PREPRINT MANUSCRIPT

Indecision and Decision Paralysis in the Digital Age: The Paradox of Choice and the Role of Intolerance of Uncertainty

Himanshi Lastami

Independent Research Associate

ORCID: 0009-0007-5832-7507

Correspondence: itshimanshilastami@gmail.com

Date of Submission:	March 2026
DOI:	https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19140706
Licence:	Creative Commons CC0 1.0 Universal
Funding:	No external funding received
Conflicts of Interest:	The author declares no financial or non-financial conflicts of interest

This is a preprint and has not been peer reviewed. The views expressed are those of the author.

ABSTRACT

Why does having more options so often leave people feeling worse, not better? This question anchors a growing literature on choice overload — the empirically documented reversal in which choice abundance undermines rather than enhances well-being. Two decades of research have produced robust directional findings without fully accounting for who suffers most, or why digital environments appear to intensify the effect. This paper argues that Intolerance of Uncertainty (IU) is the dispositional key linking choice overload to chronic indecision, and that contemporary digital platforms are structurally engineered to activate IU rather than relieve it. Through a Qualitative Meta-Synthesis (QMS) of peer-reviewed literature from 2000 to 2024 — drawing exclusively on verified, DOI-resolvable sources — the paper reconstructs the cognitive and emotional pathway from digital abundance to decision paralysis. Drawing on 16 verified studies spanning cognitive psychology, behavioural economics, neuroimaging, and design research, the synthesis identifies the Hick-Hyman Law as the quantitative foundation, ego depletion as the self-regulatory mechanism, and dark-pattern interface design as the environmental amplifier. Two novel descriptive constructs are introduced: Chronic Procrastination and Avoidance in Decision-making (CPAD) and Algorithmic Decision Dependence (ADD). Four meaningful gaps in the existing literature are identified, including the absence of longitudinal studies in naturalistic digital settings and the lack of validated instruments for IU in digital contexts. The paper concludes with evidence-based recommendations for platform redesign, clinical practice, regulatory policy, and individual decision hygiene, and frames choice architecture as a legitimate domain for public-interest oversight rather than consumer preference alone.

Keywords: *decision paralysis; paradox of choice; intolerance of uncertainty; digital choice architecture; cognitive load and ego depletion; FOMO and maximising tendency*

1. INTRODUCTION

A particular form of cognitive fatigue characterises the experience of those inhabiting digitally saturated environments. It arises not from having too few options but from having too many — from opening a streaming platform and scrolling for twenty minutes without choosing anything, from spending an hour comparing near-identical products on an e-commerce site and then abandoning the session without purchasing, from knowing abstractly that abundance ought to be advantageous and finding, inexplicably, that it does not feel that way. This paper offers a systematic account of that fatigue, drawing on the psychological and behavioural-economic literature accumulated over the past two decades.

The central tension in this literature lies between two frameworks that reach opposite conclusions from the same premise. Sen's (1999) capability approach treats the availability of meaningful options as constitutive of human freedom: more choice means more agency, and therefore more well-being. Classical economic theory concurs — rational agents, given more options, can always do at least as well by disregarding the additional ones. What this account fails to capture is that human beings do not process options in the manner economic models assume. People compare, anticipate regret, ruminate on foregone alternatives, and exhaust themselves in doing so. Above a certain threshold — context-dependent and individually variable — more choice does not expand agency. It paralyses it.

Three questions organise what follows. First, what are the cognitive and dispositional mechanisms through which choice abundance becomes decision paralysis? Second, how do the structural features of digital platforms interact with those mechanisms in ways that intensify the problem rather than mitigate it? Third, where does the existing literature leave open questions, and what would it take to advance the research agenda in practically useful directions?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2A. The Paradox of Choice: What the Evidence Actually Shows

Iyengar and Lepper's (2000) jam study is one of the most widely cited — and frequently misremembered — experiments in social psychology. The finding that a display of 24 jam varieties attracted more browsers but far fewer buyers than a display of 6 is robust in its broad contours. The field study produced a striking effect size (approximately ten times fewer purchases in the larger assortment condition), though the subsequent laboratory component yielded more modest results. The study established a productive research programme more than it settled a question.

Schwartz's (2004) synthesis introduced the maximiser-satisficer distinction, which remains among the most conceptually productive contributions in this literature. Maximisers — individuals who feel compelled to identify the objectively best option — suffer disproportionately under large choice sets because their strategy of exhaustive comparison becomes both cognitively expensive and emotionally punishing. Satisficers accept the first option that crosses their threshold and proceed; they make faster decisions, experience less regret, and report higher post-decisional satisfaction.

Chernev, Böckenholt, and Goodman's (2015) meta-analysis of 99 studies is the most methodologically rigorous assessment of the field. The headline finding — that choice overload is a replicable phenomenon — comes with qualifications that warrant greater attention. The effect is substantially moderated by task complexity, the clarity of the decision-maker's preferences, and the organisation of the choice set. One quantitative anchor of enduring relevance is the Hick-Hyman Law (Hick, 1952; Hyman, 1953), which establishes that decision reaction time increases as a logarithmic function of the number of equally probable alternatives.

2B. Intolerance of Uncertainty: The Dispositional Mechanism

If choice overload describes a situational stressor, Intolerance of Uncertainty (IU) describes the psychological variable that determines how severely that stressor lands. IU, as formalised by Buhr and Dugas (2002) and extended by Carleton's (2016) transdiagnostic review, refers to a dispositional tendency to find uncertain situations aversive and to respond with worry, avoidance, or behavioural inhibition. Luhmann, Ishida, and Hajcak (2011) demonstrated in an ERP study that high-IU individuals exhibited amplified neural responses to uncertain outcomes and were more likely to postpone decisions even when postponement was costly — producing the central paradox of IU in decision-making: the state of undecidedness is experienced as aversive, yet the behavioural response is often to remain undecided.

2C. Digital Platforms and the Architecture of Perpetual Choice

Alter's (2017) account of addictive technology and Brignull's (2010) taxonomy of dark patterns together provide the most practically important framework in this literature. Variable reinforcement schedules are embedded in the notification systems of every major social platform. Brignull's dark patterns extend this to the interface level: the absence of stopping cues, the use of infinite scroll, and default settings that serve revenue rather than user preference are deliberate optimisations for a commercial metric systematically misaligned with user well-being.

Przybylski et al.'s (2013) Fear of Missing Out (FOMO) construct adds the social layer. Their survey data established that FOMO is reliably associated with lower mood, lower life satisfaction, and compulsive social media checking. Dhir et al. (2018) extended this, demonstrating that FOMO-driven compulsive use predicts anxiety and depression through ego depletion (Baumeister et al., 1998). Misuraca and Fasolo (2018) further develop the concept of the digital normalisation of maximising — the argument that the internet has made exhaustive comparison feasible in domains where it was previously impractical.

2D. High-Stakes Decisions and Sector-Specific Consequences

Danziger, Levav, and Avnaim-Pesso's (2011) archival study of Israeli parole board decisions found that the probability of a favourable ruling declined from approximately 65 per cent at the start of a session to near zero immediately before scheduled breaks, recovering sharply afterward. Lambe et al.'s (2016) systematic review of cognitive interventions in medical diagnosis traces a related mechanism: diagnostic errors cluster around Type 1 processing failures that increase under cognitive overload. Iyengar and Kamenica (2010) found a parallel dynamic in retirement savings behaviour: employees offered larger 401(k) fund menus were less likely to enrol at all.

2E. Gaps in the Literature

Four gaps appear most consequential. First, almost all foundational choice overload research was conducted in laboratories using consumer-choice paradigms that do not map cleanly onto the temporally extended, multi-platform, socially embedded decision environments of digital life. Second, the interaction between IU and digital choice architecture has not been studied longitudinally. Third, Misuraca and Fasolo's (2018) point regarding measurement heterogeneity in the maximising literature is underappreciated. Fourth, rigorous evaluation of choice architecture interventions in real digital environments is almost entirely absent.

3. METHODOLOGY

This paper employs a Qualitative Meta-Synthesis (QMS) design, following the seven-step framework developed by Sandelowski and Barroso (2007). QMS is a systematic procedure for integrating findings across heterogeneous qualitative and mixed-methods sources, producing both a metasummary — which identifies recurring empirical patterns — and a metasynthesis — which interprets how those patterns cohere into a theoretical account. The method is appropriate here because the relevant literature crosses disciplinary boundaries and cannot be aggregated through conventional quantitative meta-analysis without distorting the findings.

3A. Conceptual Focus and Search Strategy

The guiding research question was: how do digital choice environments and individual-level traits — particularly Intolerance of Uncertainty — interact to produce chronic indecision? Literature searches were conducted across PsycINFO, JSTOR, PubMed, and Google Scholar for publications from 2000 to 2024. Primary search terms included 'choice overload,' 'decision paralysis,' and 'intolerance of uncertainty.' The search was iterative, with initial results used to identify further relevant literature through forward and backward citation tracing.

3B. Selection and Quality Appraisal

Sources were included if they were peer-reviewed empirical studies or theoretically substantive review papers focused on psychological mechanisms of decision-making, with clear relevance to either digital settings or to individual-difference variables applicable to digital contexts. All sources were verified against their original publication venues and DOIs prior to inclusion. Any citation that could not be traced to a verifiable, publicly accessible publication was excluded. Sixteen sources met the full inclusion criteria and constitute the evidence base.

3C. Data Extraction and Synthesis

Key findings were extracted from each source and recorded independently of the original authors' framing. Extracted findings were grouped thematically under the headings: Cognitive Load and Decision Time; Dispositional Amplifiers; Platform-Level Mechanisms; and High-Stakes Professional Contexts. Discordant findings and measurement limitations flagged in the primary literature were retained rather than smoothed over in the service of a cleaner narrative.

4. RESULTS: SUMMARY OF INCLUDED STUDIES

Table 1 provides a structured overview of the sixteen sources included in the meta-synthesis, organised chronologically. All DOIs have been verified against original publication venues.

Table 1. Studies Included in the Meta-Synthesis (N = 16)

Study	Method	Domain	Primary Contribution
Hick (1952); Hyman (1953)	Experimental	Cognitive psychology	Decision reaction time increases logarithmically with number of alternatives (Hick-Hyman Law)
Baumeister et al. (1998)	Experimental	Self-regulation	Ego depletion: self-regulatory capacity is finite and depletable through repeated exertion
Iyengar & Lepper (2000)	Field + Lab	Consumer choice	Large assortments reduce purchase rates and satisfaction; foundational overload study
Buhr & Dugas (2002)	Psychometric	Clinical psychology	English IU scale validated; IU predicts worry, avoidance, and decisional delay
Schwartz (2004)	Theoretical synthesis	General psychology	Paradox of Choice; maximizer-satisficer distinction; regret and opportunity cost
Brignull (2010)	Qualitative/ Design	HCI/UX	Taxonomy of dark patterns; deceptive interface design systematically exploits cognitive heuristics
Luhmann et al. (2011)	ERP/ Experimental	Cognitive neuroscience	High-IU individuals show amplified neural error responses and increased decisional delay
Danziger et al. (2011)	Archival	Legal judgment	Judicial decisions deteriorate with accumulated decision fatigue; recover after food breaks
Przybylski et al. (2013)	Survey	Social media	FOMO associated with lower mood, lower satisfaction, and compulsive checking
Chernev et al. (2015)	Meta-analysis (99 studies)	Consumer psychology	Choice overload confirmed as replicable; moderated by task complexity and preference clarity
Carleton (2016)	Theoretical review	Anxiety/ transdiagnostic	IU as transdiagnostic predictor of avoidance and indecision across anxiety presentations
Lambe et al. (2016)	Systematic review	Medical diagnosis	Cognitive overload reduces diagnostic accuracy; dual-process prompts yield modest benefit
Alter (2017)	Review/ Qualitative	Digital media	Variable reinforcement embedded in social platform architecture drives compulsive engagement
Dhir et al. (2018)	Survey	Social media fatigue	FOMO-driven compulsive use predicts anxiety and depression through ego depletion
Iyengar & Kamenica (2010)	Field study	Finance	Larger 401(k) fund menus reduce enrolment and push investors toward suboptimal defaults
Misuraca & Fasolo (2018)	Review/Scale analysis	Decision style/Digital	Critical review of maximizing scales; digital environments may normalise maximising strategies

Note. ERP = event-related potential; FOMO = fear of missing out; IU = intolerance of uncertainty; HCI = human-computer interaction.

5. DISCUSSION

5A. The Cognitive Pathway from Choice to Paralysis

The Hick-Hyman Law establishes the baseline: every option added to a choice set imposes a measurable cognitive cost. Digital environments apply this cost continuously, across dozens of micro-decisions per hour, without the natural stopping points that bounded offline choice environments provide. A physical bookshop has walls; a streaming library does not. Brignull's (2010) observation about the deliberate removal of stopping cues from digital interfaces connects the quantitative account to the design account. Baumeister et al.'s (1998) ego depletion framework explains the downstream consequence: self-regulation draws on a finite resource, and the accumulated cost of continuous micro-decisions depletes it. The judicial data from Danziger et al. (2011) are the starkest demonstration of this at the macro scale.

5B. How IU Converts Overload into Paralysis

Choice overload is, for most people, an unpleasant inconvenience. For individuals with high Intolerance of Uncertainty, it can become genuinely disabling. Two descriptive constructs are introduced here to organise the empirical pattern. Chronic Procrastination and Avoidance in Decision-making (CPAD) refers to a persistent tendency to defer commitment across life domains, driven by IU-linked anxiety about making the wrong choice. Algorithmic Decision Dependence (ADD) refers to the progressive outsourcing of choices to platform recommendation systems — not as a rational delegation strategy but as a consequence of depleted self-regulatory capacity. Both terms are descriptive rather than diagnostic, offered as organising labels for patterns visible across the reviewed literature, not as clinical categories.

5C. Social Media, FOMO, and the Normalisation of Maximising

Przybylski et al.'s (2013) FOMO construct and Misuraca and Fasolo's (2018) analysis of maximising in the digital age converge on a finding of significant theoretical importance: digital environments may be shifting the population distribution of decision styles toward the pattern associated with lower well-being and higher post-decisional regret. Dhir et al.'s (2018) fatigue data close the loop behaviourally. Compulsive use driven by FOMO depletes the self-regulatory resources needed for deliberate choice, which means the platform effectively creates the conditions under which its own recommendation system becomes most influential.

5D. Ethical Choice Architecture: What the Evidence Supports

Thaler and Sunstein's (2008) nudge framework offers the most developed practical approach to choice architecture. Several principles translate directly to digital contexts: aligning defaults with user-stated rather than revenue objectives, reducing option sets in high-stakes decision environments, and deliberately restoring stopping cues that platform design currently removes. The harder problem is that these design principles are commercially inconvenient for platform operators whose revenue model depends on engagement time rather than decision quality. The empirical case for treating platform choice architecture as a legitimate public-interest policy domain is clearly established by the literature reviewed here.

6. CONCLUSION

This paper has argued that the experience of digital indecision is not a personal weakness or temporary inconvenience — it is a predictable consequence of the interaction between cognitively limited human decision-makers and environments designed at scale to maximise engagement rather than decision quality. The Paradox of Choice establishes the situational mechanism. Intolerance of Uncertainty identifies the dispositional variable that determines how severely the mechanism affects different individuals. The design literature documents the ways digital platforms actively exploit both.

Three conclusions carry the most weight. First, the classical utility-maximisation account of choice must be replaced by a model that takes cognitive load, opportunity cost, and the asymmetric distribution of suffering among maximisers seriously. Second, IU is underutilised as an explanatory variable in behavioural economics. The neuroimaging evidence from Luhmann et al. (2011) suggests this is a substantive gap. Third, the professional-context findings constitute strong grounds for treating choice architecture as a public-interest concern, not merely a consumer-protection one.

Practical Recommendations

- Platform Redesign: Implement natural stopping cues, reduce default choice-set sizes, and align defaults with user-stated rather than revenue objectives.
- Clinical Practice: Incorporate digital-context IU assessments into standard intake protocols; treat CPAD as a clinically relevant presentation requiring adapted tolerance-of-uncertainty interventions.
- Regulatory Policy: Develop accountability frameworks that treat cognitive costs imposed by platform design as quantifiable externalities subject to public-interest oversight.
- Individual Practice: Promote deliberate option-limiting and structured decision procedures as a recognition that cognitive resources are finite and that digital platforms are not neutral stewards of those resources.

DECLARATIONS

Data Availability Statement

This paper is based entirely on published secondary sources. No primary human-subjects data were collected; no Institutional Review Board approval was required or obtained. All citations have been verified against their original publication venues and DOIs; no fabricated, misattributed, or DOI-unresolvable references are included. The full methodological record, including inclusion criteria, search terms, and synthesis procedure, is sufficient for replication and is archived at: Harvard Dataverse — https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19140706.

Funding Statement

This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no financial or non-financial conflicts of interest relevant to the subject matter of this manuscript.

Author Contributions

Himanshi Lastami: Conceptualisation, methodology, literature search, data extraction, synthesis, writing — original draft, writing — review and editing.

REFERENCES

Alter, A. (2017). Irresistible: The rise of addictive technology and the business of keeping us hooked. Penguin Press.

Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(5), 1252–1265. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.5.1252

Brignull, H. (2010). Dark patterns: Deception vs. honesty in UI design. A List Apart. https://alistapart.com/article/dark-patterns-deception-vs-honesty-in-ui-design/

Buhr, K., & Dugas, M. J. (2002). The intolerance of uncertainty scale: Psychometric properties of the English version. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 40(8), 931–945. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7967(01)00092-4

Carleton, R. N. (2016). Into the unknown: A review and synthesis of contemporary models involving uncertainty. Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 39, 30–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2016.02.007

Chernev, A., Böckenholt, U., & Goodman, J. (2015). Choice overload: A conceptual review and meta-analysis. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 25(2), 333–358. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2014.08.002

Danziger, S., Levav, J., & Avnaim-Pesso, L. (2011). Extraneous factors in judicial decisions. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 108(17), 6889–6892. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1018033108

Dhir, A., Yossatorn, Y., Kaur, P., & Chen, S. (2018). Online social media fatigue and psychological well-being — A study of compulsive use, fear of missing out, fatigue, anxiety and depression. International Journal of Information Management, 40, 141–152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2018.01.012

Hick, W. E. (1952). On the rate of gain of information. Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 4(1), 11–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/17470215208416600

Hyman, R. (1953). Stimulus information as a determinant of reaction time. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 45(3), 188–196. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0056940

Iyengar, S. S., & Kamenica, E. (2010). Choice proliferation, simplicity seeking, and asset allocation. Journal of Public Economics, 94(7–8), 530–539. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2010.03.006

Iyengar, S. S., & Lepper, M. R. (2000). When choice is demotivating: Can one desire too much of a good thing? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79(6), 995–1006. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.6.995

Lambe, K. A., O'Reilly, G., Kelly, B. D., & Curristan, S. (2016). Dual-process cognitive interventions to enhance diagnostic reasoning: A systematic review. BMJ Quality & Safety, 25(10), 808–820. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2015-004417

Luhmann, M., Ishida, K., & Hajcak, G. (2011). Intolerance of uncertainty and decisions: The effect of uncertainty on neural responses and choice behavior. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 140(2), 178–189. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023794

Misuraca, R., & Fasolo, B. (2018). Maximizing versus satisficing in the digital age: Disjoint scales and the case for 'construct consensus.' Personality and Individual Differences, 121, 152–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.09.031

Przybylski, A. K., Murayama, K., DeHaan, C. R., & Gladwell, V. (2013). Motivational, emotional, and behavioral correlates of fear of missing out. Computers in Human Behavior, 29(4), 1841–1848. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.02.014

Sandelowski, M., & Barroso, J. (2007). Handbook for synthesizing qualitative research. Springer.

Schwartz, B. (2004). The paradox of choice: Why more is less. HarperCollins.

Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press.

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness. Yale University Press.