

# Society for Judgment and Decision Making

## Annual Conference 2022



**UCSD Rady School of Management & Hilton La Jolla Torrey Pines**  
**San Diego, California, USA**  
**November 10–13, 2022**

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
Master Schedule	2
Paper Presentations Schedule	3-5
Conference Announcements & Special Events	6-8
Paper Abstracts Listed by Session	9-26
Poster Titles Listed by Session	27-42

**2022 Program Committee:** Dan Feiler (Chair), Stephen Spiller, and Jennifer Trueblood

**THANKS TO:** Lisa Ordóñez, Wendy Liu and Yuval Rottenstreich from UCSD Rady School of Management for their support.

**THANKS TO:** Kate Wessels (Conference Coordinator), Dave Hardisty (Webmaster), Suzanne Shu (President), Sudeep Bhatia, Margaret Echelbarger, Brandy Edmonson, Fausto Gonzalez, Crystal Hall, Kevin Jarbo, Tyler MacDonald, Molly Moore, Elizabeth Perry, Deidre Popovich, Jane Risen (Chair), Ovul Sezer, Eesha Sharma (SJDM DEI Committee), Wendy De La Rosa, Erika Kirgios, and Alice Moon (Underrepresented Scholars Committee), Alixandra Barasch (Student Poster Award), Ovul Sezer (Social Event Chair), Chris Olivola (Einhorn Award), Irene Scopelliti (Communication and Promotions), Daniel Mochon, Natalia Karelaia, Adelle Yang, Eyal Peer (Beattie Committee)

**THANKS TO:** SJDM Ad hoc reviewers: On Amir, Alixandra Barasch, Dan Bartels, Jonathan Berman, Sudeep Bhatia, Brad Bitterly, Hayley Blunden, Stephen Broomell, Eva Buechel, Katherine Burson, Edward Chang, Shereen Chaudhry, Nathan Cheek, Stephanie Chen, Shoham Choshen-Hillel, Helen Colby, Cindy Cryder, Hengchen Dai, Jason Dana, Shai Davidai, Wendy De La Rosa, Bart De Langhe, Michael DeKay, Enrico Diecidue, Berkeley Dietvorst, Charles Dorison, Kristen Duke, Ioannis Evangelidis, Barbara Fasolo, Susann Fiedler, Geoff Fisher, Liz Friedman, Celia Gaertig, Rachel Gershon, Daniel Goldstein, Russell Golman, Kareem Haggag, David Hagmann, Crystal Hall, Uriel Haran, Oliver Hauser, Joyce He, Hal Herschfield, Stefan Herzog, Janina Hoffmann, Alex Imas, Martha Jeong, Minah Jung, Natalia Karelaia, Uma Karmarkar, Erika Kirgios, Ian Krajbich, Amit Kumar, Daniella Kuper, Peter Kvam, Eleanor Kyung, Asher Lawson, Robyn LeBoeuf, Jennifer Lerner, Emma Levine, Ye Li, Jingyi Lu, Shenghua Luan, Cade Massey, Craig McKenzie, Daniel Mochon, Johannes Müller-Trede, Leif Nelson, Nathan Novemsky, Ed O'Brien, Chris Olivola, Thorsten Pachur, Hannah Perfecto, Jonathan Pettibone, Tim Pleskac, Ori Plonsky, Crystal Reeck, Taly Reich, Elena Reutskaja, Rick Scott, Jane Risen, David Rothschild, Silvia Saccardo, Juliana Schroeder, Michael Schulte-Mecklenbeck, Daniel Schwartz, Sydney Scott, Ovul Sezer, Anuj Shah, Marissa Sharif, Luxi Shen, Suzanne Shu, Joe Simmons, Uri Simonsohn, Stephanie Smith, Mikhail Spector, Nicolette Sullivan, Abigail Sussman, Elizabeth Tenney, Kinneret Teodorescu, Claire Tsai, Stephanie Tully, Oleg Urminsky, Eric VanEpps, Elizabeth Webb, Evan Weingarten, Elanor Williams, Paul Windschitl, Eldad Yechiam, Charles Zhang, Ting Zhang, Jiaying Zhao.

# 2022 SJDM Conference Master Schedule

## UCSD Rady School of Management & The Hilton La Jolla Torrey Pines

### November 10-13, 2022

UCSD Rady School of Management: 9500 Gilman Dr, La Jolla, CA 92093  
Hilton La Jolla Torrey Pines: 10950 N Torrey Pines Rd, La Jolla, CA 92037

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

---

- |              |                                                                                                                                                 |
|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4:30-6:30 pm | <b>Registration</b> ( <i>Fairway Foyer at Hilton Torrey Pines</i> ) <u>*NOTE: Welcome Reception Starts at 5:00 pm)*</u>                         |
| 4:00-5:00 pm | <b>Underrepresented Scholars in SJDM Networking Event</b> ( <i>Fairway Garden at Hilton Torrey Pines</i> ) *All SJDM Members Welcome to Attend* |
| 5:00-6:30 pm | <b>Welcome Reception</b> ( <i>Fairway 1 at Hilton Torrey Pines</i> ) *All SJDM Members Welcome to Attend*                                       |
| 7:00-9:00 pm | Executive Board Dinner ( <i>Invite only</i> )                                                                                                   |

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

---

- |                |                                                                                       |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 7:45-9:00 am   | <b>Registration</b> ( <i>UCSD Rady Courtyard</i> )                                    |
| 8:15-9:15 am   | <b>Paper Session #1</b> ( <i>1E106, 1E107, 1N108 at UCSD Rady</i> )                   |
| 9:30-10:30 am  | <b>Paper Session #2</b> ( <i>1E106, 1E107, 1N108 at UCSD Rady</i> )                   |
| 10:45-11:45 am | <b>Paper Session #3</b> ( <i>1E106, 1E107, 1N108 at UCSD Rady</i> )                   |
| 12:00-1:00 pm  | Lunch Break - Boxed Lunches Provided ( <i>The Lawn at UCSD Rady</i> )                 |
| 1:00-2:00 pm   | <b>Presidential Address: Suzanne Shu</b> ( <i>Beyster Auditorium at UCSD Rady</i> )   |
| 2:15-3:15 pm   | <b>Paper Session #4</b> ( <i>1E106, 1E107, 1N108 at UCSD Rady</i> )                   |
| 3:30-4:30 pm   | <b>Paper Session #5</b> ( <i>1E106, 1E107, 1N108 at UCSD Rady</i> )                   |
| 5:15-6:15 pm   | <b>Poster Session #1</b> ( <i>Fairway Ballroom at Hilton Torrey Pines</i> )           |
| 6:15-8:15 pm   | <b>Graduate Student Social Event</b> ( <i>Fairway Garden at Hilton Torrey Pines</i> ) |

#### SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 12<sup>th</sup>

---

- |                |                                                                                      |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8:15-9:15 am   | <b>Paper Session #6</b> ( <i>1E106, 1E107, 1N108 at UCSD Rady</i> )                  |
| 9:30-10:30 am  | <b>Paper Session #7</b> ( <i>1E106, 1E107, 1N108 at UCSD Rady</i> )                  |
| 10:45-11:45 am | <b>Keynote Address: Carl T. Bergstrom</b> ( <i>Beyster Auditorium at UCSD Rady</i> ) |
| 12:00-1:00 pm  | Lunch Break - Boxed Lunches Provided ( <i>The Lawn at UCSD Rady</i> )                |
| 1:00-2:00 pm   | <b>Paper Session #8</b> ( <i>1E106, 1E107, 1N108 at UCSD Rady</i> )                  |
| 2:15-3:15 pm   | <b>Paper Session #9</b> ( <i>1E106, 1E107, 1N108 at UCSD Rady</i> )                  |
| 3:30-4:00 pm   | <b>Einhorn Award Address</b> ( <i>Beyster Auditorium at UCSD Rady</i> )              |
| 4:45-5:45 pm   | <b>Poster Session #2</b> ( <i>Fairway Ballroom at Hilton Torrey Pines</i> )          |
| 5:45-6:30 pm   | <b>Closing Social Event</b> ( <i>Fairway Garden at Hilton Torrey Pines</i> )         |

#### SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 13<sup>th</sup>

---

- |              |                                                                                                                                                                |
|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8:15-9:15 am | <b>Business Meeting w/ Complimentary Breakfast &amp; Student Poster Award</b> ( <i>Fairway 1 at Hilton Torrey Pines</i> ) *All SJDM Members Welcome to Attend* |
|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

FRIDAY NOVEMBER 11, 2022			
UCSD Rady School of Management			
	Track A: 1E106	Track B: 1E107	Track C: 1N108
Session #1	Consumer Behavior	Social Judgment	Risk
8:15 AM	Desiraju - Reason Defaults: Presenting Defaults with Reasons For Choosing Each Option Helps Decision Makers With Minority Preferences	Reiff - When Peer Comparison Information Harms Physician Well-being	Mellers - Reference-Point Theory: How Emotions about Reference Points Influence Risk Preferences
8:35 AM	Shaddy - The Bundle Halo Effect	Kristal - Going Beyond the "Self" in Self-Control: Interpersonal Consequences of Commitment Strategy Use	Hirshman - Tests of Rank-dependent Probability Weighting in Risky Choice
8:55 AM	Sharif - Changeable Choices Shift Consumers Towards Uncertain Options,	O'Brien- Failure to Launch: Repeated Failures to Change Reveal a Hidden Harshness to Growth Mindset	Kapadia - Conceptual and Psychometric Issues in Behavioral Measures of Risk-Taking
Session #2	Methods & Metascience	Discrimination	Decision Modeling
9:30 AM	Maimone - Sexual Misconduct, Scientific Fraud, and Citation Penalties	Chang - The "Hidden" Gender Gap in Self-Promotion and its Consequences	Trueblood - Contextual Sensitivity in Naturalistic Multi-alternative Choice
9:50 AM	Brigden - Multitasking in Online Studies	Kirgios - The Effect of Positive and Negative Feedback About Bias on Subsequent Discrimination	McCoy - Not by Choices Alone: Evaluating Strength of Preference Judgments
10:10 AM	Charlton - Noise In The Process: An Assessment Of The Evidential Value Of Mediation Effects In Marketing Journals	Shah - A Cognitive View of Police Misconduct	Johnson - Joint Modeling of Eye-and mouse-tracking to Understand Dynamic Decision Processes
Session #3	Financial Decision Making	Interpersonal Perception	Cognitive Psychology
10:45 AM	Batista - Understanding the Co-Holding Puzzle through a Field Experiment	Guenoun - Sending Signals: Strategic Displays of Warmth and Competence	Meyers – On the Breadth of the Illusion of Explanatory Depth
11:05 AM	Shah - Identifying Data-Driven Heterogeneity Using Machine-Learning: Evidence from Text-Message Nudges Encouraging Retirement Savings Contributions in Mexico	Turetski - Anticipating Giving Feedback Changes Feedback	McKenzie - Who Accepts Description Invariance?
11:25 AM	Sharma - Scarcity and Intertemporal Choice	Wood Brooks - How Verbal, Nonverbal, and Paralinguistic Interpersonal Cues Mislead Predictions	DeKay - An Inverted-U Pattern for the Risky-Choice Framing Effect: An Experiment, a Meta-Analysis, and a Comparison of Theories
Session #4	Policy/Nudges	Negotiation & Conflict	Decision Analysis
2:15 PM	Tor - When Should Governments Invest More in Nudging? Revisiting Benartzi et al. (2017)	Long- Is Transparency Enough? The Effect of Historical Pay Information on Negotiations	Kieren - A Test of Recursive Models of Ambiguity Aversion
2:35 PM	Dai - Two Lessons for Nudge Scalability: Evidence from the Randomized Controlled Trials	Ren - Disagreement Is A Short-hand For Poor Listening: People Judge Listeners Who Disagree With Them To Be Worse Listeners And Less Open-minded Than Listeners That Agree With Them	Palley - Combining Judgmental Forecasts With Base Rates To Improve Decision Making: A Data-Driven Application To 20 Years Of Drug Development Predictions
2:55 PM	Linos - The Formality Effect	Hart - "I Avoid Negotiating Because I Care": Negotiation Avoidance Due to (Inflated) Concern about Jeopardizing a Deal	Stroom - Network Risk Dispersion: Do Network Characteristics influence Human Network Assessment?

<b>FRIDAY NOVEMBER 11, 2022</b>			
<b>UCSD Rady School of Management</b>			
	<b>Track A: 1E106</b>	<b>Track B: 1E107</b>	<b>Track C: 1N108</b>
<b>Session #5</b>	<b>Health &amp; Healthcare</b>	<b>Moral Judgment / Ethics</b>	<b>Prediction &amp; Algorithms</b>
<b>3:30 PM</b>	Shavit - Promoting Healthful Behaviors by Incentivizing Exploration for Health-Promoting Alternatives	Rude - Asymmetric Reactions to Erroneous Punishments and Rewards	Rabinovitch - Effective But Unappreciated: People Adopt Algorithmic Advice, But Do Not Value This Help
<b>3:50 PM</b>	Choshen-Hillel - A Wake Up Call: The Effect Of Nightshifts On Physicians' Decision Making	Cusimano - People Acknowledge And Condone Their Own Morally Motivated Reasoning	Shlomo - When And Why Implementing Bad AI Algorithms Feels Worse Than Self-initiating Them
<b>4:10 PM</b>	Gaissmaier - Do Physicians Interpret Cumulative Risk Curves Accurately?	Permut - Signals of Virtue and When they Backfire: How Honesty Badges Provide Cover for Dishonesty	Sun - Predicting Against Judgment: When People Fail to Predict What They Believe to be Most Likely to Arise

SATURDAY NOVEMBER 12, 2022			
UCSD Rady School of Management			
	Track A: 1E106	Track B: 1E107	Track C: 1N108
Session #6	Prosocial Behavior	Inequality & Exclusion	Cognitive Biases
8:15 AM	Yin - The Honeymoon Fund Effect: How do Choices Promote Giving Behavior?	Weingarten - Gatekeeping of Identity and Group Membership	Reb - Less-Is-More Belief and Heuristic Aversion
8:35 AM	Yang - When Donation Feels Like Volunteering, People Give: A “Donateer” Fundraising Method	Yang - Public Awareness of Algorithmic Racial Bias Worsens Racial Inequality	Scopelliti - Big Data Bias
8:55 AM	Levari - Collective Streaks Motivate Prosocial Behavior	Davidai - Economic Segregation Reduces Concern About Economic Inequality	Voicheck - Control Group Neglect
Session #7	Time & Preferences	Diversity	Learning & Attribution
9:30 AM	Thakral - Anticipatory Utility and Intertemporal Choice	Chang - Demographic “Stickiness”: The Demographic Identity of Departing Group Members Influences Who Is Chosen to Replace Them	Atanasov - Talent Spotting in Crowd Prediction
9:50 AM	Li - How Well Do Laboratory-derived Estimates of Time Preference Predict Real-world Behaviors? Comparisons to Four Benchmarks	Rai - Insider versus Outsider Perceptions of Group Diversity	Brimhall - Chasing Fictitious Variation: Random Outcomes are Attributed to Skill in Competitive Environments
10:10 AM	Lui - Value(s) of Time: How People Decide to Work for Money	Zhao - Large-Scale Inclusion Training for Online Community Moderators	Jeong - Learning From the Best (and Worst): Comparative Learning Improves Performance but is Undervalued
Session #8	Consequences of Timing	Work	Managerial/Group Decision Making
1:00 PM	Trupia - When the Unexpected Happens: How People Respond to Unbudgeted Time Savings	Smith - Workplace Competition and the Desire for Uniqueness	Faro - Organizational Accountability Systems and Managerial Risk-Taking
1:20 PM	Kang - The Streak-End Rule: Evidence from a Large-Scale Natural Field Experiment With Volunteer Crisis Counselors	Daly - Remote Work	Daniels - Are Managers Good at Using the Sunk-cost Effect as a Nudge? A Misinfluence Perspective on “Escalation of Commitment”
1:40 PM	Haghighi - The Effect of Time of Day on Extremity Bias in Online Reviews	Buechel - The “Detachment Paradox”: Employers Recognize the Benefits of Detachment for Productivity, yet Penalize it in Employee Evaluations	Winet - Pivotal Voting: The Opportunity To Tip Group Decisions Skews Juries and Other Voting Outcomes
Session #9	Estimation	Behavioral Ethics	Attention & Memory
2:15 PM	Olschewski – What’s in a Sample? How Sampling Information Affects Epistemic Uncertainty and Risk-Taking	Vu - Willful Ignorance: A Meta Analytic Review	Bhui - Attention Constraints and Learning in Categories of Time
2:35 PM	Ryan - Preparing For The Best As Much As The Worst: Decision-makers Ignore The Probability of Outcomes When Making Backup Plans	Elbaek - Material Scarcity and Unethical Economic Behavior: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis	Bhatia - A Framework for Jointly Modeling Attentional and Decision Processes in Choice
2:55 PM	Howard - What is 'Average'?	White - The Good in Evil: Decision-Makers Overestimate the Reputational Costs of Necessary Evils	Aka - A Framework for Modeling and Explaining Everyday Memory-Based Decisions

## 2022 SJDM Conference Announcements & Special Events

### Christian Elbaek wins the Beattie Memorial Travel Scholarship 2022

The 2022 Jane Beattie Memorial Travel Scholarship has been awarded to Christian Elbaek from Aarhus University in Denmark. The funds are being provided to cover his travel to San Diego.

### Bus Transport to and from UCSD

SJDM will provide bus transport on Friday and Saturday mornings from the Hilton and Hyatt Hotels, to UCSD Rady School of Management AND back to the Hilton Hotel for the afternoon Poster Sessions. The busses will be running continuously between venues during certain times. Please note the schedule below, should you wish to utilize this transport option. *Note: Parking at UCSD Rady is not recommended as parking passes are not available.*

#### Day 1: FRIDAY 11/11

BUS BEGINS	BUS ENDS	START LOCATION	END LOCATION
7:30 AM	8:30 AM	Hilton La Jolla	UCSD Rady
7:30 AM	8:30 AM	Hyatt Regency Aventine	UCSD Rady
4:15 PM	5:30 PM	UCSD Rady	Hilton La Jolla

#### Day 2: SATURDAY 11/12

BUS BEGINS	BUS ENDS	START LOCATION	END LOCATION
7:30 AM	8:30 AM	Hilton La Jolla	UCSD Rady
7:30 AM	8:30 AM	Hyatt Regency Aventine	UCSD Rady
3:45 PM	5:00 PM	UCSD Rady	Hilton La Jolla

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

4:00-5:00 pm **Underrepresented Scholars (“US”) in SJDM Networking Event**

*Fairway Garden at Hilton Torrey Pines (Note: The location is Outdoors)*

\*All\* are welcome to join our third 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, URM, 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 Wendy De La Rosa, Erika Kirgios and Alice Moon*

5:00-6:30 pm

**Welcome Reception**

*Fairway 1 at Hilton Torrey Pines*

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

7:30-8:30 am **Bus Transport from Hilton and Hyatt Hotels to UCSD Rady School of Management**

7:45-9:00 am **Registration**

12:00-1:00 pm **Lunch Break - Boxed Lunches Provided** (*The Lawn at UCSD Rady*)

*Events:*

- **Mentor Matching** – Sign-up required in advance. Please look for the reserved tables on *The Lawn* for the Mentor Matching Session. Please contact Sudeep Bhatia at [bhatia.sudeep@gmail.com](mailto:bhatia.sudeep@gmail.com) with any questions.
- **BIPOC Scholars** – Pick up your lunch and join us in Room 1S114. After a quick discussion, we will continue eating at reserved tables on *the Lawn*. Contact Kevin Jarbo ([kjarbo@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:kjarbo@andrew.cmu.edu)) for more information

1:00-2:00 pm **Presidential Address:** The Role of SJDM in Generating Research with Impact  
*SJDM has always been a society filled with researchers with an eye toward generating work that impacts external organizations and policy makers, as evidenced by Presidential Addresses of previous presidents. In this talk, I'll look back to thank many of those prior speakers, highlight impact-driven work I've done with a range of amazing coauthors and colleagues, and finally look to the future to encourage new efforts by our members to have an influence on the world around us.*

**Suzanne Shu**, Cornell University (*Beyster Auditorium*)

4:15-5:30 pm **Bus Transport from UCSD Rady School of Management to the Hilton Hotel**

5:15-6:15 pm **Poster Session 1 w/ Cash Bar**

*Fairway Ballroom at Hilton Torrey Pines*

6:15-8:15 pm **Graduate Student Social Event**

*Fairway Garden at Hilton Torrey Pines (Note: The location is Outdoors)*

This informal event will provide student members of SJDM an opportunity to network with the future stars of the field. But wait, there's more: SJDM is buying the first round of drinks!

## SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 12<sup>th</sup>

7:30-8:30 am **Bus Transport from Hilton and Hyatt Hotels to UCSD Rady School of Management**

10:45-11:45 am **Keynote Address:** The new 'new economics of science': How the norms and institutions of science deter high-risk, high-return science

*Scientific researchers may be driven by curiosity, but they are constrained by the realities of the scientific ecosystems in which they operate and motivated by the incentives with which they are confronted. In this talk I present a pair of mathematical models aimed at revealing why scientists are reluctant to propose and conduct high-risk research. In the first, we draw out the tension between the demands of ex ante review as for grant proposals and ex post review as for completed manuscripts. In the second, we develop an economic model to explore how the unobservability of risk and effort discourages risky research. Our scientific norms and institutions are not god-given; we create and maintain them. If we can understand their consequences, we have the potential to nudge them in directions that improve the functioning of the scientific enterprise.*

**Carl T. Bergstrom**, University of Washington (*Beyster Auditorium*)



12:00-1:00 pm

**Lunch Break - Boxed Lunches Provided** (*The Lawn at UCSD Rady*)

*Events:*

- **Mentor Matching** – Sign-up required in advance. Please look for the reserved tables on *The Lawn* for the Mentor Matching Session. Please contact Sudeep Bhatia at [bhatia.sudeep@gmail.com](mailto:bhatia.sudeep@gmail.com) with any questions.
- **Advice Taking** – Interested in the field of Advice Taking? Join us in Room 1S113 with your lunch for further discussion. Contact Christina Rader at [crader@coloradocollege.edu](mailto:crader@coloradocollege.edu) for more information.
- **BIPOC Scholars** – Pick up your lunch and join us in Room 1S114. After a quick discussion, we will continue eating at reserved tables on *the Lawn*. Contact Kevin Jarbo ([kjarbo@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:kjarbo@andrew.cmu.edu)) for more information

3:30-4:00 pm

**Einhorn Award** (*Beyster Auditorium*)

3:45-5:00 pm

**Bus Transport from UCSD Rady School of Management to the Hilton Hotel**

4:45-5:45 pm

**Poster Session 2** w/ Cash Bar

*Fairway Ballroom at Hilton Torrey Pines*

5:45-6:30 pm

**SJDM Evening Social Event**

*Fairway Garden at Hilton Torrey Pines (Note: The location is Outdoors)*

Come and join your colleagues after the Poster Session for a complimentary drink in the Fairway Garden. See you there!

**SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 13<sup>th</sup>**

8:15am-9:15am

**Business Meeting** with Complimentary Breakfast and **Student Poster Award**  
(*Fairway 1 at Hilton Torrey Pines*)



## 2022 SJDM Conference Paper Abstracts

FRIDAY NOVEMBER 11, 2022

### **Session #1 Track A: Consumer Behavior - Friday 8:15 am - 9:15 am**

#### **Reason defaults: Presenting defaults with reasons for choosing each option helps decision makers with minority preferences**

Desiraju, Shweta (University of Chicago); Dietvorst, Berkeley (University of Chicago);

Defaults often involve increasing uptake of one option that serves only the majority of consumers. We introduce and test a new default, a "reason default", which describes the reasons for choosing the default and alternative options. In Studies 1 & 2, we find that reason defaults help individuals who would be better served by an alternative option opt out of the default and increase satisfaction with the choice architecture. In Study 3, participants reported opinions about reason and standard defaults and felt that choices with reason defaults were less effortful and more transparent among other things.

#### **The Bundle Halo Effect**

Shaddy, Franklin (University of California - Los Angeles)

Seven preregistered studies and a field experiment (N=5,227) document the bundle halo effect: An item evaluated as part of a bundle elicits stronger purchase intentions and greater willingness-to-pay (WTP) than the exact same item evaluated in isolation. This is because when an item is evaluated as part of a bundle, consumers value not only its standalone utility, but also its gestalt connection to other items comprising the whole. Importantly, bundles are typically offered at a discount, relative to the same items sold separately. But in contrast to previous findings, conventional wisdom, and consumer expectations, this work describes how bundling can actually systematically increase WTP.

#### **Changeable Choices Shift Consumers Towards Uncertain Options,**

Sharif, Marissa (University of Pennsylvania)

Consumers frequently make temporary or changeable choices. However, there is no research to-date that has examined how the changeability of a choice might systematically influence which option consumers select. We demonstrate that consumers are more likely to temporarily choose and stick with an uncertain option (vs. a certain option) when their choice is changeable (vs. not changeable). We find that consumers are more likely to choose these options with uncertainty when their choice is changeable because they are more likely to focus on the benefits of the uncertain option than the costs of the uncertain option.

### **Session #1 Track B: Social and Self Judgment - Friday 8:15 am - 9:15 am**

#### **When peer comparison information harms physician well-being**

Reiff, Joseph (University of California - Los Angeles); Zhang, Justin (University of California - Los Angeles); Gallus, Jana (University of California - Los Angeles); Dai, Hengchen (University of California - Los Angeles); Pedley, Nathaniel (University of California - Los Angeles); Vangala, Sitaram (University of California - Los Angeles)

Peer comparisons are often used to motivate people. Yet, the impact of peer comparison interventions on recipients'™ well-being is largely unknown. In a 5-month field experiment involving 199 physicians and 46,631 patients, we found that peer comparison information did not significantly improve physicians' performance, but it decreased job satisfaction and increased burnout, even 4 months after treatment discontinuation. We showed that such harmful effects may occur because peer comparison information inadvertently signaled a lack of leadership support. Consistently, in a third condition where leaders were trained to support physicians, the negative effects of peer comparisons were mitigated.

#### **Going Beyond the "Self" in Self-Control: Interpersonal Consequences of Commitment Strategy Use**

Kristal, Ariella (Harvard University); Zlatev, Julian (Harvard University)

Commitment strategies are effective mechanisms individuals can use to overcome self-control problems. Across five pre-registered studies (total N = 2,280), we explore the negative interpersonal consequences of commitment strategy use. We first demonstrate that individuals trust people who use a commitment strategy less than people who use internal willpower to achieve their goals. We

next provide evidence that perceived effort underlies this effect. Finally, we demonstrate that people's anticipation of these negative consequences of commitment strategy use contributes to their reticence to adopt such strategies.

### **Failure to Launch: Repeated Failures to Change Reveal a Hidden Harshness to Growth Mindset**

O'Brien, Ed (University of Chicago)

Three experiments reveal that mindset effects differentially affect social judgment over time. Growth-mindset (vs. fixed-mindset) judges indeed more kindly judged others' initial failures (thus showing the popular effect) - yet also showed steeper declines as others then failed to change (thus revealing a hidden harshness to it). These findings suggest growth mindset is not as uniformly positive as popularly depicted; a growth-mindset culture may ironically create harsher-judging inhabitants in the long run. They also explain why growth-mindset effects don't (and indeed shouldn't) always replicate. Studying repeated vs. one-shot judgments may unveil new understandings of "standard" effects.

### **Session #1 Track C: Risk - Friday 8:15 am - 9:15 am**

#### **Reference-Point Theory: How Emotions about Reference Points Influence Risk Preferences**

Mellers, Barbara (University of Pennsylvania); Yin, Siyuan (University of Pennsylvania)

We present a reference-point theory of risk preferences for choices between sure things and binary gambles. We assume the sure thing is the reference point; it is what happens if risk is rejected. Two drivers shape risk preferences – hedonic contrasts (loss aversion or gain seeking) and beliefs about risk (hope or fear). We measure choices and judged feelings of pleasure about options and outcomes. Hedonic contrasts depend on feelings about the reference point. Risk aversion and risk seeking depend on beliefs about risk. Across three studies, we show that reference-point theory predicts choices better than prospect theory by taking reference points and individual differences into account.

#### **Tests of Rank-dependent Probability Weighting in Risky Choice**

Hirshman, Samuel (Norwegian School of Economics); Wu, George (University of Chicago)

Cumulative Prospect Theory (Tversky and Kahneman, 1992) posits rank-dependent probability weighting, but prior studies provide mixed evidence. That is, the decision weights reflect the order of an outcome within a gamble, with more extreme (highest and lowest) outcomes overweighted relative to the intermediate outcomes. We test a set of properties consistent with rank-dependent decision weights. Our tests use non-parametric estimates of decision weights from choices between gambles. We provide strong evidence consistent with rank-dependent decision weights.

#### **Conceptual and Psychometric Issues in Behavioral Measures of Risk-Taking**

Kapadia, Kevin (University of Southern California); Tang, Coco (University of Southern California); John, Richard (University of Southern California)

Despite the practical usefulness of behavioral risk-taking measures, several conceptual and psychometric issues have emerged over the past three decades. We report results from validity studies demonstrating systematic deviations in behavioral measures of risk-taking depending on the structure of the task, i.e., risk vs. uncertainty vs. ignorance, and whether risks are monotonically increasing, decreasing, or constant. We present data both at the individual game level and aggregated across games for individuals to estimate utility functions and risk-tolerances from behavioral game data. We further examine the convergent validity of these utility functions across different behavioral measures.

### **Session #2 Track A: Methods & Metascience - Friday 9:30 am - 10:30 am**

#### **Sexual Misconduct, Scientific Fraud, and Citation Penalties**

Maimone, Giulia (University of California - San Diego); Appel, Gil (George Washington University); McKenzie, Craig (University of California - San Diego); Gneezy, Ayelet (University of California - San Diego)

In academia, citations are used to acknowledge the contribution of past work and promote scientific advancement. Yet, analyzing citation data of 36,940 publications spanning 18 academic fields, we find evidence suggesting that citations may also serve as a currency to reward or punish scientists' morality. Specifically, we find that scholars accused of scientific fraud incur a smaller citation penalty than those accused of sexual misconduct. By extension, these findings imply that in addition to serving the purpose

of promoting scientific advancement and maintaining intellectual honesty, citation decisions are also driven by scholars' attitudes toward the publication's author(s).

### **Multitasking in Online Studies**

Brigden, Neil (Mount Royal University)

Do online research participants complete studies as continuous tasks, or do they switch back and forth between a study and other online activities? While researchers prefer for participants to complete online studies continuously, participants may have many other online activities competing for their attention. This research examines the measurement, prevalence, impact, and solutions for online-participant multitasking, showing that multitasking is common, is underreported by participants, can be observed unobtrusively, significantly affects participant responses, and is difficult to control.

### **Noise In The Process: An Assessment Of The Evidential Value Of Mediation Effects In Marketing Journals**

Charlton, Aaron; Montoya, Amanda (University of California - Los Angeles); Price, John (WU Vienna University of Economics and Business); Hilgard, Joe

This meta-analysis of mediation tests in marketing looks at how close reported confidence intervals are to zero and whether this indicates bias (low power, publication bias, p-hacking) in a similar way to how p-values just barely below .05 can indicate bias. After simulating mediation tests with various levels of statistical power and comparing the simulated distributions with distributions of statistics harvested from marketing journals and a sister journal in psychology, we found substantial evidence of bias in the marketing journals.

### **Session #2 Track B: Discrimination - Friday 9:30 am - 10:30 am**

#### **The "Hidden" Gender Gap in Self-Promotion and its Consequences**

Chang, Jenny (Carnegie Mellon University); Saccardo, Silvia (Carnegie Mellon University); Gallus, Jana (University of California - Los Angeles)

We investigate self-promotion as one of the determinants of gender gaps in labor markets, arguing that researchers and policymakers risk underestimating the importance of gender gaps if they focus on whether (extensive margin) and not on how (intensive margin) men and women self-promote. In Study 1 (N=5,456), we find that while men and women choose to self-promote at similar rates, there are differences in the intensity of their self-promotion. In Study 2 (N=855), we investigate the effects of both forms of self-promotion, finding that both forms help and hurt men and women equally: they positively affect judgments about qualifications and hiring decisions but hurt judgments of likability.

#### **The Effect of Positive and Negative Feedback About Bias on Subsequent Discrimination**

Kirgios, Erika (University of Chicago)

In a two-stage audit study with 3,981 current U.S. city councilors, I test whether people are more likely to help racial minorities after receiving positive, negative, or no feedback about racial bias in their professional ingroup. Relative to no feedback, negative feedback emphasizing evidence of racial discrimination in city councils did not affect city councilors' willingness to provide career advice to Black men. Positive feedback emphasizing evidence of pro-diversity behavior in city councils, however, increased current city councilors' willingness to support Black men by 36.3%. Prejudice reduction efforts may benefit from spotlighting pro-diversity behavior rather than discrimination.

#### **A Cognitive View of Police Misconduct**

Dube, Oeindrila (University of Chicago); MacArthur, Sandy Jo (University of Chicago); Shah, Anuj (University of Chicago)

What are the causes of excessive force in policing? We suggest that the cognitive demands of policing lead officers to narrowly construe the situations they encounter. Officers might make better decisions if they thought through alternative interpretations of these situations. In an RCT, we test this explanation by developing and evaluating a training with 2070 Chicago police officers. In several lab assessments, trained officers considered a wider range of evidence and more explanations for various situations. Critically, training also reduced uses of force and unnecessary arrests in the field. Our results highlight the power of behavioral insights for improving officer decision-making.

## **Session #2 Track C: Decision Modeling - Friday 9:30 am - 10:30 am**

### **Contextual Sensitivity in Naturalistic Multi-alternative Choice**

Trueblood, Jennifer (Indiana University Bloomington); Holmes, William (Indiana University Bloomington)

Recently, researchers have argued that context effects do not occur in naturalistic choices (Frederick et al., 2014). However, the absence of context effects does not imply the absence of contextual sensitivity. Context-dependent behavior occurs whenever the evaluation of an option is dependent on the other options, often defined as a violation of simple scalability. We take a joint experimental and computational modeling approach to address whether naturalistic decisions demonstrate contextual sensitivity. Results show that participants' choices violate simple scalability. We also show that models allowing violations of simple scalability better account for the data than those that do not.

### **Not by Choices Alone: Evaluating Strength of Preference Judgments**

McCoy, John (University of Pennsylvania)

Much of the study of decision making is concerned with uncovering people's preferences, yet we seldom ask people directly for the strength of their preferences, as opposed to simply asking people for their choices. I elicit from participants their choices and strength of preference judgments for pairs of gambles, as well as attractiveness ratings, and willingness to pay judgments for each gamble independently, and develop a Bayesian model of strength of preference judgments. I show that such strength of preferences judgments can be incentivized, are systematic across individuals, enable more accurate predictions of out-of-sample choices, and track preference reversals.

### **Joint modeling of eye- and mouse-tracking to understand dynamic decision processes**

Johnson, Joseph (Miami University); Pettit, Elizabeth (Miami University); Davidson, Lauren (Miami University)

The current work extends the conceptual and empirical means by which we can better understand information search and how it affects preference development over the course of a decision. Specifically, we provide a computational framework to represent the dynamic preference updating based on the evaluation of selectively-attended information, and use a combination of eye- and mouse-tracking in addition to subjective ratings to empirically validate this approach. We apply this to both inferential and preferential choice tasks using a single set of stimuli, and show the impact of individual differences and task difficulty.

## **Session #3 Track A: Financial Decision-Making - Friday 10:45 am - 11:45 am**

### **Understanding the Co-Holding Puzzle through a Field Experiment**

Batista, Rafael (University of Chicago); Mao, Ella (Stanford University); Min, Jessica (Princeton University); Sussman, Abigail (University of Chicago)

Partnering with a large bank, we find that approximately 1 in 5 customers simultaneously holds (i.e., "co-holds") high-interest debt and low-yielding savings. Through a large-scale field experiment, we test the effects of informing customers that they are co-holding and its costs. Customers act in response to the notification, immediately repaying debt. But, they do not appear to internalize the information, repaying less debt later in the same billing cycle. Preliminary analysis of a follow-up survey of these same customers, suggests mental accounting may play a primary role in active choices to co-hold.

### **Identifying Data-Driven Heterogeneity Using Machine-Learning: Evidence from Text-Message Nudges Encouraging Retirement Savings Contributions in Mexico**

Shah, Avni (University of Toronto); Osborne, Matthew (University of Toronto); Lefkowitz, Jaclyn (ideas42); Fishbane, Alissa (ideas42); Soman, Dilip (University of Toronto)

We combine traditional empirical methods with flexible HTE estimation methods based on machine learning to better predict variation and identify when and for whom interventions are more effective. To illustrate the impact of using machine learning, we partner with a bank in Mexico to employ a large-scale field experiment (N=97,149) testing several behavioral interventions designed to improve voluntary pension contributions. Though family-oriented SMS reminders increase contribution rates on average, we identify significant heterogeneity in the effectiveness based on the age of the individuals using machine-learning. Our work sheds insight on scaling behavioral interventions more broadly.

## **Scarcity and Intertemporal Choice**

Sharma, Eesha; Tully, Stephanie (University of Southern California); Wang, Xiang (University of Florida)

When does scarcity increase preferences for smaller, sooner outcomes, and might it ever increase preferences for larger, later outcomes? The current work contributes to judgment and decision-making research by examining how the time horizon of needs threatened by scarcity impacts the relationship between scarcity and intertemporal choice. Archival data from the Federal Reserve Board's Consumer Finance Institute and five highly powered, pre-registered studies (N = 7728) show that the time horizon of threatened needs, and its relationship to the timing of intertemporal choices, moderates the relationship between scarcity and intertemporal choice.

## **Session #3 Track B: Interpersonal Perception - Friday 10:45 am - 11:45 am**

### **Sending Signals: Strategic Displays of Warmth and Competence**

Guenoun, Bushra (Harvard University); Zlatev, Julian (Harvard University)

Our research combines experimental and computational approaches to understand how people manage- and mismanage- others' impressions of them. Specifically, we focus on the strategic use of warmth and competence signals in everyday language. To do so, we build a repository of 714 natural language processing features and use supervised machine-learning models to determine which features are most predictive of warmth and competence signaling. We find systematic differences in how people signal warmth and competence and whether they do so accurately. We discuss potential implications of these findings and how they can be used to mitigate errors in impression management attempts.

### **Anticipating Giving Feedback Changes Feedback**

Duke, Kristen (University of Toronto); Brucks, Melanie (Columbia University); Turetski, Daniella (University of Toronto)

Seeking feedback is an essential part of improving products and experiences. We propose that whether individuals anticipate having to give feedback prior to an experience systematically changes the type of feedback they provide. Anticipating having to provide feedback changes the focus of attention and subsequently yields advice biased towards delivery-focused attributes (e.g., aesthetics, mode of speech) as opposed to content-focused attributes (e.g., argument strength). These findings suggest that the experience of a feedback-provider might not mimic the experience of an end user, offering insight into how organizations can solicit different types of feedback depending on their needs.

### **How Verbal, Nonverbal, and Paralinguistic Interpersonal Cues Mislead Predictions**

Brooks, Alison Wood (Harvard University); Abi-Esber, Nicole (Harvard University); Mastroianni, Adam (Harvard University)

Speakers convey three distinct types of information: verbal content (what they say), nonverbal content (body language), and paralinguistic content (how they sound). Which do people attend to and rely on to make interpersonal inferences? Which are most predictive of future behavior? In a full factorial experimental design, participants observed interviews that contained or lacked verbal, nonverbal, and paralinguistic information, and made predictions about interviewees' subsequent performance on seven tasks (N = 4,248).

## **Session #3 Track C: Cognitive Psychology - Friday 10:45 am - 11:45 am**

### **On the Breadth of the Illusion of Explanatory Depth**

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)

Explaining how a target object works has been theorized to expose the gaps in one's knowledge of that object. This is called exposing an Illusion of Explanatory Depth (IOED). In three studies we demonstrate that the IOED can be similarly exposed by attempting to explain things unrelated to the target object. For example, explaining how a zipper works or how snow forms both led to a similar reduction in judged understanding of how a zipper works. These results suggest that exposing an IOED may have nothing to do with exposing the gaps in one's knowledge about a specific object, but rather be the result of the induction of a general state of intellectual humility.

## **Who Accepts Description Invariance?**

McKenzie, Craig (University of California - San Diego); Liu, Shirley (University of California - San Diego); Leong, Lim (University of California - San Diego); Sher, Shlomi

Do people believe that framing effects are mistakes? We examined whether people believe that frames should be treated the same, and whether presenting an argument for the normative principle of description invariance affects that belief. We found that up to 50% of people think it is reasonable (or in their best interest) to treat frames differently, and that presenting them with an argument in favor of description invariance has virtually no effect. We did find, however, that presenting an argument in favor of treating frames differently (information leakage) had a small but consistent effect of increasing the percentage of people who thought it reasonable to treat frames differently.

## **An Inverted-U Pattern for the Risky-Choice Framing Effect: An Experiment, a Meta-Analysis, and a Comparison of Theories**

DeKay, Michael (Ohio State University); Garge, Prachiti (Ohio State University)

Past research has neglected how the size of the risky-choice framing effect (FE) varies as a function of probability. DeKay et al. (in press) recently reported an inverted-U pattern, predicted by some theories but not others. We report a replication of this pattern (and other results) in a preregistered experiment (N=807). FEs are smaller but still sizeable at extreme probabilities. A meta-analysis (N=2518) confirms the reliability of the inverted-U pattern. We also assess how well 5 theories (PT, TAX, FTT, FTT with rounding, and PH) account for 7 features of the data. TAX edges out PT, which edges out the others. These results highlight the value of assessing an effect's generalizability.

## **Session #4 Track A: Policy/Nudges - Friday 2:15 pm - 3:15 pm**

### **When Should Governments Invest More in Nudging? Revisiting Benartzi et al. (2017)**

Tor, Avishalom (University of Notre Dame); Klick, Jonathan (University of Pennsylvania)

Highly influential recent work by Benartzi et al. (2017) argues that nudges often offer more cost-effective means than traditional interventions for changing individual behavior and that governments and organizations should therefore invest more in nudging. Yet this article demonstrates that these authors' calculations mistakenly exclude key cost elements and include mere transfers, to the systematic advantage of nudges, thereby biasing their results. Benartzi et al. (2017) also reach the wrong policy conclusions because they employ cost-effectiveness analysis to answer a question that can only be resolved through cost-benefit analysis.

### **Two Lessons for Nudge Scalability: Evidence from the Randomized Controlled Trials**

Saccardo, Silvia (Carnegie Mellon University); Dai, Hengchen (University of California - Los Angeles); Han, Maria (University of California - Los Angeles); Raja, Naveen (University of California - Los Angeles); Vangala, Sitaram (University of California - Los Angeles); Croymans, Daniel (University of California - Los Angeles)

Using data from 2 RCTs we designed to nudge COVID-19 vaccinations (N=187,134 & 149,720) and 111 nudge RCTs run by academics and a government agency (total N= 22 million), we identify novel factors that help explain why nudges that seem to work in some evaluations fail in others. First, nudges' estimated efficacy is higher when outcome measures are narrowly (vs. broadly) defined and collected over a shorter (vs. longer) horizon. Second, nudges' impact is smaller among individuals with lower baseline motivation to act. Considering how nudges' effectiveness is measured and who is nudged is key to reconciling discrepant findings in the literature and assessing the scalability of empirical results.

### **The Formality Effect**

Linos, Elizabeth (Harvard Kennedy School); Lasky-Fink, Jessica (UC - Berkeley); Larkin, Chris (U of London); Moore, Lindsay (BIT - Washington D.C.); Kirkman, Elspeth (BIT - London)

Despite a growing evidence base on the efficacy of behaviorally-informed government communications, there is little rigorous evidence on the impact of information presentation. Across six studies (total N = 211,248), we provide evidence of a "Formality Effect": more formal government communications yield higher average response rates, and are perceived as more important and credible, especially among residents with relatively low trust in government. This effect is in direct contrast to experts' predictions: in an online survey of 351 researchers and practitioners, respondents overwhelmingly predict that informal communications will be more effective than formal communications.

#### **Session #4 Track B: Negotiation & Conflict - Friday 2:15 pm - 3:15 pm**

##### **Is Transparency Enough? The Effect of Historical Pay Information on Negotiations**

Dai, Hengchen (UCLA); Long, Xiaoyang (University of Wisconsin); Zhang, Dennis (Washington University in St. Louis)

Pay transparency is often assumed to reduce pay inequality by prompting underpaid workers to negotiate. We test how historical peer pay information affects pay negotiations in 3 field and lab studies. Contrary to predictions of the prior literature, workers negotiate more not only when learning that they are offered lower pay than others, but also when learning that they are paid the same as others. Consequently, our behavioral model and simulations reveal that pay transparency may surprisingly amplify pay inequality by prompting workers who are already highly paid to ask for more. Our work highlights that pay transparency may not be a panacea for pay inequality.

##### **Disagreement is a short-hand for poor listening: People judge listeners who disagree with them to be worse listeners and less open-minded than listeners that agree with them**

Ren, Zhiying (University of Pennsylvania); Schaumburg, Rebecca (University of Pennsylvania)

If a person says, "I hear what you are saying, but I think differently", is the person a bad listener? Across three preregistered studies (N total = 811), we find that speakers believe listeners who agree with them are better and more open-minded than listeners who disagree with them, even when the objective listening quality is held constant. We document this effect in a variety of conversational contexts (e.g., polarized conversation, organizational decision-making). We propose that this effect could be explained by a naive-realism perspective. We discuss the implications of this effect for understanding political polarization and facilitating effective collaborative decision-making.

##### **"I Avoid Negotiating Because I Care": Negotiation Avoidance Due to (Inflated) Concern about Jeopardizing a Deal**

Hart, Einav (George Mason University); Bear, Julia (Stony Brook University)

Despite potential economic benefits of negotiating, people are often reluctant to negotiate. Across preregistered studies, including field data from managers and career advisors, and experiments, we show that people avoid negotiation not because they are indifferent, but precisely because they care greatly about outcomes and are concerned that negotiation could jeopardize a deal. We show that this concern about jeopardizing a deal reflects a flawed mental model: The concern is inflated compared to the actual likelihood of counterparts walking away. We identify informational interventions that decrease the inflated concern about jeopardizing a deal, and in turn, reduce negotiation avoidance.

#### **Session #4 Track C: Decision Analysis - Friday 2:15 pm - 3:15 pm**

##### **A Test of Recursive Models of Ambiguity Aversion**

Kieren, Pascal (Heidelberg University); Gertsman, Gleb (Tilburg University)

We study agents' preferences for ambiguity resolution in dynamic environments. We first demonstrate that popular recursive models of ambiguity make different predictions regarding the timing and graduality of ambiguity resolution. We then test the models' performance in an extension of the original Ellsberg (1961) experiment. Our results show a strong interdependence between ambiguity attitudes and preference for the timing and graduality of ambiguity resolution, consistent with the smooth model of ambiguity (Klibanoff et al., 2009). The interdependence that this paper identifies is of interest both conceptually and practically especially for researchers using these models in applications.

##### **Combining Judgmental Forecasts With Base Rates To Improve Decision Making: A Data-Driven Application To 20 Years Of Drug Development Predictions**

Palley, Asa (Indiana University Bloomington); Satopaa, Ville (INSEAD); Grushka-Cockayne, Yael (University of Virginia); Persinger, Charles

We propose a method to adjust expert probability judgments based on a behavioral model of imperfect belief updating. The model allows for the possibility that experts either remain too close to or move too far away from a prior reference probability, and prescribes a context-specific degree of adjustment to counteract any such bias. We apply the method to real expert forecasts of the probability of success in drug development. These experts are given a prior reference probability for the historical success rate of



similar drugs in each phase of clinical trials and, after a group discussion, decide together on a probability. Holdout evaluation finds strong improvements in prediction accuracy.

### **Network Risk Dispersion: Do Network Characteristics influence Human Network Assessment?**

Stroom, Martijn (Maastricht University); Rohde, Ingrid; Kessels, Roselinde (Maastricht University); Strobel, Martin (Maastricht University)

This study explored how humans perceive risk dispersion in networks. Heuristics assist subconscious guesstimating of network risk. We explore how humans perceive risk based on network characteristics. We find that the perceived risk is not solely based on the objective probability of risk, since easily assessable factors have stronger predictive values than the objective probability. Our results consolidate that humans' processing of risk in networks is not completely rational and also depends on the simple characteristics of these networks. The often-complex mental calculation of objective risk dispersion in networks is substituted by a heuristics-driven approach.

### **Session #5 Track A: Health and Healthcare - Friday 3:30 pm - 4:30 pm**

#### **Promoting Healthful Behaviors by Incentivizing Exploration for Health-Promoting Alternatives**

Shavit, Yael (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology); Teodorescu, Kinneret (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology); Roth, Yefim (University of Haifa)

The current study addresses the reluctance to engage in healthy behaviors as a problem of insufficient exploration for healthy rewarding options. We present a new intervention focused on encouraging exploration of new healthy alternatives rather than incentivizing repeated healthy behaviors. In a pilot intervention, we found that incentivizing exploration led participants to try more new and varied salads, which they continued to consume one year after the intervention ended. In a follow-up study that included a larger number of participants, we used limited changing menus to encourage exploration and found that this method effectively promoted exploration without monetary incentives.

#### **A Wake Up Call: The Effect Of Nightshifts On Physicians' Decision Making**

Choshen-Hillel, Shoham (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Gordon-Hecker, Tom (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Israel, Salomon (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Caruso, Eugene (University of California - Los Angeles); Perry, Anat (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Gileles-Hillel, Alex (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

Adequate pain management is one of the biggest challenges of the healthcare system. Physicians must assess patient subjective pain and integrate medical factors to decide whether to prescribe a pain medication and which one. We hypothesized that nightshifts affected physician pain management decisions by impairing their empathy for pain. We studied physicians' decisions in a controlled experiment (N=67 physicians) and in medical decisions in the field (N=13,482 hospital discharge notes). As predicted, following a nightshift, physicians showed reduced empathy for pain and prescribed fewer analgesics. We consider the implications for sleep deprived individuals and for organizations.

#### **Do physicians interpret cumulative risk curves accurately?**

Neth, Hansjoerg (University of Konstanz); Ehmann, Nina (University of Konstanz); Streeb, Dirk (University of Konstanz); Rhiem, Kerstin (Other); Schmutzler, Rita K. (Other); Gaissmaier, Wolfgang (University of Konstanz)

Increasingly available personalized disease predictions based on genetic risk factors require good risk counselling. For instance, women with BRCA mutations have a vastly increased risk of breast cancer and face dramatic treatment decisions. An accurate understanding of their risk is crucial and can be derived from cumulative risk curves that depict their likelihood of cancer by age. Physicians (N = 294) failed to interpret such curves correctly and made predictable mistakes that over- or underestimated risk. Tailored visualizations increased accuracy, but did not yield comprehension transfer. Thus, interactive tools that tailor and individualize representations may be required in practice.

### **Session #5 Track B: Moral Judgment/Ethics - Friday 3:30 pm - 4:30 pm**

#### **Asymmetric Reactions to Erroneous Punishments and Rewards**

Rude, Eitan (University of California - Los Angeles); Shaddy, Franklin (University of California - Los Angeles)

Punishments and rewards are intended to discourage negative behaviors and encourage positive ones. But mistakes happen. Sometimes the deserving are not punished or rewarded (false negatives), and other times, the undeserving are (false positives). Which is worse, when, and why? For punishments, we find that people care more about preventing false negatives than fixing them. For rewards, the opposite holds: people care more about preventing false positives than fixing them. These findings help shed light on why real-world policies can often seem inconsistent in prospect vs. retrospect (e.g., calls for "tough-on-crime" reforms in prospect vs. support for "innocence projects" in retrospect).

### **People acknowledge and condone their own morally motivated reasoning**

Cusimano, Corey (Yale University); Lombrozo, Tania (Princeton University)

Prominent models of belief formation claim that people operate under an "illusion of objectivity"; such that they nearly always take their beliefs to have been formed impartially. We identify an exception in the domain of morally motivated reasoning. Across two studies (N = 1,766), we found that when evaluating scientific evidence, participants engaged in morally motivated skepticism of morally risky beliefs (e.g., race-based differences), acknowledged that they had done so, and judged their motivated reasoning to be ideal reasoning. Motivated reasoning is not always the result of unconscious processes; it can also result from conscious norms for reasoning that reject impartiality.

### **Signals of Virtue and When they Backfire: How Honesty Badges Provide Cover for Dishonesty**

Permut, Stephanie (Carnegie Mellon University); Saccardo, Silvia (Carnegie Mellon University); Chapman, Gretchen (Carnegie Mellon University)

Organizations have begun using public signals of virtue (e.g., honesty badges) to incentivize good behavior. In six studies (N=2047), we show that, although people expect badges to motivate honesty (Study 1a), they can backfire by giving cover to dishonest individuals. Workers will engage in the minimum amount of honesty needed to earn honesty badges and behave dishonestly elsewhere (S1b). Honesty badges benefit dishonest workers by making them appear more honest relative to no-badge controls (S1c). Removing badges "abilities to provide cover" by clarifying how they were earned "prevents backfiring" (S2a & S2b). These effects extend to real-world badge policies like Open Science badges (S3).

### **Session #5 Track C: Prediction and Algorithms - Friday 3:30 pm - 4:30 pm**

#### **Effective but unappreciated: People adopt algorithmic advice, but do not value this help**

Bereby-Meyer, Yoella (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Rabinovitch, Hagai (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Budescu, David (Fordham University)

Candidates' selection is often affected by irrelevant factors like gender or race, and people fail to adjust their predictions accordingly. An algorithm based on a regression model can account for the irrelevant information by treating it as a suppressor variable. In four studies, we found that participants followed algorithms' and humans' advice to the same extent, which improved their choices compared to participants deciding by themselves. Yet, they strongly rejected algorithms and preferred human advisors as a means for selecting candidates in general. Despite algorithms' ability to correct for irrelevant information, people do not appreciate such assistance.

#### **When and why implementing bad AI algorithms feels worse than self-initiating them**

Shlomo, Bar (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Moran, Simone (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Schurr, Amos (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)

Algorithm regulation i.e., the question of who is authorized to decide which algorithms to implement, portrays a key ethical debate regarding AI. We focus on AI programmers, who play a central role in AI deployment processes. Findings of 4 studies suggest that compared to Low-agency programmers who are instructed which algorithm (deontological or utilitarian) to implement, high agency programmers who freely choose which algorithm to employ, engage in a pre-justification process, and are thus better equipped to overcome cognitive-dissonance when encountering fatal unfavorable outcomes, and feel less responsibility, guilt, and regret about both their programming and the outcome.

#### **Predicting Against Judgment: When People Fail to Predict What They Believe to be Most Likely to Arise**

Sun, Chengyao (Washington University in St Louis); LeBoeuf, Robyn (Washington University in St Louis)

People often predict the outcome of an event from a set of possible outcomes. Normatively, people should pick whichever they believe to be the most likely outcome as their prediction. We document a robust disconnect between what people predict and what they believe to be most likely to arise. We find that people consider not only which outcome is most likely relative to other outcomes but also whether the most likely outcome is likely to happen in an absolute sense. When the most likely outcome has a low (vs. high) likelihood of happening, people less often choose the most likely outcome as their prediction—even though they still know this outcome is the most likely outcome to arise.

# 2022 SJDM Conference Paper Abstracts

SATURDAY NOVEMBER 12, 2022

## **Session #6 Track A: Prosocial Behavior - Saturday 8:15 am - 9:15 am**

### **The Honeymoon Fund Effect: How do Choices Promote Giving Behavior?**

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

Many fundraising programs only list the total amount of their goals. However, recently in the wedding industry, websites allow newly married couples to set up a honeymoon fund. Honeymoon funds are cash registries, which often break up the trip into a series of smaller expenses, such as travel, lodging, and experiences. Guests can then choose which expense to contribute to. In this research, we examine whether the idea behind these websites is effective; does allowing people to choose from the breakdown of costs increase giving? We find that givers respond more generously when they can choose compared to when they cannot because they perceive their contribution to be more helpful.

### **When Donation Feels Like Volunteering, People Give: A "Donateer" Fundraising Method**

Yang, Adelle (National University of Singapore); Urmitsky, Oleg (University of Chicago)

Eight preregistered experiments ( $N = 4,586$ ) show that a "donateer fundraising method" asking people to donate income from a dedicated future session of their regular work increases donations relative to standard donation appeals that ask directly for a monetary gift of the same value. We find the donateer method is more effective primarily because it evokes more positive emotions, those that are typically associated with a volunteering experience. The experiments support the emotion mechanism and rule out alternative explanations, including time vs. money-associated mindsets, different charity perceptions, perceived impact, and the signaling of moral image.

### **Collective Streaks Motivate Prosocial Behavior**

Levari, David (Harvard University); Norton, Michael (Harvard University)

We introduce a novel way to encourage prosocial behavior: highlighting collective streaks across individuals (e.g., "the last X people in a row have done it"). In six experiments ( $N = 6,619$ ), asking people to join an ongoing streak of workplace volunteers or donors was more effective than describing a high percentage (e.g., "X% of people have done it"), because streaks increased feelings of personal impact and predicted future donation rates. While many streaks in everyday life and organizations involve people who know each other, collective streaks can be effective even when their members are anonymous, and offer a way to encourage prosocial behaviors that are not already popular.

## **Session #6 Track B: Inequality & Exclusion- Saturday 8:15 am - 9:15 am**

### **Gatekeeping of Identity and Group Membership**

Weingarten, Evan (Arizona State University); Gershon, Rachel (University of California - San Diego); Bhattacharjee, Amit (INSEAD)

Who defines identity or group membership, and how do we perceive those who exclude (vs. include) outsiders? Five preregistered studies ( $N=2,566$ ) and ratings of field stimuli find that excluders (gatekeepers) are seen as less likeable but more committed to their group (vs. those who are inclusive to outsiders). These perceptions depend on candidate fit and group is defined by "sacred values". While gatekeeping increases perceived commitment only when the applicant is a bad fit with the group's values, it reduces likeability regardless of fit. However, people who hold group values sacred favor gatekeeping more and reward exclusive group leaders with increased support and actual donations.

### **Public Awareness of Algorithmic Racial Bias Worsens Racial Inequality**

Zhang, Shunyuan (Harvard University); Yang, Yang (University of Florida)

While public awareness is important for compelling companies and policymakers to address the issue of algorithmic bias, we discover an unintended consequence of raising awareness: When people learn that certain algorithms are biased, they

overgeneralize the information, treating "good" (i.e., fair and beneficial) algorithms as biased, too. An analysis of a longitudinal Airbnb dataset reveals that awareness of algorithmic racial bias widened the racial gap in the usage of Airbnb's Smart Pricing, a "good" algorithm, by 61.2%. Controlled experiments confirm that raising awareness of algorithmic racial bias can deter Black consumers (but not white consumers) from using "good" algorithms.

### **Economic segregation reduces concern about economic inequality**

Davidai, Shai (Columbia University); Goya-Tocchetto, Daniela (Duke University); Lawson, Asher (Duke University)

Five studies find evidence that economic segregation - "the geographical separation of people with different economic means" - reduces concerns about inequality. Combining archival and experimental methods, we show that when the rich and the poor are segregated from each other, people are less likely to engage in social comparisons and are therefore less likely to notice and be concerned by economic inequality. Importantly, we find that this is true even when people are exposed to the same levels of inequality, poverty, or wealth, suggesting that segregation in and of itself affects judgments of inequality.

## **Session #6 Track C: Cognitive Biases- Saturday 8:15 am - 9:15 am**

### **Less-Is-More Belief and Heuristic Aversion**

Reb, Jochen (Singapore Management University); Masters-Waage, Theodore (Singapore Management University); McGuire, Jack (National University of Singapore)

In three pre-registered experiments we 1) establish the presence of heuristic aversion, 2) examine whether this effect is mediated by perceptions of accuracy and speed, and 3) investigate "more-is-more" vs "less-is-more" beliefs as a possible moderator. In all three studies we asked participants with hiring experience to indicate which strategy (i.e., inference vs. multiple regression) they would prefer to use in making the hiring decision between two job candidates. Overall, the findings provide strong evidence for a heuristic aversion in hiring decisions, that is mediated by perception of accuracy and moderated by the belief that "less-is-more".

### **Big Data Bias**

Vosgerau, Joachim (Bocconi University); Scopelliti, Irene (City University of London); Giambastiani, Gaia (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

We show that as sample size increases, decision-makers with varying levels of expertise are more likely to erroneously interpret correlational evidence as indicative of causation. They do so because they believe that increasing data quantity necessarily increases data quality, neglecting the dramatic benefits of random assignment, and because they have difficulties applying the abstract principle that "correlation does not imply causation" to specific contexts. Advocates of the big data revolution claim that "with enough data, the numbers speak for themselves" (Anderson, 2008) irrespective of the process generating the data. Our results show that this is a dangerously misleading belief.

### **Control Group Neglect**

Voichok, Guy (Imperial College London); Dhar, Ravi (Yale University); Frederick, Shane (Yale University)

The benefits of treatments or services are often assessed by comparing a treatment group (who receives the treatment or service) and a control group (who does not). Accordingly, any analytic decisions that serve to increase the apparent performance of the treatment group or depress the apparent performance of the control group can exaggerate the apparent effect. We show that analytic decisions that affect control group data evoke less concern and receive less scrutiny than analogous decisions regarding treatment group data. We discuss origins and implications of this asymmetry as well as ways to reduce it.

## **Session #7 Track A: Time and Preferences - Saturday 9:30 am - 10:30 am**

### **Anticipatory Utility and Intertemporal Choice**

Thakral, Neil (Brown University)

This paper presents a theory of intertemporal choice based on utility from anticipation of future consumption. Following psychological and neural evidence, the model posits that decision makers initially focus on the most tempting alternative in their choice set and experience gain-loss utility from looking forward to future consumption. When evaluating a consumption stream, the decision maker chooses a level of anticipation each period, and anticipatory utility exhibits reference dependence with respect

to their previous level of anticipation. The model explains a large collection of existing empirical and experimental evidence on intertemporal choice and makes new predictions.

### **How well do laboratory-derived estimates of time preference predict real-world behaviors? Comparisons to four benchmarks**

Bartels, Daniel (University of Chicago); Li, Ye (University of California - Riverside); Bharti, Soaham (University of Chicago)

A large literature implicates time preference as a predictor of a wide range of behaviors, because most behaviors involve sooner and delayed consequences. We aimed to provide the most comprehensive examination to date of how well estimates of time preference relate self-reports of 36 behaviors, ranging from retirement savings to flossing, in a test-rest design over 4.5 months (N = 1308). We found time preference was modestly associated with about half of the 36 behaviors we measured, even after controlling for 15 covariates. Moreover, time preference researchers (N = 55) overestimated its predictive power. We discuss implications of invoking time preference as a predictor of behavior.

### **Value(s) of Time: How People Decide to Work for Money**

Smitizsky, Gal (University of California - San Diego); Liu, Wendy (University of California - San Diego); Gneezy, Uri (University of California - San Diego)

We examine how people assign monetary value to their time in a labor context. In theory, the exchange rate between time and money is invariant to the elicitation method. In contrast, we find time valuation to directly depend on whether the payment structure is defined by a fixed amount of money or a fixed amount of time. When the task fixes the money earned (vs. time worked), people become more sensitive to the pain of their effort, resulting in divergent wage demands. Results provide a deeper understanding of how individuals value their time and when the quality of the time spent matters, with implications for wellbeing.

### **Session #7 Track B: Diversity - Saturday 9:30 am - 10:30 am**

#### **Demographic "Stickiness": The Demographic Identity of Departing Group Members Influences Who Is Chosen to Replace Them**

Chang, Edward (Harvard University); Kirgios, Erika (University of Chicago)

People tasked with replacing a departing group member are disproportionately likely to choose a replacement with the same demographic identity, leading to demographic "stickiness" in group composition. We find evidence of this effect in U.S. federal judge appointments, board director selections, and experiments. The propensity to select new group members based on demographic resemblance to their predecessors suggests that demographic change in organizations will be slow, but increases in diversity will persist longer than might otherwise be expected.

#### **Insider versus Outsider Perceptions of Group Diversity**

Rai, Aneesh (University of Pennsylvania); Kirgios, Erika (University of Chicago); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania)

We propose an important hurdle preventing organizations from diversifying is their ability to accurately diagnose a lack of diversity in their ranks. We theorize that people who belong to or create groups ("insiders") perceive their groups to be more diverse than outside observers ("outsiders"). Across two pre-registered experiments (N=2,787), we find that participants judge groups they created (i.e., "insiders") to be more diverse and less in need of further diversification than outsider participants with no role in the group (i.e., "outsiders"). Our findings provide new evidence to help explain why some organizations may do less than is necessary to increase the diversity of their ranks.

#### **Large-Scale Inclusion Training for Online Community Moderators**

Zhao, Xuan (Stanford University); Hamedani, MarYam (Stanford University); Lee, Cino (Stanford University); Markus, Hazel (Stanford University); Eberhardt, Jennifer (Stanford University)

Maintaining civil and inclusive conversations is a persistent challenge for online communities. In collaboration with a large social networking platform, we report the first attempt to introduce a short online bias and inclusion training course for volunteer community moderators and a large-scale, preregistered field study (N = 297,322) to examine course engagement and effectiveness. Among four messaging strategies, "facilitate respectful conversation" was the most effective in mobilizing people to participate in

this course and appealed across the political divide. Furthermore, completing the course successfully led to both immediate attitude change and long-term behavior change.

### **Session #7 Track C: Learning and Attribution - Saturday 9:30 am - 10:30 am**

#### **Talent Spotting in Crowd Prediction**

Atanasov, Pavel (Pytho); Himmelstein, Mark (Fordham University)

How can we spot skilled forecasters? Study 1 provides a literature review and summary of over 40 skill-spotting measures, listed in five categories: accuracy-related, intersubjective, behavioral, dispositional and expertise-based. Intersubjective, behavioral and performance-based measures exhibit strong correlations with accuracy, while self-reports on thinking-style dispositions and expertise do not. Study 2 replicates these findings by pitting a subset of measures across the five categories in a direct comparison. A LASSO model provides a parsimonious set of predictors that include proxy scores and belief updating measures.

#### **Chasing Fictitious Variation: Random Outcomes are Attributed to Skill in Competitive Environments**

Brimhall, Craig (University of California - Los Angeles); Tannenbaum, David (University of Utah)

We examine how decision makers often fail to appreciate that as competitions become increasingly skilled, chance plays an increasingly important role in deciding who wins. The reason for this "paradox of skill" is simple: competition removes low performers which reduces the variation in skill among those who remain and thus random variation plays a greater role in determining outcomes. In seven studies we show people misunderstand this relationship because when assessing outcome randomness individuals focus on absolute skill instead of relative differences in skill. As a result, when competitors are highly competent but equally skilled, people view outcomes as more predictable than they are.

#### **Learning From the Best (and Worst): Comparative Learning Improves Performance but is Undervalued**

Jeong, Martha (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Dong, Sherry Xiawei (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology)

We frequently attempt to learn from other's experiences, particularly successful others. While learning from successes appears reasonable, our research demonstrates these preferences are suboptimal. Our studies show those who viewed exemplars underperformed compared to those who simultaneously learned how someone failed and succeeded. Not only do people undervalue comparative learning, they develop a false sense of confidence when basking in the glory of others' success. Our research suggests we can increase people's chances of reaping the benefits of comparative learning by highlighting the dichotomous nature of the feedback and increasing the salience of learning, over performance, goals.

### **Session #8 Track A: Consequences of Timing - Saturday 1:00 pm - 2:00 pm**

#### **When the Unexpected Happens: How People Respond to Unbudgeted Time Savings**

Trupia, Maria Giulia (University of California - Los Angeles); Engeler, Isabelle (IESE Business School)

As people suffer from time famine, one might expect that unexpected time savings should make people happy. However, five preregistered studies show that whereas finishing a task later than planned significantly decreases happiness, finishing the task earlier by the same amount of time does not substantially increase happiness. This numbness to windfalls is specific to time "monetary savings increase happiness significantly more than time savings" and holds when controlling for outcome quality. We uncover one reason for this numbness to time windfalls: People seem to fail to reinvest them. Crucially, people overpredict how happy they would feel when saving time.

#### **The Streak-End Rule: Evidence from a Large-Scale Natural Field Experiment With Volunteer Crisis Counselors**

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

We examine how the content and order of past experiences causally influence future behaviors by 14,383 volunteer crisis counselors, who were repeatedly and randomly assigned to perform 1,976,649 prosocial behaviors that were either harder (suicide conversations) or easier (non-suicide conversations). Content of past experiences mattered: Harder (versus easier) behaviors encouraged quitting. But order of past experiences also profoundly mattered: Harder behaviors caused disproportionately more



quitting if they came in long "streaks" or at the "end". Our results suggest a reordering intervention which avoids the creation of hard "streaks" would reduce volunteer quitting by 22%, saving lives.

### **The Effect of Time of Day on Extremity Bias in Online Reviews**

Haghighi, Nasir (Washington State University); Sepehri, Amir (ESSEC Business School); Jami, Ata (Kellogg School of Management); Kouchaki, Maryam (Kellogg School of Management)

The precision of information processing is subject to cognitive limitations and it is an open question whether deciders have the meta-cognitive awareness to adapt their risk-taking to these limitations. To test this, we conducted studies in which participants estimated the means of number distributions from sequential samples and bet on their estimation accuracy. As a result, participants integrated highly variable information more imprecisely. Crucially, participants' risk-taking behavior was adapted to this pattern of imprecision, while deviating from the predictions of Bayesian models. Thus, it is important to account for cognitive limitations to understand risk-taking.

### **Session #8 Track B: Work - Saturday 1:00 pm - 2:00 pm**

#### **Workplace Competition and the Desire for Uniqueness**

Smith, Samantha (Harvard University); Chang, Edward (Harvard University); Kirgios, Erika (University of Pennsylvania); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania)

Across four preregistered studies (n=3,202), we find that intra-group competition increases people's willingness to join groups where they will be underrepresented along a given identity dimension (e.g., area of specialization, political affiliation). Via mediation and moderation, we show that desires for uniqueness help explain competition's effects on people's group selection preferences. These findings illuminate how competition drives desires for uniqueness in organizations, with implications for understanding when people's fundamental needs for belonging versus needs for uniqueness prevail in group selection decisions.

#### **Remote Work**

Sherlock, Joseph (Duke University); Daly, Michael (Duke University)

Detachment of work from place was a growing trend that the global COVID-19 pandemic greatly accelerated. Several large-scale studies suggest that remote work is associated with an increase in productivity. The Center for Advanced Hindsight worked with partners to understand the ecosystem within which people work remotely and improve it using behavioral science. Overall, respondents expressed the desire to spend more of their time working remotely after COVID-19. Intervening with home-office redesign seems promising to boost productivity for individuals who lose productivity with remote work.

#### **The "Detachment Paradox": Employers Recognize the Benefits of Detachment for Productivity, yet Penalize it in Employee Evaluations**

Buechel, Eva (University of South Carolina); Solinas, Elisa (University of Southern California)

Psychological detachment from work increases worker wellbeing and productivity and should thus be encouraged. However, we highlight a cognitive bias that leads to a "Detachment Paradox". Despite recognizing the benefits of detachment for worker wellbeing and productivity, managers penalize detaching workers in worker evaluations because they perceive them as less committed. Workers, aware of the penalty, avoid detaching activities when employee evaluation is salient, match detaching behaviors to company norms, and are reluctant to share detaching activities with employers. We propose interventions to reduce the detachment penalty in an attempt to break a reinforcing culture of non-detachment.

### **Session #8 Track C: Managerial/Group Decision Making - Saturday 1:00 pm - 2:00 pm**

#### **Organizational Accountability Systems and Managerial Risk-Taking**

Faro, David (London Business School); Gurdamar Okutur, Nazli (Koç University)

Managers are often reluctant to take risks, even when those are warranted and may benefit the organization. In other cases, however, there is excessive risk taking. We show that the performance evaluation system of an organization affects managerial risk-taking. Using 3 online studies and 1 field study, we show that decision-makers tend to take less risk when they expect to be evaluated by the results of their decisions rather than by the process that led to those decisions. However, when decision-makers

carry past losses, and when taking risk could offset these losses, holding them accountable for results (vs. process) increases the tendency to take risk.

### **Are managers good at using the sunk-cost effect as a nudge? A misinfluence perspective on 'escalation of commitment'**

Goh, E-Yang (National University of Singapore); Daniels, David (National University of Singapore)

Many current theoretical perspectives suggest that managers will be good at strategically leveraging others' decision biases to influence them. A common bias is the sunk-cost effect, where individuals are more likely to choose a course of action merely because resources were previously invested in it. In a series of experiments, we tested how good managers are at strategically using the sunk-cost effect as a nudge to influence others' commitment levels in desired directions. In contrast to theoretical predictions, we find that managers often fail to optimally use the sunk-cost effect to nudge others in desired directions, supporting an emerging "misinfluence perspective" on influence.

### **Pivotal voting: The opportunity to tip group decisions skews juries and other voting outcomes**

Winet, Yuji K. (University of Chicago); Davenport, Diag (University of Chicago)

Many important policy decisions are made by small groups of people with the hope that a collective process will yield better and fairer decisions. But how do group members get swayed away from voting for what they initially believe and into what simply gets the group to a decision? Across four studies (N = 4,657), we present evidence from real U.S. juries and online labs to show that pivotal voters often vote merely to help their group reach a decision, which can lead to drastically different group outcomes (e.g., convictions instead of hung juries). We demonstrate that our effect is influenced by inferences about responsibility for outcomes. Policy implications are discussed.

## **Session #9 Track A: Estimation - Saturday 2:15 pm - 3:15 pm**

### **What's in a Sample? How Sampling Information Affects Epistemic Uncertainty and Risk-Taking**

Olschewski, Sebastian (University of Basel); Scheibehenne, Benjamin (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology)

The precision of information processing is subject to cognitive limitations and it is an open question whether deciders have the meta-cognitive awareness to adapt their risk-taking to these limitations. To test this, we conducted studies in which participants estimated the means of number distributions from sequential samples and bet on their estimation accuracy. As a result, participants integrated highly variable information more imprecisely. Crucially, participants' risk-taking behavior was adapted to this pattern of imprecision, while deviating from the predictions of Bayesian models. Thus, it is important to account for cognitive limitations to understand risk-taking.

### **Preparing for the best as much as the worst: Decision-makers ignore the probability of outcomes when making backup plans**

Ryan, William (University of California - Berkeley); Baum, Stephen (University of California - Berkeley); Evers, Ellen (University of California - Berkeley)

People often must plan for the worst. They purchase product warranties, insure their homes, and proactively make backup plans. All else equal, people should be willing to pay more to hedge against bad outcomes when those bad outcomes are more likely to occur. For example, flood insurance should be more attractive to a homeowner in Florida than in Arizona. In 7 studies (N = 3,163) we find that participants almost fully ignore probability information and dramatically overinvest in hedges that are unlikely to be needed while underinvesting in hedges that are likely to be helpful.

### **What is 'Average'?**

Howard, Ray (Texas A&M University); Shiri, Amin (Texas A&M University)

In the present research we test the hypothesis that when people encounter a positively (negatively) skewed distribution of outcomes over time, their perception of what is average systematically underestimates (overestimates) the true mean. This hypothesis is supported by twenty pre-registered experiments (N = 8,748).

## **Session #9 Track B: Behavioral Ethics - Saturday 2:15 pm - 3:15 pm**

### **Willful ignorance: a meta analytic review**

Vu, Linh (University of Amsterdam); Soraperra, Ivan (University of Amsterdam); Leib, Margarita (University of Amsterdam); van der Weele, JoÃ«l (University of Amsterdam); Shalvi, Shaul (University of Amsterdam)

People sometimes avoid information about the impact of their action as an excuse to be selfish. Such "willful ignorance" reduces prosociality and has detrimental effects. We report the first meta-analysis on willful ignorance, analyzing 33,603 decisions made by 6,531 participants. Results reveal the ability to avoid information decreases prosociality by 28%, even if participants can easily acquire information. About 40% of the observed ignorance is committed by reluctant altruists who use ignorance to excuse selfishness. We investigate the boundary conditions of willful ignorance and address implications of our findings on who engages in willful ignorance, as well as when and why.

### **Material Scarcity and Unethical Economic Behavior: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis**

Truelsen Elbaek, Christian (Aarhus University); Mitkidis, Panagiotis (Aarhus University); AarÃ«e, Lene (Aarhus University); Otterbring, Tobias

Individuals around the globe experience different forms of resource scarcity. While experiences of scarcity have been shown to make people focused on regaining resources, findings on how scarcity affects moral behavior remain mixed. In this meta-analysis, we evaluate how material scarcity affects moral economic behavior, by analyzing a comprehensive dataset (k=44, N=6,921) across four distinct types of scarcity. We find that acute scarcity increases the propensity to engage in unethical behavior. Importantly, we find no evidence that low social class affects unethical behavior. We discuss how these findings advance our understanding of the psychological and moral consequences of scarcity.

### **The Good in Evil: Decision-Makers Overestimate the Reputational Costs of Necessary Evils**

White, Michael (Columbia University); King, Stacia (Stanford University); Levine, Emma (University of Chicago)

Decision-makers often have opportunities to commit necessary evils (i.e., behaviors that cause harm to produce a benefit). In two novel incentive-compatible games, we find that decision-makers underestimate targets' appreciation of necessary evils. Decision-makers focus on the immediate harm they cause, whereas targets focus on the instrumental benefits that result. Consequently, targets judge decision-makers who commit necessary evils more positively than they expect. This research suggests that everyday necessary evils may not be as costly as past work on deontological-utilitarian dilemmas has assumed, and highlights how harm aversion can bias decision-makers' social expectations.

## **Session #9 Track C: Attention and Memory - Saturday 2:15 pm - 3:15 pm**

### **Attention Constraints and Learning in Categories**

Bhui, Rahul (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Jiao, Peiran (Maastricht University)

Decision makers may cope with attention constraints by processing information at the simpler level of a category. We test whether this category focus stems from an adaptive response to attention constraints, as predicted by seminal theories, in five preregistered experiments using an information sampling paradigm with mousetracking. Consistent with rational principles, we find that people focus more on category-level information when individual differences are small, when time constraints are more severe, and when the category contains more members. Our results thus substantiate core elements of influential theories of categorical information processing.

### **A Framework for Jointly Modeling Attentional and Decision Processes in Choice**

Wall, Daniel (University of Pennsylvania); Bhatia, Sudeep (University of Pennsylvania)

We propose a computational framework for modeling attentional and decision processes. Within the framework, we implement 63 existing and new decision models, and a new attentional model. Our combined attention and decision models can predict what people sample, when they terminate choice, and which option they choose. We evaluate our models on eye-movement and choice data from five experiments in three domains: risk, time, and effort allocation. Our findings reveal the core mechanisms at play in choice and resolve recent theoretical debates on the interplay of attention and choice. In doing so, they provide new insights on how researchers can model complex choice processes.

## **A Framework for Modeling and Explaining Everyday Memory-Based Decisions**

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

We study how people retrieve and choose between hundreds of choice items stored in memory. Our approach combines leading theories of memory search and decision making, with new techniques from data science (which allow us to derive representations for everyday choice items, and model individual-specific preferences and retrieval tendencies). We successfully describe the items that are retrieved from memory in naturalistic settings and can thus accurately predict choice even when memory processes are not directly observed. Our results show how established theories can be combined with new computational techniques, to predict and explain complex decision processes.

## **SJDM Poster Session #1**

**Friday, November 11; 5.15-6.15 pm**

1. Anchoring the Advisor: Do decision makers induce cognitive biases in their advisors when asking for advice?  
Reif, Jessica (Duke University); Larrick, Richard (Duke University); Soll, Jack (Duke University)
2. Strategy Selection in Sequential Advice Taking  
Rebholz, Tobias R. (University of Tuebingen); Huetter, Mandy (University of Tuebingen); Voss, Andreas (Heidelberg University)
3. Decline, Adopt, or Compromise: A New Model of Advice Taking  
Himmelstein, Mark (Fordham University); Budescu, David (Fordham University)
4. How Evaluation Mode and Beneficiary's Emotional Expressions Affect Donations  
De Roni, Prisca (University of Padova); Caserotti, Marta (University of Padova); Pittarello, Andrea (Virginia Tech); Lotto, Lorella (University of Padova); Rubaltelli, Enrico (University of Padova)
5. Risky Prospects are Valued Differently in Isolation Versus in Comparison Contexts  
Cho, Kristine (University of California - Berkeley); Evers, Ellen (University of California - Berkeley)
6. How Mood Changes Judgments about Experiences: Happiness Leads People to Perceive Purchases as More Experiential than Material  
Oh, Hyewon (University of Illinois); Goodman, Joseph (Ohio State University); Vohs, Kathleen (University of Minnesota); Choi, Incheol (Seoul National University)
7. We're Not All in This Together: Consumers Reactions to Empathy-based Advertisements During the COVID-19 Pandemic  
Brimhall, Craig (University of Utah); VanEpps, Eric (University of Utah); Bitterly, Thomas Bradford (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Nair, Neha (University of California - Los Angeles)
8. Connecting to Others: Loneliness Induces Anthropomorphism and Spending on Pets  
Derksen, Timothy (University of Alberta); Murray, Kyle (University of Alberta); Orazi, Davide (Monash University); Seenivasan, Satheesh (Monash University)
9. Partners in crime: Gratitude increases corrupt collaboration  
Wang, Ke (Harvard University); Moore, Molly (Harvard University); Lerner, Jennifer (Harvard University)
10. The long-term leader: When thinking about the future hurts short-term employees  
Somerville, Kaylee (Queen's University); Barling, Julian (Queen's University)
11. Consumer Choices Around Corporate Giving: Should Companies Prioritise Aid to the Most Effective Causes?  
Shine, Aaron (University of Bath); Simonyan, Yvetta (University of Bath); Johnson, Samuel (University of Waterloo)
12. Justification aversion: The road to stickier defaults?  
Banki, Daniel (Universitat Pompeu Fabra); Navarro-Martinez, Daniel (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)
13. Moral Wiggle Room in Consumption Scenarios  
Segal, Shoshana (New York University); Menon, Geeta (New York University)
14. Misinformation can undermine prosocial behavior in a public goods game  
Martel, Cameron (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Druckman, James (Northwestern University); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
15. The social impact of sharing economy: investigating the role of market vs. communal relationships  
Kuzminska, Anna (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities); Gasiorowska, Agata (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities); Narkun, Magda (University of Warsaw); Kasalka, Ola (University of Warsaw); Zaleskiewicz, Tomasz (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities)

16. Honesty in Personal and Professional Life  
Kim, Yena (University of Chicago); Bitterly, T. Bradford (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Levine, Emma (University of Chicago)
17. Charitable Donation Theories in the Wild: Evidence from a Large Online Donation Platform  
Gordon-Hecker, Tom (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Morvinsky, Coby (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
18. Why reminders undermine impressions of genuine gratitude?  
Wang, Jiabi (University of Chicago); Chaudhry, Shereen (University of Chicago); Koch, Alex (University of Chicago)
19. Money Illusion for Others  
Majumder, Rajarshi (Grenoble Ecole de Management); Ziano, Ignazio (Grenoble Ecole de Management)
20. Minimal Conditions for the Coexistence of Hoarding and Overbuying  
Zohar, Vered (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology); Teodorescu, Kinneret (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology); Erev, Ido (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology)
21. Ownership aversion: Self-signaling underlies preferences for consuming without owning  
MacDonald, Tyler (Boston University); Trudel, Remi (Boston University); Morewedge, Carey (Boston University)
22. Smartphone Use Decreases Trustworthiness of Strangers  
Campbell, Sandy (University of California - Berkeley); Gneezy, Uri (University of California - San Diego)
23. An Empirical Examination of Deeper Indicators of Choice Architecture Effectiveness  
Tanner, Braden (University of Oklahoma); Hoang, Gwen (University of Oklahoma); Mahmoud-Elhaj, Dana (University of Oklahoma); Asif, Muhammad (University of Oklahoma); Holt, Jenna (University of Oklahoma); Sabatini, David (University of Oklahoma)
24. Impact of Green-Energy Label on Food Healthiness Perception  
Paul, Iman; Mohanty, Smaraki (Elon University); Parker, Jeffrey (University of Illinois)
25. Validating a new tool for social scientists to collect data  
Wang, Liman (Fudan University); Nelson, Leif (University of California - Berkeley); Gao, Randy (New York University); Jung, Minah (New York University); Hung, Iris (The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen)
26. Searching less in higher values: Experimental evidence and a threshold mechanism underlying the bias  
Rozenblit, Danielle (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology); Roth, Yefim (University of Haifa); Teodorescu, Kinneret (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology)
27. Predictors of Performance in Separating Valid Explanations from Conspiracy Theories  
Delarosa, Alyssa (University of Southern California); John, Richard (University of Southern California)
28. Quality in Context: Evidence that Consumption Context Influences User-Generated Product Ratings  
Meister, Matt (University of Colorado Boulder); Reinholtz, Nicholas S. (University of Colorado Boulder)
29. Biases in Resource Competition  
Hsee, Christopher (University of Chicago); Li, Xilin (China Europe International Business School); Imas, Alex (University of Chicago); Zeng, Ying (University of Toronto)
30. The Consumption Escalation Effect of Over-priced Permission Fees on Consumer Purchase  
Li, Bingjie (University of Warwick); Jia, Miaolei (University of Warwick); Lee, Nick (University of Warwick)
31. Hard to digest: people judge investments in both ethically-dirty and ethically-clean meat producers unfavorably  
Niszczoła, Paweł (Poznań University of Economics and Business)
32. Reluctant to minimize: How order of evaluation influences punishment of moral transgressions  
Geiser, Amanda (University of California - Berkeley); Silver, Ike (Northwestern University); Small, Deborah (Yale University)

33. Effects of cost salience and scarcity on sentencing judgments in experts and laypeople  
Aharoni, Eyal (Georgia State University); Kleider-Offutt, Heather (Georgia State University); Brosnan, Sarah (Georgia State University); Nahmias, Eddy (Georgia State University); Hoffman, Morris (District Judge (ret.), State of Colorado.)
34. Experimental Overoptimism and the Focusing Illusion  
Gandhi, Linnea (University of Pennsylvania); Manning, Ben (University of Pennsylvania); Duckworth, Angela (University of Pennsylvania); Kahneman, Daniel (Princeton University)
35. People prefer products with directionally consistent causal chains  
Bharti, Soham (University of Chicago); Sussman, Abigail (University of Chicago)
36. You Didn't Follow the Plan: People View Contracting COVID as Controllable and Blameworthy  
Abreu, Luis (Duke University); Woolley, Kaitlin (Cornell University); Etkin, Jordan (Duke University)
37. Using drift-diffusion models to understand misinformation sharing behavior  
Lin, Hause (University of Regina); Bear, Adam (Harvard University); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Pennycook, Gordon (University of Regina)
38. Social Information Affects Risky Choices  
Ostrovksy, Tehilla (University of New South Wales); Liew, Shi Xian (University of New South Wales); Newell, Benjamin (University of New South Wales)
39. Self-performance estimates in computationally-complex decision-making  
Lu, Xiaping (University of Melbourne); Murawski, Carsten (University of Melbourne); Bossaerts, Peter (University of Melbourne); Suzuki, Shinsuke (University of Melbourne)
40. DIST: Developing a new model of mean estimation  
Wort, Finian (University of Warwick); Walasek, Lukasz (University of Warwick); Brown, Gordon D. A. (University of Warwick)
41. Metacognitive Accuracy in Detecting Political Misinformation  
Geers, Michael (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Fischer, Helen (Leibniz Institut für Wissensmedien); Lewandowsky, Stephan (University of Bristol); Herzog, Stefan (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
42. It's Only Fair when I Get a Good Price: The Effectiveness of Range Pricing Strategy Depends on the Final Price  
Kim, Junha (Ohio State University); Malkoc, Selin (Ohio State University); Johnson, Lily (Ohio State University)
43. Just Between You and Me: Private Financial Transactions Signal Communal Traits and Enhance Other's Willingness to Cooperate  
Chapman, Lennay (Florida International University); Valenzuela, Ana (Baruch College); Vohs, Kathleen (University of Minnesota)
44. When More is Not Better: Financial Constraints Jeopardize Sustainability by Increasing Preferences for Quantity  
Wang, Yusu (University of Chicago); Sussman, Abigail (University of Chicago)
45. Fighting Fiscal Awkwardness: How Relationship Strength Changes Consumers' Approach to Resolving Peer Debt  
Park, Alexander (Washington University in St Louis); Cryder, Cynthia (Washington University in St Louis); Gershon, Rachel (University of California - San Diego)
46. Threshold versus Capped Price Promotions: The Asymmetric Effect of Equivalent Discounts on Sales  
Yi, Shangwen (University of British Columbia); Allard, Thomas (Nanyang Technological University); Hardisty, David (University of British Columbia); Griffin Dale (University of British Columbia)
47. Temporal Frames of Life Expectancy  
Tetik, Ozlem (London Business School); Faro, David (London Business School)
48. The Logged-In Shopper: How Consumer Identification Affects Purchase Behavior  
Kim, Hyoseok (Southern Connecticut State University); Haeubl, Gerald (University of Alberta)



49. Too Much of a Good Thing: Frequent Checking Decreases Subjective Performance Evaluation  
Duncan, Shannon (University of Pennsylvania); Sharif, Marissa A. (University of Pennsylvania); Etkin, Jordan F. (Duke University)
50. The Level of Patience is Affected by Investment and Loan Framing in Intertemporal Choices  
Yamamoto, Shohei (Hitotsubashi University); Shiba, Shotaro (Waseda University)
51. The Impact of Peer Recognition on User-Generated Content for Social Network Platforms.  
Zeng, Zhiyu (Tsinghua University); Dai, Hengchen (University of California - Los Angeles); Zhang, Dennis (Washington University in St Louis); Zhang, Heng (Arizona State University); Zhang, Renyu (CUHK Business School); Shen, Zuojun (University of California - Berkeley)
52. The effect of intolerance of uncertainty and time perspective on goal motivation  
Bavolar, Jozef (Pavol Jozef Safarik University); Kacmar, Pavol (Pavol Jozef Safarik University)
53. Correcting mis-perceptions of political ingroup member's open-mindedness can increase political curiosity  
Wallace, Laura (University of Chicago); Kashdan, Todd (George Mason University); Kelso, Kerry (Medical University of South Carolina); Craig, Logan (George Mason University); Gino, Francesca (Harvard University); McKnight, Patrick (George Mason University)
54. Smart, or just lucky? Inferring question-asking competence from strategies' expected efficiency versus observed effectiveness  
Torok, Georgina (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Swaboda, Nora (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Ruggeri, Azzurra (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
55. Impact severity increases likelihood communications in Impact Based Weather warnings - an investigation with forecasters in Southeast Asia.  
Harris, Adam (University College London); Jenkins, Sarah (University of London); Liefgreen, Alice (Swansea University)
56. The Choice Architect Doth Protest Too Much: Ironie Effects of Nudging on Perceptions of Descriptive Social Norms  
Bogard, Jonathan (Washington University in St Louis); Goldstein, Noah (University of California - Los Angeles)
57. Does Unpacking the Carbon Footprint Affect Travel Choices?  
Kuehne, Swen J. (Zurich University of Applied Sciences); Reijnen, Ester (Zurich University of Applied Sciences); Bremermann-Reiser, Sabine M. (Zurich University of Applied Sciences)
58. Mental imagery and emotions in relation to declared choices under risk  
Zaleskiewicz, Tomasz (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities); Smieja, Joanna (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities); Traczyk, Jakub (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities); Sobkow, Agata (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities)
59. Meaning Aids Consumer Acceptance of Firms' Actions to Reduce Gun Violence  
Light, Nicholas (Portland State University); Pomerance, Justin (University of New Hampshire); Williams, Lawrence (University of Colorado Boulder)
60. Self as Anchor in Judgments of a Perpetrator's Weight, but not Height  
Roy, Michael (Elizabethtown College); Kosik, Jocelyn (Elizabethtown College)
61. People are worse at detecting fake news in their foreign language  
Muda, Rafal (Maria Curie-Sklodowska University); Pennycook, Gordon (University of Regina); Hamerski, Damian (Maria Curie-Sklodowska University); Bialek, Michal (University of Wroclaw)
62. Predictive utility of risk profiles  
Stark, Hannah (Louisiana State University); Zhang, Don (Louisiana State University)
63. The Case for Diversity: How Diversity Narratives Influence Team Performance  
Hu, Xinlan Emily (University of Pennsylvania); Chang, Linda (University of Pennsylvania); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania)

64. Spatial Uncertainty in Forecasts Lowers Perceived Risk and Likelihood of Precautionary Action  
Gubernath, John (Robert Koch Institute); Fleischhut, Nadine (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
65. How Helpful is a Coin Toss? Evaluations of Predictions at Chance Accuracy  
Naborn, Jay (Washington University in St Louis); Perfecto, Hannah (Washington University in St Louis)
66. Individual Differences in Judgment and Decision-Making: Novel Predictors of Counterproductive Work Behavior  
Alaybek, Balca (MITRE); Dalal, Reeshad S (George Mason University); Dade, Brynee (George Mason University)
67. Empirical scrutiny for monetary loss aversion: The classic hypothesis versus the magnitude-dependent hypothesis  
Khan, Ouroz (Indian Institute of Technology - Delhi); Mukherjee, Sumitava (Indian Institute of Technology - Delhi)
68. Rational analysis of moral reasoning in a repeated public goods game  
Dewey, Caleb (University of Arizona)
69. The Power of Temporal Framing: Framing a Donation in Periodic Terms Increases Charitable Perceptions  
Park, Alexander (Washington University in St Louis); Leng, Yani (Washington University in St Louis); Cryder, Cynthia (Washington University in St Louis)
70. Prosocial Intentions may Increase Dishonesty  
Guzikevits, Mika (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Choshen-Hillel, Shoham (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
71. Does Unpacking a COVID-19 Treatment Method into its Constituents Increase People's Preference for the Treatment?  
Cheng, Yimeng (Australian National University); Smithson, Michael (Australian National University)
72. Perception or Reality? The relationship between ability and risk-taking  
Refaie, Nabhan (University of Guelph); Mishra, Sandeep (University of Guelph)
73. The Advantages of Numeric Uncertainty Information in a Complex Decision-Making Task  
Han, Jee Hoon (University of Washington); Joslyn, Susan (University of Washington)
74. Utilization of anchoring bias for wisdom of crowds  
Honda, Hidehito (Otemon Gakuin University); Kagawa, Rina (University of Tsukuba); Shirasuna, Masaru (Otemon Gakuin University)
75. Using a foreign language does not promote more effortful thinking  
Borkowska, Anna (University of Wroclaw); Milczarski, Wojciech (University of Wroclaw); Bialek, Michal (University of Wroclaw)
76. The Yogi or the Runner: Who is Happier?  
Barkan, Rachel (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
77. Plastic Recycling Risk Literacy  
Holt, Jenna (University of Oklahoma); Asif, Muhammad (University of Oklahoma); Hoang, Gwen (University of Oklahoma); Mahmoud, Elhaj Dana (University of Oklahoma); Tanner, Braden (University of Oklahoma); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma)
78. Combining Forecasts from Advisors: The Impact of Verbal-vs.-Numeric Format and Advisor Independence  
Strueder, Jeremy (University of Iowa); Windschitl, Paul (University of Iowa)
79. Teaching JDM: Integrating scholarly research with widely read texts  
Langholtz, Harvey (College of William and Mary)
80. Predicting Myside Biases with Covid Death Estimate Inaccuracy  
Katz, Austin (University of South Florida); Hampton, Brittnee (University of South Florida); Pyo, Sung (University of South Florida); Schneider, Sandra (University of South Florida)
81. In competent jerks we trust: Differential effects of leadership errors on judgements of trust in leadership  
Burke, Vanessa (Louisiana State University); Nguyen, Tin (University of Nebraska – Omaha)

82. The Impact of Background Diversity on Researcher Innovation  
Paquet, Ethan (University of Houston); Rude, Dale (University of Houston)
83. Framing Effects in Consumer Price Processing: A review and synthesis  
Ramaswami, Seshan (Singapore Management University)
84. Stimuli affect within a ratio-bias task  
Voss, Jr. Raymond P. (Purdue University - Fort Wayne); Clarkson, Evan (University of Toledo); Corser, Ryan (Vanderbilt University); Jasper, John D. (The University of Toledo)
85. Moral Judgments and Punishment Decisions on Social Media  
Vahed, Sarah (Radboud University); Goanta, Catalina (Utrecht University); Ortolani, Pietro (Radboud University); Sanfey, Alan (Radboud University)
86. Can Playing Short Online Games Teaching Behavioral Literacy Improve Financial Wellbeing in Adolescents?  
Rayburn-Reeves, Rebecca (Duke University); Bartmann, Nina (Duke University); Corbin, Jonathan (Humana); Choa, Daryl (WGBH Boston); Condon, David (WGBH Boston); Varamo, Gina (WGBH Boston)
87. Explicit Difficulty Information is Ignored in Reasoning  
Stewart, Kaiden (University of Waterloo); Fugelsang, Jonathan (University of Waterloo)
88. (Mis)perceptions of Racial Wealth Inequality: The Role of Colorblind Racism and Implications for Public Policy  
Cortesi, Jordan (University of Kansas); Biernat, Monica (University of Kansas)
89. What good is thinking about the future?  
Bergstrom, Tayler (University of California - Los Angeles); Hershfield, Hal (University of California - Los Angeles); Maglio, Sam (University of Toronto)
90. Dilution effect in selection and promotion decisions  
Luong, Alexandra (University of Minnesota); Sanchez, Katherine (University of Minnesota)
91. Modeling Local Knowledge and Beliefs about Health Risks  
Widmer, Cara (Kairos Research); Summerville, Amy (Kairos Research); Creagh, Noelle (Kairos Research); Stabler, Valerie (Kairos Research); Leung, Alice (Raytheon BBN)
92. Social (In)Security: Stock-Flow Reasoning and Beliefs about the Future of Social Security  
Weber, Megan (University of California - Los Angeles); Spiller, Stephen (University of California - Los Angeles); Hershfield, Hal (University of California - Los Angeles); Shu, Suzanne (University of California - Los Angeles)
93. Challenges of Informal Graph Judgment: Top-Down and Bottom-Up Influences  
Guthrie, Ethan (College of Charleston); Bishara, Anthony (College of Charleston)
94. Too Hard, Too Easy, Or Just Right? The Paradox of Effort and Boredom Aversion  
Embrey, Jake (University of New South Wales); Gelagin, Luke (University of New South Wales); Newell, Benjamin (University of New South Wales)
95. Excluding numeric side-effect information produces lower vaccine intentions  
Shoots-Reinhard, Brittany (Ohio State University); Lawrence, Eliza (University of Oregon); Schulkin, Jay (University of Washington); Peters, Ellen (University of Oregon)
96. The Wisdom of the Confident Crowd in Medical Image Decision-making  
Hasan, Eeshan (Indiana University Bloomington); Trueblood, Jennifer (Indiana University Bloomington)
97. Developmental experiences, gambling cognitions, and problem gambling behavior  
Wuth, Amanda (University of Guelph); Mishra, Sandeep (University of Guelph)
98. Breaking a Culture of Silence: Information sharing in group decision making.  
Composto, Jordana (Princeton University); Majumdar, Rohini (Princeton University); Coman, Alin (Princeton University)
99. Thinking Deep, Thinking Shallow: The Role of Emotions and Cognitive Load in Decision Processes

Chen, Sarah (Shih-Hua) (Harvard University); Baumann, Christiane (Harvard University); Koenig, Fabian (Harvard University); Lerner, Jennifer S. (Harvard University)

100. Quality Perceptions of Work Submitted Early, on Time, or Late  
Fang, David (University of Toronto); Didi, Kevin (University of Toronto); Maglio, Sam (University of Toronto)
101. The Behavioral Science of Parking Pricing  
Sherlock, Joseph (Duke University); Daly, Michael (Duke University); McDonald, Shayne-Ann (Duke University); Shah, Kahini (Duke University)
102. Safety Messaging Boosts Parental Vaccination Intention for Children Ages 5-11  
Cui, Zhihan (University of California - Los Angeles); Liu, Lu (New York University); Li, Dan (Yale University); Wu, Jueyu (University of California - Los Angeles); Zhai, Xinyue (University of Pennsylvania)
103. The influence of free-play mode in online casino gambling: Next steps  
Reilly, Theresa (University of Georgia); Goodie, Adam S. (University of Georgia)
104. A little bit of each: Unpacking a goal into detailed subtypes leads to more ambitious planning  
Xiao, Angela Ziyang (Carnegie Mellon University); Lu, Joy (Carnegie Mellon University)
105. Different Risk Preferences in the Social and Financial Domains  
Lee, Sunme (University of Iowa); Cole, Cathy (University of Iowa); Nayakankuppam, Dhananjay (University of Iowa)
106. Perceiving COVID-19 as Symbolic Conflict  
Stein, Randy (Cal Poly Pomona); Sin, Alice (California State University - Northridge); Rutchick, Abraham M. (California State University - Northridge)
107. Driving Reader Interpretations with Text Annotations in Data Visualizations  
Stokes, Chase (University of California - Berkeley); Xiong, Cindy (University of Massachusetts); Hearst, Marti (University of California - Berkeley)
108. When is Cherished Memory Contaminated?  
Shin, Sally MyungJin (Yale University); Rozin, Paul (University of Pennsylvania); Zauberman, Gal (Yale University)
109. The Voice Empathy Gap: How Employees and Managers Hold Differing Beliefs About Lack of Voice  
Park, Hyunsun (University of Maryland); Sah, Sunita (Cornell University); Tangirala, Subrahmaniam (University of Maryland)
110. Antecedents of academicians leveraging prevaricative sesquipedalianisms: Status insecurity & jargon use  
Brown, Zachariah (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Anicich, Eric (University of Southern California); Galinsky, Adam (Columbia University)
111. Point Forecasts from Experience: An Empirical Examination of Judgmental Forecasting  
Ozlu, Neslihan (Stockholm University)
112. How Should COVID-19 Vaccines be Distributed between the Global North and South? A Discrete Choice Experiment in Six European Countries  
Sternberg, Henrike (Technical University of Munich); Steinert, Janina Isabel (Technical University of Munich); Veltri, Giuseppe Alessandro; Universita di Trento; Buethe, Tim (Technical University of Munich)
113. Past over Future? How managerial cognition of the past shapes the business model innovation decision for the future  
Freisinger, Elena (Technical University of Ilmenau); Zürn, Michael (Nuremberg Institute for Market Decisions); Unfried, Matthias (Nuremberg Institute for Market Decisions)
114. High-Stakes Failures of Backward Induction: Evidence from “The Price Is Right”  
Klein Teeselink, Bouke (Yale University); van Dolder, Dennie (University of Essex); van den Assem, Martijn (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam); Dana, Jason (Yale University)
115. People do not generally object to experiments; their attitudes toward them are “just” context dependent  
Elbaek, Christian (Aarhus University); Mazar, Nina (Boston University); Mitkidis, Panagiotis (Aarhus University)

116. Signal Detection Theory Analysis of Fake News Interventions  
John, Richard (University of Southern California); Ma, Yunrong (University of Southern California); Roantree, Laura (University of Southern California); Kapadia, Kevin (University of Southern California)
117. The Impact of Installment Plans on Perceived Financial Constraint and Monetary Outlays  
Katz, Daniel (University of Chicago); Kan, Christina (University of Connecticut); Sussman, Abigail (University of Chicago)
118. Effect of Micro-incentives and Daily Deadlines on Practice Behavior  
Sobolev, Michael (Cornell University); Okeke, Fabian (Cornell University); Plonsky, Ori (Technion)
119. Overconfidence in self-assessment: The black swan of replication  
McKnight, Patrick (George Mason University); McKnight, Simone (Global Systems Technology); Nuhfer, Ed
120. Spending Responses to Income vs. Balance Information  
Dolifka, David (University of California - Los Angeles); Smith, Stephanie (University of California - Los Angeles); Spiller, Stephen (University of California - Los Angeles)
121. Constructing Cognitive Topographies for Right- and Left-wing Authoritarianism  
Costello, Thomas (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
122. Pessimism in charity efficiency estimates  
Pracejus, John (University of Alberta); Brown, Norman (University of Alberta)
123. Going ESG: The economic value of ESG policy adoption  
Rosenboim, Mosi (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Finger, Maya (The College of Management Academic Studies)

## **SJDM Poster Session #2**

**Saturday November 12; 4.45-5.45 pm**

1. How Lack of Benevolence Harms Trust in Algorithmic Management  
Li, Mingyu (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Bitterly, Brad (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology)
2. I am dishonest and I know it! Paradox mindset and self-concept.  
Danaj, Eriselda (IESE Business School)
3. Affective Motivated Reasoning about a Solution to a Threat: The Brain-Eating Amoeba Study  
Silverstein, Michael (University of Oregon); Peters, Ellen (University of Oregon)
4. Anticipated regret and anticipated counterfactual relief predict decisions about influenza vaccination  
Feeney, Aidan; Lorimer, Sara; Teresa, McCormack; Hoerl, Christoph (Warwick University); Beck, Sarah (University of Birmingham); Johnston, Matthew (Queen's University Belfast)
5. Cognitive and emotional interaction in contemporary risks perception  
Tedaldi, Elisa (University of Padova); Orabona, Noemi (University of Padova); Scrimin, Sara (University of Padova); Rubaltelli, Enrico (University of Padova)
6. The Choice of Ideology and Everyday Decisions  
Burs, Carina (Paderborn University); Gries, Thomas (Paderborn University); Miller, Veronika (Johns Hopkins University)
7. On the Resource-Rationality of the Description-Experience Gap  
Nobandegani, Ardavan (McGill University); Shultz, Thomas (McGill University); Dube, Laurette (McGill University)
8. Small interpersonal loans between friends: Repayment expectation, behavior, and recall  
Morvinski, Coby (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Shani, Yaniv (Tel Aviv University)
9. Reducing Misinformation Online through Corrections: A Twitter Study  
McDonald, Shaye-Ann (Duke University); Sherlock, Joseph (Duke University)
10. Mental Health and the Targeting of Social Assistance  
Naik, Canishk (London School of Economics and Political Science)
11. Contextually adaptive decisions to engage in precommitment.  
Sussman, Lauren (Boston University); Onipede, Yeshim (Boston University); McGuire, Joseph (Boston University)
12. Positive and Negative Generalizations  
Banker, Mohin (Yale University); Klusowski, Joowon (Yale University); Zauberman, Gal (Yale University)
13. How do Cognitive Processes regulate the Wisdom and Madness of Crowds? A Registered Report  
Kommol, Erik (Vienna University of Economics and Business); Lettl, Christopher (Vienna University of Economics and Business)
14. Targeting Behavioral Interventions Based on Baseline Motivation Increases Vaccine Uptake  
Brody, Ilana (University of California - Los Angeles); Dai, Hengchen (University of California - Los Angeles); Saccardo, Silvia (Carnegie Mellon University)
15. Stop being so negative: Reports correcting false claims are distrusted more than reports confirming claims  
Stein, Randy (Cal Poly Pomona); Meyersohn, Caroline (Cal Poly Pomona)
16. Left-Digit Bias: Tracking Account Balances  
Herzog, Nicholas (University of Chicago); Bartels, Daniel (University of Chicago)
17. Colorism and Gendered Biases in Face Impressions  
Austin, Maura (University of Virginia); Bart-Plange, Diane-Jo (University of Virginia)

18. Who Likes it More? Choice Set Size Effect on Inference of Others' Preferences  
Jang, Minkwang (University of Chicago)
19. The best-case heuristic: Relative optimism in a global health pandemic  
Sjastad, Hallgeir (Norwegian School of Economics); Van Bavel, Jay (New York University)
20. The Easier-Is Better-Heuristic: The False Allure of Easy Work  
Polimeni, Eliana (Kellogg School of Management); Nordgren, Loran (Kellogg School of Management)
21. Actively Open-Minded Thinking and Liberal Political Orientation Predict Enhanced Immunity to Pandemic Fake News Stories: A Signal Detection Approach  
Barajas, Jeremy (University of Southern California); John, Richard (University of Southern California)
22. The reputational benefits of selective exposure to partisan information  
Moore, Molly (Harvard University); Dorison, Charles (Northwestern University); Minson, Julia (Harvard University)
23. Learning to suppress: Decision makers can learn to adjust for irrelevant information using the Multiple Cue Probability Learning paradigm  
Rabinovitch, Hagai (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Bereby-Meyer, Yoella (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Budescu, David V. (Fordham University)
24. Modeling Numeracy's Effect on Likert Data; An IR-Tree Based Approach  
Block, Jared (University of California - Los Angeles); Kay-Montoya, Amanda (University of California - Los Angeles)
25. Numerate People Understand Controversial Risks Better, Regardless of Their Worldview Biases: An Integrated Model of Climate Change Judgments  
Cho, Jinhyo (University of Oklahoma); Cokely, Edward (University of Oklahoma); Ramasubramanian, Madhuri (University of Oklahoma); Allan, Jinan (Max Planck Institute); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma); Garcia-Retamero, Rocio (University of Granada)
26. The Optimism Gap: Lay Prescriptions for Communicating About Uncertainty  
Miller, Jane (University of Iowa); Park, Inkyung (University of Iowa); Smith, Andrew (Appalachian State University); Windschitl, Paul (University of Iowa)
27. Quantification myopia  
Chang, Linda (University of Pennsylvania); Kirgios, Erika (University of Chicago); Mullainathan, Sendhil (University of Chicago); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania)
28. Hosting Leads People to Prioritize Themselves over Others in Decisions about Shared Consumption  
Kim, Hyebin (Washington University in St Louis); Steffel, Mary (Northeastern University); Williams, Elanor (Washington University in St Louis)
29. "If it's labeled, it must be good": Consumer Preference for Products with Non-evaluable Label Claims  
Yu, Jiaqi (University of Chicago); Urminsky, Oleg (University of Chicago)
30. Attention Predicts Preference Reversals Under Joint vs. Separate Evaluation  
Smith, Stephanie (University of California - Los Angeles); Krajbich, Ian (Ohio State University); Spiller, Stephen (University of California - Los Angeles)
31. EVAdopt: Increasing Electrical Vehicle Adoption with non-monetary treatments  
Savelsberg, Jonas (ETH Zurich); Bernardic, Ursa (University of Geneva); Ugazio, Giuseppe (University of Geneva); Filipini, Massimo (ETH Zurich)
32. How Initial Preference Elicitations Influence Subsequent Decisions  
Healey, Matthew (Washington University in St Louis); Nowlis, Stephen (Washington University in St Louis)
33. Why Minimum Purchase Restrictions Work: The Role of Reference Points  
Du, Guanzhong (University of British Columbia); Hardisty, David (University of British Columbia)



34. How Social Functioning Ability And Crowdedness Impact Consumer Decision Making  
Chen, Shiyun (University of Iowa); Gaeth, Gary (University of Iowa); Levin, Irwin (University of Iowa); Levin, Aron (Northern Kentucky University)
35. Swift Brand Activism is The Most Effective and Memorable  
Nam, Jimin (Harvard University); Balakrishnan, Maya (Harvard University); De Freitas, Julian (Harvard University); Wood Brooks, Alison (Harvard University)
36. Honesty is Such a Lonely Word. People Underestimate Others' Honesty in Negotiations  
Garber Lachish, Shira (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Moran, Simone (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Keysar, Boaz (University of Chicago); Bereby-Meyer, Yoella (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
37. Toward full-cycle organizational research on group relational accounting: Multimethod investigation of the impact on business, labor, and social movements  
Kim, Daehyeon (Washington University in St Louis); Bottom, William (Washington University in St Louis)
38. Market mindset hinders interpersonal trust: The exposure to market relationships makes people trust less through elevated proportional thinking and reduced state empathy  
Gasiorowska, Agata (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities); Kuzminska, Anna (University of Warsaw); Zaleskiewicz, Tomasz (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities)
39. The Social Media Context Interferes with Truth Discernment  
Epstein, Ziv (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Sirlin, Nathaniel (University of Pennsylvania); Arehcar, Antonio (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Pennycook, Gordon (University of Regina); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
40. Using response time to identify accurate opinions in a crowd of opinions  
Efendic, Emir (Maastricht University); Kurz, Jacqueline (Maastricht University); Van de Calseyde, Philippe (Eindhoven University of Technology); Goukens, Caroline (Maastricht University)
41. What Does Knowledge Buy? The Effect of Experience in Recommended Search  
Fei, Lin (University of Chicago); Bartels, Daniel (University of Chicago)
42. "It's All for Show": Performative Allyship as Saying One Thing but Doing Nothing  
Huang, Hsuan-Che (Brad) (University of British Columbia)
43. Consequences of Elite Moral Rhetoric for Political Independents  
Wang Sze Yuh, Nina (University of Toronto); Inbar, Yoel (University of Toronto)
44. Stakeholders Expect Loyalty from Male-led Startups and Fairness from Female-led Startups  
Gyurovski, Ivo (Hampden-Sydney College); Khurana, Indu (Hampden-Sydney College); Lee, Daniel (University of Delaware)
45. How does variability affect humanization? Variable (vs. constant) behavior increases perceptions of experience, but decreases perceptions of agency  
Wald, Kristina (University of Chicago); Risen, Jane (University of Chicago)
46. Beliefs about gender differences in social preferences  
Exley, Christine (Harvard University); Hauser, Oliver (Exeter University); Moore, Molly (Harvard University); Pezzuto, John-Henry (University of California - San Diego)
47. Getting more wisdom out of the crowd: The case of competence-weighted aggregates  
Goedde-Menke, Michael (University of Muenster); Diecidue, Enrico (INSEAD); Jacobs, Andreas (University of Muenster); Langer, Thomas (University of Muenster)
48. The Heterogenous Effects of Mental Contrasting on Saving Behavior: Evidence from a Field Experiment in a Financial Saving App  
Nobel, Nurit (Stockholm School of Economics)
49. Heterogenous Effects of Unusual Spending Notifications on Consumer Spending and Credit Card Repayment

Kettle, Keri (University of Ottawa); Blanchard, Simon (Georgetown University); Trudel, Remi (Boston University)

50. A blind spot for attractiveness discrimination in hiring decisions  
Jaeger, Bastian (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam); Boegershausen, Johannes (Erasmus University Rotterdam); Paolacci, Gabriele (Erasmus University Rotterdam)
51. Perceived risk of alcohol and drug use during long-term remission from substance addiction  
Hayes, Bridget (Cornell University)
52. To vaccinate or not to vaccinate, what reason?  
Caserotti, Marta (University of Padova); Girardi, Paolo (University of Venice); Sellato, Roberta (University of Padova); Rubaltelli, Enrico (University of Padova); Tasso, Alessandra (University of Ferrara); Lotto, Lorella (University of Padova)
53. Impact of Face Threat in Cross-Cultural Collaboration  
Semnani-Azad, Zhaleh (California State University - Northridge); Adair, Wendi (University of Waterloo); Sycara, Katia (Carnegie Mellon University); Mor, Shira (Mona Lisa Consulting)
54. Berlin Numeracy Test Norms and Risk Literacy Benchmarks for Predicting Decision Vulnerability and Risk Communication Difficulty Levels  
Allan, Jinan N. (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Cokely, Edward T. (University of Oklahoma); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma); Garcia-Retamero, Rocio (University of Granada)
55. Source Memory Is More Accurate for Opinions Than for Facts  
Mirny, Daniel (University of California - Los Angeles); Spiller, Stephen (University of California - Los Angeles)
56. Reducing the Use of Single Occupancy Vehicles in New Movers  
Bartmann, Nina (Duke University); McDonald, Shaye-Ann (Duke University); Gavin, Lyndsay (Duke University)
57. Medical and Food Applications of Modern Technologies: Individual Differences in Information Processing Style and Hazards Evaluations  
Sleboda, Patrycja (University of Southern California)
58. Estimating the Threshold of Perceived Threat for Intent to Engage in Proactive Self Defense  
Qiao, Aili (University of Southern California); Baucum, Matthew (University of Southern California); John, Richard (University of Southern California)
59. Moral judgements of showrooming behavior  
Arnestad, Mads Nordmo (BI Norwegian Business School); Andvik, Christian (BI Norwegian Business School); Skard, Siv (Norwegian School of Economics)
60. Understanding Determinants of Vaccination Decision Making among Pregnant Women and Caregivers in Nigeria: A Longitudinal Study  
Adeyanju, Collins G. (University of Erfurt)
61. Peripheral visual information halves attentional choice biases  
Eum, Brenden (California Institute of Technology); Dolbier, Stephanie (University of California - Los Angeles); Rangel, Antonio (California Institute of Technology)
62. Why Do People Discount? The Role of Impatience and Future Uncertainty  
Diecidue, Enrico (INSEAD); Hardardottir, Hjördis (Lancaster University); Islam, Marco (Lund University)
63. Narcissism and Risk-Taking for Others  
Cowley, Tyler (Louisiana State University)
64. Relationship between performance of machine learning and algorithm aversion  
Kagawa, Rina (University of Tsukuba); Honda, Hidehito (Otomon Gakuin University); Nosato, Hirokazu (National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology)
65. Do cognitive aids improve metacognitive knowledge in school choice decisions?

Cash, Trent N. (Carnegie Mellon University); Oppenheimer, Daniel M. (Carnegie Mellon University)

66. Bird in hand not worth two in the bush? The sampling mindset, its antecedents, and its (unintended) consequences  
Bawa, Ravneet (London School of Economics and Political Science); Chakravarti, Amitav (London School of Economics and Political Science)
67. The paradox of the environmentally conscious: when product return behavior misaligns with intentions  
Williams, Amy (University of California - Irvine); Keller, L. Robin (University of California - Irvine)
68. Affective judgments about gains versus losses of marks  
Mukherjee, Sumitava (Indian Institute of Technology – Delhi)
69. Waiting for one second improves accuracy: Experimental examinations based on mouse trajectories during binary choice tasks  
Shirasuna, Masaru (Otemon Gakuin University); Kagawa, Rina (University of Tsukuba); Honda, Hidehito (Otemon Gakuin University)
70. The Effect of Dyadic Incentives on Daily Language Learning: An Online Field Experiment on Duolingo  
Cloughesy, Jonathan (Duke University); Lindemans, Jan Willem (Duke University); Ariely, Dan (Duke University)
71. Overconfidence due to preference for control  
Frollova, Nikola (Prague University of Economics and Business); Hajdu, Gergely (Vienna University of Economics and Business)
72. Simple Rules Outperform Machine Learning in the 3rd Annual SIOP Machine Learning Competition  
Harman, Jason L. (Louisiana State University); Scheuremann, Jaelle (Naval Research Lab)
73. Context Effects in a Massive Real-World Retail Dataset  
Devine, Sean (McGill University); Goulding, James (University of Nottingham); Otto, Ross (McGill University); Skatova, Anya (University of Bristol)
74. Raising the white flag: When do competitors quit?  
Zak, Uri (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Avrahami, Judith (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Kareev, Yaakov (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
75. Foreign language effect in verbal probability phrases - English/Polish investigation  
Milczarski, Wojciech (University of Wroclaw); Borkowska, Anna (University of Wroclaw); Bialek, Michal (University of Wroclaw)
76. Virtual reality for philanthropy: an immersive approach to attract (young) donors  
Sooter, Nina (University of Geneva); Ugazio, Giuseppe (University of Geneva)
77. Bigger than Black or White: Cultural Capital and Employment Discrimination  
Edmondson, Brandy (University of Minnesota)
78. Defaults are more influential when they are counter to decision makers' expectations  
Kleiman-Lynch, Leo (University of California - San Diego); McKenzie, Craig (University of California - San Diego)
79. Feelings of rightness decreases perceived accuracy of fake news and time spent reevaluating intuitive judgments  
Newton, Christie (University of Regina); Thompson, Valerie (University of Saskatchewan); Pennycook, Gordon (University of Regina)
80. Social class contexts shape social activities in daily life  
Chi, Kevin (Stanford University)
81. Probabilistic Tornado Warning  
Qin, Chao (University of Washington); Joslyn, Susan (University of Washington); Savelli, Sonia (University of Washington); Demuth, Julie (University Corporation for Atmospheric Research); Morss, Rebecca (University Corporation for Atmospheric Research); Ash, Kevin (University of Florida)

82. Does Size Matter? Why Women Typically Choose to Lead Smaller Teams  
Elleithy, Taqua (Harvard University); Abi-Esber, Nicole (Harvard University); Lee, Margaret (University of California - Berkeley)
83. Managers' sensemaking of multiple, competing goals  
Blettner, Daniela (Simon Fraser University); Gollisch, Simon (Hochschule Ansbach)
84. Constraining hypothesis generation through instructions  
Szollosi, Aba (University of Edinburgh); Bramley, Neil (University of Edinburgh)
85. Benevolent Machiavellianism: A Study of the Nature of Prosocial Political Skills  
Houdek, Petr (Prague University of Economics and Business); Bahník, Štěpán (Prague University of Economics and Business); Say, Nicolas (Prague University of Economics and Business); Vranka, Marek (Prague University of Economics and Business)
86. The effects of compensation structure on consumption behavior  
Tsai, Paige (Harvard University); Buell, Ryan (Harvard University)
87. Can People Learn to Use the Inner Crowd? Testing Strategies to Improve Numeric Estimates  
London, Brian (Appalachian State University); Smith, Andrew (Appalachian State University); Windschitl, Paul (University of Iowa)
88. Consequences of Artificial Intelligence-Based Recommendations on Consumer Agency and Purchase Behaviors  
Jenkins, Mason (University of North Carolina at Charlotte); Beck, Jonathan (University of Kansas)
89. Increase in trust level as a result of education: A case study in water reuse.  
Hoang, Uyen (University of Oklahoma); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma); Tanner, Braden (University of Oklahoma); Mahmoud, Dana (University of Oklahoma)
90. Letting Technology Brag for You  
Xu, Wezhuo (Carnegie Mellon University); Downs, Julie (Carnegie Mellon University)
91. Drawing Different Conclusions from the Same Evidence: Belief in Hydroxychloroquine During the COVID-19 Pandemic  
Drummond Otten, Caitlin (Arizona State University); Anglin, Stephanie (Hobart and William Smith Colleges); Broomell, Stephen (Purdue University)
92. The role of fear of missing out (FOMO) in the consumer decision-making.  
Jaworska, Diana (Other); Sekscinska, Katarzyna (Other)
93. Effects of Education and Framing on Preferences to Write a Do-Not-Resuscitate Order  
Asif, Muhammad (University of Oklahoma); Tanner, Braden (University of Oklahoma); Holt, Jenna (University of Oklahoma); Hoang, Gwen (University of Oklahoma); Mahmoud-Elhaj, Dana (University of Oklahoma); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma)
94. Exploring the Link Between Science Curiosity and Motivated Reasoning  
Goodwin, Raleigh (University of Oregon); Peters, Ellen (University of Oregon)
95. The Desirability Bias in Predictions under Aleatory and Epistemic Uncertainty  
Park, Inkyung (University of Iowa); Windschitl, Paul (University of Iowa); Miller, Jane (University of Iowa); Smith, Andrew (Appalachian State University)
96. Temporal normalization during valuation creates preference reversals  
Bernardic, Ursa (University of Geneva); Gomez, Teijeiro Lucia (University of Geneva); Lebretn, Maïl (University of Geneva); Ugazio, Giuseppe (University of Geneva)
97. NBA Decision-Making: Risk-Taking and Future Discounting with Resource Limitations  
Gonzales, Josh (University of Guelph); Pegoraro, Ann (University of Guelph); Mishra, Sandeep (University of Guelph)
98. The Use of Algorithmic Support: Are Individuals Averse Towards Algorithms or Rather Overconfident Regarding Their Skills?

Hofmann, Janina (University of Passau)

99. Risky swings. Maximizing mindset and numeracy predicts risk preferences.  
Powers, Chandrima (Palm Beach Atlantic University); Corser, Ryan (Vanderbilt University); Voss Jr. , Raymond. P (Purdue University - Fort Wayne)
100. Nudges increase disparities in recycled water acceptance  
Mahmoud, Dana (University of Oklahoma); Tanner, Braden (University of Oklahoma); Hoang, Gwen (University of Oklahoma); Holt, Jenna (University of Oklahoma); Asif, Muhammad (University of Oklahoma); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma)
101. Prejudiced helpers are more dishonest after helping a stigmatized person  
Wang, Jiaqian (Northwestern University); Achar, Chethana (Northwestern University)
102. Moment-to-moment changes in expectations predict happiness  
Marciano, Deborah (University of California - Berkeley); Mayer, Ida (University of California - Berkeley); Hsu, Ming (University of California – Berkeley)
103. Postchoice Memory Errors Reflect Prechoice (Not Postchoice!) Information Processing  
Gray, Brian (Ohio State University); DeKay, Michael (Ohio State University)
104. Measuring Knowledge of Behavior Risk and Perceived Barrier Identification in a Medical Student Sample  
Nelson, Brittany (Michigan Technological University); Petushek, Erich (Michigan Technological University); Teising, Sarah (Michigan State University)
105. The politicization of COVID-19 interventions among physicians and laypeople in the United States  
Levin, Joel (University of Pittsburgh); Bukowski, Leigh (University of Pittsburgh); Minson, Julia (Harvard University); Kahn, Jeremy (University of Pittsburgh)
106. Expertise Heuristics, Credibility Judgement, and Self-Categorization in Prosocial Decision  
Rong, Yu (University of Nevada, Reno); Sundali, James (University of Nevada, Reno); Szabo, Edit (University of Nevada, Reno)
107. Blinded by trust: Examining the effect of social closeness on cooperative behaviors during the COVID-19 pandemic  
Dorfman, Anna (Bar-Ilan University); Cote, Eloise (Université de Montréal); Pelletier Dumas, Mathieu (Université de Montréal); Lacourse, Eric (Université de Montréal); Stolle, Dietlind (McGill University); de la Sablonnière, Roxane (Université de Montréal)
108. The Impact of Online Review Language on Reviewers and Readers  
Wu, Alisa (Columbia University); Morwitz, Vicki (Columbia University)
109. Psychological Methods for Detecting Bots  
Rodriguez, Christopher (Carnegie Mellon University); Oppenheimer, Danny (Carnegie Mellon University)
110. Good luck is perceived as a limited resource in space and time  
Marciano, Deborah (University of California - Berkeley); Wertheimer, Oded (Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Bourgeois-Gironde, Sacha (Institut Jean-Nicod, École Normale Supérieure, PSL-Research University, Paris); Deouell, Leon (Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
111. The emergence and development of information avoidance  
Santhanagopalan, Radhika (University of Chicago); Risen, Jane (University of Chicago); Kinzler, Katherine (University of Chicago)
112. The vicious cycle that stalls statistical revolution  
Bialek, Michal (University of Wrocław); Misiak, Michal (University of Wrocław); Dziekan, Martyna (Adam Mickiewicz University)

113. The (in)efficiency of children's search strategies selectively supports task-related memory  
Stanciu, Oana (Central European University); Jones, Angela (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Metzner, Nele (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Fandakova, Yana (Max Planck Institute); Ghetti, Simona (University of California - Davis); Ruggeri, Azzurra (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
114. How much can I spend? The role of projections and anchor-values in guiding spending in retirement  
Newell, Benjamin (University of New South Wales); Nian, Rochelle (University of New South Wales); Dobrescu, Isabella (University of New South Wales); Bateman, Hazel (University of New South Wales); Thorp, Susan (University of Sydney)
115. High-stakes overprecision  
Moore, Don (University of California - Berkeley); Campbell, Sandy (University of California - Berkeley)
116. Thanks, but no thanks: Gratitude reveals relationship expectations  
Chaudhry, Shereen (University of Chicago); Yu, Jiaqi (University of Chicago)
117. Carryover of Default Effects: The Interplay Among Nudges, Prior Preferences, and Experienced Choice Consequences  
Waisman, Rory (University of Alberta); Häubl, Gerald (University of Alberta); Godfrey, D. Matthew (University of Massachusetts); Dellaert, Benedict (Erasmus University Rotterdam)
118. The Annihilation of Lazy Hierarchies: Why Biases Are Never Enough to Understand Human Beings  
Elerick, George (University of Exeter)
119. Can increased processing noise induce better decisions? Evidence polarization through exponential weighting  
Vanunu, Yonatan (University of Chicago); Newell, Ben R. (University of New South Wales)
120. The functional relevance of right DLPFC and VMPFC in risk-taking behavior  
Dantas, Aline (Maastricht University); Sack, Alexander (Maastricht University); Bruggen, Elisabeth (Maastricht University); Jiao, Peiran (Maastricht University); Schuhmann, Teresa (Maastricht University)
121. QualtricsRT: A tool for collecting high quality response time data in online (Qualtrics) studies  
Thomson, Keela, (University of Toronto); Sun, Michael (Carnegie Mellon University); Rifai, Stephanie (Carnegie Mellon University)
122. The impact of political ideology on negotiation propensity  
Pan, Archer (Cornell University); Thomas, Manoj (Cornell University)
123. Cognitive processing of emotional biases: An integrative approach to the emotional influence on judgment and decision making  
Szabó, Edit (University of Nevada, Reno); Sundali, James (University of Nevada, Reno)
124. "I'd Rather Die by My Own Hand: When and Why Self-Serving Attributions Reverse"  
Maimone, Giulia (UC San Diego); Vosgerau, Joachim (Bocconi University); Gneezy, Ayelet (UC San Diego)