

# Society for Judgment and Decision Making

## Annual Conference 2023



**Hilton San Francisco Union Square**  
**San Francisco, California, USA**  
**November 17–20, 2023**

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
Master Schedule	2
Paper Presentations Schedule	3-4
Conference Announcements & Special Events	5-7
Paper Abstracts Listed by Session	8-24
Poster Titles Listed by Session	25-40

**2023 PROGRAM COMMITTEE:** Stephen Spiller (Chair), Jennifer Trueblood, and Silvia Saccardo

**THANKS TO:** Kate Wessels & Kathryn Ingraham (Conference Coordinators), Dave Hardisty (Webmaster), Abigail Sussman (President), Jane Risen (D&I Chair), Ashley Angulo, Margaret Echelbarger, Fausto Gonzalez, Ania Jaroszewicz, Molly Moore, Elizabeth Perry, Deidre Popovich, Crystal Reeck, Aaron Sackett, Ovul Sezer, Stephen Spiller, Yiyun Shou, Eric VanEpps (D&I Committee), Erika Kirgios, Alice Moon, Avni Shah (Underrepresented Scholars Committee), Ioannis Evangelidis (Student Poster Award), Alex Imas, Molly Crockett, Ben Newell, Christopher Olivola, Elanor Williams (Einhorn Award Committee), Natalia Karelaia, Adelle Yang, Eyal Peer, Samuel Hirshman (Beattie Committee)

**THANKS TO:** SJDM ad hoc reviewers: On Amir, Peter Ayton, Alix Barasch, Dan Bartels, Jonathan Berman, Sudeep Bhatia, Amit Bhattacharjee, Rahul Bhui, Brad Bitterly, Hayley Blunden, Melanie Brucks, Katherine Burson, Edward Chang, Stephanie Chen, Helen Colby, Cynthia Cryder, Hengchen Dai, Junyi Dai, Jason Dana, David Daniels, Shai Davidai, Bart De Langhe, Michael DeKay, Berkeley Dietvorst, Charles Dorison, Julie Downs, Ioannis Evangelidis, Barbara Fasolo, Daniel Feiler, Susann Fiedler, Geoff Fisher, Celia Gaertig, Rachel Gershon, Ayelet Gneezy, Dan Goldstein, Kareem Haggag, David Hagmann, Crystal Hall, Yaniv Hanoch, Joyce He, Hal Herschfield, Stefan Herzog, Samuel Hirshman, Janina Hoffmann, Kevin Jarbo, Martha Jeong, Leslie John, Minah Jung, Polly Kang, Natalia Karelaia, Uma Karmarkar, Erika Kirgios, Ian Krajbich, Ariella Kristal, Amit Kumar, Daniella Kupor, Eleanor Kyung, Richard Larrick, Robyn LeBoeuf, Jennifer Lerner, David Levari, Emma Levine, Ye Li, Alicea Lieberman, Jingyi Lu, Shenghua Luan, Johannes Müller-Trede, Cade Massey, John McCoy, Craig McKenzie, Katherine Milkman, Robert Mislavsky, Daniel Mochon, Alice Moon, Leif Nelson, Ben Newell, Nathan Novemsky, Ed O'Brien, Christopher Olivola, Daniel Oppenheimer, Thorsten Pachur, Asa Palley, Hannah Perfecto, Stephanie Permut, Jonathan Pettibone, Tim Pleskac, Ori Plonsky, Crystal Reeck, Taly Reich, Elena Reutskaja, Jane Risen, David Rothschild, Juliana Schroeder, Daniel Schwartz, Irene Scopelliti, Sydney Scott, Ovul Sezer, Franklin Shaddy, Anuj Shah, Avni Shah, Marissa Sharif, Luxi Shen, Stephanie Smith, Jack Soll, Mikhail Spektor, David Tannenbaum, Elizabeth Tenney, Neil Thakral, Claire Tsai, Stephanie Tully, Oleg Urminsky, Eric VanEpps, Evan Weingarten, Keith Wilcox, Elanor Williams, Paul Windschitl, Kaitlin Woolley, Adelle Yang, Yang Yang, Ting Zhang, Julian Zlatev

# 2023 SJDM Conference Master Schedule

## Hilton San Francisco, Union Square

### November 17-20, 2023

Hilton Union Square: 333 O'Farrell Street, San Francisco, California, USA 94102

#### FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 17<sup>th</sup>

---

3:30-6:00 pm	<b>Registration</b> ( <i>Golden Gate 1, Lobby Level</i> ) *NOTE: Welcome Reception Starts at 5:00 pm)*
3:45-5:00 pm	<b>Underrepresented Scholars in SJDM Networking Event</b> ( <i>Vista Room, 45<sup>th</sup> Floor</i> ) *All SJDM Members Encouraged to Attend. Please check in at 3:45pm; programming begins at 4pm sharp*
5:00-7:00 pm	<b>Welcome Reception</b> w/ cash bar ( <i>Golden Gate Foyer, Lobby Level</i> ) *All SJDM Members Welcome to Attend*
6:00-7:15 pm	<b>John Payne Tribute</b> ( <i>Golden Gate 7&amp;8, Lobby Level</i> ) *All SJDM Members Welcome to Attend*
7:00-9:00 pm	Executive Board Dinner ( <i>Invite only</i> )

#### SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 18<sup>th</sup>

---

8:00-9:15 am	<b>Registration</b> ( <i>Golden Gate 1, Lobby Level</i> )
8:30-9:30 am	<b>Paper Session #1</b> ( <i>Golden Gate 2&amp;3, GGate 4&amp;5, GGate 7&amp;8; Lobby Level</i> )
9:45-10:45 am	<b>Paper Session #2</b> ( <i>Golden Gate 2&amp;3, GGate 4&amp;5, GGate 7&amp;8; Lobby Level</i> )
11:00-12:00 am	<b>Paper Session #3</b> ( <i>Golden Gate 2&amp;3, GGate 4&amp;5, GGate 7&amp;8; Lobby Level</i> )
12:00-1:00 pm	Lunch Break (on your own)
1:15-2:15 pm	<b>Paper Session #4</b> ( <i>Golden Gate 2&amp;3, GGate 4&amp;5, GGate 7&amp;8; Lobby Level</i> )
2:30-3:30 pm	<b>Paper Session #5</b> ( <i>Golden Gate 2&amp;3, GGate 4&amp;5, GGate 7&amp;8; Lobby Level</i> )
3:45-4:45 pm	<b>Keynote Address: Tania Lombrozo</b> ( <i>Continental Ballroom 5&amp;6; Ballroom Level</i> )
5:00-6:00 pm	<b>Paper Session #6</b> ( <i>Golden Gate 2&amp;3, GGate 4&amp;5, GGate 7&amp;8; Lobby Level</i> )
6:00-8:00 pm	<b>Graduate Student Social Event</b> ( <i>Golden Gate Foyer, Lobby Level</i> )

#### SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 19<sup>th</sup>

---

8:00-9:45 am	<b>Poster Session #1</b> w/ light breakfast ( <i>Grand Ballroom, Grand Ballroom Level</i> )
10:00-11:00 am	<b>Paper Session #7</b> ( <i>Golden Gate 2&amp;3, GGate 4&amp;5, GGate 7&amp;8; Lobby Level</i> )
11:15-12:15 pm	<b>Presidential Address: Abigail Sussman</b> ( <i>Continental Ballroom 5&amp;6; Ballroom Level</i> )
12:15-1:15 pm	Lunch Break (on your own)
1:30-2:30 pm	<b>Paper Session #8</b> ( <i>Golden Gate 2&amp;3, GGate 4&amp;5, GGate 7&amp;8; Lobby Level</i> )
2:45-3:45 pm	<b>Paper Session #9</b> ( <i>Golden Gate 2&amp;3, GGate 4&amp;5, GGate 7&amp;8; Lobby Level</i> )
4:00-4:40 pm	<b>Awards and Einhorn Award Address</b> ( <i>Continental Ballroom 5&amp;6; Ballroom Level</i> )
4:45-6:30 pm	<b>Poster Session #2</b> w/ cash bar ( <i>Grand Ballroom, Grand Ballroom Level</i> )

#### MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20<sup>th</sup>

---

8:00-9:30 am	<b>Business Meeting</b> w/ Complimentary Breakfast ( <i>GGate 6-8</i> ) *All SJDM Members Welcome to Attend*
--------------	---

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2023			
Rooms - Hilton - Golden Gate 2 & 3, Golden Gate 4 & 5, Golden Gate 7 & 8			
	Track I Golden Gate 2 & 3	Track II Golden Gate 4 & 5	Track III Golden Gate 7 & 8
Session #1	Algorithms	Misinformation	Prosocial
8:30 AM	Logg - A Simple Explanation Reconciles Algorithm Aversion vs. Appreciation: Hypotheticals vs. Real Judgments	Lin - Shifting attention to accuracy reduces misinformation sharing: Evidence from computational modeling and online field experiments	Segal - I'm Not Too Generous: Examining the Desirability of Prosocial Traits in the Self
8:50 AM	Balakrishnan - Improving Human-Algorithm Collaboration: Causes and Mitigation of Over- and Under-Adherence	Pennycook - Overconfidently conspiratorial: Conspiracy believers are dispositionally overconfident and massively overestimate how much others agree with them	Brody - From Warm Glow to Cold Chill: The Effect of Choice Framing on Donations
9:10 AM	Chang - Quantification fixation	Orchinik - Habits of truth: Base rates of veracity flexibly affect belief in true and false news	Slater - Between self-interest and social preferences: A neuromodulation approach to establish the role of cognitive-control
Session #2	Probability	Conversation and engagement	(In)sensitivity
9:45 AM	Fox - The Role of Attention in Probability Weighting	Yeomans - Conversational receptiveness transmits between parties and bridges ideological conflict	Amir - Inaction Neglect
10:05 AM	Thoma - A Longitudinal Investigation of Probability Learning Across Childhood	Wang - The Illusion of Effective Discussion in Group Judgment and in Advice Taking	Hong - Reducing Hedonic Adaptation By Assessing Hedonic Reactions Less Frequently
10:25 AM	Neto - Low probability, low credibility	Kirgios - Does Q&A Boost Engagement? Health Messaging Experiments in the US and Ghana	Voichek - Positive Contrast Scope-Insensitivity
Session #3	Taking advice	Gender gaps	Numeracy and numbers
11:00 AM	Kommel - Advice Utilization under Time Pressure	Hirshman - Does Increasing the Riskiness of Choices Widen Gender Gaps?	Eber - Numeracy and stated preference valuation
11:20 AM	Gallus - Note From Self: The effects of intra-personal advice on educational outcomes at scale	Chang - The Impact of Highlighting Gender Identity and Self-Promotional Language in Help-Seeking Requests	Meyer - The CRT is not 'just' Math: An adversarial collaboration
11:40 AM	Jeong - Preference for the Natural Advice-Giver: Failure is overlooked unless people think about who learned more	Pink - Does challenging women to close the gender gap in competitiveness change their behavior?: Evidence from the field	Geiser - Ratios of Small Numbers Seem Larger
Session #4	In situ	Trust	Spending and saving
1:15 PM	Saccardo - Field Tested: Assessing the Transferability of Behavioral Interventions	Neumann - Trust Mindsets: People Trust More After Learning Trust Can Be Self-Fulfilling	Yin - The Life you Save (For): Experiences Dominate Goods in Motivating Savings
1:35 PM	Lob - Modelling the influence of situational uncertainty on risk taking in everyday life	Tulan - Restoring trust in news: Conversational receptiveness improves evaluations of opinion articles across the political divide	Schwartz - The Rise of a Nudge: Field Experiment and Machine Learning on Minimum and Full Credit Card Payments
1:55 PM	Bhatia - Exploring the Sources of Variance in Everyday Decision Making with Large Language Models	Blunden - When does flattery fail? Flattery backfires when perceived as inauthentic	Echelbarger - Loosen Up, Kid: An investigation of parent-child conversations about spending and saving
Session #5	Judgment aggregation	Meta-questions	Morality
2:30 PM	Epping - Crowdsourcing a labeled dataset using binary choices versus elicited beliefs	Gandhi - Research Cartography: Building a Map to Navigate and Generalize Behavioral Science	Le Pargneux - Contractualist moral cognition: An experimental and computational investigation
2:50 PM	Dorison - Beyond accuracy: The reputational costs of independent judgment aggregation	Weingarten - A Meta-Analysis and Metastudy of the Anchoring Effect	Small - Reluctance to Downplay Harm: Asymmetric Sensitivity to Differences in the Severity of Moral Transgressions
3:10 PM	Oktar - Learning from Aggregated Opinion	Gao - Extremity Bias in Survey Responses Generates Strong Yet Invalid Results	Garber - Negotiators are More Honest Than We Think: A Theory of Initial Distrust in Negotiation

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2023			
Rooms - Hilton - Golden Gate 2 & 3, Golden Gate 4 & 5, Golden Gate 7 & 8			
	Track I Golden Gate 2 & 3	Track II Golden Gate 4 & 5	Track III Golden Gate 7 & 8
Session #6	Risk and uncertainty	Disagreement and difficult conversations	Beliefs
5:00 PM	Hu - When Goods Were Odds: Do People Evaluate the Same Option Differently if it was Previously Uncertain?	Mackin - Harnessing Ingroup Disagreement to Dampen Outgroup Animosity	Protzko - How People Correct Their Beliefs
5:20 PM	Rude - Evaluating Point and Range Predictions Under Epistemic vs. Aleatory Uncertainty	Kim - Difficult Conversations As An Intertemporal Choice	Banker - People are more likely to generalize positive information than negative information
5:40 PM	Yang - Risky Feeling Varies: Examining Anticipatory Emotions Towards Risks Across Different Domains	Kardas - How civil conversations dissolve disagreements and are surprisingly likely to reduce attitude polarization	Bharti - Directionally consistent causal chains are considered more effective

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2023			
Rooms - Hilton - Golden Gate 2 & 3, Golden Gate 4 & 5, Golden Gate 7 & 8			
	Track I Golden Gate 2 & 3	Track II Golden Gate 4 & 5	Track III Golden Gate 7 & 8
Session #7	What comes next?	Inequality and systems	Inferences
10:00 AM	Klusowski - When do people predict a trend will progress vs. regress?	Hagerty - Inequality of Opportunity Cost Salience	Bogard - Making Sense of Dominated Options
10:20 AM	Brimhall - Predicting Sequences Under Epistemic Versus Aleatory Uncertainty	Lasky-Fink - Examining the impact of stigma on decision-making in the US social safety net	Lieberman - How the Choice Environment Can Signal Social Norms and Change Behavior
10:40 AM	Kukavica - Rational and Irrational Belief in the Hot Hand: Evidence from Jeopardy!	Hagmann - Costly Distractions: Focusing on Individual Behavior Undermines Support for Systemic Reforms	Kim - Less is More (Natural): The Effect of Ingredient Quantity on Preferences and Naturalness Judgments
Session #8	Wisdom of crowds	Medicine	Framing time
1:30 PM	Atwell - Metawisdom Of The Crowd: How Choice Within Aided Decision Making Can Make Crowd Wisdom Robust	Milkman - How Do Free Rides and Text Reminders Affect COVID-19 Vaccinations? A 3.5-Million Person Megastudy	Wang - When the end is in sight: Time periods feel longer when expressed in minutes compared to end time
1:50 PM	Zhang - Stubborn Non-Experts or True Experts? Leveraging Advice-taking and Kernel Density Estimation to Identify the Cluster of Experts and Improve Wisdom of Crowds	Tetik - Illness Severity and Consumers' Experience of Drug Side Effects	Faro - Temporal Frames of Environmental Threats
2:10 PM	McCoy - Small sample crowd wisdom with honesty incentives	Allen - Quantifying the Impact of Vaccine-Skeptical Content on Facebook	Gaerth - The Dates-and-Hours Framing Effect in Temporal Evaluations
Session #9	Reference points	Workplace	Online platforms
2:45 PM	Owsley - The Dynamics of Motivation in Goal Pursuit	Campbell - An unexpected bias: High levels of achievement change the biases women face at work	Dai - The choice overload effect in online retailing platforms
3:05 PM	Skowronek - It's Easy To Learn, Save Money, and Work Out: When Framing Tasks as Easy Can Backfire	Agarwal - Gender differences in accusations and believability	Yi - Testing the Digital Frontier: Validity Tradeoffs in Online Platform A/B Tests
3:25 PM	Müller-Trede - Risk Aversion for Qualitative Losses	Haggag - Present-Biased Labor Supply: Evidence from Uber's Instant Pay	Silver - Put your mouth where your money is: A field experiment encouraging donors to share about charity

## 2023 SJDM Conference Announcements & Special Events

### GUIDE TO SAN FRANCISCO

Psychonomics' guide to San Francisco and the local area can be found here:

<https://www.psychonomic.org/page/2023exploresf>

### FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 17<sup>th</sup>

3:30-6:00 pm **Registration**  
*Golden Gate I, Lobby Level*

3:45-5:00 pm **Underrepresented Scholars (US) in SJDM Networking Event**  
*Vista Room, 45<sup>th</sup> Floor*  
*Check-in for the US in SJDM event begins at 3:45. Programming begins promptly at 4:00.*

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

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

### ***Thank You to the Generous Sponsors of the 2023 Underrepresented Scholars in SJDM Event!***



Behavioural Economics in  
Action at Rotman (BEAR)



The University of Chicago  
Booth School of Business

**This event was made possible entirely through sponsorship.**

5:00-7:00 pm **Welcome Reception**  
*Golden Gate Foyer, Lobby Level*

6:00-7:15 pm **John Payne Tribute: The Adaptive Decision Researcher**  
*Golden Gate 7 & 8, Lobby Level* <https://tinyurl.com/sjdm2023payne>  
*Organized by Eric Johnson and Rick Larrick*  
Featuring remarks by: Paul Slovic, Jim Bettman, Mary Frances Luce, Shlomo Benartzi, Suzanne Shu, Richard Thaler, and the Adaptive Decision Researcher himself, John Payne!

## SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 18<sup>th</sup>

8:00-9:15 am **Registration**  
*Golden Gate 1, Lobby Level*

12:00-1:00 pm **Lunch Break**  
*On your own. Sessions resume at 1:15pm*

3:45-4:45 am **Keynote Address: Believing Beyond the Evidence**  
*Continental Ballroom 5 & 6, Ballroom Level*

*The mathematician and philosopher W.K. Clifford famously wrote that “...it is wrong always, everywhere, and for anyone to believe anything on insufficient evidence.” While Clifford intended this as a normative stricture, it raises a question about human psychology: to what extent do people hold the beliefs of others to this standard? To what extent do people obey it in forming and evaluating their own beliefs? In this talk I'll present recent work from my lab investigating the extent to which people believe beyond the evidence, and moreover think they *\*should\** believe beyond the evidence. Such cases seem to arise predominantly when moral considerations favor a belief for which the evidence is insufficient or even inconsistent - such as giving a friend the benefit of the doubt (out of loyalty) when evidence suggests they may be to blame, or believing in God in part because this belief is taken to have positive moral value. .*

**Tania Lombrozo, Princeton University**

*Tania Lombrozo is the Arthur W. Marks '19 Professor of Psychology at Princeton University. She received her Ph.D. in Psychology from Harvard University in 2006 after receiving a B.S. in Symbolic Systems and a B.A. in Philosophy from Stanford University. Dr. Lombrozo's research aims to address foundational questions about cognition using the empirical tools of cognitive psychology and the conceptual tools of analytic philosophy. Her work focuses on explanation and understanding, conceptual representation, categorization, social cognition, causal reasoning, and folk epistemology. She is the recipient of numerous early-career awards, including the Association for Psychological Science Janet Taylor Spence Award for Transformative Early Career Contributions and a CAREER award from the National Science Foundation. She has blogged about psychology, philosophy, and cognitive science at Psychology Today and for NPR's 13.7: Cosmos & Culture.*

6:00-8:00 pm **Graduate Student Social Event**  
*Golden Gate Foyer, Lobby Level*

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

<p><b>Please note that SJDM has access to two Mother's Wellness Rooms:</b> <b>Union Square 1 and Union Square 2, located on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the hotel.</b></p>
--

## SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 19<sup>th</sup>

8:00-9:45 am **Poster Session 1** w/ Light Breakfast

*Grand Ballroom, Grand Ballroom Level*

(Note: The ballroom will be open to Poster presenters on 11/18 from 8-9 pm; and on the morning of 11/19 from 7-8 am.

8:00-9:45 am **Meet the Directors of Decision, Risk, and Management Sciences at the NSF**

*Poster Session 1, Grand Ballroom, Grand Ballroom Level*

*Drs. Claudia González Vallejo and Robert O'Connor, Directors of Decision, Risk, and Management Sciences, DRMS, Program at the National Science Foundation, will be available to answer questions about the program. DRMS supports scientific research directed at increasing understanding and effectiveness of decision making by individuals, groups, organizations, and society. DRMS supports research with solid foundations in theories and methods of the social and behavioral sciences. The program participates in several types of funding mechanisms such as the RAPID mechanism for research that involves ephemeral data, typically tied to disasters or other unanticipated events. Much less frequently, the program also supports highly unusual, proof-of-concept, high-risk projects that are potentially transformational (Early Concept Grants for Exploratory Research – EAGER). DRMS also supports Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grants (DDRIGs).*

11:15-12:15 pm **Presidential Address:** Canonical Aspects of SJDM Research

*Continental Ballroom 5&6, Ballroom Level*

*The field of judgment and decision-making examines a broad and diverse set of topics that has grown and expanded its reach over the past several decades. In this talk, I begin by discussing key themes in judgment and decision-making and how their prevalence has evolved over time. Next, I highlight three canonical aspects of SJDM research that have contributed to my enthusiasm for the area: broad disciplinary representation, examination of impactful outcomes, and a focus on methodological rigor. I discuss ways that each of these aspects has influenced my own research and how we can leverage these qualities as a field moving forward.*

**Abigail Sussman**, University of Chicago

12:15-1:15 pm **Lunch Break**

*On your own. Sessions resume at 1:30pm*

4:00-4:40 pm **Awards and Einhorn Award Address**

*Continental Ballroom 5&6*

Winners of the Best Student Poster Award, Best Paper Award, and Einhorn Award will be announced. The Einhorn Award winner will present their research.

4:45-6:30 pm **Poster Session 2** w/ Cash Bar

*Grand Ballroom, Grand Ballroom Level*

## MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20<sup>th</sup>

8:00-9:30am **Business Meeting** with Complimentary Breakfast

*Golden Gate 6-8*

# 2023 SJDM Conference Paper Abstracts

**Saturday November 18, 2023**

## **Session #1 Track I: Algorithms - Hilton - Golden Gate 2&3 - Saturday 8:30 am - 9:30 am**

### **A Simple Explanation Reconciles Algorithm Aversion vs. Appreciation: Hypotheticals vs. Real Judgments**

Logg, Jennifer M. (Georgetown University); Schlund, Rachel (Cornell University)

We propose a simple explanation to reconcile algorithm aversion with algorithm appreciation results: elicitation methods. When making judgments, people consistently utilize algorithmic advice more than human advice. In contrast, hypotheticals produce unstable preferences; either indifference or algorithm aversion. Moreover, people fail to correctly anticipate behavior, utilizing algorithmic advice more than they anticipate. A framing change to hypotheticals additionally moderates algorithm aversion. Stated preferences about algorithms are less stable than actual judgments, suggesting that algorithm aversion may be less stable than previous research leads us to believe. Contact: jenn.logg@georgetown.edu

### **Improving Human- Algorithm Collaboration: Causes and Mitigation of Over- and Under-Adherence**

Balakrishnan, Maya (Harvard University); Ferreira, Kris (Harvard University); Tong, Jordan (University of Wisconsin)

We propose a model that captures how a person combines information she directly observes (some of which is private) with an algorithmic prediction to make a final demand forecast. We hypothesize people take a constant weighted average between their own forecast and the algorithm's. This leads to people over-adjusting the algorithm's predictions when it performs well and under-adjusting the algorithm's predictions when it performs poorly. We confirm this using a lab experiment where participants make demand forecasts for 20 products using an algorithm's recommendations. In a follow-up experiment, we show that providing transparency into the algorithm's input features can mitigate this bias. Contact: mayanb@gmail.com

### **Quantification fixation**

Chang, Linda (University of Pennsylvania); Kirgios, Erika (University of Chicago); Mullainathan, Sendhil (University of Chicago); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania)

Individuals and organizations often rely on a mix of numerical metrics and qualitative information to make decisions. We explore how quantification affects decisions that involve weighing competing attributes. In six pre-registered experiments (n=7,000) involving managerial, policy, and consumer decisions, we document evidence of quantification fixation: when making trade-offs, people systematically shift their preferences towards options that dominate on dimensions described numerically vs. qualitatively. We identify one mechanism that underlies quantification fixation: fluency of quantified information. Our findings suggest that when we count, we change what counts. Contact: changlw@sas.upenn.edu

## **Session #1 Track II: Misinformation - Hilton - Golden Gate 4&5 - Saturday 8:30 am - 9:30 am**

### **Shifting attention to accuracy reduces misinformation sharing: Evidence from computational modeling and online field experiments**

Lin, Hause (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Pennycook, Gordon (Cornell University)

Researchers and practitioners have been looking for ways to combat the spread of misinformation online. One promising solution involves prompting users to think about the accuracy of the information before sharing it. We used computational modeling (5633 participants) to show that the intervention is effective because it shifts people's attention to accuracy (but does not make them deliberate more). We then conducted three field experiments (75763 users) via Twitter ad campaigns and found that showing users accuracy-prompt ads reduced misinformation sharing by up to 4.6%. These results suggest the intervention is an effective and scalable solution for combating misinformation. Contact: hauselin@gmail.com



**Overconfidently conspiratorial: Conspiracy believers are dispositionally overconfident and massively overestimate how much others agree with them**

Pennycook, Gordon (Cornell University); Binnendyk, Jabin (Cornell University); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

Past work has focused on the needs and motivations of conspiracy believers. Here, we propose an alternative driver of belief in conspiracies: overconfidence. Across eight studies with 4,181 U.S. adults, conspiracy believers consistently overestimated their performance on cognitive tests. This relationship was robust to controlling for analytic thinking, need for uniqueness, and narcissism. We also found that conspiracy believers—particularly overconfident ones—massively overestimated (>4x) how much others agree with them: Although conspiracy beliefs were in the majority only 12% of the time across 150 questions, believers thought themselves to be in the majority 93% of the time. Contact: [grpennycook@gmail.com](mailto:grpennycook@gmail.com)

**Habits of truth: Base rates of veracity flexibly affect belief in true and false news**

Orchinik, Reed (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Martel, Cameron (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Bhui, Rahul (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

We show that susceptibility to misinformation may be driven by the ecologically rational use of environmental statistics. Experimental participants who were initially exposed to mostly true news became more likely to misjudge false news as accurate, and vice versa, consistent with a base-rate veracity heuristic. These effects persisted when base rates abruptly and discreetly changed. Computational modeling of the deliberation process reveals that these effects occurred largely in the starting point of a drift diffusion model, suggesting that the intuitive response adapts to environmental conditions. Contact: [reed.orchinik@gmail.com](mailto:reed.orchinik@gmail.com)

**Session #1 Track III: Prosocial - Hilton - Golden Gate 7&8 - Saturday 8:30 am - 9:30 am**

**I'm Not Too Generous: Examining the Desirability of Prosocial Traits in the Self**

Segal, Shoshana (New York University); Zwebner, Yonat (Reichman University); Barasch, Alixandra (University of Colorado Boulder)

Generosity is often thought of as an important moral trait in person perception and evaluation. However, across 3 reported studies (N=1,401) and 11 additional studies (N=3,161), we find that while individuals want to be moral and warm, they prefer to think of themselves as 'not-too-generous.' We find that this lowered desirability is due to the costliness of generosity and propose preliminary implications of this finding on prosocial behavior. Specifically, we demonstrate that individuals act less prosocially when a costly task is described as generous (versus moral) and that our effect translates to self-other perceptions. Contact: [shoshana.segal@stern.nyu.edu](mailto:shoshana.segal@stern.nyu.edu)

**From Warm Glow to Cold Chill: The Effect of Choice Framing on Donations**

Brody, Ilana (University of California - Los Angeles); Dai, Hengchen (University of California - Los Angeles); Gallus, Jana (University of California - Los Angeles)

We challenge the common assumption that choice is beneficial for motivating prosocial behavior. Using three preregistered field and online experiments (N=25,399), we identify when and why choice is helpful versus harmful. Relative to no choice, a choice framed as 'what to give' increases donation interest by elevating one's sense of agency; however, a choice framed as 'who to help' does not, due to the morally-induced emotional discomfort from choosing between different groups of people to help. While choice can satisfy donors' quest for a 'warm glow', facing a tradeoff between recipient populations may instead instill a 'cold chill' on the likelihood of making a donation at all. Contact: [ilana.brody.phd@anderson.ucla.edu](mailto:ilana.brody.phd@anderson.ucla.edu)

**Between self-interest and social preferences: A neuromodulation approach to establish the role of cognitive-control**

Slater, Jonathan (Maastricht University); Assor, Haim (Bar-Ilan University); Lavidor, Michal (Bar-Ilan University); Halali, Eliran (Bar-Ilan University)

An ongoing debate centers on whether economic self-interest or social preferences are automatically driven whereas the other requires cognitive control. Two different inhibitory brain regions were found to be involved in resolving the often exist conflict between social preferences and self-interest, the right, dorsolateral (rDLPFC) and ventrolateral (rVLPFC), prefrontal-cortex. Using tDCS, we enhanced cortical activity in these regions. rDLPFC stimulation increased fairness preferences, whereas rVLPFC stimulation increased self-interest, suggesting separate cognitive control systems for self-interest and social preferences, which imply that both motivations are automatic processes. Contact: [yonit268@gmail.com](mailto:yonit268@gmail.com)

## **Session #2 Track I: Probability - Hilton - Golden Gate 2&3 - Saturday 9:45 am - 10:45 am**

### **The Role of Attention in Probability Weighting**

Fox, Craig (University of California - Los Angeles); Bogard, Jonathan (Washington University in St Louis); Smith, Stephanie (University of Chicago)

We argue that probability weighting is driven by relative attention to possible outcomes. Thus, when a chance prospect is explicitly described (e.g., 10% chance of \$100, or else \$0), it directs attention equally to described outcomes (\$100 or \$0) with insufficient adjustment for probability extremity, yielding inverse-S weighting. In contrast, when distributions learned by sampling (e.g., \$100, \$0, \$0, \$0, \$0, \$0, \$0, \$0, \$0, \$0), attention is directed to outcomes in proportion to their respective probabilities, yielding more linear/accurate weighting. We show evidence for this interpretation in 4 preregistered studies of decisions under various modalities, including 1 study tracking visual attention. Contact: craig.fox@anderson.em.ucla.edu

### **A Longitudinal Investigation of Probability Learning Across Childhood**

Thoma, Anna (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Schulze, Christin (University of New South Wales)

In a two-year longitudinal study (N = 74 at T1), we investigated the development of probability learning in relation to executive functions from 3.5 to 6.5 years. On average, children became more likely to make high-probability choices over time. For older children, higher memory capacity was related to greater choice diversification. We observed a longitudinal increase in probability matching; yet, younger children in the sample remained more likely to probability maximize across test waves. Our findings contribute to research on exploration tendencies in childhood and emphasize how children's variability in choice behavior may affect the estimated direction of developmental change. Contact: thoma@mpib-berlin.mpg.de

### **Low probability, low credibility**

Neto, M. Leonor (New York University); Lewis, Joshua (New York University)

Past research shows that people mismanage low probability risks. However, this work mostly assumes people believe the probability information. In the real world, people must evaluate the accuracy of risk estimates. Our research reveals an additional obstacle to tail-risk communication: people perceive low-probability estimates as less credible than high-probability ones. The effect holds with pure framing manipulations and using probabilities elicited from participants themselves. Contact: mldinisneto@gmail.com

## **Session #2 Track II: Conversation and engagement - Hilton - Golden Gate 4&5 - Saturday 9:45 am - 10:45 am**

### **Conversational receptiveness transmits between parties and bridges ideological conflict**

Minson, Julia (Harvard University); Yeomans, Michael (Imperial College London); Collins, Hanne (Harvard University); Dorison, Charles (Georgetown University)

Does conversational receptiveness transmit between parties and prevent conflict spirals? Across four studies (N=13,061), we refine the receptiveness algorithm (Study 1) and find that conversational receptiveness enacted by one party predicted receptiveness by the other party among government leaders in the laboratory (Study 2) and students in online class forums (Study 3). In a pre-registered experiment (Study 4), we find that briefly training one individual in this technique also increased its use by an out-party counterpart. This transmission is distinct from mimicry or emotion contagion and is driven by a deeper shift in linguistic style, which we term 'indirect accommodation.' Contact: m.yeomans@imperial.ac.uk

### **The Illusion of Effective Discussion in Group Judgment and in Advice Taking**

Wang, Feiyi (University of Pennsylvania); Silver, Ike (Northwestern University); Manfredi, Dylan (University of Pennsylvania); Duncan, Shannon (University of Pennsylvania); Mellers, Barbara (University of Pennsylvania)

Three pre-registered experiments unveil an 'illusion of effective discussion' afflicting people's perceptions of group interactions. Silver, Mellers, and Tetlock (2021) observed that group discussion often inflates confidence without improving judgment accuracy. We investigate this bias directly. We show that undue confidence increases are more prevalent after group- relative to individual-deliberation, particularly when groups reach a consensus (either spontaneously or upon instruction). Furthermore, overconfidence in discussion's merits may be driven by lay theories: Participants weigh numeric advice more heavily when they believe it stems from a group that interacted vs. one that did not. Contact: feiyiw@sas.upenn.edu

## **Does Q&A Boost Engagement? Health Messaging Experiments in the US and Ghana**

Kirgios, Erika (University of Chicago); Athey, Susan (Stanford Graduate School of Business); Duckworth, Angela (University of Pennsylvania); Luca, Michael (Harvard University); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania); Offer-Westort, Molly (University of Chicago); Christopher Udry (Northwestern University); Dean Karlan (Northwestern University)

People are less likely to neglect information that is easy to access and process. But are there instances in which adding friction spurs interest? We suggest that despite adding friction, sharing information only after posing a relevant question may enhance engagement by stimulating curiosity. Across field experiments in the U.S. and Ghana, we find that Q&A-style messaging increases information-seeking and self-reported behavior change relative to providing identical information in a direct statement format. Further, an implementation experiment suggests that social media users are more likely to engage with health information advertised with a question rather than a statement of fact. Contact: erika.kirgios@chicagobooth.edu

### **Session #2 Track III: (In)sensitivity - Hilton - Golden Gate 7&8 - Saturday 9:45 am - 10:45 am**

#### **Inaction Neglect**

Kim, Michelle (University of California - San Diego); Amir, On (University of California - San Diego)

Traditional decision theory assumes that all possible outcomes need to be known to find the optimal decision. While this seems trivial in binary choice (yes-no choice), we contend that it is not. Building on the prior literature that alternative hypotheses are often ignored, we propose inaction neglect—that people systematically fail to attend to the inaction option, degrading decision consequences. We demonstrate inaction neglect by showing that giving (superfluous) information about the inaction alters their choices because people do not naturally sufficiently attend to it. Our empirics also differentiate inaction neglect from status quo bias and opportunity cost neglect. Contact: oamir@ucsd.edu

#### **Reducing Hedonic Adaptation By Assessing Hedonic Reactions Less Frequently**

Hong, Stephanie (University of Chicago); O'Brien, Ed (University of Chicago)

Six preregistered experiments (N=2635) find that asking people to rate a repeated stimulus less (vs. more) frequently reduces their hedonic adaptation to it, holding exposure constant. We document this effect for both positive and negative stimuli and online and laboratory contexts. Moreover, this effect is not explained by incidental differences between having to make more (vs. fewer) ratings. Instead, we propose the effect is driven by immersion: simply allowing people to more naturally experience things reveals longer-lasting reactions. By asking people to repeatedly rate a stimulus, existing studies on hedonic adaptation may paint an overly grim picture of its real-world prevalence. Contact: stephanie.hong@chicagobooth.edu

#### **Positive Contrast Scope-Insensitivity**

Voicheck, Guy (Imperial College London); Novemsky, Nathan (Yale University)

Negative contrast makes the inferior option seem worse and positive contrast makes the superior option seem better. We show that positive contrast is scope-insensitive: changes in the size of the difference between options affect negative contrast but not positive contrast. Thus, even when the difference is small enough to make negative contrast negligible, positive contrast remains strong. Consequently, contrast from small differences makes the superior option seem better without making the inferior option seem any worse. This happens because people are less likely to consider the size of the difference when evaluating the superior option than when evaluating the inferior option. Contact: g.voicheck@imperial.ac.uk

### **Session #3 Track I: Taking advice - Hilton - Golden Gate 2&3 - Saturday 11:00 am - 12:00 pm**

#### **Advice Utilization under Time Pressure**

Kommel, Erik (Vienna University of Economics and Business); Lettl, Christopher (Vienna University of Economics and Business)

Many important decisions are not made alone, but decision-makers seek advice from others. In increasingly hypercompetitive markets, management teams are often placed under pressure to make strategic decisions fast. Therefore, decision-making and associated advice taking often takes place in decision environments that are associated with time pressure. Using an online experiment (n = 294), we tested the influence of time manipulations on advice utilization. Our results indicate that confidence mediates the association of time manipulations on advice utilization and that this effect is dependent on when time pressure is elicited in the advice taking process. Contact: erik.kommel@wu.ac.at

### **Note From Self: The effects of intra-personal advice on educational outcomes at scale**

Gallus, Jana (University of California - Los Angeles); Wasserman, Melanie (University of California - Los Angeles)

A 12mo experiment with Coursera studies the effects of receiving intra-personal advice. Preliminary analyses using 104,000 students show positive results: the intervention led to 5 more items (e.g. assignments) completed within 30d, and to a directional increase in modules (i.e., sets of items) completed. The effects are driven by men. We use a novel approach to study heterogeneous effects based on micro-level data from motivation and advice statements. Our first analyses show larger effects for students (1) with social motivations, and (2) who are not pursuing education for intrinsic reasons. The study has implications for the design of scalable, freedom-preserving interventions. Contact: jana.gallus@anderson.ucla.edu

### **Preference for the Natural Advice-Giver: Failure is overlooked unless people think about who learned more**

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

As advice-seekers, the naturalness bias prevails, as we prefer advice from those who succeed effortlessly, compared to those who succeed by overcoming failure. Our studies show we underappreciate the value of failures and instead prefer advice from those who have a consistent track record of success. Interestingly, we have evidence to show that strivers can be better advice-givers—spending greater time writing longer, more concrete advice. This preference can be reversed when advice-seekers consider how much and what exactly the advice-givers learned. This contemplation reverses the preference, so advice-seekers now value advice from those who experienced failure on their way to success. Contact: marthajeong@ust.hk

### **Session #3 Track II: Gender gaps - Hilton - Golden Gate 4&5 - Saturday 11:00 am - 12:00 pm**

#### **Does Increasing the Riskiness of Choices Widen Gender Gaps?**

Hirshman, Samuel (Norwegian School of Economics); Willen, Alexander (Norwegian School of Economics)

Do changes in the riskiness of choices affect gender gaps? We exploit a national reform to the regrade policy of Norwegian universities which provides us with exogenous variation in the probabilities of the outcome of regrade requests. We demonstrate how ostensibly gender-neutral policies can generate gaps across men and women because they differ in their risk preferences and beliefs. Specifically, the exogenous shift in the riskiness of requesting a regrade augmented the regrade request gap by nearly 100 percent. We show that this gender gap in regrade requests is generated by the increased likelihood of a negative regrade outcome. Contact: samuel.hirshman@nhh.no

#### **The Impact of Highlighting Gender Identity and Self-Promotional Language in Help-Seeking Requests**

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

Using a large-scale field experiment, we investigate the impact of gender identity and self-promotion on the effectiveness of help-seeking requests. We emailed researchers from various disciplines (N=66,121) a request to help a research team advance a project by completing a survey linked in the email. We find that self-promotion (i.e., highlighting the team's credentials) increases responses to help-seeking requests, both when the all-female composition of the team is emphasized and when it is not. In an online lab experiment (N=802), we find that people hold incorrect beliefs that women receive backlash for help-seeking in professional contexts, with or without self-promotional language. Contact: jaeyeonc@andrew.cmu.edu

#### **Does challenging women to close the gender gap in competitiveness change their behavior?: Evidence from the field**

Pink, Sophia (University of Pennsylvania); Cervantez, Jose (University of Pennsylvania); Kirgios, Erika (University of Chicago); Chang, Edward (Harvard University); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania)

Does telling women about gender differences in willingness to compete increase their likelihood of entering a competition? We present a field experiment on an executive job search platform where we find that telling women about gender differences in willingness to compete causes them to apply to over 20% more leadership positions, although the effects are short-lived. In an incentive-compatible laboratory experiment, we conceptually replicate this effect and find that it is mediated by psychological reactance. We discuss theoretical implications for the literatures on stereotype threat and reactance, and practical implications for increasing women's representation in leadership positions. Contact: sophialpink@mac.com

### **Session #3 Track III: Numeracy and numbers - Hilton - Golden Gate 7&8 - Saturday 11:00 am - 12:00 pm**

#### **Numeracy and stated preference valuation**

Eber, Michael (Harvard University)

Survey practitioners often document insensitivity in respondents' willingness to pay for hypothetical goods as the magnitude of the good changes. In an online survey experiment (N=1,200), we examined whether insensitivity in valuations reflects cognitive limitations of survey takers in the context of a hypothetical food safety program that reduces risk of mortality by a randomized amount. Average valuations of participants with higher numeracy increased almost linearly with the risk reduction but did not significantly change among those with lower numeracy. A randomized intervention that made risks more difficult to understand reduced the sensitivity of valuations among the highly numerate. Contact: meber@g.harvard.edu

#### **The CRT is not 'just' Math: An adversarial collaboration**

Meyer, Andrew (The Chinese University of Hong Kong); Attali, Yigal (Duolingo); Bar-Hillel, Maya (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Frederick, Shane (Yale University); Kahneman, Daniel (Princeton University)

We report an adversarial collaboration testing Attali and Bar-Hillel's (2020) proposal that the Cognitive Reflection Test (CRT) measures nothing but mathematical aptitude. We administer a survey including eight CRT items, a Mathematical Aptitude Test (MAT) consisting of eight comparably difficult mathematical items that lack intuitive lures; followed by measures of unfounded beliefs and unreasonable preferences; and a reflection scale consisting of non-mathematical items that have intuitively appealing incorrect answers. We find that the CRT has incremental predictive validity over MAT for all three measures, even after correcting for the inherently imperfect reliability of the latter. Contact: andrewmeyer@cuhk.edu.hk

#### **Ratios of Small Numbers Seem Larger**

Geiser, Amanda (University of California - Berkeley); Nelson, Leif (University of California - Berkeley)

People often communicate probabilities using small numbers (e.g., 'There is a 1 in 2 chance that the coin will land on heads'). How does the small-number ratio format impact perceived likelihood and risky choice? Although previous research has argued that smaller numbers reduce perceived likelihood, we find the opposite: Events described using small numbers seem more likely and promote riskier choices. Seven preregistered experiments document this effect and investigate why it occurs. Contact: ageiser@berkeley.edu

### **Session #4 Track I: In situ - Hilton - Golden Gate 2&3 - Saturday 1:15 pm - 2:15 pm**

#### **Field Tested: Assessing the Transferability of Behavioral Interventions**

Saccardo, Silvia (Carnegie Mellon University); Dai, Hengchen (University of California - Los Angeles); Han, Maria (University of California - Los Angeles); Vangala, Sitaram (University of California - Los Angeles); Hoo, Juyea (University of California - Los Angeles); Fujimoto, Jeffrey (University of California - Los Angeles)

There is growing need to examine the transferability of empirical findings to consequential behaviors. We assess the transferability of findings a) from prediction surveys and hypothetical experiments to field settings; and b) from one field context to another after evolving circumstances. Across three RCTs in COVID-19 booster uptake context (N=317,175), we show that findings based on experts' predictions or laypeople's vaccination intentions fail to transfer to our field setting; and text-reminders and psychological ownership framing—which worked in prior field research—increased booster uptake. This work highlights the importance of field-testing interventions and field replication. Contact: ssaccard@andrew.cmu.edu

#### **Modelling the influence of situational uncertainty on risk taking in everyday life**

Lob, Aaron Benjamin (University of Zurich); Frey, Renato (University of Zurich)

Which situational factors shape everyday risk taking? In a preregistered study (N=61) using ecological momentary assessments we investigated the extent to which persons perceive epistemic uncertainty in real-life risky choices, and whether such perceptions are expressed in natural language. We replicated that people are generally risk-averse, choosing the safe option in 58.2%. Moreover, 80.1% of the choices were perceived to involve epistemic uncertainty. Yet, epistemic uncertainty was not systematically related to risk taking (OR=1.30, BF01=5.99). In sum, we expand the knowledge about factors shaping everyday risk taking and present an innovative method for studying such choice situations. Contact: lob.aaronb@gmail.com

## **Exploring the Sources of Variance in Everyday Decision Making with Large Language Models**

Bhatia, Sudeep (University of Pennsylvania)

We use large language models (LLMs) to quantify the reasons at play in real-world risky decision making. In two studies, we show that LLM-based multi-attribute decision models make accurate out-of-sample predictions for people's propensities to engage in common behaviors, and moreover predict the reasons why people may or may not want to engage in these behaviors. These models also explain variability in behavior in terms of the reasons different items and domains elicit, and the weights different individuals and groups place on reasons. Our approach has important theoretical and practical implications for the study of everyday decision making. Contact: bhatiasu@sas.upenn.edu

### **Session #4 Track II: Trust - Hilton - Golden Gate 4&5 - Saturday 1:15 pm - 2:15 pm**

#### **Trust Mindsets: People Trust More After Learning Trust Can Be Self-Fulfilling**

Neumann, Eric (Stanford University); Dweck, Carol (Stanford University); Zaki, Jamil (Stanford University)

Trust can be a self-fulfilling prophecy where trustees generally appreciate being trusted and resent being distrusted and often act in self-fulfilling ways. I show across 5 studies (N = 1977) that trustors trust more when adopting a mindset that acknowledges such self-fulfilling effects but not when adopting a fixed or growth mindset about trustworthiness. Only the self-fulfilling trust mindset gives trustors agency where they realize they can bring out another's trustworthy side. This finding holds using both vignette and behavioral measures of trust. This research suggests a new way to build trust and trustworthiness at the same time by extending mindset work into the trust space. Contact: ericneumann1996@gmail.com

#### **Restoring trust in news: Conversational receptiveness improves evaluations of opinion articles across the political divide**

Tulan, Dilan (Harvard University); Dorison, Charles (Georgetown University); Minson, Julia (Harvard University)

How can trust in news media be restored? Two studies (N=5676 participants evaluating over 600 articles) test whether partisans (and non-partisans) evaluate opinion articles more positively when the article demonstrates higher receptiveness (i.e., the use of language to demonstrate willingness to engage with opposing views). We also examine the relative size of this relationship, potential boundary conditions, and an underlying mechanism. Receptiveness displayed in the text of opinion articles has a consistently positive relationship with evaluations of the article that is meaningful in size, holds across the political spectrum, and is differentiated from perceived agreement. Contact: dilantulan@gmail.com

#### **When does flattery fail? Flattery backfires when perceived as inauthentic**

Blunden, Hayley (American University); Kirgios, Erika (University of Chicago); Rai, Aneesh (University of Maryland); Chang, Edward (Harvard University); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania)

Flattery, the act of giving someone compliments or praise, has been characterized in prior research as one of the most universally successful influence strategies. We counter this conception with theory and evidence illuminating when and why flattery can backfire. Integrating social exchange theory with research on authenticity, we propose that flattery can generate a negative behavioral response from the recipient (i.e., can backfire) when the flatterer is deemed inauthentic, a perception we propose is moderated by flattery content. We find evidence consistent with our theorizing in a field experiment (N=2,544) of U.S. city councilors, and three follow up experiments (combined N=2,786). Contact: hayley.blunden@gmail.com

### **Session #4 Track III: Spending and saving - Hilton - Golden Gate 7&8 - Saturday 1:15 pm - 2:15 pm**

#### **The Life you Save (For): Experiences Dominate Goods in Motivating Savings**

Yin, Siyuan (University of Pennsylvania); Donnelly, Grant (Ohio State University); Lamberton, Cait (University of Pennsylvania); Norton, Michael (Harvard University)

Prior research suggests that experiences (vs. goods) motivate prioritizing the present, such that consumers are more likely to take on debt and show impatience. The current research investigates whether this dominance of experiences over goods extends to savings that requires imagining the future and making plans. Across one field study and eight experiments (seven preregistered), consumers report higher saving intentions for experiences (vs. goods) across multiple contexts (e.g., initiating saving goals, saving intentions, and protecting savings), because experiences (vs. goods) activate more vivid imagination, prompting the activation of an implementation mindset. Contact: syyin@wharton.upenn.edu

## **The Rise of a Nudge: Field Experiment and Machine Learning on Minimum and Full Credit Card Payments**

Schwartz, Daniel (University of Chile)

The minimum payment warning, a notice that informs credit cardholders of the downside of making the minimum payment, has been described as a perverse nudge. This issue is tackled in a massive field experiment by introducing a new statement balance warning. The experiment used email payment reminders that randomly added minimum payment and statement balance warnings. The analysis is combined with causal random forests to examine heterogeneous effects and underlying mechanisms. Results indicate that the messages shifted actual payment distribution depending on the warning, and adding a statement balance warning significantly increased payments. Contact: danielsp2318@gmail.com

## **Loosen Up, Kid: An investigation of parent-child conversations about spending and saving**

Echelbarger, Margaret (Stony Brook University); Gelman, Susan A. (University of Michigan); Rick, Scott I. (University of Michigan)

Over 90% of US parents report talking about money with their children, yet very little work exists reporting on how these conversations actually unfold. We recorded and transcribed 203 parent-child dyads as they discussed a range of money-related topics. Results revealed that parents and children respond very differently, and in an unexpected way, to spending and that parent-child talk about money maps onto children's financial decision making. We discuss the implications of our findings for researchers and practitioners committed to improving financial well-being from early childhood. Contact: echelbar@umich.edu

## **Session #5 Track I: Judgment aggregation - Hilton - Golden Gate 2&3 - Saturday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm**

### **Crowdsourcing a labeled dataset using binary choices versus elicited beliefs**

Epping, Gunnar (Indiana University Bloomington); Caplin, Andrew (New York University); Holmes, William (Indiana University Bloomington); Martin, Daniel (University of California - Santa Barbara); Trueblood, Jennifer (Indiana University Bloomington)

Labeled datasets can be costly and time-consuming to collect, especially for narrowly defined tasks such as those present in medical image diagnostics. To circumvent this challenge, we evaluate whether crowdsourcing is a viable method for obtaining labels in a medical image classification task and compare the quality of the labels using two elicitation methods: binary choices and incentive-compatible belief elicitation. After harnessing the wisdom of the crowd by aggregating responses across individuals, incentive-compatible belief elicitation provides more accurate labels and leads to a better machine learning classifier, in terms of accuracy and calibration, compared to binary choices. Contact: gunnarepping@gmail.com

### **Beyond accuracy: The reputational costs of independent judgment aggregation**

Dorison, Charles (Georgetown University); DeWees, Bradley (United States Air Force); Minson, Julia (Harvard University)

Independent judgment aggregation increases collaborative judgment accuracy. However, we reveal a novel tension with reputation management. Participants who followed an independent process (and thus first generated their own estimate) assessed collaborators' judgments more negatively. Study 1 demonstrated the effect. Study 2 revealed that the effect was mitigated when disagreement was negligible. Study 3 showed that as disagreement increased, others' judgments  $\hat{\pi}$  but not one's own  $\hat{\pi}$  were seen as less accurate. Studies 4-5 replicated the effect in complex ethical scenarios and with national security experts. Finally, Study 6 demonstrated generalizability to future collaboration intentions. Contact: charles.dorison@georgetown.edu

### **Learning from Aggregated Opinion**

Oktar, Kerem (Princeton University); Lombrozo, Tania (Princeton University); Griffiths, Thomas L. (Princeton University)

The capacity to leverage information from others' opinions is a hallmark of human cognition. Past research has thus investigated the socio-cognitive mechanisms underlying learning from others' testimony. Yet a distinct form of social information—aggregated opinion—is increasingly guiding people's judgments and decisions. We investigated how people learn from such information by conducting two experiments comparing the predictions of three computational models: an optimal, Bayesian model, and two alternatives from epistemology and economics. We found the strongest concordance between the predictions of the Bayesian model and human judgments, with some heterogeneity across participants. Contact: keremoktar1@gmail.com

## **Session #5 Track II: Meta-questions - Hilton - Golden Gate 4&5 - Saturday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm**

### **Research Cartography: Building a Map to Navigate and Generalize Behavioral Science**

Gandhi, Linnea (University of Pennsylvania); Watts, Duncan (University of Pennsylvania)

Despite the popularity of nudges, the question of their efficacy remains unresolved. Highly varied design decisions across studies make meaningful comparisons and precise inferences challenging. We argue that the issue is not heterogeneity but incommensurability: Studies could productively differ in their designs if those differences were consistently measured. We propose a method to do so - research cartography - and use it to build a living map of evidence across academic and practitioner RCTs. We code each RCT (n=92 to date) across 306 dimensions - demographics, context, theories - developing an empirical language to describe, analyze, and predict study differences via machine learning. Contact: lgandhi@wharton.upenn.edu

### **A Meta-Analysis and Metastudy of the Anchoring Effect**

Weingarten, Evan (Arizona State University); Schley, Dan (Erasmus University Rotterdam)

We meta-analyze 2,051 anchoring effect sizes in which participants, following exposure to a higher or lower numeric value, have numeric estimates impacted by said anchor. We find a large effect ( $d = 0.876$ , 95% CI [0.808, 0.943]) that is robust to publication bias and weaker for incidental numbers and nondiagnostic anchors. Further, we find a robust but weaker effect comparing anchors to a no-anchor control ( $d = 0.425$ , 95% CI [0.355, 0.495]). We follow up this meta-analysis with a metastudy in which we manipulate several theoretically-relevant moderators simultaneously while comparing high against low anchors. Contact: evan.weingarten@asu.edu

### **Extremity Bias in Survey Responses Generates Strong Yet Invalid Results**

Gao, Yang (New York University); Wang, Liman (University of California - Berkeley); Nelson, Leif (University of California - Berkeley)

Four preregistered studies (total  $N = 4,252$ ) reveal an extremity bias in online survey responses: inattentive participants tend to select values toward the right end of a horizontal scale, the top of a vertical scale, and the upper limit in open-ended input. This extremity bias generates seemingly robust but ultimately spurious results, such as misleadingly strong correlations that reverse direction when scale endpoints are switched. Furthermore, this response bias appears difficult to expunge: it is not fully (and frequently, even partially) remedied by common data quality controls such as attention checks and filters based on approval rates. Contact: ygao2@stern.nyu.edu

## **Session #5 Track III: Morality - Hilton - Golden Gate 7&8 - Saturday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm**

### **Contractualist moral cognition: An experimental and computational investigation**

Le Pargneux, Arthur (University of Warwick); Zeitoun, Hossam (University of Warwick); Konstantinidis, Emmanouil (University of Warwick); Chater, Nick (University of Warwick)

Contractualist moral theories hold that morality is primarily about acting according to what would be agreed by rational agents. Drawing upon virtual bargaining, a contractualist theory of social interactions, we develop a new experimental paradigm to investigate the influence of contractualist reasoning on moral judgment and decision making in three preregistered online experiments. We find that a tendency to follow tacit agreements influences both incentivized decisions (Study 1,  $n = 1,007$ ) and third-party moral judgments (Study 2,  $n = 332$ ) and show that a computational model with an agreement-based component describes choices in the task (Study 3,  $n = 118$ ). Contact: arthur.lepargneux@gmail.com

### **Reluctance to Downplay Harm: Asymmetric Sensitivity to Differences in the Severity of Moral Transgressions**

Geiser, Amanda (University of California - Berkeley); Silver, Ike (Northwestern University); Small, Deborah (Yale University)

When comparing bad acts (e.g., two cases of misconduct), people generally agree that the more severe one deserves greater condemnation. Yet we find that the degree to which people differentiate between transgressions hinges on a seemingly trivial factor: the direction of comparison. People readily differentiate between bad acts when scaling up condemnation from the lesser transgression to the worse one. But when scaling down from the worse transgression to the lesser one, people differentiate between them much less—and often not at all. We suggest that this asymmetry is driven by a reluctance to downplay harm, which may also shed light on broader trends in moralization and public outrage. Contact: deborah.small@yale.edu



## **Negotiators are More Honest Than We Think: A Theory of Initial Distrust in Negotiation**

Garber, 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)

We predict and demonstrate an actual-expected honesty gap in negotiations. We show that people underestimate the extent to which other negotiators are driven by moral concerns, which in turn leads them to over-estimate others' deception in negotiation. Correspondingly, we find that the actual-expected honesty gap is narrowed when people are prompted to consider other negotiators' moral concerns. Our findings challenge the common notion that deception is the custom in negotiations, enhance an understanding of how initial negotiation trust is formed, and shed light on ways to enhance it. Contact: shiragar@post.bgu.ac.il

### **Session #6 Track I: Risk and uncertainty - Hilton - Golden Gate 2&3 - Saturday 5:00 pm - 6:00 pm**

#### **When Goods Were Odds: Do People Evaluate the Same Option Differently if it was Previously Uncertain?**

Hu, Beidi (University of Pennsylvania); Yin, Siyuan (University of Pennsylvania); Moon, Alice (University of Pennsylvania)

Though people frequently face uncertainty, much of that uncertainty is eventually resolved. How do people evaluate options (e.g., prizes) that result from uncertainty (e.g., a random lottery)? Five studies (N = 7496) demonstrate that people are more likely to hold onto goods when they were previously uncertain (versus always certain). We propose that this is because people perceive having 'won' options that resulted from uncertainty. Supporting this proposal, this effect attenuates for the worst outcome of uncertainty and reverses for losses. Contact: beidihu@wharton.upenn.edu

#### **Evaluating Point and Range Predictions Under Epistemic vs. Aleatory Uncertainty**

Rude, Eitan (University of California - Los Angeles); Fox, Craig (University of California - Los Angeles); Hershfield, Hal (University of California - Los Angeles)

Experts can express predictions as points (e.g., 'Sea levels will rise by 4 in.'), or as ranges of various widths (e.g., 'Sea levels will rise by 2-6 in.'). In four studies we show that listeners' evaluations of such formats depend on their match with the perceived nature of uncertainty. Under epistemic (knowable) uncertainty, experts are rewarded for point estimates and penalized for successively wider ranges. In contrast, under aleatory (random) uncertainty, experts are rewarded for range estimates but punished for point estimates and ranges that are too narrow or wide. These results have implications for how we communicate uncertainty and interpret confidence intervals. Contact: eitan.rude.phd@anderson.ucla.edu

#### **Risky Feeling Varies: Examining Anticipatory Emotions Towards Risks Across Different Domains**

Yang, Minwen (University of Toronto); Tsai, Claire (University of Toronto); Zeng, Ying (University of Toronto)

Do people experience similar visceral emotions when considering different risky activities? These anticipatory emotions are different from anticipated emotions by the timing of occurrence. This research examined anticipatory emotions in risky decisions in a series of nine experiments (eight pre-registered, total N=2212), including one incentive-compatible study. We find that people experience more-intense positive feelings than negative feelings toward social, recreational, and financial risks and more-intense negative feelings for health and ethical risks, and these discrepancies affect risk-taking behaviors. Positive anticipatory emotions also predict lower perceived risks. Contact: minwenyang318@gmail.com

### **Session #6 Track II: Disagreement and difficult conversations - Hilton - Golden Gate 4&5 - Saturday 5:00 pm - 6:00 pm**

#### **Harnessing Ingroup Disagreement to Dampen Outgroup Animosity**

Mackin, Matejas (Northwestern University); Silver, Ike (Northwestern University)

Hostility between political groups is a growing societal concern. Current interventions focus on helping opposing partisans identify areas of common ground: But asking people to consider areas of agreement with their political enemies often provokes discomfort and resistance. Three preregistered studies (total N = 4175) explore an alternative approach. We find that asking people to consider areas of disagreement with their political ingroup can be similarly effective for reducing outgroup hostility, but meets less resistance. Participants prefer our task across a variety of dimensions. Considering areas of ingroup disagreement may be a promising route for reducing outgroup hostility. Contact: matejas.mackin@kellogg.northwestern.edu

## **Difficult Conversations As An Intertemporal Choice**

Kim, Yena (University of Chicago); Levine, Emma (University of Chicago); Bitterly, T. Bradford (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Wallace, Laura (University of Chicago); Lee, Nathan (Rochester Institute of Technology); Kim, Karen (University of Chicago)

Difficult conversations are necessary for personal, relational, and societal growth. In this work, we examine the degree to which intertemporal conflict explains people's failure to engage in difficult conversations. Across diverse samples (laypeople, politicians, physicians, Hong Kong students), we find that people tend to associate difficult conversations with short-term harm and long-term benefit. Due to these intertemporal tradeoffs, people expect to engage in difficult conversations more in the future than in the present—i.e., they procrastinate. Precommitment opportunities may help people overcome these dynamics. Contact: yena@chicagobooth.edu

## **How civil conversations dissolve disagreements and are surprisingly likely to reduce attitude polarization**

Kardas, Michael (Oklahoma State University); Nordgren, Loran (Northwestern University); Rucker, Derek (Northwestern University)

People with opposing attitudes often avoid discussing their differences because they expect that they are unlikely to find common ground. In five studies, participants with opposing attitudes toward cats versus dogs, cancel culture, and Joe Biden's presidency underestimated how much their own and others' attitudes would depolarize in a spoken conversation. This occurred because participants attributed differences in their attitudes to disagreements rather than to differences in how they were construing the issue, and so underestimated how much they would agree with each other's construals. Conversations may be surprisingly likely to dissolve disagreements and reduce attitude polarization. Contact: mkardas@chicagobooth.edu

## **Session #6 Track III: Beliefs - Hilton - Golden Gate 7&8 - Saturday 5:00 pm - 6:00 pm**

### **How People Correct Their Beliefs**

Protzko, John (Central Connecticut State University); Schooler, Jonathan (University of California - Santa Barbara)

When evidence is debunked, beliefs should return to prior levels. In 2 preregistered studies, we examined how beliefs revert after an immediate retraction. 3,000 participants were presented with a phenomenon, relevant or irrelevant supportive research, then an immediate retraction. People who held a higher prior belief engaged in greater updating after learning the relevant evidence than those with more moderate priors (confirmation updating). After retraction, beliefs dipped below priors (an overcorrection), those high in belief, however, showed less decrease than those who held a more moderate belief. Our findings help explain persistent beliefs, even when evidence is debunked. Contact: protzko@gmail.com

### **People are more likely to generalize positive information than negative information**

Banker, Mohin (Yale University); Klusowski, Joowon (Yale University); Zauberman, Gal (Yale University)

People often use positive or negative information about familiar objects to generalize about the unfamiliar. A positive (or negative) experience at a restaurant may lead one to expect a positive (or negative) experience at a similar restaurant. While previous research suggests that people generalize negative more than positive, we show that some documented instances of negativity effects may have resulted from positive priors. Consistently, positive priors yield negativity effects, and negative priors yield positivity effects. However, once we account for priors, positivity effects dominate. We show this positivity effect arises because positive information is considered more diagnostic. Contact: mohin.banker@yale.edu

### **Directionally consistent causal chains are considered more effective**

Bharti, Soham (University of Chicago); Sussman, Abigail (University of Chicago)

Interventions often work via rich causal paths. Sequential steps in these paths can evoke distinct directionalities - either increasing or decreasing variables in each step. We find that the structure of these paths influences perceived efficacy. Across seven studies, people infer higher efficacy from directionally consistent causal chains (i.e., all steps evoke the same directionality) as opposed to inconsistent ones (i.e., steps invoke contrasting directionality). This is because directional consistency facilitates mental simulation of the described causal chain, which in turn boosts perceptions of efficacy. Contact: soham.bharti@chicagobooth.edu

## **Sunday November 19, 2023**

### **Session #7 Track I: What comes next? - Hilton - Golden Gate 2&3 - Sunday 10:00 am - 11:00 am**

#### **When do people predict a trend will progress vs. regress?**

Klusowski, Joowon (Yale University)

Previous research suggests that people may predict a trend to progress or regress, yet limited work has explored what moderates this pattern beyond the nature of the context (e.g., skill- vs. chance-oriented) or the intensity of the trend (e.g., strong vs. weak). In this research, we identify the width of a prediction interval as another moderator of this phenomenon, e.g., whether people predict an increasing trend over Rounds 1 to 5 to continue in Round 6 depends on whether they are making predictions for Round 6 vs. Rounds 6 to 10. Specifically, we show that people are relatively more likely to predict that a trend will continue when given a narrower interval. We discuss implications. Contact: joowon.klusowski@yale.edu

#### **Predicting Sequences Under Epistemic Versus Aleatory Uncertainty**

Brimhall, Craig (University of California - Los Angeles); Fox, Craig (University of California - Los Angeles)

We examine how people infer the predictability of a domain from sequences and how beliefs about predictability impact when they predict a streak will revert or continue. We find people attribute sequences with high alternation rates to chance (i.e., aleatory uncertainty) but attribute streakier sequences to knowable factors like skill (i.e., epistemic uncertainty). Further, we find people are more likely to predict a streak will continue when they perceive a sequence as epistemic. We also find perceptions of epistemic and aleatory uncertainty predict when people prefer to predict the outcome of a streaky sequence compared to a sequence that has a higher, more predictable, alternation rate. Contact: cibrimhall@gmail.com

#### **Rational and Irrational Belief in the Hot Hand: Evidence from Jeopardy!**

Kukavica, Anthony (Stanford Graduate School of Business); Narayanan, Sridhar (Stanford Graduate School of Business)

A longstanding question in behavioral economics concerns whether a ‘hot hand’ exists in sports, gambling, and related settings. In this paper, we leverage a novel play-by-play dataset from the game show “Jeopardy!” to show that a hot hand effect exists in players’ performances. In parallel, contestants believe in the effect as reflected by their wagering decisions during gameplay. We find that players overestimate the magnitude of the true effect by approximately 3 to 8 times, though more successful contestants as well as those from more quantitative demanding professions exhibit lower levels of bias. Lastly, we discuss potential underlying mechanisms that may generate the observed effects. Contact: kukavica@stanford.edu

### **Session #7 Track II: Inequality and systems - Hilton - Golden Gate 4&5 - Sunday 10:00 am - 11:00 am**

#### **Inequality of Opportunity Cost Salience**

Hagerty, Serena (University of Virginia)

Lower-income individuals are often subject to harsher evaluations of their consumption decisions relative to their higher-income peers. This research investigates a novel mechanism for why these systematic differences in permissible consumption arise. Four studies (N = 2,002; 3 pre-registered) demonstrate an inequality in opportunity cost consideration, such that observers are more likely to spontaneously consider the opportunity costs of a purchase made by a lower-(vs. higher-) income consumer, and therefore perceive the same purchase as less of a necessity and as less permissible. Importantly, reducing opportunity costs salience mitigates the income gap in consumption permissibility. Contact: serenahagerty@gmail.com

#### **Examining the impact of stigma on decision-making in the US social safety net**

Lasky-Fink, Jessica (Harvard University); Linos, Elizabeth (Harvard University)

A large literature documents learning, compliance, and psychological barriers that contribute to so-called ‘take-up gaps’ across the social safety net. Yet, evidence from behavioral interventions aimed at reducing these barriers has been mixed. Across five studies (N = 120,032), we examine the role of stigma – an often cited, but understudied psychological barrier – on decision-making. We document that stigma varies significantly by program and can be conceptualized as three distinct constructs. Then, in the context of rental assistance we show that destigmatizing outreach significantly increases initial engagement, and has a positive directional effect on program applications. Contact: jessica\_lasky-fink@hks.harvard.edu

## **Costly Distractions: Focusing on Individual Behavior Undermines Support for Systemic Reforms**

Hagmann, David (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Liao, Yi-tsen (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Chater, Nick (Warwick University); Loewenstein, George (Carnegie Mellon University)

Policy challenges can be addressed through systemic reforms and by encouraging individual behavior change. In two preregistered experiments ( $n = 1,800$ ), we show that participants presented with individual interventions (vs. systemic reforms) are less likely to propose systemic reforms across domains. They also think systemic reforms are less important and that the issue should be addressed by individuals making better choices, rather than governments implementing better regulations (Study 1). They are also less likely to support an organization advocating for retirement reform over an organization promoting financial literacy with an incentivized donation (Study 2). Contact: david.hagmann@gmail.com

## **Session #7 Track III: Inferences - Hilton - Golden Gate 7&8 - Sunday 10:00 am - 11:00 am**

### **Making Sense of Dominated Options**

Bogard, Jonathan (Washington University in St Louis); Reiff, Joseph (University of Maryland); Caruso, Eugene (University of California - Los Angeles); Herschfield, Hal (University of California - Los Angeles)

Consider how different it is to encounter a choice set containing a dominated option in (a) a decontextualized attribute matrix versus, for instance, (b) when browsing a used car lot. In the latter case, dominated options aren't normatively irrelevant, but may instead signal untrustworthiness of the choice set's curator. This may then spill over onto evaluations of even non-dominated options in the set. Across 6 experiments using vignette studies and incentivized economic games we demonstrate such effects. We show that including dominated options in a choice set, when embedded in a more social context, can engender mistrust in the choice architect and result in higher rates of deferral. Contact: jonathan.bogard@gmail.com

### **How the Choice Environment Can Signal Social Norms and Change Behavior**

Lieberman, Alicea (University of California - Los Angeles); Duke, Kristen (University of Toronto)

Social norms can have a powerful effect on behavior. The current research suggests that policymakers, organizations, and marketers can shape perceptions of social norms merely by changing the choice environment. While many interventions aim to increase healthy choices by making healthier options easier or more salient, we suggest that such interventions may also change behavior for an undiscovered reason: they signal social norms. Six experiments, including two in the field, demonstrate that changes to the choice environment increase perceived social norms, thereby increasing healthy behaviors as well as broader inferences about community norms. Contact: alicea.lieberman@anderson.em.ucla.edu

### **Less is More (Natural): The Effect of Ingredient Quantity on Preferences and Naturalness Judgments**

Kim, Michelle (University of California - San Diego); Chen, Tianqi; Gershon, Rachel (University of California - Berkeley); Scott, Sydney (Washington University in St Louis); Kupor, Daniella (Boston University); Trudel, Remi (Boston University)

People value natural goods, but how do we determine whether a product is natural? In six pre-registered experiments, including two field experiments, we find that individuals utilize ingredient quantity as a cue to gauge product naturalness. In fact, describing the same product with the same ingredients as having few (vs. many) ingredients increases naturalness judgments and preferences for the product. We further investigate relevant moderators of this preference for products with fewer ingredients, providing insights into consumer preferences and beliefs about naturalness. Contact: ysmichellekim@gmail.com

## **Session #8 Track I: Wisdom of crowds - Hilton - Golden Gate 2&3 - Sunday 1:30 pm - 2:30 pm**

### **Metawisdom Of The Crowd: How Choice Within Aided Decision Making Can Make Crowd Wisdom Robust**

Atwell, Jon (Stanford University); Twyman, Marlon (University of Southern California)

Quality information can improve individual judgments but make group decisions less accurate; if individuals attend to the same information, the predictive diversity that underlies crowd wisdom may be lost. We explore this tension within the context of decision support systems that provide the choice of decision aids and before then primary judgments. We argue that whenever a set of decision aids induce diverse errors, this structure leads to higher group accuracy because aid choice will exhibit predictive diversity itself. In two experiments---the prediction of inflation ( $N=1907$ , pre-registered) and a tightly controlled bean-count estimation task ( $N=1198$ )---we find strong evidence for this. Contact: atwell.jonathan@gmail.com

## **Stubborn Non-Experts or True Experts? Leveraging Advice-taking and Kernel Density Estimation to Identify the Cluster of Experts and Improve Wisdom of Crowds**

Zhang, Yunhao (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

We introduce a method leveraging weight on advice (WOA) and kernel density estimation to identify a cluster of experts to improve Wisdom of Crowds. First, past literature has established that accurate experts on average have smaller WOA. Second, experts may cluster around the truth, while stubborn non-experts' answers scatter widely. Although relying solely on WOA or cluster size may not identify experts (due to stubborn non-experts or the sheer number of non-experts), we demonstrate that finding the cluster that exhibits the least average WOA can. Using ours and past research's data, we show that averaging over the initial responses within our identified cluster improves Wisdom of Crowds. Contact: zyhjerry@mit.edu

## **Small sample crowd wisdom with honesty incentives**

McCoy, John (University of Pennsylvania); Prelec, Drazen (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

We propose an integrated mechanism for aggregating and incentivizing probabilistic beliefs, which relies on eliciting predictions about the average beliefs of others. Unlike most previous related work, our theoretical results hold for finite samples, e.g., panels or juries. We exploit belief predictions to derive a common prior, which enables the computation of the exact full-information posterior over possible answers. On three datasets, our mechanism selects the correct crowd-wisdom answer with superior accuracy, penalizes hypothetical dishonest strategies with respect to how much they perturb beliefs, and tracks respondent expertise Contact: jpmccoy@wharton.upenn.edu

## **Session #8 Track II: Medicine - Hilton - Golden Gate 4&5 - Sunday 1:30 pm - 2:30 pm**

How Do Free Rides and Text Reminders Affect COVID-19 Vaccinations? A 3.5-Million Person Megastudy

Milkman, Katherine L. (University of Pennsylvania); Ellis, Sean F. (University of Pennsylvania); Gromet, Dena M. (University of Pennsylvania); Luscher, Alex S. (University of Pennsylvania); Mobarak, Rayyan S. (University of Pennsylvania); Paxson, Madeline K. (University of Pennsylvania); Ramon A. Silvera Zumaran; Rob Kuan; Ron Berman; Neil A. Lewis Jr.; John A. List; Mitesh S. Patel; Christophe Van den Bulte; Kevin G. Volpp; Maryann V. Beauvais; Jonathon K. Bellows; Cheryl A. Marandola; Angela L. Duckworth

Encouraging routine COVID vaccinations will likely be a crucial policy challenge for decades. We conducted a megastudy with 3.5 million CVS Pharmacy patients testing eight behaviorally-informed interventions aimed at encouraging COVID booster vaccinations. Sending two sets of vaccination reminders seven days apart resulted in a 20% relative increase in 30-day COVID-19 booster vaccinations and generated a positive spillover, increasing 30-day flu vaccinations by 7%. Offering patients free round-trip Lyft rides to pharmacies had no benefit over and above sending simple reminders. Both experts and laypeople incorrectly predicted that offering free rides would outperform sending reminders. Contact: kmilkman@wharton.upenn.edu

## **Illness Severity and Consumers' Experience of Drug Side Effects**

Tetik, Ozlem (London Business School); Faro, David (London Business School); Botti, Simona (London Business School); Heller, Monika (University College London)

The side effects of a drug are determined by dosage, the patient's age and metabolism, and concomitant drugs – not by the illness for which the drug is used. Counter to this medical fact, across three sets of archival data of clinical trials and two online experiments, we show that people expect and experience more severe side effects when using a drug for a more severe (versus milder) illness. We also illustrate the consequences of this tendency on people's inclination to use suboptimal alternative treatments and expensive supplements meant to alleviate side effects. Contact: otetik@london.edu

## **Quantifying the Impact of Vaccine-Skeptical Content on Facebook**

Allen, Jennifer (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Watts, Duncan (University of Pennsylvania)

We estimate the extent to which vaccine-skeptical content on Facebook reduces COVID vaccine acceptance and determine the contribution of misinformation to the resulting hesitancy. By combining survey experiments, crowdsourcing, and machine learning, we estimate the causal effects of 13,206 vaccine-related URLs on Facebook. We combine these estimates with exposure data and find that all vaccine-skeptical Facebook content lowered vaccination intentions by approximately -2.33pp (95% QI: -2.28,

-.328) per US Facebook user. However, due to much wider reach, factually-accurate mainstream media content that selectively reported on vaccine deaths had 50X the impact of outright misinformation. Contact: jennifer.n.l.allen@gmail.com

### **Session #8 Track III: Framing time - Hilton - Golden Gate 7&8 - Sunday 1:30 pm - 2:30 pm**

#### **When the end is in sight: Time periods feel longer when expressed in minutes compared to end time**

Wang, Jiabi (University of Chicago); Donnelly, Kristin (University of Chicago)

In this research, seven experiments demonstrate that time periods are perceived as longer when described by their duration (e.g., 45 mins, assuming a current time of 2:00pm) rather than their endpoint (e.g., 2:45pm). Reflecting this, participants anticipated being able to complete more things during a period when it was described by duration (compared to endpoint). Moreover, we demonstrate that describing waiting periods by duration reduces participants' willingness to wait and increases their willingness to pay to reduce the wait. Contact: jiabiwang98@gmail.com

#### **Temporal Frames of Environmental Threats**

Faro, David (London Business School); Tetik, Ozlem (London Business School)

Scientists often make temporal predictions about environmental threats. Typically, the prediction is described in terms of the date by which a negative environmental outcome is expected to occur (UK water shortage is expected in 2050). Less commonly, it refers to the amount of time left until the outcome (UK water shortage is expected in 27 years). Across three online experiments and one field experiment, we demonstrate that time until an environmental threat is perceived as shorter in time-left frame compared to the corresponding date frame. Consequently, consumers are more engaged with environmental news stories in time-left rather than in date frame. Contact: dfaro@london.edu

#### **The Dates-and-Hours Framing Effect in Temporal Evaluations**

Sokolova, Tatiana (Tilburg University); Gaerth, Maximilian (University of Pennsylvania)

We find that describing temporal intervals with dates and hours (from May 2nd at 4 p.m. until May 5th at 3 p.m.) vs. dates only (from May 2nd until May 5th) elongates perceived duration. We propose that, to simplify the duration evaluation process, people represent dates-and-hours framed intervals as collections of granular time units, and, consequently, perceive them as longer. We further demonstrate that this change in perceived duration has consequences for time-versus-money trade-offs. Our results contribute to extant work on precise versus round magnitude evaluations and add to a more nuanced understanding of how number and unit information shapes people's judgments. Contact: mgaerth@wharton.upenn.edu

### **Session #9 Track I: Reference points - Hilton - Golden Gate 2&3 - Sunday 2:45 pm - 3:45 pm**

#### **The Dynamics of Motivation in Goal Pursuit**

Wu, George (University of Chicago); Rowsey, Donovan (University of Chicago); Owsley, Nicholas C (University of Chicago)

This paper investigates the effect of near-failures and near-successes on future motivation and performance using a novel dataset of US high school track times. We find that boys who narrowly surpass a round number time in the 1600 meters are less likely to improve in their next race and over the remaining track season, and are less likely to run an additional race. This effect does not persist in the longer term. We find that a static reference-point model of reference-dependent preferences cannot explain our main results. However, the key qualitative results are consistent with a dynamic reference-point model in which the weight placed on reference dependent utility changes with success. Contact: nowsley@chicagobooth.edu

#### **It's Easy To Learn, Save Money, and Work Out: When Framing Tasks as Easy Can Backfire**

Skowronek, Samuel (University of California - Los Angeles); Schaumberg, Rebecca (University of Pennsylvania)

A core feature of nudges is to make behavior easier to enact. This focus on ease has led scholars and practitioners to describe engaging in desirable behavior as easy and simple. While framing tasks as easy may be initially motivating, we find that it also affects the attributions people make when they inevitably struggle. Using field and lab experiments, we show that easy frames can undermine people's sense of competence and willingness to seek help. We also provide some evidence that affirming a task as hard can promote help seeking. Our results highlight the consequences of using easy frames on people's wellbeing and provide an explanation for why easy frames may limit desirable behavior. Contact: sam.skowronek@gmail.com

## **Risk Aversion for Qualitative Losses**

Müller-Trede, Johannes (IESE Business School); Sher, Shlomi (Pomona College); McKenzie, Craig (University of California - San Diego)

Do prospect theory's risk attitudes generalize to choice problems in which - as is common outside the laboratory - outcomes are described qualitatively rather than numerically? We formulate and test a general condition for diminishing sensitivity, and risk seeking, that applies to qualitative as well as quantitative losses. In a series of studies involving losses of consumer goods that are not numerically quantified, choices consistently violate this condition. Instead of the risk seeking predicted by prospect theory, we find robust risk aversion for qualitative losses. Our findings raise important questions about the cognitive sources of risk preference and the scope of prospect theory. Contact: [jmuller@iese.edu](mailto:jmuller@iese.edu)

## **Session #9 Track II: Workplace - Hilton - Golden Gate 4&5 - Sunday 2:45 pm - 3:45 pm**

### **An unexpected bias: High levels of achievement change the biases women face at work**

Zhang, Jean (University of California - San Diego); Campbell, Elizabeth Lauren (University of California - San Diego); Amir, On (University of California - San Diego)

Emerging evidence suggests increased awareness of gender bias leads others to view highly accomplished women more positively than equivalent men, driven by the assumption that successful women have advanced despite repeatedly being held to higher standards. We propose these beliefs can also lead to overly high expectations of high-achieving women. Examining requests for revisions of final deliverables on an online freelance platform, we find buyers are more likely to request platform-vetted high-quality female sellers revise their deliverables than equivalent male sellers. Robustness checks suggest this effect is not driven by differences in buyers' evaluations of the work's quality. Contact: [ecampbell@ucsd.edu](mailto:ecampbell@ucsd.edu)

### **Gender differences in accusations and believability**

Agarwal, Grusha (University of Toronto); DeCelles, Katy (University of Toronto); Kovacheff, Chloe (University of Toronto); Adams, Gabe (University of Virginia); Ruttan, Rachel (University of Toronto)

Accusations of workplace retaliation, discrimination etc. are commonplace in organizations. Credibility of these accusations are influenced by factors like race, prototypicality of victims, delay in making accusations and more robustly, gender. While it is interesting who perceivers deem as more credible, men or women, it is imperative to understand why that may be the case. Using an archival dataset, survey, and two experiments, we show that women's cases are given more merit than men's, although complainants are not aware of this and often perceive the opposite. Perceiver's lay beliefs about how severe workplace unfairness events are for women compared to men drive this effect. Contact: [grusha.agarwal2201@gmail.com](mailto:grusha.agarwal2201@gmail.com)

### **Present-Biased Labor Supply: Evidence from Uber's Instant Pay**

Chen, Keith (University of California - Los Angeles); Feinerman, Katherine (University of California - Los Angeles); Haggag, Kareem (University of California - Los Angeles)

We investigate the labor supply effects of pay flexibility and the implications of present-biased preferences on gig-economy workers. Modern platforms provide workers real-time control over when they work, and increasingly, these platforms also provide flexible pay: the option to be paid immediately after work. Using a nationwide field experiment at Uber, we estimate the effects of switching from a weekly pay schedule to an 'Instant Pay' option. We find that this policy substantially increased drivers' earnings and work time. Furthermore, the response is significantly higher when a worker is further away from their weekly payday, aligning with predictions of hyperbolic discounting models. Contact: [kareem.haggag@gmail.com](mailto:kareem.haggag@gmail.com)

**Session #9 Track III: Online platforms - Hilton - Golden Gate 7&8 - Sunday 2:45 pm - 3:45 pm**

**The choice overload effect in online retailing platforms**

Long, Xiaoyang (University of Wisconsin); Sun, Jiankun (Imperial College London); Dai, Hengchen (University of California - Los Angeles); Zhang, Dennis (Washington University in St Louis)

In a field experiment (N=1,615,325), we vary the number of products recommended to consumers. We find as the choice set increases, consumers may become not only less likely to purchase any product but also less willing to start a search (i.e., click on any product). Using machine learning, we identify substantial effect heterogeneity depending on the time of recommendation, price, and product category. Our 2-stage behavioral model suggests that the findings support anticipated regret, rather than information overload, as the prominent mechanism of choice overload effect in our setting. This work provides a valuable field replication and extension of literature on the choice overload effect. Contact: hengchen.dai@anderson.ucla.edu

**Testing the Digital Frontier: Validity Tradeoffs in Online Platform A/B Tests**

Cornil, Yann (University of British Columbia); Yi, Shangwen (University of British Columbia); Boegershausen, Johannes (Erasmus University Rotterdam); Hardisty, David (University of British Columbia)

Researchers have increasingly relied on online platform A/B tests such as Facebook or Google Ads split tests. These studies allow researchers to compare ad effectiveness and study “real” consumer behavior but lack true random assignment, exposing researchers to unique tradeoffs between internal and ecological validity, as well as unique challenges for transparent results reporting. We present a case study demonstrating how validity tradeoffs operate, as well as a review of 76 published platform A/B tests revealing how researchers have navigated these tradeoffs. Finally, we propose guidelines for researchers to maximize the usefulness of platform A/B tests while being clear about the caveats. Contact: yishangwen123@gmail.com

**Put your mouth where your money is: A field experiment encouraging donors to share about charity**

Silver, Ike (Northwestern University); Small, Deborah (Yale University)

Sharing about charity can raise awareness and boost fundraising for good causes. However, many donors are uncomfortable talking about their giving. Three preregistered experiments explore this psychology and test an intervention. Two lab studies link donors’ reluctance to share to an outsized attentional focus on the reputational risks of touting one’s generosity (vs. the potential to influence others to give). A large field experiment (N=77,485) finds that a simple message reorienting donors to the social impact case for sharing (‘Your donation can start a chain reaction’) can increase both their willingness to share and their likelihood of recruiting others to the cause. Contact: ike.m.silver@gmail.com



# SJDM Poster Sessions #1

## Sunday, November 19<sup>th</sup> 8:00am-9:45am

1. The role of salience driven attention in multi-alternative multi-attribute choice, Hasan, Eeshan (Indiana University Bloomington); Trueblood, Jennifer (Indiana University Bloomington)
2. Attentional Over-weighting in Gains, Attentional Under-weighting in Losses, Eum, Brenden (California Institute of Technology); Gonzalez, Stephen (Stanford University); Rangel, Antonio (California Institute of Technology)
3. Value Magnitude Dependent Choice and Attention Dynamics, Jingkai, Hong (University of Warwick); Tim, Mullett (University of Warwick); Wenjia, Zhao (University of Warwick)
4. Lessons learned while developing a 5-trial adjusting cognitive effort discounting task Mitchell, Suzanne (Oregon Health & Science University)
5. Non-Invasive Neuromodulation as a Method for Enhancing Time-Constrained Decision-Making, MacNeil, Emma (InfoScitex Corporation); Alexander, Kevin (ORISE); Shrestha, Reeshav (Ball Aerospace); Frantz, Evan (InfoScitex Corporation); Yuan, Yong (ORISE); Helton, Rick (InfoScitex Corporation); Aue, William (Air Force Research Lab)
6. The neural correlates of post hoc rationalization and choice blindness: a fMRI study, Vogel, Gabriel (Lund University); Von Westen, Danielle (Lund University); Hall, Lars (Lund University); Mannfolk, Peter (Lund University); Mårtensson, Johan (Lund University); Johansson, Petter (Lund University);
7. What is your Problem Solver Profile? Strauss Einhorn, Cheryl (Cornell University)
8. Western researchers can and should be accessing Eastern samples: scientific validation and practical guidance, Wang, Liman (Fudan University), Gao, Randy (New York University), Jung, Minah New York University), Hung, Iris (Chinese University of Hong Kong), Nelson, Leif (University of California, Berkeley)
10. Not-so-general g: Novel measurements of individual differences in type 1 cognitive abilities break the positive manifold of human intelligence, Thomson, Keela (University of Toronto); Oppenheimer, Daniel (Carnegie Mellon University)
11. Real-World Estimation Taps Into Basic Numeric Abilities, Kreis, Barbara (University of Mannheim); Grofl, Julia (University of Mannheim); Pachur, Thorsten (Technical University of Munich)
12. Are Numerate People More Media Literate? Perrin, Olivia D. (University of Oklahoma); Cho, Jinhyo (University of Oklahoma); Nguyen, Long (University of Oklahoma); Garcia-Retamero, Rocio (University of Granada); Cokely, Edward T. (University of Oklahoma)
13. Would You Use a South-Pointing Compass? Consumers Underestimate the Informativeness of Systematic Errors and Disagreement, Naborn, Jay (Washington University in St Louis); André, Quentin (University of Colorado Boulder); Perfecto, Hannah (Washington University in St Louis); Hirshman, Samuel (Norwegian School of Economics); Reinholtz, Nicholas (University of Colorado Boulder)
14. Complete vs incomplete evaluations effect in social media: Spillovers of social media use to judgments and decision-making, Ertekin, Ceylin Petek (London School of Economics and Political Science)
16. Busy Bias: Your Busyness Indicates Competence, Mine Does Not Zhang, Hui (Iowa State University); Raju, Sekar (Iowa State University)
17. Viruses & Vetoes: Unilateral actors are often motivated by failures of reasoning, Lewis, Joshua (New York University); Allen, Carter (New York University); Caviola, Lucius (Harvard University)
18. Do individuals selectively engage their scientific reasoning abilities? Drummond Otten, Caitlin (Arizona State University); Anglin, Stephanie (Hobart and William Smith Colleges); Broomell, Stephen (Purdue University)
19. Reasoning About Practical Significance for Everyday Decisions, Michal, Audrey (University of Michigan); Shah, Priti (University of Michigan)
20. What does the typical experimental manipulation of process vs. outcome accountability actually manipulate? A comprehensive investigation of possible psychological mechanisms, Rollwage, Johannes (University of Goettingen); Treffenstädt, Christian (University of Goettingen); Schulz-Hardt, Stefan (University of Goettingen)

21. Spatial position affects quantity judgments and product preference, Vanunu, Yonatan (University of Chicago); Donnelly, Kristin (University of Chicago)
22. Do Large Language Models Display the Fundamental Attribution Error? Trott, Sean (University of California - San Diego); Walker, Drew (University of California - San Diego)
24. Rejection vs. Choice: How Decision Frame Shifts the Compromise and Attraction Effects, Heeyoung Yoon (Bocconi University), Joshua Lewis (NYU), Minah Jung (NYU)
25. Identifying context effect sweet spots: There's an app for that! Cavagnaro, Daniel (California State University - Fullerton); Pettit, Elizabeth (Miami University); Huang, Yu (University of Illinois); Johnson, Joe (Miami University); Regenwetter, Michel (University of Illinois)
26. Bias in the Eye of the Beholder, Chance, Madeline J. (Middle Tennessee State University); Jackson, Alexander T. (Middle Tennessee State University); Frame, Mark C. (Middle Tennessee State University)
27. Structured analysis of personal criteria can save lives in joint (but not separate) evaluation, Gordon-Hecker, Tom (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Kogut, Tehila (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
28. Is the repulsion effect the similarity effect in disguise? Conway, Sean (University of Massachusetts); Cohen, Andrew (University of Massachusetts)
29. Status Quo Bias Signals Loyalty, Milligan, Shannon (Central Connecticut State University); Protzko, John (Central Connecticut State University)
30. Heuristics and Biases in Dyads vs. Individuals Breaux, Jacob (Montclair State University); Bixter, Michael (Montclair State University)
31. A loss mindset helps people make more rational decisions: Evidence from the default bias, sunk cost bias, and outcome bias Yu, Xinhao (Hong Kong Polytechnic University); Savani, Krishna (Hong Kong Polytechnic University); Rao, Hayagreeva (Stanford Graduate School of Business)
32. Motivation Myopia: The Overestimation of Motivation's Impact on Performance, Polimeni, Eliana (Kellogg School of Management); Nordgren, Loran (Kellogg School of Management)
34. An Empirical Test of the Relative State Model Using Poker Scenarios, Deminchuk, Jeffrey (Washington State University); Mishra, Sandeep (University of Guelph)
35. The ecology of risk: Mapping the risky choices prevalent in modern life Frey, Renato (University of Zurich); Fischer, Olivia (University of Zurich)
36. Risk takers at work: A meta-analytic investigation, Reeves, Katelyn (Louisiana State University); Perkins, Hannah (Louisiana State University); Cowley, Tyler (Louisiana State University); Zhang, Don (Louisiana State University)
37. Seeking isolated-uncertainty while averting-comparative uncertainty: the case of information conflict, Dan, Ohad (Yale University); Sanghvi, Maya (Yale University); Levy, Ifat (Yale University)
38. Comparison of risk perception regarding food radiation contamination and COVID-19: Thirteen-wave panel survey after the Fukushima nuclear accident, Kusumi, Takashi (Kyoto University), Miura, Asako (Osaka University); Ogura, Kanayo (Iwate Prefectural University); Nishikawa, Kazuji (Osaka University of Commerce)
39. Eliciting Risk Perceptions: Does Conditional Question Wording Have a Downside? Strueder, Jeremy (University of Iowa); Miller, Jane (Vanderbilt University); Yu, Xianshen (New York University); Windschitl, Paul (University of Iowa)
40. Mental accounting of time: Which information and strategies do people use to decide about their time? Miccoli, Maria Rosa (University Konstanz); Miller, Malena (University Konstanz); Reips, Ulf-Dietrich (University Konstanz)
41. Stealing Time: Why we don't protect our time like we do our money, Hillegass, Kathryn (University of California - San Diego); Amir, On (University of California - San Diego)
42. Gains and Losses of Time: Do People Show Temporal Loss Aversion? Horn, Sebastian (University of Zurich)

43. The Effect of Task Framing on Intertemporal Choice, Liu, Tiantong (University of Warwick); Read, Daniel (University of Warwick); Wei, Sarah (University of Warwick); Ding, Isabel (University of Warwick)
44. Testing an Emotion Regulation Intervention on Intertemporal Choice, Wang, Ke (Harvard University); Lerner, Jennifer (Harvard University); Goldenberg, Amit (Harvard University); Gross, James (Stanford University)
45. Vividly Imagining the Future Predicts Demand for Commitments, Weber, Megan (University of California - Los Angeles); Hershfield, Hal (University of California - Los Angeles)
46. The Long and Short of It: Video Length Formats Influence Time Perception, Shen, Lucy (Harvard University); Nam, Jimin (Harvard University); Elleithy, Taqua (Harvard University); Norton, Michael (Harvard University)
47. Updating, Evidence Evaluation, and Operator Availability: A Framework for Understanding Belief (Sommer, Joseph (Rutgers University); Musolino, Julien (Rutgers University); Hemmer, Pernille (Rutgers University)
48. Probability Updating When Drawing Signals Without Replacement, Langer, Thomas (University of Muenster), Mohrschladt, Hannes (University of Muenster), Siedhoff, Susanne (University of Muenster), Stitz, Lennar (University of Muenster)
49. Optimism and attributions of group loyalty, Lukumon, Gafari (University Mohammed VI Polytechnic & Institut Ecole Normale Supérieure); Cusimano, Corey (Yale University); Strickland, Brent (University Mohammed VI Polytechnic & Institut Ecole Normale Supérieure)
50. Optimism Beliefs across Cultures, Liu, Coco (University of Utah); Tenney, Elizabeth (University of Utah); Talhelm, Thomas (University of Chicago)
51. Impact of Event Boundaries on Wishful Thinking in Predictions, Park, Inkyung (University of Iowa); Strueder, Jeremy (University of Iowa); Miller, Jane (Vanderbilt University); Windschitl, Paul (University of Iowa)
52. Delegation Opportunities: A Source of Overconfidence??, Frollova, Nikola (Prague University of Economics and Business); Hajdu, Gergely (Vienna University of Economics and Business)
53. Does Good News Wash out the Bad? Belief Updating and Climate Risk Information, Conell-Price, Lynn (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau); Mulder, Philip (University of Wisconsin)
54. Strategic Thinking in Disclosing and Unraveling of Hidden Information, Xu, Wenzhuo (Carnegie Mellon University); Cash, Trent (Carnegie Mellon University); Downs, Julie (Carnegie Mellon University)
55. The Role of Information Availability in Simple Decisions, Lee, Douglas (Tel Aviv University); Tsetsos, Kostantinos (University of Bristol); Pezzulo, Giovanni (National Research Council of Italy); Shahar, Nitzan (Tel Aviv University); Usher, Marius (Tel Aviv University)
56. Extracting information from obstetricians' judgments using order-constrained models (Ortmann, Alexandra (Stony Brook University); Urs, Medhini (Stony Brook University); Cavagnarro, Daniel R. (California State University - Fullerton); Luhmann, Christian C. (Stony Brook University); Regenwetter, Michel (University of Illinois)
58. Novel Effects of Predecisional Information Distortion in the Stepwise Evolution-of-preference Paradigm, Häffner, Carolin (University of Cologne); Jekel, Marc (University of Cologne); Lisovoj, Daria (University of Cologne)
59. Effects of Exploring Counterattitudinal Data Before Reading Persuasive Messages, French, Sarah (University of Louisville); DeCaro, Daniel (University of Louisville); DeCaro, Marci (University of Louisville)
60. Limits and heterogeneity of the implied truth effect, Martel, Cameron (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
61. Self-Nudging Accuracy to Reduce Misinformation Sharing Online, Stock, Friederike (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Hertwig, Ralph (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Lorenz-Spreen, Philipp (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
62. Single-peaked, but Polarized Preferences: Deliberation in a Team Dictator Game Jachimowicz, Jessica (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology)

63. Polarization in a global state of emergency: Quantifying heterogeneity in perceived risks of pandemic mitigation measures Fischer, Olivia (University of Zurich); Frey, Renato (University of Zurich)
64. Changing voting decisions via the manipulation of gaze, Coronel, Jason (Ohio State University); Yang, Xiaozhi (Ohio State University); Riggs, Elizabeth (Ohio State University); Krajbich, Ian (Ohio State University)
65. Differential Functioning of Political Beliefs and Gender Identity in a Gamified Drone Strike Decision Making Task, Delgado, Jesus (University of Minnesota); Santos, Paloma (California State University - Northridge); Rutchick, Abraham (California State University - Northridge)
66. Communication is key - a close replication and extension of Weisel and Shalvi (2015), Tønnesen, Mathilde (Aarhus University); Elbæk, Christian (Aarhus University); Pfattheicher, Stefan (Aarhus University); Mitkidis, Panagiotis (Aarhus University)
67. The curse of agreement: Why agreement in conversation hinders people from sharing information and learning about their counterparts Ren, Zhiying (Bella) (University of Pennsylvania); Carton, Andrew (University of Pennsylvania); Schaumburg, Rebecca (University of Pennsylvania)
68. Revealing resilience: Exploring people's reluctance to share personal stories of resilience, Tan, Li Shi (University of Leeds); Sezer, Ovul (Cornell University); Basu, Shankha (University of Leeds)
69. Conversational Receptiveness Enhances Vaccine Discussions, Minson, Julia (Harvard University); Hagmann, David (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Luo, Kara (Stanford Graduate School of Business)
71. Short and Sweet or Short and Sour: The Influence of Text Message Abbreviations on Relational Outcomes, Fang, David (Stanford Graduate School of Business); Yang, Liang (University of Toronto); Maglio, Sam (University of Toronto)
72. The Credibility Dilemma: When Acknowledging a (Perceived) Lack of Credibility Can Make a Boast More Believable Wald, Kristina (University of Chicago); Chaudhry, Shereen (University of Chicago); Risen, Jane (University of Chicago)
73. The Advantages for Cooperation of a Bayesian Theory of Mind, Kleiman-Weiner, Max (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Vientos, Alejandro (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Tenenbaum, Joshua (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
74. The Role of Emotional Arousal and Regulation in Positive Reciprocity: A Psychophysiological Approach (Milstein, Nir (Bar-Ilan University); Rosenblatt, Marina (Bar-Ilan University); Katzir, Maayan (Bar-Ilan University); Halali, Eliran (Bar-Ilan University)
75. Morality Affecting Your Affect: How Moral Dilemmas Evoke Integral Emotions Brown, Kayla D. (University of Georgia); Goodie, Adam S. (University of Georgia)
76. Emotion and Handedness, Saki, Jessica (University of Toledo); Clarkson, Dr. Evan (Indiana University Bloomington); Jasper, Dr. JD (University of Toledo)
77. Violations of Procedure Invariance in Moral Judgments of Sacrificial Dilemmas, Landy, Justin (Nova Southeastern University); Lemli, Benjamin (Nova Southeastern University); Shah, Pritika (Nova Southeastern University); Perry, Alexander (Iowa State University); Sager, Rebekah (Arizona State University)
78. Naturalistic Moral Dilemmas: A Case Study on Melding Big Data and Experimental Approaches (Ryan, William (University of California - Berkeley); Hadjimina, Philipp (ETH Zurich); Critcher, Clayton (University of California - Berkeley)
79. Critical Moral Judgments: Expectations of Moral Behavior and Character of Others while Experiencing Visceral Drive States Blythe, Paul (University of Colorado Boulder); Bhattacharjee, Amit (University of Colorado Boulder); Barasch, Alixandra (University of Colorado Boulder)
80. The Psychometrics of Deception, Bitterly, Brad (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology)
81. Liking scales are broken for probabilistic outcomes, Kristine Y. Cho (UC Berkeley), Stephen M. Baum (Washington University in St. Louis) Ellen R. K. Evers (UC Berkeley)

82. How Attention and Frames Influence Third-Party Punishment and Compensation Preferences, Civali, Claudia (London South Bank University); Capraro, Valerio (University of Milano - Bicocca); Polonio, Luca (University of Milano - Bicocca)
83. Trait self-control and altruistic behavior, Assor, Haim (Bar-Ilan University); Halali, Eliran (Bar-Ilan University)
84. Social image and social distance, Asulin, Yamit (Bar-Ilan University); Heller, Yuval (Bar-Ilan University); Munichor, Nira (Bar-Ilan University); Zultan, Ro'i (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
85. A framework of donation decisions as expected value estimations using mental representations, Männik, Sille-Liis (University of Tartu); Uusberg, Andero (University of Tartu)
86. Altruism and Attention to Social Information, Cotet, Miruna (Ohio State University); Blanco, Mariana (Universidad del Rosario); Krajbich, Ian (Ohio State University)
88. ADVISOR PERFORMANCE DISTORTS PERCEIVED ADVICE QUALITY AND UTILIZATION Levari, David (Harvard University); Feffer, Jacqueline (Harvard University)
89. AI advice taking in Financial Decision-Making: The Role of Preference on Advice Integration, Musso, Constanza (City University of London); Kappes, Andreas (City University of London)
90. Households' Decision on Capital Market Participation: What Are the Drivers? A Multi-Factor Contribution to the Participation Puzzle Oehler, Andreas (Bamberg University); Horn, Matthias (Bamberg University)
91. On the Factors Affecting Savings Behavior, Alrashid, Ibrahim H. (Saudi Development Bank); Allaheeb, Bassim A. (Rushd Consulting); AlHamidi, Sultan A. (Saudi Development Bank); Albishi, Meaid N. (Saudi Development Bank); Bawazeer, Faisal B. (Saudi Development Bank); Alhodaib, Khawlah I. (Saudi Development Bank); Binrushaid, Abdulmajeed A. (Saudi Development Bank) Alnagar, Ahmed M. (Rushd Consulting)
92. Perceptions of financial scarcity and the debt management. Caserotti, Marta (University of Padova); Girardi, Paolo (University of Venice); Stocco, Maria (University of Padova); Sellaro, Roberta (University of Padova); Gavaruzzi, Teresa (University of Bologna); Tasso, Alessandra (University of Ferrara); Roux, Caroline (Concordia University); Lotto, Lorella (University of Padova); Rubaltelli, Enrico (University of Padova)
93. Death anxiety and executing life's financial denouement: Death anxiety's effect on lifespan estimation and financial planning Royer, Joseph (University of Houston); Rude, Dale (University of Houston)
94. Understanding NFT Purchase Intentions and Regret in a Market Downturn, Hossli, Nils (University of Zurich); Natter, Martin (University of Zurich); Shen, Luxi (CUHK Business School)
95. Streamer Number and Purchase Intention: A Preliminary Study in China Ma, Bicheng (Bocconi University)
96. Exploding Deals: Consumer Response to Time-Limited Promotional Offers, Kim, Hyoseok (Southern Connecticut State University); Häubl, Gerald (University of Alberta)
97. The Effect of Divergent Consumer Ratings on Purchase Likelihood Leng, Yanyi (Washington University in St Louis); Nowlis, Stephen (Washington University in St Louis)
98. The Influence of Mean Product Ratings on Judgments of Review Helpfulness Katz, Daniel (University of Chicago); Bartels, Daniel (University of Chicago)
99. Budgeting for Self-Control: Is Sorting Expenses into 'Luxuries' and 'Necessities' Better than Sorting into Traditional Budget Categories? Kuan, Robert (University of Pennsylvania); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania); Herschfield, Hal (University of California - Los Angeles)
100. Set Composition Induces Overbuying, Bocchi, Elena (City University of London); Scopelliti, Irene (City University of London); Estes, Zachary (City University of London)
101. Oh no! that was too sudden: Role of Sudden Product-Failures in Repair-Intentions, Tatavarthy, Aruna (Norwegian School of Economics); Agrawal, Nidhi (University of Washington)
102. Forgoing Unearned Rewards, Kim, Jin (Tongji University); Wong, Jared (Yale University); Cusimano, Corey (Yale University)

103. Forgoing Consumption for the Sake of Others, Ferreira, Kirla (City University of London); Steinmetz, Janina (City University of London); Scopelliti, Irene (City University of London)
104. Human contact in the digital age: a soon to be scarce luxury good? Carrus, Elisa (London South Bank University); Caserotti, Marta (Universita degli Studi di Padova); Skelton, Nazia Yasmeen (London South Bank University); Civai, Claudia (London South Bank University)
105. Inequality in Music Consumption: A Comparative Analysis of 67 Countries, Gonzales, Josh (University of Guelph); Pegoraro, Ann (University of Guelph); Mishra, Sandeep (University of Guelph)
106. A method for measuring consumer confusion due to copycat product labels van de Mosselaar, Piet (Aarhus University); Schoemann, Martin (Technische Universität Dresden); Perkovic, Sonja (Aarhus University); Orquin, Jacob L. (Aarhus University)
107. Activating subjective norms to promote environmental consumption: What you think people do supersedes your sustainability beliefs. Wilhelms, Evan (Hiram College); Kirsch, Estefani (Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos); Brust-Renck, Priscila (Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos)
108. Nudging Sustainable Meal Choices, Camilleri, Adrian R. (University of Technology Sydney); Newell, Ben (University of New South Wales); Roberts, John (University of New South Wales)
109. How Food Neophobia influences the decision to consume conventional meat and meat alternatives, Tedaldi, Elisa (University of Padova); Sparkman, Gregg (Boston College); Carraro, Luciana (University of Padova); Lenzi, Michela (University of Padova); Rubaltelli, Enrico (University of Padova)
110. Lagging Behind and Lagging Ahead: Friction as an Overlooked Influence on Online Engagement, Mazar, Asaf (University of Pennsylvania), Tomaino, Geoff (INSEAD), Carmon, Ziv (INSEAD), Wood, Wendy (University of Southern California) Duckworth, Angela (University of Pennsylvania)
111. Sustainability Goals Can Lead to Less Sustainable Choices, Padua, Gabriela (Washington University in St Louis); Scott, Sydney (Washington University in St Louis)
112. Unrealistic optimism in climate change risk perception undermines support for climate mitigation efforts Kim, Taeik (University of Missouri); Hennes, Erin (University of Missouri)
113. Life can be better! Increasing support for polarizing green policies via visuals of a better future, Dubey, Rachit (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Hardy, Matt (Princeton University); Bhui, Rahul (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Griffiths, Thomas (Princeton University)
114. Exploring the Differential Impact of Green Nudges and Welfarist Nudges on Long-Term Behavioral Change: An Experimental Analysis, Mathew, Shawn (IMT Business School Dubai)
115. Psychological Barriers and Accelerants to Collaborating on the Net-Zero Energy Transition Composto, Jordana (Princeton University); Weber, Elke (Princeton University)
116. Giving farm animals a name and a face: Eliciting animal advocacy among omnivores using the single identifiable victim effect. Cohen Ben-Arye, Rakefet (Bar-Ilan University); Halali, Eliran (Bar-Ilan University)
117. Are Defaults More Likely to be Overridden? Evidence from End of Life Care Preferences, Cloughesy, Jon (Duke University); Campagna, Ada (Duke University); Lindemans, JW (Duke University); Ariely, Dan (Duke University)
118. Improving End-of-Life: Exploring the Effect of Default Disclosure, Chew, Brianna (University of California - San Diego); Fridman, Ariel (ESADE Business School); Gneezy, Ayelet (University of California - San Diego)
119. Psychological Barrier to COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance, Han, Jee Hoon (University of Washington); Qin, Chao (University of Washington); Joslyn, Susan (University of Washington); Agrawal, Nidhi (University of Washington); Savelli, Sonia (University of Washington)
120. Ask, don't tell: priming people to be consistent for vaccination, Arellano, Jose (Carnegie Mellon University); Chapman, Gretchen (Carnegie Mellon University); Saccardo, Silvia (Carnegie Mellon University)

121. Decisions involving tradeoffs between health and economic losses during the COVID-19 pandemic, Sokolowska-Pohorille, Joanna (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities); Swiatnicki, Kornel (Kozminski University)
122. Graphically represented medical information is harder to process and is rather chosen than numerically represented information Tiede, Kevin E. (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Wolfgang, Gaissmaier (University of Konstanz)
123. “Mild”, “Severe”, “Critical” - Communication of disease severity and its impact on risk perception and protective behavior Gubernath, John (Robert Koch Institute); Daschowski, Yvonne (Robert Koch Institute); Leuker, Christina (Robert Koch Institute)
124. Violations of Procedure and Presentation Invariance in a Medical Helping Dilemma, Lemli, Benjamin (Nova Southeastern University); Landy, Justin (Nova Southeastern University)
125. Neither Biased Algorithms nor Biased Humans are Desirable, But Combining Them may be Permissible Wang, Sophie (University of Chicago); Dietvorst, Berkeley (University of Chicago)
126. Slow Moral Trade-Off by AI Increases AI Appreciation, Yang, Adelle (National University of Singapore); Chen, Sijin (National University of Singapore); Gu, Yu (Tsinghua University)
127. Aversion to Algorithms or an Aversion to Unconventional Options? Tariq, Hamza (University of Waterloo); Fugelsang, Jonathan (University of Waterloo); Koehler, Derek (University of Waterloo)
128. Diagnostic Accuracy across Light and Dark Skin by Specialists, Generalists, and Physician-Machine Partnerships (Groh, Matthew (Northwestern University); Badri, Omar (Northeast Dermatology Associates); Danehsjou, Roxana (Stanford University); Koochek, Arash (Bannerhealth); Harris, Caleb (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Soenksen, Luis (Harvard University); Doraiswamy, P. Murali (Duke University); Picard, Rosalind (MIT Media Lab)
129. Women who cry to manipulate others face more backlash than men, Pittarello, Andrea (Stony Brook University); Motro, Daphna (Hofstra University)
130. Networks as Newsletters: The Effects of Female Network Connectedness on Gender Diversity Efforts Lin, Jun (Stanford Graduate School of Business); Hur, Julia (New York University)
131. Faculty Hiring Analysis Garrett, Karin (University of Pennsylvania); Wang, Angelica (University of Michigan); Moore, Don (University of California - Berkeley)
132. Selection Neglect in Hiring Choices: When the Lower-Performing Candidate Is Preferred, Hagmann, David (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Sajons, Gwendolin (ESCP Business School); XU, Feiyu (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology)
133. Safety in Numbers? Women Prefer Managing Smaller Teams due to Fewer Anticipated Negative Outcomes Elleithy, Taqua (Harvard University); Abi-Esber, Nicole (London School of Economics and Political Science)
134. What do you need? Evolutionary needs and preferences for organizational culture Refaie, Nabhan (University of Guelph); Mishra, Sandeep (University of Guelph)
135. Preferential Differences for Transactional vs. Transformational Leadership in a Student and Working Population, Lusser, Sophie-Claire (Georg August University Gottingen); Mojzisch, Andreas (University of Hildesheim); Schulz-Hardt, Stefan (Georg August University Gottingen)
136. The Profit-as-Pushy Effect: For-Profit Organizations Attract and Inspire Dominance Santoro, Erik (Stanford University); Davidai, Shai (Columbia University)
137. The Past is Now: Inaccuracy in Work-from-Home Productivity and Stress Recollection Stroom, Martijn (Maastricht University)
138. A Research Agenda for Decision Education: Teaching Decision-Making and Evaluating the Results, Lee, Jinsol (Alliance for Decision Education); Anderson, Madeline (Alliance for Decision Education); Diamond, Hannah (Alliance for Decision Education)
139. Sludged out of school: A comparative ‘sludge audit’ of policies that make school progression hard (vs. easy) for children in low- and middle-income countries, Hodson, Nathan (University of Southern California); Llopis, Jimena (Save The

Children International); Rava, Matteo (Aix- Marseille University); Majerowicz, Stephanie (Universidad de los Andes); Walatka, Robert (University of Chicago); Wangenheim, Sven (Oxford Economics); Wändi Bruine de Bruin (University of Southern California); Ivo Vlaev (Warwick Business School)

140. The role of self-esteem and Theory of Mind in preschoolers' materialism, Trzcińska, Agata (University of Warsaw); Podsiadłowski, Wojciech (University of Warsaw); Golus, Patrycja (University of Warsaw); Wielešczyk, Jowita (University of Warsaw); Sekścińska, Katarzyna (University of Warsaw)



## SJDM Poster Session #2

### Sunday, November 19<sup>th</sup> 4:45pm-6:30pm

1. Decision-Making Foundations in Cognition and Probability, Langholtz, Harvey (William & Mary)
2. The Impact of Grouping on Decisions Based on Multidimensional Observations, Leshkowitz, Maya (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Hassin, Ran (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
3. Modern Preference Learning Model Evaluation for Individual Discrete Choices, Cao, Sheng Lun (Carnegie Mellon University); Nock, Destenie (Carnegie Mellon University); Davis, Alex (Independent Consultant)
4. The Effect of Feedback and Knowledge of the Distribution of Option Values on Learning in Sequential Search, Bugbee, Erin (Carnegie Mellon University); Gonzalez, Cleotilde (Carnegie Mellon University)
5. Escaping technological ‘learning traps’ through mechanistic understanding, Sankar, Anirudh (Stanford University); Davies, Ben (Stanford University)
6. Evaluating Metacognition in Subjective, Multi-attribute Choice, Cash, Trent N. (Carnegie Mellon University); Oppenheimer, Daniel M. (Carnegie Mellon University)
7. Conflict detection predicts the temporal stability of intuitive and deliberate reasoning, Voudouri, Aikaterini (University Paris Cité); Bialek, Michał (University of Wrocław); Domurat, Artur (Kozminski University); Kowal, Marta (University of Wrocław); De Neys, Wim (University Paris Cité)
8. Intuitive reasoning about psychological constraint, Cusimano, Corey (Yale University); Zorrilla, Natalia (Princeton University); Danks, David (University of California - San Diego); Lombrozo, Tania (Princeton University)
9. Probability estimates increase in a communication chain, Harris, Adam (University College London); Kau, Shi-Hui (University College London); Liefgreen, Alice (Swansea University)
10. Learning the lie of the land: How people construct mental representations of distributions, Szollosi, Aba (University of Edinburgh); Mason, Alice (University of Bath); Newell, Ben (University of New South Wales)
11. Do People Strategically Prescribe Pessimism for Threatening Weather Events? Miller, Jane (Vanderbilt University); Windschitl, Paul (University of Iowa)
12. Questioning in sensemaking: When counterfactual strategies are effective, Lehman, Betsy (Michigan Technological University); Veinott, Elizabeth (Michigan Technological University)
13. Inaction Acceleration vs. Inaction Inertia: The Divergent Impact of Missed Opportunities, Wang, Meiying (London Business School); Berman, Jonathan (London Business School); Faro, David (London Business School)
14. Learning from and about climate scientists, Orchinik, Reed (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Dubey, Rachit (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Gershman, Samuel (Harvard University); Powell, Derek (Arizona State University); Bhui, Rahul (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
15. Judgment and decision analysis of professional weather impact judgments, Niu, Xiaoxiao (University College London); Harris, Adam (University College London); Singmann, Henrik (University College London)
16. Do Numerate People Know that Knowledge is Power? Cho, Jinhyo (University of Oklahoma); Cokely, Edward (University of Oklahoma); Baldwin, Alantis (University of Oklahoma); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma); Garcia-Retamero, Rocio (University of Granada)
17. Cognitive Forecasting in Emotion-Based Choice, Demircioglu, Dogukan (University of Waterloo); Johnson, Sam (University of Waterloo); Dawson, Chris (University of Bath)
18. Novel Insights Into the Wisdom of Crowds by Process-Consistent Modeling, Rebholz, Tobias R. (University of Tuebingen); Biella, Marco (University of Tuebingen); Hütter, Mandy (University of Tuebingen)
19. Debiasing people’s estimates with cognitive models to improve the wisdom of the crowd, Lee, Michael (University of California - Irvine); Villarreal, Manuel (University of California - Irvine)

20. Where's Waldo, Ohio? Improving Wisdom of the Crowd Aggregates for Spatial Knowledge, Montgomery, Lauren (University of California - Irvine); Baldini, Charles (University of California - Irvine); Vandekerckhove, Joachim (University of California - Irvine); Lee, Michael (University of California - Irvine)
21. Examining Strategies Used to Boost the Wisdom of the Inner Crowd, London, Brian (Appalachian State University); Smith, Andrew (Appalachian State University); Windschitl, Paul (University of Iowa)
22. Debiasing Intuitions among French Speaking Reasoners, Franiatte, Nina (Université Paris Cité & onepoint); Boissin, Esther (Université Paris Cité); Delmas, Alexandra (onepoint); De Neys, Wim (CNRS & Université Paris Cité)
23. Debiasing reasoning: Education and urban living boost the effect of a short training intervention in a non-Western population Boissin, Esther (Université Paris Cité); Josserand, Mathilde (Université Lyon 2); De Neys, Wim (Université Paris Cité); Caparos, Serge (Université Paris 8)
24. Navigating the Unseen: The consequences of Prioritizing Passive Risks, Krava, Lidor (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Carmeli, Ron (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Bereby-Meyer, Yoella (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
25. Completion Time Estimates Under Epistemic versus Aleatory Uncertainty, Carney, Stephan (University of Southern California); Ülkümen, Gülden (University of Southern California)
26. A Fuzzy-Trace Theory Approach to Understanding the Relationship Between Reward Sensitivity and Risky-Decision Making Edelson, Sarah (Cornell University); Reyna, Valerie (Cornell University); Garavito, David (Cornell University); Keebler, Matthew (Cornell University); Yohannan, Jonathan (Cornell University); McKamey, Lucas (Cornell University); Zameer Hoque, Jordan Roue
27. Cognitive training in risky choice persists across time and value domains, Ubiali, Anna (City University of London); Jarvstad, Andreas (City University of London)
28. Executive functions and risky financial choices, Sekścińska, Katarzyna (University of Warsaw); Jaworska, Diana (University of Warsaw); Rudzinska-Wojciechowska, Joanna (Kozminski University); Trzecińska, Agata (University of Warsaw)
29. Experiential amplification of risk judgements about Covid-19, Schulte-Mecklenbeck, Michael (University of Bern); Hertwig, Ralph (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Wagner, Gert (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
30. The Influence of Expertise and Anchor Relevance on Anchoring Effects, Mayer, Maren (Leibniz-Institut für Wissensmedien, Tübingen); Rebholz, Tobias R. (Eberhard Karls Universität Tuebingen)
31. Does experience extinguish biases? Resolving a 50-year controversy with a large-scale five-year natural field experiment on prosocial behavior, Daniels, David (National University of Singapore); Kang, Polly (INSEAD)
32. From Preference Shifts to Information Leaks: Rethinking the Framing Effect, Ghasemi, Omid (University of New South Wales); Harris, Adam J.L. (University College London); Newell, Ben R. (University of New South Wales)
33. The Influence of Maximizing Tendency and Numeracy on the Attraction and Compromise Effects in Multialternative Decision- making, Tsuzuki, Takashi (Rikkyo University)
34. Characterizing the causes, dynamics, and consequences of choice deferral Su, Yi-Hsin (Brown University); Leng, Xiamin (Brown University); Shenhav, Amitai (Brown University)
35. Maximizers in Action: Understanding the Decision Making Process of Those Who Strive for the Best Idzikowska, Katarzyna (Kozminski University)
36. Is the virtual crowd the wiser crowd? Goedde-Menke, Michael (University of Muenster); Selimaj, Edona (University of Muenster); Aliman, Dorothea Nilusha (University of Muenster); Hennig-Thurau, Thorsten (University of Muenster); Langer, Thomas (University of Muenster)
37. Comprehension in economic games, Koppel, Lina (Linköping University); Andersson, David (Linköping University); Johansson, Magnus (Stockholm School of Economics); Ström, Eirik (Western Norway University of Applied Sciences); Tinghög, Gustav (Linköping University)

38. All Roads Lead to Rome? Evaluating Value Elicitation Methods, Huang, Hongzhang (University of California - Berkeley); Gao, Randy (New York University); Jung, Minah (New York University)
39. Structural Properties of Association Networks Predict Preference-Based Set Choice, Fernandez, Kianté (Ohio State University); Karmarkar, Uma (University of California - San Diego); Krajbich, Ian (Ohio State University)
40. Using Large-Scale, Randomized Experiments to Assess Contextual Sensitivity in Naturalistic Choice (Hayes, William (SUNY - Binghamton University); Trueblood, Jennifer (Indiana University Bloomington); Holmes, William (Indiana University Bloomington)
41. How Correlation Deviates From Causation in Big Data Analyses, Banerjee, Akshina (University of Michigan); Urminsky, Oleg (University of Chicago)
42. ‘No Time to Buy’: Asking to Spend Money to Save Time is Perceived as Less Fair than Asking to Spend Time to Save Money Trupia, Maria Giulia (University of California - Los Angeles); Shaddy, Franklin (University of California - Los Angeles)
43. Time Flips and Price Dips: Machine Learning Tools for Preference Reversal Modeling in Intertemporal Paradigms, Sokratous, Konstantina (University of Florida); Kvam, Peter (University of Florida)
44. Time neglect: Consumers overlook time and overemphasize accumulative index of quality Qiu, Tian (East China Normal University); Lu, Jingyi (East China Normal University)
45. Perceptions of Confidence and Responses to Different Elicitations, Campbell, Sandy (University of California - Berkeley)
46. Forms of Overconfidence: Reconciling Divergent Levels with Consistent Individual Differences Lawson, M. Asher (INSEAD); Larrick, Richard P. (Duke University); Soll, Jack B. (Duke University)
47. Social Responses to Overconfidence, Wallmueller, Peter (INSEAD); Lawson, M. Asher (INSEAD)
48. Is overconfidence an individual difference? Li, Sophia (University of California - Berkeley); Moore, Don (University of California - Berkeley)
49. Beliefs about the Stock Market: A Reverse Framing Effect in Subjective Expectations, Chin, Alycia (Securities and Exchange Commission); VanEpps, Eric (Vanderbilt University); Scholl, Brian (Securities and Exchange Commission)
50. Understanding zero-sum beliefs for both material and symbolic resources, Gallardo, Roman (University of Chicago); Wei, Kevin (University of Chicago); Risen, Jane (University of Chicago)
51. Out of sight but not out of mind: FOMO, regret, and counterfactual thinking, Jaworska, Diana (University of Warsaw); Sekścińska, Katarzyna (University of Warsaw)
52. What influences belief-inconsistent information seeking? Newton, Christie (University of Regina); Pennycook, Gordon (University of Regina)
53. Effects of Emotion on Judgments of News Veracity, Baumann, Christiane (Harvard University); Koenig, Fabian (Harvard University); Chen, Sarah (Harvard University); Lerner, Jennifer (Harvard University)
54. Why are Numerate People Less Susceptible to Misinformation? A test of the Knowledge is Power Account, Cho, Jinhyo (University of Oklahoma); T. Cokely, Edward (University of Oklahoma); Baldwin, Alantis (University of Oklahoma); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma); Garcia-Retamero, Rocio (University of Granada)
55. The impact of emotionality on belief in false claims and effectiveness of fact-checks, Wang, Sze Yuh Nina (Cornell University); Phillips, Samantha (Carnegie Mellon University); Pennycook, Gordon (Cornell University)
56. Measuring self-censorship, Binnendyk, Jabin (University of Regina); Pennycook, Gordon (University of Regina)
57. The Role of Demographic and Psychological Factors in Misinformation Veracity Judgements: A Systematic Independent Participant Data Meta-Analysis Using Signal Detection Theory, Sultan, Mubashir (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Tump, Alan (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Gollwitzer, Anton (BI Norwegian Business School); Lorenz-Spreen, Philipp (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Hertwig, Ralph (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Kurvers, Ralf (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)

58. Punishing Misinformation Due to Bias versus Dishonesty, Wallace, Laura (University of Chicago); Levine, Emma (University of Chicago)
59. A Systematic, Epistemically Rigorous Approach is Required for Determining Political Information Source Reliability. Heuristics and Open Vigilance Mechanisms Leave Us Vulnerable to Disinformation from Sources We Trust, Sawyer, Timothy (Epistemic Crossroads)
60. Zero-Sum Beliefs and the Avoidance of Political Conversations, Boland, F. Katelynn (Columbia University); Davidai, Shai (Columbia University)
61. Factual Knowledge and Attitude Polarization: A Direct Test of Politically Motivated Reasoning Stagnaro, Michael (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
62. Politicization Induces Zero-Sum Thinking in Problem Solving, Molnar, Almos (Brown University); Sloman, Steven (Brown University)
63. To blame or to apologize? The interaction between relational and informational motives shapes conflict reconciliation. Chen, Eva (University of Chicago); Chaudhry, Shereen (University of Chicago)
64. The Shadow of the Past: Disclosed Undesirable Precedents Harm (Objective and Subjective) Negotiation Outcomes Wang, Chao (ESADE Business School); Schmid, Katharina (ESADE Business School)
65. Conflict in decision-making is registered automatically but monitored deliberately, Stewart, Kaiden (University of Waterloo); Fugelsang, Jonathan (University of Waterloo)
66. Whispered words and social dynamics: The perception of gossipers' morality and sociability and their impact on advice seeking Basu, Shankha (Leeds University Business School); Ibrahim, Nahid (Leeds University Business School); Zhang, Lijun (Shirley) (Leeds University Business School)
67. Putting the 'Us' in Autonomous: The Differential Effects of Cooperation and Competition on Autonomy Chai, Valentino (Stanford Graduate School of Business); Halevy, Nir (Stanford Graduate School of Business)
68. People Are Less Likely to Ask Gossips for Advice, Gordon, Alexis (University of Pennsylvania); Schweitzer, Maurice (University of Pennsylvania)
69. Social Support and Cooperation in Dynamic Networks: An Experimental Approach Buitrago-Rubiano, Felipe (Universidad de los Andes)
70. The Interpersonal Benefits of Giving Bad Advice, Chen, Amanda (Zaidan) (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Hagmann, David (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology)
71. The spread of financial unfairness: paying forward and reciprocity in consecutive interactions, Rudzińska-Wojciechowska, Joanna (Kozminski University); Sekścińska, Katarzyna (University of Warsaw); Wojciechowski, Jerzy (University of Warsaw)
72. How people systematically disregard expert advice about medical treatments. Genc, Yasemin (City University of London); Kappes, Andreas (City University of London); Yearsley, James (City University of London)
73. Does the Prospect of Upward Mobility Undermine Support for Redistribution? Moore, Don (University of California - Berkeley); Choudhari, Rene (University of California - Berkeley); Wu, Aileen (University of California - Berkeley)
74. The effect of procedural and distributive justice on tax evasion decision. Kolodziej, Sabina (Kozminski University)
75. Trust Across Contexts: The US vs. Japan, Banki, Daniel (Universitat Pompeu Fabra); Navarro-Martinez, Daniel (Universitat Pompeu Fabra); Yamamoto, Shohei (Hitotsubashi ICS)
76. A scarcity mindset does not influence economic cheating across or between social classes, T. Elbaek, Christian (Aarhus University); Aarøe, Lene (Aarhus University); Otterbring, Tobias (University of Agder); Baskakovs, Aleksandrs (Aarhus University); Hochman, Guy (Reichman University); Mitkidis, Panagiotis (Aarhus University);
77. Competition Penalty: Observers Overestimate Competitors' Unethical Behaviors in Competition, Chen, Yuqi (East China Normal University); Lu, Jingyi (East China Normal University)

78. Playing blind: Absent other information, self-interested players act as if others will mirror their moves, Cashman, Matthew (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Prelec, Drazen (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
79. Consistently (un)Ethical: The Order of Stakes Matters Fan, Angela (Carnegie Mellon University)
80. Imperfect selection of cheaters in cheating-enabling environments, Say, Nicolas (Prague University of Economics and Business); Bahník, Štěpán (Prague University of Economics and Business); Hudík, Marek (Prague University of Economics and Business); Houdek, Petr (Prague University of Economics and Business)
81. Perceptions of Applicants Who Deceive: Does Physical Attractiveness Matter? Luong, Alexandra (University of Minnesota Duluth); Burditt, Jay (University of Minnesota Duluth)
82. Norm Violations and Remediations in Honor, Face and Dignity Cultures, Sharma, Suraj (California State University - Northridge); Semnani Azad, Zhaleh (California State University - Northridge); Zukerman, Ingrid (Monash University); Aslani, Soroush (University of Wisconsin)
83. Language matters: how normative expressions shape norm perception and affect norm compliance, Kuang, Jinyi (University of Pennsylvania); Bicchieri, Cristina (University of Pennsylvania)
84. Revisiting the norm of self-interest: The case for prosocial modesty Carlson, Ryan (University of Chicago); Small, Deborah (Yale University)
85. Social Learning from Incomplete Information in a Dynamic Decision-Making Task, Ortmann, Alexandra (Stony Brook University); Luhmann, Christian (Stony Brook University)
86. Ripple Effects of Social Harms on Prosocial Decisions: U.S. Fatal Police Shootings Reduce Potentially Lifesaving Prosocial Choices, Especially When Shooting Victims Are Black, Kang, Polly (INSEAD); Daniels, David (National University of Singapore)
87. Exploring Intersectional Stereotypes: Gender, Age, and Workforce Perceptions, Roux, Sydney (Louisiana State University); Burke, Vanessa (Louisiana State University); Finkelstein, Lisa (Northern Illinois University); Cheung, Ho Kwan (University of Calgary)
88. He Said, She Said: The Impact of Gendered Language on Perceived Confidence, Nerenberg, Mandi (Harvard University); Hickman, Louis (Virginia Tech); Duckworth, Angela (University of Pennsylvania)
89. Detecting Bias in Police Searches, Meyer, Margaret (University of Michigan); Richard, Gonzalez (University of Michigan)
90. Do Gender Differences in Numeracy Primarily Reflect a Gap in Decision Making Skills? Allan, Jinan N. (Clemson University); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma); Garcia-Retamero, Rocio (University of Granada); Cokely, Edward T. (University of Oklahoma)
91. Does Diversity Count? Testing the Effects of Real-time Feedback to Boost Representation Within Organizations Cervantez, Jose (University of Pennsylvania); Pink, Sophia (University of Pennsylvania); Rai, Aneesh (University of Pennsylvania); Chang, Linda (University of Pennsylvania); Mosleh, Mohsen (University of Exeter); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania)
92. Failing to Promote Women Does Not Harm Perceptions of Diversity Efforts, Liao, Yi tsen (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Hagmann, David (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Catherine, Tinsley (Georgetown University)
93. Investigating the impact of contract length on manager perceptions of employees, Somerville, Kaylee (Queen's University); Pupco, Shani (Queen's University); Barling, Julian (Queen's University)
94. Task Prioritization: Navigating the Trade-off between Urgency and Importance Wu, Kristina (University of Waterloo); Johnson, Samuel (University of Waterloo)
95. When Does A 'Fresh Start' Reminder Promote Early Task Completion?, Min, Kyeong Sam (University of New Orleans); Min, Dong-Jun (DJ) (University of New Orleans); Tadesse, Amanuel (University of New Orleans); Kemp, Elyria (University of New Orleans)

96. Does This Building Make Me Look Fat? Relationship Between Work from Home, Healthy Decision Making, and The Role of Stress, Plotnikova, Ksenia (Middle Tennessee State University); Jackson, Alexander T. (Middle Tennessee State University); Van Hein, Judith (Middle Tennessee State University)
97. Tasks Beyond Taxonomies: A Multidimensional Design Space for Team Tasks, Hu, Xinlan Emily (University of Pennsylvania); Gandhi, Linnea (University of Pennsylvania); Whiting, Mark (University of Pennsylvania); Watts, Duncan (University of Pennsylvania); Almaatouq, Abdullah (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
98. How can I Rescue you? Vs. Why am I Roped into this? The Role of Prestige Vs. Dominance In Refusing Work Requests, Sankaran, Krithiga (University of Utah)
99. When and why agency makes programmers stick to the same algorithm, Shlomo, Bar (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Moran, Simone (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Schurr, Amos (Ben- Gurion University of the Negev)
100. Designing Processes of Humans and Machines: Overcoming AI Aversion, Xia, Qiong (INSEAD); Tomaino, Geoffrey (INSEAD); Evgeniou, Theodoros (INSEAD); Wertenbroch, Klaus (INSEAD)
101. Unlocking the Ethical Black Box: A Comparative Study of AI (ChatGPT) and Human Moral Judgments, Fernandes, Sharlene (Georgia State University); Nahmias, Eddy (Georgia State University); Caelan, Alexander (Georgia State University); Aharoni, Eyal (Georgia State University)
102. Studying Slogan Memorability with Large Language Models, Aka, Ada (Stanford Graduate School of Business); McCoy, John (University of Pennsylvania)
103. Consumer Lay Beliefs about the Marketplace: Antecedents and Consequences Ramaswami, Seshan (Singapore Management University)
104. Autopilot or Copilot? Label Mismarketing and Autonomous Vehicle Liability Agarwal, Stuti (Harvard University); De Freitas, Julian (Harvard University)
105. A New Way to Spend: The Psychology Behind the Buy-Now-Pay-Later Boom, Zhang, Jean (University of California - San Diego); Liu, Wendy (University of California - San Diego)
106. On the Likelihood of Acquiring a Premium Service Under Freemium vs. Paymium: Field and Experimental Evidence Dorfman, Anna (Bar-Ilan University); Ash, David (Tel Aviv University); Ben Shahr, Danny (Tel Aviv University)
107. Accelerating the Sustainability Transition through Mainstream Marketing, McRae, Cameron (McGill University); Saarijarvi, Hannu (Tampere University); Nevalainen, Jaakko (Tampere University); Fogelholm, Mikael (University of Helsinki); Ma, Yu (McGill University); Dube, Laurette (McGill University)
108. Luxury Triggers Compensatory Consumption, Harpaz, Shir (Tel Aviv University); Hadar, Liat (Tel Aviv University)
109. The Effects of Compensation Structure on Consumption Behavior Tsai, Paige (Harvard University); Buell, Ryan (Harvard University)
110. Access Preferred: Consumption Without Identity Costs, MacDonald, Tyler (Boston University); Morewedge, Carey (Boston University)
111. When 'Netflix and Chill' Leaves us Cold: Binge-Watching, Opportunity Costs, and Regret Ciulli, Rachele (University of Pennsylvania); Lamberton, Catherine (University of Pennsylvania)
112. Maximizing the Impact of CSR Investments: Consumers' Preferences for Internal versus External CSR Depend on Perceived Firm Responsibility Wang, Yusu (University of Chicago); Powell, Emily (Ipsos); Sussman, Abigail (University of Chicago)
113. The Downside of Generosity: When Giving More Undermines Social Connection, Jang, Minkwang (University of Chicago); Fishbach, Ayelet (University of Chicago); Chaudhry, Shereen J. (University of Chicago)
114. The Charity Competence Curse: When Signals of Competence Backfire Zhang, Lijun (Leeds University Business School); Allard, Thomas (Singapore Management University); Wang, Shane (Virginia Tech); Hardisty, David (University of British Columbia)

115. Pay or Donate? How Language Shapes Generosity, Neto, Leonor (New York University); An, Eunkyung (New York University); Jung, Minah (New York University); Erdem, Tulin (New York University)
116. Company cost and social benefit: How acts of corporate altruism drive consumer choices, Shine, Aaron (University of Bath); Johnson, Samuel (University of Waterloo); Simonyan, Yvetta (University of Bath)
117. Estimating the Impact of the Inflation Reduction Act on Used and New Vehicle Markets: Combining Theory and Fieldwork Woodley, Lucas (Harvard University)
118. Do mandated financial disclosures help people make better choices? Turetski, Daniella (University of Toronto); Christensen, Asha (University of Toronto); Chou, Karrie (University of Toronto); Hilchey, Matthew (University of Toronto); Soman, Dilip (University of Toronto)
119. Readability and Bank Risk-Taking, Abu-Abbas, Bassam (Qatar University); Hassam, Mostafa (Qatar University)
120. Time Horizons Vary Between Financial Decisions, Bruine de Bruin, Wändi (University of Southern California); Chin, Alycia (Securities and Exchange Commission); Zimmerman, David (Securities and Exchange Commission); van der Klaauw, Wilbert (Federal Reserve Bank of New York)
121. Price Contrasts in the Wild, Fridman, Ariel (University of California - San Diego); Amir, On (University of California - San Diego); Hansen, Karsten (University of California - San Diego)
122. Eat Beautifully: How aesthetic food can resolve the conflict between health and taste, Erensoy, Eda (Yale University); Lu, Louise (Stanford Graduate School of Business); Aaker, Jennifer (Stanford Graduate School of Business); Fishbach, Ayelet (University of Chicago)
123. In the mood for health: How does emotion relate to healthy food consumption? Sun, Rui (University of Chicago); Urminsky, Oleg (University of Chicago)
124. The Calories-Must-Be-Bad Bias: How the Belief that Calories are Unhealthy Increases the Choice Share of Less Nutritious Options, Monnier, Arnaud (Nova School of Business and Economics); Sweldens, Steven (Erasmus University Rotterdam); Puntoni, Stefano (University of Pennsylvania)
125. Examining the mechanisms of stress related meal skipping, Jackson, Alexander T. (Middle Tennessee State University); Meggison, Andrea C. (Middle Tennessee State University); Loveless, James P. (Middle Tennessee State University); Donovan, Britney J. (University of South Carolina); Al-Amin, Ryah N. (Middle Tennessee State University)
126. Combatting confirmation bias in health information processing: debias or nudge? Kourtidis, Ploutarchos (London School of Economics and Political Science); Fasolo, Barbara (London School of Economics and Political Science); Galizzi, Matteo (London School of Economics and Political Science)
127. Do Health Locus of Control and Domain General Risk Perceptions Influence Trust and Acceptance of Risk Calculator Outputs? Ramasubramanian, Madhuri (University of Michigan); Brotzman, Laura (University of Michigan); Zikmund-Fisher, Brian (University of Michigan)
128. Using Adaptive Experiments for Personalizing Mental-Health Related Interventions to Account for Heterogeneity between Participants, Kumar, Harsh (University of Toronto); Shi, Jiakai (University of Toronto); Li, Tong (University of Toronto); Musabirov, Ilya (University of Toronto); Bhattacharjee, Ananya (University of Toronto); Williams, Joseph Jay (University of Toronto)
129. Emotions and Health Decisions: The Opposing Effects of Incidental and Integral Sadness, Chen, Sarah (Shih-Hua) (Harvard University); Wang, Ke (Harvard University); Rees, Vaughan (Harvard University); Lee, Irene (Harvard University); Tan, Andy (University of Pennsylvania); Lerner, Jennifer (Harvard University)
130. Twice as nice? A Longitudinal Field Study of Separate vs. Combined Nudges for Laundry Behaviors, Hardisty, David (University of British Columbia); Appelt, Kirstin (University of British Columbia); Mookerjee, Siddhanth (University of British Columbia); Zhao, Jiaying (University of British Columbia); Wang, Yanwen (University of British Columbia); Korteland, Arien (BC Hydro)
131. How does choice architecture influence attention and decision making? Shi, Chaoyi (University of British Columbia); Luo, Yu (University of British Columbia); Soman, Dilip (University of Toronto); Zhao, Jiaying (University of British Columbia)

132. Self-nudging self-control, Liu, Xingyu (Shirley) (University of California - San Diego); McKenzie, Craig (University of California - San Diego); Sher, Shlomi (Pomona College)
133. Effects of transparency and domain literacy on opting out of suboptimal defaults, Kleiman-Lynch, Leo J. (University of California - San Diego); McKenzie, Craig R.M. (University of California - San Diego)
134. The Intention-Behavior Gap: A Novel Domain-General Measure, Wilson, Daniel (University of Toronto); Hutcherson, Cendri (University of Toronto)
135. Argument Visualization Affects Comprehension, Evaluation, and Support for Economic Policies, Connolly, Daniel (Carnegie Mellon University); Oppenheimer, Danny (Carnegie Mellon University)
136. Can Narrative Stories Convince Managers to Adopt Evidence-Based Practices? Mojzis, Jan (Prague University of Economics and Business); Houdek, Petr (Prague University of Economics and Business); Frollova, Nikola (Prague University of Economics and Business)
137. Beyond Hypothetical Scenarios: Investigating the Influence of the 1-in-X Numerical Format on Actual Choices (Savadori, Lucia (University of Trento); Bogani, Alessandro (University of Trento); Castro Davalos, Gloria (University of Trento); Pighin, Stefania (University of Trento) )
138. Hypothetically Nudging: Hypotheticals provide misleading, noisy estimates of real behavior change, Gandhi, Linnea (University of Pennsylvania); Kiyawat, Anoushka (University of Pennsylvania); Camerer, Colin (California Institute of Technology); Watts, Duncan (University of Pennsylvania)
139. Exploring Potential of Heterogeneity in Behavioral Science Interventions with Contextual Multiarmed Bandits Musabirov, Ilya (University of Toronto); Song, Haocheng (University of Toronto)
140. The Relationship Between Justifying Choices and Seeing Stars in Consumer Choice, Yu, Jingqi (University of Toronto)