

# Society for Judgment and Decision Making

## The 42nd Annual Conference



*Virtual*

**February 9–12, 2022**

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

### **CONTENTS**

### **PAGES**

Master Schedule	2
Paper Presentations Schedule	3-7
Conference Special Events	8-10
Paper Abstracts Listed by Session	11-30
Poster Titles Listed by Session	31-55

**Program Committee:** Barbara Fasolo & Abigail Sussman (Co-Chairs), Daniel Feiler, and Stephen Spiller

# SJDM Conference Master Schedule

**February 9–12, 2022**

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

## **WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9<sup>th</sup>**

---

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

## **THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10<sup>th</sup>**

---

9:30-10:30 am      **Paper Session #1**  
10:30-10:45 am      *Break / Paper Session #1 additional discussion*  
10:45-11:45 am      **Paper Session #2**  
11:45-12:00 pm      *Break / Paper Session #2 additional discussion*  
12:00-1:00 pm      **Presidential Address: Daniel Oppenheimer**  
1:00-1:15 pm      *Break*  
1:15-2:15 pm      **Paper Session #3**  
2:15-2:30 pm      *Break / Paper Session #3 additional discussion*  
2:30-3:30 pm      **Paper Session #4**  
3:30-3:45 pm      *Break / Paper Session #4 additional discussion*  
3:45-4:45 pm      **Noise Session led by Daniel Kahneman, Olivier Sibony & Cass Sunstein**

## **FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 11<sup>th</sup>**

---

9:30-10:30 am      **Poster Session 1**  
10:30-10:45 am      *Break*  
10:45-11:45 am      **Paper Session #5**  
11:45-12:00 pm      *Break / Paper Session #5 additional discussion*  
12:00-1:00 pm      **Keynote Address: Sendhil Mullainathan**  
1:00-1:15 pm      *Break*  
1:15-2:15 pm      **Paper Session #6**  
2:15-2:30 pm      *Break / Paper Session #6 additional discussion*  
2:30-3:30 pm      **Paper Session #7**  
3:30-3:45 pm      *Break / Paper Session #7 additional discussion*  
3:45-4:45 pm      **Poster Session 2**  
4:45-5:00 pm      *Break*  
5:00-6:30 pm      **Social Round Tables**

## **SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 12<sup>th</sup>**

---

9:30-10:30 am      **Paper Session #8**  
10:30-10:45 am      *Break / Paper Session #8 additional discussion*  
10:45-11:45 am      **Paper Session #9**  
11:45-12:00 pm      *Break / Paper Session #9 additional discussion*  
12:00-12:30 pm      **Einhorn Award**  
12:30-12:45 pm      *Break*  
12:45-1:45 pm      **Business Meeting**

**THURSDAY FEBRUARY 10, 2022**

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

**RECORDINGS WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE FOR PAPERS MARKED WITH AN \***

<b>Session #1</b>	<b>Track A</b> Theme: <b>Moral Reasoning</b>	<b>Track B</b> Theme: <b>Advice</b>	<b>Track C</b> Theme: <b>Algorithms &amp; Machine Learning</b>	<b>Track D</b> Theme: <b>Trust/Belief Change</b>
	<b>Discussants:</b> Brad Bitterly Geoff Goodwin	<b>Discussants:</b> Adelle Xue Yang Reid Hastie	<b>Discussants:</b> Berkeley Dietvorst Cade Massey	<b>Discussants:</b> Emma Levine Francesca Gino
9:30 AM	Helgason: Reflecting on Identity-Change Facilitates Confession of Past Misdeeds	*Cormier: Not All Experts Are Equal: Advice-Seekers Favor Experts with Direct over Vicarious Experience	*Davenport: Do Startup Investors Make Systematic Mistakes in Selecting Investments? A machine learning approach	Dorison: Maintaining Trust When De-Escalating Commitment: Using Precommitment to Signal Consistency
9:50 AM	Skowronek: Cheating and Lying are Qualitatively Distinct	Abi-Esber: "Just letting you know": Underestimating others' desire for constructive feedback	Maglio: How to Overcome Algorithm Aversion: Learning from Mistakes	Anglin: Predictors and Persistence of Belief Change in Response to Evidence
10:10 AM	Peer: Honesty pledges reduce cheating through involvement and identification	Moran: Confidently at your service: Advisors alter their stated confidence to be helpful	Walasek: Machine learning methods for studying food perception and the impact of nutrient labeling	Zwebner: The Downside of Doing Good: Nonprofits Have a Harder Time Rebounding than For-profits After Transgressing
<b>Session #2</b>	<b>Track A</b> Theme: <b>Diversity &amp; Inclusion</b>	<b>Track B</b> Theme: <b>Eating &amp; Health</b>	<b>Track C</b> Theme: <b>Marketing</b>	<b>Track D</b> Theme: <b>Nudges &amp; Choice Architecture</b>
	<b>Discussants:</b> Jen Dannals Jane Risen	<b>Discussants:</b> Sydney Scott Gretchen Chapman	<b>Discussants:</b> Hannah Perfecto Susa Fiedler	<b>Discussants:</b> Daniel Mochon Shlomo Benartzi
10:45 AM	Kirigos: Diversity targets increase application rates from women and racial minorities, but hiring managers resist using them	Molnar: Choosing the Light Meal: Real-time Aggregation of Calorie Information Reduces Meal Calories	Chaudhry: The Language of Apologies in Responses to Customer Reviews	Williams: Should We Encourage the Good or Discourage the Bad? People's Reactions to Nudges Depend on How They Are Framed
11:05 AM	He: Identities Between the Lines: Re-aligning Gender and Professional Identities by Altering Job Advertisement Language	Wang: Positive emotions and health decisions: The case of gratitude in reducing substance use	Katz: The Influence of Mean Product Ratings on Perceived Helpfulness of Reviews	Zimmermann: Digital Nudges for Screen Time Reduction
11:25 AM	Cheek: The Neglect of Non-Prototypical Sexual Harassment Victims	Woolley: Undermining Desire: When and Why Emphasizing Short-term Costs Reduces Indulgence	Goldklank Fulmer: Embracing Unintentionality: Why Focusing on Unintentional Outcomes in Malleable Domains Promotes Ideation	Saccardo: Behavioral Nudges Increase COVID-19 Vaccinations

**THURSDAY FEBRUARY 10, 2022 – CONTINUED**

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

**RECORDINGS WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE FOR PAPERS MARKED WITH AN \***

<b>Session #3</b>	<b>Track A</b> Theme: <b>Algorithms</b>	<b>Track B</b> Theme: <b>Behavioral Economics</b>	<b>Track C</b> Theme: <b>Methods</b>	
	<b>Discussants:</b> Jenn Logg Stefan Herzog	<b>Discussants:</b> Steph Tully Lamar Pierce	<b>Discussants:</b> Rob Mislavsky Ulf Reips	
1:15 PM	Atanasov: Human Forest vs. Random Forest in Time-Sensitive COVID-19 Clinical Trial Prediction	*Lasky-Fink: Reducing stigma to increase take-up of rental assistance	*Kyung: The Scale Orientation Effect: The Intuitiveness of Horizontal and Vertical Scales	
1:35 PM	Bogard: Algorithm Aversion and the Aversion to Counter-Normative Decision Procedures	Cotet: Response times in the wild: eBay sellers take hours longer to reject high offers and accept low offers	Bowen: Using adaptive assignment to make mega-studies (much) more informative and efficient	
1:55 PM	De Freitas: Deliberately prejudiced self-driving vehicles elicit the most outrage	Pertl: Everyday Emotions and Economic Preferences Around the Globe	Rothschild: Data Quality of Platforms and Panels for Online Behavioral Research	
<b>Session #4</b>	<b>Track A</b> Theme: <b>Choosing Actions</b>	<b>Track B</b> Theme: <b>Context &amp; Order Effects</b>	<b>Track C</b> Theme: <b>Revisiting Classic Findings</b>	
	<b>Discussants:</b> Clayton Crichter Cynthia Cryder	<b>Discussants:</b> Johannes Muller-Trede Jack Soll	<b>Discussants:</b> David Tannenbaum Don Moore	
2:30 PM	Goldklank Fulmer: In the Face of Self-threat: Why Ambivalence Heightens People's Willingness to Act	Bhui: A rational account of the repulsion effect	Duke: Reflecting on the Reflection Effect	
2:50 PM	Lieberman: Tangential Immersion: Increasing Persistence in Low-Attention Behaviors	Mehr: How Evaluating Specific Attributes of an Experience Changes People's Overall Evaluation	Leong: Is it a Judgment of Representativeness? Re-examining the Birth Sequence Problem	
3:10 PM	Srna: When Limits Backfire: The Ironic Effect of Setting Time Limits on Unproductive Activities	Barnea: The Prediction Order Effect: People Are More Likely to Choose Improbable Outcomes in Later Predictions	Alaukik: Polarization and extremism emerge from rational choice: Estimation as a solution to unrepresentative sampling	

**FRIDAY FEBRUARY 11, 2022**

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

**RECORDINGS WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE FOR PAPERS MARKED WITH AN \***

<b>Session #5</b>	<b>Track A</b> Theme: <b>Financial Decision Making</b>	<b>Track B</b> Theme: <b>Info &amp; Belief Updating</b>	<b>Track C</b> Theme: <b>Motivation</b>	<b>Track D</b> Theme: <b>Consumer Decision Making</b>
	<b>Discussants:</b> Wendy De La Rosa Eric Johnson	<b>Discussants:</b> Jonathan Z. Berman Mike DeKay	<b>Discussants:</b> Juliana Schroeder Ayelet Fishbach	<b>Discussants:</b> Eric Van Epps Hal Hershfield
10:45 AM	Fei: Beyond Food and Entertainment: The Effect of Budgeting Taxonomy	Rand: Understanding and reducing online misinformation across 6 continents	Healey: How Incentives Help Us Do Hard Things	Sullivan: Thinking fast about taste and slow about health leads to unhealthy choices with extensions to intertemporal choice
11:05 AM	White: Preferences for Price Complexity in Market Settings	Minson: Self-other differences in cognitive dissonance during attitude conflict	Turnwald: Do mental representations of healthy foods as pure decrease motivation to eat them?	Fridman: Increased Generosity under COVID-19 Threat
11:25 AM	Yin: How and when does a used (vs. unused) account affect consumption behavior?	Pai: The Distortionary Power of Naysaying: Naysaying and Negativity Inflate Decision-Makers' Confidence	Sharif: Work-to-Unlock Rewards: Leveraging Goals in Reward Systems to Increase Consumer Persistence	Gershon: The Illegal = Effective Heuristic
<b>Session #6</b>	<b>Track A</b> Theme: <b>Methods</b>	<b>Track B</b> Theme: <b>Vaccine Takeup</b>	<b>Track C</b> Theme: <b>Public Policy</b>	
	<b>Discussants:</b> Ellen Evers Julie Irwin	<b>Discussants:</b> Hengchen Dai Oleg Urminsky	<b>Discussants:</b> Eesha Sharma Jenn Lerner	
1:15 PM	Andre: Outlier exclusion procedures must be blind to the researcher's hypothesis	Rosenbaum: Informing patients that they are at high risk for serious complications of viral infection increases vaccination rates	Weber: Opportunity cost reminders and public policy support	
1:35 PM	Simmons: Can Consumer Research Be Trusted?	Milkman: Two Megastudies of Text-Message Nudges Encouraging Patients to Get Vaccinated	Lacetera: Engaging the middle person: The effect of providing performance feedback to customer representatives on organ donor registrations	
1:55 PM	Ramsey: Can Fabricated Data be Ignored when it is Detected?	Gandhi: A Quasi-Experiment Evaluating the Impact of Large-Scale, High-Payoff Regret Lotteries	Shaddy: When to Use Markets, Lines, and Lotteries: How Beliefs About Preferences Shape Beliefs About Allocation	

Session #7	Track A Theme: <b>Giving and Taking from Others</b>	Track B Theme: <b>Forecasting &amp; Accuracy</b>	Track C Theme: <b>Context Effects</b>	Track D Theme: <b>Consumer Behavior/Beliefs</b>
	<b>Discussants:</b> Amit Bhattacharjee Nick Epley	<b>Discussants:</b> Asa Palley Barbara Mellers	<b>Discussants:</b> Elena Reutskaja Ben Newell	<b>Discussants:</b> Ioannis Evangelidis Robyn Leboeuf
2:30 PM	Prinsloo: Tainted Donations	Campbell: Overprecision in the Survey of Professional Forecasters	*Hagen: The Trap of the Gap: People Seek to Salvage Lost Time by Holding Out for Higher Value	Echelbarger: Pennies and nickels and dimes, oh my!: Understanding saving and spending in childhood
2:50 PM	Baltiansky: Belief in Zero-Sum Happiness: Relationships to Prosocial Behavior and Well Being	Himmelstein: Proxy Scores as a Real Time Forecaster Evaluation Tool	Trueblood: Similarity-based Attention Explains the Elusiveness of Context Effects	de la Fuente: The Moralization of Debt: Some Causes and Consequences
3:10 PM	Davidai: Zero-sum aversion	Hasan: Leveraging Representational Similarity to Improve Medical Image Decision Making	Buechel: Mysterious Consumption and the Preference for (Horizontal) Uncertainty	Fox: Reserved For You: Implied Exclusivity as a Tool of Choice Architecture

**SATURDAY FEBRUARY 12, 2022**

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

**RECORDINGS WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE FOR PAPERS MARKED WITH AN \***

<b>Session #8</b>	<b>Track A</b> Theme: <b>Choices Over Time</b>	<b>Track B</b> Theme: <b>Inequality</b>	<b>Track C</b> Theme: <b>Preferences/Judgments</b>	
	<b>Discussants:</b> Minah Jung Ilana Ritov	<b>Discussants:</b> Ben Converse Mike Norton	<b>Discussants:</b> Martha Jeong Rick Larrick	
9:30 AM	Jang: Choice Delegation Over Time	Jaroszewicz: A Randomized Controlled Trial Varying Unconditional Cash Transfer Amounts in the United States	Rebholz: The Advice Less Taken: On the Consequences of Receiving Unexpected Advice	
9:50 AM	Chun: Task Duration Salience on Procrastination	Shah: Impossible Expectations for the Poor	Zeng: Hiding in the crowd: Preference for diversity in competition	
10:10 AM	He: Interactive attention processes in intertemporal choice	Shechter: The ironic effect of inequality on the regulation of resource-distribution conflicts	Roberts: Can't wait to lose: The desire for goal closure increases impatience to incur costs	
<b>Session #9</b>	<b>Track A</b> Theme: <b>Politics</b>	<b>Track B</b> Theme: <b>Risk</b>	<b>Track C</b> Theme: <b>Expertise</b>	
	<b>Discussants:</b> Kareem Haggag Elke Weber	<b>Discussants:</b> Elizabeth Tenney George Wu	<b>Discussants:</b> Celia Gaertig Maurice Schweitzer	
10:45 AM	Rand: Shared partisanship dramatically increases social tie formation in a Twitter field experiment	Ramasubramanian: Numeracy Predicts Risk Perceptions: Measuring Specific, General and Relative Risk Perceptions	Bas: Why Do People Condemn and Appreciate Experiments?	
11:05 AM	Kim: When Is Too Few a Bias? The Impact of Political Ideology on Perceptions of Fairness in Outcomes	Segal: Alleviating Risk Aversion to Uncertain Impact Donations	Peker: Extracting the collective wisdom of experts in probabilistic judgments	
11:25 AM	Yeomans: Strategies for Improving Conversational Receptiveness to Opposing Views	Wyszynski: The impact of framing, need-thresholds, time pressure, and gamble variables on loss-avoidance decisions under risk.	Martel: Does distrust in fact-checkers actually undermine the effect of fact-checks?	



## 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, FEBRUARY 9<sup>th</sup>

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

\*All\* are welcome to join our second annual Underrepresented Scholars in SJDM (*US in SJDM*; formerly *Women in SJDM*) networking event. Our goal is to foster meaningful relationships between faculty and students, especially those who are underrepresented in our field (e.g., women, URMs, people with disabilities, etc.). We hope to continue to build and strengthen the relationships between all members of our SJDM community.

We will discuss career-relevant topics and rotate groups so that everyone has the opportunity to meet several new colleagues. We will also continue our conversations about inclusion and exclusion in SJDM. Our hope is that the event will be interactive, engaging, and rewarding for everyone involved.

*This event is organized by Jennifer Dannals, Wendy De La Rosa and Alice Moon*

### THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10<sup>th</sup>

12:00-1:00 pm **Presidential Address – by Daniel Oppenheimer**

While most psychologists focus on thinking that occurs in the brain, most would also acknowledge that cognition is not exclusively accomplished by the brain, but by an interaction between brains, tools, and environments. According to the "extended mind" perspective, cognitive processes are often offloaded to various technologies, freeing our limited cognitive resources for more complex thought. Extending cognition to our environment is not new, however with recent advances in artificial intelligence and machine learning, cognition enhancing devices are being developed at unprecedented rates. For nearly every human mental ability, there are researchers developing tools to enhance it. Using augmenting technologies does not merely improve our thinking, but in many ways can qualitatively change the nature of how we think. Different media lead us to ask different questions, remember (or forget) different information, attend to different details, and interact with other people in different ways.

These types of thinking aren't inherently better or worse, but they may be better or worse for facilitating specific goals, change our decisions, and impact the effectiveness of policy interventions. In this talk, I will discuss why it is important for decision scientists to extend our frameworks to account for extended cognition, and highlight some recent research from my own lab that explores how the use of technology can impactfully affect how we think and behave.

3:45-4:45 pm **Noise Session led by Daniel Kahneman, Olivier Sibony & Cass Sunstein**

The authors will present an introduction to the topic of noise and a review of the responses to their appeal, including some that changed their mind about significant issues.



## FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 11<sup>th</sup>

12:00-1:00 pm

### **Algorithms and Behavioral Science by Sendhil Mullainathan**

Behavioral science can improve computer science; and vice versa. First, computer science is suffering from what economics suffered from before the behavioral economics revolution: existing algorithms are "behaviorally naive", built on faulty presumptions about human psychology. The result is the bad outcomes we are seeing, such as 'addictive' technologies and algorithms that display racial and ingroup biases. Empirically, I illustrate this argument with a lab study and a large-scale audit that shows sizable ingroup bias in Facebook's largest algorithm, Newsfeed. Second, conversely, I will show how machine learning can be an aid in behavioral scientists to aid discovery. I will describe a technique by which black box algorithms can help discover novel - and importantly interpretable - hypotheses about why people do what they do. The procedure is illustrated in the case of judicial decision-making, where we algorithmically discover a new factor that influences who judges jail.

5:00-6:30 pm

### **Social Roundtables**

We've got an incredible host of great topics from members of our JDM community. Here is a list of the Social Roundtable topics:

**Art Imitating Life: Lessons in Behavioral Economics From the Silver Screen** with Tyler MacDonald

**BIPOC scholars in JDM** with Kevin Jarbo

**Canceling student debt and baking sourdough bread: Using JDM research to understand why certain ideas go from niche to mainstream** with Eric VanEpps

**Deciding Under the Influence: Would the world be a better place without recreational alcohol consumption?**  
With Nick Byrd

**Effective Altruism: How can we use JDM to do the most good in the world?** With Jon Bogard

**Introduction to Psychgeist Media: Pitching and Writing Op-Eds** with Dave Nussbaum

**JDM Research on Advice and Advice Interactions** with Hayley Blunden and Christina Rader

**LGBTQ scholars in JDM** with Nate Cheek

**"Talking about Talking: Conversation Research in JDM** with Juliana Schroeder, Alison Wood Brooks and Michael Yeomans

**Work-Life Balance before, during, and hopefully after COVID-19** with Christian Gilde

**THANKS TO:** Kaye de Kruif and Kate Wessels (Conference Coordinators), Anastasiya Apalkova (Conference Assistant), Dave Hardisty (Webmaster), Danny Oppenheimer (President), Nathan Cheek, Brandy Edmondson, Crystal Hall (Chair), Kevin Jarbo, Jennifer Lerner, Tyler MacDonald, Elizabeth Perry, Todd Rogers, Eesha Sharma, Oleg Urminsky (SJDM DEI Committee), Jennifer Dannals, Wendy De La Rosa, and Alice Moon (US in SJDM), Shai Davidai (Social Roundtable Coordinator), Irene Scopelliti (Student Poster Award), Dilip Soman (Einhorn Award), Hengchen Dai (Communication and Promotions), and the ad hoc reviewers: On Amir, Kumar Amit, Shahzeen Attari, Peter Ayton, Alixandra Barasch, Dan Bartels, Jonathan Berman, Sudeep Bhatia, Charlotte Blank, Wandí Bruine de Bruin, Katherine Burson, Gretchen Chapman, Stephanie Chen, Helen Colby, Cindy Cryder, Hengchen Dai, Junyidai Dai, Jason Dana, Bart De Langhe, Wendy De La Rosa, Michael DeKay, Berkeley Dietvorst, Philip Fernbach, Geoff Fisher, Craig Fox, Ana Franco-Watkins, Liz Friedman, Mirta Galecic, Ayelet Gneezy, Daniel Goldstein, Etan Green, Kareem Haggag, Crystal Hall, Uriel Haran, Oliver Hauser, Janina Hoffmann, Alex Imas, Minah Jung, Natalia Karelaia, Uma Karmarkar, Ian Krajbich, Daniella Kupor, Rick Larrick, Robyn LeBoeuf, Tomas Lejarraga, Jennifer Lerner, Ye Li, Jingyi Lu, Shenghua Luan, Cade Massey, Nina Mazar, Joe McGuire, Craig McKenzie, Katy Milkman, Daniel Mochon, Johannes Müller-Trede, Gideon Nave, Leif Nelson, Ben Newell, Nathan Novemsky, Chris Olivola, Danny Oppenheimer, Thorsten Pachur, Hannah Perfecto, Jonathan Pettibone, Devin Pope, Crystal Reeck, Alex Rees-Jones, Taly Reich, David Rothschild, Juliana Schroeder, Christin Schulze, Daniel Schwartz, Ovul Sezer, Anuj Shah, Luxi Shen, Suzanne Shu, Joe Simmons, Jack Soll, Stephen Spiller, David Tannenbaum, Kinneret Teodorescu, Jennifer Trueblood, Claire Tsai, Oleg Urminsky, Keith Wilcox, Nora Williams, Paul Windschitl, Alison Wood Brooks, Adelle Yang, Eldad Yechiam, Charles Zhang, Jiaying Zhao

Poster Award Judges: Hal Arkes, Pavel Atanasov, Anna Balatel, Daniela Blettner, Shirley (Shuo) Chen, Charlene Chu, Paul Conway, Cynthia Cryder, Hengchen Dai, Mike DeKay, Nathan Dhaliwal, Enrico Diecidue, Charles Dorison, Caitlin Drummond Otten, Helen Fischer, Geoff Fisher, Piers Fleming, Max Gaerth, Ximena Garcia-Rada, Christian Gilde, Han Gong, Fausto Gonzalez, Adam Greenberg, David Hagmann, Robert Hamm, Lisheng He, Janina Hoffmann, Peter Jarnebrant, Minah Jung, Heather Kappes, Sadaf Khan, Hyoseok Kim, Antonia Krefeld-Schwalb, Daniella Kupor, Tei Laine, Jannine Lasaleta, David Levari, Charlene Lew, Meng Li, Zhongquan Li, Alicea Lieberman, Lauren Min, Percy Mistry, Suzanne Mitchell, Debora Mola, Melina Moleskis, Andras Molnar, Coby Morvinski, Sumitava Mukherjee, Jayant Nasa, Ben Newell, Christie Newton, Byrd Nick, Michael O'Donnell, Nerea Ortega, Asa Palley, Sethuraman Sivakumar Paramasivan, Hannah Perfecto, Ethan Pew, Mark Pezzo, Paul Price, Hagai Rabinovitch, Crystal Reeck, Agnes Rosner, Yefim Roth, Kai Ruggeri, Juliana Schroeder, Jackie Silverman, Janina Steinmetz, Kevin Tiede, Shane Timmons, Stephanie Tully, Oleg Urminsky, Eric VanEpps, Pieter Verhallen, Sarah Wei, Evan Weingarten, Elanor Williams, Thomas K.A. Woiczynski, Marc Wyszynski, Yuan Zhang, Ignazio Ziano

Discussants: Shlomo Benartzi, Jonathan Berman, Amit Bhattacharjee, Brad Bitterly, Gretchen Chapman, Ben Converse, Clayton Crichton, Cynthia Cryder, Hengchen Dai, Jen Dannals, Wendy De La Rosa, Mike DeKay, Berkeley Dietvorst, Nick Epley, Ioannis Evangelidis, Ellen Evers, Susa Fiedler, Ayelet Fishbach, Celia Gaertig, Francesca Gino, Geoff Goodwin, Kareem Haggag, Reid Hastie, Hal Herschfield, Stefan Herzog, Julie Irwin, Martha Jeong, Eric Johnson, Minah Jung, Rick Larrick, Robyn Leboeuf, Jenn Lerner, Emma Levine, Jenn Logg, Cade Massey, Barbara Mellers, Rob Mislavsky, Daniel Mochon, Don Moore, Johannes Mueller-Trede, Ben Newell, Mike Norton, Asa Palley, Hannah Perfecto, Lamar Pierce, Ulf Reips, Elena Reutskaja, Jane Risen, Ilana Ritov, Juliana Schroeder, Maurice Schweitzer, Sydney Scott, Eesha Sharma, Jack Soll, Liz Tenney, Steph Tully, Oleg Urminsky, Eric Van Epps, Elke Weber, George Wu, Adelle Xue Yang, Mike Yeomans

Facilitators: Alexandra Anderson, Ravneet Bawa, Abigail Bergman, Jonathan Bogard, Craig Brimhall, Ilana Brody, Dane Cannon, David Dolifka, Shannon Duncan, Ceylin Ertekin, Yanting He, Sarah Jensen, Julia Nolte, Farrah Madanay, Daniel Mirny, Nurit Nobel, Joseph Reiff, David Zimmerman

# **SJDM Conference Paper Abstracts**

**THURSDAY FEBRUARY 10, 2022**

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

### **Reflecting on Identity-Change Facilitates Confession of Past Misdeeds**

Helgason, Beth Anne (London Business School); Berman, Jonathan (London Business School)

We demonstrate that asking people to reflect on how they have changed as a person over time increases their confessions of past misdeeds and further decreases the tendency for individuals to excuse or justify their past actions. By reflecting on personal change, individuals can admit to past a misdeed ("I did it"), while reducing the fear that it will implicate their present moral character ("But that's not who I am anymore").

### **Cheating and Lying are Qualitatively Distinct**

Skowronek, Sam (University of Pennsylvania)

Cheating is fundamentally different from lying yet prior work has conflated the terms and considers them interchangeable. In this paper, I draw the conceptual distinction between cheating and lying and introduce a new class of deception paradigms capable of identifying both types of deception. Across three preregistered studies, I show that the distinction between cheating and lying can add clarity to our understanding of the average magnitude of deception, the behavioral consequences that follow of deception, and design of successful countermeasures. This work reconciles three conflicting predictions presently asserted in literature and offers organizations new tools for promoting honesty.

### **Honesty Pledges Reduce Cheating Through Involvement and Identification**

Peer, Eyal (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Mazar, Nina (Boston University); Feldman, Yuval (Bar-Ilan University); Ariely, Dan (Duke University)

Honesty pledges are commonly deployed to prevent unethical behavior, but research findings have produced mixed results about their effectiveness. We systematically uncover two key factors that are critical for the effectiveness of pledges: involvement (required from the individual making the pledge) and identification. Across five studies ( $N > 4,000$ ) we show how the effectiveness of the pledge is maximal when both factors are utilized, and insignificant when both are absent. We thus propose both involvement and identification can be used to predict and explain results of past and future attempts of using pledges to curb dishonesty.

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

### **Not All Experts Are Equal: Advice-Seekers Favor Experts with Direct over Vicarious Experience**

Cormier, Grace (Harvard University); Shah, Shaaref (University of Maryland); Zhang, Ting (Harvard University); O'Brien, Ed (University of Chicago); Gino, Francesca (Harvard University)

People often go to those with first-hand experience for advice, expecting that direct experience will yield greater expertise and more helpful insights. However, across a series of studies ( $N = 1,479$ ), we show that people exhibit a "direct experience bias" - they overvalue advice from those with direct experience. As a result, people seek and adopt more advice from advisors with direct experience, even when doing so makes them worse off.

### **"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)

People often avoid giving feedback to others. In five pre-registered experiments ( $N = 2,039$ ), we identify a possible reason: people underestimate how much others want to receive constructive feedback. We find at least two mechanisms that explain why people underestimate others' desire for feedback: considerations about their own experience (e.g., anticipated discomfort) and considerations about the receiver's experience (e.g., feedback not being valuable). Two interventions can enhance the likelihood of providing feedback: perspective-taking (considering the receiver's experience) or having someone else provide the feedback (removing considerations about the givers' own experience).

## **Confidently at Your Service: Advisors Alter Their Stated Confidence to Be Helpful**

Moran, Simone (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Haran, Uriel (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Mazar, Asaf (University of Southern California)

When giving advice, people seek not only to inform advisees, but also to facilitate their decision making. We propose that the latter motivation affects advisors' stated confidence. When advice is likely to be accurate, expressing high confidence is useful. But at low certainty, chances of misleading increase, rendering expressing high confidence unlikely. In three experiments, advisors in high-certainty situations stated higher confidence in their recommendations than individuals who merely provided opinions. In low-certainty environments, however, advisors exercised caution. This effect was mediated by advisors' helping motivations.

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

### **Do Startup Investors Make Systematic Mistakes in Selecting Investments? A Machine Learning Approach**

Davenport, Diag (University of Chicago)

I combine a novel dataset of over 35,000 startups (representing over \$22 billion in investment) with machine learning methods to explore early investor decisions. First, I show that startup success is predictable and VCs generally use the predictors of success appropriately when deciding which startups to invest in, but not when deciding how much to invest. Investors systematically underweight the prior experience of the founders and overweight their current activities. These mistakes are costly. Despite the large returns these investors reap, I estimate that returns could be 30% higher if investors avoided predictably bad investments.

### **How to Overcome Algorithm Aversion: Learning from Mistakes**

Kaju, Alex; Reich, Taly (Yale University); Maglio, Sam (University of Toronto)

When consumers avoid taking algorithmic advice, it can prove costly to both marketers and to themselves. In a departure from previous research focusing on when algorithm aversion proves more or less likely, we sought to identify and remedy one reason why it occurs in the first place. In five pre-registered studies, we find that consumers tend to avoid algorithmic advice on the often-faulty assumption that those algorithms, unlike their human counterparts, cannot learn from mistakes, in turn offering an inroad by which to reduce algorithm aversion: highlighting their ability to learn.

### **Machine learning methods for studying food perception and the impact of nutrient labeling**

Walasek, Lukasz (University of Warwick); Zou, Wanling (University of Pennsylvania); Gandhi, Natasha (University of Warwick); Bhatia, Sudeep (University of Pennsylvania)

People regularly make subjective judgments about the healthiness of different foods, which in turn influence their food choices and health outcomes. We use recent advances in machine learning to extract people's mental representations and associations for thousands of common foods, and to model how lay decision makers and experts judge the healthiness of these foods. We are also able to predict the impact of nutrient labels and can thus identify foods for which nutrient information increases or decreases health perceptions. Our results show how new machine learning methods, combined with survey-based behavioral data, can be used to better predict, understand and influence health perception.

## **Session #1 Track D: Thursday 9:30 am - 10:30 am**

### **Maintaining Trust When De-Escalating Commitment: Using Precommitment to Signal Consistency**

Dorison, Charles (Northwestern University); Kristal, Ariella (Harvard University); Gino, Francesca (Harvard University)

Escalation of commitment, the tendency to remain committed to a course of action, even in the face of negative prospects, is surprisingly common. We show that costly escalation can be driven by reputational concerns, specifically regarding trustworthiness. In four experiments with managers (N=2,661) we demonstrate that precommitment (specifying conditions for stopping a project) not only leads managers to de-escalate more often, but also leads third-party observers to perceive de-escalators as higher in integrity--and trust them more in a behavioral economic game. We consider the implications of this research in the broader context of social and organizational influences on decision making.

## **Predictors and Persistence of Belief Change in Response to Evidence**

Anglin, Stephanie (Hobart and William Smith Colleges)

We tested the persistence and predictors of belief change in response to empirical evidence. Participants maintained belief change in response to disconfirming evidence on capital punishment (Study 1), gun control (Study 2), and video games and aggression (Study 3) one day later. Participants were more sensitive to the strength of the evidence in the moment than the next day, for positive vs. null results. Perceived evidence quality and scientific certainty reliably predicted belief change; measures of open-mindedness and belief commitment did not. People may be receptive to evidence if they view it as strong and science as certain, irrespective of individual differences in receptivity.

## **The Downside of Doing Good: Nonprofits Have a Harder Time Rebounding than For-profits After Transgressing**

Zwebner, Yonat (Interdisciplinary Center); Srna, Shalena (University of Michigan)

Understanding people's responses to organizational mistakes is of utmost managerial importance. Although nonprofits are perceived more positively than for-profits and could enjoy a benevolent halo effect, 6 studies (N=4194) show that people are less forgiving of and less willing to transact with a nonprofit than a for-profit that commits the same wrongdoing. We propose that, when transacting with nonprofits, people expect them to do good in exchange; however, a nonprofit that does wrong violates these expectations, and people feel exploited. Thus, paradoxically, organizations that do good have more trouble rebounding after they transgress.

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

### **Diversity Targets Increase Application Rates from Women and Racial Minorities, but Hiring Managers Resist Using Them**

Kirgios, Erika (University of Pennsylvania); Silver, Ike (University of Pennsylvania); Chang, Edward (Harvard University)

Prior work suggests that marginalized group members are reluctant to apply to jobs with hiring quotas because they worry about facing stigma. However, strategic considerations may override these concerns. In a preregistered field experiment (n = 5,557), we find that including diversity targets in job ads increases application rates from women and racial minorities, without sacrifices to candidate quality. A preregistered follow-up experiment (n = 495) finds women and racial minorities believe it would be strategically beneficial to apply to a job ad with a measurable diversity target. However, hiring managers (n = 298) are reluctant to use diversity targets due to moral repugnance.

### **Identities Between the Lines: Re-aligning Gender and Professional Identities by Altering Job Advertisement Language**

He, Joyce (UCLA); Kang, Sonia (University of Toronto)

We theorize and test how a 'gender de-biasing' intervention on masculine language in job advertisements for male-dominated jobs increases gender diversity of applicants by attracting more people (women but also men) who may not strongly adhere to the male gender identity. Across a large database of 576 job postings and over 30,000 applicants from a large organization, a quasi-experiment in an organization, and a pre-registered online experiment, we find that removing masculine language from job postings leads to an increase in application rates from individuals who appear incongruent with the masculine identity - including both women and men who identified as less masculine.

### **The Neglect of Non-Prototypical Sexual Harassment Victims**

Cheek, Nathan (Princeton University); Bandt-Law, Bryn (University of Washington); Sinclair, Stacey (Princeton University); Goh, Jin (Colby College); Kaiser, Cheryl (University of Washington)

Sexual harassment is a widespread and urgent social problem with a broad range of harmful consequences, but not all victims receive the same attention, care, and justice. This series of studies shows that people hold a narrow prototype of "sexual harassment victim:" a feminine, White woman. Across lab studies, archival studies, and an analysis of a large sample of social media data, we find that people neglect and mistreat victims of harassment who do not fit with this narrow prototype, thereby denying non-prototypical victims the support and justice they need and deserve.

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

### **Choosing the Light Meal: Real-time Aggregation of Calorie Information Reduces Meal Calories**

Molnar, Andras (University of Chicago); VanEpps, Erik (University of Utah); Downs, Julie (Carnegie Mellon University); Loewenstein, George (Carnegie Mellon University)

We report results from 5 pre-registered experiments ( $N = 11,900$ ), including a field study, showing that real-time traffic light feedback about the total caloric content of a meal reduces calories ordered, even compared to similarly aggregated numeric feedback. Patterns of ordering reveal this effect to be driven by people revising high-calorie orders more frequently, leading them to choose fewer and lower-calorie items. Consumers also like traffic light aggregation, indicating greater satisfaction with their order and greater intentions to return to restaurants that use them. We also discuss how dynamic feedback using intuitive signals could yield benefits in contexts beyond food choice.

### **Positive Emotions and Health Decisions: The Case of Gratitude in Reducing Substance Use**

Wang, Ke (Harvard University); Lerner, Jennifer (Harvard University); Rees, Vaughan (Harvard University); Dorison, Charles (Northwestern University); Heckel, Emily (Harvard University); Liu, Jessica (Harvard University); Zabel, Chelsea (Harvard University); Tan, Andy (University of Pennsylvania); Kawachi, Ichiro (Harvard University)

Should one conclude that positive affect has no causal effect on health cognition and behavior, given meta-analyses revealing that none of the observed effects to date are reliable? We argue no. Focusing on decisions regarding substance use, experiments to date have examined only global positive affect, leaving unexplored the potential role of specific positive emotions. We drew on the Appraisal Tendency Framework to predict that gratitude, specifically, rather than positive affect, generally, would decrease addictive behavior. Studies using experiments and field datasets provided converging evidence. We discuss the implications for interventions and health decision-making.

### **Undermining Desire: When and Why Emphasizing Short-term Costs Reduces Indulgence**

Woolley, Kaitlin (Cornell University); Stillman, Paul (Yale University)

To motivate behavior change, traditional interventions and lay intuition suggest people should focus on long-term health costs of indulging (e.g., consider weight implications of consuming sugar). Yet many still struggle to reduce their consumption of unhealthy foods (e.g., cut down on alcohol, dietary sugar). Ten studies ( $N=5,968$ ) propose an alternative: Emphasizing short-term costs of indulging (e.g., irritability or indigestion following sugar consumption) can better motivate behavior change than emphasizing long-term costs or no costs. This strategy is effective because, unlike long-term costs, short-term costs undermine the key driver of indulging: anticipated enjoyment.

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

### **The Language of Apologies in Responses to Customer Reviews**

Chaudhry, Shereen (University of Chicago); Banerjee, Akshina (University of Chicago)

We use natural language processing to examine the linguistic features of apologies in manager responses to online customer reviews. We ask what features are essential for a response to be perceived as an apology by third-party observers. Further, we examine the relationship between apologies and customer satisfaction with the response.

### **The Influence of Mean Product Ratings on Perceived Helpfulness of Reviews**

Katz, Daniel (University of Chicago); Bartels, Daniel (University of Chicago)

When searching for information, normative models suggest one should acquire maximally informative information. However, confirmation biases can lead people to seek redundant information or interpret information in ways partial to preexisting beliefs. Product reviews is a context where this could be important in terms of how people search for and integrate information in reviews. We manipulated preexisting beliefs by varying the mean product rating, which impacted judgements of review helpfulness, the cues used to make those judgements, belief updating, and search behavior. Our results suggest there may be significant confirmation bias when searching for and reacting to product reviews.

## **Embracing Unintentionality: Why Focusing on Unintentional Outcomes in Malleable Domains Promotes Ideation**

Goldklank Fulmer, Alexander (Yale University); Reich, Taly (Yale University); Herd, Kelly (University of Connecticut)

Companies increasingly rely on the input from consumer ideation to steer marketing activities. In seven laboratory studies and one field experiment conducted with Marketing and Sales employees at an apparel company, we demonstrate a novel strategy to promote ideation. In line with Osborn (1953), we define ideation as the total number of ideas produced. We find that prompting people to focus on a history of their unintentional outcomes in a malleable domain promotes subsequent ideation (but discourages ideation in a non-malleable domain). This occurs because focusing on a history of one's own unintentional outcomes incites motivation to regain threatened control.

### **Session #2 Track D: Thursday 10:45 am - 11:45 am**

## **Should We Encourage the Good or Discourage the Bad? People's Reactions to Nudges Depend on How They Are Framed**

Williams, Elanor F. (Washington University in St Louis); Steffel, Mary (Northeastern University); Kupor, Daniella (Boston University)

Across four studies (N=1628), we find that interventions framed as encouraging good behavior seem to be more ethical than those framed as discouraging bad behavior, and people are more interested in organizations that put encouraging nudges into place. This framing effect is stronger when nudges are meant to help people than when nudges are designed to help a business. The perception that positively framed nudges are more ethical is driven by a belief that discouraging bad behavior is more manipulative than encouraging good behavior. Seeing organizations that institute negatively framed nudges as less ethical leads people in turn to be less interested in interacting with such organizations.

## **Digital Nudges for Screen Time Reduction**

Zimmermann, Laura (IE University); Sobolev, Michael (Cornell University)

Many people try to reduce their mobile usage to improve productivity and well-being but fail to achieve this goal. We present the results of a pre-registered field experiment (N=112) testing the effectiveness of two widely available digital nudges for screen time reduction. We find that a passive design friction nudge (i.e. grayscale mode) led to an immediate reduction of objectively measured screen time compared to a self-monitoring control condition. An active goal-setting nudge (i.e., time limits) led to a smaller, but gradual reduction. In contrast to the popular belief that reducing screen time has broad benefits, we found no causal effects of reducing screen time on well-being and GPA.

## **Behavioral Nudges Increase COVID-19 Vaccinations**

Saccardo, Silvia (Carnegie Mellon University); Dai, Hengchen (University of California - Los Angeles); Croymans, Daniel (University of California - Los Angeles); UCLA Health collaborators

Enhancing COVID-19 vaccinations is critical. In two sequential randomized controlled trials (RCTs), we tackle this challenge with behavioral nudges. We deliver text-based reminders to patients one day (N=93,354,) and eight days (N=67,092) after they receive notification of vaccine eligibility from a hospital. The first reminder boosts appointment and vaccination rates by 6.07 (84%) and 3.57 (26%) percentage points; the second increases them by 1.65 and 1.06 percentage points. Leveraging psychological ownership further increases vaccinations but combining reminders with a standard information intervention does not. Online studies of vaccination intentions find a divergent pattern.

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

## **Human Forest vs. Random Forest in Time-Sensitive COVID-19 Clinical Trial Prediction**

Atanasov, Pavel (Pytho, American University); Joseph, Regina (Pytho, American University); Feijoo, Felipe (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile); Marshall, Max (Johns Hopkins University); Siddiqui, Sauleh (American University)

How can we effectively combine inside and outside views? We describe a forecasting tournament comparing machine models and crowdsourcing methods in predicting the timely advancement of clinical trials, such as COVID-19 vaccines and treatments. The modeling approach, a time-specific random survival forest model, is pitted against human crowdsourcing, including the new Human Forest process that enables forecasters to select custom reference classes, query databases, review base rates, and adjust their probabilistic estimates. The base-rate-informed crowdsourced forecasts outperformed the model, yielding 32%-48% better Brier scores and exhibiting superior calibration on 28 forecasting questions.



## **Algorithm Aversion and the Aversion to Counter-Normative Decision Procedures**

Bogard, Jonathan (University of California - Los Angeles); Shu, Suzanne (Cornell University)

Often, studies of Algorithm Aversion (AA) confound use of algorithms with use of unconventional decision procedures. Across 4 studies, we show that much of what appears as AA can instead be explained by an aversion to counter-normative decisions. Largely, algorithms are excessively penalized only to the extent that using an algorithm is uncommon for that particular domain. In fact, changing the norm can reverse AA and lead to a preference for algorithms. Using these insights, we decompose apparent AA into (a) the aversion to unconventional decision procedures, versus (b) the residual veritable AA. Overwhelmingly, the driving force seems to be an aversion to uncommon decision procedures.

## **Deliberately Prejudiced Self-Driving Vehicles Elicit the Most Outrage**

De Freitas, Julian (Harvard University)

Should self-driving vehicles be prejudiced, e.g., deliberately harm the elderly over young children? When consumers make such forced-choices on the vehicle's behalf, they exhibit systematic preferences (e.g., favor young children), yet when their options are unconstrained they favor egalitarianism, which should guide AV marketing and policy? We measure an industry-threatening consumer reaction: moral outrage. We find that consumers are more outraged by AVs that kill discriminately than indiscriminately. They are even more outraged by AVs that deliberately kill less preferred groups (e.g., an elderly person over a child) than by ones that indiscriminately kill more preferred groups.

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

### **Reducing Stigma to Increase Take-Up of Rental Assistance**

Lasky-Fink, Jessica (University of California – Berkeley); Linos, Elizabeth (University of California – Berkeley)

This paper reports some of the first evidence that perceptions of stigma can affect decisions to participate in government programs, especially for racial and ethnic minorities. In a field experiment (N=62,529), we tested the effect of two mail communications on take-up of rental assistance in a mid-sized US city. Providing information about rental assistance did not significantly increase applications compared to a no-communication group. Providing information with de-stigmatizing language increased applications by ~40% and led to a higher proportion of applications from Black and Hispanic renters. In an online study, we show that the de-stigmatizing language reduced fears of mistreatment.

### **Response Times in the Wild: eBay Sellers Take Hours Longer to Reject High Offers and Accept Low Offers**

Cotet, Miruna (Ohio State University); Krajbich, Ian (Ohio State University)

Laboratory experiments have confirmed that subjects' response times (RT) reveal their strength-of-preference, and that the Drift Diffusion Model (DDM) can account for their behavior. We investigate whether the DDM can also account for choices and RTs in bargaining exchanges both in the lab and in the field where RTs are on the order of hours instead of seconds. Using a dataset of millions of eBay bargaining exchanges, we found that sellers' response times are strongly related to the size of the offer that they receive. The DDM can account for laboratory bargaining results but misses some aspects of the field bargaining RT data.

### **Everyday Emotions and Economic Preferences Around the Globe**

Pertl, Samuel (Stanford University); Urmitsky, Oleg (University of Chicago)

Emotions have been theorized to be an important driver of economic decision-making with evidence of a link between incidental affective states and intertemporal choices or risk-taking. Our meta-analysis indicates limited robustness and a failure to test generalizability. Using representative samples from 74 countries, we document global relationships between self-reported emotions and economic decisions, controlling for potential confounds. People reporting more positive emotions were more patient and willing to take risks. However, the results varied substantially across countries with the strongest relationships observed in the most economically developed and individualistic countries.

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

#### **The Scale Orientation Effect: The Intuitiveness of Horizontal and Vertical Scales**

Kyung, Ellie (University of Pennsylvania); Thomas, Manoj (Cornell University); Krishna, Aradhna (University of Michigan)

Researchers commonly use vertical and horizontal scales interchangeably in surveys. Are responses elicited on vertical scales identical to those elicited on horizontal scales? Results from five experiments (N=2198) using consequential measures such as Net Promoter Score and life satisfaction demonstrate a scale orientation effect: responses measured on top-to-bottom vertical scales are lower than those on left-to-right horizontal ones. This is because people have a more intuitive sense of the spatial-numeric orientation of a left-to-right horizontal scale than a top-to-bottom vertical scale because numeric magnitudes are associated with specific spatial orientations in the human mind.

#### **Using Adaptive Assignment to Make Mega-Studies (Much) More Informative and Efficient**

Bowen, Dillon (University of Pennsylvania); Green, Etan (University of Pennsylvania); Simmons, Joseph (University of Pennsylvania)

Social scientists are increasingly conducting “mega-studies” in which they randomly assign large numbers of participants to many treatments to determine which works best. Unfortunately, mega-studies are often too underpowered to identify the best treatment. Instead of using random assignment, mega-studies should use \*adaptive assignment\*. After an initial period of equal assignment to all conditions, algorithms are used to assign participants to better-performing treatments with higher probability. We show that adaptive assignment substantially increases the probability of identifying the best treatment, achieving similar performance as random assignment with half as many participants.

#### **Data Quality of Platforms and Panels for Online Behavioral Research**

Rotschild, David (Microsoft Research); Gordon, Andrew (Prolific Inc.); Evernden, Zak (Prolific Inc.); Damer, Ekaterina (Prolific Inc.)

In two large-scale studies (N~4,000), we compare online platforms (MTurk, CloudResearch, Prolific) and panels (Dynata, Qualtrics) on key data quality aspects that were rated as most important by surveyed JDM researchers: attention, comprehension, honesty and reliability. We find inferior quality on most aspects among MTurk (even with approval ratings filters) and superior data quality on Prolific (even without filters) and CloudResearch (only with filters). Most differences were found in attention, comprehension, and honesty. We also show how usage patterns can predict data quality and propose a framework for ongoing monitoring of online data quality between sites.

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

#### **In the Face of Self-threat: Why Ambivalence Heightens People’s Willingness to Act**

Dhar, Ravi (Yale University); Fulmer, Alexander (Yale University)

Be it the choice to ask for a promotion, negotiate a job offer, or even ask a potential romantic partner out on a date, people frequently find themselves faced with the decision of whether to approach or avoid desired outcomes that carry a risk of failure. We propose that for such self-threatening choices, people who consider both pros and cons of an outcome, that is, generate ambivalence, will be more willing to pursue them than those who consider only the positive features. We posit that bringing to mind the negatives of an outcome mitigates the threat of failure by reducing the outcome’s desirability, while keeping in mind the positives of the outcome propels people to pursue it.

#### **Tangential Immersion: Increasing Persistence in Low-Attention Behaviors**

Lieberman, Alicea (University of California - Los Angeles); Amir, On (University of California - San Diego); Morales, Andrea (Arizona State University)

People often get stuck in ruts, continuing inferior activities when they could easily switch to preferred alternatives. We investigate such behavior-change failures and identify a novel underlying cause: behavioral entrenchment, a state of increasing task-set accessibility that makes switching feel costly. Five experiments demonstrate that people entrenched in a less-preferred task actively choose to continue that task, even when given an opportunity to switch to something they prefer. This phenomenon is driven by the felt cost of change, increases with duration, and is attenuated by disrupting task-set activation.

## **When Limits Backfire: The Ironic Effect of Setting Time Limits on Unproductive Activities**

Srna, Shalena (University of Michigan); Silverman, Jackie (University of Delaware); Etkin, Jordan (Duke University)

People often wish to reduce how much time they spend on fun, unproductive activities, like social media and online games. To manage such behaviors, individuals (and even organizations and governments) may decide to set costless, non-binding limits on the maximum amount of time they would wish to spend. Building on prior work on reference points, we examine how setting a time limit actually affects subsequent time expenditures and feelings about the time spent. Six pre-registered (N=2,083) experiments demonstrate that, contrary to their intended effect, setting limits can backfire, increasing, rather than decreasing, time spent on unproductive fun activities at the expense of paid work.

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

#### **A Rational Account of the Repulsion Effect**

Bhui, Rahul (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Xiang, Yang (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

The repulsion effect occurs when the presence of an inferior option decreases the attractiveness of the option that dominates it. We formally develop and experimentally test a normative theory of this puzzling phenomenon, which is based on the idea that the underlying values of options are uncertain and must be inferred from the available information, including other options' attributes. This can help explain several previously observed properties of the effect, such as differences between qualitative and quantitative stimuli, non-monotonic effects of decoy distance, and order effects.

#### **The Prediction Order Effect: People Are More Likely to Choose Improbable Outcomes in Later Predictions**

Silverman, Jackie (University of Delaware); Barnea, Uri (Bocconi University)

People often need to predict the outcomes of future events. We investigate the influence of order on such forecasts. Eight studies show that people are more likely to forecast improbable outcomes (e.g., that an “underdog” will win) for predictions they make later, versus earlier, within a sequence of multiple predictions. This effect generalizes across various contexts and persists when correct predictions are incentivized. We propose that this effect is driven by people’s assumption that improbable outcomes are bound to occur at some point within small sets of independent events (i.e., “belief in the law of small numbers”).

#### **How Evaluating Specific Attributes of an Experience Changes People’s Overall Evaluation**

Mehr, Katie (University of Pennsylvania); Simmons, Joseph (University of Pennsylvania)

Many companies ask people to rate their consumption experiences but vary in how they elicit those ratings. Some ask for a single overall rating, while others also ask people to rate specific attributes of an experience. In five preregistered experiments, we find that people’s overall rating of a subpar experience increases when they also rate specific attributes of that experience. This occurs only when they rate negative aspects of the experience, not when those attributes are uniformly positive. Overall, people are less likely to incorporate negative aspects of an experience into their overall evaluation when they can directly rate those aspects, resulting in a higher overall rating.

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

#### **Reflecting on the Reflection Effect**

Duke, Kristen (University of Toronto); Mochon, Daniel (Tulane University); Amir, On (University of California - San Diego)

Individuals tend to be risk averse in gains and risk seeking in losses, a pattern termed the reflection effect. This is typically attributed to the curvature of the value function (i.e., diminishing marginal sensitivity), that is, how individuals process payoffs. Instead, we implicate how individuals process probabilities. Our six experiments demonstrate that making small changes to how probabilities are explained can change how individuals perceive the underlying probabilities. Ultimately, we find that this change can weaken and even eliminate this classic risk-attitude asymmetry altogether.

## **Is it a Judgment of Representativeness? Re-examining the Birth Sequence Problem**

Leong, Lim (University of California - San Diego); Müller-Trede, Johannes (IESE Business School); McKenzie, Craig (University of California - San Diego)

We show that likelihood judgments in Kahneman and Tversky's famous "birth sequence problem" reflect conversational pragmatics, not a representativeness heuristic. The original study confounded representativeness with the direction of comparison, and we disentangle this confound in a series of experiments. We find that likelihood judgments strongly depend on the direction of comparison, a pattern that representativeness cannot account for, and that judgments are virtually unaffected by removing representativeness as a cue. Moreover, we show that the "biased" likelihood judgments in the birth sequence problem reflect adaptive responses to the social environment that they are embedded in.

## **Polarization and Extremism Emerge from Rational Choice: Estimation as a Solution to Unrepresentative Sampling**

Alaukik, Abhay (University of Florida); Kvam, Peter (University of Florida); Baldwin, Matt (University of Florida)

Polarization and extremism (P&E) are often construed as arising from biases. We show that P&E occurs among decision makers applying rational choice strategies. This occurs because while extreme information lets decision makers make a choice and stop information sampling, moderate information is unlikely to do so and is thus under-represented in the information collected. A re-analysis of existing data as well as simulations gave preliminary evidence for the hypotheses. A follow-up experiment showed that polarization occurred when people had to choose between two options (choice task). In contrast, an estimation task, inferring the difference between two quantities, produces no P&E.

## **FRIDAY FEBRUARY 11, 2022**

### **Session #5 Track A: Friday 10:45 am - 11:45 am**

#### **Beyond Food and Entertainment: The Effect of Budgeting Taxonomy**

Fei, Lin (University of Chicago); Bartels, Daniel (University of Chicago)

How people mentally represent expenditures is crucial to how they budget. Across 5 studies, we investigate how people's mental representation affect their use of money by asking people to form taxonomic categories of common expenditures of money (e.g., rent, dining out etc.). We found that there is consensus in people's representations of expenditures, and that people's adjustment in their spending behavior can be represented by the distance between items in their representation. Specifically, when people overspent on an item, they were more likely to spontaneously adjust spending for items closer in representation than further.

#### **Preferences for Price Complexity in Market Settings**

White, Shannon (Facebook); Sussman, Abigail (University of Chicago)

Recent work showed that many consumers actively prefer more disaggregated (hence more complex) price disclosure formats even when these disclosures led them to select higher-price options. The current paper examines both sellers' intentions and consumer choices in a yoked pair study simulating a market setting. Sellers assigned to sell higher-price options more likely chose disaggregated disclosures, and the presence of some disaggregated disclosures in a choice set caused consumers to choose more expensive products. Additionally, we examined whether preferences for disaggregated disclosures are driven by specific fees, finding that they are not. We discuss implications for consumer welfare.

#### **How and When Does a Used (Vs. Unused) Account Affect Consumption Behavior?**

Yin, Siyuan (University of Pennsylvania); Sharif, Marissa (University of Pennsylvania)

How does a used (vs. unused) account affect subsequent consumption in the same account? We find that people are more likely to spend their resources on non-essential activities and items from a used (vs. unused) account. We propose this is because consumers naturally engage in a within-account comparison, perceiving the used account as closer to exhaustion, and thus are more likely to devalue and spend resources in a used (vs. unused) account. Thus, if the used account is relatively full, the effect is attenuated. We demonstrate this effect across several resources, including credit card reward points, gift cards, and time.

## **Session #5 Track B: Friday 10:45 am - 11:45 am**

### **Understanding and Reducing Online Misinformation Across 6 Continents**

Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Arechar, Antonio (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Berinsky, Adam (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Allen, Jennifer (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Epstein, Ziv (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Pennycook, Gordon (University of Regina); Garimella, Kiran; Lu, Jackson; Ross, Robert M.; Zhang, Jerry

We investigate how four key experimental regularities observed in US subjects generalize in a sample of N=33,480 subjects from 16 countries across 6 continents using true and false claims about COVID-19. Across countries: scores on the Cognitive Reflection Test were positively correlated with the ability to tell truth from falsehood; the average accuracy rating of 20 random participants produced an AUC above 0.85 when identifying true versus false claims; accuracy judgments were much more discerning than sharing intentions; and evaluating the accuracy of a non-COVID claim at the study outset, or providing minimal digital literacy tips, increased subsequent sharing discernment.

### **Self-Other Differences in Cognitive Dissonance During Attitude Conflict**

Minson, Julia (Harvard University); Dorison, Charles (Kellogg School of Management)

Effective judgment and decision making demands thoughtful consideration of different perspectives. Yet, people systematically fail at this task, misinterpreting the behaviors, intentions, and motivations of others (Epley, Keysar, Van Boven, & Gilovich, 2014). Building on research on naive realism (Pronin, Gilovich, & Ross, 2004), we hypothesized that individuals overestimate how much dissonance is felt by conflict counterparts, in part because they feel excessively certain in the correctness of their own views while expecting disagreeing others to experience doubt. We present eight pre-registered studies (N=3116) testing this and related hypotheses.

### **The Distortionary Power of Naysaying: Naysaying and Negativity Inflate Decision-Makers' Confidence**

Pai, Jieun (University of Virginia); Chou, Eileen (University of Virginia)

Four studies investigated whether the act of naysaying emboldens individuals to overestimate their actual abilities and inflate their sense of confidence. We demonstrated that naysayers are overconfident when giving advice on related subject, solving difficult trivia questions, and assessing their control over chance events - three distinct manifestation of overconfidence (Moore & Healy, 2008). This causal effect is mediated by a heightened sense of subjective power (Studies 1-3) and moderated by the target of naysaying (Study 4). Overall, the current research demonstrated that, fueled by power, naysayers might make unrealistic judgments and decisions that are miscalibrated with reality.

## **Session #5 Track C: Friday 10:45 am - 11:45 am**

### **How Incentives Help Us Do Hard Things**

Healey, Matthew (Washington University in St Louis); LeBoeuf, Robyn (Washington University in St Louis)

When facing two tasks of differing difficulty, which do you choose to do first? We find that people's preference for doing the hard task first increases when task completion is incentivized: People who stand to earn a bonus for task completion are more likely to choose to begin with the harder (vs. easier) task than are people who do not stand to earn a bonus. We further find that people perceive the difficult-first order to be more likely to lead to success, and that incentives increase motivation and thus the preference for the difficult-first order.

## **Do mental representations of healthy foods as pure decrease motivation to eat them?**

Turnwald, Bradley (University of Chicago); Fishbach Ayelet (University of Chicago)

What comes to mind when you think of broccoli? How about a burger? Is the dish cooked and mixed with other ingredients, or do you think of it in its purest state? Five preregistered studies show that people implicitly and explicitly think of healthy foods in their purest, least delicious forms but think of unhealthy foods in their most prepared, most delicious forms – even though nearly all foods are perceived as more delicious when prepared (cooking, mixing, adding toppings). The effect is larger among people who think that healthy foods and tasty foods are non-overlapping categories and smaller (but not eliminated) among people with more exposure to prepared healthy foods (vegetarians, foodies). Describing restaurant menu items as prepared closed the gap in participants' preference for unhealthy over healthy items by 69%. Without such description, participants assumed only healthy menu items to be less prepared (and less appealing).

## **Work-to-Unlock Rewards: Leveraging Goals in Reward Systems to Increase Consumer Persistence**

Sharif, Marissa (University of Pennsylvania); Woolley, Kaitlin (Cornell University)

In six real behavior studies, we demonstrate consumers persist more in goal-related activities when they need to “work-to-unlock” rewards - that is, when they receive continuous rewards only after first completing a few unrewarded goal-related actions compared to “work-to-receive” rewards - that is, when they receive continuous rewards after the first goal-related action completed. We suggest that work-to-unlock rewards encourage consumers to reach an earlier reference point and then leverage continuous rewards to encourage persistence once this initial target is reached.

## **Session #5 Track D: Friday 10:45 am - 11:45 am**

### **Thinking Fast About Taste and Slow About Health Leads to Unhealthy Choices with Extensions to Intertemporal Choice**

Sullivan, Nicolette (London School of Economics and Political Science)

Consumers often struggle to achieve their healthy eating goals. This talk presents a model in which attributes (e.g. taste and health) begin to influence option consideration at different times, with consequences for choice. In dietary choice, results indicate that taste is considered 450 ms earlier than health on average, meaning it has relatively longer to influence the decision process. However, longer response times allow slower-processed health a chance catch up. We extend this to monetary intertemporal choice and present a causal manipulation of this timing feature. Lastly, we present a toolbox to potentiate use of this model by others.

### **Increased Generosity under COVID-19 Threat**

Fridman, Ariel (University of California - San Diego); Gershon, Rachel (University of California - San Diego); Gneezy, Ayelet (University of California - San Diego)

During major crises, two conflicting behaviors may emerge, increased selfishness or increased generosity. In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, we study the effect of threat, proxied by the number of COVID-19 deaths in one's geographic location, on generosity. A large dataset of donations made through Charity Navigator (N = 696,942 donations) and dictator game allocations over a six-month longitudinal study (N = 1,003 participants) show that individuals exhibited greater generosity in response to COVID-19 deaths in their county. Our work provides insight into how the COVID-19 pandemic affected other-regarding behaviors and advances our understanding of the impact of threat on generosity.

### **The Illegal = Effective Heuristic**

Gershon, Rachel (University of California - San Diego); Lieberman, Alicea (University of California - Los Angeles); Scott, Sydney (Washington University in St Louis)

Across a range of product domains, we find that people believe illegal products are more effective than legal products. We show that this illegal=effective heuristic stems from the belief that illegal products are more potent, thereby leading to larger consequences, both positive (efficacy) and negative (harm). We provide evidence that this is driven by heuristic processing by demonstrating that the relationship attenuates when participants are familiar with the product. A field experiment shows that

these beliefs influence people's choices. The illegal=effective heuristic has implications for consumers, medical practitioners, and policymakers.

### **Session #6 Track A: Friday 1:15 pm - 2:15 pm**

#### **Outlier exclusion procedures must be blind to the researcher's hypothesis**

André, Quentin (University of Colorado Boulder)

Excluding outliers within conditions (rather than across the data) is a common practice in psychology and behavioral disciplines. However, this paper shows that this practice runs against the logic of null-hypothesis testing and leads to unacceptable increases in false-positive rates (as high as 43%). Simulated experiments, and a re-analysis of existing data, show that this Type I error inflation is observed across a variety of statistical tests, exclusion criterion, sample sizes, and response types.

#### **Can Consumer Research Be Trusted?**

Simmons, Joseph (University of Pennsylvania); Nelson, Leif (University of California – Berkeley)

We describe 21 highly powered attempts to replicate 10 different online experiments that were recently published in two leading behavioral marketing journals. We find that consumer research is woefully underpowered and cannot be reliably replicated; of the 10 attempts, only 1 was an unambiguous success, and 6 were unambiguous failures. Beyond these failures, our efforts uncovered direct evidence that consumer research is not transparently reported, and that it too often suffers from other methodological limitations that invalidate the presented evidence. Consumer research cannot currently be trusted. It is time to implement effective commonsense reforms.

#### **Can Fabricated Data be Ignored when it is Detected?**

Ramsey, Adam (Vanderbilt University); Trueblood, Jennifer (Vanderbilt University)

As information sharing via social media increases, individuals are increasingly exposed to misinformation which they may utilize when forming inferences. Over five experiments, we investigated whether participants could ignore information that they determined was fabricated. Participants sampled values from Gaussian distributions, attempting to ignore outliers which were inserted into the value sequences. Participants' estimates of the distributions' underlying means were systematically biased towards the outlier, even when participants were confident they detected the fabricated data. The addition of multiple visual warning cues did not eliminate over- and under-estimation due to outliers.

### **Session #6 Track B: Friday 1:15 pm - 2:15 pm**

#### **Informing Patients That They Are at High Risk for Serious Complications of Viral Infection Increases Vaccination Rates**

Rosenbaum, Gail (Geisinger Health System); Shermohammed, Maheen (Geisinger Health System); Goren, Amir (Geisinger Health System); Doyle, Joseph (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Meyer, Michelle (Geisinger Health System); Chabris, Christopher (Geisinger Health System); Lanyado, Alon; Yescharim, Rachel; Wolk Donna M.

We studied whether informing patients at high risk for flu complications, identified by a machine learning model, about their risk status would increase vaccination. Patients (N=39,717) were randomized to 1) a control condition, or to be told that they were (2) at high risk for flu complications; 3) at high risk based on a review of their medical records; or 4) at high risk based on a computer algorithm analysis. Treatment patients were 5.7% more likely to get vaccinated and did so 1.4 days earlier than control patients. There were no efficacy differences among messages, suggesting patients are neither averse to nor appreciative of their records being reviewed or algorithms being involved.

#### **Two Megastudies of Text-Message Nudges Encouraging Patients to Get Vaccinated**

Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania)

We present two preregistered field experiments testing dozens of text messages designed to encourage Americans to get a flu vaccine. These megastudies encouraged vaccination at an upcoming doctor's visit (N=47,306) or at Walmart (N=689,693). Our



results demonstrate that well-designed text reminders can boost vaccination rates by 5-10%. Reminders generally performed better when they reminded patients to get flu shots that were described as reserved or waiting for them and were congruent with the sort of communications patients expected to receive from their healthcare provider (i.e., not surprising, casual, or interactive).

### **A Quasi-Experiment Evaluating the Impact of Large-Scale, High-Payoff Regret Lotteries**

Gandhi, Linnea (University of Pennsylvania); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania); Ellis, Sean (University of Pennsylvania); Graci, Heather (University of Pennsylvania); Gromet, Dena (University of Pennsylvania); Mobarak, Rayyan (University of Pennsylvania); Buttenheim, Alison (University of Pennsylvania); Duckworth, Angela (Character Lab); Pope, Devin (University of Chicago), Stanford, Ala (Black Doctors Consortium), Thaler, Richard (University of Chicago); Volpp, Kevin (University of Pennsylvania)

We evaluate three, high-payoff regret COVID-19 vaccine lotteries within and across Philadelphia county compared to nearby counties. Residents were eligible to win but could not claim their prize unless they had received at least one dose. Residents of one randomly selected zip code per drawing won half the prizes, but diff-in-diff estimates from the first drawing show an insignificant vaccination rate increase of 1.1% over other eligible zip codes ( $p=0.703$ ). Philadelphia vaccination rates significantly increased 1.7% over adjacent counties ( $p=0.003$ ) but insignificantly increased 1.7% over Pittsburgh county ( $p=0.211$ ).

### **Session #6 Track C: Friday 1:15 pm - 2:15 pm**

#### **Opportunity Cost Reminders and Public Policy Support**

Weber, Megan E. (University of California - Los Angeles); Fox, Craig R. (University of California - Los Angeles)

We present 3 preregistered studies that demonstrate the impact of opportunity cost salience in public policy. First, participants who ranked programs in terms of priority before indicating spending preferences for those programs wanted to increase spending for significantly fewer programs than those who ranked after indicating their spending preferences. In 2 additional experiments, we show that mentioning an example of an opportunity cost in a policy description can decrease support for the focal policy only when the example is a higher priority. The effect of opportunity costs is not significantly distinguishable in magnitude from the effect of an eight-fold increase in policy cost.

#### **Engaging the Middle Person: The Effect of Providing Performance Feedback to Customer Representatives on Organ Donor Registrations**

Lacetera, Nicola (University of Toronto); House, Julian (Government of Ontario); Macis, Mario (Johns Hopkins University); Mazar, Nina (Boston University)

We conducted an RCT in Canada to increase organ donor registrations. Specifically, we tested the impact of providing ServiceOntario customer service representatives (CSRs) with information about their past organ-donor registration performance. The RCT, which was conducted in three waves over two years (2017-2019) with 694 CSRs in 80 offices and assessed the longer-term effectiveness of the interventions (i.e., wear-off after exposure and habituation with repeated exposure), found significantly positive results. A post-intervention survey revealed additional benefits but also costs policymakers need to take into account when considering implementing such nudges.

#### **When to Use Markets, Lines, and Lotteries: How Beliefs About Preferences Shape Beliefs About Allocation**

Shaddy, Franklin (University of California - Los Angeles); Shah, Anuj (University of Chicago)

When allocating scarce goods/services, firms often either prioritize those willing to spend the most resources (e.g., money, in markets; time, for lines), or they ignore such differences and allocate randomly (e.g., through lotteries). When do these allocation rules seem most appropriate? We propose people are more likely to endorse markets/lines when they increase the likelihood that things will go to those who have the strongest preferences (i.e., when they help sort preferences). And this is most feasible when preferences are dissimilar (i.e., some people want something much more than others). Consequently, people are naturally attuned to preference variance when deciding how to allocate.

## **Session #7 Track A: Friday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm**

### **Tainted Donations**

Prinsloo, Emily (Harvard University); Nam, Jimin (Harvard University); Keenan, Elizabeth (Harvard University)

We find that donors penalize charities that have received donations from tainted donors (e.g., donors who have transgressed), by assigning less moral credit, endowing less trust, and indicating lower donation likelihood. Penalization occurs even when the donor's tainted behavior occurred after the donation. We explore different charity rebound strategies.

### **Belief in Zero-Sum Happiness: Relationships to Prosocial Behavior and Well Being**

Baltiansky, Dean (Columbia University); Santos, Laurie R. (Yale University); Zaki, Jamil (Stanford University)

Does helping others deplete our own well-being, or replenish it? Here we explore the role that lay beliefs about this question (belief in zero-sum happiness; i.e., BZSH) play in prosocial behavior and well-being. In 7 online studies ( $N = 3,597$ ), we demonstrate that BZSH negatively predicts self-reported prosociality, and prosociality in turn positively predicts subjective happiness. Experimentally, we show that inducing a belief that happiness is win-win (vs. zero-sum) leads to greater charitable donations and ensuing positive affect. Together, these findings suggest that when people believe happiness is zero-sum, they ironically deprive themselves of a key to well-being: helping others.

### **Zero-Sum Aversion**

Davidai, Shai (Columbia University); White, Mike (Columbia University); Gregorich, Genevive (Columbia University)

Zero-sum beliefs affect behavior. Yet, what happens when people can freely decide whether they wish to enter a zero-sum situation? We find evidence for zero-sum aversion, the desire to avoid situations that are (or are believed to be) zero-sum. Across various contexts (economic games, market-entry decisions, performance reviews, negotiations), samples (online participant pool, MBA students), and designs (within- and between-participant, real and hypothetical decisions), people avoid situations that inversely link their and others' outcomes. Because people expect zero-sum situations to be rife with conflict, they exhibit zero-sum aversion, and this is true even when doing so is costly.

## **Session #7 Track B: Friday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm**

### **Overprecision in the Survey of Professional Forecasters**

Campbell, Sandy (University of California – Berkeley); Moore, Don (University of California – Berkeley)

Decisions about economic policy depend on forecasts of the nation's economy. In order to inform forecasting and policy, the US Federal Reserve has, since 1968, conducted a quarterly Survey of Professional Forecasters (SPF). We test the accuracy of those forecasts ( $n = 12,359$ ) and measure the degree to which they fall victim to overconfidence. We find forecasts are overly precise; forecasters report 53% confidence in the accuracy of their forecasts but are correct only 28% of the time. We employ novel methodology in analyzing archival data: we split our dataset into exploration and validation. The final manuscript will include results from the hold-out sample, as guided by editorial input.

### **Proxy Scores as a Real Time Forecaster Evaluation Tool**

Himmelstein, Mark (Fordham University); Ho, Emily (Northwestern University); Budescu, David (Fordham University)

A major challenge in evaluating the skill of individual forecasters is the lack of evaluation criterion available prior any of the forecasted events resolving. Recent work has proposed using aggregate crowdsourced judgments as a proxy criterion for the expected accuracy of forecasters, which, given a large enough participant pool, could allow forecasters to be evaluated in real time, prior to any event resolutions. We explore the efficacy of proxy scores as forecaster evaluation tools in a balanced

longitudinal study conducted at the end of 2020. We found that proxy scores were highly correlated with actual accuracy, and successfully discriminated high performing forecasters.

### **Leveraging Representational Similarity to Improve Medical Image Decision Making**

Hasan, Eeshan (Vanderbilt University); Trueblood, Jennifer (Vanderbilt University); Eichbaum, Quentin (Vanderbilt University Medical Center); Seegmiller, Adam (Vanderbilt University Medical Center); Stratton, Charles (Vanderbilt University Medical Center)

Improving medical image interpretation is crucial to improving diagnostic decisions. We analyzed data where novices (undergraduates) and medical professionals made decisions (cancerous vs. non-cancerous) about cell images. We investigated algorithms for improving individual accuracy where decisions on similar images were aggregated with image similarity determined from neural networks. We observed that aggregating responses on similar images improved accuracy for novices and not experts, suggesting differences in the decision mechanisms of these groups. Results showed that experts were more likely to give similar responses on similar images, yielding insights to the algorithm's failure.

### **Session #7 Track C: Friday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm**

#### **The Trap of the Gap: People Seek to Salvage Lost Time by Holding Out for Higher Value**

Hagen, Linda (University of Southern California); O'Brien, Ed (University of Chicago)

People often experience long gaps of time between enjoyable activities. Five experiments reveal that, paradoxically, the longer the gap since people's last time enjoying an activity, the more they demand their return be "extra special" to offset the wait causing them to delay returning. For example, participants avoided reconnecting with close friends after long vs. short gaps in contact, and declined opportunities to return to fun (and safe and available) activities as COVID-19 restrictions were lifted, choosing to wait even longer for something to better mark the occasion, contrary to economists' predictions. Prompting participants to reconstrue the mundane as special attenuated the effect.

#### **Similarity-based Attention Explains the Elusiveness of Context Effects**

Trueblood, Jennifer (Vanderbilt University); Liu, Yanjun (Vanderbilt University); Murrow, Matthew (Vanderbilt University); Holmes, William (Vanderbilt University)

Recent studies have shown that context effects (attraction, compromise, and similarity) often disappear or reverse. In this work, we show how a similarity-based attention process explains both standard and reversed context effects. When similar options receive enhanced attention, standard effects emerge. However, when dissimilar options receive enhanced attention, the attraction and compromise effects reverse and the similarity effect strengthens. We test the theory by reanalyzing eye-tracking data from Noguchi and Stewart (2014) and in new experiments manipulating similarity-based attention processes. We also discuss how the theory explains the influence of deliberation time on the effects.

#### **Mysterious Consumption and the Preference for (Horizontal) Uncertainty**

Buechel, Eva (University of Southern California); Li, Ruouou (University of South Carolina)

Challenging the notion that people are universally averse to uncertainty, we establish that people value and actively choose uncertainty in the context of mysterious consumption when the nature of the outcome is unknown. Reconciling this finding with existing demonstrations of risk/uncertainty aversion, we identify horizontal uncertainty around the nature of the outcome (vs. vertical uncertainty around the quantity of a known outcome; uncertainty/risk aversion) as being desirable because it allows the decision-maker to focus on the positive side of uncertainty: the ability to be surprised.

### **Session #7 Track D: Friday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm**

#### **Pennies and nickels and dimes, oh my!: Understanding saving and spending in childhood**

Echelbarger, Margaret (University of Chicago); Gelman, Susan (University of Michigan); Rick, Scott (University of Michigan)

Adults differ in the degree to which they experience “pain of paying”--characterized by affective orientations: spendthrifts, tightwads, unconflicted spenders. We tested the presence and stability of these orientations in children aged 5-10 and the relation between child spending behavior and parent-child talk about money. Using the child-adapted Spendthrift-Tightwad scale, we found that spending and saving orientation predicted spending behavior, that these orientations are stable across a 1-3 year period, and that parent-child talk about money mapped onto child spending behavior. We end with recommendations for next steps, including considerations to make when studying children and money.

### **The Moralization of Debt: Some Causes and Consequences**

de la Fuente, Malena (University of California - Los Angeles); Shaddy, Franklin (University of California - Los Angeles)

In this research, we examine the moralization of debt when people view the repayment of borrowed money as an ethical duty. We find that a nontrivial percentage of people exhibit a willingness to pay off debt when there is no formal, legal, or otherwise binding obligation to do so. And this propensity for what we call discretionary repayment can be predicted by the extent to which people moralize debt. Moralization is both correlated with and causally increases discretionary repayment, because it leads people to view these repayment decisions as self-diagnostic of their identities. Consequently, the effect is moderated by factors that make repayment decisions feel less personal.

### **Reserved for You: Implied Exclusivity as a Tool of Choice Architecture**

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

Across 5 studies and multiple domains, we demonstrate that framing a benefit as “reserved” for someone considerably increases uptake compared to merely informing them that the benefit is available. Building on Imas and Madarász (2020), we identify \*implied exclusivity\* as a significant mechanism driving the effect. This simple, costless framing intervention operates independently of actual market supply or demand. As such, it represents a promising new general-purpose tool of choice architecture.

## **SATURDAY FEBRUARY 12, 2022**

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

#### **Choice Delegation Over Time**

Jang, Minkwang (University of Chicago); Urminsky, Oleg (University of Chicago)

We examine previously unaddressed factors in decision avoidance and delegation of choice--outcome timing and direct utility from delegation. People are more likely to delegate choice to a decision device, even a random lottery, when choosing for an outcome to be received in the future than immediately. This increased tendency for not-choosing (i.e., delegating) is persistent even when people do not have to make a choice now, but it does not extend to choosing the default. These results cannot be explained solely by temporal discounting or the costs of choosing but are consistent with utility driven from momentary uncertainty provided by delegation and its instant resolution.

#### **Task Duration Salience on Procrastination**

Chun, Libby (Erasmus University Rotterdam); Lembregts, Christophe (Erasmus University Rotterdam); Van den Bergh, Bram (Erasmus University Rotterdam)

It has been documented that people neglect duration in retrospective evaluations. What about prospectively, especially when deciding to procrastinate on a task? In this research, we argue that people do not naturally factor in task duration in their procrastination decisions. When attention is drawn to it explicitly, however, people are less likely to procrastinate. With five studies, we show that task duration salience leads people to predict a lower likelihood of procrastination and increases task completion. We demonstrate this relationship in various contexts: with real behaviors, with self-generated estimates, when the task is more concrete, and when there is an upcoming event.

## **Interactive Attention Processes in Intertemporal Choice**

He, Lisheng (Shanghai University); Bhatia, Sudeep (University of Pennsylvania)

Recent empirical work suggests that the payoffs and delays have independent influences on the intertemporal decision process. We outline theoretical problems with such an account and argue that the decision processes must include interactions between the two attributes to generate reasonable choice behavior. In four eye-tracking and MouseLab experiments, we find that participants reliably display the proposed interactive attention and propose a Markov model of attention dynamics to capture the rich decision processes, including crucially the interaction attention. We further integrate the model with classic decision process metrics such as the Payne index and formal behavioral choice models.

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

### **A Randomized Controlled Trial Varying Unconditional Cash Transfer Amounts in the United States**

Jaroszewicz, Ania (Harvard University); Hauser, Oliver (University of Exeter); Jachimowicz, Jon (Harvard University); Jamison, Julian (University of Exeter)

In late 2020, we randomized 5243 Americans in poverty to receive no money, \$500, or \$2000, then measured the effects on financial well-being, psychological well-being, cognitive capacity, and physical health one week, six weeks, and 15 weeks later. In stark contrast to experts' (N=475) and laypeople's (N=968) predictions, our analyses reveal that the money had no or even negative effects on our prespecified outcomes at every surveyed time point. We test several explanations for these unexpected results. Our data are most consistent with the possibility that cash recipients felt stress, preoccupation, and choice overload from the decision of how to spend limited money on many competing needs.

### **Impossible Expectations for the Poor**

Shah, Anuj (University of Chicago)

People often expect poor individuals to do many things to improve their financial situation. This paper demonstrates that these expectations can be inconsistent or even logically impossible. Moreover, people judge the poor harshly when they fail to meet these impossible expectations. And this can lead people to favor inconsistent or burdensome conditions for anti-poverty policies.

### **The Ironic Effect of Inequality on the Regulation of Resource-Distribution Conflicts**

Shechter, Anat (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Gilead, Michael (Tel Aviv University); Bereby-Meyer, Yoella (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)

Coordination is fundamental in everyday life. Schelling (1960) suggested that people coordinate by relying on easily recognized focal points. We examine whether social hierarchy can serve as a focal point for coordination. We found that both territory and wealth served as focal points that facilitated coordination. Players coordinated on the equilibrium that favored the high-status over the low-status player, even when status cues were implicit and arbitrary. Because coordination without communication is so common, our results point to the ironic possibility that inequalities facilitate coordination which in turn leads to the preservation of these same inequalities (the rich getting richer).

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

### **The Advice Less Taken: On the Consequences of Receiving Unexpected Advice**

Rebholz, Tobias (Tubingen University); Hütter, Mandy (Tubingen University)

One cannot always be sure to get support on a judgment task. Whether or not one expects to receive advice, however, may affect the weight assigned to it. Across four preregistered experiments (total N = 908), we investigated the judgment processes'

dependence on the expectation of advice in the traditional advice taking paradigm. We obtained support for a positive effect of advice expectation on advice weighting in three out of four experiments. The results suggest that the conventional paradigm fails to capture a class of judgment processes frequently encountered in everyday life where advice is unexpected and therefore weighted less.

### **Hiding in The Crowd: Preference for Diversity in Competition**

Zeng, Ying (University of Toronto); Liu, Jiajia (Peking University); Lu, Jingyi (East China Normal University)

This research uncovers a novel preference in competitor choices: consumers prefer to compete with diversified over homogenous competitors, even when competing with diversified others entails a lower chance to win. We attribute this tendency to the motivation to reduce the salience of one's disadvantages. Four pre-registered studies provided supporting evidence for our hypotheses.

### **Can't Wait to Lose: The Desire for Goal Closure Increases Impatience to Incur Costs**

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

Impatience is often portrayed as the preference to receive gains sooner. But are people also impatient to incur costs sooner? Across five studies (N=1,099), people chose to incur larger costs sooner rather than smaller costs later. Specifically, participants preferred to pay and work more sooner instead of pay and work less later. We find that this preference is caused by a desire for goal closure, and thus, increased when the desire for closure was stronger, such as when keeping the work in mind was mentally costly and when completing the work sooner finished a goal. We discuss implications for marketplace anomalies and interventions to improve patience.

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

### **Shared Partisanship Dramatically Increases Social Tie Formation in a Twitter Field Experiment**

Mosleh, Mohsen (Exeter University); Martel, Cameron (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Eckles, Dean (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

### **When Is Too Few a Bias? The Impact of Political Ideology on Perceptions of Fairness in Outcomes**

Kim, Jin (Yale University); Zauberman, Gal (Yale University); Hauser, Ryan (Harvard University)

We often encounter assertions that an entity is biased against some target group (e.g., "Google hires too few women"). Across 15 studies (N > 9,000), we find that such judgments of "bias" regarding distributional imbalances depend on both the evaluators' political ideology (liberal vs. conservative) and nature of the target (whether the target group is traditionally dominant, known, or ideologically relevant). Importantly, we find that such judgments of "bias" themselves may be biased. Our findings highlight the importance of stimulus sampling and selecting the right controls and contribute to the ongoing debate on the ideological (a)symmetry hypotheses.

### **Strategies for Improving Conversational Receptiveness to Opposing Views**

Yeomans, Michael (Imperial College London); Minson, Julia (Harvard University); Collins, Hanne (Harvard University); Gino, Francesca (Harvard University)

We develop an interpretable machine learning algorithm to detect "conversational receptiveness" - language that communicates thoughtful engagement during a disagreement. Across several populations (online education forums, Wikipedia editors, local government officials) receptive writers are more persuasive, and prevent conflict escalation. To teach receptiveness, we find benefits from a static "receptiveness recipe" explaining the model, and even moreso from a personalized feedback system that evaluates their previous responses. Our results show how algorithms can be used to improve the choices people make during difficult conversations.

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

### **Numeracy Predicts Risk Perceptions: Measuring Specific, General and Relative Risk Perceptions**

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

Risk perception measurement 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 societal risk perceptions, especially in relation to new and emerging risks. Results from two studies indicate that numeracy predicted risk perceptions. Finally, a new measure of general risk perceptions was tested with a sample of 1,039 U.S. residents to explain perceptions of a novel, emerging risk (i.e., COVID-19), as well as downstream consequences (i.e., knowledge, beliefs and intentions).

### **Alleviating Risk Aversion to Uncertain Impact Donations**

Segal, Shoshana (New York University); Lewis, Joshua (New York University)

Organizations raising funds for sustainable solutions to today's issues face a major problem: donations to their causes are inherently risky in impact, and potential donors are widely risk averse. This risk aversion leads donors to prefer certain impact charities, which often do not enact change on a systematic level. In four studies (N=1,870), we show that consumers are more likely to donate funds to uncertain high-impact charities (versus certain lower-impact charities) when they make donation decisions in a broad-bracketed (versus narrow-bracketed) context, which reduces the perceived stakes of the risky impact.

### **The Impact of Framing, Need-Thresholds, Time Pressure, and Gamble Variables on Loss-Avoidance Decisions Under Risk**

Wyszynski, Marc (Jacobs University); Diederich, Adele (Jacobs University)

In an experiment, participants were equipped with a budget (points) for a given block of trials. On each trial, a specific initial amount (IA) was possibly taken from the budget by the outcome of a gamble or the choice of a sure loss option. The goal was to avoid losing points from the budget for not falling below a need-threshold (NT). Different levels of frames, NT, IA, gamble probabilities, and time limit were included. We further tested a sequential component (SC) of human risk-behavior towards NT inspired by research on animal foraging behavior. We found that framing, NT, IA, and probabilities influenced risky choices. Time limit and IA moderated the framing effect. No SC was observed.

## **Session #9 Track C: Saturday 10:45 am - 11:45 am**

### **Why Do People Condemn and Appreciate Experiments?**

Bas, Burcak (Bocconi University); Rachele Ciulli (University of Pennsylvania); Vosgerau, Joachim (Bocconi University)

We show in four pre-registered studies (N = 1,301) that people evaluate experiments based on their lay beliefs about normative standards of best practice, which leads them to condemn and to appreciate almost identical experiments. When a normative standard is believed to exist in a given domain, an experiment violates the standard and people disapprove of it. When instead an experiment is designed to discover or improve a normative standard of best practice, people appreciate it. The demonstration of experiment appreciation helps provide guidelines for promoting experiments to the public.



## **Extracting the Collective Wisdom of Experts in Probabilistic Judgments**

Peker, Cem (Erasmus University Rotterdam)

How should we combine disagreeing expert judgments on the likelihood of an event? Despite its intuitive appeal, simple averaging produces an inconsistent estimator when experts have shared information. This paper proposes a novel Bayesian aggregation algorithm where experts are asked to report a probabilistic prediction and a meta-prediction. The latter is an estimate on the average of other experts' predictions. Three experimental studies suggest that the Surprising Overshoot algorithm consistently outperforms simple averaging. Furthermore, the algorithm compares favorably to alternative aggregation algorithms in questions where experts disagree greatly.

## **Does Distrust in Fact-Checkers Actually Undermine the Effect of Fact-Checks?**

Martel, Cameron (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

Are fact-checks effective for those who distrust fact-checkers? We find that Republican participants report lower trust in fact-checkers, and that cognitive reflection and news knowledge are more negatively associated with trust in fact-checkers for Republicans than Democrats. Those who distrust fact-checkers were also less likely to choose to see fact-checks on news. Yet in an experiment in which half of participants viewed fact-check labels on news headlines, lack of trust in fact-checkers did not undermine the effectiveness of fact-checks on subsequent beliefs (assessed 1 wk later). Our results show that fact-checks may be effective even for those who report low trust in fact-checkers.

## **SJDM Virtual Poster Session #1 – Friday, February 11, 9:30-10:30am Eastern Time**

### **Affect**

1. **The Influence of Numeracy and Frame on the Affect-Gap in Willingness-to-Pay/Buy**  
Voss Jr., Raymond P. (Purdue University - Fort Wayne); Corser, Ryan (Vanderbilt University); Jasper, John D. (University of Toledo)
2. **Is the Affect Gap in Risky Choice Due to Affect or Numeric Outcomes?**  
Martin, Jordan (University of South Florida); Cumberbatch, Marcus (University of South Florida); Schneider, Sandra (University of South Florida)
3. **When Choosing to Help Feels Better than You Think: How Affective Forecasting Errors Prevent Us from Helping Others**  
Peters, Eva K. (Singapore Management University); Masters-Waage, Theodore C. (Singapore Management University); Reb, Jochen (Singapore Management University)
4. **Who is the “Optimal” Identified Victim? A Tolerable Picture and Severe Words**  
Barkan, Rachel (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
5. **When Apologizing Hurts: Felt Transgression and Reconciliation Outcomes**  
Conrad, Carlina (IE University); Li, Shike (IE University); Radivojevic, Ivana (IE University); Jain, Kriti (IE University)
6. **The Mechanisms of Affect Misattribution on Judgment and Evaluation**  
Ling, Aiqing (University College Dublin); George, Nathalie (Université de Paris); Shiv, Baba (Stanford University); Kalenscher, Tobias (Heinrich-Heine-University Dusseldorf); Plassmann, Hilke (INSEAD)
7. **More Than a Feeling: Emodiversity Improves Decision-Making**  
Pirla, Sergio (Universitat Pompeu Fabra); Quoidbach, Jordi (ESADE Business School); Navarro-Martinez, Daniel (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)
8. **Effects of Induced Mood on Attention and Decision Strategies in Risky Choice**  
Gong, Rui (Columbia University); Corter, James (Columbia University)

### **Communication**

9. **Do Stories Help Stick to Evidence-Based Practices in Decision-Making?**  
Mojžiš, Jan (Faculty of Business Administration, Prague University of Economics and Business); Houdek, Petr (Faculty of Business Administration, Prague University of Economics and Business); Frollová, Nikola (Faculty of Business Administration, Prague University of Economics and Business)
10. **Time Will Tell: A Time-Based Judgment Analysis of Peer-Reviewer Judgments of a Grant Proposal**  
Vallée-Tourangeau, Gaëlle (Kingston University London); Szigetvari, Fanni (Kingston University London); Vandrevale, Tushna (Kingston University London); Harries, Priscilla (Kingston University London)
11. **An Interpretable NLP Approach to Encouraging Civil Discourse**  
Bevis, Burint (Imperial College London); Yeomans, Michael (Imperial College London)
12. **Coaudience Neglect**

Reichel, Friederike (Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich); Schwarzmann, Peter (Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich); Weizsäcker, Georg (Humboldt- Universität zu Berlin)

13. **Facts vs. Story? How Narrative Communication Mitigate Skeptical People's Negativity Bias in Information Search**  
Qi, Honghan (University of Leeds)
14. **People are Worse at Detecting Fake News in Their Foreign Language**  
Muda, Rafał (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University); Pennycook, Gordon (University of Regina); Hamerski, Damian (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University); Bialek, Michał (University of Wrocław)
15. **Social-Processing Fluency in Voice-Based Judgments**  
Mohsenin, Shahryar (Bocconi University); Munz, Kurt (Bocconi University)
16. **The Influence of Polish Grammatical Aspect on the Perception of Event Duration**  
Milczarski, Wojciech (University of Wrocław)
17. **The Role of Controlled vs Autonomously Motivated Apologies in Transgressor Reconciliation Outcomes**  
Li, Shike (IE University); Conrad, Carlina (IE University); Jain, Kriti (IE University)
18. **Information, Argument Choice and Prior Beliefs**  
Aßmann, Leonie (University of Erfurt); Betsch, Tilmann (University of Erfurt)
19. **Are Your Two Apples Worth More to Me When They Are All of the Apples You Have?: Negotiating All Versus Part of the Sellers Endowment.**  
Moyal, Adiel (University of California - Davis); Schurr, Amos (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Moran, Simone (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Ritov, Ilana (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
20. **Collaborative and Individual Incentives on a Repeated Self-Control Task**  
Cloughesy, Jonathan (Duke University); Reddy, Aasha (Duke University); Lindemans, Jan Willem (Duke University); Ariely, Dan (Duke University)

### **Consumer Decisions**

21. **Givers' Overestimation About Satisfaction Experienced by Recipients who Receive Unearned Benefits**  
Chen, Xiaoya (East China Normal University); Lu, Jingyi (East China Normal University)
22. **It Takes One to Buy but Two to Say Goodbye: Preferring Others' Involvement at Different Customer Journey Stages**  
Kwon, Theresa (University of Pittsburgh); Liu, Peggy (University of Pittsburgh); Haws, Kelly (Vanderbilt University)
23. **On the Hunt: Search Enjoyment Motivates Collecting Behavior**  
Bocchi, Elena (City University of London); Greenberg, Adam Eric (Bocconi University); Estes, Zachary (City University of London)
24. **Laziness is Beautiful: How Consumers' Efficiency is Mistakenly Considered Lazy**  
Ciulli, Rachele (University of Pennsylvania); Lamberton, Catherine (University of Pennsylvania)
25. **Negative Publicity and Marketing Communication Sources**  
Young, So (University of Oxford); Simonyan, Yvetta (University of Bath)
26. **Shared Aesthetics: Increased Preference for Minimalism in Choices for Communal Use**

Anderson, Cary (University of Pittsburgh); Liu, Peggy (University of Pittsburgh); Min, Lauren (University of Kansas)

**27. Consumers Prefer System 2 Marketing Tactics**

Khon, Zarema (University of Bath); Chen, Yi-Ju (University of Bath); Johnson, Samuel (University of Warwick); Simonyan, Yvetta (University of Bath); Hang, Haiming (University of Bath)

**28. Refund Psychology**

Yu, Tianjiao (Washington University in St Louis); Cryder, Cynthia (Washington University in St Louis); LeBoeuf, Robyn (Washington University in St Louis)

**29. The Struggle is Real: Motivating Goal Pursuit by Normalizing Difficulty**

Park, Alexander (Washington University in St Louis); Gershon, Rachel (University of California - San Diego); Sharif, Marissa (University of Pennsylvania)

**30. When More is Not Better: Financial Constraints Jeopardize Sustainability by Increasing Preferences for Quantity Over Quality**

Wang, Yusu (University of Chicago); Sussman, Abigail (University of Chicago)

**31. Asymmetric Variety Seeking in Hierarchical Choices**

Banerjee, Akshina (University of Chicago); Winet, Yuji (University of Chicago)

**32. Price Expectations and Spontaneous Opportunity Cost Consideration**

Herzog, Nicholas (University of Chicago); Bartels, Daniel (University of Chicago)

**33. The George Banks Effect: People Prefer Dominated Options to Avoid Booking Losses on Their Mental Accounts**

MacDonald, Tyler (Boston University)

**34. The Quantity Framing Effect: How Quantity Description Affects Perceived Value**

Monnier, Arnaud (Cornell University); Thomas, Manoj (Cornell University)

**35. Choosing More Food for Others**

Ziano, Ignazio (Grenoble Ecole de Management); Liu, Peggy (University of Pittsburgh)

**Decision Models**

**36. Adaptive Behavior in Optimal Sequential Search**

Baumann, Christiane (University of Zurich); Schlegelmilch, René (University of Bremen); von Helversen, Bettina (University of Bremen)

**37. Multi-Alternative Decisions With Multiplicative Time Cost: Theory and Empirics**

Pirrone, Angelo (London School of Economics and Political Science); Reina, Andreagiovanni (Universite Libre de Bruxelles); Hay, Celia (Toulouse University); Dussutour, Audrey (Toulouse University); Marshall, James (University of Sheffield)

**38. Time preferences and survival risk**

Diecidue, Enrico (INSEAD); Hardardottir, Hjördis (University of Iceland); Islam, Marco (Lund University)

**39. Good Time, Bad Time: Do People Invest Processing Effort Adaptively in Decision Making With Opportunity Costs?**

Tiede, Kevin (University of Konstanz); Zilker, Veronika (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Pachur, Thorsten (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)

**40. Improving External Validity with Machine Learning**

Tkacik, Marcel (University of Economics in Prague)

**Experts, Algorithms, and Predictions**

**44. Credibility Repair in Advice Relationships**

Torgovitsky, Ilan (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Haran, Uriel (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)

**45. Boosting and Nudging: Interventions for Decreasing Planning Fallacy**

Say, Nicolas (Prague University of Economics and Business); Frollová, Nikola (Prague University of Economics and Business); Vranka, Marek (Prague University of Economics and Business); Houdek, Petr (Prague University of Economics and Business)

**46. Relevance Insensitivity to the Start Leads to Biased Outcome Predictions**

Yang, Minwen; Hsee, Christopher (University of Chicago)

**47. Algorithm-Based Advice Taking and Clinical Judgement: Impact of Advice Distance and Algorithm Information**

Palfi, Bence (Imperial College London); Arora, Kavleen (Imperial College London); Kostopoulou, Olga (Imperial College London)

**48. Preference For Using Predictions From Humans Over Algorithms Goes Beyond Perceived Accuracy**

Senapati, Deeptimayee (Indian Institute of Technology - Delhi); Khan, Ouroz (Indian Institute of Technology - Delhi); Mukherjee, Sumitava (Indian Institute of Technology - Delhi)

**50. Judgemental Forecasting: The Effect of Experience and Learning on Professional Forecasters**

Ozlu, Neslihan (Stockholm University)

**51. Algorithm Advice Acceptance: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda**

Kaufmann, Esther (University of Konstanz); Chacon, Alvaro (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile); Herrera, Nicolas (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile); Kausel, Edgar (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile); Reyes, Tomas (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile)

**52. On the Intuitions for First Occurrences: How Many Trials Do People Believe They Will Need Until They Observe a Probabilistic Outcome for the First Time?**

Sun, Chengyao (Washington University in St Louis); LeBoeuf, Robyn (Washington University in St Louis); Nelson, Leif (University of California - Berkeley)

**53. Preference Uncertainty + Outcome Uncertainty = Inflated Probability Estimates of Favorable Outcomes**

Wang, Xiang (University of Florida); Shiri, Amin (Texas A&M University); Janiszewski, Chris (University of Florida)

**54. How Does Training Reduce Miscalibration? Insights From The Good Judgment Project**

Karimi Motahhar, Vahid (University of Iowa); Gruca, Thomas (University of Iowa)

**55. The Prescription Gap: People Prescribe Feeling Optimistic but Estimating Pessimistically**

Miller, Jane (University of Iowa); Park, Inkyung (University of Iowa); Smith, Andrew (Appalachian State University); Windschitl, Paul (University of Iowa)

**56. Does Providing A Belief Distribution Truly Reduce (Over)confidence?**

Hu, Beidi (University of Pennsylvania); Simmons, Joseph (University of Pennsylvania)

## Financial Decisions

57. **Experiments on Targeted Wealth Management Strategies for Prospect Theory Investors**  
Moore, Jordan (Rowan University)
58. **The Trust Risk Puzzle: The Impact of Trust on the Willingness to Take Financial Risk**  
Oehler, Andreas (Bamberg University); Horn, Matthias (Bamberg University); Wendt, Stefan (Bifröst University)
59. **When and Why Evaluative Labels and Consumption Baskets Affect the Choice of a Pension Contribution Rate**  
Barrett, Adriana M. (Maastricht University); Brüggem, Elisabeth C. (Maastricht University); Jiao, Peiran (Maastricht University); Post, Thomas (Maastricht University)
60. **How Financial Well-Being Impacts Financial Communication Between Couples**  
Mishra, Nirajana (Boston University); Garbinsky, Emily (Cornell University); Shu, Suzanne (Cornell University)
61. **It Depends Who you Ask: Context Effects in the Perception of Stock Returns**  
Antoniou, Constantinos (University of Warwick); Guo, Junyang (University of Warwick); Stewart, Neil (University of Warwick)
62. **Weighing Anchor on Credit Card Debt**  
Guttman-Kenney, Benedict (University of Chicago); Leary, Jesse (Financial Conduct Authority); Stewart, Neil (Warwick University); Adams, Paul (Unaffiliated)

## Groups and Crowds

63. **How do Individuals' Confidence About Their Judgments Affect Group Judgments? Medium-Level Confidence Will Decrease Accuracy**  
Shirasuna, Masaru (Otemon Gakuin University); Honda, Hidehito (Otemon Gakuin University)
64. **Response Format in Numerical Estimations and the Wisdom of Crowds**  
Honda, Hidehito (Otemon Gakuin University); Kagawa, Rina (University of Tsukuba); Shirasuna, Masaru (Otemon Gakuin University)
65. **Cognitive Overload in Financial Decision Making: The Impact of Gender-Homogeneous and Gender-Heterogeneous Groups**  
Sitbon, Nitzanit (College of Management); Lahav, Eyal (College of Management); Manos, Ronny (College of Management); Kashy Rosenbaum, Gaby (College of Management)
66. **Know Your Network: Sensitivity to Structure in Social Learning**  
Fränken, Jan-Philipp (University of Edinburgh); Valentin, Simon (University of Edinburgh); Lucas, Christopher (University of Edinburgh); Bramley, Neil (University of Edinburgh)
67. **The Importance of Response Time Asymmetry in Collective Decision Making**  
Novaes Tump, Alan (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Wolf, Max (Leibniz-Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries); Romanczuk, Pawel (Humboldt University of Berlin); Pleskac, Tim (University of Kansas); Kurvers, Ralf (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
68. **A Crowd of 'Crowds Within': Improving Aggregated Crowd Accuracy in a Small Team Counterfactual Forecasting Task**  
Widmer, Colin (Kairos Research); Summerville, Amy (Kairos Research); Leung, Alice (Raytheon BBN); Creagh, Noelle (Kairos Research); Humez, Andrea (Raytheon BBN); Juvina, Ion (Wright State University); Bernardin, Fred (Raytheon BBN); Minnery, Brandon (Kairos Research)

69. **Wisdom of the Crowd or People Like Me? Preferences Between Volume and Similarity in eWOM**  
Sahar-Inbar, Limor (Bar-Ilan University); Peer, Eyal (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
70. **Walking in Many Shoes: How Do We Feel Empathy Towards Groups?**  
Gordon-Hecker, Tom (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Yaniv, Ilan (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Perry, Anat (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Choshen-Hillel, Shoham (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

### Health and Medical

71. **Is Stronger Religious Faith Associated With a Greater Willingness to Take the Covid-19 Vaccine? Evidence From Israel and Japan**  
Lahav, Eyal (The Open University of Israel); Shahrabani, Shosh (Yezreel Valley College); Rosenboim, Mosi (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Tsutsui, Yoshiro (Kyoto Bunkyo University)
72. **Presenting Diagnostic Alternatives Early in the Diagnostic Process to Reduce Cognitive Biases**  
Kourtidis, Ploutarchos (Imperial College London); Nurek, Martine (Imperial College London); Delaney, Brendan (Imperial College London); Kostopoulou, Olga (Imperial College London)
73. **Do You Trust an Impassive Doctor? Effects of Verbal Probabilities With Facial Expressions and Trust on Decision Making**  
Gu, Yuanqi (University of Tokyo); Honda, Hidehito (Otemon Gakuin University); Ueda, Kazuhiro (University of Tokyo)
74. **Understanding Drivers of Vaccine Hesitancy among Pregnant Women in Nigeria**  
Adeyanju, Gbadebo Collins (University of Erfurt)
75. **Nudge Me! Response to and Demand for Healthy Habit Reminders**  
Barron, Kai (WZB Berlin Social Science Center); Damgaard, Mette (Aarhus University); Gravert, Christina (University of Copenhagen)
76. **Your Money or Your Life: The Role of Message Framing in Affecting Smoking Cessation**  
Nobel, Nurit (Stockholm School of Economics)
77. **Incentives for Reducing Mobile Usage: A Rational Addiction Perspective**  
Somasundaram, Jeeva (IE University); Zimmermann, Laura (IE University); Pham, Duc (IE University)
78. **Ambiguity Aversion in COVID-19 Vaccinations**  
Zimmermann, Laura (IE University); Somasundaram, Jeeva (IE University); Saha, Barsha (Indian Institute of Management)
79. **Interpreting Time-Series COVID Data: The Correlation Heuristic, Reasoning Biases, and Support for Public Health Measures**  
Harman, Jason (Louisiana State University); Weinhardt, Justin (University of Calgary); Beck, James (University of Waterloo); Mai, Ivy (University of Calgary)
80. **Consumers' Behavior and Intentions to Change Dietary Habits Following the Israel "Front-Of-Package Labeling Reform"**  
Shahrabani, Shosh (The Yezreel Valley College, Israel)
81. **Exposure to the Natural Environment Leads to Healthier Food Consumption Decisions**  
Langlois, Maria (INSEAD); Chandon, Pierre (INSEAD)



## **Moral Judgment**

82. **Morals, Markets, and Crises: Evidence from the COVID Pandemic**  
Mahmoud, Ola (University of St. Gallen); Meyer, Julia (University of Zurich)
83. **Contractualist Moral Decision Making: Empirical Evidence from an Economic Game**  
Le Pargneux, Arthur (University of Warwick); Chater, Nick (University of Warwick); Zeitoun, Hossam (University of Warwick)
84. **The Influence of Foreign Accent on Moral Decision Making**  
Borkowska, Anna (University of Wrocław)
85. **Does Pandemic Triage Undermine Trust in the Medical System? How Lay People and Medical Practitioners View COVID-19 Sacrificial Decisions**  
Conway, Paul (University of Portsmouth)
86. **Perspective-Taking Does not Mitigate Victim Blaming**  
Houdek, Petr (Prague University of Economics and Business); Bahník, Štěpán (Prague University of Economics and Business); Hájek, Jiří (Prague University of Economics and Business); Vrbová, Lucie (Prague University of Economics and Business)
87. **Justifications of Taking a Bribe and Corrupt Behavior in a Laboratory Task**  
Bahník, Štěpán (Prague University of Economics and Business); Vranka, Marek (Prague University of Economics and Business)
88. **Market Mindset Reduces Endorsement of Individualizing Moral Foundations, but Not in Liberals**  
Zaleskiewicz, Tomasz (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities); Gasiorowska, Agata (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities); Kuzminska, Anna (University of Warsaw)
89. **Judgments of Market Ethics in a Pandemic**  
Simonyan, Yvetta (University of Bath); Smith, N. Craig (INSEAD)
90. **Why General Moral Values Do Not Predict Specific Moral Behaviour in Real Life**  
van den Berg, Tom (Delft University of Technology); Kroesen, Maarten (Delft University of Technology); Chorus, Caspar (Delft University of Technology)
91. **Saint Fund Managers Cannot Earn the License to Sin**  
Niszczota, Paweł (Poznań University of Economics and Business); Conway, Paul (Florida State University)

## **Policy and Politics**

92. **Wishful Thinking in the 2020 U.S. Presidential Election: Does Perspective Taking Mitigate the Preference-Expectation Link?**  
Smith, Andrew (Appalachian State University); Windschitl, Paul (University of Iowa)
93. **Wishful Thinking in the 2020 U.S. Presidential Election: Does the Preference-Expectation Link Change Over Time?**  
Plowman, Kailey (Appalachian State University); Smith, Andrew (Appalachian State University); Windschitl, Paul (University of Iowa)

94. **Quality of Voting Decisions in 16-75 Year Old Germans Before the 2021 Federal Election**  
Anna Lang (University of Erfurt)
96. **Frequency of enforcement is more important than the severity of punishment in reducing violation behavior**  
Teodorescu, Kinneret (Technion); Plonsky, Ori (Technion); Ayal, Shahar (Interdisciplinary Center); Barkan, Rachel (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
99. **It's Not Me, It's You: Awareness of Being Nudged Results in Oppositional Changes in Self-Perceptions**  
Haltman, Cory (Ohio State University); Reczek, Rebecca (Ohio State University); Lamberton, Cait (University of Pennsylvania)
100. **How Reasonable Are Police Officers? How Prior Experiences and Jury Instructions Affect Americans' Judgments**  
Spruill, Mikaela (Cornell University); Lewis Jr., Neil (Cornell University)

### **Prosocial Behavior**

101. **Attributional Ambiguity as Moral Wiggle Room**  
tho Pesch, Fiona (Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods); Dana, Jason (Yale University)
102. **When Measuring Backfires: Moral Aversion to Quantification in Sacred Domains**  
Draga, Solomiya (University of Toronto); Ruttan, Rachel (University of Toronto)
103. **Is it all About Appearance? Limited Cognitive Control and Information Advantage Reveal Self-Serving Reciprocity**  
Katzir, Maayan (Bar-Ilan University); Cohen, Shachar (Bar-Ilan University); Halali, Eliran (Bar-Ilan University)
104. **Can Beggars Be Choosers? How Donors Respond to Recipient Requests for Different Aid**  
Kassirer, Samantha (Kellogg School of Management); Schroeder, Juliana (University of California - Berkeley)
105. **Perceived Scarcity And Cooperation Contextualized to the COVID-19 Pandemic.**  
Civai, Claudia (London South Bank University); Caserotti, Marta (University of Padova); Carrus, Elisa (London South Bank University); Huijsmans, Inge (Radboud University); Rubaltelli, Enrico (University of Padova)
106. **Using Benchmarks to Mitigate Overhead Aversion and Increase Donations**  
Bas, Burcak (Bocconi University); Estes, Zachary (City University of London); Krishna, Aradhna (University of Michigan)
107. **How Different Subsidies Promote Charitable Giving: Evidence From Public Good Games**  
Bernardic, Ursa (University of Geneva); Lebreton, Mael (University of Geneva); Lideikyte-Huber, Giedre (University of Geneva); Peter, Henry (University of Geneva); Ugazio, Giuseppe (University of Geneva)
109. **The Competence Curse: Need Misattribution Explains Why Donors Fail to Reward Effective Charities**  
Zhang, Lijun (Shirley) (Nanyang Technological University); Allard, Thomas (Nanyang Technological University); Hardisty, David (University of British Columbia)
110. **Altruistic Cooperation and Related Prosocial Behaviors Are (Mis)perceived as Signs of General Intelligence**  
Kang, Polly (National University of Singapore); Daniels, David (National University of Singapore)

## **Risk Taking, Risk Perception, and Risk Preference**

- 111. Underweighting Rare Events in Repeated Strategic Games From Experience**  
Plonsky, Ori (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology); Roth, Yefim (University of Haifa)
- 112. Time and Risk Perceptions Mediate the Causal Impact of Objective Delay on Delay Discounting**  
Jiang, Jingya (Zhejiang University); Dai, Junyi (Zhejiang University)
- 113. Adult Age Differences in Monetary Decisions with Real and Hypothetical Reward**  
Horn, Sebastian (University of Zurich); Freund, Alexandra (University of Zurich)
- 114. The Repeated Gambles Task: A Measure of Individual Differences in Normative Decision Making**  
McCormick, Michael (Troy University)
- 115. Age Differences in Risk-Taking Propensity: A Coordinated Analysis of Longitudinal Panels**  
Liu, Yunrui (University of Basel); Bagañi, Alexandra (University of Basel); Son, Gayoung (University of Basel); Kapoor, Madlaina (University of Basel); Mata, Rui (University of Basel)
- 116. Parameter Interactions in the Cumulative Prospect Theory**  
Babula, Elżbieta (University of Gdansk); Park, Juhyun (ENSIIE & LaMME)
- 117. The Zero Effect: An Eye-Tracking Study of Affect and Motivation in Risky Choices**  
Ludwig, Jonas (University of Würzburg); Jaudas, Alexander (Zeppelin University Friedrichshafen); Achtziger, Anja (Zeppelin University Friedrichshafen)
- 118. Foreign Language does not Affect Gambling-Related Judgments**  
Muda, Rafał (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University); Walker, Alexander (University of Waterloo); Fugelsang, Jonathan (University of Waterloo); Hamerski, Damian (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University); Białek, Michał (University of Wrocław)
- 119. Approaching Hot Hand with a Cool Head**  
Bako, Barna (Corvinus University of Budapest); Sandor Csaba, Mate
- 120. A Meta-Analysis of the Temporal Stability of Risk Preference**  
Bagañi, Alexandra (University of Basel); Liu, Yunrui (University of Basel); Son, Gayoung (University of Basel); Kapoor, Madlaina (University of Basel); Bürkner, Paul-Christian (University of Stuttgart); Mata, Rui (University of Basel)
- 121. Privacy Decision-Making in Digital Markets: Eliciting Individuals' Preferences for Transparency**  
Sachs, Nikolai (University of Passau); Schnurr, Daniel (University of Passau)
- 122. Risk and Ambiguity Preferences in Chimpanzees**  
Haux, Lou M. (Max Planck Institute); Engelmann, Jan M. (University of California - Berkeley); Arslan, Ruben (Max Planck Institute); Hertwig, Ralph (Max Planck Institute); Herrmann, Esther (University of Portsmouth)
- 123. Psychological Drivers of Individual Differences in Risk Perception: A Systematic Case Study Focusing on 5G**  
Renato, Frey (University of Basel)
- 325. Uncertainty Explains Social Information Use Across Adolescence**  
Ciranka, Simon (Max Planck Institute); van den Bos, Wouter (University of Amsterdam)

## **Social Judgment**

125. **The Mere Audience-Size Effect: Actors' Competence is Nonnormatively Inferred by Audience Size**  
Qiu, Tian (East China Normal University); Lu, Jingyi (East China Normal University)
126. **Perspective Taking Improves Criteria Generation in Value-Focused Decision-Making**  
Hájek, Jiří (Prague University of Economics and Business); Houdek, Petr (Prague University of Economics and Business); Bahník, Štěpán (Prague University of Economics and Business); Vrbová, Lucie (Prague University of Economics and Business)
127. **Error Reporting and Interpersonal Perception**  
Ling, Bin (Hohai University)
128. **Unrealistic Optimistic? On the Contrary, Watson, People are Pessimistic about Everyone but Themselves.**  
Haase, Niels (University of Erfurt)
129. **Mispredicting Others' Evaluations: Overestimation of the Contrast Effect**  
Chen, Yuqi (East China Normal University); Lu, Jingyi (East China Normal University)
130. **Sunk Cost Effect in Social Situations**  
Biesiada, Emilia
131. **The Better than Average Effect (BTA) in Children's Self-Evaluation of their Prosociality**  
Sabato, Hagit (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Levy, Bar (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Bereby-Meyer, Yoella (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Kogut, Tehila (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
132. **The Benefits of Getting Perspective: Recipients Prefer Requested Gifts, So Why are Givers Reluctant to Ask?**  
Leng, Yanyi (Washington University in St Louis); Echelbarger, Margaret (University of Chicago); Epley, Nicholas (University of Chicago)
133. **Measuring Perspective-Taking with Perspective-Faking: The Ideological Turing Test**  
Mastroianni, Adam (Columbia University); Dana, Jason (Yale University)
134. **Are Critics Credible? Negative Sources are Perceived to be Less Credible**  
Kim, Junha (Ohio State University); Goodman, Joseph (Ohio State University)
135. **Interpersonal Streaks as Effective Social Norms**  
Levari, David (Harvard University); Norton, Michael (Harvard University)

#### Sustainability

136. **Consumer Attitudes, Perceptions & Willingness to Pay for Bio-Based Plastics**  
Zwicker, Maria V. (University of Amsterdam); Brick, Cameron (University of Amsterdam); Gruter, Gert-Jan (University of Amsterdam); van Harreveld, Frenk (University of Amsterdam)
137. **Going ESG: The Economic Value of ESG Policy Adoption**  
Finger, Maya (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Rosenboim, Mosi (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
139. **Giving Lucky a Name and a Face: Increasing Animal Advocacy Activism Among Meat-Eaters Using the Identifiable Victim Effect**  
Cohen, Rakefet (Bar-Ilan University); Halali, Eliran (Bar-Ilan University)

## Thinking and Reasoning

- 140. Tell Us What You Really Think: A Think Aloud Protocol Analysis of the Verbal Cognitive Reflection Test**  
Byrd, Nick (Stevens Institute of Technology); Gongora, Gabriella (Florida State University); Joseph, Brianna (Florida State University); Sirota, Miroslav (University of Essex)
- 141. Tracking the Intention-Behavior Gap**  
Wilson, Daniel (University of Toronto); Hutcherson, Cendri (University of Toronto)
- 142. Intuitive, Not Analytical Thinking, Predicts Decision Satisfaction In Real-World Choices**  
Gregory, Claire (University of Surrey); Banks, Adrian (University of Surrey)
- 143. Nudges for People Who Think**  
Szollosi, Aba (University of Edinburgh); Camilleri, Adrian (University of Technology Sydney); Wang-Ly, Nathan (University of New South Wales); Newell, Ben (University of New South Wales)
- 144. Generating and Evaluating Hypothesis Testing Strategies**  
Szollosi, Aba (University of Edinburgh); Bramley, Neil (University of Edinburgh)
- 145. Misunderstanding of Place Value Can Explain Logarithmic Compression in Symbolic Number Judgments**  
Oberholzer, Yvonne (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology); Lindskog, Marcus (Uppsala University); Scheibehenne, Benjamin (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology)
- 146. Hindsight Bias in the Absence of Outcome Knowledge**  
Kreis, Barbara K. (University of Mannheim); Pachur, Thorsten (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Groß, Julia (University of Mannheim)
- 147. An Attempt to Replicate the Effect of (Process) Accountability on Loss Aversion in 3 Studies. Process Accountability's Potential to Improve Judgement and Decision Quality Seems to be Less Robust Than Previously Thought**  
Rollwage, Johannes (Georg August University Göttingen); Schulz-Hardt, Stefan (Georg August University Göttingen); Häusser, Jan (Justus Liebig University Giessen)
- 148. Making Debiasing Possible: Insight From the Foreign Language Effect**  
Bialek, Michal (University of Wrocław)
- 149. Reason Based Defaults**  
Desiraju, Shweta (University of Chicago); Dietvorst, Berkeley (University of Chicago)
- 150. Framing, Fast and Slow**  
Lawson, M Asher (Duke University); Larrick, Richard P (Duke University); Soll, Jack B (Duke University); Soll, Justin (University of Chicago)
- 151. Pernicious Problems with Premortems: Self-serving Bias in a Popular Debiasing Strategy**  
Gandhi, Linnea (University of Pennsylvania); Duke, Annie (University of Pennsylvania); Schweitzer, Maurice (University of Pennsylvania)

## Workplace and Motivation

- 152. Decision Confidence Predicts Career Outcomes Better than Decision-Making Rationality**  
Kiseleva, Meg (Birkbeck, University of London); Teoh, Kevin (Birkbeck, University of London); Dewberry, Chris (Independent researcher)
- 153. Demystifying Natural Talent: People Learn More from “Strivers” than from “Naturals”**  
Tolsa Caballero, Nuria (University College London); Tsay, Chia-Jung (University College London)
- 154. Time Reference Points in the Nonspecific Goal Pursuits**  
Abilova, Almira (Erasmus University Rotterdam); Lembregts, Christophe (Erasmus University Rotterdam)
- 155. Gender Bias in Perception of Competence in Take-Over Dilemma**  
Frollová, Nikola (Vienna University of Economics and Business, Prague University of Economics and Business); Hajdu, Gergely (Vienna University of Economics and Business); Houdek, Petr (Prague University of Economics and Business)
- 156. Strategically Influence Others?**  
Goh, E-Yang (National University of Singapore); Daniels, David (National University of Singapore)
- 157. Is the Antidote Also the Poison? Downstream Effects of Blind Hiring**  
Jha, Nilotpal (Singapore Management University); Loo, Charis (Boston University); Reb, Jochen (Singapore Management University)
- 158. Running a Longer Race: A Potential Intervention to Eliminate Class-Based Bias in Hiring Decisions**  
Goya-Tocchetto, Daniela (Duke University); Davidai, Shai (Columbia University)
- 159. Loss Framing and Social Norms Nudges to Encourage Enrollment in an Employee Wellness Program: A Pragmatic Trial**  
Santos, Henri C. (Geisinger Health System); Goren, Amir (Geisinger Health System); Meyer, Michelle N. (Geisinger Health System); Chabris, Christopher F. (Geisinger Health System)

**Communication**

- 160. Misarticulation: Theory and Evidence**  
Batista, Rafael (University of Chicago); Mittal, Aastha (University of California - Berkeley); Schroeder, Juliana (University of California - Berkeley); Mullainathan, Sendhil (University of Chicago)
- 161. A Typology of Reference Points Used by CEOs to Interpret Firm-Level Performance Feedback and the Relation to Strategic Change**  
Blettner, Daniela (Simon Fraser University); Gollisch, Simon (Hochschule Ansbach)
- 162. Jargon Use is Predicted by Both Local and Global Status Concerns**  
Brown, Zachariah (Columbia University); Anicich, Eric (University of Southern California); Galinsky, Adam (Columbia University)
- 163. Agentic Storytelling: What we Tell Children and who they See Succeed**  
Richardson, Lauren (University of California - Berkeley); Schroeder, Juliana (University of California - Berkeley)
- 164. Overestimation of Gossip Influence**  
Choi, Andrew (University of California - Berkeley); Mishra, Sonya (University of California - Berkeley); Schroeder, Juliana (University of California - Berkeley)
- 165. Retelling Uncertainty: Numerical Formats Improve Serial Reproduction Of Probability Compared To Verbal Formats**  
Salmen, Karolin (Heidelberg University); Dhami, Mandeep K. (Middlesex University); Fiedler, Klaus (Heidelberg University)
- 166. Shapes of Valuable Answers**  
Boyce-Jacino, Christina (Carnegie Mellon University); Chapman, Gretchen (Carnegie Mellon University); DeDeo, Simon (Carnegie Mellon University)
- 167. How Should Time Estimates be Structured to Maximize People's Satisfaction?**  
Hu, Beidi (University of Pennsylvania); Gaertig, Celia (University of California - Berkeley); Dietvorst, Berkeley (University of Chicago)
- 168. What's Meant vs. Heard When Communicating Busyness**  
Trupia, Maria Giulia (IESE Business School); Mogilner, Cassie (University of California - Los Angeles); Engeler, Isabelle (IESE Business School)
- 169. Source Memory is More Accurate for Subjective Claims than for Objective Claims**  
Mirny, Daniel (University of California - Los Angeles); Spiller, Stephen (University of California - Los Angeles)
- 170. Anecdotes Ushered in Marijuana Legalization: A Machine Learning-Aided Big Data Analysis of Reddit Discourse (2008-2019)**  
Hemmatian, Babak (Brown University); Srivastava, Aryan (Brown University); Goodman, Nathaniel (Brown University); Lee, Jonathan (Brown University); Eickhoff, Carsten (Brown University); Sloman, Steven A. (Brown University)
- 171. Honest Hypocrites: When and How We Learn to Value Hypocrisy**  
Huppert, Elizabeth (University of Chicago); Lister, Solomon (University of Chicago); Levine, Emma (University of Chicago); Shaw, Alex (University of Chicago)

- 172. “Zebra” is Probably More Memorable than “Tick”: How Accurate Are People When Making Memorability Predictions?**  
Aka, Ada (University of Pennsylvania); Bhatia, Sudeep (University of Pennsylvania); McCoy, John P. (University of Pennsylvania)
- 173. Instrumentality Killed The Cat (but Curiosity Saved It): The Role of Showcasing Curiosity in Information-Gathering**  
Guenoun, Bushra (Harvard University); Gino, Francesca (Harvard University); Harrison, Spencer (INSEAD)
- 324. Dialogue vs. Debate: Causes and Consequences of Two Approaches to Disagreement**  
Wald, Kristina (University of Chicago); Apalkova, Anastasiya (University of Chicago); Zhao, Xuan (Stanford University); Caruso, Heather (University of California – Los Angeles); Risen, Jane (University of Chicago)

### **Consumer Decisions**

- 174. Individual Differences in Quality-Quantity Trade-Offs**  
Dias, Rodrigo (Duke University); Sharma, Eesha (San Diego State University); Fitzsimons, Gavan (Duke University)
- 175. Variety Increases Maximizing by Making Choices Feel More Self-Expressive**  
McMahon, Casey (Princeton University); Cheek, Nathan (Princeton University)
- 176. The Bundle Halo Effect: Why Bundles Are More Attractive Than the Same Items Offered Separately**  
Shaddy, Franklin (University of California - Los Angeles); Tjoa, Stephanie (University of California - Los Angeles)
- 177. Inclusion of Brand in Self as a Measure of Future Consumer Behavior**  
Sin, Alice (California State University - Northridge); Ross, Bryan J. (California State University - Northridge); Rutchick, Abraham M. (California State University - Northridge)
- 178. Autonomous Properties of Identity**  
Kettle, Keri (University of Ottawa); Morgan, Carter (University of South Florida); Reed, Americus (University of Pennsylvania)
- 179. Four Stars: Out of Five, but of What?**  
Meister, Matt (University of Colorado Boulder); Reinholtz, Nicholas S. (University of Colorado Boulder)
- 180. How Threshold versus Percentage Promotion Framings affect Coupon Usage**  
Yi, Shangwen (University of British Columbia); Allard, Thomas (Nanyang Technological University); Hardisty, David (University of British Columbia); Griffin, Dale (University of British Columbia)
- 181. Revenge Fueled Shopping Decisions in a Post-Pandemic Marketplace**  
He, Xin (University of Central Florida); Klucarova, Sona (Montpellier Business School); Gong, Baiyun (Nova Southeastern University)
- 182. Biting the Bullet: Consumers' Responses to Mass Shootings**  
Light, Nicholas (Portland State University); Pomerance, Justin (University of New Hampshire); Williams, Lawrence (University of Colorado Boulder)
- 183. Digital Natives, Leave that Cash at Home: Discretionary Purchase Payment Preferences by Generation**  
Ratkiewicz, Sidney (Duke University); Bolton, Margaret (Duke University); Zhao, Jiayu (Duke University); Ariely, Dan (Duke University)



- 184. Consumer Judgments of Product Complexity, Risk, and Performance**  
Light, Nicholas (Portland State University)
- 185. Say No, Follow Your Heart: Rejection Increases Reliance on Subjective Taste versus Objective Cues**  
Park, Jen (Stanford Graduate School of Business); Simonson, Itamar (Stanford Graduate School of Business)
- 186. It's Wasteful: When Talking about Product Disposal Hurts Product Evaluations**  
Chang, Sylvia (University of Washington); Agrawal, Nidhi (University of Washington)
- 187. Exploding Deals: Consumer Response to Time-Limited Promotional Offers**  
Kim, Hyoseok (University of Alberta); Häubl, Gerald (University of Alberta)
- 188. When and Why Consumers Prefer to Interact With Artificial Intelligence Over Human Service Providers**  
Jin, Jianna (Ohio State University); Walker, Jesse (Ohio State University); Reczek, Rebecca (Ohio State University)
- 189. The Deferral Momentum Effect: Consequences of Choice Deferral**  
Singh, Tanya (Concordia University); Roux, Caroline (Concordia University)

#### **Decision Models**

- 190. Running it Twice (or Thrice): Double-Header and Triple-Header Baseball Arbitration**  
Hasday, Michael (DeSales University)
- 191. Measuring Model Complexity in Terms of Predictions: A Counterintuitive Result For The Luce-Choice Rule**  
Villarreal, Manuel (University of California - Irvine); Michael, Lee (University of California - Irvine)
- 192. Using Cognitive Modeling to Improve the Wisdom of the Crowd in Bandit Problems**  
Westfall, Holly (University of California - Irvine); Lee, Michael (University of California - Irvine)
- 193. (In)ability of the Win-Stay-Lose-Shift Heuristic to Predict Domain Differences in Exploratory Search: Descriptive and Mechanistic Accounts**  
Fronzek, Alexandra F. (Stony Brook University); Luhmann, Christian C. (Stony Brook University)
- 194. A Reference Value Theory of Sequential Choice**  
Amir, On (University of California - San Diego); Morvinski, Coby (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Weingarten, Evan (Arizona State University)
- 195. Context Effects with Prior Experience of Options**  
Liu, Yanjun (Vanderbilt University); Trueblood, Jennifer (Vanderbilt University)
- 196. Gaze dynamics in many-option choice**  
Zhao, Joyce Wenjia (Ohio State University); Thomas, Armin (Stanford University); Bhatia, Sudeep (University of Pennsylvania); Krajbich, Ian (Ohio State University)
- 197. Are Preference Reversals due to Decision Contexts or Elicitation Procedures?**  
Lee, Chang-Yuan (Boston University); Mazar, Nina (Boston University); Morewedge, Carey (Boston University)
- 198. Two-Faced: A Value-Based Computational Model of Emotional Expression and Suppression**  
Teoh, Yi Yang (University of Toronto); Hutcherson, Cendri (University of Toronto)

- 199. The (In)stability of Risk Preferences in Lottery Choice Tasks**  
Krefeld-Schwalb, Antonia (Columbia University); Bogdanski, Piotr (University of Warwick); Walasek, Lukasz (University of Warwick); Konstantinidis, Emmanouil (University of Warwick)
- 200. Attentional Shifts Explain Amplified Framing Effects Under Time Pressure**  
Roberts, Ian (University of Toronto); Teoh, Yi Yang (University of Toronto); Hutcherson, Cendri (University of Toronto)

### **Experts, Algorithms, and Predictions**

- 201. Confidently Conspiratorial?**  
Binnendyk, Jabin (University of Regina); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Pennycook, Gordon (University of Regina)
- 202. A Look into How a Human-in-the-Loop Experience May Alleviate Algorithm Aversion**  
Hussein, Yasmin (Fordham University); Budescu, David (Fordham University)
- 203. Fake Experts Elicit Judgment Conformity, Confidence, and Source Trust**  
van der Valk, Alexandra (University of Waterloo); Bourgeois, David (Saint Mary's University); Carroll, Steven (Saint Mary's University)
- 204. The Compensatory Nature of Algorithm Aversion: Effects of Accuracy, Wait Time, Severity, and Sense of Uniqueness on Choice of Medical Provider**  
Pezzo, Mark (University of South Florida); Beckstead, Jason (University of South Florida); Brooks, Tara (University of South Florida)
- 205. Failure to Replicate the Basic Dilution Effect in GPA Predictions**  
Childers, Marie (Bowling Green State University); Freier, Lindsey (Bowling Green State University); Stevenor, Brent (Bowling Green State University); Shea, Michael (Bowling Green State University); Melick, Sarah (Bowling Green State University); Highhouse, Scott (Bowling Green State University)
- 206. Rational Biases in Expert and Novice Predictions for NFL Games**  
Montgomery, Lauren (University of California - Irvine); Lee, Michael (University of California - Irvine)
- 207. People Express More Bias in Their Predictions than in Their Likelihood Judgments**  
Park, Inkyung (University of Iowa); Windschitl, Paul (University of Iowa); Smith, Andrew (Appalachian State University); Miller, Jane (University of Iowa); O'Rourke Stuart, Jillian (Virginia Military Institute); Biangmano, Mark (University of Iowa)
- 208. Can we Tell the Difference Between Human and Machine Generated Art?**  
Samo, Andrew (Bowling Green State University); Highhouse, Scott (Bowling Green State University)
- 209. How Pictogram Arrangements Impact Individuals' Optimism and Judgments**  
Jain, Gaurav (Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute); Shrivastava, Sunaina (Manhattan College); Tolun, Zeynep (Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute)
- 210. Failing to Explain One Phenomenon Reduces Self-Reported Understanding of Other Phenomena: an Illusion of Explanatory Breadth?**  
Meyers, Ethan (University of Waterloo); Gretton, Jeremy (University of Waterloo); Budge, Joshua (University of Waterloo); Fugelsang, Jonathan (University of Waterloo); Koehler, Derek (University of Waterloo)
- 211. Exploring the Influence of Science Curiosity on Motivated Reasoning**  
Goodwin, Raleigh (University of Oregon); Peters, Ellen (University of Oregon)

- 212. High Stakes Overconfidence**  
Moore, Don (University of California - Berkeley); Campbell, Sandy (University of California - Berkeley)
- 213. Learning Best Practices: Can Machine Learning Improve Human Decision-Making?**  
Bastani, Hamsa (University of Pennsylvania); Bastani, Osbert (University of Pennsylvania); Sinchaisri, Park (University of California - Berkeley)
- 214. When Metrics Matter: Elicitation Metric Influences Uncertainty Estimates**  
Zimmerman, David (University of California - Los Angeles); Spiller, Stephen (University of California - Los Angeles); Reinholtz, Nicholas (University of Colorado Boulder); Maglio, Sam (University of Toronto)
- 215. Exponential Numeracy and the Ability to Forecast COVID-19**  
Bitterly, Brad (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); VanEpps, Eric (University of Utah); Schweitzer, Maurice (University of Pennsylvania)
- 216. Lay Perceptions of Scientific Findings: Swayed by the Crowd?**  
Alzahawi, Shilaan (Stanford Graduate School of Business); Monin, Benoît (Stanford Graduate School of Business)

### **Financial Decisions**

- 217. Doomscrolling of Consequence: How our Devices and Information Format Drive our Financial Knowledge**  
Harvey, Joseph (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau); Salisbury, Linda (Boston College)
- 218. Motivating or Inhibiting? The Impact of Deadlines on Retirement Plan Enrollment Rates**  
Shah, Kahini (Duke University); Torre, Jianna (Duke University); Beasley, Mariel (Duke University); Ariely, Dan (Duke University)
- 219. The Impact and Management of Investment Losses**  
Gudapati, Sai (University of Houston); Rude, Dale (University of Houston)
- 220. Behavioral Consequences and Intervention of Financial Shocks**  
Carriaga, Riona (University of British Columbia); Hall, Crystal (University of Washington); Larsen, Vance (University of Washington); Wething, Hilary (Penn State University); Zhao, Jiaying (University of British Columbia)
- 221. Happy Workers are “Rich” Consumers: Enjoyable Earnings Inflates Subjective Income**  
Dolifka, David (University of California - Los Angeles)
- 222. Who Knows Whether Spending is a True Signal of Wealth?**  
Gladstone, Joe (University of Colorado Boulder); Kappes, Heather (London School of Economics and Political Science)
- 223. Decisions Due to DEI? How Information about Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Affects Retirement Plan Fund Allocations**  
Thompson, Michael (Morningstar, Inc.); Wendel, Stephen (Morningstar, Inc.)
- 224. Help-Seeking as a Moderator Between Financial Decision-Making Ability and Decision Fatigue**  
Lee, Heejae (University of Georgia); Warmath, Dee (University of Georgia)

## Groups and Crowds

- 225. **Disagreements and Delays in a Multiparty Bargaining Experiment with Inside Options**  
Mak, Vincent (University of Cambridge); Zwick, Rami (University of California - Riverside)
- 226. **Smartphones and Trust**  
Gneezy, Uri (University of California - San Diego); Campbell, Sandy (University of California - Berkeley)
- 227. **Reputational Stakes Shape Partisans' Responses to Material Suffering**  
Dorison, Charles (Kellogg School of Management); Kteily, Nour (Kellogg School of Management)
- 229. **Comparing Aggregation of Social Forecasts With Wisdom of Select Crowd**  
Ho, Emily (Northwestern University); Himmelstein, Mark (Fordham University); Budescu, David (Fordham University)
- 230. **Doing It Alone: Universality and Cultural Specificity of Lay Theories of Good Decisions**  
Dorfman, Anna (University of Waterloo); Barr, Kelli (University of Pittsburgh); Smith, Kristopher (University of Pennsylvania); Barrett, Clark (University of California - Los Angeles); Machery, Edouard (University of Pittsburgh); Grossmann, Igor (University of Waterloo); Stich, Steve (Rutgers University)
- 231. **Magical Thinking, Self-Signaling, and Social Projection in Economic Games**  
Cashman, Matthew (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Prelec, Drazen (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

## Health and Medical

- 232. **Jumping-to-Conclusions About Vaccines: Investigating a New Predictor and a Related Potential Intervention for Anti-Vaccine Attitude Endorsement**  
Hall, Andrew (Queen's University); Hauser, David (Queen's University)
- 233. **How Scientific-based Mental Health Risk-factors of Suicide Ideation Can Aid in Interpreting What's in People's Minds, and When**  
Dubé, Laurette (McGill University); Whitehead, Jocelyne (McGill University); Du, Pan (Thomson Reuters Labs); Armony, Jorge (McGill University); Nie, Jian-Yun (University of Montreal)
- 234. **Conflicting Media Messages in a Health Crisis: Asymmetric Updating and Covid-19**  
Katz, Austin (University of South Florida); Schneider, Sandra (University of South Florida); Hampton, Brittnee (University of South Florida)
- 235. **A Preliminary Investigation of Intuitions About Dosing: People Think Increases in Causes Produce Larger Effects than Equivalent Decreases**  
Bharti, Soham (University of Chicago); Bartels, Daniel (University of Chicago)
- 236. **Development and Validation of a Knowledge of Do Not Resuscitate Scale**  
Asif, Muhammad (University of Oklahoma); Tanner, Braden (University of Oklahoma); Holt, Jenna (University of Oklahoma); Hoang, Gwen (University of Oklahoma); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma)
- 237. **If the Vaccine is 95% Effective then I have a 5% Chance of Getting Sick, Right?**  
Butler, Alison (Carnegie Mellon University); Chapman, Gretchen (Carnegie Mellon University)
- 238. **Social Norms, Individual Critical Thinking Skills, and Uptake of COVID-19 Preventative Behaviors**  
Drummond Otten, Caitlin (Arizona State University); Cohen, Alex (University of Southern California); Lutzke, Lauren (University of Southern California); Arvai, Joseph (University of Southern California)

- 239. Collectivism Consistently Encourages Vaccination, While Even Good Numbers Backfire for those With Low Numeracy**  
Avery, Nina-Simone (College of Wooster); Wilhelms, Evan (College of Wooster)
- 240. Operating on Anxiety: Affect Motivates Evaluations and Choice of Double Mastectomy**  
Silverstein, Michael (University of Oregon); Lee, Clara (Ohio State University); Scherer, Laura (University of Colorado Denver); Phommasathit, Crystal (Ohio State University); Merrill, Andrea (Boston Medical College); Peters, Ellen (University of Oregon)
- 241. Risky but Alluring: Severe COVID-19 Pandemic Influence Increases Risk Taking**  
Tsai, Claire (University of Toronto); Zeng, Ying (University of Toronto)
- 242. Perceiving a Pandemic: Global-local Incompatibility and COVID-19 Superspreading Events**  
Broomell, Stephen (Carnegie Mellon University); Kane, Patrick (McGill University)
- 243. A Well-Timed Reminder Can Increase Patient Portal Enrollment by 200%**  
Goren, Amir (Geisinger Health System); Shermohammed, Maheen (Geisinger Health System); Rosenbaum, Gail (Geisinger Health System); Meyer, Michelle (Geisinger Health System); Chabris, Christopher (Geisinger Health System)
- 244. Less is More (Natural): The Effect of the Number of Ingredients on Naturalness Perception**  
Kim, Michelle (University of California - San Diego); Gershon, Rachel (University of California - San Diego)
- 245. “I won’t have what you can’t have” Avoiding Consumption based on Food Restriction Inferences**  
Shah, Shaaref (University of Maryland); Prinsloo, Emily (Harvard University); Keenan, Elizabeth (Harvard University)
- 246. Does Nature Nurture? How Nature (Micro-) Breaks Influence Mood and Snack Food Cravings**  
Corbin, Jonathan (Duke University); Bartmann, Nina (Duke University); Probst, Birgit

### **Moral Judgment**

- 247. The Impact of Ethical Company Ratings on Consumer Behavior**  
Nichols, Aaron (Boston University); Cadario, Romain (Erasmus University Rotterdam); Mazar, Nina (Boston University)
- 248. Some Moral Rules are Believed to be as Objective as Facts**  
Obrecht, Natalie (William Paterson University)
- 249. Honesty in the Face of Good and Bad Consequences**  
Saki, Jessica (University of Toledo); Clarkson, Evan (University of Toledo); Karmol, Ann (University of Toledo); Jasper, John (University of Toledo)
- 250. Moral Judgments and Individual Differences: Putting Moral Foundations Theory and Social Domain Theory into Competition**  
Huang, Yu (University of Illinois); Currie, Brittney (University of Illinois); Regenwetter, Michel (University of Illinois); Carlson, Anna (University of Illinois); Smeulders, Bart (Eindhoven University of Technology); E, Sylvia (University of Illinois)
- 251. The Contaminating Effect of Social Capital: How Upper-Class Networks Increase Unethical Behavior**  
Yu, Siyu (Rice University); Cao, Jiyin (Stony Brook University); Cohen-Mohliwer, Aharon (London Business School); Galinsky, Adam (Columbia University)
- 252. “False Positive” Emotions, Responsibility, and Moral Character**

Anderson, Rajen (Cornell University); Kamtekar, Rachana (Cornell University); Nichols, Shaun (Cornell University); Pizarro, David (Cornell University)

253. **Noticing More: Mindfulness Increases Moral Awareness and Helps Individuals Notice Ethical Red Flags**  
Loo, Charis (Boston University); Peters, Eva (Singapore Management University); Reb, Jochen (Singapore Management University)

### **Policy and Politics**

254. **The Effectiveness of Transparent Defaults Depends on the Nature of the Transparency and How that Transparency is Revealed**  
Kleiman, Leo (University of California - San Diego); Leong, Lim (University of California - San Diego); McKenzie, Craig (University of California - San Diego)
255. **Modeling Dynamic Supply Chains with Endogenous Allocations and Market Clearing**  
Paine, James (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
256. **How Well Do Parents Know Their Own Preferences When Making School Choice Decisions?**  
Cash, Trent N. (Carnegie Mellon University); Oppenheimer, Danny (Carnegie Mellon University)
257. **A Comparison of Value of Statistical Life Estimates Derived from Revealed and Stated Preferences**  
Cohen, Elissa (American University)
258. **The Strategy of Social Change: Explaining Support for Black Lives Matter across Racial Groups**  
Srinivasan, Preeti (Stanford University); Alzahawi, Shilaan (Stanford University); Dannals, Jennifer (Dartmouth College); Halevy, Nir (Stanford University)
259. **A Meta-Analytic Cognitive Framework of Nudge and Sludge**  
Luo, Yu (University of British Columbia); Soman, Dilip (University of Toronto); Zhao, Jiaying (University of British Columbia)
260. **The Effects of Cognitive Constraints on High-Stakes Choices: Evidence from Parole Hearings and Police Searches**  
Shanmugam, Priya (Mathematica Policy Research)
261. **Nobody Can Pay the Right Price for Parking: It's Time to Change the System**  
Li, Meng (University of Colorado Denver); Mahanthege, Shalini (University of Colorado Boulder); McAndrews, Carolyn (University of Wisconsin)
262. **The Impact of Framing on Political Conservatives' Attitude toward Boundaries**  
Jin, Jianna (Ohio State University); Malkoc, Selin (Ohio State University); Fazio, Russell (Ohio State University)
263. **The Moral and Equity Implications of Behavior Change via Policy**  
Corbin, Jonathan (Duke University); Clark, Jenna (Duke University); Bonick, Judson (Duke University); Lindemans, Jan Willem (Duke University); Lewis Jr., Neil (Cornell University)
264. **Hydroxychloroquine Prescriptions for COVID-19: Did Political Preferences Matter?**  
Madanay, Farrah (Duke University); McDevitt, Ryan (Duke University); Ubel, Peter (Duke University)

## Prosocial Behavior

265. **When Does Gratitude Backfire?**  
Yu, Jiaqi (University of Chicago); Chaudhry, Shereen (University of Chicago)
266. **Self-Interested Giving: The Relationship Between Conditional Gifts, Charitable Donations, and Donor Self-Interestedness**  
Matthew, Chao (Williams College); Geoffrey, Fisher (Cornell University)
267. **Individual Differences in Anger and Psychopathic Traits Predict Punishment and Compensation Strategies for Dealing With Unfairness**  
Fernandes, Sharlene (Georgia State University); Aharoni, Eyal (Georgia State University)
268. **Skin in the Game: The Effect of Personal Experience on Prosocial Behavior**  
Banker, Mohin (Yale University); Zauberman, Gal (Yale University)
269. **Warm Glow or Cold Chill? Choice Avoidance in Charitable Donations**  
Brody, Ilana (University of California - Los Angeles); Dai, Hengchen (University of California - Los Angeles); Gallus, Jana (University of California - Los Angeles)
270. **Overhead as Investment: A Framing Intervention to Reduce Overhead Aversion**  
Geiser, Amanda (University of California - Berkeley); Lewis, Joshua (New York University)
271. **Incidental “Warm Glow” Feelings Enhances Effective Altruism**  
Coleman, Matthew (Northeastern University); DeSteno, David (Northeastern University)
272. **Increasing Prosocial Behavior Through Incentive Salience**  
Yoon, Y. Rin (Cornell University); Woolley, Kaitlin (Cornell University)

## Risk Taking, Risk Perception, and Risk Preference

274. **Clustering Process Tracing Trajectories During Risky Decision Making**  
Pettit, Elizabeth (Miami University)
275. **General Risk Literacy Skills are Causally Related to Improved Self-Evaluations: Training Graph Literacy Improves Decision Making and Lowers Overconfidence**  
Ybarra, Vincent (University of Oklahoma); Cho, Jinhyo (University of Oklahoma); Allan, Jinan (University of Oklahoma); Ramasubramanian, Madhuri (University of Oklahoma); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma); Garcia-Retamero, Rocio (Other); Cokely, Edward (University of Oklahoma)
276. **Characterization of the Reflection Effect Across DOSPERT Risk Content Domains**  
Kos, Maciej (Northeastern University); Babula, Elżbieta (University of Gdansk); Kołatka, Marek (University of Gdansk); Mrzygłód, Urszula (University of Gdansk); Wach, Dagmara (University of Gdansk)
277. **The Influence of Free-play Mode in Online Casino Gambling**  
Reilly, Theresa (University of Georgia); Goodie, Adam (University of Georgia); Kogan, Steven (University of Georgia)
278. **Systematic Cognitive Effort Discounting in Adolescents**  
Sevigny-Resetco, Deborah (Oregon Health & Science University); Mitchell, Suzanne (Oregon Health & Science University)

- 279. Relations Among Gambling Behavior, Associated Problems, Game Type, and Contextual Factors in a Rural, African American, Adolescent Sample**  
Reilly, Theresa R. (University of Georgia); Goodie, Adam S. (University of Georgia); Kogan, Steven M. (University of Georgia)
- 280. An Online Gambling Intervention Using the Realization Effect**  
Zhang, Ke (University of British Columbia); Imas, Alex (University of Chicago); Clark, Luke (University of British Columbia)
- 281. Anxious and Risk Averse? Two Studies on the Correlation Between Trait Anxiety and Risk Taking**  
Price, Paul (California State University - Fresno); Crisosto, Kiana (California State University - Fresno); Fernandez, Leslie (California State University - Fresno)
- 282. A Bayesian Method for Measuring Risk Propensity in the Balloon Analogue Risk Task**  
Coon, Jeff (University of California - Irvine); Lee, Michael (University of California - Irvine)
- 283. Sequential Information Preferences in Risky Decision-Making**  
Clithero, John (University of Oregon); Karmarkar, Uma (University of California - San Diego)
- 284. Unpacking Reduces Underestimation of Disjunctive Risk**  
Ramos, Jairo (University of Colorado Boulder); Walker, Jesse (Ohio State University); Van Boven, Leaf (University of Colorado Boulder)
- 285. Incentives and Arousal Modulate Contextual Effects on Valuation in Risky Choice**  
Alsharawy, Abdelaziz (Virginia Tech); Ball, Sheryl (Virginia Tech); Smith, Alec (Virginia Tech)

#### **Social Judgment**

- 286. Actor-Observer Asymmetry in the Outcome Bias**  
Corser, Ryan (Vanderbilt University); Voss, Raymond (Purdue University - Fort Wayne)
- 287. The Spillover Effect in Social and Non-Social Diversity Judgments**  
Navarro, Samantha (California State University - Fresno); Mijalli, Yazmine (California State University - Fresno); Price, Paul (California State University - Fresno)
- 288. Self as Anchor in Judgments of Other' Height and Weight**  
Roy, Michael (Elizabethtown College)
- 289. Was that Appropriate? The Mechanism Behind Judgments of Appropriateness**  
Etgar, Shir (Columbia University); Caspi, Avner (The Open University of Israel)
- 290. Personality Information Influences Perceived Cuteness of Children and Adults' Nurturing Motivation Toward Them**  
Takamatsu, Reina (Kyoto University); Kusumi, Takashi (Kyoto University); Nittono, Hiroshi (Osaka University)
- 291. #MeToo and Perceptions of Sexual Harassment in an International Context**  
Arya, Pragya (University of Southern California); Gorenz, Andrew (University of Southern California); Schwarz, Norbert (University of Southern California)
- 292. The Masked Majority: Underprediction Of Widespread Support For Covid-19 Safety Policies.**  
Urmitsky, Oleg (University of Chicago); Bergman, Abigail (Stanford Graduate School of Business)



- 293. Sellers' Status Signaling Fallacy**  
Moyal, Adiel (University of California - Davis); Garcia, Stephen (University of California - Davis)
- 294. Invisibility of Social Privilege to Those Who Have It**  
Wu, Kaidi (University of California - San Diego); Dunning, David (University of Michigan)
- 295. The Social Signaling Value of Selective Exposure**  
Moore, Molly (Harvard University); Dorison, Charles (Northwestern University); Minson, Julia (Harvard University)
- 296. Why Do We Punish Negligent Agents?**  
Sarin, Arunima (Harvard University); Cushman, Fiery (Harvard University)

### **Sustainability**

- 297. Mapping Norm Networks for Sustainable Food Consumption**  
Matt-Navarro, Johanna (University of California - Los Angeles); Sparkman, Gregg (Princeton University); Weber, Elke (Princeton University)
- 298. Development of a Plastic Recycling Knowledge Scale**  
Holt, Jenna (University of Oklahoma); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma)
- 299. Recycled Water Risk Literacy: Libertarian Paternalism, Education, and Shallow Versus Deep Acceptance**  
Tanner, Braden (University of Oklahoma); Hoang, Gwen (University of Oklahoma); Sabatini, David (University of Oklahoma); Chamberlain, Jim (University of Oklahoma); Rainbolt-Forbes, Elanor (Colorado State University); Nijhawan, Anisha; Feltz, Adam
- 300. Do Incentives Change More than Project Economics? How Incentive design Can Speed or Slow Adoption of Decarbonization Technologies By changing Customer Perceptions of Norms**  
Hirsch, KC (Stanford University); Wong-Parodi, Gabrielle (Stanford University)
- 301. Not All Green is Equal: The Order of Environmental Harm and Benefit Influences Sustainability Evaluation**  
Hur, Elina (Cornell University); Shu, Suzanne (Cornell University)

### **Thinking and Reasoning**

- 302. Planning or Not Planning a Disengagement**  
Safarpour, Niusha (Alberta School of Business); Haeubl, Gerald (Alberta School of Business)
- 303. Is Poverty Low Control Over Queue Priorities?**  
Gallo, Marcos (California Institute of Technology); Camerer, Colin (California Institute of Technology)
- 304. Generality of Individual Differences in Actively Open-Minded Thinking**  
Baron, Jonathan (University of Pennsylvania); Streicher, Wesley
- 305. Dynamics of Counterfactual Retrieval**  
Wang, Feiyi (University of Pennsylvania); Aka, Ada (University of Pennsylvania); Bhatia, Sudeep (University of Pennsylvania)
- 306. What are My Options? Prompting Option Generation with Varying Goals in a Context of Possible Sexual Assault**

Yu, Karen (Sewanee: The University of the South); Garcia, Dana (Sewanee: The University of the South); Castillo Gomez, Julia (Sewanee: The University of the South)

- 307. Causes and Predictors of Intransitive Choices in High-Stakes, Pairwise Comparison Measurement of Personality**  
Gallagher, Christopher (Bowling Green State University); Samo, Andrew (Bowling Green State University)
- 308. Who Accepts Description Invariance?**  
Liu, Xingyu (Shirley) (University of California - San Diego); Leong, Lim (University of California - San Diego); McKenzie, Craig (University of California - San Diego); Sher, Shlomi (Pomona College)
- 309. The Big Nature Bias**  
Eskreis-Winkler, Lauren (Northwestern University); Erensoy, Eda (University of Chicago)
- 310. Learning and Predicting New Categories for Natural Objects**  
Zou, Wanling (University of Pennsylvania); Bhatia, Sudeep (University of Pennsylvania)
- 311. The Comprehensive Thinking Styles Questionnaire: A Novel Measure of Intuitive-Analytic Thinking Styles**  
Newton, Christie (University of Regina); Feeney, Justin (Rhode Island College); Pennycook, Gordon (University of Regina)
- 312. Individual Differences in NFC and the Perception of Risk**  
Sleboda, Patrycja (University of Southern California)
- 313. The Intuitive Mind of Smartphone Users: How Smartphone Use Reshape Thinking Styles**  
Zhu, Ying (University of British Columbia); Liu, Jiajia (Peking University); Wang, Jingjing (Peking University)
- 314. Analytic Engagement in Single- and Dual-Process Theories**  
Caleb, Dewey (University of Arizona)
- 315. When More is Less: Incorporating Irrelevant Information Into Judgments and Decisions Can Be Less Effortful Than Ignoring It**  
Thomson, Keela (Carnegie Mellon University); Oppenheimer, Daniel (Carnegie Mellon University); Rifai, Stephanie (Carnegie Mellon University)

#### **Workplace and Motivation**

- 316. Cognitive (In)Flexibility as a Predictor for Sexist Workplace Attitudes**  
Cordova, Jose (Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis); Colby, Helen (Indiana University Bloomington)
- 317. Spending Gained Time**  
Malkoc, Selin (Ohio State University); Tonietto, Gabriela (Rutgers Business School); Bunosso, Isabella (Ohio State University)
- 318. Choosing When to Work and When to Play: How Implicit Theories of Intelligence Impact Psychology Students' Decision to Allocate Effort and Time to Scholar Activities?**  
Combette, Léa (Paris Brain Institute); Rotgé, Jean-Yves (Paris Brain Institute); Schmidt, Liane (Paris Brain Institute)
- 319. The Work-Life Balance Paradox**  
Solinas, Elisa (University of Southern California); Buechel, Eva (University of Southern California)

- 320. Navigating Pre-Commitment: Effective Strategies for Others but Appropriate Strategies for the Self**  
Brimhall, Craig (University of Utah); Tannenbaum, David (University of Utah); VanEpps, Eric (University of Utah)
- 321. Making Up for Failure: A Simple Nudge to Improve Goal Persistence**  
Duncan, Shannon (University of Pennsylvania); Sharif, Marissa A. (University of Pennsylvania)
- 322. Proximal Goals Boost Productivity: A Field Experiment**  
Rai, Aneesh (University of Pennsylvania); Sharif, Marissa (University of Pennsylvania); Chang, Edward (Harvard University); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania); Duckworth, Angela (University of Pennsylvania)
- 323. Opportunity Luck: How People Allocate Rewards When Merit Was Made Possible by Luck**  
Munguia Gomez, David (University of Chicago)