

Society for Judgment and Decision Making

The 2020 41st Annual Conference



Virtual
December 9–12, 2020

Please note that the time zone is U.S. Eastern Standard Time

CONTENTS	PAGES
Master Schedule	2
Paper Presentations Schedule	3-6
Special Events	7-9
Paper Abstracts Listed by Session	10-26
Poster Titles Listed by Session	27-44

2020 Program Committee: Julia Minson (Chair), Shai Davidai, Daniel Feiler, and Tim Pleskac

THANKS TO: Kaye de Kruif and Kate Wessels (Conference Coordinators), Dave Hardisty (Webmaster), Katy Milkman (President), Crystal Hall, Edward Chang, Nathan Cheek, Jennifer Lerner, Suzanne Shu and Todd Rogers (SJDM Diversity Committee), Eesha Sharma, Jennifer Dannals, and Wendy De La Rosa (Women in SJDM committee), Ovul Sezer (student poster award), Susann Fiedler and Derek Koehler (Einhorn Award), Suzanne Shu and Jon Baron (Poster Session Coordinators), Hengchen Dai (Communication and Promotions), Alexandra Anderson, Liz Beard, Abby Bergman, Ilana Brody, Steve Carney, Christy Kang, Joowon Klusowski, Molly Moore, Julia Nolte, Catherine Owsik, Nate Posner, Dan Stein (Session Facilitators), and the ad hoc reviewers: On Amir, Kumar Amit, Richard Anderson, Shahzeen Attari, Peter Ayton, Alixandra Barasch, Daniel Bartels, Yoella Bereby-Meyer, Jonathan Berman, John Beshears, Sudeep Bhatia, Charlotte Blank, Wandi Bruine de Bruin, Katherine Burson, Gretchen Chapman, Keith Chen, Stephanie Chen, Shoham Choshen Hillel, Edward Cokely, Helen Colby, Cynthia Cryder, Keisha Cutright, Hengchen Dai, Junyidai Dai, Jason Dana, Clinton Davis-Stober, Bart De Langhe, Michael DeKay, Berkeley Dietvorst, Daniel Effron, Ido ErevIoannis Evangelidis, Ellen Evers, Dan Feiler, Philip Fernbach, Geoffrey Fisher, Craig Fox, Ana Franco-Watkins, Liz Friedman, Mirta Galecic, Rocio Garcia-Retamero, Oriane Georgeac, Ayelet Gneezy, Daniel Goldstein, Indranil Goswami, Etan Green, Todd Gureckis, Kareem Haggag, Crystal Hall, Uriel Haran, Oliver Hauser, Stefan Herzog, Scott Highhouse, Guy Hochman, Janina Hoffmann, Alex Imas, Ena Inesi, Mirjam Jenny, Leslie John, Minah Jung, Natalia Karelaia, Uma Karmarkar, Selin Kesebir, Ian Krajbich, Michael Kraus, Daniella Kupor, Richard Larrick, Robyn LeBoeuf, Tomas Lejarraga, Jennifer Lerner, Emma Levine, Meng Li, Ye Li, Jingyi Lu, Shenghua Luan, Selin Malkoc, Cade Massey, Nina Mazar, Joseph McGuire, Craig McKenzie, Katherine Milkman, Julia Minson, Daniel Mochon, Carey Morewedge, Johannes Müller-Trede, Thomas Mussweiler, Gideon Nave, Leif Nelson, Ben Newell, Nathan Novemsky, Christopher Olivola, Ivy Onyeador, Daniel Oppenheimer, Nailya Ordabayeva, Thorsten Pachur, Andreas Pape, Eyal Peer, Hannah Perfecto, Ellen Peters, Jonathan Pettibone, Taylor Phillips, Lamar Pierce, Devin Pope, Crystal Reeck, Alex Rees-Jones, Taly Reich, Nicholas Reinholdt, Jane Risen, Todd Rogers, Emily Rosenzweig, Ashleigh Rosette, David Rothschild, Krishna Savani, Dan Schley, Juliana Schroeder, Christin Schulze, Amos Schurr, Daniel Schwartz, Ovul Sezer, Victoria Shaffer, Anuj Shah, Eesha Sharma, Steven Shechter, Luxi Shen, Suzanne Shu, Joseph Simmons, Uri Simonsohn, Jack Soll, Stephen Spiller, Nina Strohming, Abigail Sussman, David Tannenbaum, Kinneret Teodorescu, Jennifer Trueblood, Claire Tsai, Stephanie Tully, Oleg Urminsky, Bettina von Helversen, Edward Vul, Elizabeth Webb, Keith Wilcox, Nora Williams, Paul Windschitl, Alison Wood Brooks, George Wu, Adelle Yang, Eldad Yechiam, Charles Zhang, Jiaying Zhao

2020 SJDM Conference Master Schedule

December 9–12, 2020

Please note that the time zone is U.S. Eastern Standard Time, all sessions will be hosted virtually through Whova and Zoom

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 9th

12:00-1:30 pm	Underrepresented Scholars (“US”) in SJDM Networking Event – *ALL WELCOME*
---------------	---

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10th

8:00-9:15 am	<u>Poster Session #1</u>
9:30-10:30 am	Paper Session #1
10:30-10:45 am	<i>Break / Paper Session #1 additional discussion</i>
10:45-11:45 am	Paper Session #2
11:45-12:00 pm	<i>Break / Paper Session #2 additional discussion</i>
12:00-1:00 pm	Presidential Address: Katy Milkman
1:00-1:15 pm	<i>Break</i>
1:15-2:15 pm	Paper Session #3
2:15-2:30 pm	<i>Break / Paper Session #3 additional discussion</i>
2:30-3:30 pm	Paper Session #4
3:30-3:45 pm	<i>Break / Paper Session #4 additional discussion</i>
3:45-4:15 pm	Einhorn Award Address
4:15-4:30 pm	<i>Break</i>
4:30-6:00 pm	Social Roundtables

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 11th

8:00-9:15 am	Social Roundtables
9:30-10:30 am	Paper Session #5
10:30-10:45 am	<i>Break / Paper Session #5 additional discussion</i>
10:45-11:45 am	Paper Session #6
11:45-12:00 pm	<i>Break / Paper Session #6 additional discussion</i>
12:00-1:00 pm	Keynote Address: Elke Weber
1:00-1:15 pm	<i>Break</i>
1:15-2:15 pm	Paper Session #7
2:15-2:30 pm	<i>Break / Paper Session #7 additional discussion</i>
2:30-4:00 pm	<u>Poster Session #2</u>

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12th

8:00-9:15 am	<u>Poster Session #3</u>
9:30-10:30 am	Paper Session #8
10:30-10:45 am	<i>Break / Paper Session #8 additional discussion</i>
10:45-11:45 am	Paper Session #9
11:45-12:00 pm	<i>Break / Paper Session #9 additional discussion</i>
12:00-1:00 pm	Social Roundtables

THURSDAY DECEMBER 10, 2020

Please note that the time zone is U.S. Eastern Standard Time, all sessions will be hosted virtually through Whova and Zoom

**** INDICATES JOB MARKET CANDIDATE**

	Track A	Track B	Track C
Session #1	MC: Ed O'Brien Discussant: Michael Norton	MC: Edward Chang Discussant: Jennifer Lerner	MC: Dan Schley Discussant: Oleg Urminsky
9:30 AM	Kang: Do major disasters motivate prosocial behavior?	Ritov: Transaction Frame Determines Preferences: Valuation of Labor by Employee and Contractor	Litovsky: Facts are like snacks: Variety preferences for information mirror those for consumable goods**
9:50 AM	Jaroszewicz: Beliefs about need and informal help	Daniels: How do firms' gender diversity numbers influence investors' judgments and decisions?	Epstein: Priming an accuracy mindset protects against illusory truth for false news
10:10 AM	Yi Yang Teoh: The games we play: Prosociality under time pressure reflects context-sensitive information priorities.	Munguia Gomez: People adjust their impression of a candidate more based on disadvantage than advantage	Allan: Stakeholder and Public Understanding of Hurricane Forecasts: Numeracy Predicts Comprehension of Probabilistic Weather Information**
Session #2	MC: Ian Krajbich Discussant: George Wu	MC: Minah Jung Discussant: Jane Risen	MC: Juliana Schroeder Discussant: Shane Frederick
10:45 AM	Batteux: Impressed by numbers: how do investors respond to precise numerical information in a context of uncertainty?	Kristal: Signing at the beginning versus at the end does not decrease dishonesty	Lawson: Mindless Math: Anticipating Cognitive Effort Impairs Insight
11:05 AM	Zeisberger: What is risk?	Danziger: Judging Those We Cheat	Lewis: The Bottleneck Heuristic: Why People Improve the Chances of Less Likely Requirements for Success
11:25 AM	Iliewa: Dynamic Inconsistency in Risky Choice: Evidence from the Lab and Field	Plassmann: Are we what we eat? Nutrition shifts discounting in an intertemporal choice task	Ybarra: Skilled Self-Evaluation of Decision Making: Numerate Individuals are Less Biased and Know it
Session #3	MC: Gordon Pennycook Discussant: Ayelet Fishbach	MC: Hengchen Dai Discussant: Maurice Schweitzer	MC: Celia Gaertig Discussant: Rick Larrick
1:15 PM	Silver: Motivated Self-Censorship: How impression management concerns bias fact-sharing among ideological allies	Linós: Affirming social belonging reduces burnout and turnover	Feng: Using selected peers to improve forecasting accuracy
1:35 PM	Chaudhry: Apologizing first (but not second) is a risky choice	Blunden: Requesting Advice Rather Than Feedback Yields More Developmental Input**	Palley: Boosting the Wisdom of Crowds Within a Single Judgment Problem: Weighted Averaging Based on Peer Predictions
1:55 PM	Dev: Sadder != Wiser: Depressive Realism is not Robust to Replication	Gershon: Friends with Health Benefits: Bundling Social Engagement with Incentives to Increase Gym Usage	Zhang: Identify Experts through Revealed Confidence: Application to Wisdom of Crowds

THURSDAY PROGRAM CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

THURSDAY DECEMBER 10, 2020 – CONTINUED

Please note that the time zone is U.S. Eastern Standard Time, all sessions will be hosted virtually through Whova and Zoom

**** INDICATES JOB MARKET CANDIDATE**

	Track A	Track B	Track C
Session #4	MC: Alison Wood-Brooks Discussant: Tom Gilovich	MC: Abby Sussman Discussant: Nina Mazar	MC: Kinneret Teoderescu Discussant: Jack Soll
2:30 PM	<u>Collins: Why won't you learn about me? Self-other differences in conversational goals.</u>	<u>Hoover: Default Tip Suggestions in NYC Taxi Cabs</u>	<u>Ramasubramanian: Individual Differences and Risk Perception: Numeracy Predicts Differences in General and Specific Risk Perceptions</u>
2:50 PM	<u>Kardas: Keep Talking: (Mis)Understanding the Hedonic Trajectory of Conversation</u>	<u>Habib: When Does the Tortoise Win the Race? Progress Towards Fundraising Goals has Different Effects in Joint Evaluation vs Separate Evaluation of Charities</u>	<u>Benjamin: Quantifying Machine Influence over Human Forecasters</u> **
3:10 PM	<u>Srinivasan: Unsolicited Advice is Valued More Than People Realize</u>	<u>Reiff: Save More Today or Tomorrow: The Role of Urgency and Present Bias in Nudging Pre-commitment</u>	<u>Bogard: Weighting expert opinions in decisions from description vs. experience</u>

FRIDAY DECEMBER 11, 2020

Please note that the time zone is U.S. Eastern Standard Time, all sessions will be hosted virtually through Whova and Zoom

**** INDICATES JOB MARKET CANDIDATE**

	Track A	Track B	Track C
Session #5	MC: Alex Imas Discussant: George Loewenstein	MC: Jen Dannals Discussant: Crystal Hall	MC: Susa Fiedler Discussant: Neil Stewart
9:30 AM	Gorji: A Behavioral Option Value Model for Consumer Product Set Choice	Kirgios: I'm a Woman: The Role of Identity Statements in Improving Outcomes for Women and Racial Minorities	Woiczuk: Evaluating Categories from Experience: The Simple Averaging Heuristic
9:50 AM	Saccardo: Cognitive Flexibility or Moral Commitment? Evidence of Anticipated Belief Distortion	Lin: When a star shines too bright: High-status minority members decrease diversity in future hiring decisions	Pachur: The Perception of Dramatic Risks: Biased Media, Biased Minds?
10:10 AM	Thakral: Anticipation and Consumption	Rai: Group Size and Its Impact on Diversity-Related Perceptions and Hiring Decisions	Poon: A multi-component process-tracing study of the attraction effect**
Session #6	MC: Alix Barasch Discussant: Don Moore	MC: Eesha Sharma Discussant: Suzanne Shu	MC: Lukasz Walasek Discussant: Ralph Hertwig
10:45 AM	Helgason: It Might Become True: How Prefactual Thinking Licenses Dishonesty Especially When People Want to Excuse It	Gaertig: Should Advisors Provide Confidence Intervals Around Their Estimates?	Steiner: Representative Design in Psychological Assessment: A Case Study Using the Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART)
11:05 AM	Berman: Moral Choice When Harming is Unavoidable	MacDonald: Waste Not, Wait a Lot: The mental accounting of sunk costs leads to delayed consumption	Krefeld-Schwalb: Assembled Preferences: Using task effects to measure latent traits**
11:25 AM	Evangelidis: A Reexamination of the Impact of Decision Conflict on Choice Deferral	Khambatta: Calibrating Algorithms to People's Ideal Preferences	Mrkva: Do Nudges Reduce Disparities? Choice Architecture Compensates for Low Knowledge and SES
Session #7	MC: Nora Williams Discussant: Leif Nelson	MC: Steph Tully Discussant: Craig Fox	MC: Johannes Mueller-Trede Discussant: Uri Simonsohn
1:15 PM	Zlatev: Returnable Reciprocity: Returnable Gifts Promote Virtuous Behaviors	De La Rosa: Assistance Resistance: Psychological Ownership of Money as an Intervention	Sump: The Hot Kitchen Effect: Categories, Generalization, and Exploration
1:35 PM	Dhaliwal: Signaling benefits of partner choice decisions**	Mehr: The Motivating Power of Streaks: Increasing Productivity Is as Easy as 1, 2, 3	Dietvorst: People Take More Risk When Their Decisions Generate Prediction Errors in Addition to Monetary Outcomes
1:55 PM	Donnelly: Once and again: Repeated viewing affects judgments of spontaneity and preparation	Baum: Intuitive Substitutes: Consumers Mistakenly Think Complimentary Preferences Are Substitutes	Olsson: Using wisdom-of-crowds methods to forecast the 2018 and 2020 US elections

SATURDAY DECEMBER 12, 2020

Please note that the time zone is U.S. Eastern Standard Time, all sessions will be hosted virtually through Whova and Zoom

**** INDICATES JOB MARKET CANDIDATE**

	Track A	Track B	Track C
Session #8	MC: Dirk Wulff Discussant: Coty Gonzalez	MC: Julian Zlatev Discussant: Deepak Malhotra	MC: Dan Bartels Discussant: Dan Goldstein
9:30 AM	<u>Yang: Decision Diagnosticity: Rejecting Induces a Larger Post-Decision Evaluation Gap Than Choosing</u>	<u>Hart: Relational Concerns and the Economic Value of Negotiated Agreements</u>	<u>Rabinovitch: (Ir)relevant or Not? The Intuitive Understanding of Irrelevant Information in Selection Decisions</u>
9:50 AM	<u>Erev: Six Contradicting Deviations from Rational Choice, and the Impact of Experience</u>	<u>Dorison: Escalation of commitment to a failing course of action signals trustworthiness</u>	<u>Pe'er: When two wrongs make a right: The efficiency-consumption gap under separate vs. joint evaluations</u>
10:10 AM	<u>Prinsloo: Opportunity Neglect: Rejecting Strictly Non-Negative Low-Chance Prospects that Feel Like "Nothing to Gain"</u>	<u>Hagmann: The Agent-Selection Dilemma in Distributive Bargaining**</u>	<u>Fei: Prediction by Replication: People Prefer Forecasting Methods Similar to the Event Being Predicted</u>
Session #9	MC: Sander van der Linden Discussant: David Budescu	MC: Clayton Critcher Discussant: Deb Small	MC: Sunita Sah Discussant: Gretchen Chapman
10:45 AM	<u>Mislavsky: First is the Worst: Forecasters Get Less Credit for Predictions Made Far in Advance</u>	<u>Mastroianni: The Illusion of Moral Decline</u>	<u>Roth: On the potential of promoting healthy behavior with small repeated commitment betting</u>
11:05 AM	<u>Allen: Scaling up fact-checking using the wisdom of crowds</u>	<u>Effron: The Moral Repetition Effect: Bad Deeds -- But Not Good Deeds -- Seem More Ethical When Repeatedly Encountered</u>	<u>Aka: Predicting Health Judgment</u>
11:25 AM	<u>Zhao: How (Corrected) Errors Humanize an Online Communicator</u>	<u>Dai: The Impacts of Algorithmic Work Assignment on Fairness Perceptions and Productivity: Evidence from Field Experiments</u>	<u>Roberts: When Wanting Closure Reduces Patients' Patience</u>

2020 SJDM Conference Special Events

Please note that the time zone is U.S. Eastern Standard Time, all sessions will be hosted virtually through Whova and Zoom

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 9th

12:00-1:30 pm **Underrepresented Scholars (“US”) in SJDM Networking Event**
Co-organized by US in SJDM and the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion committee

All are welcome and encouraged to attend the first Underrepresented Scholars in SJDM (US in SJDM) networking event. Given recent world events, SJDM is expanding the Women in SJDM subcommittee to include all underrepresented groups in our field.

Our goal is to foster meaningful relationships between faculty and students, especially those who are underrepresented in our field. We would be delighted if you would join the event which will involve interacting in small groups with senior and junior faculty as well as PhD students.

We will discuss career-relevant topics and rotate groups so that everyone has the opportunity to meet several new colleagues. Our hope is that the event will be interactive, engaging, and rewarding for everyone involved.

This event is organized by Eesha Sharma, Jennifer Dannals, and Wendy De La Rosa.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10th

8:00-9:15 am [Poster Session #1](#)

12:00-1:00 pm **Presidential Address:** Behavior Change for Good
Katherine L. Milkman, Wharton School of The University of Pennsylvania

3:45-4:15 pm **Einhorn Award**

4:30-6:00 pm **Social Roundtables**

Q&A with Editors of JDM

Hosted by Mandeep Dhani, Jon Baron and Andreas Gloeckner

JDM Research on Advice and Advice Interactions

Hosted by Hayley Blunden & Christina Rader

Educating the Next Generation: Best Practices for Teaching JDM

Hosted by Katherine Fox-Glassman

What's your Workout? Staying Fit During COVID-19

Hosted by Keri Kettle

NSF Information Session

Hosted by Bob O'Connor, Claudia Gonzalez-Vallejo and Trish Van Zandt

Be All That You Can Be: JDM Lessons for Embracing Human Potential (session will be 1 hr)

Hosted by George Elerick

Writing and Pitching Op-Eds

Hosted by Dave Nussbaum

Meet the SJDM Diversity and Inclusion Committee

Hosted by Crystal Hall and Edward Chang

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 11th

8:00-9:15 am **Social Roundtables**

Outside the Ivy Tower: JDM Research in Industry

Hosted by Himanshu Warudkar

Research that Matters: Real World Applications of JDM Research

Hosted by Talya Miron-Shatz

How Interdisciplinary is JDM?

Hosted by Marijke Leliveld

It's Complicated: The Concept of Complexity and its Role in JDM

Hosted by Jonathan Berman

Balancing Life, Work, and Parenting Pre-tenure

Hosted by Suzanne Shu

LGBTQ+ Scholars in JDM

Hosted by Nathan Cheek

12:00-1:00 pm **Keynote Address: Cognition and Motivation in Social and Physical Space and Time**

Perception, attention, learning, and memory are studied by cognitive psychologists, whereas values, goals, emotions, and social identity are the domain of social psychologists. Things get interesting, however, when we look at the way in which cognition and motivation intersect and interact. The probabilities and utilities of the outcomes of risky choice alternatives, for example, are not evaluated independently, as normative models say they should be. Instead, wishful thinking increases the perceived odds of positive events and fear raises the perceived likelihood of adverse events.

Attention is clearly driven by cognitive variables such as past experience, but also by motivational variables such as social identity. As boundedly-rational information processors, we navigate the long list of daily choices with input from our physical and social environmental where cognition and motivation intersect and with a focus that can shift from the past to the present and the future.

I will argue that many patterns of behavior are better understood and predicted when the decisions of individuals are embedded into a framework that allows for the influence of the physical and social context on cognition and motivation and for some dynamic evolution over time. I will illustrate this point with recent data on responses to important social issues, from intergenerational contributions to combat climate change to political polarization on Covid-19 and climate change and the depolarizing effect of personal exposure to these hazards.

Elke U. Weber, Princeton University

2:30-4:00 pm [Poster Session #2](#)

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12th

8:00-9:15 am [Poster Session #3](#)

12:00-1:00 pm **Social Roundtables**

Talking About Talking: Conversation Research in JDM

Hosted by Juliana Schroeder

Strength in Numbers: How to Diversify JDM research and the JDM Community

Hosted by Paul Price

Is a Hot Dog a Sandwich? Online Controversies

Hosted by Tyler MacDonald

Keeping it Real: JDM Lessons from Reality TV

Hosted by Eric VanEpps

What Will Happen to Our Jobs? The Future of Higher Education

Hosted by Christian Gilde

BIPOC Scholars in JDM

Hosted by Crystal Hall

1:00-2:00 pm **J. Frank Yates SJDM Informal Celebration**

Frank Yates influenced many researchers in the JDM community through his scholarship, his leadership and his humor over his 50 year career. Please join us on zoom to celebrate Frank right after SJDM. This will be informal, we will be sharing stories about Frank and celebrating him. Come join in with your own Frank story or just listen. Please email Elizabeth Veinott at eveinott@mtu.edu for the Zoom information.

2020 SJDM Conference Paper Abstracts

THURSDAY DECEMBER 10, 2020

Session #1 Track A: Thursday 9:30 am - 10:30 am

Do major disasters motivate prosocial behavior?

Kang, Polly (University of Pennsylvania); Daniels, David (National University of Singapore); Schweitzer, Maurice (University of Pennsylvania)

Normative theories and lay beliefs predict people will help more when others face more harm. But due to ethical and methodological difficulties, this prediction is untested when others face large harm. We overcome these difficulties by analyzing a quasi-experiment with a unique, massive field dataset (~3M time-stamped prosocial behaviors by ~19K volunteers) and 108 exogenous shocks that created large harm (hurricanes, earthquakes, fires, and mass shootings). We find that major disasters actually demotivate prosocial behavior. We develop and experimentally test the Prosocial Prospects Framework (PPF) to explain why large harm demotivates prosocial behavior, even as small harm motivates it.

Beliefs about need and informal help

Jaroszewicz, Ania (Harvard University)

People often neglect to offer help to those in need, even when they would be happy to help if asked. I offer one explanation for this phenomenon: potential helpers systematically underestimate others' needs. Across several studies, I demonstrate this bias and its behavioral consequences. I further find that people who are in need fail to anticipate the bias, and therefore lack a basis on which to adjust their behaviors in response. Finally, I identify a mechanism underlying the would-be helpers' bias and a method of correcting beliefs. Together, the results suggest that biased beliefs about need act to limit the amount of help that is transferred between parties.

The games we play: Prosociality under time pressure reflects context-sensitive information priorities.

Teoh, Yi Yang (University of Toronto); Hutcherson, Cendri (University of Toronto)

Time pressure is thought to reveal whether people are intuitively prosocial or selfish but has yielded mixed conclusions. Measuring both choice and information search during the ultimatum and dictator game, we find instead that time pressure drives people to prioritize different information in the ultimatum compared to the dictator game. Importantly, these information priorities disproportionately drive choices under time pressure, leading to changes in overall prosociality. Thus, individual and contextual differences in attentional priorities may explain why time pressure sometimes leads to more prosocial behavior and other times more selfish behavior.

Session #1 Track B: Thursday 9:30 am - 10:30 am

Transaction Frame Determines Preferences: Valuation of Labor by Employee and Contractor

Ritov, Ilana (The Hebrew University); Schurr, Amos (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)

Peer-to-peer platforms have changed the labor market by enabling millions of workers to earn money on their own schedules, whether driving for Uber or Lyft or caring for others' pets through Rover. Unfortunately, this freedom and flexibility often come at a cost, quite literally. Three experiments demonstrate that "contract trading" in which contract pricing replaces traditional wage setting", lowers freelance contractors' perceived value and actual earnings alike, even when their actual work product is identical to that of a traditional employee.

How do firms' gender diversity numbers influence investors' judgments and decisions?

Daniels, David (National University of Singapore); Dannals, Jen (Dartmouth College); Lys, Thomas (Northwestern University); Neale, Margaret (Stanford University)

How do firms' announcements of gender diversity numbers influence investors' judgments and decisions? Two field quasi-experiments (in tech and finance) and three preregistered lab experiments (with investors as participants) show investors increase their valuations of firms who reveal more diversity; e.g., if Google revealed that 32% (vs. 31%) of their employees are women, its

stock market valuation would be \$375 million higher. This seems to happen because investors view diversity as a signal of creativity, reduced exposure to legal risk, and a more ethical investment. Also, investors care more about diversity in upper-level roles. Our findings suggest firms underinvest in gender diversity.

People adjust their impression of a candidate more based on disadvantage than advantage

Munguia Gomez, David (University of Chicago); Levine, Emma (University of Chicago); Phillips, Taylor (New York University)

We examine how much decision-makers update their impression of a candidate based on whether their circumstances were advantageous versus disadvantageous, and why they update as much as they do. We focus on impressions of competence and examine this question in the context of hypothetical college admissions decisions. Across 3 studies (N = 1730), we find that decision-makers adjust their impression of a college applicant, as well as their decision to admit or reject them, more after learning about their disadvantage than advantage. These insights have practical and theoretical implications for decision-making in selection contexts and for institutions seeking to reduce inequality.

Session #1 Track C: Thursday 9:30 am - 10:30 am

Facts are like snacks: Variety preferences for information mirror those for consumable goods.

Litovsky, Yana (Carnegie Mellon University); Loewenstein, George (Carnegie Mellon University)

The expression "consuming content" suggests a similarity between acquiring information and consuming material goods. We show that one of the most well-established patterns of preferences for goods, "variety seeking" also applies to information. Study 1 shows that people shift preferences between learning one of two topics in an effort to maximize the variety of subjects learned. Study 2 explicitly compares variety-seeking for objects and information. Study 3 shows that the desire for varied information changes preferences not only for the information category but for the information itself. Study 4 shows a diversification bias for information as observed with consumable goods.

Priming an accuracy mindset protects against illusory truth for false news.

Epstein, Ziv (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Brashier, Nadia (Harvard University); Pennycook, Gordon (University of Regina); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

Repeated exposure to blatantly fake news headlines increases their perceived veracity. Evaluating neutral trivia statements' accuracy at exposure protects against this illusory truth effect. Here we show (i) this extends to fake news, and (ii) it is sufficient to prime an accuracy mindset, rather than requiring an accuracy assessment of every headline at exposure. Participants first judged headlines for humor, accuracy, or a mix of both; then later evaluated the accuracy of the same headlines and new ones. Exposure increased belief in the humor-only condition, but not the others, indicating that any consideration of accuracy is enough to protect against illusory

Stakeholder and Public Understanding of Hurricane Forecasts: Numeracy Predicts Comprehension of Probabilistic Weather Information

Allan, Jinan N. (University of Oklahoma); Ripberger, Joseph T. (University of Oklahoma); Gupta, Kuhika (University of Oklahoma); Krocak, Makenzie (University of Oklahoma); Jenkins-Smith, Hank (University of Oklahoma); Cokely, Edward T. (University of Oklahoma)

The National Weather Service develops models to communicate hurricane forecast uncertainty to partners and the public. However, there remain barriers to comprehension and communication. The current study aims to assess the extent to which some cognitive factors and individual differences (e.g. numeracy) can impact comprehension of probabilistic information. We provide data from (i) a survey of 200 forecasters, and (ii) a US national survey (N=3,000). Structural models indicate that differing levels of numeracy and experience have direct and indirect influences on hurricane forecast comprehension. Discussion focuses on implications for training to improve comprehension and risk communication.

Session #2 Track A: Thursday 10:45 am - 11:45 am

Impressed by numbers: how do investors respond to precise numerical information in a context of uncertainty?

Batteux, Eleonore (University College London); Bilovich, Avri (University College London); Johnson, Samuel (University of Bath); Tuckett, David (University College London)

Consumers are often shown investment returns with high levels of precision, which is misleading given their inherent uncertainty. We test whether consumers are impressed by numbers (i.e. over-rely on precise numerical information) and what effects that has on their decisions over time. We find that consumers prefer and invest more in point estimates than ranges, which holds when consumers are made aware of their inherent uncertainty. However, experiencing that forecasts are incorrect dissipates the preference for precision, while eroding trust in the forecaster to a greater extent than when incorrect ranges are communicated.

What is risk?

Zeisberger, Stefan (Radboud University / University of Zurich)

Risk is a fundamental factor in economic decisions, particularly in finance. We investigate what drives investors' perception of risk and investment propensity. In a series of experiments, participants are presented with return distributions and have to assess each distribution's riskiness. Our results hint to the probability of losing being a main driver of risk perception and investment propensity. Volatility, which is typically used by academics, financial advisors and the regulator, plays a more minor role. Our findings are robust with regard to color-coding of return distributions, various subject pools, (non-)incentives and return distribution variability.

Dynamic Inconsistency in Risky Choice: Evidence from the Lab and Field

Heimer, Rawley (Boston College); Iliewa, Zwetelina (University of Bonn); Imas, Alex (University of Chicago); Weber, Martin (University of Mannheim)

Many economically important settings, from financial markets to consumer choice, involve dynamic decisions under risk. We use a unique brokerage dataset containing traders' ex-ante plans and their subsequent decisions ($N = 190,000$) and two pre-registered experiments ($N = 940$) to study what motivates risk-taking in dynamic environments. We find that people accept risk as part of a "lossexit-strategy" planning to continue after gains and stop after losses. Their actual behavior exhibits the reverse pattern. We use our data to formally identify a model of decision-making that predicts this dynamic inconsistency and use this model to quantify the substantial welfare costs of naivete.

Session #2 Track B: Thursday 10:45 am - 11:45 am

Signing at the beginning versus at the end does not decrease dishonesty

Kristal, Ariella (Harvard University); Whillans, Ashley (Harvard University); Bazerman, Max (Harvard University); Gino, Francesca (Harvard University); Shu, Lisa (London Business School); Mazar, Nina (Boston University); Dan Ariely (Duke University)

Honest reporting is essential for society to function well; yet, people often lie when asked to provide information. A landmark finding provided evidence that asking people to sign a veracity statement at the beginning, instead of the end, of a form, increases honest report (Shu et al., 2012). In this project, we failed to replicate this result. Across 5 conceptual replications and a high powered preregistered direct replication ($n = 5,794$) conducted with the original authors, we observed no effect. Given the policy applications of this result, it is important to update the scientific record regarding the veracity of these results.

Judging Those We Cheat

Hod, Nurit (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Peer, Eyal (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Danziger, Shai (Tel Aviv University)

How do people judge organizations they have cheated? Existing theories offer contradicting predictions: On the one hand, cheaters may feel guilty for having cheated so they judge the organization more favorably; on the other hand, to protect their self-image, cheaters may blame the organization for their misbehavior, consequently judging it more negatively. We find that cheaters judge organizations more negatively the more they cheat, but only when they could justify their cheating. The findings have important implications because cheating is common and individuals' judgments drive their own future choices and word of mouth, thus influencing other people's behavior.

Are we what we eat? Nutrition shifts discounting in an intertemporal choice task

Koban, Leonie (INSEAD); Schelski, Daniela (University of Bonn); Weber, Bernd (University of Bonn); Simon, Marie-Christine (University of Bonn); Plassmann, Hilke (INSEAD)

First evidence exists that what people eat impacts how they decide. A new path to explain this phenomenon is the communication between the gut and the brain. One mechanism shaping the "gut-brain-axis" is the composition of the bacteria in the gut. We tested whether delay discounting is affected by a short-term diet change altering the composition of the gut microbiome. We found an increased discount factor in the treatment, but not in the placebo group after vs. before the intervention (N=118). These results reveal a novel surprising link between nutrition and delay discounting.

Session #2 Track C: Thursday 10:45 am - 11:45 am

Mindless Math: Anticipating Cognitive Effort Impairs Insight

Lawson, Asher (Duke University); Larrick, Richard (Duke University); Soll, Jack (Duke University)

We presented people with problems that invited numeric operations but that had a correct answer that did not require math. We manipulated the difficulty of the tempting math in the problems. Anticipating having to perform challenging math induces people to allocate more cognitive resources in preparation for doing this math. As a result, they have fewer cognitive resources available to check their representation of the problem, leading them to provide a final answer that is based on the tempting "but unnecessary" math. Across five pre-registered studies (total N = 3,051), we studied the relationship between numeric demands and individuals' ability to represent and solve problems correctly.

The Bottleneck Heuristic: Why People Improve the Chances of Less Likely Requirements for Success

Lewis, Joshua (New York University); Feiler, Daniel (Dartmouth)

Do people work harder to improve chances of success via the chances of likely or unlikely subgoals? E.g., if people need a 20% chance event and an independent 40% chance event both to occur for success, are they more motivated to improve the 20% chance to 30% (giving a $12\% = 30\% \times 40\%$ success rate) or the 40% chance to 60% (also giving a $12\% = 20\% \times 60\%$ success rate)? Despite the 40% to 60% improvement being of greater absolute magnitude and past findings that people tend to improve more favorable chances, we present multiple preregistered studies showing that people would generally prefer to improve 20% to 30%. This is due to a bottleneck heuristic: people fixate on the biggest barrier to success.

Skilled Self-Evaluation of Decision Making: Numerate Individuals are Less Biased and Know it

Ybarra, Vincent (University of Oklahoma); Cokely, Edward (University of Oklahoma); Allan, Jinan (University of Oklahoma); Ramasubramanian, Madhuri (University of Oklahoma); Cho, Jinhyo (University of Oklahoma); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma)

There has been little exploration of the relationship between cognitive sophistication and self-assessments. One study showed that cognitive sophistication leads to more bias and overconfidence in self-assessments (Meserve et al., 2012). This finding may be from the lack of analyses related to individual differences and exclusive reporting of averages. The presented study looked at self-assessments (via confidence ratings and the bias blind spot scale; Scopelliti et al., 2015) and cognitive sophistication via the Berlin Numeracy Test (Cokely et al., 2012) analyzed with individual differences in decision skill. Results indicated that numerate individuals tended to be less biased and knew it.

Session #3 Track A: Thursday 1:15 pm - 2:15 pm

Motivated Self-Censorship: How impression management concerns bias fact-sharing among ideological allies

Silver, Ike (University of Pennsylvania); Small, Deborah (University of Pennsylvania); Goodwin, Geoff (University of Pennsylvania)

Four preregistered experiments (N=1,663) find evidence of self-censorship effects in fact-sharing about moral and political issues. People on both sides of the aisle omit from discussion evidence they believe to be factual and relevant to important social issues (e.g., gun control, immigration) if bringing up such evidence might cast public doubt on their loyalty to valued political causes. This tendency to self-censor politically inconvenient facts contravenes how participants say they ought to communicate upon reflection, and it threatens the quality and balance of information shared in social networks.

Apologizing first (but not second) is a risky choice

Chaudhry, Shereen (University of Chicago); Burdea, Valeria (Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich)

We find that mutual blame conflicts, where both people could apologize, introduce novel game theoretic considerations. The decision to apologize is influenced by order: people are more willing to apologize second than first. This "apology gap" partly results from people treating apologizing first (but not second) like a risky choice", it is sensitive to risk aversion and beliefs about the other's likelihood of reciprocating. People expect the experience of being the only one to apologize to be worse than the experience of both people apologizing. This theoretical insight generates novel predictions including that belief miscalibration could lead to unnecessary "apology stalemates."

Sadder != Wiser: Depressive Realism is not Robust to Replication

Dev, Amelia (University of California, Berkeley); Moore, Don (University of California, Berkeley); Johnson, Sheri (University of California, Berkeley)

Despite being a well-known and highly influential theory, depressive realism has tenuous empirical support. In a pre-registered study, we test for depressive realism in a classic contingency task (to measure bias in perceived control) and an overconfidence task (to measure bias in perceived performance). We incorporate several key study design suggestions from the past 40 years of depressive realism research. We find no evidence of a relationship between depressive symptoms and greater accuracy in assessing control or confidence. Our results suggest that the depressive realism effect is not as robust as previously thought.

Session #3 Track B: Thursday 1:15 pm - 2:15 pm

Affirming social belonging reduces burnout and turnover

Linos, Elizabeth (University of California, Berkeley); Ruffini, Krista (Georgetown University); Wilcoxon, Stephanie (The Behavioral Insights Team)

The alarming rates of employee burnout are well-documented, yet we know very little about how to mitigate its risk. This paper presents four studies aimed at exploring how social support impacts burnout amongst front line workers. In a multi-city field experiment (n=536), we find that a light-touch social support intervention significantly reduced burnout by 0.4 SDs and cut resignations by more than half over a six-month period. To unpack the theoretical mechanism more precisely, we document that social belonging and workplace identity threat are highly associated with burnout in two field surveys (n=6325), and clarify our experimental manipulation in an online lab experiment (n=497).

Requesting Advice Rather Than Feedback Yields More Developmental Input

Blunden, Hayley (Harvard University); Yoon, Jaewon (Harvard University); Kristal, Ariella (Harvard University); Whillans, Ashley (Harvard University)

Asking for feedback is a popular means to solicit third-party input to improve one's performance. Yet employees often lament that the feedback they receive is unhelpful. We propose that asking for feedback may not effectively solicit the type of input feedback seekers desire: critical and actionable insights that promote development. We offer a simple yet powerful alternative: ask for advice instead. Across four studies (N=1,379), including a field experiment, we find individuals often ask for feedback to seek developmental input. However, people offer more critical and actionable input, and comments that are ultimately judged more useful, when they are asked to provide advice instead.

Friends with Health Benefits: Bundling Social Engagement with Incentives to Increase Gym Usage

Gershon, Rachel (UCSD); Cryder, Cynthia (Washington University in St. Louis); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania)

We test the benefits of social engagement on healthy behaviors. In a large field experiment (n = 774), we compared a standard financial incentive, where participants received a reward for each gym visit, to a social engagement incentive, where participants only received the reward if they visited the gym simultaneously with a friend. Despite the higher coordination cost of exercising with a friend, we observe benefits of the social requirement. Participants in the social-engagement reward condition went to the gym 34% more than the standard reward condition. Our findings suggest that social engagement provides non-monetary motivation for exercise that offers accountability and enjoyment.

Session #3 Track C: Thursday 1:15 pm - 2:15 pm

Using selected peers to improve forecasting accuracy

Feng, Ye (Fordham University); Budescu, David (Fordham University)

In situations where large number of judges predicting multiple events, one often encounters large numbers of "missing" forecasts. This paper proposes a new approach that predicts the missing responses, based on the median of "peers" forecasters, identified based on every judge's recorded forecasts. We use a large-scale geopolitical forecasting tournament data to illustrate the approach. Our analysis indicates that the proposed method can improve the performance of most individuals, and the collective accuracy while preserving diversity. Analysis of the selected peers suggests that the method is successful as it propagates the responses of the most engaged and accurate forecasters.

Boosting the Wisdom of Crowds Within a Single Judgment Problem: Weighted Averaging Based on Peer Predictions

Palley, Asa (Indiana University); Satopaa, Ville (INSEAD)

A simple average of judgments over-emphasizes the common component at the expense of the unique components of a crowd's opinions. We propose a weighting of individual estimates that appropriately combines their collective information within a single estimation problem. Judges are asked to provide both a point estimate of the quantity of interest and a prediction of the average estimate that will be given by all other judges. Predictions of others are then used as part of a customized criterion to weight the estimates to form an aggregate estimate for that problem. We use simulated and experimental data to illustrate that the procedure can improve the accuracy of the aggregate estimate.

Identify Experts through Revealed Confidence: Application to Wisdom of Crowds

Zhang, Yunhao (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

We propose our Revealed Confidence (RC) algorithm that improves crowd prediction by identifying experts from the crowds. We highlight the important distinction between first-order and second-order uncertainty, which also serves as an explanation for rational overconfidence. Under our proposed belief-updating mechanism, we show RC could identify the more accurate prior estimates even if agents report the same prior confidence under conventional confidence elicitation. Our empirical analyses test and confirm our theoretical predictions regarding belief update behaviors as well as the better performance of RC relative to other methods in some crowd prediction contexts.

Session #4 Track A: Thursday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm

Why won't you learn about me? Self-other differences in conversational goals.

Collins, Hanne (Harvard University); Dorison, Charles (Northwestern University); Minson, Julia (Harvard University); Gino, Francesca (Harvard University)

Conversations about strongly-held opposing views rarely go well. We reveal a self-other difference in people's beliefs about their own and their partner's goals that helps explain why such conversations are aversive. Three online experiments and a field dataset (collective N = 3,049) provide converging evidence that people believe themselves to be able to combine the goals of learning and persuasion when talking to a disagreeing counterpart but believe their counterparts to be focused solely on persuasion. We explore downstream effects of this self-other difference for individuals' engagement in, and experience of, conversations where strongly held beliefs collide.

Keep Talking: (Mis)Understanding the Hedonic Trajectory of Conversation

Kardas, Michael (Northwestern University); Schroeder, Juliana (University of California at Berkeley); O'Brien, Ed (University of Chicago)

Conversation is both common and consequential, yet this research finds that people misunderstand one important element of this experience: how long it should continue. Four experiments (N = 893 individuals) reveal that people expect conversation material to run dry sooner than it does. As a result, they overestimate the speed with which their enjoyment will decline and prefer to end conversations too soon for their own enjoyment. Misunderstanding the hedonic trajectory of conversation keeps people from investing in closer connections.

Unsolicited Advice is Valued More Than People Realize

Srinivasan, Preeti (Stanford University); Abel, Jennifer (Harvard University); Schroeder, Juliana (University of California, Berkeley); Flynn, Francis (Stanford University)

Do others appreciate our unsolicited advice more than we think they will? Using a multi-method approach across four studies (N = 1,305), this research demonstrates that advice-givers underestimate advice-receivers' appreciation and felt closeness to the giver.

This effect holds among both strangers and best friends, in both personal and professional contexts, and about both trivial and consequential topics. We further demonstrate that one reason why advice-givers underestimate receivers' appreciation is because givers undervalue their own legitimacy to give advice. These experiments suggest that unsolicited advice is valued more than people anticipate.

Session #4 Track B: Thursday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm

Default Tip Suggestions in NYC Taxi Cabs

Hoover, Hanna (University of Michigan Ann Arbor)

How do default suggestions influence tips? To identify the impact of defaults, I use variation of credit payment vendors within the New York City taxi industry. Using both timing of the payment screen installations and variation in technology vendors, I identify how changes in the default tips influence consumer tipping behavior. I find that higher tip suggestions result in an increase in tip amounts of approximately \$0.57 per fare which translates to an increase in a cab drivers hourly wage by 5.35 percent. I discuss the policy implications of these results and how they are particularly relevant for low-wage workers in economies increasingly dominated by the service industry.

When Does the Tortoise Win the Race? Progress Towards Fundraising Goals has Different Effects in Joint Evaluation vs Separate Evaluation of Charities

Habib, Rishad (University of British Columbia); Hardisty, David (University of British Columbia); White, Katherine (University of British Columbia)

Research on the goal gradient effect shows that people contribute more to campaigns that are closer to reaching their goals. However, across four studies and one large dataset we demonstrate that when individuals are asked to choose between two similar charities, they donate more to the one that is further from its goal. This occurs because in separate evaluations, people are often unaware of other organizations that might be in need, demonstrating opportunity cost neglect. However, in joint evaluations of charities they are made aware of and are motivated to help needier charities.

Save More Today or Tomorrow: The Role of Urgency and Present Bias in Nudging Pre-commitment

Reiff, Joseph (University of California, Los Angeles); Dai, Hengchen (University of California, Los Angeles); Beshears, John (Harvard University); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania); Benartzi, Shlomo (University of California, Los Angeles)

In a field experiment (N=5,196), we offered people a choice between enrolling in a saving plan now or pre-committing to enroll in it later. This reduced immediate enrollment by 21%, had a null effect on overall enrollment, and reduced total savings by 6%, compared to merely inviting people to enroll in the same savings plan now. Why? We theorize and show across three pre-registered lab studies (N=5,059) that offering a precommitment option alongside an immediate enrollment option leads people to infer that whatever behavior is on offer is less urgently recommended and reduces engagement in the behavior, especially immediately (even though the option to delay makes saying "yes" less painful).

Session #4 Track C: Thursday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm

Individual Differences and Risk Perception: Numeracy Predicts Differences in General and Specific Risk Perceptions

Ramasubramanian, Madhuri (University of Oklahoma); Allan, Jinan (University of Oklahoma); Cho, Jinhyo (University of Oklahoma); Garcia-Retamero, Rocio (Universidad de Granada); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma); Cokely, Edward (University of Oklahoma)

The measurement of risk perception has spanned over four decades of research, with a seminal finding indicating that people perceive risk on two orthogonal dimensions; dread and unknown (Fischhoff et al., 1978). However, less research has focused on the role of individual differences in risk perceptions, especially in relation to new and emerging risks. Results from two studies indicate that numeracy predicts risk perceptions as observed from two Structural Equation Models. Finally, replication results from a preliminary study with a sample of 500 U.S. residents collected during the early stages of COVID-19 infections are also presented.

Quantifying Machine Influence over Human Forecasters

Benjamin, Daniel (University of Southern California); Abeliuk, Andres (University of Southern California); Morstatter, Fred (University of Southern California); Galstyan, Aram (University of Southern California)

We present a model that estimates the trust humans assign to machine models in a hybrid forecasting system. The analytic capabilities of the machine models should improve mercurial forecaster reasoning. However, documented biases detail how humans often mistrust such models in their forecasts. We compare forecasts made in the absence and presence of machine models to quantify the weights placed on the models. Our results show that the strengths of machine models and crowdsourced predictions can be simultaneously leveraged to improve accuracy, but distrust and confirmation bias impede performance. Improving hybrid systems requires cultivating trust for machine models.

Weighting expert opinions in decisions from description vs. experience

Bogard, Jonathan (University of California, Los Angeles); Fox, Craig (University of California, Los Angeles)

One way to frame the putative Description-Experience gap is that sensitivity to probability differences is greater in decisions from experience than description. In 5 studies (domains: medical, public policy, incentivized consumer choices), we examine decisions (e.g., allocating funds to abate climate change) based on varying proportions of expert opinions (e.g., whether a city could be submerged). We find that people's decisions are more sensitive to differences in relative frequencies of expert opinion when they are presented in an experiential way rather than being explicitly given. This suggests a novel method for promoting more rational probability weighting.

FRIDAY DECEMBER 11, 2020

Session #5 Track A: Friday 9:30 am - 10:30 am

A Behavioral Option Value Model for Consumer Product Set Choice

Gorji, Paniz (Erasmus University Rotterdam); Dellaert, Benedict (Erasmus University Rotterdam); Donkers, Bas (Erasmus University Rotterdam)

We propose a behavioral model of consumers' option value for sets from which they will consume a product in the future. For example, consumers may choose between health insurance networks from which they can select a provider for treatment later. Results from three experiments support our model and hypotheses.

Cognitive Flexibility or Moral Commitment? Evidence of Anticipated Belief Distortion

Saccardo, Silvia (Carnegie Mellon University); Serra-Garcia, Marta (UCSD)

Do people anticipate the conditions that enable them to manipulate their beliefs when confronted with unpleasant information? We study whether individuals seek out the "cognitive flexibility" needed to distort beliefs or rather attempt to constrain it, committing to unbiased judgment. Experiments with 6500 advisors, including financial and legal professionals, show that preferences are heterogeneous: over 40% of advisors prefer flexibility even if costly. Actively seeking flexibility does not preclude belief distortion. Individuals anticipate the effects of cognitive flexibility, suggesting some sophistication about the cognitive constraints to belief distortion.

Anticipation and Consumption

Thakral, Neil (Brown University); To, Linh (Boston University)

We present a model in which consumers form intertemporal plans and experience utility from anticipating future consumption. We show that more time to anticipate leads to more patient decisions. Using Nielsen Consumer Panel data to examine responses to the 2008 Economic Stimulus Payments, we find higher marginal propensities to spend for households that receive payments sooner after they are announced. Using data from randomized experiments in Kenya and Malawi which induced variation in the timing of lump-sum unconditional cash transfers, we find higher savings among households that wait longer to receive payment.

Session #5 Track B: Friday 9:30 am - 10:30 am

I'm a Woman: The Role of Identity Statements in Improving Outcomes for Women and Racial Minorities

Kirgios, Erika (University of Pennsylvania); Rai, Aneesh (University of Pennsylvania); Chang, Edward (Harvard University); Katherine Milkman (University of Pennsylvania)

What strategies can women and racial minorities use to increase their chances of receiving support from key career stakeholders? Prior work and conventional wisdom suggest that they should obscure or de-emphasize their minority status to reduce their likelihood of experiencing discrimination. However, we share the results of a pre-registered audit study (N=2,477) showing that underrepresented candidates are more likely to receive career advice from majority group members when they explicitly highlight their identity than when they do not. Our results suggest that women and racial minorities should highlight rather than hide their demographic identities in requests for professional support.

When a star shines too bright: High-status minority members decrease diversity in future hiring decisions

Lin, Jun (New York University); Hur, Julia (New York University)

People often consider the "star" minority members as evidence for progress on racial diversity. However, we suggest that the presence of higher-status minority member decreases the likelihood of hiring more minority members and that this effect is specific to high-status (vs. low-status) minority members. We analyzed hiring decisions of Major League Baseball teams from 1988 to 2019 and found that teams with higher-status minority players hired significantly fewer minority players in the next draft than teams with lower-status minority players. The results suggest that we often talk about diversity in numbers, but numbers might not give us a full picture.

Group Size and Its Impact on Diversity-Related Perceptions and Hiring Decisions

Rai, Aneesh (University of Pennsylvania); Chang, Edward (Harvard University); Kirgios, Erika (University of Pennsylvania); Katherine Milkman (University of Pennsylvania)

Why do some groups face backlash for lacking diversity, while others escape censure? We suggest that a group's size may help explain this puzzle. Across three pre-registered lab experiments (N=2,510) and an archival analysis of S&P 1500 corporate board data, we demonstrate that as a homogeneous group's size increases, decision-makers are more likely to add members who increase the group's demographic diversity. This is mediated by perceptions of the homogeneous group's diversity levels, fairness in the hiring process, and impression management concerns. Our findings highlight the importance that group size and Bayesian reasoning play in shaping diversity-related perceptions and decisions.

Session #5 Track C: Friday 9:30 am - 10:30 am

Evaluating Categories from Experience: The Simple Averaging Heuristic

Woiczuk, Thomas (Universitat de les Illes Balears); Le Mens, Gael (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

People form attitudes toward categories such as social groups based on their experiences. Prior research suggests that such evaluations depend on some experience average but is unclear about the specific kind of average. Are attitudes driven by the "Àsimple average" of experiences with the category or by the "Àmember average" (average of attitudes toward category members)? In 8 studies (N=1576), participants' attitudes were consistently best explained by the "Àsimple average." This tendency results from a cognitive bias: In settings where relying on simple averaging was incorrect, most participants nevertheless did so despite having the cognitive capacity to produce correct judgments.

The Perception of Dramatic Risks: Biased Media, Biased Minds?

Pachur, Thorsten (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)

In their classical study, Lichtenstein, Slovic, Fischhoff, Layman, and Combs (1978) concluded that people tend to overestimate the frequency of dramatic causes of death (e.g., homicide, tornado) and to underestimate those of nondramatic ones (e.g., diabetes, heart disease). I examine the robustness and replicability of these conclusions, by submitting Lichtenstein et al.'s original data as well as two more recent data sets to statistical analyses. All three studies indicated an overrepresentation of dramatic risks in media coverage. An overestimation of dramatic risk in people's judgments, by contrast, emerged only for Lichtenstein et al., but not for the other two data sets.

A multi-component process-tracing study of the attraction effect

Poon, Neo (Warwick University); Isoni, Andrea (Warwick University); Mullett, Tim (Warwick University); Luckman, Ashley (Warwick University)

This study aims to investigate high-level cognitive processes behind the attraction effect (Huber, 1983), including reasoning, attention, information search, and memory. Two process-tracing techniques were in this study, namely mouse tracking and reason listing. Results showed that the structure of reasons generated by participants can be used to model multi-alternative choices, specifically the order and quantity of the reasons supporting the chosen option are significant predictors, and supported the model Query Theory. A series of exploratory analysis was performed on the weights of reasons, as well as mouse-tracing data, and results was used to inform further model development.

Session #6 Track A: Friday 10:45 am - 11:45 am

It Might Become True: How Prefactual Thinking Licenses Dishonesty, Especially When People Want to Excuse It

Helgason, Beth Anne (London Business School); Effron, Daniel (London Business School)

Five studies (N = 2,907) show that people think falsehoods are less unethical to tell in the present when they imagine how the falsehood could become true in the future. Our findings suggest that when people imagine how a falsehood could become true, they perceive the falsehood's general message, or "gist", as truer, which is associated with reduced moral condemnation. Moreover, we find that prefactuals had a stronger effect in reducing condemnation of falsehoods that participants were motivated to excuse. We discuss implications for flexible moral judgment, partisan division, and the spread of misinformation.

Moral Choice When Harming is Unavoidable

Berman, Jonathan (London Business School); Kupor, Daniella (Boston University)

Past research finds that actors prefer to minimize social harm rather than maximize social benefits. However, prior research has confounded a desire to minimize harmful actions with a desire to avoid causing any harm whatsoever. We find that while individuals are reluctant to tradeoff no harm for some harm to achieve benefits, they are much more willing to tradeoff some harm for more harm in return for the same, or even fewer, marginal benefits. Thus, tradeoffs that people refuse to accept when it is possible to avoid causing harm can suddenly become desirable when some harm must be committed.

A Reexamination of the Impact of Decision Conflict on Choice Deferral

Evangelidis, Ioannis (Universitat Ramon Llull); Levav, Jonathan (Stanford University); Simonson, Itamar (Stanford University)

Tversky and Shafir (1992) argued that the tendency to defer a decision can increase when the offered set is enlarged because of decision conflict. They showed that decision-makers defer choice more when faced with two options presenting a trade-off compared to when they are offered a single option. Despite its intuitive appeal, we argue that the association between decision conflict and deferral has been overstated. We reexamine published data and report the results of 35 well-powered replications of the effect (total n = 21,686), raising doubts about the generality of the impact of conflict on choice and deferral.

Session #6 Track B: Friday 10:45 am - 11:45 am

Should Advisors Provide Confidence Intervals Around Their Estimates?

Gaertig, Celia (University of Chicago); Simmons, Joseph (University of Pennsylvania)

Are people more likely to follow advice that communicates uncertainty in the form of a confidence interval? In ten studies (N = 14,461), participants predicted the outcomes of upcoming sporting events or the future number of deaths due to Covid-19 in the U.S. We provided participants with an advisor's (or model's) best guess, and we manipulated whether or not the best guess was accompanied by a confidence interval. Participants were either directionally or significantly more likely to follow the advice when it was accompanied by a confidence interval. These results suggest that advisors may be more persuasive if they provide confidence intervals around their estimates.

Waste Not, Wait a Lot: The mental accounting of sunk costs leads to delayed consumption

MacDonald, Tyler (Boston University); Walker, Jesse (Ohio State University); Silverstein, Michael (University of Oregon)

Previous research has demonstrated that higher sunk costs elicit greater immediate consumption from individuals. We identify common, everyday situations in which this traditional finding is reversed. When individuals do not have to consume a product immediately, we observe no effect of sunk costs on immediate consumption. Instead, we find that when individuals have the option, they prefer to delay consumption and consume more in the future as sunk costs increase. Further, both immediate and delayed consumption, are driven by a desire to avoid feeling wasteful and arise from divergent mental accounting strategies to reduce feelings of waste.

Calibrating Algorithms to People's Ideal Preferences

Khambatta, Poruz (University of California, Los Angeles); Mariadassou, Shwetha (Stanford University); Wheeler (S. Christian (Stanford University); Morris, Joshua I.

People often struggle between what they actually want and what they ideally want. Thus, recommendation algorithms must decide how to weight these competing desires. While current algorithms appear to be prioritizing actual over ideal preferences, this may have harmful effects. Could the alternative prove superior? To examine this, we built algorithmic recommendation systems that catered to people's actual or ideal preferences ($n = 898$) and used these to conduct a high-powered, pre-registered experiment ($n = 6,488$). Results suggest that programming algorithms to nudge people toward their highest ideals rather than their basest desires would make both individuals and companies better off.

Session #6 Track C: Friday 10:45 am - 11:45 am

Representative Design in Psychological Assessment: A Case Study Using the Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART)

Steiner, Marcus (University of Basel); Frey, Renato (University of Basel)

We investigate the role of representative design in achieving valid and reliable psychological assessments by focusing on the Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART). We demonstrate that the task's original implementation violates the principle of representative design, and show in two studies ($N = 772$ and $N = 632$) that participants acquired more accurate beliefs in an adapted, more representative BART. Yet, improving representativeness was insufficient to enhance the task's psychometric properties. Thus, valid task designs may require novel ecological assessments, to identify those real-life behaviors and associated psychological processes that lab tasks are supposed to capture and generalize to.

Assembled Preferences: Using task effects to measure latent traits

Krefeld-Schwalb, Antonia (Columbia University); Johnson, Eric (Columbia University)

Eliciting preferences with behavioral tasks, long assumed the gold-standard of preference measurement, has faced multiple challenges recently. The present project provides a conceptual model to overcome the problems by partitioning the responses that we observe in a true and stable latent trait, and effects of the response task and trials, along with the usual random error. The model is operationalized with a new adaptive paradigm that combines choice with judgment trials. A validation study shows that our estimates for intertemporal preferences predict 20% variance of respondents' credit scores and accurately predict 70% of respondents' choices between two delayed true bonus payments.

Do Nudges Reduce Disparities? Choice Architecture Compensates for Low Knowledge and SES

Mrkva, Kellen (Columbia University); Posner, Nathaniel (Columbia University); Reeck, Crystal (Temple University); Johnson, Eric (Columbia University);

Across five pre-registered experiments and surveys of real retirement decisions, we demonstrate that nudges reduce disparities across people. Individuals lower in SES, domain knowledge, and numeracy were impacted more by several types of nudges. As a result, "good nudges" that were designed to facilitate selection of welfare-enhancing options reduced disparities by helping low-SES, low-knowledge, and low-numeracy people most. Nudges that made it easier to choose welfare-reducing options exacerbated disparities, because low-SES individuals were more likely to choose inferior nudged options. Our results suggest that nudges can be useful for those who wish to reduce disparities across people.

Session #7 Track A: Friday 1:15 pm - 2:15 pm

Returnable Reciprocity: Returnable Gifts Promote Virtuous Behaviors

Zlatev, Julian (Harvard University); Rogers, Todd (Harvard University)

We leverage a novel version of the norm of reciprocity, 'returnable reciprocity', to promote compliance with virtuous requests. Across four studies (N=3,791), we find that giving people the opportunity to return a gift counterintuitively leads to greater compliance than both traditional reciprocity and no reciprocity requests. We demonstrate this may be due to increased feelings of guilt for non-compliance. Finally, while the economic cost of returnable reciprocity is negligible, we find that it can create additional psychological that affect the social welfare implications of this tactic.

Signaling benefits of partner choice decisions

Dhaliwal, Nathan (University of British Columbia); Martin, Justin (Boston College); Young, Liane (Boston College)

When choosing a partner for a cooperative interaction people often make the seemingly irrational decision of valuing willingness over ability, even when doing so results in immediate losses. Why would people choose willing partners when the expected economic payoff of choosing able partners is greater? We posit and find evidence that such decisions provide signaling benefits. Our results show that people who choose willing over able partners gain reputational benefits and are chosen more often as cooperation partners. We also find that this signal is honest: those who choose willing partners are more generous in an economic game and score lower on a measure of trait Machiavellianism.

Once and again: Repeated viewing affects judgments of spontaneity and preparation

Donnelly, Kristin (University of California, Berkeley); Ryan, William (University of California, Berkeley); Nelson, Leif (University of California, Berkeley)

Do people evaluate the content of a video differently the second or third time around? Despite the prevalence of video re-watching, the topic has received only modest empirical attention. Across seven preregistered studies we document a novel effect: Repeated viewing makes the actions of actors in videos appear to be more prepared. We find this effect holds across domains ranging from reality TV contestant auditions, apologies from CEOs, dance videos and more.

Session #7 Track B: Friday 1:15 pm - 2:15 pm

Assistance Resistance: Psychological Ownership of Money as an Intervention

De La Rosa, Wendy (Stanford University); Tully, Stephanie (Stanford University); Sharma, Eesha (Dartmouth College); Gianella, Eric (Code for America); Rino, Gwen (Code for America)

Few problems in the world pose as many challenges as income inequality, with millions living in poverty. Government benefits serve as cash transfers aimed at reducing poverty. The EITC is the largest anti-poverty program in America; however, many eligible consumers fail to claim these benefits. We propose that increasing the extent to which benefits seem like one's own money reduces how much consumers feel they are asking for assistance. Three large-scale field experiments (N=38,738) show that leveraging psychological ownership of money is a simple and effective marketing tool that stimulates interest in claiming benefits over and above currently popular approaches.

The Motivating Power of Streaks: Increasing Productivity Is as Easy as 1, 2, 3

Mehr, Katie (University of Pennsylvania); Silverman, Jackie (University of Delaware); Sharif, Marissa (University of Pennsylvania); Barasch, Alixandra (New York University); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania)

Companies often reward people for completing a streak, or three consecutive valued activities, to increase customer engagement and productivity. But does this practice actually boost productivity? Five incentive-compatible, pre-registered experiments show that it does: rewards that encourage streaks of behavior increase people's productivity over and above larger, consistent rewards by making otherwise dull tasks feel more game-like. This effect is robust across different means of rewarding streaks, payment amounts, and types of tasks. Further, this effect is specific to streak rewards encouraging the completion of consecutive activities, rather than other features of a streak reward.

Intuitive Substitutes: Consumers Mistakenly Think Complimentary Preferences Are Substitutes

Baum, Stephen (University of California, Berkeley); Nelson, Leif (University of California, Berkeley)

In 7 studies (combined $N > 11,000$), we demonstrate that consumers mistakenly believe that various preferences are mutually exclusive. For example, consumers infer that if someone likes Coca-Cola, they must dislike Pepsi. However, the true correlation between the two preferences is observable, strong, and positive. Moreover, consumers appear to neglect how a specific preference (e.g., a taste for Coca-Cola) implies a generalized preference (e.g., a taste for various sugary sodas). Consumers lean on incorrect lay theories about how preferences are related (e.g., "Coke people are not Pepsi people") when assessing others' likes.

Session #7 Track C: Friday 1:15 pm - 2:15 pm

The Hot Kitchen Effect: Categories, Generalization, and Exploration

Woiczuk, Thomas (Universitat de les Illes Balears); Sump, Franziska (University of Southern Denmark); Le Mens, Gael (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

In this study, we develop theoretical predictions about how the number and alignment of categories affect the exploration of uncertain alternatives based on a computational model. We test these predictions experimentally ($N=400$) by manipulating the categorization of uncertain alternatives. In line with our predictions, we find less exploration of uncertain alternatives when those belong to fewer categories. Moreover, we find that participants select superior alternatives more often when categories are aligned with the true quality of the alternatives. The core of our mechanism is that more distinct categories reduce the generalization of negative experiences to other alternatives.

People Take More Risk When Their Decisions Generate Prediction Errors in Addition to Monetary Outcomes

Dietvorst, Berkeley (University of Chicago); Fei, Lin (University of Chicago)

We find that people make riskier choices when the decisions that they face have a prediction component (e.g. which team will win the sports game?) in addition to monetary consequences (e.g. a 50% chance of \$25). We replicate these results across multiple sets of stimuli and experimental designs. These results help to explain people's inconsistent risk preferences across contexts (e.g. insurance vs. gambling) and suggest manipulations that may alter people's tolerance for risk (e.g. highlighting or hiding the prediction component of a decision under risk).

Using wisdom-of-crowds methods to forecast the 2018 and 2020 US elections

Olsson, Henrik (Santa Fe Institute)

Most election polls ask participants who they will vote for. Election prediction accuracy can be improved by asking people whom they expect will win, or whom their friends or social circles, will vote for. We compare the accuracy of these single-item forecasts with Bayesian Truth Serum (BTS, Prelec, 2004) weighted forecasts and a full information forecast based on a Bayesian bootstrap. Of the single-item forecasts, social-circle questions are the most accurate for the 2018 US election. BTS weighting of social-circle questions can improve forecasting accuracy and the full information forecast tends to outperform all other forecasts. We will also present 2020 US election forecast results.

Session #8 Track A: Saturday 9:30 am - 10:30 am

Decision Diagnosticity: Rejecting Induces a Larger Post-Decision Evaluation Gap Than Choosing

Yang, Adelle (National University of Singapore); Teow, Jasper (National University of Singapore)

Prior theories suggest that choice induce preference changes, we find that rejection induces more preference changes than choice. Six studies ($N = 3,882$) demonstrate that choose-versus-reject framing affects post-decision preference changes, with a larger evaluation gap between wanted and unwanted options observed from the reject frame than the choose frame. This effect is mediated by a greater perceived diagnosticity of the reject action than the choose action. This effect is attenuated when the consideration set comprised of highly similar options and when participants perceived a high level of decision difficulty. Finally, the effect is reversed when all options are undesirable.

Six Contradicting Deviations from Rational Choice, and the Impact of Experience

Erev, Ido (Technion); Ert, Eyal (Hebrew Univ.); Plonsky, Ori (Technion); Roth, Yefim (Univ. of Haifa)

To help predict choice behavior, JDM research tries to identify robust deviations from rational choice. Our analysis questions the value of this convention and proposes an alternative. First, we demonstrate that 6 of the best-known deviations from rationality are not robust; they can be reversed by small changes in the incentive structure. For example, behavior consistent with loss aversion becomes behavior consistent with overconfidence (the opposite bias) when changing the correlation between the outcomes. Then, we demonstrate that a simple model, assuming reliance on small samples of past experiences, captures all 12 contradicting deviations and provides useful ex-ante predictions.

Opportunity Neglect: Rejecting Strictly Non-Negative Low-Chance Prospects that Feel Like "Nothing to Gain"

Prinsloo, Emily (Harvard University); Barasz, Kate (Ramon Llull University); John, Leslie (Harvard University); Norton, Mike (Harvard University)

We suggest that people exhibit opportunity neglect, failing to engage in behavior with low odds of success but high payoffs. Participants considered consequential gambles that yielded a payoff of zero or a positive dollar amount with some very low probability: "There is a 1% chance that you will win \$99, and a 99% chance that you will win nothing." Across 9 studies, participants frequently rejected gambles with low odds of winning - even when their alternative was \$0 and when they acknowledged that they could not lose money - due to a subjective feeling that they had "nothing to gain."

Session #8 Track B: Saturday 9:30 am - 10:30 am

Relational Concerns and the Economic Value of Negotiated Agreements

Hart, Einav (George Mason University); Schweitzer, Maurice (University of Pennsylvania)

We introduce the "Economic Relevance of Relational Outcomes" (ERRO), a dimension of negotiation contexts reflecting the extent to which relational outcomes impact post-negotiation economic outcomes. We challenge the implicit assumption that the negotiated deal terms represent the economic value of the negotiation. In seven experimental studies (N=2,756), we show that negotiators in high ERRO contexts (e.g., service exchanges) privilege relational concerns over deal terms, compared to negotiators in low ERRO contexts (e.g., product purchases). We show the impact of ERRO on negotiators' strategies, and post-negotiation outcomes.

Escalation of commitment to a failing course of action signals trustworthiness

Dorison, Charles (Northwestern University); Umphres, Christopher (Harvard University); Lerner, Jennifer (Harvard University)

We test whether escalating commitment in the face of negative prospects allows decision makers to signal that they are trustworthy. In two pre-registered experiments using trust games with real financial stakes (N=2,198 U.S. adults), decision makers who escalated commitment to a failing course of action (1) were entrusted with 29% more money by third-party observers and (2) returned 15% more money than decision makers who de-escalated. Thus, accounting for the reputational causes and consequences of decisions to escalate yields a more complete understanding of why escalation is so pervasive and highlights a mechanism for reducing its pervasiveness.

The Agent-Selection Dilemma in Distributive Bargaining

Hagmann, David (Harvard University); Feiler, Daniel (Dartmouth College)

Principals often bargain through agents, and past work suggests that such bargaining too often ends in costly impasse. We present experimental evidence that the agent-selection process which precedes bargaining may be a significant driver of such impasse. We find that principals select overly aggressive agents, such that the agents sent to the bargaining table are more polarized in their beliefs than are potential agents in general. Both parties do worse when selecting agents than if selection were random and both could improve their outcomes if they selected a less aggressive agent, even if they did so unilaterally.

Session #8 Track C: Saturday 9:30 am - 10:30 am

(Ir)relevant or Not? The Intuitive Understanding of Irrelevant Information in Selection Decisions

Rabinovitch, Hagai (Ben-Gurion University); Bereby-Meyer, Yoela (Ben-Gurion University); Budescu, David V. (Fordham University)

Choosing candidates for positions can be tricky, especially when irrelevant attributes (e.g., height) affect the process. Participants selected one of two candidates for a position according to a score on a selection test that was affected by an irrelevant attribute. There was a substantial preference for the candidate high on the irrelevant attribute, in fact rewarding instead of "punishing" for the biased advantage. Encouraging participants to think analytically reduced this erroneous preference. The counter-intuitive nature of the correction process makes it difficult to overcome this bias. Understanding what can be done to reduce this bias can help underprivileged groups.

When two wrongs make a right: The efficiency-consumption gap under separate vs. joint evaluations

Gamliel, Eyal (Ruppin Academic Center); Pe'er, Eyal (Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

The MPG illusion and the time-saving bias show that people provide biased estimation of gains from increases in efficiency or speed. In parallel, people have been found to show a diminished sensitivity to increases in magnitudes when judged under separate vs. joint evaluation modes (SE vs. JE). In two studies, we empirically show that these "two wrongs can make a right" when people judge efficiency upgrades under SE mode, their subjective judgments follow a concave curve that resembles the curvilinear pattern of efficiency upgrades, making their preferences less biased than they are under JE.

Prediction by Replication: People Prefer Forecasting Methods Similar to the Event Being Predicted

Fei, Lin (University of Chicago); Dietvorst, Berkeley (University of Chicago)

People often need to choose between prediction methods (e.g. recommendation systems, market forecast models). However, they don't always prefer the best performing method. How do people choose between methods that operate in different ways? We find that people prefer forecasting methods that replicate the prediction task, even when such method is not the best performing on average. In other words, people prefer prediction methods that are more similar (e.g. in its outcome distribution, process, etc.) to the event being predicted. Based on the findings, we propose an intervention that is both attractive to people who seek similarity and accurate.

Session #9 Track A: Saturday 10:45 am - 11:45 am

First is the Worst: Forecasters Get Less Credit for Predictions Made Far in Advance

Mislavsky, Robert (Johns Hopkins University); Gaertig, Celia (University of Chicago)

When should forecasters make predictions? Many people believe that they will get more credit if they are the first to make a prediction and feel compelled to make predictions far in advance of an event. However, in 3 studies, we find that this is not the case. Forecasters are given less credit (e.g., are rated as less competent) when they make correct predictions far in advance. That is, a forecaster that makes a correct prediction 1 year in advance is judged to be less competent than one that is correct 1 month in advance. However, this does not hold for incorrect predictions, where predictions made farther in advance are judged less harshly than those made close to an event.

Scaling up fact-checking using the wisdom of crowds

Allen, Jennifer (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Arechar, Antonio A (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Pennycook, Gordon (University of Regina); Rand, David G. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

Professional fact-checking has received considerable attention for its role in combating the spread of misinformation on social media. However, fact-checking typically falls far short of realizing its potential, due to problems with both scalability and trust. Here we explore a potential solution to both of these problems: applying the "wisdom of crowds" to make fact-checking possible at scale. We experimentally compare the ratings given to a set of 207 news articles by professional fact-checkers and 1,246 U.S.

residents. We find that a politically balanced crowd of 10 laypeople given only the headline and lead can match the performance of fact-checkers researching the whole article.

How (Corrected) Errors Humanize an Online Communicator

Zhao, Xuan (University of Chicago); Bluvstein, Shirley (New York University); Barasch, Alixandra (New York University); Schroeder, Juliana (University of California Berkeley)

Text-based communication has become a primary means of disseminating information online. Because written communication lacks human nonverbal cues, people sometimes struggle to distinguish whether they are interacting with a human or a chatbot. Across three experiments using either human or bot confederates on various conversation platforms ($N = 1,117$), we found consistent evidence that an ambiguous communicator who made and corrected typographical errors ("typos") was perceived to be more humanlike and warmer, yet no less competent, than one who did not make or did not correct their typos. As a consequence, respondents were more likely to disclose personal information to the communicator.

Session #9 Track B: Saturday 10:45 am - 11:45 am

The Illusion of Moral Decline

Mastroianni, Adam (Harvard University); Gilbert, Daniel (Harvard University)

Five empirical studies and two meta-analyses suggest that a) people believe that morality has declined and b) this perception is likely an illusion. Surveys spanning 90 years and 44 countries show that large majorities perceive moral decline across time and cultures. Further studies show that people think decline has been happening at least since they were born, and that people today are worse even than people a few years ago. However, people think that people they know have actually improved. Finally, another meta-analysis of 127 results suggests this perception is an illusion, as indicators of morality essentially have not changed over time.

The Moral Repetition Effect: Bad Deeds -- But Not Good Deeds -- Seem More Ethical When Repeatedly Encountered

Effron, Daniel A. (London Business School)

When reports about a moral transgression go viral, the same person may read about the transgression repeatedly. Four pre-registered experiments show that people will condemn a transgression less severely when they have read the same description of it multiple times. By contrast, repeatedly reading descriptions of a good deed does not appear to affect moral judgments. The results support mechanisms based on habituation and fluency, and offer a new perspective on how feelings influence moral judgment. The more people that hear about a transgression, the wider moral outrage will spread; but the more times an individual hears about it, the less outraged that person may be.

The Impacts of Algorithmic Work Assignment on Fairness Perceptions and Productivity: Evidence from Field Experiments

Bai, Bing (Washington University in St. Louis); Dai, Hengchen (University of California, Los Angeles); Zhang, Dennis (Washington University in St. Louis); Zhang, Fuqiang (Washington University in St. Louis); Hu, Haoyuan

The growing concern that algorithms may reproduce or even magnify the inequality historically exhibited by humans calls for research on how people perceive the fairness of algorithmic decisions relative to alternative decision-making methods. We study how algorithmic (vs. human-based) task assignment processes change task recipients' fairness perceptions and work productivity. In two field experiments with Alibaba where workers who picked products received tasks either from an algorithm or a human, we find that the algorithmic assignment process is perceived as fairer and results in productivity benefits, despite that the two processes used the same underlying rule to allocate tasks.

On the potential of promoting healthy behavior with small repeated commitment betting

Erev, Ido (Technion); Hiller, Maximilian (Universitaet Vechta); Kloessner, Stefan (Universitaet des Saarla); Lifshitz, Gal (Technion); Mertins, Vanessa (Universitaet Vechta); Roth, Yefim (University of Haifa)

Previous interventions to promote healthy behavior using monetary incentives led to mixed results. The current research investigates repeated small value commitment betting. Two different studies (breathing exercise and walking) reveal that allowing participants to bet against themselves were both much more effective and cheaper than incentivizing desired behavior or providing a fixed pay.

Predicting Health Judgment

Aka, Ada (University of Pennsylvania); Bhatia, Sudeep (University of Pennsylvania)

Predicting how people perceive medical conditions is necessary for many health and marketing applications. We present a machine learning approach that uses online text explanations of medical conditions and health outcomes to model people's perceptions of these conditions and outcomes. We apply this approach to over 700 distinct medical conditions discussed on UK's National Health Service website, and find that our trained algorithm is able to closely mimic how human subjects evaluate these conditions. We also use our algorithm to analyze how language on the NHS website influences health perceptions, shedding light on the psychological underpinnings of lay medical judgment.

When Wanting Closure Reduces Patients' Patience

Roberts, Annabelle (University of Chicago); Fishbach, Ayelet (University of Chicago)

What makes patients impatient? Across six preregistered studies (N=1,908), we find that people make impatient health decisions and experience impatience when waiting for healthcare partially because they are eager to achieve goal closure. We first find an increased preference for a worse health device (Study 1) and procedure (Study 2) when they allow for earlier goal closure. We then document a negative relationship between experiencing impatience and healthy habits (Study 3). Finally, we find the experience of impatience increases when closer to the end of a medical goal (Studies 4-6). We discuss implications of the desire for goal closure on the pursuit of health habits and health care.

SJDM Poster Session #1
Thursday December 10th
8:00am – 9:15am

- 1) [COVID-19 Lockdown Policy and Hue Preferences](#)
Han, Wenjie (University of Zurich)
- 2) [Shared Emotions Foster Tacit Coordination](#)
Jonaityte, Inga (Ca' Foscari University of Venice); Warglien, Massimo (Ca' Foscari University of Venice)
- 3) [What Is Happening Outside of COVID-19: Spillover Effects of Emotions During a Pandemic on Risk Decisions Across Domains](#)
Wen, Yingting (ESSEC); Onculer, Ayse (ESSEC)
- 4) [Disturbed by disagreement: People are more disturbed by others' false beliefs than by different beliefs](#)
Molnar, Andras (Carnegie Mellon University); Loewenstein, George (Carnegie Mellon University)
- 6) [Giving more when you're feeling good? An investigation of affect and prosocial behavior.](#)
Rahal, Rima-Maria (Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods; Tilburg University); Sezer, Bengisu (Tilburg University); van Beest, Ilja (Tilburg University)
- 8) [Moral deception? Comparing judgments of prosocial and selfish lies](#)
Guzikevits, Mika (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Choshen-Hillel, Shoham (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
- 9) [Presenting charitable options in joint \(vs separate\) evaluation increases charitable behaviors](#)
Tan, Li Shi (University College London); Tsay, Chia-Jung (University College London); Paharia, Neeru (Georgetown University)
- 10) [Different Justification Mechanisms for Different Moral Threats](#)
Barkan, Rachel (Ben-Gurion University); Vered, Hadar (Ben-Gurion University); Azulai, Nogah (Ben-Gurion University)
- 11) [Morality as a Market Friction](#)
Zallot, Camilla (Erasmus University); Paolacci, Gabriele (Erasmus University Rotterdam)
- 12) [Discouraging self-selection to cheating-enabling environments](#)
Vranka, Marek (University of Economics, Prague); Houdek, Petr (University of Economics, Prague); Bahník, Štěpán (University of Economics, Prague); Hudík, Marek (University of Economics, Prague)
- 13) [Self-Selection and Dishonest Behavior: A Field Experiment on Hours Worked Reporting](#)
Frollová, Nikola (University of Economics, Prague); Houdek, Petr (University of Economics, Prague); Bahník, Štěpán (University of Economics, Prague); Sýkorová, Markéta (University of Economics, Prague); Vranka, Marek (University of Economics, Prague)
- 14) [The association of moral competence and moral orientations with emotion regulation difficulties](#)
Faiciuc, Lucia (Romanian Academy, Cluj-Napoca Branch)
- 15) [The Presence of Automation Enhances Deontological Considerations in Moral Judgments](#)
Schurr, Amos (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Moran, Simone (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)

- 16) [The Moral Devaluation of Art](#)
Chituc, Vladimir (Yale University); Bloom, Paul (Yale University); Crockett, Molly (Yale University)
- 17) [Thank me! Seeking gratitude leads to interpersonal avoidance](#)
Li, Shike (IE University); Jain, Kriti (IE University); Radivojevic, Ivana (IE University)
- 18) [Consuming Objectification and Accepting Inequality](#)
Palumbo, Helena (Universitat Pompeu Fabra); Cornelissen, Gert (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)
- 19) [Proud to be guilty](#)
Shuster, Shaked (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Moran, Simone (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Eyal, Tal (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Ayal, Shahar (The Interdisciplinary Center (IDC) Herzliya)
- 20) [Experimental test of the effects of punishment probability and size on the decision to take a bribe](#)
Bahník, Štěpán (University of Economics, Prague); Vranka, Marek (University of Economics, Prague)
- 21) ["Lie to me!": The Problem with \(and a Solution to\) the Dominant Behavioral Ethics Paradigms](#)
Skowronek, Samuel (University of Pennsylvania); Schweitzer, Maurice (University of Pennsylvania)
- 22) [Coronavirus Ethics: Judgments of Market Ethics in a Pandemic](#)
Simonyan, Yvetta (University of Bath); Smith, Craig (INSEAD)
- 24) [Dynamics of Pro-Social Behavior in Adults and Children: The consequences of giving in to vs resisting a selfish black lie](#)
Mazar, Nina (Boston University); Montinari, Natalia (University of Bologna); Piovesan, Marco (University of Copenhagen)
- 25) [Moral overconfidence: Immoral actors' meta-perceptions are moderately inaccurate and overly positive](#)
Lees, Jeffrey (Clemson University); Young, Liane (Boston University); Waytz, Adam (Northwestern University)
- 26) [The role of organizational affiliation for punishment intention of non-work related transgressions: A study on the stereotype rub-off effect](#)
Stiegert, Peer (University of Groningen); Tauber, Susanne (University of Groningen); Leliveld, Marijke (University of Groningen); Oehmichen, Jana (University of Groningen)
- 27) [Tapping in: the Effect of Contactless Payment Methods on Spending, Debt and Cash Usage](#)
van den Akker, Merle (University of Warwick); Stewart, Neil (University of Warwick); Isoni, Andrea (University of Warwick)
- 28) [How do physician wait time and AI accuracy impact algorithm aversion?](#)
Brooks, Tara M. (University of South Florida); Beckstead, Jason W. (University of South Florida); Pezzo, Mark V. (University of South Florida)
- 29) ["HOPE" Shirts and "MAGA" Hats: When Small Donors Choose to Display their Political Preferences](#)
Schneider, Gustavo (University of South Carolina); Savary, Jennifer (University of Arizona); Pocheptsova Ghosh, Anastasiya (University of Arizona); Matherly, Ted (Tulane University)
- 30) [Investigating the Effect of Nicknaming on Perceived Control Over Autonomous Products](#)
Zimmermann, Jenny Lena (University of St.Gallen); de Bellis, Emanuel (University of Lausanne); Hofstetter, Reto (University of Lucerne)

- 31) [Lay Theories of Marketing Manipulation](#)
Khon, Zarema (University of Bath); Johnson, Samuel (University of Bath); Hang, Haiming (University of Bath)
- 32) [The Effects of Visual Features on Consumer's Click Behavior: A DDM Analysis on Field Data of Short Videos](#)
Song, Danyang (Zhejiang University); Wang, Shichao (Zhejiang University); Chen, Xi (Zhejiang University); Chen, Fadong (Zhejiang University)
- 33) [The effects of time pressure on managerial decision making](#)
Summers, Barbara (University of Leeds); Maule, A John (University of Leeds)
- 34) [Magnitude-Dependent Loss Aversion](#)
Mukherjee, Sumitava (Indian Institute of Technology Delhi); Srinivasan, Narayanan (Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur)
- 35) [Effort Makes Consumers Spend More Money: The Effort Paradox and Price Discounts](#)
Gaerth, Maximilian (University of Mannheim); Kost, Bettina (University of Mannheim); Kraus, Florian (University of Mannheim)
- 36) [The Impact of High Dispersion Across Reviewers' Online Ratings on Persuasion](#)
Gaerth, Maximilian (University of Mannheim); Paharia, Neeru (Georgetown University); Kraus, Florian (University of Mannheim)
- 38) [The Scale Effect: How Rating Scales Affect Product Evaluation](#)
Hosseini, Rahil (Pompeu Fabra University); Le Mens, Gael (Pompeu Fabra University)
- 39) ["Who" You Rent from Matters: The Differential Effects in Perceived Ownership When Renting](#)
Mishra, Nirajana (Boston University); Whitley, Sarah (University of Georgia)
- 40) [When Searching Pays Off: Options Discovered Later are Valued More](#)
Hur, Elina (Cornell University); Woolley, Kaitlin (Cornell University); Tu, Yanping (University of Florida)
- 41) [Age and Hunger Interact in Reward Valuation](#)
Edelson, Sarah (Cornell University); Reyna, Valerie (Cornell University); Erez, Yuval (Lehigh University); Weldon, Rebecca (SUNY Polytechnic Institute); Rohatgi, Varun (Cornell University)
- 42) [A Concrete Example of Construct Construction in Natural Language](#)
Yeomans, Michael (Imperial College London)
- 43) [Engaging versus Plausible: Headline Features That Predict News Sharing Decisions on Social Media](#)
Chen, Xi (Cathy) (MIT); McPhetres, Jonathon (Durham University); Pennycook, Gordon (University of Regina); Rand, David (MIT)
- 44) [Gamification and financial well-being: Increasing saving intentions through leaderboards](#)
Zhang, Yi (Vrije University Amsterdam); van Horen, Femke (Vrije University Amsterdam); Zeelenberg, Marcel (Vrije University Amsterdam)
- 45) [Compliance with Mass Marketing Solicitation: The Role of Verbatim and Gist Processing](#)
Nolte, Julia (Cornell University); Hanoach, Yaniv (University of Southampton); Wood, Stacey (Scripps College); Reyna, Valerie (Cornell University)
- 46) [Measuring Financial Temptation and Self-Regulation: Situationally-Based Behavioral Indexes](#)
Middlewood, Brianna (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau); Chin, Alycia (U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission)

- 47) [Friends With Benefits: Strengthening Peer Effects Through Aligning Salient Reference Group Characteristics With Subjects' Traits](#)
Verhallen, Pieter (Maastricht University); Post, Thomas (Maastricht University); Brüggem, Elisabeth (Maastricht University); Odekerken-Schröder, Gaby (Maastricht University)
- 48) [Decisions from experience: Competitive search and choice in kind and wicked environments](#)
Frey, Renato (University of Basel)
- 49) [Exploration, Exploitation, and Sensitivity to Patterns in Decisions from Sampling](#)
Cohen, Doron (University of Basel); Teodorescu, Kinneret (Technion)
- 50) [Foraging for Rare Events](#)
Bonder, Taly (Technion); Teodorescu, Kinneret (Technion)
- 51) [Probability Learning: Why Toddlers Choose More Like Adults Than Older Children](#)
Thoma, Anna (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Newell, Ben (University of New South Wales); Schulze, Christin (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
- 52) [David and Goliath: Adult-Age Differences in Strategic Competition](#)
Horn, Sebastian (University of Zurich); Avrahami, Judith (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Kareev, Yaakov (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Hertwig, Ralph (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
- 53) ["I think you shared fake news!": Engagement with corrective messages on social media](#)
Mosleh, Mohsen (Massachusetts institute of technology); Martel, Cameron (Massachusetts institute of technology); Eckles, Dean (Massachusetts institute of technology); Rand, David (Massachusetts institute of technology)
- 54) [Sequential sampling and utility maximization in risky choice](#)
He, Lisheng (Shanghai International Studies University); Bhatia, Sudeep (University of Pennsylvania)
- 57) Patience decreases with age for the poor but not for the rich: An international comparison
Read, Daniel (University of Warwick Warwick); McDonald, Rebecca (University of Birmingham); Burro, Giovanni (University of Bocconi)
- 58) [The Cost-Benefit Trade-Off of Information in Sample-Based Decisions](#)
McCaughey, Linda (Heidelberg University); Prager, Johannes (Heidelberg University)
- 59) [Information Theory Meets Expected Utility: The Entropic Roots of Probability Weighting Functions](#)
Akrenius, Mikaela (Indiana University Bloomington)
- 60) [Intertemporal choices in decision from experience](#)
Shavit, Yael (Technion); Roth, Yefim (University of Haifa); Teodorescu, Kinneret (Technion)
- 61) [Consumption Portfolio Management: The Very Good Stuff Is Best Enjoyed by Itself](#)
Shen, Luxi (The Chinese University of Hong Kong); Yu, Chong (The Chinese University of Hong Kong)
- 62) [The Impact of Personal Benefit on the Economic Value of Moral Judgment](#)
Blaywais, Reut (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Israel); Haran, Uriel (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Israel); Rosenboim, Mosi (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Israel)
- 63) [On the prominence of number: Using very large datasets to explore the categorical representation of number](#)
Guo, Junyang (University of Warwick); Stewart, Neil (University of Warwick)

- 64) [Conflicting conclusions about under- and overweighting of extreme values in economic and psychophysical tasks: An artefact of different modeling frameworks?](#)
 Clarmann von Clarenau, Verena (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Appelhoff, Stefan (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Pachur, Thorsten (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Spitzer, Bernhard (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
- 65) [Jointly Estimating Risk Aversion and Intertemporal Elasticity of Substitution for E-Z Preferences Using Micro-data](#)
 Sunil Kumar, Shilpi (University of Notre Dame)
- 66) [Looking forward or looking back: Examining the effect of perspective and collaboration on plan confidence and forecasts](#)
 Veinott, Elizabeth (Michigan Technological University); p, Elizabeth (Michigan Technological University); Wojtyna, Aliyah (Michigan Technological University)
- 67) [Nonstandard Framing Effects with Somewhat Risky Options: Explorations and Theory Comparisons](#)
 Garge, Prachiti (Ohio State University); DeKay, Michael (Ohio State University)
- 68) [Taking risks for the best: Maximizing and risk-taking tendencies](#)
 Qiu, Tian (East China Normal University); Bai, Yang (East China Normal University); Lu, Jingyi (East China Normal University)
- 69) [Predictive Accuracy of Risk Perception Ratings for Investment Decisions](#)
 Bagañi, Alexandra (University of Basel); Mata, Rui (University of Basel)
- 70) [Higher Risk Taking in Individuals with Methamphetamine Use Disorder during the Balloon Analogue Risk Task: Evidence from Computational Modeling](#)
 Sui, Xiao-Yang (Chinese Academy of Sciences); Rao, Li-Lin (Chinese Academy of Sciences)
- 71) [Analytic and Associative Thinking in Creative Problem Solving](#)
 Policarpio, Monica Renee (De La Salle University)
- 72) [Aggregation of Subjective Location Judgments: An Extension of Cultural Consensus Theory to Two-Dimensional Continuous Data](#)
 Mayer, Maren (University of Mannheim); Heck, Daniel W. (Univeristy of Marburg)
- 73) [If it's broken, fix it: The effectiveness of moral requests depends on prior behavior](#)
 Segel, Assaf (Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Pittarello, Andrea (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University); Schmidt, Thekla (Otto Beisheim School of Management); Mayo, Ruth (Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
- 74) ["Just letting you know": Underestimating others' desire for constructive feedback](#)
 Abi-Esber, Nicole (Harvard University); Abel, Jennifer (Harvard University); Schroeder, Juliana (University of California, Berkeley); Gino, Francesca (Harvard University)

SJDM Poster Session #2
Friday December 11th
2:30pm – 4:00pm

- 1) [From nothing to something: Increasing retirement saving among non-contributors](#)
Perry, Elizabeth (Harvard University)
- 2) Insights from the Regulated Price Plan Pilot Project in the Province of Ontario
Thomson, David (BEworks); Van Patter, Jesse (BEworks); Carpentier, Sarah (BEworks);
Christopher, Leigh (BEworks); Whittingham, Nathaniel (BEworks); Peters, Kelly (BEworks)
- 3) [The gifted kids aren't alright: A JDM approach to understanding low support for gifted education programs](#)
Anderson, Craig (Washington University in St. Louis)
- 5) [Fighting Fiscal Awkwardness: The \(Dis\)Advantages of Digital Payment Methods on Peer-Debt Dynamics](#)
Park, Alexander (Washington University in St. Louis); Cryder, Cynthia (Washington University in St. Louis); Gershon, Rachel (UC - San Diego)
- 6) [The Impact of Borrowing on Perceived Financial Constraint and Monetary Outlays](#)
Katz, Daniel (University of Chicago); Kan, Christina (University of Connecticut); Sussman, Abigail (University of Chicago)
- 7) [A Venmo Effect on Relationships: Electronic Payment Makes Social Relations More Transactional and Experiences Less Enjoyable](#)
Alberhasky, Max (University of Texas at Austin); Kumar, Amit (University of Texas at Austin)
- 8) [Refunded Money is More Likely to be Spent](#)
Yu, Tianjiao (Washington University in St. Louis); Cryder, Cynthia (Washington University in St. Louis); LeBoeuf, Robyn (Washington University in St. Louis)
- 9) [Disclosure design, consumer comprehension, and decision making for overdraft services](#)
Chin, Alycia (Securities and Exchange Commission); Zimmerman, David (University of California, Los Angeles); Johnson, Heidi (Financial Health Network); Shu, Suzanne (Cornell University)
- 10) [On the Psychology of Resource Monitoring](#)
Katz, Daniel (University of Chicago); Sussman, Abigail (University of Chicago)
- 11) [Two Processes of Patience: Information Search Shapes Consumer Patience](#)
Reeck, Crystal (Temple University); Lee, Byung (Columbia University); Johnson, Eric (Columbia University)
- 12) [To Err Is Human, to Correct Is Algorithmic](#)
Sun, Chengyao (Washington University in St. Louis); Cryder, Cynthia (Washington University in St. Louis)
- 13) [When Do Attribute Ratings Change How Consumers Evaluate the Overall Experience?](#)
Mehr, Katie (University of Pennsylvania); Simmons, Joseph (University of Pennsylvania)
- 15) [Does wishing lead to seeing? A pre-registered replication of Balcetis & Dunning \(2010\)](#)
Babin, Brynne (Louisiana State University); Zhang, Don (Louisiana State University)

- 16) [Not a Mirror Image: The Differential Effect of Emojis on Judgments of Positively and Negatively Valenced Messages](#)
Almaguer, Jacob (University of Texas Rio Grande Valley); Felix, Reto (University of Texas Rio Grande Valley)
- 17) [I'm Happy to See Your Benefit Go: The Impact of Reductions in Other Consumers' Loyalty Program Benefits on Consumers' Loyalty Program Satisfaction](#)
Mu, Yumei (West Virginia University); Givi, Julian (West Virginia University); He, Stephen (West Virginia University)
- 18) [Preferences for cognitive-based options in self-other decision making](#)
Jiang, Congjiao (The University of Florida); Smith, Colin (The University of Florida); Ratliff, Kate (The University of Florida)
- 19) [Product reviews as a valid source of product attribute information](#)
Meister, Matt (University of Colorado); Reinholtz, Nicholas (University of Colorado)
- 20) [How Individuals Differ in Response to the COVID Crisis: The Role of Social Functioning](#)
Chen, Shiyun (University of Iowa); Levin, Irwin P (University of Iowa); Gaeth, Gary J (University of Iowa); Levin, Aron M (Northern Kentucky University)
- 21) [The Psychology of Positive Unknowns](#)
Smithson, Michael (The Australian National University); Chen, Junwen (The Australian National University); Shou, Yiyun (The Australian National University)
- 22) [Tone and Timing of a COVID-19 Vaccine: Impact on Emotions, Perceptions and Behavior](#)
Raue, Martina (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Born, Nadja (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München); D'Ambrosio, Lisa (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Balmuth, Alexa (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Brady, Samantha (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Patskanick, Taylor (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Joseph F. Coughlin
- 23) [Limited effects of exposure to fake news about climate change](#)
Drummond, Caitlin (Arizona State University); Siegrist, Michael (ETH Zurich); Arvai, Joseph (University of Southern California)
- 24) [Understanding individual information seeking and adoption of protective measures in the COVID-19 pandemic](#)
Kolotylo-Kulkarni, Malgorzata (Drake University); Marakas, George (Florida International University); Xia, Weidong (Florida International University)
- 25) [Moral and Social Foundations of Beliefs about Scientific Issues: The Case of GM Food and Vaccination](#)
van der Does, Tamara (Santa Fe Institute); Galesic, Mirta (Santa Fe Institute); Fedoroff, Nina (Penn State University); Stein, Daniel L. (New York University)
- 26) [Network Structures of Collective Intelligence: The Contingent Benefits of Group Discussion](#)
Becker, Joshua (University College London); Almaatouq, Abdullah (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Horvat, Agnes (Northwestern University)
- 27) [It's tough to make predictions, especially about the future: On interventions to enhance the crowd within for prospective forecasts](#)
Illingworth, David (University of Maryland, College Park); Dougherty, Michael (University of Maryland, College Park); Erbas, Serra (Vanderbilt University); Thomas, Rick (Georgia Institute of Technology)

- 28) [Affect Heuristic: The Roles of Task Type, Cognitive Capacity, and Biased Judgments](#)
Nolte, Julia (Cornell University); Löckenhoff, Corinna (Cornell University)
- 29) [Not Knowing How to Know: Adults Underestimate the Efficacy of Getting Perspective](#)
Echelbarger, Margaret (University of Chicago); Epley, Nicholas (University of Chicago)
- 30) [The Surprising Benefits of Planning Possible Topics Before Conversing](#)
Abi-Esber, Nicole (Harvard University); Yeomans, Mike (Harvard University); Wood Brooks, Alison (Harvard University); Berger, Jonah (University of Pennsylvania)
- 31) [The Functions of Affect and Motivated Reasoning During the COVID-19 Pandemic](#)
Silverstein, Michael (University of Oregon); Markowitz, David (University of Oregon); Shoots-Reinhard, Brittany (Ohio State University); Goodwin, Raleigh (University of Oregon); Bjaelkebring, Paer (University of Gothenburg); Peters, Ellen (University of Oregon)
- 32) [Finite Pool of Worry: Evidence and Qualifications](#)
Sisco, Matthew (Columbia University); Constantino, Sara (Princeton University); Gao, Yu (Peking University); Tavoni, Massimo (European Institute on Economics & the Environment); Bosetti, Valentina (Bocconi University); Weber, Elke (Princeton University)
- 33) [Investigating Domain-Specific Risk Tolerance among Violent and Nonviolent Male Offenders](#)
Shou, Yiyun (Australian National University); Wang, Mengcheng (Guangzhou University)
- 34) [The role of emotions on self-other differences in decisions under risk](#)
Yi, Ye Dam (Wake Forest University); Stone, Eric R. (Wake Forest University)
- 35) [Predicting and choosing for others: How and why we fail](#)
Smith, Stephanie (University of California Los Angeles); Krajbich, Ian (Ohio State University)
- 36) [Systematic differences in risk preferences between financial and social contexts](#)
Lee, Sunme (University of Iowa); Cole, Catherine (University of Iowa); Nayakankuppam, Dhananjay (University of Iowa)
- 37) [Social Exploration: When People Deviate from Options Explored by Others](#)
Winet, Yuji (University of Chicago); Tu, Yanping (University of Florida); Choshen-Hillel, Shoham (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Fishbach, Ayelet (University of Chicago)
- 39) [Measuring risk preference: is a single item enough?](#)
Zhang, Don (Louisiana State University); Matthews, Russell (University of Alabama)
- 40) [Meeting self-image needs through perceiving person-organization fit: the role of employer image and risk propensity](#)
DePatie, Thomas (Hofstra University); Nolan, Kevin (Hofstra University)
- 41) [Choosing Commitment Contracts with Teeth: Decision Makers Select Effective Self-Control Strategies for Others but not for Themselves](#)
Brimhall, Craig (University of Utah); Tannenbaum, David (University of Utah); VanEpps, Eric (University of Utah)
- 42) [Reliance on emotion promotes belief in fake news](#)
Martel, Cameron (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Pennycook, Gordon (University of Regina); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
- 43) [Clueless critics: Overconfidence in oneself fosters unjustified criticism of others who try \(and fail\)](#)
Wald, Kristina (University of Chicago); O'Brien, Ed (University of Chicago)

- 44) [Judging Diversity: A Conceptual Replication of the Spillover Bias in Diversity](#) Judgments
Mijalli, Yazmine (California State University, Fresno); Price, Paul (California State University, Fresno)
- 45) [The Mistaken Preference for Overclaiming Credit in Groups](#)
Stein, Daniel (UC Berkeley); Schatz, Derek (UC Berkeley); Schroeder, Juliana (UC Berkeley); Chatman, Jennifer (UC Berkeley)
- 46) [Intentional Use of Logically Irrelevant Neuroscience Information](#)
Leong, Lim (University of California, San Diego); McKenzie, Craig (University of California, San Diego)
- 47) [Good for the Soul but Bad for Friendship? When Forgiveness is Disloyal](#)
Landers, Mitchell (University of Chicago); Shaw, Alex (University of Chicago); Schroeder, Juliana (University of California, Berkeley)
- 48) [Decreases loom larger than increases: Asymmetry in perceiving decreasing and increasing patterns underlies loss aversion](#)
Luo, Yu (University of British Columbia); Odic, Darko (University of British Columbia); Zhao, Jiaying (University of British Columbia)
- 49) [Lay Attitudes about Optimism in the Face of a Pandemic](#)
Miller, Jane (The University of Iowa); Park, Inkyung (The University of Iowa); Windschitl, Paul (The University of Iowa)
- 50) [Using Strength-Based Language to Decrease Stigma Associated with Psychiatric Hospitalization](#)
Grabow, Jaime (St. John's University); Chesney, Dana (St. John's University)
- 51) [Misjudgment of Time Series Graphs Due to Serial Dependence](#)
Bishara, Anthony (College of Charleston); Tanton, Craig (College of Charleston); Guthrie, Ethan (College of Charleston)
- 52) [The Real Momentum Effect: When Do People Expect a Streak to End?](#)
Weingarten, Evan (Arizona State University); Shen, Luxi (The Chinese University of Hong Kong)
- 53) [When alternative hypotheses shape your beliefs: Context effects in probability judgments](#)
Cai, Xiaohong (University of Kansas); Pleskac, Tim (University of Kansas)
- 54) [Culture and Risk Perception: The Effect of Risk Framing on Financial Deception](#)
Zhou, Yubo (University of California Santa Barbara); Zang, Lu (Fudan University); Kim, Heejung (University of California Santa Barbara)
- 55) [Contrasting lay and expert perceptions of highly versus lowly confident individuals](#)
Parker, Andrew (RAND Corporation); Somerville, Annie (Wake Forest University); Stone, Eric (Wake Forest University)
- 56) [Conditional Regret Theory: People Behave as if they Anticipate Regret Conditional on Bad Outcomes](#)
Ryan, William H. (University of California, Berkeley); Baum, Stephen M. (University of California, Berkeley); Evers, Ellen R. K. (University of California, Berkeley)
- 57) [Understanding factors that affect responses to risk framing manipulations in portfolio allocation decisions: A hierarchical cognitive modeling approach](#)
Mistry, Percy (Stanford University); Trueblood, Jennifer (Vanderbilt University)
- 59) [Numeracy Predicts Accurate Knowledge and Beliefs: The Case of Climate Change](#)
Cho, Jinhyo (University of Oklahoma); Ramasubramanian, Madhuri (University of Oklahoma);

Allan, Jinan (University of Oklahoma); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma); Garcia-Retamero, Rocio (University of Granada); Cokely, Edward (University of Oklahoma)

- 60) [Pretty Healthy Food: How and When Aesthetics Enhance Perceived Healthiness](#)
Hagen, Linda (University of Southern California)
- 61) [What Gives a Diagnostic Label Value? Common Use Over Informativeness](#)
Hemmatian, Babak (Brown University); Chan, Sze-Yu (Peking University); Sloman, Steven (Brown University)
- 62) [Deliberative Thinking Protects Against the Decay of Corrections to Misinformation](#)
Humiston, Graelyn (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Wamsley, Erin (Furman University); Berinsky, Adam (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
- 63) [Biased or motivated? Starting point biases reflect early attention, not pre-choice preferences](#)
Cho, Hyuna (University of Toronto); Teoh, Yi Yang (University of Toronto); Hutcherson, Cendri (University of Toronto)
- 64) [What is the best way to elicit belief distributions?](#)
Hu, Beidi (University of Pennsylvania); Simmons, Joseph (University of Pennsylvania)
- 66) [Apprehension of the Prospective Unknown: Evidence of Uncertainty Aversion in the Job Choice Process](#)
Acosta, Joshua (Auburn University); Franco-Watkins, Ana (Auburn University)
- 67) [Pre- and Post-Action Confidence in Uncertainty](#)
Kim, Dongeun (University of Iowa); Nayakankuppam, Dhananjay (University of Iowa)
- 68) [Influence of Expectation Metric on Desirability Bias](#)
Park, Inkyung (University of Iowa); Windschitl, Paul (University of Iowa); Smith, Andrew (Appalachian State University); Miller, Jane (University of Iowa); Biangmano, Mark (University of Iowa)
- 69) [How Uncertainty Can Promote Investment in Energy-Efficient Upgrades](#)
Sharman, Alanna (University of Manitoba); Kettle, Keri (University of Manitoba)
- 70) [Are Confidence and Certainty the Same Meta-cognitive Traits?](#)
Law, Marvin (The University of Sydney); Kleitman, Sabina (The University of Sydney)
- 71) [Making Donation Decisions in a Portfolio Context Increases Preference for Uncertain High-Impact Charities](#)
Segal, Shoshana (New York University); Lewis, Joshua (New York University)
- 72) [Motivated Inconsistency in Probability Importance Judgments during COVID-19](#)
Goodwin, Raleigh (University of Oregon); Shoots-Reinhard, Brittany (Ohio State University); Silverstein, Michael (University of Oregon); Bjaelkebring, Paer (University of Gothenburg); Markowitz, David (University of Oregon); Peters, Ellen (University of Oregon)
- 73) [Feelings of Culpability: The effect of decision agency on responsibility for adverse outcomes](#)
Malter, Maayan (Columbia University); Kim, Seung-Eun Sonia (Columbia University); Metcalfe, Janet (Columbia University)
- 74) [Reducing Math Anxiety to Increase Recruitment: A Randomized Controlled Trial](#)
Sylvester, Benjamin (Department of National Defence); Kemp, Colin (Treasury Board); Gooch, Stephen (Department of National Defence); Feeney, Justin (University of Regina)

- 75) [Levels of Belongingness in Multiracial and Monoracial Individuals](#)
Coble, Jeavonna (St. John's University); Chesney, Dana (St. John's University)
- 76) [The Psychology of Propaganda](#)
Heyman-Schrum, Cassandra (William & Mary); Langholtz, Harvey (William & Mary)
- 77) [Interplay of group threat and task complexity affects group diversity and performance](#)
Galesic, Mirta (Santa Fe Institute); Barkoczi, Daniel (University of Southern Denmark & Chinese Academy of Sciences); Adem, Muna (Indiana University, Bloomington)
- 78) [Developing and validating a method of coherence-based judgment aggregation](#)
Ho, Emily (Northwestern University); Budescu, David (Fordham University)
- 79) [Maximizer or satisficer? Uncovering a hybrid with latent profile analysis](#)
Willits, Taylor (Auburn University); Whitman, Rachel (Auburn University); Shiffrin, Nicole (Auburn University); Franco-Watkins, Ana (Auburn University)
- 80) [An Analysis of how Individual Thinking and Decision Complexity Interactively Shape Decision Choice](#)
McElroy, Todd (Florida Gulf Coast University); Salapska-Gelleri, Joanna (Florida Gulf Coast University); Schuller, Kelly (Florida Gulf Coast University); Bourgeois, Martin (Florida Gulf Coast University); Day, Jillian (Florida Gulf Coast University); Rodriguez, Rebekah (Florida Gulf Coast University)
- 81) [Turking in the time of COVID](#)
Arechar, Antonio (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
- 82) [Novel Moderators of the Reception and Detection of Pseudo-Profound Bullshit](#)
Neybert, Emma (University of Cincinnati); Gaffney, Donald (University of Cincinnati); Shen, Liang (University of Cincinnati); Flout, Stephanie (Ohio State University); Richards, Maxwell (University of Cincinnati); Kardes, Frank (University of Cincinnati); Sarah Elizabeth Perry; Zoey Phelps
- 83) [Effect of attention on trust behavior](#)
Grant, Dani (University of Colorado Boulder); Pedersen, Eric (University of Colorado Boulder); Van Boven, Leaf (University of Colorado Boulder)
- 84) [The Cost of Opposition: Harming our Own Rather than Helping our Opponent](#)
Gershon, Rachel (University of California, San Diego); Fridman, Ariel (University of California, San Diego)
- 85) [The Search for Predictable Moral Partners: Predictability and Preferences in Moral Character](#)
Turpin, Martin Harry (University of Waterloo); Walker, Alexander (University of Waterloo); Fugelsang, Jonathan (University of Waterloo); Sorokowski, Piotr (University of Wroclaw); Grossmann, Igor (University of Waterloo); Bialek, Michal (University of Wroclaw)
- 86) [Algorithms as advisors in the future of the workplace](#)
Tatlidil, Semir (Brown University); Bugbee, Erin (Carnegie Mellon University); Dick, Madison (Brown University); Hemmatian, Babak (Brown University); Sloman, Steven (Brown University)
- 87) [Sit Down, Be Humble: Buffering Political Polarization and Authoritarianism in the United States](#)
Hickey, Hayden (Auburn University); Leavitt, Mackenzie (Auburn University); Bird, Ryan (Auburn University)

- 88) [Multiple Instances of Negative Brand Publicity: Effects of Need for Cognition and Self-Brand Connection](#)
Basar, Berna (Baruch College)
- 89) [Greater Objective Numeracy Protects Pandemic Grades but Endangers Academic Interest](#)
Svensson, Hayley (Rutgers University); Shoots-Reinhard, Brittany (Ohio State University); Peters, Ellen (University of Oregon)
- 90) [When Curiosity is Generosity: The impact of advisor social curiosity on advice quality](#)
Guenoun, Bushra (Harvard University); Blunden, Hayley (Harvard University); Zhang, Ting (Harvard University); Gino, Francesca (Harvard University)
- 91) [Does Looking Mean Liking: Processing Differences across Perceptual and Preferential Choice](#)
Grunevski, Sergej (University of Kansas); Pleskac, Timothy (University of Kansas); Yu, Shuli (); Liu, Taosheng (Michigan State University)
- 92) [How Incentives Help Us Do Hard Things](#)
Healey, Matthew (Washington University in St. Louis); LeBoeuf, Robyn (Washington University in St. Louis)
- 93) [How Big is \(Sample\) Space? Judgement and Decision Making with Unknown States and Outcomes](#)
Smithson, Michael (The Australian National University); Shou, Yiyun (The Australian National University)

SJDM Poster Session #3
Saturday December 12th
8:00am – 9:15am

- 1) [Understanding and utilizing medical Artificial Intelligence](#)
Cadario, Romain (Erasmus University); Longoni, Chiara (Boston University); Morewedge, Carey (Boston University)
- 2) [Unrealistic optimism in the face of feedback](#)
Cinks, Ronalds (University of Latvia); Austers, Ivars (University of Latvia)
- 3) [The "bullshit blind spot": Higher confidence in bullshit detection ability is associated with greater bullshit receptivity and bullshitting frequency](#)
Littrell, Shane (University of Waterloo); Fugelsang, Jonathan (University of Waterloo)
- 4) [When do you rather believe in their face? Numerical interpretation of verbal probabilities with facial expressions](#)
Gu, Yuanqi (The University of Tokyo); Honda, Hidehito (Otemon Gakuin University); Ueda, Kazuhiro (The University of Tokyo)
- 5) [Understanding the nature of cognitive biases underlying rejection of mixed gambles](#)
Singhi, Nishad (Indian Institute of Technology Delhi); Agarwal, Sumeet (Indian Institute of Technology Delhi); Mukherjee, Sumitava (Indian Institute of Technology Delhi)
- 6) [Does Expressing a Different View Cause Negative Consequences as We Think?](#)
Chen, Yuqi (East China Normal University); Lu, Jingyi (East China Normal University)
- 7) [Device, Fast and Slow: How Devices Influence Consumer Decisions](#)
Zhu, Shuqi (University of Warwick); Wei, Sarah (University of Warwick); Rudd, John (University of Warwick); Hu, Yansong (University of Warwick)
- 8) [How variance and skewness shape retail investors' selling behavior](#)
Bernard, Sabine (University of Mannheim); Weber, Martin (University of Mannheim); Loos, Benjamin (Technical University of Munich)
- 9) [Perceiving greater variance in public opinion on a platform with vested interest positively affects evaluation](#)
Tan, Li Shi (University College London); Basu, Shankha (University of Leeds)
- 10) [The Numerator Neglect: When the Denominator Carries More Information](#)
Rafieian, Hoori (Fordham University); Aggarwal, Anubhav (Iona College)
- 11) [Do Robo-Advisors Make Us Better Investors?](#)
Back, Camila (Ludwig-Maximilian University); Morana, Stefan (Saarland University); Spann, Martin (Ludwig-Maximilian University)
- 12) [Intuitive summation results in systematic underestimation of abstract and familiar numerical sequences](#)
McGowan, Feidhlim (Trinity College Dublin); Denny, Eleanor (Trinity College Dublin); Lunn, Pete (Behavioural Research Unit, ESRI, Dublin)
- 13) [Can Agents Add and Subtract When Forming Beliefs?](#)
Kieren, Pascal (University of Mannheim); Müller-Dethard, Jan (University of Mannheim); Weber, Martin (University of Mannheim)

- 14) [Medical decision making under uncertainty: Effects of risk preference, tolerance of uncertainty and regret on physician's surgical decisions](#)
Yang, Zijing (University of Warwick); Safra, Zvi (University of Warwick); Mujcic, Redzo (University of Warwick); Melkonyan, Tigran (University of Warwick); Hanoch, Yaniv (University of Southampton)
- 15) [The Influence of Option Complexity on Risky Judgment and Choice](#)
Oberholzer, Yvonne (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology); Olschewski, Sebastian (University of Warwick); Scheibehenne, Benjamin (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology)
- 16) [Improving the effectiveness of impact-based weather warnings in South East Asia](#)
Jenkins, Sarah (University College London); Harris, Adam (University College London)
- 17) [Longitudinal Associations between Parenting Practices and Decision-Competence](#)
Weller, Joshua (University of Leeds); Michaels, Linsie (Oregon State University); Parker, Andrew (Rand Corporation); Reynolds, Maureen (University of Pittsburgh); Kirisci, Levent (University of Pittsburgh)
- 18) [Do We Know Our Own Tornado Season? A Psychological Investigation of Tornado Risk Perception in the Southeast U.S.](#)
Broomell, Stephen (Carnegie Mellon University); Wong-Parodi, Gabrielle (Stanford University); Morss, Rebecca (National Center for Atmospheric Research); Demuth, Julie (National Center for Atmospheric Research)
- 20) [Signaling Status by Acquiring Ownership \(vs. Access\)](#)
Guo, Yang (Jenny) (University of Pittsburgh); Lamberton, Cait (University of Pennsylvania)
- 21) ["Will I be judged harshly after trying to help but causing more troubles? A misprediction about help recipients](#)
Shang, Xuesong (East China Normal University); Chen, Zhuo (East China Normal University); Lu, Jingyi (East China Normal University)
- 22) [Misattribution of Good Leadership - Evidence from a Field experiment](#)
Frollová, Nikola (University of Economics in Prague); Houdek, Petr (University of Economics in Prague)
- 23) [Learning other people's preference](#)
Zou, Wanling (University of Pennsylvania); Bhatia, Sudeep (University of Pennsylvania)
- 24) [Looking forward or looking back: Examining the effect of perspective and collaboration on plan confidence and forecasts](#)
Keysor, Elizabeth (Michigan Technological University); Wojtyna, Aliyah (Michigan Technological University); Veinott, Elizabeth (Michigan Technological University)
- 25) [Exploring college student self-stigma judgment and campus resource awareness](#)
Giroux, Dominique (St. John's University); Chesney, Dana (St. John's University)
- 26) [The Conjunction Fallacy is not One Error but Many](#)
Ludwin-Peery, Ethan (New York University)
- 27) [A Job Scarcity Mindset Impairs Job Seeker's Decision Making](#)
Masters-Waage, Theodore (Singapore Management University); Peters, Eva (Singapore Management University); Loo, Charis (Singapore Management University); Reb, Jochen (Singapore Management University); Cheong, Ernie (Singapore Management University); Nguyen Tran, Tuyen (Kings College London)

- 28) [Default Effects and Framing Effects: replication of Johnson & Goldstein \(2003\) and Johnson, Bellman & Lohse \(2002\)](#)
Chandrashekar, Subramanya Prasad (The Open University of Hong Kong); Henne, Paul (Lake Forest College)
- 29) [Anticipating Habit Change: A Randomized Controlled Trial on Reducing Smartphone Overuse](#)
Zimmermann, Laura (IE University); Somasundaram, Jeeva (IE Business School); Pham, Duc (IE Business School)
- 30) [Sticker-Created Hand Hygiene Zones to Increase Emergency Department Hand Hygiene Compliance](#)
Sairafi, Betule (King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences); Batarfi, Bader (); Binjassas, Abdullatif (); Mulla, Moyser (King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences); Suhaibani, Sara (Princess Nourah Bint Abdul Rahman University); Al-Fakhri, Talal ()
- 31) [A customized nudge to increase consumers' willingness to pay for electric vehicles](#)
Herberz, Mario (University of Geneva); Hahnel, Ulf J.J. (University of Geneva); Brosch, Tobias (University of Geneva)
- 33) [In a future nudge dystopia, people may be perceived as less competent and accountable for their actions](#)
Michaelsen, Patrik (University of Gothenburg); Andersson, Ylva (University of Gothenburg); Lindkvist, Amanda (University of Gothenburg); Olsson, Lisa (University of Gothenburg)
- 34) [Boosting the Detection of Microtargeted Advertising](#)
Lorenz-Spreen, Philipp (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Geers, Michael (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Pachur, Thorsten (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Hertwig, Ralph (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Lewandowsky, Stephan (University of Bristol); Herzog, Stefan (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
- 35) [Uncertainty resolution in numerosity comparison: the moderating role of math ability](#)
Duong, Shirley (University of Pittsburgh); Libertus, Melissa (University of Pittsburgh)
- 36) [Entrust Your Future to Others' Hands: Preferences for Externalizing Choices for Future Outcomes](#)
Jang, Minkwang (University of Chicago); Urminsky, Oleg (University of Chicago)
- 37) [How to admit uncertainty and still be trusted: External and internal uncertainty and the confidence heuristic](#)
Løhre, Erik (BI Norwegian Business School); Teigen, Karl Halvor (University of Oslo)
- 38) [Through the Window of My Mind: Mapping Information Integration and the Cognitive Representations Underlying Self-Reported Risk Preference](#)
Steiner, Markus (University of Basel); Seitz, Florian (University of Basel); Frey, Renato (University of Basel)
- 39) [Lay, Professional and Artificial Intelligence perspectives on risky choice framing for clinical trials: Number of lives matter in gain frames but not in loss frames](#)
Mukherjee, Sumitava (Indian Institute of Technology Delhi); Reji, Divya (Indian Institute of Technology Gandhinagar)
- 40) ["Luckily, I don't believe in statistics" - Why Women Keep Choosing Futile Fertility Treatments](#)
Miron-Shatz, Talya (Ono Academic College); Tsafir, Avi (Shaarei Zedek Hospital)
- 41) [Concurrent disasters: Planning for a hurricane amid a pandemic](#)
Losee, Joy (University of Dayton); Lipsey, Nikolette (North Carolina State University); Webster, Gregory (University of Florida)

- 42) [Risk compensation during COVID-19: The impact of face mask usage on social distancing.](#)
Luckman, Ashley (University of Warwick); Zeitoun, Hossam (University of Warwick); Isoni, Andrea (University of Warwick); Loomes, Graham (University of Warwick); Vlaev, Ivo (University of Warwick); Powdthavee, Nattavudh (University of Warwick); Daniel Read (University of Warwick)
- 43) [The reputational costs of ignoring decision frames](#)
Dorison, Charles (Northwestern University); Heller, Blake (Harvard University)
- 44) [Knowing is like owning: Loss-aversion and diminishing sensitivity for non-instrumental information.](#)
Litovsky, Yana (Carnegie Mellon University); Loewenstein, George (Carnegie Mellon University)
- 45) [Generalized SHAP: Generating multiple types of explanations in machine learning](#)
Bowen, Dillon (University of Pennsylvania); Ungar, Lyle (University of Pennsylvania)
- 46) [Multiple numeric competencies predict decision outcomes beyond fluid intelligence and cognitive reflection](#)
Sobkow, Agata (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities); Olszewska, Angelika (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities); Traczyk, Jakub (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities)
- 47) [Taking a disagreeing perspective improves the accuracy of people's estimates](#)
Efendic, Emir (Maastricht University); van de Calseyde, Philippe (Eindhoven University of Technology)
- 48) [Modeling Multi-Winner Approval Voting](#)
Scheuerman, Jaelle (Naval Research Lab); Harman, Jason (Louisiana State University); Mattei, Nicholas (Tulane University); Venable, K. Brent (Institute for Human & Machine Cognition)
- 49) [The Autonomy-Validity Dilemma in Mechanical Judgment Procedures: The Search for a Compromise](#)
Neumann, Marvin (University of Groningen); Niessen, A. Susan M. (University of Groningen); Tendeiro, Jorge N. (University of Groningen); Meijer, Rob R. (University of Groningen)
- 50) [A collective approach to inductive inference & causal reasoning using Simpson's paradox](#)
Ermark, Florian (Heidelberg University); Kutzner, Florian (Heidelberg University); Fiedler, Klaus (Heidelberg University)
- 52) [Judgment using the 'totality principle': When more crimes means less punishment](#)
Dhami, Mandeep (Middlesex University, London)
- 53) [May we be kind to ourselves: The role of self-compassion in judgments of showing vulnerability](#)
Bruk, Anna (University of Mannheim); Scholl, Sabine G. (University of Mannheim); Bless, Herbert (University of Mannheim)
- 54) [The Scientific Contagion Effect: Judgments about acceptability of water for religious use reduces after scientific treatment](#)
Mukherjee, Sumitava (Indian Institute of Technology Delhi); Chattopadhyay Mukherjee, Payel (Indraprastha Institute of Information Technology Delhi)
- 55) [Choose your words wisely: semiotic characteristics predict halo effects and attrition in the serial reproduction of person descriptions](#)
Salmen, Karolin (Ruprechts-Krals-Universitaet Heidelberg); Fiedler, Klaus (Ruprechts-Krals-Universitaet Heidelberg)

- 56) [Using game-based decisions to measure personality: a systematic test of elements of gamification](#)
Harman, Jason (Louisiana State University); Brown, Kayla (Louisiana State University)
- 57) [Accentuation in Self-Determined In-/Out-Group Formation](#)
Prager, Johannes (Heidelberg University); Fiedler, Klaus (Heidelberg University)
- 58) [Selective aversion for Artificial Intelligence: Domain specificity and perceived understanding influences algorithm aversion](#)
Mukherjee, Sumitava (Indian Institute of Technology Delhi); Senapati, Deeptimayee (Indian Institute of Technology Delhi); Mahajan, Isha (Symbiosis International (Deemed University))
- 59) [Sunk costs as cooperative social signals](#)
Meyers, Ethan (University of Waterloo); Bialek, Michal (University of Waterloo); Fugelsang, Jonathan (University of Waterloo); Friedman, Ori (University of Waterloo); Koehler, Derek (University of Waterloo); Turpin, Martin (University of Waterloo); Alexander Walker (University of Waterloo)
- 60) [An Implicit Preference for Intuitive Decision-Makers](#)
Tan, Li Shi (University College London); Tolsá-Caballero, Nuria (University College London); Tsay, Chia-Jung (University College London)
- 61) [Judging others' wise reasoning: Wise writers are perceived more favorably and are more often chosen as partners](#)
Rotella, Amanda (University of Waterloo); Grossmann, Igor (University of Waterloo)
- 62) [Selective Exposure as a Signal of Group Membership](#)
Moore, Molly (Harvard University); Dorison, Charles (Northwestern University); Minson, Julia (Harvard University)
- 63) [Perceptions of conflict: Ingroup love and outgroup hate revisited](#)
Weisel, Ori (Tel Aviv University); Zultan, Ro'i (Ben Gurion University of the Negev)
- 64) Praising others promote dyadic cooperation in 2-player public goods game
Lv, jieyu (Central University of Finance and Economics); Wang, Huang; Luo, Zixi
- 65) [Too old for the job? Isolated choice effect and its implications for age diversity hiring for organizations](#)
Jolles, Daniel (University of Essex); Juanchich, Marie (University of Essex)
- 66) [Influence of Poverty on Decision Making](#)
McGinley, Maggie (William & Mary); Langholtz, Harvey (William & Mary)
- 67) [Bias at Play: Investigating Sensitization and Desensitization to Diversity and Inclusion via Interactions with Bots](#)
Kaufman, Geoff (Carnegie Mellon University); Jarbo, Kevin (Carnegie Mellon University); Gonzalez, Cleotilde (Carnegie Mellon University)
- 68) [Wasting to avoid feeling wasteful](#)
Shani, Yaniv (Tel Aviv University); Weisel, Ori (Tel Aviv University); Zultan, Ro'i (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
- 69) [Parental Gendered Messages and GPA](#)
Korins, Jessica (St. John's University); Chesney, Dana (St. John's University)
- 70) [Releasing Regret \(For Better and For Worse\): Mindfulness Disrupts the Role of Past Regrets on Decision Making with Positive and Negative Effects on Performance](#)
Masters-Waage, Theodore (Singapore Management University); Jha, Nilotpal (Singapore)

Management University); Tai, Amos (Singapore Management University); Reb, Jochen (Singapore Management University); Tan, Brian (James Cook University)

- 71) [Numeracy, numeric attention, and number use](#)
Tiede, Kevin (University of Konstanz); Bjaelkebring, Paer (The University of Gothenburg); Peters, Ellen (University of Oregon)
- 72) [Beauty and truth, truth and beauty: Chiasmus and the Keats heuristic](#)
Kara-Yakoubian, Mane (University of Waterloo); Walker, Alexander (University of Waterloo); Sharpinskyi, Konstantyn (University of Waterloo); Assadourian, Garni (University of Waterloo); Fugelsang, Jonathan (University of Waterloo); Harris, Randy (University of Waterloo)
- 73) [Size doesn't matter: Lower price heuristics bias shopping decisions, regardless of math anxiety](#)
Storozuk, Andie (University of Ottawa); Maloney, Erin (University of Ottawa)
- 74) [Advisors Discount the Future Less than Actors Do](#)
Scholl, Sabine G. (University of Mannheim); Bruk, Anna (University of Mannheim); van Lange, Paul A.M. (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)
- 75) [Scaling up advice weighting: Weighting scales reduce the prevalence of ignoring](#) advice
Ache, Fabian (Fern Universitaet in Hagen); Rader, Christina (Colorado College); Hütter, Mandy (Eberhard Karls Universitaet Tübingen)
- 76) [A Comparison of the Relationship Between Adaptive versus Maladaptive Perfectionism and Academic Performance in STEM versus non-STEM Majors](#)
Pudner, Gwyneth (William & Mary); Langholtz, Harvey (William & Mary)
- 77) An Eye-Tracking Study Separated by Decision-Making Styles: The Case of Attraction and Compromise Effects
Tsuzuki, Takashi (Rikkyo University); Chiba, Itsuki (Rikkyo University)
- 78) [The Effect of Duration Salience on Procrastination](#)
Chun, YoungJin (Erasmus); Van den Bergh, Bram (Erasmus); Lembregts, C.J.P. (Erasmus)
- 79) [Generalization in category learning depends on both: the object's reward magnitude and its category membership](#)
Hosch, Ann-Katrin (University of Bremen); Schlegelmilch, René (University of Bremen); von Helversen, Bettina (University of Bremen)
- 80) [Over and Under Commitment to a Course of Action in Decisions from Experience](#)
Cohen, Doron (University of Basel); Erev, Ido (Technion)