shipment through a new route (e.g., from airport C to airport D), the customer may also expect some delays because of the reliability experienced when using the same logistics company in the past. These information spillovers could be further enhanced if the two routes share certain characteristics. For example, the following two paths,  $A \to B$  and  $A \to C$ , share the same origin airport and this would make the experience on route  $A \to B$  potentially more informative about the delays to be anticipated when shipping on route  $A \to D$ , than when anticipating the reliability of shipments on route  $C \to D$ .

In the literature, a similar phenomenon has been studied (e.g., Erdem (1998), Sridhar et al. (2012)). For example, Erdem (1998) considers a model where the prior quality beliefs are correlated across products in different categories from the same "umbrella brand" (i.e., a brand that operates in multiple categories) through the use of a covariance matrix, and finds evidence that consumers learn from experiences across umbrella brands in the toothpaste and toothbrush categories. In this paper, we explore a new methodology that relies on a Bayesian hierarchical model, which yields a more parsimonious formulation and can be easily extended to accommodate a variety of learning spillover processes. This is also possible because we have access to quality information and hence we don't need to impute this information as in the case in most papers in the quality learning literature.

Third, data on service quality is often subjective rather than objective. It is thus not surprising that most of the extant studies about customer sensitivity to service quality rely on survey data (e.g., Bolton 1998). While surveys are useful in providing information about how customers perceive the quality of the service, it is not clear how to link subjective service quality assessments to an operational decision or service level. The delivery times and on-time frequency in our dataset, however, correspond to objective service quality metrics, making our model more applicable for operational decision making.

In terms of our results, applying our methodology to model customer behavior in the international air cargo transport industry, we find evidence consistent with information spillovers driving future purchase decisions. This result is important when estimating the overall impact of a service improvement or failure, because a change in one particular service may also affect other related services. Thus, our model can be used to identify the overall effect of an operational change in all products/services accounting for learning spillovers. We also find that service quality beliefs have an economically significant impact on the purchasing decisions of shipping services from the logistics

<sup>1</sup> In this study, a route is defined as a directed pair from origin airport A to destination airport B,  $A \to B$ , and it is different from  $B \to A$ .

company. Moreover, this effect is asymmetric — customers are approximately 1.7 times more sensitive to "poor" than to "good" service experiences. Similar to the results in the previous literature, we find customers to be risk averse. In particular, we find that customers are not only averse to experience variability, but also to belief uncertainty (i.e., customer's uncertainty about their beliefs, see §4.3 for definition and details). In fact, we find that belief uncertainty affects customers' utilities more compared to experience variability. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to separately estimate the effect of these two types of service quality uncertainty on customer behavior. We show that these results have important implications for designing service improvement strategies, which should be based on a good understanding of the learning rules that customers use and a careful balance of the direct and indirect (i.e., spillover) effect of changes in service quality against the corresponding operational costs.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We position our work within the literature in Section 2. In Section 3 we describe the empirical setting. Section 4 presents the learning and demand model and discusses the identification of the model parameters. In Section 5 we report the results. Section 6 discusses managerial implications of our model and its empirical results through counterfactual experiments. Section 7 concludes the paper and presents future research directions.

# 2. Contributions to the Literature

Our study contributes to three steams of research. In this section we provide a brief review of the literature that is most closely related to our study in each of these streams.

# 2.1. Contributions to the Empirical Service Operations Management Literature

Recent empirical studies have explored the problem of estimating the effect of service quality on demand. For example, Brown et al. (2005) and Aksin et al. (2013) study customers' abandonment behavior in the context of call centers, whereas Batt and Terwiesch (2015) study patients abandonment behavior in the context of hospital emergency room. Allon et al. (2011) quantify the effect of waiting time on sales, using market level data from the fast food industry and Lu et al. (2013) study the effect of waiting time and queue length on customers' purchase decisions in a supermarket deli section. Other studies have focused on different service quality measures including delivery time in quick service restaurants (Cho et al. 2015), signal quality in video streaming services (Sridhar et al. 2012), on-time performance of airlines (Grewal et al. 2010) and order fill-rate in a supplier-retailer supply chain (Craig et al. 2014).

Our paper contributes to this stream of research by explicitly modeling the customers' learning process about service quality, such that their beliefs about the quality of future experiences may depend on past experiences. The previous empirical work in service operations management typically uses a static approach to consider customers' beliefs about service quality. For example, Lu et al.

(2013) assume that customers form beliefs about service quality when they arrive at the physical queue based on the current observed length of the queue; Aksin et al. (2013) assume the customers (i.e. callers) correctly anticipate service quality (i.e., the probability of receiving service in a certain period) based on their past experiences and that this service quality is common knowledge among all customers; Batt and Terwiesch (2015) considers a hospital emergency department and argues that it is not clear what customers (i.e. patients) can learn from what they observe while waiting, so they investigate how the factors that customers observe and experience in the waiting room impacts their abandonment behavior. Instead of relying on this static assumption about consumer beliefs, we explicitly allow consumer expectations to evolve over time as each customer gains additional experiences with the service provider. Allowing customers to form beliefs based only on what they observe immediately before choosing a service provider can be a reasonable assumption when the service environment is observable (e.g., when the customer observes the length of the queue as in Lu et al. (2013)). However, in other contexts this is not the case, such as in call centers where a caller does not directly observe the state of the queue, and in air cargo transportation where a shipper chooses a service provider before observing the congestion level that his shipment will face once the cargo is picked up. Hence, our model is particularly relevant when customer learning is an important driver of customer behavior and the service environment is not observable to the customer.

### 2.2. Contributions to the Customers' Bayesian Learning Literature

Our paper uses a Bayesian learning modeling framework. Ching et al. (2013) provide an extensive literature review and identifies four categories of recent developments. Our work falls into the category: *models of correlated learning*. Ching et al. (2013) summarize the few existing studies in this stream (e.g., Erdem 1998, Coscelli and Shum 2004, Sridhar et al. 2012, Chan et al. 2013) and indicates that correlated learning means "··· learning about a brand in one category by using the same brand in another category and/or learning about one attribute (e.g., drug potency) from another (e.g., side effects). This occurs if priors and/or signals are correlated across products or attributes ····". Previous literature has explored the information spillover across multiple categories under the same brand (e.g., Erdem 1998) or type (e.g., Sridhar et al. 2012), or the information spillover among attributes of a multi-attribute product (e.g., Coscelli and Shum 2004, Chan et al. 2013). Our study explores the information spillover from past shipping service experiences, specifically the shipping experiences on multiple routes, of the same logistics company.

Our paper differs from previous studies of correlated learning in several important aspects. First, we directly observe objective service level metrics (e.g., the actual and planned time when the cargo is delivered at the destination) while none of the previous studies observe this information. Being able to observe service levels significantly lowers our computational burden compared to previous studies, because we can separate the estimation of a customer learning model from the estimation of a purchase model, thus eliminating the need of integrating out unobserved service quality. Therefore we are able to estimate the learning process about the quality of  $1000^+$  products, a dramatically larger number compared to 2-7 products usually seen in the learning model literature, and obtain results within a reasonable computational time. Moreover, having access to quality data enables us to explore the potential impact of different quality measures (see §4 for details), beyond the classic measures of perceived quality mean and risk, on customers' purchase decisions.

Second, the Bayesian hierarchical model provides a parsimonious and structural (i.e., theorybased) approach to characterize the information spillover process, and enables us to model the correlation among the true qualities of the products. We note that previous studies of correlated learning rely on estimating the covariance matrix of customers' quality priors (e.g., Erdem 1998, Coscelli and Shum 2004) and/or the covariance matrix of noise in quality signals (e.g., Sridhar et al. 2012, Chan et al. 2013, Coscelli and Shum 2004). The number of parameters in these approaches rapidly (i.e., quadratically) grows with the number of products for which spillovers are allowed. In contrast, our model provides a more parsimonious approach to allow for information spillovers among large numbers of products. Furthermore, in our approach it is straightforward to allow for information spillovers based on multiple product characteristics (e.g., distance and weight). This can be easily modeled embedding a linear model of quality as a function of product characteristics within the Bayesian learning framework. Finally, and in contrast with previous approaches, because we have access to quality data we can allow the true quality of the same service (or product) to be different for different customers. This is relevant in services, because a provider may set different service levels for different customers (e.g., giving priority to high volume customers). Note that without access to quality data it would be very challenging to separately estimate heterogeneity in service quality sensitivity and heterogeneity in true service quality. In fact, to our knowledge all previous approaches have assumed that the quality of a product or service is homogeneous across all customers.

Third, we relax the constant experience variability and belief uncertainty assumption that are used in the previous correlated learning literature. Specifically, existing correlated learning models assume that consumers are uncertain about the mean quality of a product or service, but that the variability of the service (i.e., the precision of quality signals) is constant and known to consumers (e.g., Coscelli and Shum 2004, Sridhar et al. 2012, Chan et al. 2013). The implication of this assumption is that as a consumer receives more information, his uncertainty about the mean quality of the product is lower (i.e., the consumer's perceived risk associated with the product). In general, this is true when the new information that a customer receives about a product is relatively congruent with his or her prior knowledge of the product (e.g., when a customer has experienced short delays in the past and her most recent experience also involves a short delay). However, when this new information is markedly inconsistent with the customer's prior beliefs, it could raise rather than reduce the consumer's uncertainty associated with the mean quality level. This is relevant for our application because severe transport disruptions (e.g., a delay longer than a couple of days) happen much more often than large quality changes for physical goods. Accordingly, our model allows consumers to update their beliefs about not only the mean product quality but also about the precision of the quality signals. This feature yields a richer and more realistic description of the customers' learning process.

# 2.3. Contributions to the Airline Customer Satisfaction Literature

There is a large body of literature aiming to relate airline service quality to microeconomic factors (e.g, price, competition, firm merging) and another important stream that seeks to forecast flight delays using statistical methods (refer to Deshpande and Arikan 2012 for a detailed literature review). Different from our interests in air cargo transport service, almost all of these studies have focused on passenger airlines, with Shang et al. (2016) as an exception, in which the authors also studied air cargo transport delivery performance.

There are a few studies sharing a similar interest to our paper in terms of studying the customerside consequences of airline transport service performance focusing on passengers (e.g., Taylor 1994; Forbes 2008; Anderson et al. 2008). Our paper contributes to this literature by providing evidence for the air cargo industry, which suggests that customers and their beliefs are more sensitive to "poor" rather than "good" service quality. We also provide evidence that customers are averse to service experience variability.

# 3. Empirical Setting

We first describe the air cargo shipping process in §3.1. In §3.2, we describe the main features of the data set that was made available to us by a world leading freight forward company, hereafter referred to as *AlphaShip* (the true company name is disguised for confidentiality). We collected additional information from Internet sources, as described in §3.3. We conclude this section in §3.4 with an exploratory analysis providing model-free evidence of spillovers in customer learning.

# 3.1. Air Cargo Shipping Process

An air cargo transport typically involves four parties: shippers (e.g., manufacturers), freight forwarders (forwarders in short), carriers (i.e., airlines) and consignees (e.g., downstream manufacturers or distributors). The shipping process starts with a request from the shipper to the forwarder with certain shipping needs, such as origin and destination cities, collection and delivery date, and cargo information (pieces, weight and volume). The forwarder, who typically has reserved spaces from airline partners, is often able to tell the shipper immediately whether it has shipping space available that fits the customer's requirements; and if so, the forwarder will provide the customer with a route map, i.e., a shipping proposal that includes flight numbers and airline information. The route map may be modified a few times before both the shipper and the forwarder agree on a final version as well as on the shipping fee. Then, the shipping process may start, which consists of three stages: (1) the door to airport stage (D2A): the forwarder picks up cargoes from the shipper at the required time, consolidates cargoes sharing the same route if possible, and then sends cargoes to the selected airline at an origin airport; (2) the airport to airport stage (A2A): the airline is in charge of the cargoes until they arrive at the destination airport; (3) the airport to door stage (A2D): the forwarder accepts cargoes at the destination, and delivers them to the consignees. In this process, it is the shipper who decides which forwarder company to use and pays the shipping fees (in most of the cases), so we refer to the shipper as the *customer* in what follows.

As an intermediary, the forwarder is the service provider and direct contact for its customers. Its responsibilities range from making the first route map to updating the customer with alternative shipping plans if the shipment does not proceed as planned (such as if the flight took off before the cargoes could have been loaded).<sup>2</sup> As a result, if a shipment is not delivered on-time and hence customer satisfaction drops, the forwarder faces the risk of losing the opportunity of conducting business with this customer in the future.

# **3.2.** Shipping Panel Data Descriptives

The data provided by AlphaShip contains the records of its air freight shipments from January to December in 2013. This data set follows the Cargo 2000 standard, an air cargo industry information system standard initiated in 1997 and currently widely used across the entire industry (adopted by 80 major airlines, freight forwarders, ground handler agents, trucking companies and IT providers). It records not only the actual delivery time at each milestone, but also the planned latest-by time for each milestone (see Shang et al. 2016 for more details). By comparing the actual delivery time against the planned delivery time, we can easily obtain the objective on-time delivery performance for each shipment: whether the shipment is delayed and how many hours it is delayed. For each shipment, the *transport delay*, is defined as the deviation of the actual final delivery time at the destination from the planned delivery time:

transport delay  $\equiv$  actual delivery time – planned delivery time

Neither earliness (i.e., a negative transport delay) nor tardiness (i.e., a positive transport delay) may be desirable for customers. While tardiness causes delays in production and/or product delivery to

 $^{2}$  Given that more than 90% of the air cargo shipments are handled by forwarders, we do not discuss the less frequent situations where the airlines deal with air cargo shipments directly without an intermediate forwarder.

Variable	Mean (std. dev)	Per customer Statistics	Mean (std. dev)
Transport delay (hours)	-0.77 (3.51)	Number of shipments	41.83 (13.78)
Chargeable weight (kg)	1274.07 (4785.73)	Number of routes	3.25 (1.00)
Pieces	1.13 (0.55)		
Distance (km)	7758.25 (3341.17)		

Table 1 Data Summary Statistics

all downstream customers, earliness may potentially yield additional storage and handling costs. We use transport delay as the primary measure of service quality of a shipment.

The data set contains customer IDs, which allows us to track customer purchases and model customers' learning about transport delay from their experiences with AlphaShip. After data cleaning and selecting customers with enough observations for model estimation (see Appendix A.1 for details), there are 725 customers and 26,045 shipments left in the data. The cargoes are transported from 53 countries to 153 countries on 2,897 routes all over the world. Table 1 provides more information about the data, including the choice predictors we use in our models (refer to §4 for details) and presents customer level statistics. As we can see from Table 1, even though the average transport delay is negative (i.e. cargoes delivered earlier than planned time), the variance is significantly large, meaning that the actual shipping service levels vary dramatically from shipment to shipment. In particular, 26.0% of the shipments are delayed and 9.2% of the shipments are delayed more than 2 hours (regarded as transport disruptions by industry standards, according to our discussion with company executives).

# 3.3. Price and Other External Data Descriptives

Due to its sensitive nature, AlphaShip cannot provide us the shipping fee associated with each shipment. In order to reconstruct prices, we train a forecasting model by merging two external datasets. The first is a sample of the official price data provided by IATA.<sup>3</sup> The data contains price information on routes from six airports in the Netherlands to almost all other airports in the world (846 airports), spanning 12 months in 2013; in addition, the chargeable weight and weight break associated with the prices are also included.<sup>4</sup> However, the number of routes included in the IATA sample is much smaller than that in our data, so we seek additional data from a shipping service quotation website www.worldfreightrates.com. Specifically, we build a Python program to crawl shipping prices from the website using the input (i.e. route, chargeable weight) extracted from our Cargo 2000 data. Thus, we are able to obtain price information for the majority of the routes and weight range. We crawled this website twice, in September 2014 and February 2016 respectively,

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$  The IATA official price might be slightly different from the actual shipping price, however both prices should be very similar.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Chargeable weight = max{volume weight (kg), actual weight (kg)}; volume weight = volume (cubic meter)/6.

Table 2	Price Dat	a Descriptives	Table 3	Price Forecast Model Estir	nates
	df	Mean (std. dev)		Estimate (std. err)	t value
In(Price) (\$)	1	6.7 (1.4)	$\gamma_0$ (Intercept)	4.50 (7.69e-03)***	584.90
Distance (km)	1	7201.8 (3534.2)	$\gamma_1$ (Distance)	1.15e-5 (3.26e-07)***	35.32
Weight (kg)	1	962.4 (5077.1)	$\gamma_2$ (Weight)	1.65e-6 (1.65e-07)***	10.00
$Weight\_break$	23		F-statistics (331	1, 473,520) = 1.62e + 04	
Month	14		$R^2 = 0.914$ ; Adj	justed $R^2 = 0.914$	
To_country	220		*p < 0.05; **p	< 0.01; ***p < 0.001.	
Pieces	71				

and each process took approximately 15 days. Then, we merged the data from the two sources to train the price forecasting model. The following equation shows the best fitting forecasting model (adjusted  $R^2 = 0.914$ ):

$$ln(P) = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \cdot Distance + \gamma_2 \cdot Weight$$

+ Weight break + Month + To country + Pieces (1)

More details about the data and the estimation results can be found in Table 2 and Table 3. By using the coefficients estimated from Equation (1), we forecast the price for each shipment obtained from AlphaShip.

We note that the *Distance* variable is not included in either the Cargo 2000 data nor the IATA price sampler. Instead, we obtained latitude and longitude information for all the airports in our data set and calculated the great-circle distance between the original and destination airport as the approximate distance for that route. Although this great-circle distance is shorter than the actual flight distance (especially if the shipping process includes multiple flights), it proves to be useful not only in predicting shipping price but also in specifying the learning and shipping choice model that we describe next.

### 3.4. Exploratory Analysis

In this subsection, we use simple descriptive models to explore how customers use past experiences, especially experiences from similar yet not identical services, to form quality beliefs which further affect their future purchase decisions. For each customer i, we denote by  $r_i$  his most frequently used route during the 1-year sample period. We then define as a dependent variable an indicator  $y_{it}$ , where  $y_{it} = 1$  if customer i ships on route  $r_i$  during period t, and zero otherwise. We use the average transport delay that customer i has experienced on route  $r_i$  until period t(averag\_TR\_on\_this\_route), and the average transport delay customer i has experienced on all other routes (averag\_TR\_on\_other\_routes) as independent variables. We control for customer heterogeneity by adding customer fixed effects (724 of them) and control for seasonality by adding

		-
Variable	Estimate (std. err)	z value
$averag\_TR\_on\_this\_route$	-9.92e-1 (3.89e-02)**	1.92
$averag\_TR\_on\_other\_routes$	-9.65e-1 (1.72e-02)***	1.98
Pseudo $R^2 = 0.08$		

Table 4 Linear Regression of Purchase Probability on Delays

\*p < 0.05; \*\*p < 0.01; \*\*p < 0.001.

month fixed effects. Linear regression results are reported in Table 4. As expected, higher average transport delays (e.g., more delays or less earliness) on route  $r_i$  lower customer *i*'s likelihood of shipping on this route in the future. This provides evidence consistent with customers forming quality beliefs using past experiences, which in turn affect their future decisions. What is more relevant to our research is that experiences on other routes also affect the customer's purchase decisions on the focal route  $r_i$ . These results suggest that when considering a focal route, experiences with other services may spillover and affect future purchasing decisions on that focal route. In the next section we will introduce a learning model that takes into account these information spillovers. Moreover, this learning model will allow us to consider a variety of policy simulation scenarios, such as evaluating the impact of reducing not only the average magnitude of delays, but also their variability. In addition, a learning model will allow us to consider a service quality improvement on a focal route and evaluate how quickly customers will change the likelihood of shipping through not only the focal route, but also through other routes.

# 4. Modeling Framework

We formulate a model comprised of three interrelated components: demand arrival, shipping choice decision and Bayesian learning about service quality. We explain the details of each component in  $\S4.1$ ,  $\S4.2$  and  $\S4.3$ , respectively.

### 4.1. Demand Arrival

One limitation of our data is that it only includes the observed purchases of shipping services performed by AlphaShip. In other words, we do not observe data for cases where the customer contacted AlphaShip to find out fees for shipping services but decided not to rely on AlphaShip (i.e., using a competitor or simply not shipping during that period). Similarly, our data does not separately identify periods where a customer did not have a shipping need. Both scenarios from the perspective of AlphaShip correspond to a no-purchase observation.

In order to overcome this difficulty, we first borrow the modeling approach used in Newman et al. (2014). Specifically, we divide the whole time horizon into a series of small discrete time slices during which a customer arrival may or may not be observed (an "arrival" means contacting AlphaShip for a shipping service quote, which does not necessarily lead to a final purchase). The slices must be sufficiently short so that the probability of two or more shipping demands from one customer

arriving during the same time period is small. Arrivals are exogenous and modeled as a Bernoulli process with parameter  $\lambda_i$  corresponding to the probability that customer *i* arrives to AlphaShip in a given time period. In this study, we choose half a week (i.e., 3.5 days) as a period. This choice leads to a low probability of multiple arrivals.<sup>5</sup>

A customer *i* arriving at AlphaShip may be interested in shipping on any route in his "route set",  $\Upsilon_i \subset \Delta$ , where  $\Delta$  is the set of all the routes (2000+ routes) in the data set. For tractability, we focus on customers with a set containing between 2 and 10 routes.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, upon arrival the probability that he is interested in shipping on route *j* is given by  $m_{ij}$ , where  $0 \leq m_{ij} \leq 1$ ,  $\sum_{j \in \Upsilon_i} m_{ij} = 1$  and  $m_{ij} = 0$  for  $j \in \Delta/\Upsilon_i$  (i.e., the choice of routes follows a multinomial distribution).

Defining  $d_{ijt}$  as an indicator which equals 1 if customer *i* is interested in shipping on route *j* in period *t* and 0 otherwise, then:

$$\operatorname{Prob}\left(d_{ijt}=1\right) = \lambda_i m_{ij}.\tag{2}$$

Note that this demand arrival process is independent from the actions of AlphaShip. However, whether the customer decides to fulfill this demand through AlphaShip will depend on AlphaShip's prices and prior performance, as described next.

# 4.2. Shipping Choice Model

A customer i with a shipping demand on route j in period t needs to decide whether to use AlphaShip or not (i.e., to use a competitor or not to ship). The utility that customer i derives from using AlphaShip is given by (we use bold symbols for parameter vectors and regular symbols for scalars):

$$U_{ijt} = \beta_i^0 + \beta^p \cdot Price_{jt} + \boldsymbol{\beta}^X \cdot X_{jt} + f\left(I_{it}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i^q\right) + e_{ijt},\tag{3}$$

while the utility of the outside option (i.e., not using AlphaShip) is normalized to  $U_{i0t} = e_{i0t}$ . Here  $e_{ijt}$  captures idiosyncratic preferences of the customer unobserved to the researcher. In Equation (3), we use an individual-level intercept  $\beta_i^0$  to control for customer heterogeneity. We use the shipping price,  $(Price_{ijv})$ , as a factor influencing customers' utility, which allows us to estimate customers' price sensitivity and to put a dollar tag on the cost of service quality. Given that in most cases, customers call the forwarder's local branch or use the forwarder's online price quotation tool to get shipping prices before making purchase decisions, we assume that prices are known to customers. However, due to lack of pricing information, we use the price forecasted by model (1) in §3 to impute prices. Furthermore,  $X_{ijt}$  is a vector of controls which include: (i) cargo chargeable weight

 $<sup>^{5}</sup>$  For periods when multiple arrivals from the same customer are observed (only 10.5% among all the customer-period), we choose to keep the route with the highest total arrival times from that customer.

 $<sup>^{6}</sup>$  Customers with 1 or more than 10 routes represent 9% and 12%, respectively, of the customer base. For more details about customer selection, please refer to Appendix A1.

(Weight); (ii) monthly dummies (e.g., April, May) to control for seasonality across months and (iii) a dummy variable equal to 1 when a period corresponds to the second half of a week to control for seasonality within a week. One important element in Equation (3) is the parametric function,  $f(\cdot)$ , that captures the utility impact of a customer's beliefs about service quality contained in his information set  $I_{it}$ .  $\beta_i^q$  is the function's parameter vector to be estimated. We will discuss the functional form for  $f(\cdot)$  in §4.3.3 after describing the customer service quality learning process in §4.3.1 and §4.3.2.

Assuming a standard extreme value distribution for  $e_{ijt}$ , the random utility model described by Equation (3) becomes a binary logit model. Let  $y_{ijt}$  be an indicator that is set to 1 if consumer *i* purchases shipping services on route *j* at time *t*, and 0 otherwise. Then the probability of a purchase,  $y_{ijt} = 1$ , given a demand  $d_{ijt}$  is:

$$P_{ijt} \equiv \operatorname{Prob}\left(y_{ijt} = 1 \mid d_{ijt} = 1\right) = e^{V_{ijt}} / (1 + e^{V_{ijt}}),\tag{4}$$

where  $V_{ijt}$  is the deterministic component of  $U_{ijt}$ :  $V_{ijt} \equiv U_{ijt} - e_{ijt}$ . The model in Equation (3) includes not only a customer-specific intercept, but also individual coefficients for the terms associated with the effect of the shipping service quality  $(\beta_i^0, \beta_i^q)$ . These individual coefficients are assumed to follow a multivariate normal distribution with mean  $(\beta^0, \beta^q)$  and for simplicity a diagonal covariance matrix  $\Omega$ , which we seek to estimate from the data.

# 4.3. Customer Learning Spillover

We now describe the customer learning process. This formulation will allow for information spillovers under which a customers' experience with one particular service may offer relevant information about the service quality of other similar (yet not identical) services from the same firm. Throughout, we model this learning process as being independent across customers. Therefore, we describe the learning mechanism for customer i, omitting the subscript i in most of the equations below for ease of exposition. We focus on transport delay (Q) as the primary service quality measure. We refer to Q as tardiness if Q > 0 and earliness if Q < 0. Given that the transport process consists of a series of multiple stochastic events (i.e. multiple connected flights, loading and unloading at the airports) and because Q can be either positive or negative, we assume that Q follows a normal distribution:

$$Q_{jt} \sim N(\mu_{jt}, \sigma_{jt}^2) \tag{5}$$

where  $\mu_{jt}$  and  $\sigma_{jt}^2$  are the true mean and variance of service quality on route j for a customer's visit during period t;  $Q_{jt}$  is the customer's experienced service quality, which he observes after the cargo has been delivered at the destination. Although more flexible distributions could be used to model delays, a normal distribution offers important tractability advantages. Also note that different

customers may have different true quality means and variances (we have omitted the consumer subscript in  $Q_{jt}$  and its moments for ease of exposition). We assume that customers do not know the mean quality level  $\mu_{jt}$  due to "inherent product variability" (Ching et al. 2013)  $\sigma_{jt}^2$ , which is referred to as "experience variability" in the learning literature. Customers form beliefs about both the mean quality level  $\mu_{jt}$  and experience variability  $\sigma_{jt}^2$  from the signals  $Q_{jt}$  received from their own usage experiences. In contrast to previous empirical research in learning models, not only customers, but also the researchers (us) observe the objective transport delay,  $Q_{jt}$ . This data advantage enables us to explore more flexible and general learning models and also allows us to relax strong assumptions used in many previous literature, such as rational prior information (Chan et al. 2013) or full knowledge of experience variability  $\sigma_{jt}^2$  (Sridhar et al. 2012). We will explain these in more details in §4.3.1 and §4.3.2.

4.3.1. A Simple Bayesian Hierarchical Model for Customers' Learning First, we consider a simple Bayesian Hierarchical learning model (referred to as the "simple model" in the following context) to characterize customer learning spillovers. Throughout, we adopt the indexing convention where subscript t denotes the beginning of period t. As a simplification of Equation (5), customers assume that the true mean is constant across periods, i.e.  $\mu_{jt} = \mu_j$  and hence it is only differentiated across routes j. Moreover, we assume that the variance  $\sigma_{jt}^2 = \sigma^2$  is the same for all service types and periods. Accordingly:

$$Q_{jt} \sim N(\mu_j, \sigma^2) \tag{6}$$

Given that the service on all routes is arranged by the same logistics firm, one might expect that the quality of the service for one route might offer information about the quality of the service on another route. Mathematically, a Bayesian hierarchical model allows for information borrowing among the true qualities for different routes by adding one more layer to the model. Here we assume that the true qualities  $\mu_j, \forall j \in \Upsilon_i$ , are generated exchangeably from a common population, with a distribution governed by the hyper-parameters  $\mu$  and  $\xi$ :

$$\mu_j \sim N\left(\mu, \xi^2\right), \forall j \in \Upsilon_i. \tag{7}$$

The hyper-parameter  $\mu$  provides the grand mean of qualities across all routes, while  $\xi^2$  measures the degree of heterogeneity in service quality across routes. This heterogeneity parameter is related to the degree of shrinkage of route qualities towards the grand mean. Smaller values of this parameter imply that route qualities are more similar and hence experiences for one route become more informative about the quality of another route.

We further allow these hyper-parameters ( $\mu$  and  $\xi^2$ ) to be unknown to consumers. Hence, their prior beliefs about these parameters are modeled using a Normal-Gamma distribution (this facilitates computations due to its conjugacy properties). The consumer also doesn't know how variable experiences are  $(\sigma^2)$ , so an inverse gamma prior is used to model consumer beliefs about this variability. Accordingly, at the beginning of period t = 1, customer *i* has the following initial beliefs:

$$\sigma^2 \sim IG\left(\alpha_{\sigma}, \delta_{\sigma}\right), \qquad \mu \sim N\left(\mu_0, \sigma_{\mu}^2\right), \qquad \xi^2 \sim IG\left(\alpha_{\xi}, \delta_{\xi}\right) \tag{8}$$

Here  $IG(\alpha, \beta)$  represents the inverse-Gamma distribution such that for  $x \sim IG(\alpha, \beta)$  the pdf is  $f(x) = \frac{\beta^{\alpha}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} x^{-\alpha-1} \exp(-\beta/x)$  and the expectation is  $E[x] = \frac{\beta}{\alpha-1}$ .

Because our data presents a left truncation problem (i.e., most of the customers have shipped with AlphaShip before our observation period starts), we cannot assume the customers' priors to be the same during the first period in our data. Borrowing a solution used in previous studies (e.g., Mehta et al. 2004 and Zhao et al. 2011), we use the first 24 periods (around 3 months) of data as a pre-estimation sample. We then assume that at the beginning of the pre-estimation sample all customers have the same prior beliefs about experience variability ( $\sigma^2$ ), grand mean of product quality ( $\mu$ ) across routes and quality heterogeneity across routes ( $\xi^2$ ), such that  $\sigma^2 \sim IG(1.05, 10)$ ,  $\mu \sim N(0, 30^2)$  and  $\xi^2 \sim IG(1.05, 3)$ . Here, contrary to the widely used assumption of "rational expectation of priors" (e.g., Chan et al. 2013), we use proper but relatively flat priors adding very weak assumptions to the estimation. Based on this formulation, we calibrate individual learning using the pre-estimation sample and calculate the posterior distribution of { $\sigma^2, \mu, \xi^2$ } for each customer at the end of the 24<sup>th</sup> period. Then we use these posteriors as the corresponding prior for { $\sigma^2, \mu, \xi^2$ } for every customer in the 25<sup>th</sup> period (see Table 9 in Appendix B.1 for details) and estimate the full model using the remaining 80 periods in our data.

The evolution of a customer's beliefs over time can then be updated each period given every new piece of information acquired (i.e., shipping experiences in our application) using Bayes' rule. Different from the previous literature in which the posterior distribution of the learning parameters has a closed-form expression, after adding a hierarchy to our model to allow for learning spillovers (i.e.,  $\mu_j \sim N(\mu, \xi^2)$ ), a closed-form expression is not available. Thus we resort to Gibbs sampling for calculating the posterior distribution of all quality moments ( $\mu_j, \sigma^2, \mu$  and  $\xi^2$ ). A discussion of the need of using a simulation-based method such as Gibbs sampling and its advantages over other simulation methods such as Metropolis-Hastings can be found in Appendix B.2.

Accordingly, let  $I_t$  denote the information set of a customer at the beginning of time period t( $25 \le t \le T$ ). Then  $I_t = \{Q_{j,p-1}, \mu_{jp}^E, \sigma_p^E, \xi_p^E, \forall j \in \Upsilon_i \text{ and } 25 \le p \le t\}$ , which contains both (i) the customer's shipping experiences  $Q_{j,p}$  in the past periods 1, ..., t-1; and (ii) his expectation for shipping service quality at the beginning of each period. Here, we use the E superscript to denote a customer's "estimated" value for a quantity of interest (in our model, this estimated value corresponds to the posterior mean). For example,  $\mu_{jp}^E$  is a customer's shipping service quality estimates of  $\mu_j$  at the beginning of period p; similar definitions apply to  $\sigma_p^E$  and  $\xi_p^E$ . The customer's shipping service quality estimates



Figure 1 Spillover learning in the hierarchical Bayesian model.

(e.g.,  $\mu_{jp}^E$ ) are updated if he has new shipments delivered by AlphaShip in the previous period; otherwise, the estimates are the same as before. Assuming customer *i* has shipments finished in period *t*, then he updates his quality beliefs at the beginning of period t+1 using the new information set  $I_{t+1}$ . A Gibbs sampler is implemented to update customer beliefs by sampling each parameter from its full-conditional posterior distribution until convergence (we use "…" to indicate all other parameters and data):

$$\mu_j \mid \dots \sim N\left(\frac{n_j \xi^2 \bar{Q}_j + \sigma^2 \mu}{n_j \xi^2 + \sigma^2}, \frac{\xi^2 \sigma^2}{n_j \xi^2 + \sigma^2}\right),\tag{9}$$

$$\sigma^2 \mid \dots \sim IG\left(\alpha_{\sigma} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j \in \Upsilon_i} n_j, \, \delta_{\sigma} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j \in \Upsilon_i} \sum_{p=1}^t y_{jp}^* \left(Q_{jp} - \mu_j\right)^2\right),\tag{10}$$

$$\mu \mid \dots \sim N\left(\frac{J\sigma_{\mu}^{2}\bar{\mu} + \xi^{2}\mu_{0}}{J\sigma_{\mu}^{2} + \xi^{2}}, \frac{\sigma_{\mu}^{2}\xi^{2}}{J\sigma_{\mu}^{2} + \xi^{2}}\right),$$
(11)

$$\xi^2 \mid \dots \sim IG\left(\alpha_{\xi} + \frac{J}{2}, \, \delta_{\xi} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \Upsilon_i} \left(\mu_j - \mu\right)^2\right). \tag{12}$$

where the number of routes is denoted as  $J \equiv |\Upsilon_i|$ , the average quality is given by  $\bar{\mu} \equiv \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j \in \Upsilon_i} \mu_j$ ;  $y_{ijt}^*$  is an indicator that is set to 1 if customer *i* had a shipment on route *j* delivered during period *t*, and 0 otherwise;  $\bar{Q}_j = \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{p=1}^t Q_{jp} y_{jp}^*$ ; and  $n_j = \sum_{p=1}^t y_{jp}^*$ .<sup>7</sup>

Given that Gibbs sampling is a simulation-based method, its outcome is a set of values for all the parameters (i.e.,  $\mu_j, \sigma^2, \mu$  and  $\xi^2$ ) drawn from their posterior distribution. To construct estimates of mean quality beliefs such as  $\mu_{j,t+1}^E$ , we take the average of the (posterior) draws for  $\mu_j$ , which gives an estimate of the posterior mean of this parameter. The same approach is used for all other parameters. The estimates,  $\mu_{j,t+1}^E$ ,  $\mu_{t+1}^E$ ,  $\sigma_{t+1}^E$  and  $\xi_{t+1}^E$ , are in turn used as predictors in the quality function  $f(I_{it}, \beta_i^q)$  that describes how quality beliefs affect a customer's decision to rely on AlphaShip for shipping services (see §4.3.3).

It is important to note that besides being an efficient computational tool to estimate the posterior distribution of quality beliefs, the Gibbs sampling steps are also useful to understand how learning

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Note that  $y_{ijt}^*$  is a shipment delivery indicator and  $y_{ijt}$  (§4.2) is a shipment start indicator. A shipment is not always finished in the same period when it was initiated, thus  $y_{ijt}$  and  $y_{ijt}^*$  are often different.

spillovers shape these beliefs. Specifically, a new quality (i.e., delay) observation on route j ( $Q_{jt}$ ) changes the customer's beliefs about the mean transport delay on route j ( $\mu_j$ , see Figure 1 and equation 9). This in turn influences the customer's (grand) mean quality ( $\mu$ ) about all routes served by AlphaShip (see equation 11). Through this iterative process, the new beliefs about service quality grand mean shifts the beliefs of all other routes ( $\mu_{-j}$ ) and more strongly when the degree of route quality heterogeneity  $\xi^2$  is small (see equation 9). Consequently, information about one product (route) is used not only to update beliefs about that product, but also about others.

Furthermore, new experiences not only change consumer beliefs about the mean qualities  $(\mu_j \text{ and } \mu)$ , but also about the variability of the experiences. More specifically, experience variability  $(\sigma^2)_t^E$  reflects the variance of service quality  $Q_{jt}$  around its mean  $(\mu_j)$ . The properties of the inverse-gamma distribution imply that the consumer's estimate of experience variability  $(\sigma^2)_p^E$  can be expressed as:

$$E\left[\sigma^{2}\mid\cdots\right] = \left[\delta_{\sigma} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j\in\Upsilon_{i}}\sum_{p=1}^{t}y_{jp}^{*}\left(Q_{jp} - \mu_{j}\right)^{2}\right] / \left(\alpha_{\sigma} - 1 + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j\in\Upsilon_{i}}n_{j}\right)$$
(13)

Note that the denominator in this equation increases with the arrival of new information, because  $\sum_{j \in \Upsilon_i} n_j$  is the cumulative number of experiences. However, the corresponding numerator also increases when new information arrives. In particular, if the new delay information  $Q_{jp}$  is very inconsistent with mean quality beliefs  $\mu_j$  (e.g., after experiencing a unusually long delay), beliefs about experience variability will increase dramatically.

It is important to note that the standard learning models in the literature assume experience variability  $\sigma^2$  to be a constant known by the customer. In addition, the variance of prior (i.e., initial) beliefs about  $\mu_j$  is also assumed to be constant (e.g., consumers might start with very vague beliefs). This last assumption is reasonable when modeling the learning process about the quality (or other attributes) of a single product in isolation. However, this assumption also makes beliefs about the mean quality of a product to monotonically become more precise as the customer gains new experiences. Zhao et al. (2011) relax this assumption by assuming an inverse-gamma distribution for belief uncertainty. Our model not only relaxes the assumption about the experience variability  $\sigma^2$  being known to the consumer, but also allows the uncertainty about mean quality beliefs to potentially increase or decrease as new information is gained by the customer. Accordingly, to the best of our knowledge our paper is the first study in correlated learning to relax both assumptions, thus providing a more flexible quality learning structure.

A similar pattern is observed when focusing on the evolution of beliefs about route quality heterogeneity  $(\xi^2)_t^E$ , which measures service quality differences across routes. When new information about a route is dramatically different from prior beliefs (e.g., an unusually early delivery), this will shift mean quality beliefs about that route, and if doing so the estimated quality of that route  $(\mu_{it}^E)$ 



Figure 2 Top: updates of perceived shipping quality on each route and overall shipping quality; Bottom: updates of experience variability and belief uncertainty

shifts away from AlphaShip's grand mean quality ( $\mu$ ), then the estimated route heterogeneity  $(\xi^2)_t^E$  will increase.

To help readers better understand the information spillover process, we estimate the learning process for a customer (in our data) who operates on three routes denoted by  $\{a, b, c\}$ . We plot the changes to his estimated mean quality beliefs for each route  $\mu_{at}^{E}$ ,  $\mu_{bt}^{E}$ ,  $\mu_{ct}^{E}$ , grand mean quality  $\mu_{t}^{E}$ , experience variability  $\sigma_{t}^{E}$  and quality heterogeneity across routes  $\xi_{t}^{E}$  throughout the observation period. As we can see from the top panel in Figure 2, the estimated mean quality for each route changes over time and so does the grand mean quality ( $\mu_{t}^{E}$ ) which takes values between the highest and lowest of the route quality beliefs. To maintain the readability of the figure, we did not plot the quality of all shipping experiences  $Q_{ijt}$ . Instead, let us focus on the events corresponding to t = 59. We use two vertical lines in the top and bottom panels to highlight the period in which this "experience" was gained (t = 59) and the following period (t = 60). The top panel shows a large increase of estimated quality (i.e., delay) on route c in period 60. This is caused by a severe delay of almost 9 hours on this route in period 59. This severe delay also causes the estimated grand mean quality  $\mu_{t}^{E}$  to increase in period 60 (see the top plot). Furthermore, as we explained before,

the large inconsistency between the experience in period 59 and the estimated mean quality  $\mu_{c59}^E$  causes a surge in experience variability  $\sigma_t^E$  following the severe transport disruption as depicted in the bottom plot.

With this large increase in experience variability  $\sigma_t^E$  and a relatively small increase in quality heterogeneity across routes  $\xi_t^E$ , the estimated mean quality for each route j (i.e.,  $\mu_{jt}^E$ ) places more weight on the grand mean quality  $\mu_t^E$  compared to the average observed quality on that route  $(\bar{Q}_j)$ . Mathematically, this can be seen using the Gibbs sampling formula  $E[\mu_j | \cdots] = \frac{n_j \xi^2 \bar{Q}_j + \sigma^2 \mu}{n_j \xi^2 + \sigma^2}$ (Equation (9)). Note that this expectation is a weighted average between the average observed quality on route j ( $\bar{Q}_j$ ) and the overall mean quality across all routes ( $\mu$ ). As a result, when quality exhibits large variability ( $\sigma_t^E$ ), the estimated mean qualities on routes a and b,  $\mu_{at}^E \mu_{bt}^E$ , respectively, more strongly shift towards the overall quality  $\mu_t^E$ .

4.3.2. Bayesian Regression Hierarchical Model for Customers' Learning We now consider an alternative setting where customers learn from their shipping experiences at AlphaShip taking into account the characteristics of different routes when using information about one route to learn about the quality on another route. For example, when forming beliefs about the quality of a route, the quality of more similar routes (e.g., routes sharing an origin or destination airport) might be more informative. Formally, this approach is based on embedding a Bayesian hierarchical regression within the learning model. Accordingly, instead of modeling consumer beliefs in a given period t for route j as  $\mu_{jt} = \mu_j$  in Equation (5), we allow  $\mu_{jt}$  to not only depend on the identity of that route as in §4.3.1 but also with the specific characteristics of that route. Focusing on distance as one of those characteristics,  $\mu_{jt}$  becomes a linear function of route distance:

$$\mu_{jt} = \theta_j + \gamma \cdot Distance_j, \tag{14}$$

where  $\theta_j$  is a route-level mean quality intercept for route j;  $Distance_j$  is the great-circle distance of route j; and  $\gamma$  measures the effect of distance on the mean transport delay. Due to data constraints, especially the missing no-purchase data as explained in §4.1, we use only distance as a predictor of mean quality. However, our model and estimation method can be easily extended to include more route characteristics if more observations were available. As before, we add a hierarchy to these parameters to allow for information sharing:

$$\theta_j \sim N\left(\mu, \xi^2\right), \forall j \in \Upsilon_i,$$

and we adopt a Normal-Gamma hyper-prior distribution:  $\theta \sim N(\mu_0, \sigma_\mu^2)$ ,  $\gamma \sim N(\gamma_0, \sigma_\gamma^2)$ ,  $\xi^2 \sim IG(\alpha_{\xi}, \delta_{\xi})$ ,  $\sigma^2 \sim IG(\alpha_{\sigma}, \delta_{\sigma})$ . We solve the left truncation problem in the same way as before by using the first 24 periods data as pre-estimation sample and adopting the same initial beliefs except

for the distance coefficient for which we assume a vague prior:  $\gamma \sim N(0, 30^2)$ . Finally, under this learning model each customer's information set becomes  $I_t = \{Q_{j,p-1}, \mu_{jp}^E, \theta_{jp}^E, \gamma_p^E, \sigma_p^E, \xi_p^E \ \forall j \in \Upsilon_i$ and  $25 \leq p \leq t\}$ ,  $\forall 25 \leq t \leq T$ . For detailed Gibbs sampling formulas, please refer to Appendix B.3 and B.4.

4.3.3. Service Quality Related Factors in the Utility Function In this subsection we discuss how shipping service quality beliefs may affect customers' shipping decisions through  $f(I_{jt}, \beta^q)$  in Equation (3) (subscript *i* is omitted for ease of exposition). In particular we focus on three characteristics of this function.

First, we consider the potentially asymmetric effect of the estimated mean quality  $\mu_{jt}^E$ . In our application positive and negative quality values have a different meaning, they imply tardiness and earliness, respectively and this different meaning may yield different consequences for customers. Therefore, we will allow positive and negative values of the mean quality to have a different impact on the utility function that determines a customer's shipping decisions.

Second, we explore the possible nonlinear effect of the estimated mean quality (i.e., transport delay). Customers might respond differently to minor delays (e.g., 2 hours) than to disruptive delays (e.g., 2 days). For example, compared to the smaller inconvenience brought by a 2-hour day, a delay of 2 days may probably disrupt the customer's production or delivery plan and cause more severe loss of business. Accordingly, we consider a quadratic function of the estimated mean quality  $\mu_{jt}^E$  to account for this possibility.

Finally, similar to several previous learning models in the literature (e.g., Erdem 1998, Sridhar et al. 2012), we consider that customers might be risk averse. The uncertainty about service quality  $Q_j$  has two components:  $Var[Q_j] = E\left[(\sigma^2)_{jt}\right] + Var[\mu_{jt}]$ . The first component  $E\left[(\sigma^2)_{jt}\right]$  measures the estimated degree of experience variability and originates from inherent variability in the delivery of the service and thus cannot be reduced with additional experiences. The second component  $Var[\mu_{jt}]$  measures customers' uncertainty about the true value of the mean quality and it originates from a customer's limited knowledge. The effect of these two uncertainty components on customer utility may differ. Previous studies have explored customers' risk aversion by either combining the two components (i.e., estimating the effect of the total uncertainty  $Var[Q_j]$ , such as Erdem (1998)) or only focusing on the effect of the uncertainty associated with learning the true value of the mean quality  $Var[\mu_{jt}^E]$  (e.g., Coscelli and Shum 2004, Sridhar et al. 2012, Zhao et al. 2011). In contrast, in our model we separately estimate and compare the effect of these two sources of uncertainty.

# 4.4. Model Identification

Given that customers directly observe the service quality  $Q_{ijt}$  for each of their shipments with AlphaShip, the identification of the learning model (see §4.3) is a standard Bayesian statistics problem: the parameters will always have proper posterior distributions given the prior distributions that we use, and the magnitude of the posterior variance depends on the information contained in the Cargo 2000 shipping data. So we focus on the identification of the demand arrival (see §4.1) and shipping choice models (see §4.2).

From Equation (2) and (4), we obtain the probability of observing a purchase from customer i on route j at time t:

$$P(y_{ijt} = 1) = P(y_{ijt} = 1 \mid d_{ijt} = 1) \cdot P(d_{ijt} = 1) = \lambda_i m_{ij} \cdot e^{V_{ijt}} / (1 + e^{V_{ijt}})$$

In the above equation, the parameter  $\lambda_i$  determines the overall demand level of customer *i*, given that  $P(y_{ijt} = 1) \propto \lambda_i$ . However, the customer-level intercept  $\beta_i^0$  also plays the role of adjusting the overall probability of shipping: if  $\beta_i^0$  increases then  $e^{V_{ijt}}/(1 + e^{V_{ijt}})$  increases. As a result, separately identifying both  $\lambda_i$  and  $\beta_i^0$  is very difficult, especially when having few observations (around 20 for each customer). For example, the data generated from a high  $\lambda_i$  and low  $\beta_i^0$  customer can be very similar to that from a customer with low  $\lambda_i$  and high  $\beta_i^0$ . As a result, we set  $\lambda_i = 1$  for all customers and focus on estimating  $\beta_i^0$ .

Now consider  $m_{ij}$ , which is a parameter of a multinomial distribution. These parameters must satisfy the following constraints  $0 < m_{ij} \le 1$  for  $j \in \Upsilon_i$  and  $\sum_{j \in \Upsilon_i} m_{ij} = 1$  for customer *i*. To enforce these constraints, we estimate  $\bar{m}_{ij}$  instead of  $m_{ij}$ , where  $m_{ij} \equiv \exp(\bar{m}_{ij}) / \sum_{j \in \Upsilon_i} \exp(\bar{m}_{ij})$  and  $-\infty < \bar{m}_{ij} < \infty$ . Without loss of generality, we normalize the value of  $\bar{m}_{ij}$  for the first route ever chosen by customer *i* to 0. The identification of the remaining model parameters (i.e.  $\beta^p$ ) is standard in discrete choice models and will be omitted for brevity.

Finally, we conducted a Monte Carlo simulation study to test our methodology. We simulated the shipping behavior of 80 customers for 100 periods. The arguments, such as shipping service quality, used in the simulation test are set close to those in the real data. Results show that our parameters can be reasonably recovered from the simulated data. These results provide evidence that our estimation approach can recover the true parameters of the data generating process (detailed results are available in the online appendix C.2). For more details about the estimation, please refer to Appendix A.2 and C.1.

# 5. Results and Discussion

We first describe different learning models and compare their goodness-of-fit in §5.1. In §5.2, we then provide the results of the demand arrival and shipping choice model, particularly, we provide results for the choice models based on different learning assumptions.

#### 5.1. Quality Learning Model

After every experience customers in our study obtain an objective measure of service quality (i.e., transport delay). Different from most models in the empirical quality learning literature, because we also observe these service quality metrics, the estimation of each customers' learning process can be performed independently from the estimation of the remaining model parameters. Before presenting the estimates of the learning model, we first compare the goodness-of-fit of several competing learning models using the shipping service quality data.

**5.1.1. Learning Model Comparison** In addition to the Bayesian hierarchical model explained in section 4.1, we further consider several benchmark learning models. The first benchmark is a short-memory learning model under which customers only rely on the most recent experience when anticipating the service quality they will receive. Specifically, we let

$$f(I_t, \boldsymbol{\beta}^q) = Q_{ijt-1} \tag{15}$$

where  $Q_{ij,t-1}$  is the actual shipping service quality experienced by customer *i* on route *j* in period t-1 ( $Q_{ij,t-1}$  is the same as  $Q_{ij,t-2}$  if there is no new experience in period t-1), and is set to 0 if the customer has not chosen route *j* by period *t* to rely on the services of AlphaShip.

The second benchmark model describes an independent learning process — a customer only updates his beliefs about shipping quality on a route using the usage experience on that specific route, without borrowing information from other routes he has experienced before. Recall that we model Q using a normal distribution, i.e.  $Q_{jt} \sim N(\bar{Q}_{jt}, \sigma_{jt}^2)$  (see Equation (5) in §4.3.1). In the independent learning model, customer beliefs about the mean quality  $\mu_{jt}$  can be expressed as follows:

$$\mu_{jt} \sim N\left(\mu_{0j}, \xi_j^2\right) \tag{16}$$

Due to the lack of data for each customer on each route, we do not consider an independent learning model with predictors here.

The third benchmark model relies on full information pooling — for each customer the information coming from all routes is equally informative to learn about the mean quality of a particular route. Specifically, we consider two sub-models: benchmark  $3A^8$  (equation (17)) and benchmark 3B(equation (18)), where model 3B has an additional predictor *Distance* compared to model 3A:

$$\mu_{jt} = \mu, \qquad \qquad \mu \sim N\left(\mu_0, \xi^2\right) \tag{17}$$

$$\mu_{jt} = \theta + \gamma \cdot Distance, \qquad \qquad \theta \sim N\left(\mu_0, \xi^2\right), \qquad \qquad \gamma \sim N\left(\gamma_0, \sigma_\gamma^2\right) \tag{18}$$

We fit each alternative learning model using the quality (i.e., delay) data. Table 5 provides fit mea-

 $<sup>^{8}</sup>$  In both benchmark model 2 and 3, we use the first 24 period pre-estimation sample to obtain the customer-level priors for the rest of the periods

Table 5 Model Comparison and Goodness of Fit							
	Benchmark	Benchmark	Benchmark	Simple	Full model		
	Model 2	Model 3A	Model 3B	hierarchical			
				model			
Features	Independent	Information	Regression IP	Simple	Regression		
	learning	pooling (IP)		hierarchical	hierarchical		
Model	Eq (16)	Eq (17)	Eq (18)	$\S4.3.1$	$\S4.3.2$		
-LL	4.540e + 4	4.559e + 4	4.659e + 4	4.384e + 4	4.542e + 4		
DIC	1.219e + 5	1.208e + 5	1.236e + 5	1.179e + 5	1.223e + 5		

\_ . . \_ . . . .

sures: negative log-likelihood (-LL) and Deviance Information Criterion (DIC) of the benchmark models, the simple hierarchical model (see  $\S4.3.1$ ) and the regression hierarchical model (see  $\S4.3.2$ ).<sup>9</sup> For both -LL and DIC, the smaller the values, the better the model fits the shipping experience data. Given that benchmark model 1 does not involve learning, it is not included in Table 5. Among all the models, the simple hierarchical model provides the best fit in terms of both -LL and DIC. This implies that a customer that relies on this learning model more accurately estimates the service quality of a future experience. However, it is important to note that the model that provides the best fit to the shipping quality data may not necessarily be the actual learning model that customers use. We will explore this issue in  $\S5.2$  where we will compare the ability of the different learning models to provide useful predictors of customer choices.

In terms of the fit of the quality data, a closer look into Table 5 reveals that adding the *Distance* predictor decreases model fit, and this is shown by the fact that the corresponding model without this predictor performs better for both the hierarchical model (simple hierarchical model vs. full model) and the information pooling models (models 3A vs. 3B). Contrary to a linear regression where adding more predictors does not decrease in-sample fit, in a learning model this is not necessarily the case. In a learning model the importance of a predictor ( $\gamma$  in our model) changes over time based on the gained experiences. So all previous experiences determine the weight of a predictor, however this weight is then used to predict a new experience.<sup>10</sup>

Furthermore, the hierarchical model systematically fits the data better than the information pooling model. Finally we observe that the fit of the independent learning model is similar to that of the information pooling model 3A. Overall, the model comparison results justify our interest of considering spillovers in our learning model specifications. Before examining the ability of each

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> DIC is a hierarchical modeling generalization of the AIC (Akaike information criterion) and BIC (Bayesian information criterion, and is particularly useful in Bayesian model selection.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> To illustrate ideas, suppose that all previous experiences with long distance shipments were satisfactory (no delays), while those with short distances were not. Then this will give a strong weight to distance when the consumer anticipates the quality of future experiences. However, if the next experiences reverse this pattern (e.g., they involve a satisfactory short distance shipment and an unsatisfactory long distance shipment), then using distance will not make quality beliefs more accurate for these new experiences.

	•
Mean	Percentiles (5%, 95%)
-0.727	(-2.863, 1.560)
2.592	(1.150, 5.122)
1.759	(1.280, 2.572)
	Mean -0.727 2.592 1.759

Table 6 Learning model parameters' population mean and 90% quantile interval

learning model to predict customer choices, we discuss in more detail the features of the best-fitting learning model in the next subsection.

5.1.2. Estimation of the Bayesian Simple Hierarchical Model Given that the simple hierarchical model (see §4.3.1) provides the best fit of the shipping quality data, in what follows we discuss the results for this model, while the results of other learning models are similar.

Under this model, each customer learns from his own experiences without using information from other customers. Therefore there are multiple parameters  $\{\mu_{ij}, \mu_i, \sigma_i^2, \xi_i^2, \forall j \in \Upsilon_i, i = 1, \dots, N\}$  to estimate for each customer, leading to more than 2,000 parameters in total. Due to the large number of individual-level parameters, in Table 6, we only provide the population mean and 90% interval of the grand mean quality  $\mu_{iT}^E$ , experience variability  $(\sigma^2)_{iT}^E$  and route quality heterogeneity  $(\xi^2)_{iT}^E$ as estimated by customers under this model during the last period T in our dataset. The summary statistics of the route-specific quality beliefs,  $\mu_{ijT}^E$ , are not included in Table 6 due to the varying set of routes  $\Upsilon_i$ , across customers.

From the results in 6, we observe considerable heterogeneity among customers with a 90% interval implying that some customers anticipate mean delays of 1.56 hours on one extreme, while others expect mean earliness of 2.86 hours on the other extreme. In previous learning models, the heterogeneity in customers' learning processes mainly comes from the limited number of trials (e.g., Coscelli and Shum 2004). Due to experience variability, customers can only observe noisy signals of the true quality. When the number of experiences is small, customers may form beliefs which are far from the true mean quality, thus resulting in different service quality beliefs. In contrast to previous approaches in the learning literature, we do not restrict the underlying true mean quality  $\mu_{ijt}$  to be the same for all customers.

In addition, we find that the population mean of  $\mu_{iT}^E$  equals -0.727 is close to the empirical shipping quality average of -0.77 hours (see Table 1), and the population mean of the quality standard deviation  $\sigma_{iT}^E$  equals 2.56 and is somewhat smaller than the empirical standard deviation of shipping quality 3.51. This shows that after one year and under this learning model, customer quality beliefs are on average close to the true empirical values, implying considerable learning compared to the initial flat priors.

In sum, from the estimates of the customer Bayesian learning models, we conclude that considerable learning can be achieved on a period-by-period basis with the arrival of new information and that the learning processes may vary greatly across customers. As before, we note that these conclusions are based on a particular learning model. The empirical relevance of this model to predict customer decisions will be evaluated in the remainder of this section.

# 5.2. Choice Model and Demand Arrival

We now consider the estimation of the utility function that determines customer choices to use AlphaShip as a service provider. This estimation depends on i) which learning model customers use to predict quality and ii) the shape of the shipping quality function (i.e., asymmetry, nonlinearity and risk aversion). Table 7 reports a rank of goodness-of-fit for alternative specifications of the shipping quality function (see §4.3.3) and learning models (see Table 5). Here we use all the predictors (e.g., intercept, price) explained in §4.2, because we find they are all significant for all the models and that the values of the coefficients remain mostly unchanged across models.

As previously mentioned, the models we compare differ on two major dimensions: (1) the learning model and (2) the shape of the service quality function  $f(I_t, \beta^q)$ . Specifically, we compare different learning assumptions, including short memory (i.e., benchmark model 1), independent learning (i.e., benchmark model 2), information pooling learning (i.e., benchmark model 3A) and spillover learning (i.e., simple hierarchical model). Here we do not compare the regression counterparts of the models because *Distance* is not a useful predictor based on the results in §5.1. As we have discussed in §4.3.3, the specification of the service quality function  $f(I_t, \beta^q)$  may differ in terms of three aspects: (1) whether the effect of expected service quality mean  $\bar{Q}^E$  is symmetric or asymmetric; (2) whether the effect of expected service quality  $\bar{Q}^E$  is linear or nonlinear; (3) whether the customers are risk averse or risk neutral, and if the customers are risk averse, whether the customers are averse to either one of or both of sources of uncertainty (experience variability and mean quality uncertainty).

We test all the specification combinations and report the likelihood of selected models in Table 11 in the Appendix and provide a goodness of fit rank in Table 7. The results of these goodness of fit comparisons show how these measures improve with the properties of the learning model and service quality function. Specifically, for each row of Table 7, the rank decreases from left to right, meaning that the simple hierarchical learning model (see Table 8 for the estimates) fits the data better than the independent learning assumption under the same specification of the quality function  $f(I_t, \beta^q)$  (i.e., within the same row). In addition, the fit of the independent learning model is in turn better than that of the information pooling learning model. Overall, these results provide evidence consistent with information spillovers driving customer choices.

Next, if we look at each column, we find the rank by model log-likelihood improves from top to bottom, showing that as the model becomes more flexible, goodness-of-fit improves under the same learning model (i.e., the same column). This model comparison, however, does not consider the

LL/AIC	Benchmark	Benchmark	Benchmark	Simple
	Model 1 (short	Model 3A	Model 2	Hierarchical
	memory)	(information	(independent	Model
		pooling)	learning)	
S*	16/16**	15/15	14/14	13/13
A		12/12	11/11	9/9
A + ERA		10/10	8/8	7/7
A + ERA + BUA		6/5	4/3	2/1
A + ERA + BUA + Q		5/6	3/4	1/2

Table 7 Rank of Goodness of Fit on Alternative Specifications of the Shipping Quality Function

\*: We use S for symmetric; A for Asymmetric; ERA for Experience risk averse; BUA for belief uncertainty averse; Q for Quadratic.

\*\*: The rank of models' goodness-of-fit by log-likelihood is before the slash, and that by Akaike information criterion (AIC) is after the slash. 1 means the model fits the best under the criterion, and 16 means the model fits the worst.

number of parameters of each model. Accordingly, it is useful to note that the ranks in the last two rows reverse under the criterion of AIC, because the improvement by adding the quadratic structure is not enough to compensate for the penalty associated with adding the quadratic parameters. Considering both model fit and model parsimony, we choose the asymmetric risk averse model (i.e., A + ERA + BUA) as the best model, and use its coefficients under the simple hierarchical learning model for the following discussion and the policy simulations in section 6.

5.2.1. Results for Shipping Choice and Demand Arrival Model The coefficients estimated for alternative models under different learning models are very similar (i.e., same signs and similar magnitudes), so we only provide the results under the simple hierarchical learning specification (see Table 8). In this table the variance of the random coefficients for a particular predictor is indicated with the  $\Omega$  symbol (e.g.,  $\Omega(Intercept)$  denotes the variance of the random intercepts across customers). These variances measure the extent of heterogeneity for the effect of each utility predictor across customers.

As expected, the log-likelihood of customer choices increases from left to right as the utility model becomes more flexible in terms of the service quality function. We focus on the asymmetric risk averse model (i.e., A + ERA + BUA) which provides the best balance between fit and parsimony (model 5). In particular, allowing for an asymmetric effect of the predicted mean quality, we find that customers are more sensitivity to tardiness than earliness. Note that the coefficients for both tardiness ( $[\mu_{jt}]^+$ ) and earliness ( $[\mu_{jt}]^-$ ) are both negative, however the magnitude of the first coefficient is estimated to be greater. This implies customers exhibit a negative response to tardiness, a positive response to earliness and that negative responses to tardiness are approximately 1.7 times greater than positive responses to earliness. We also tried adding random coefficients for tardiness ( $[\mu_{jt}]^+$ ) and earliness ( $[\mu_{jt}]^-$ ) to allow for heterogeneity across customers on these two dimensions, however the log-likelihood increase is very small (i.e., around 3 points).

	Table 8 Estimation Results for Shipping Choice Model							
Model	1	2	3	4	5	6		
	Null	S†	А	A + ERA	A + ERA +	A + ERA +		
					BUA	BUA + Q		
Shipping Choice	Parameters							
Intercept	-1.74e-1***	-1.76e-1***	-1.73e-1***	-1.67e-1***	-1.31e-1***	-1.26e-2***		
	(2.74e-2)	(2.74e-2)	(2.74e-2)	(2.70e-2)	(2.58e-2)	(2.35e-2)		
$\Omega(Intercept)$	6.05e-2***	6.06e-2***	6.05e-2***	6.05e-2***	5.89e-2***	5.88e-2***		
	(2.65e-2)	(2.62e-2)	(2.65e-2)	(2.64e-2)	(2.51e-2)	(2.51e-2)		
Price	-1.44e-1***	-1.44e-1***	-1.46e-1***	-1.44e-1***	-1.42e-1***	-1.42e-1***		
	(1.06e-2)	(1.06e-2)	(1.07e-2)	(1.07e-2)	(1.08e-2)	(1.07e-2)		
Weight	3.64e-1***	3.64e-1***	3.64e-1***	3.63e-1***	3.62e-1***	3.62e-1***		
	(1.54e-2)	(1.54e-2)	(1.54e-2)	(1.54e-2)	(1.54e-2)	(1.54e-2)		
SecondHalfWeek	-5.54e-2***	-5.54e-2***	-5.52e-2***	-5.52e-2***	-5.53e-2***	-5.33e-2***		
	(8.77e-3)	(8.77e-3)	(8.76e-3)	(8.79e-3)	(8.54e-3)	(8.56e-3)		
$\mu_{jt}$		-5.01e-2***						
		(1.02e-2)						
$[\mu_{jt}]^+$			-7.98e-2***	-8.03e-2***	-8.71e-2***	-9.13e-1***		
			(3.67e-2)	(3.67e-2)	(3.88e-2)	(4.12e-2)		
$[\mu_{jt}]^-$			-4.69e-2***	-4.65e-2***	-4.98e-2***	-5.22e-2**		
			(2.11e-2)	(2.10e-2)	(2.13e-2)	(2.19e-2)		
$\sigma^2$				-3.73e-2***	-3.75e-2***	-3.76e-2***		
				(1.02e-2)	(1.02e-2)	(1.02e-2)		
$\Omega\left(\sigma^2\right)$				1.38e-2***	1.39e-2***	1.39e-2***		
				(6.20e-3)	(6.20e-3)	(6.22e-3)		
$Var(\mu_{jt})^*$					-6.76e-2***	-6.75e-2***		
					(1.91e-2)	(1.91e-2)		
$\Omega\left(Var\left(\mu_{jt}\right)\right)$					2.37e-2***	2.36e-2***		
					(8.43e-3)	(8.41e-3)		
$\left(\left[\mu_{jt}\right]^+\right)^2$						2.60e-3		
						(1.12e-2)		
$\left(\left[\mu_{jt}\right]^{-}\right)^{2}$						2.30e-3		
(						(7.40e-3)		
Demand Arrival	Parameters (m	ean and 95% q	uantile interval)			-		
$\max_{j \in \Upsilon_i} (m_{ij})$	0.539	0.538	0.540	0.542	0.541	0.541		
	(0.317, 0.734)	(0.317, 0.735)	(0.319, 0.748)	(0.319, 0.736)	(0.319, 0.736)	(0.319, 0.739)		
$\min_{j \in \Upsilon_i} (m_{ij})$	0.180	0.182	0.183	0.184	0.184	0.185		
	(0.024, 0.440)	(0.024, 0.443)	(0.025, 0.443)	(0.027, 0.443)	(0.026, 0.445)	(0.025, 0.446)		
LL	-53648.6	-53623.6	-53582.1	-53569.7	-53544.2	-53544.0		

<sup>†</sup>: We use S for symmetric; A for asymmetric; ERA for experience risk averse; BUA for belief

uncertainty averse; Q for quadratic.

\*:  $Var(\mu_{jt}) = \xi^2 + \sigma_{\mu}^2$  under the simple hierarchical model.

\*p<0.1, \*\*p<0.05, \*\*\*p<0.01

Note. Most of the predictors are normalized to have zero mean and approximate 1 standard

deviation. Specifically,  $\sigma^2$  and  $Var(\mu_{jt})$  are scaled by 10;  $\mu_{jt}$ ,  $[\mu_{jt}]^+$  and  $[\mu_{jt}]^-$  are scaled by 2;

Price is scaled by 5000; Weight is scaled by 3000; CR is scaled by 6.

In terms of the impact of uncertainty, we find that customers are averse to experience variability  $(\sigma^2)$ , but even more so to belief uncertainty  $(Var(\mu_{jt}))$ . This finding again confirms the importance

of taking into account both sources of uncertainty. Our results show that even though customers are averse to both risks, the impact of belief uncertainty is almost twice as large as that of the experience variability. We also note that by comparing models 5 and 6 we find that adding quadratic terms to the service quality function yields almost no improvement in the log-likelihood, and this is consistent with the quadratic coefficients being non-significant.

Finally, recall that the model also includes demand arrival parameters  $\bar{\boldsymbol{m}}_i = \{\bar{\boldsymbol{m}}_{ij}, \forall j \in \Upsilon_i\}$ , which allow some routes for a given customer to be more frequently demanded than others (see equation 2). We obtained demand arrival parameters  $\bar{\boldsymbol{m}}_i$  for each customer *i*, rendering 3000+ parameters in total. Given that customers have different numbers of routes, we only provide the population summary of each customer's most and least frequent route. On average, the top route for a given customer is roughly three times more popular than the least demanded route.

### 5.3. Robustness to Choice Set (Route) Definition

In addition to using routes as choice alternatives for each customer, we have also used a more aggregated definition based on destination countries. Given that the customers in our data have fixed physical locations and usually rely on only a single origin airport, different routes of a customer are actually differentiated by different destination airports. To test the model robustness to different levels of product aggregation, we aggregated the destination airports into destination countries and consistent with our spillover formulation allowed customers' experiences shipping to one country to affect their expectations about service quality when shipping to other countries. After re-estimating all models we obtain virtually the same results: the information spillover model not only outperforms other learning models at predicting shipping service qualities, but also in terms of predicting customers' purchase decisions. These results again provide evidence consistent with information spillovers driving customer choices.

# 6. Policy Simulations and Managerial Implications

The results of the previous section suggest that customer choices are consistent with the use of quality information from other products to form beliefs about a particular product. In addition, customers are sensitive to not only the predicted mean service quality but also to quality uncertainty. In this section, we discuss managerial insights directly related to these findings. More specifically, we study the consequences of unsatisfactory levels of service quality. When service quality decreases on certain routes (e.g., due to higher average transport delay or larger experience variability), our model can be used to predict the corresponding impact on customer behavior.

For simplicity, we consider customers with routes A and B and whose demand arrival on the two routes follows a multinomial (0.5, 0.5) distribution. Transport delays on these two route,  $Q_A$  and  $Q_B$  respectively, follow the same normal distribution,  $Q_A \sim N(0, 5^2)$  and  $Q_B \sim N(0, 5^2)$ . Customers



independent learning; Right: information pooling learning.

decide whether to ship based on the utility of shipping compared to that of the outside option and then update their quality beliefs if new information is acquired (i.e., if they used AlphaShip services).<sup>11</sup> In order to examine the effect of an increase in the average transport delay, we change the transport delay on route A to  $Q_A \sim N(5, 5^2)$  starting from period 20. The left panel in Figure 3 presents the average purchase probability on the two routes over 40 periods.<sup>12</sup> As we can see from the left panel (spillover learning), before the quality change on route A in period 20 (marked by the vertical line in Figure 3), the purchase probabilities on routes A and B are very similar and both increase over time, where the increase in purchase probability is caused by the decrease in learning uncertainty as customers collect more information. However, after the average transport delay on route A increases from 0 to 5 in period 20, the average purchase probability on route A drops rapidly due to the deteriorating transport service quality. Interestingly, the purchase probability on route B stops increasing and also drops after period 20. Given that the service quality on route Bnever changes, the drop in purchase probability is exclusively caused by the spillover of customers' experiences from deteriorating service quality on route A. If we use the average empirical price of \$2,288 as the revenue obtained from a shipment on route A and B, then when reaching the last period the increase of transport delay on route A causes a direct expected loss of \$91.5 per customer on route A and an indirect expected loss of 7.2 per customer on route B.

This policy simulation also illustrates the consequences of using an alternative learning model, such as independent learning or information pooling. Specifically, the center and right panel of Figure 3 show the changes in purchase probability on routes A and B under independent learning and information pooling, respectively. As we can see, under independent learning, the quality deterioration on route A won't be expected to affect the demand on route B. In fact, as customers acquire more information, the purchase probability on route B increases over time. In contrast,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> When calculating utilities we set other exogenous variables (e.g., price) to their empirical means.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> The average purchase probability is the mean of purchase probability of 200 simulated customers, and the customers' quality sensitivities are simulated from the distribution of the estimated random coefficients.

under information pooling, experiences from routes A and B are equally informative about either route; thus the purchase probability for these two routes is identical. Moreover, the low service quality experiences on route A are compensated by the good experiences on route B. Hence, the decrease of purchase probability on route A is smaller than that under information spillover learning or independent learning. As before, we use an average price of \$2,288 for the revenue obtained from a shipment on route A and B. If instead of accounting for spillovers, customers were assumed to be independent learners, the increase of transport delay on route A would be anticipated to cause only a direct expected loss of \$107.2 on route A, while no indirect loss on route B would be expected. If instead customers were assumed to adopt information pooling as a learning rule, the expected revenue loss on route A and B would be identical and equal to \$50.3.

The results of this policy simulation illustrates that when making decisions about whether to improve service quality and particularly how much budget to allocate to quality improvements, it is important to consider and account for information spillovers. This is because the financial consequences of service improvements for each product may be strongly affected by the learning processes that customers use when relying on previous experiences across multiple services to form quality beliefs about future service encounters. Another counterfactual experiment comparing the effects of deteriorating quality mean and variance is provided in Appendix D.

# 7. Conclusions, Limitations and Future Direction

In this paper, we used a one-year shipping and sales historical data of individual customers of a world-leading third-party logistics company to study how customers learn about shipping service quality from their past experiences, especially from experiences of similar yet not identical service encounters. This learning behavior is referred to as "correlated learning" or "spillover learning" in the learning literature. Most of the previous studies in this literature do not directly observe quality and hence rely on imputing quality or on surveys for gathering subjective measures of product or service quality. Our dataset instead contains objective service quality measures. This advantage allows us to flexibly estimate customers' learning and its impact on shipping choices. This further enables us to estimate learning models that describe beliefs for more than 2,000 products (i.e., routes).

An important contribution of this paper is methodological. In contrast to the approaches that have been used in the correlated learning literature, we use a Bayesian hierarchical methodology to model the learning process. This model provides a natural way to represent the information borrowing process and can be easily applied to problems with more complex correlation structures without adding too many parameters.

We derive insights by comparing the Bayesian hierarchical model with three benchmark learning models: (1) a short-memory learning model; (2) a model of independent learning; and (3) a model of

information pooling. Our results show that the hierarchical model not only outperforms alternative models in forecasting transport delays, but also achieves the best goodness of fit when predicting customer purchases. This finding confirms that customer choices are best predicted by a learning model that allows experiences about one product to influence beliefs about other products. In addition, we find asymmetries in how customers react to earliness and tardiness – negative responses to delays are greater than positive responses to the early arrival of a shipment. We further obtain evidence of customers being risk averse and we are able to separate the effect of experience variability from belief uncertainty, with the latter having a greater impact on customer choices. Finally, using counterfactual experiments, we illustrate how quality deterioration on one product affects not only the revenues of that product, but also the revenues of other products through learning spillovers. Therefore, decisions about operational quality improvements should account for both the direct and indirect effects of these improvements on customer behavior.

Our study can be extended in several ways in future research. One possible extension is to measure how observable customer characteristics — such as company demographics — are related to the customer learning process. This would be useful, for example, to develop targeted service improvement strategies. Competition could also be an important aspect to consider; this would probably require data from multiple leading companies in the market to study how the market structure mediates the effect of service quality on customer purchases. On a final note, this study showcases the importance of bringing advanced methodologies in statistics, economics and marketing into the the fields of operations management. We hope that this work stimulates further research on the interface between these academic disciplines.

# References

- Aksin, Z, B Ata, SM Emadi, CL Su. 2013. Structural estimation of callers' delay sensitivity in call centers. Management Sci. 59(12) 2727–2746.
- Allon, G, A Federgruen, M Pierson. 2011. How much is a reduction of your customers' wait worth? An empirical study of the fast-food drive-thru industry based on structural estimation methods. *Manufacturing Service Oper. Management* 13(4) 489–507.
- Anderson, SW, LS Baggett, SK Widener. 2008. The impact of service operations failures on customer satisfaction: evidence on how failures and their source affect what matters to customers. *Manufacturing Service Oper. Management* 11(1) 52–69.
- Batt, RJ, C Terwiesch. 2015. Waiting patiently: An empirical study of queue abandonment in an emergency department. *Management Sci.* 61(1) 39–59.
- Bolton, RN. 1998. A dynamic model of the duration of the customer's relationship with a continuous service provider: the role of satisfaction. *Marketing Sci.* 17(1) 45–65.

- Brown, L, N Gans, A Mandelbaum, A Sakov, H Shen, S Zeltyn, L Zhao. 2005. Statistical analysis of a telephone call center: A queueing-science perspective. J. Amer. Statistical Association 100(469) 36–50.
- Chan, T, C Narasimhan, Y Xie. 2013. Treatment effectiveness and side effects: a model of physician learning. Management Sci. 59(6) 1309–1325.
- Ching, A, T Erdem, M Keane. 2013. Invited paper learning models: an assessment of progress, challenges, and new developments. *Marketing Sci.* 32(6) 913–938.
- Cho, J, A Aribarg, P Manchanda. 2015. The value of measuring customer satisfaction. SSRN.
- Coscelli, A, M Shum. 2004. An empirical model of learning and patient spillovers in new drug entry. J. Econometrics **122**(2) 213–246.
- Craig, N, N DeHoratius, A Raman. 2014. The impact of supplier inventory service level on retailer demand in the supply chain for functional apparel items. Harvard Business School Technology & Operations Management Unit Working Paper 11–034.
- Deshpande, V, M Arikan. 2012. The impact of airline flight schedules on flight delays. Manufacturing Service Oper. Management 14(3) 423–440.
- Erdem, T. 1998. An empirical analysis of umbrella branding. J. Marketing Res. 35(3) 339–351.
- Forbes, SJ. 2008. The effect of air traffic delays on airline prices. Internat J. Indust. Organ. 26(5) 1218–1232.
- Grewal, R, M Chandrashekaran, AV Citrin. 2010. Customer satisfaction heterogeneity and shareholder value. J. Marketing Res. 47(4) 612–626.
- Lu, Y, A Musalem, M Olivares, A Schilkrut. 2013. Measuring the effect of queues on customer purchases. Management Sci. 59(8) 1743–1763.
- Mehta, N, S Rajiv, K Srinivasan. 2004. Role of forgetting in memory-based choice decisions: a structural model. Quantitative Marketing and Economics 2(2) 107–140.
- Newman, JP, ME Ferguson, LA Garrow, TL Jacobs. 2014. Estimation of choice-based models using sales data from a single firm. *Manufacturing Service Oper. Management* 16(2) 184–197.
- Shang, Y, D Dunson, JS Song. 2016. Exploiting big data in logistics risk assessment via bayesian nonparametrics.
- Sridhar, K, R Bezawada, M Trivedi. 2012. Investigating the drivers of consumer cross-category learning for new products using multiple data sets. *Marketing Sci.* **31**(4) 668–688.
- Taylor, S. 1994. Waiting for service: the relationship between delays and evaluations of service. J. Marketing 56–69.
- Train, K. 2009. Discrete choice methods with simulation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Zhao, Y, Y Zhao, K Helsen. 2011. Consumer learning in a turbulent market environment: modeling consumer choice dynamics after a product-harm crisis. J. Marketing Res. 48(2) 255–267.

		cotimation	
	t = 1		t = 25
		Mean	Quantile (5%, 95%)
$\alpha_{\sigma}$	1.05	5.39	(3.55, 8.55)
$\delta_{\sigma}$	10	40.95	(14.13, 118.03)
$\mu_0$	0	-0.77	(-3.26, 1.77)
$\sigma_{\mu}$	30	1.15	(0.36, 2.17)
$\alpha_{\xi}$	1.05	2.37	(2.05, 3.05)
$\delta_{\xi}$	3	9.51	(5.65, 16.13)

Table 9 Pre-estimation Priors and Model Priors

# Appendix A: Data Selection and Missing Data Interpolation

This section explains the data manipulation steps we used to generate the data set for model estimation.

#### A.1. Data Selection

We focus on customers with at least 5 shipments during January to March (to construct the pre-estimation sample that is explained in §4.3.1) and at least 15 shipments in the last 9 months in 2013 (to construct the data for model estimation). Among the customers that have shipped no less than 5 times in the year, only 12% of them have only shipped on one route. Because we are interested in customer's learning spillover, specifically across multiple routes, and to limit the computational complexity, we limit our focus to customers with shipping experiences on 2 - 10 routes. For the same reason, we only consider customers whose most frequent route accounts for no more than 70% of his total shipments during the year. In addition, we also exclude customers with too many shipments (exceeding 100 shipments in our case), because these customers may have deep long-term business partnership with AlphaShip and share integrated information system that make them very reluctant to change service suppliers in a short period (such as the one year time in our data) even after experiencing poor services. We further exclude data with obvious errors (e.g., shipments with arrival times earlier than their departure times).

#### A.2. Missing Data Interpolation

Our data, the purchase data, records the shipping information of each shipment, as described in §3. We only observe these information of the purchased shipping services, but in order to estimate the choice model (Equation (3)), we need to reconstruct the data series to include the control variables  $X_{ijt}$  and  $Price_{ijt}$  for the periods when there is no purchase and for all routes of each customer. The method to reconstruct price data is described in §3.3. For the cargo-related information in  $X_{ijt}$  — cargo volume and pieces – for simplicity we use the customer-route level average to interpolate the missing data.

# Appendix B: Supplementary Material for Customers' Bayesian Learning Model

This section includes the supplementary material for the estimation of customers' Bayesian learning model.

# B.1. Pre-estimation for Customer-level Priors

At the beginning of period 1, all customers have the same quality priors (see column t = 1 in Table 9). After calibrating the individual learning process for each customer using the pre-estimation sample (i.e., the first 24 periods data), we obtain quality priors for each customer at the beginning of period 25. The column t = 25of Table 9 provides summary statistics of these customer-level quality priors.

#### B.2. Advantages of Gibbs Sampling

In Bayesian statistics, the posterior distribution is often not available analytically, typically because the posterior distribution requires the computation of a normalizing constant which is typically not available in closed form. For this reason, posterior calculations usually rely on Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling. The basic idea in MCMC sampling is to construct a Markov chain having a stationary distribution corresponding to the joint posterior distribution of the model parameters, with this done in a manner that avoids ever having to calculate the intractable constant.

In order for the Markov chain to have the appropriate behavior, the Markov transition kernel needs to be carefully chosen, with usual choices corresponding to either Metropolis–Hastings (MH) or Gibbs sampling. MH can involve a substantial degree of tuning for models with many parameters, while Gibbs sampling avoids tuning by sampling sequentially from the full-conditional posterior distributions of subsets of parameters given current values of the other parameters. Gibbs sampling relies on a property known as conditional conjugacy. Focusing on a subset of the model parameters and conditioning on the other parameters, the prior probability distribution is conditionally conjugate if the conditional posterior distribution takes the same form as the prior. The specific choices of our model form and prior distributions are motivated by retaining conditional conjugacy (see Equation (5), (6), (7) and (8)).

#### B.3. Gibbs Sampling of the Regression Hierarchical Model

Gibbs sampling of the full proposed model in  $\S4.3.3$  can be conducted by using the following full conditional distributions of the model parameters, and the sampling process is iterated multiple times until convergency (we use "…" to indicate all the other parameters and data):

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{j} \mid \cdots &\sim N\left(\frac{n_{j}\xi^{2}\bar{G}_{j}+\sigma^{2}\mu}{n_{j}\xi^{2}+\sigma^{2}}, \frac{\xi^{2}\sigma^{2}}{n_{j}\xi^{2}+\sigma^{2}}\right), \\ \mu^{d} \mid \cdots &\sim N\left(\frac{\sigma_{\mu^{d}}^{2}G^{d}+\sigma^{2}\mu_{0}^{d}}{n^{d}\sigma_{\mu^{d}}^{2}+\sigma^{2}}, \frac{\sigma_{\mu^{d}}^{2}\sigma^{2}}{n^{d}\sigma_{\mu^{d}}^{2}+\sigma^{2}}\right), \\ \sigma^{2} \mid \cdots &\sim IG\left(\alpha_{\sigma}+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j\in\Upsilon_{i}}n_{j}, \delta_{\sigma}+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j\in\Upsilon_{i}}\sum_{p=1}^{t}y_{jp}^{*}\left(Q_{jp}-\theta_{j}-\mu^{d}\cdot Distance_{j}\right)^{2}\right), \\ \mu \mid \cdots &\sim N\left(\frac{J\sigma_{\mu}^{2}\bar{\theta}+\xi^{2}\mu_{0}}{J\sigma_{\mu}^{2}+\xi^{2}}, \frac{\sigma_{\mu}^{2}\xi^{2}}{J\sigma_{\mu}^{2}+\xi^{2}}\right), \\ \xi^{2} \mid \cdots &\sim IG\left(\alpha_{\xi}+\frac{J}{2}, \delta_{\xi}+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j\in\Upsilon_{i}}\left(\mu_{j}-\mu\right)^{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

$$\tag{19}$$

where  $y_{ijt}^*$  is an indicator that is set to 1 if customer *i* has a shipment on route *j* delivered during period *t*, and 0 otherwise. Specifically,  $J = |\Upsilon_i|, \bar{\theta} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j \in \Upsilon_i} \theta_j$ .  $\bar{G}_j = \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{p=1}^t \left[ y_{jp}^* \cdot (Q_{jp} - \mu^d \cdot Distance_j) \right], n_j = \sum_{p=1}^t y_{jp}^*, n^d = \sum_{j \in \Upsilon_i} \sum_{p=1}^t \left( y_{jp}^* \cdot Distance_j^2 \right)$  and  $G^d = \sum_{j \in \Upsilon_i} \sum_{p=1}^t \left[ y_{jp}^* \cdot (Q_{jp} - \mu_j) \cdot Distance_j \right].$ 

# B.4. Computation

The Gibbs sampling estimation of the simple (see §4.3.2) and regression model (see §4.3.3) is carried out in the same way: for each customer in each period, if new information is available to the customer (i.e., the customer observes the service quality of a shipment with AlphaShip), 1000 samples are iteratively drawn from the full-conditional posterior distributions, where the first 500 samples are discarded as burn-in. To speed up convergence, for each period, we use the last period's estimate (e.g.  $\mu_{j,t-1}^{E}$ ,  $\mu_{t-1}^{E}$ ,  $\sigma_{p}^{E}$ ) as a starting point. Finally, because customers learn service quality independently, parallel computing (32 threads) is adopted, which significantly reduces the computational time. Accordingly, each of the 32 threads generates the posterior draws for a different customer. This code was implemented in Matlab, and the longest running time was 50h on a 2.96-GHz Intel Xeon E5-2690 computer with 32 cores.

#### Appendix C: Supplementary Material for Choice Model Estimation

This section provides supplementary material for the computation details, simulation experiments to test and validate our methodology and estimation results of the shipping choice model.

#### C.1. Shipping Choice Model Estimation

The estimation of the demand arrival and shipping choice model parameters (Equation (2) and (3)) is implemented using a simulated maximum likelihood estimation technique (Train 2009). The goal is to estimate (*i*) the distribution of the intercept, price and service quality sensitivity parameters, which are governed by  $\beta$  and  $\Omega$ ; and (*ii*) the vector of parameter,  $\beta^{X}$ , related to the control variables. The likelihood function is then given by:

$$L = \int \prod_{i} \prod_{t} \left[ \left( \prod_{j \in \Upsilon_{i}} \left( \lambda_{i} m_{ij} P_{ijt} \right)^{y_{ijt}} \right) \left( 1 - \sum_{j \in \Upsilon_{i}} \lambda_{i} m_{ij} P_{ijt} \right)^{1 - \sum_{j \in \Upsilon_{i}} y_{ijt}} | \boldsymbol{\theta} \right] dF(\boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

where  $\theta$  is the vector of draws from a multivariate normal distribution with mean  $\beta$  and  $\Omega$ . We resort to Halton draws to simulate the above integral over the parameter spaces in order to keep the simulation error low (Train 2009). We run the simulated maximum likelihood estimation for 100 draws for each of the individual-level parameters of the model.

#### C.2. Simulation Experiment

In this subsection, we test the proposed methodology using simulated data. We generate purchase and service experience data for 100 customers and 50 periods. Specifically, each customer can ship from 2 to 6 routes in the 50 periods, and we simulate his shipping demand in each period from a multinomial distribution. Then, we simulate the service experience (i.e., delays) data from a N(0,1) distribution. In each period, within the arrival of each new experience, the customer updates his belief about delays following the simple Bayesian hierarchical model and their prior beliefs are flat priors as we use in §9. Then, the beliefs about service quality (represented by  $x_1$ ), together with the intercept and another variable (represented by  $x_2$ ) are used in the utility function, where the values of  $x_2$  are generated from N(0,1). We use random coefficients for the intercept and transport delay  $x_1$ , and assume fixed (i.e., constant across customers) coefficients for  $x_2$ . Accordingly, The coefficient of the intercept,  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are generated from a multivariate normal distribution with mean  $\bar{\theta} = [-0.5, 0.3, -0.4]$  and diagonal variance matrix  $\Sigma$  in which elements equal to 0.6 and 0.5 for the intercept and  $x_1$ , respectively, and the element equals to zero for  $x_2$ .

Because there are too many parameters in the multinomial distribution demand model (see §4.1), instead of listing all the estimation values in a table, we plot the estimates versus the true values into Figure 4. As



Actual (Y axis) vs. Estimated (X axis) Values of the Multinomial Distribution Parameters Figure 4

	True value	Estimate	ed value
		Mean	Std. err.
$\theta_1$	-5e-1	-5.5e-1	3.3e-2
$\theta_2$	3e-1	2.8e-1	4.8e-2
$ heta_3$	-4e-1	-4.2e-1	3.9e-2
$\Omega\left(\theta_{1}\right)$	6e-1	5.7e-1	4.2e-2
$\Omega\left(\theta_{2}\right)$	5e-1	4.6e-1	4.3e-2

Table 10	Actual vs.	Estimated	Values of	the Discrete	Choice I	Model F	Parameters

Table 11	Log-Likelihood of Alternative Model Specifications						
	Benchmark	Benchmark	Benchmark	Simple			
	Model 1 (short	Model 3A	Model 2	Hierarchical			
	memory)	(information	(independent	Model			
		pooling)	learning)				
S*	-53647.9	-53,628.4	-53,626.4	-53,623.6			
A		-53,613.6	-53,593.5	-53,582.1			
A + ERA		-53,588.0	-53,572.1	-53,569.7			
A + ERA + BUA		-53,563.3	-53,557.7	-53,544.2			
A + ERA + BUA + Q		-53.563.8	-53.557.6	-53.544.0			

\*We use S for symmetric, A for asymmetric, ERA for experience risk averse, BUA for belief uncertainty averse, Q for quadratic.

we can see from Figure 4, the estimates are close to the true value (i.e., the dots spread evenly around the y = x line). Table 10 provides the estimates of the discrete choice model parameters, where we can see the estimates are close to the true values and the estimation standard errors are very small compared to the true value. The results in Figure 4 and Table 10 show that our method recovers well the original parameters.

#### **Supplementary Material for Results** C.3.

.

In Table 11 are the log-likelihoods under different combinations of the learning model and the quality function specification.



Figure 5 Purchase probability changes on route A and B under variance deterioration.

#### Appendix D: Supplementary Material for Policy Simulations

In addition to the policy simulation study provided in §6, we also consider the effect of an increase in experience variability (i.e., more volatile service experiences) on a certain route.

Same as in §6, we consider customers with frequent routes A and B and whose demand on the two routes follows a multinomial (0.5, 0.5) distribution. Transport delays on these two route,  $Q_A$  and  $Q_B$  respectively, follow the same normal distribution,  $Q_A \sim N(0, 5^2)$  and  $Q_B \sim N(0, 5^2)$ . Customers decide whether to ship based on the utility of shipping compared to that of the outside option and then update their quality beliefs if new information is acquired (i.e., if they used AlphaShip services).<sup>13</sup>

Figure 5 depicts the average purchase probabilities for routes A and B. For this scenario, we consider an increase in the service quality variability for route A which takes place in period 20:  $Q_A \sim N(0, 10^2)$ . This change makes customers anticipate more variability in service quality not only for that route for also for route B. This greater variability in turn decreases the purchase probability on route B. Even though both route A and B share the same experience variability and belief uncertainty, the additional drop of average purchase probability on route A is caused by the asymmetric effect of delays and earliness. Specifically, because service quality variability on A becomes larger after period 20, both the magnitude of delays and early deliveries experienced on route A increase. Although the service quality distribution is symmetric, customers are more sensitive to delays rather than earliness. Hence, as the magnitude of delays increases, the average purchase probability on route A decreases more than that on route B. In terms of revenues per customer, in period 40, the direct loss from the increased transport delay variance of route A is \$18.3 on route A and \$8.0 on route B. This implies that indirect losses account for 31% of the total revenue loss.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> When calculating utilities we set other exogenous variables (e.g., price) to their empirical means.