## **Does Hindsight Bias Impair Learning?**

# Evidence from a visual pattern learning task

## Abstract

Pezzo & Quinn (2015) reported that hindsight bias (HSB) was negatively associated with learning. We used a similar but more difficult version of their task to replicate this and test the possibility that working memory drives this effect. Ss were trained to identify three impressionist artists' paintings. Two measures of HSB were taken during training: A memory measure and obviousness (OBV) of various stimuli with the answers provided. Prior to training, 2 measures of working memory were taken: Visual patterns test (VPT) and perceptual sensitivity test (PST), after training a second PST and a final multiple choice test was given. Regression analyses indicated that memory HSB was not associated with final test scores, but obviousness ratings were. Working memory as measured by the VPT was unrelated to HSB, but baseline perceptual sensitivity (PST) predicted both measures of obviousness.

### Introduction

Does hindsight bias impair learning? (e.g., Fischhoff, 1975; Wears & Nemeth, 2007). Some say yes because it reduces surprise necessary to motivate learning. Others note that because a sensemaking process underlies the bias (Blank et al., 2008; Pezzo, 2003), HSB should be positively associated with learning (Hoch & Loewestein, 1989; Nestler et al., 2012). To our knowledge no study has ever directly tested the relationship between learning and hindsight bias.

## Method

mTurk workers (N = 88) were trained (1 hr) to recognize French Impressionist paintings as being the work of Cezanne, Degas, or Morisot. Ss were shown a total of 75 paintings (25) each artist). Before training, they received the Visual Patterns Test (VPT, Brown, et al., 2006) and the Perceptual Sensitivity **Test** (PST, Tanaka et al., 2005). Both are related to working memory. During training, they were given two different measures of hindsight bias:

- Memory Measure (HSB): Difference between ratings of artist. (30 paintings)
- true artist (1 to 7 scale) (30 paintings) alpha = .

Blank, H., Nestler, S., von Collani, G., & Fischer, V. (2008). How many hindsight biases are there?. Cognition, 106(3), 1408-1440. likelihood (hindsight – foresight) that each painter is true Brown, L. A., Forbes, D., & McConnell, J. (2006). Limiting the use of verbal coding in the Visual Patterns Test. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *59*(7), 1169–1176. Calvillo, D. P. (2012). Working memory and the memory distortion component of hindsight bias. Memory, 20(8), 891-898. DOI: 10.1080/09658211.2012.706309 Fischhoff, B. (1975). Hindsight is not equal to foresight: The effect of outcome knowledge on judgment under uncertainty. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance,* 1(3), 288. • **Obviousness Rating (OBV)**: Mean rating after being told Hoch, S., J. and Loewenstein, G. F. (1989). Outcome Feedback: Hindsight and Information. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 15*(4), 605-619. Nestler, S., Egloff, B., Kufner, A. C. P., and Back, M. D. (2012). An integrative lens model approach to bias and accuracy in human inferences: Hindsight effects and knowledge updating in personality judgments. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103(4), 689-717. DOI: 10.1037/a0029461 Pezzo, M.V. (2003). Surprise, defense, or making sense?: What removes hindsight bias? *Memory*, 11, 421-441. Tanaka, J. W., Curran, T., & Sheinberg, D. L. (2005). The training and transfer of real-world perceptual expertise. Psychological Science 16(2), 145-151. Participants were then given a **final test** (60 unique MC items) DOI: 10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.00795.x and the **second PST**. Wears, R. L., & Nemeth, C. P. (2007). Replacing hindsight with insight: Toward better understanding of diagnostic failures. Annals of Emergency *Medicine, 49*(2), 206-209.

#### Training





ezanne painted just a few different subjects till lifes, portraits, landscapes, and bathers



Degas is especially identified with the subject of dance; nore than half of his works denict dance



#### References

#### Mark Pezzo **University of South Florida**

## Molly Quinn University College Dublin



Morisot's portraits are almost exclusively of women and in home

#### **Foresight Judgments**



- . What's % that Cezanne painted this?
- 2. What's % that that Degas painted this?
- 3. What's % that Morisot painted this?

#### **Hindsight Judgments**

Ss shown same image (above) w/ correct answer, and asked to recall their previous (foresight) answers

#### **Obviousness Judgments**



This painting is by Degas

- 1. How **obvious** is this?
- 2. How likely would you have been to **guess** this?
- 3. How **surprising** is this? (reverse coded)

	HSB	OBV	PST	Final Score
VPT	062	.096	.141	.230**
HSB		077	226**	170*
OBV			.285**	.365**
PST				.349**

\* p < .05 \*\* p < .01

#### DV = Final Score Mean Predictor Constant HSB 8.65 OBV 5.55 VPT 6.34 PST .805

Note: Model  $R^2 = .388$ ; F (4, 85) = 12.824, p < .001. HSB = Hindsight Bias; OBV = Obviousness; VPT = Visual Working Memory; PST = Perceptual Sensitivity (t1) Homoscedasticy violated; Bootstrapped 5000 BCa. 1 multivariate outlier retained. Coefficients and significance levels remain unchanged when dropped.



This study replicated Pezzo & Quinn's (2015) finding that HSB (memory measure) during training is negatively correlated with test performance. However, when included in a regression model along with measures of obviousness and WM, HSB was no longer a significant predictor. Further, judgments of obviousness emerged as a strong positive predictor of performance. High ratings of obviousness here do not reflect arrogance or overconfidence, but actual ability, as also evidenced by the relationship with baseline PST. Figure 1 shows that obviousness ratings mediated the effect of PST on final score. Hindsight bias appears to be unrelated to learning.



## Hannah Foster **Claremont Graduate University**

#### Results

Pearson's r is reported for PST only. Kendall's tau\_b is reported for all other correlations.

В	bias	SE	р	BCaL	BCaU
.09	.001	.180	.619	278	.443
002	.000	.002	.429	006	.003
.122	.000	.030	.001	.064	.182
.012	.001	.005	.009	.004	.020
.026	.000	.025	.315	026	.077

#### Discussion