

# Society for Judgment and Decision Making Annual Conference 2024



**New York Marriott Marquis  
New York City, New York, USA  
November 22-25, 2024**

<b><u>CONTENTS</u></b>	<b><u>PAGES</u></b>
Master Schedule	2
Paper Presentations Schedule	3-5
Workshop Schedule	6
Conference Announcements & Special Events	7-11
Paper Abstracts Listed by Session	12-28
Poster Titles Listed by Session	29-53

**2024 PROGRAM COMMITTEE:** Jennifer Trueblood (Chair), Silvia Saccardo, and Berkeley Dietvorst

**THANKS TO:** Kate Wessels (Conference Coordinator), Dave Hardisty (Webmaster), Joe Simmons (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, David Munguia Gomez, Avni Shah (Underrepresented Scholars Committee), Ellen Evers (Student Poster Award), Quentin Andre, Celia Gaertig, Alex Imas, Yoel Inbar, Ben Newell, Christopher Olivola, Elanor Williams (Einhorn Award Committee), Adelle Yang, Eyal Peer, Samuel Hirshman (Beattie Committee), Dan Schley (LLM program assistance)

**THANKS TO:** SJDM ad hoc reviewers: Ada Aka, On Amir, Alix Barasch, Dan Bartels, Jonathan Berman, Sudeep Bhatia, Amit Bhattacharjee, Rahul Bhui, Brad Bitterly, Hayley Blunden, Jonathan Bogard, Stephen Broomell, Melanie Brucks, Eva Buechel, Katherine Burson, Edward Chang, Shereen Chaudhry, Stephanie Chen, Helen Colby, Benjamin Converse, Cynthia Cryder, Corey Cusimano, Hengchen Dai, Junyi Dai, Jason Dana, David Daniels, Bart De Langhe, Michael DeKay, Kristin Donnelly, Charles Dorison, Julie Downs, Kristen Duke, Margaret Echelbarger, Ioannis Evangelidis, Daniel Feiler, Geoff Fisher, Liz Friedman, Celia Gaertig, Ayelet Gneezy, Dan Goldstein, Russell Golman, Serena Hagerty, Kareem Haggag, David Hagmann, Crystal Hall, Uriel Haran, William Hayes, Hal Hershfield, Stefan Herzog, Samuel Hirshman, Janina Hoffmann, Beidi Hu, Martha Jeong, Leslie John, Minah Jung, Polly Kang, Natalia Karelaia, Uma Karmarkar, Erika Kirgios, Joowon Klusowski, Ian Krajbich, Ariella Kristal, Amit Kumar, Daniella Kupor, Peter Kvam, Robyn LeBoeuf, Jennifer Lerner, David Levari, Emma Levine, Ye Li, Yanjun Liu, Jingyi Lu, Shenghua Luan, Cade Massey, John McCoy, Craig McKenzie, Andrew Meyer, Katherine Milkman, Robert A. Mislavsky, Daniel Mochon, Alice Moon, Don Moore, Johannes Muller Trede, Nathan Novemsky, Ed O'Brien, Christopher Olivola, Daniel Oppenheimer, Thorsten Pachur, Asa Palley, Hannah Perfecto, Jonathan Pettibone, Timothy Pleskac, Ori Plonsky, Elena Reutskaja, Jane Risen, David Rothschild, Rebecca Schaumberg, Juliana Schroeder, Daniel Schwartz, Irene Scopelliti, Sydney Scott, Ovul Sezer, Franklin Shaddy, Avni Shah, Anuj Shah, Marissa Sharif, Luxi Shen, Joseph Simmons, Samuel Skowronek, Stephanie Smith, Tatiana Sokolova, Mikhail Spektor, Stephen Spiller, Nicolette Sullivan, Abigail Sussman, David Tannenbaum, Kinneret Teodorescu, Neil Thakral, Anna Thoma, Claire Tsai, Brandon Turner, Marlon Twyman, Oleg Urminsky, Eric VanEpps, Guy Voicheck, Evan Weingarten, Elanor Williams, Paul Windschitl, Kaitlin Woolley, Adelle Yang, Yang Yang, Jiaying Zhao, Julian Zlatev

**2024 SJDM Conference Master Schedule**  
**NYC Marriott Marquis Times Square**  
**November 22-25, 2024**

NYC Marriott Marquis Times Square: 1535 Broadway, New York, NY 10036

**FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22<sup>nd</sup>**

- 4:30-6:30 pm     **Registration** (*7<sup>th</sup> Floor Foyer*) \*NOTE: Welcome Reception Starts at 5:00 pm\*
- 3:45-5:00 pm     **Underrepresented Scholars in SJDM Networking Event** (*Skylobby; 16<sup>th</sup> Floor*)  
\*All SJDM Members Welcome to Attend\*
- 5:00-7:00 pm     **Welcome Reception** (*Astor Ballroom; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*) \*All SJDM Members Welcome to Attend\*
- 7:30-9:30 pm     Executive Board Dinner (*Off-site invite only*)

**SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 23<sup>rd</sup>**

- 7:45-9:00 am     **Registration** (*7<sup>th</sup> Floor Foyer*)
- 8:30-9:30 am     **Paper Session #1** (*Soho Complex; Empire Complex; Duffy & Columbia; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*)
- 9:45-10:45 am    **Paper Session #2** (*Soho Complex; Empire Complex; Duffy & Columbia; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*)
- 11:00 am-12:00 pm **Paper Session #3** (*Soho Complex; Empire Complex; Duffy & Columbia; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*)
- 12:00-1:15 pm    Lunch Break (on your own)
- 1:15-2:15 pm     **Keynote Address: Iris Bohnet** (*Astor Ballroom; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*)
- 2:30-3:30 pm     **Paper Session #4** (*Soho Complex; Empire Complex; Duffy & Columbia; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*)
- 3:45-4:45 pm     **Paper Session #5** (*Soho Complex; Empire Complex; Duffy & Columbia; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*)
- 5:00-6:00 pm     **Paper Session #6** (*Soho Complex; Empire Complex; Duffy & Columbia; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*)
- 6:15-8:15 pm     **Graduate Student Social Event** (*Skylobby; 16<sup>th</sup> Floor*)

**SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 24<sup>th</sup>**

- 8:30-9:30 am     **Poster Session #1** (*Broadway Ballroom North, South, Majestic, Shubert; 6<sup>th</sup> Floor*)
- 9:45-10:45 am    **Paper Session #7** (*Soho Complex; Empire Complex; Duffy & Columbia; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*)
- 11:00 am-12:00 pm **Presidential Address: Joseph Simmons** (*Astor Ballroom; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*)
- 12:00-1:15 pm    Lunch Break (on your own)
- 1:15-2:15 pm     **Paper Session #8** (*Soho Complex; Empire Complex; Duffy & Columbia; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*)
- 2:30-3:30 pm     **Paper Session #9** (*Soho Complex; Empire Complex; Duffy & Columbia; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*)
- 3:45-4:25 pm     **Awards Ceremony and Einhorn Award Address** (*Astor Ballroom; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*)
- 4:30-5:30 pm     **Poster Session #2** (*Broadway Ballroom North, South, Majestic, Shubert; 6<sup>th</sup> Floor*)

**MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25<sup>th</sup>**

- 8:30-9:30 am     **Business Meeting w/ Complimentary Breakfast** (*Astor Ballroom; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*) \*All SJDM Members Welcome to Attend\*
- 9:45-10:45 am    **Workshops and Panel Discussions #1** (*Soho Complex; Empire Complex; Duffy & Columbia; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*) \*All SJDM Members Welcome to Attend\*
- 11:00 am-12:00 pm **Workshops and Panel Discussions #2** (*Soho Complex; Empire Complex; Duffy & Columbia; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*) \*All SJDM Members Welcome to Attend\*

<b>SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 2024</b>			
<b>Rooms - Marriott Marquis - Soho Complex, Empire Complex, Duffy &amp; Columbia</b>			
	<b>Track I Soho Complex</b>	<b>Track II Empire Complex</b>	<b>Track III Duffy &amp; Columbia</b>
<b>Session #1</b>	<b>Beliefs and Learning</b>	<b>Risk and Uncertainty</b>	<b>Communication Strategies</b>
<b>8:30 AM</b>	Selimaj - How does new information influence the uncertainty of individual's beliefs?	Lenkovskaya - Recalculating Ambiguity Aversion: How Numerical Cognition Determines Preferences for Precise versus Imprecise Probabilities and Outcomes	Sezer - Too Slow to Hire: Reply Speed Penalties in Hiring Decisions
<b>8:50 AM</b>	Hirshman - (Mis)perceptions of stability and learning	Scheibehenne - Range as Variability	Dorison - Write Shorter Messages
<b>9:10 AM</b>	Moore - How Information Homogeneity and Unknown Unknowns Suppress the Confidence-Accuracy Correlation	Li - Reference-Point Theory: An Account of Preferences for Ambiguity and Risk	Lasky-Fink - Government outreach and resident decision-making: Does the modality or message matter more?
<b>Session #2</b>	<b>Resource Allocation</b>	<b>Consideration Sets</b>	<b>Belief and Intuition</b>
<b>9:45 AM</b>	Su - Should I Take a Pay Cut for My Partner to Get a Raise? Partners' Decisions Increase Inequality	Vanunu - Coping with complexity: A selective sampling account of how people form consideration sets of product bundles.	Dannals - Conveying frequency distributions: When most is stronger than average
<b>10:05 AM</b>	Nahari - Are random devices fair for allocating resources? Why people use them less for losses than gains	Amir - Consideration Set Entry Order is Crucial: Theory and Evidence from the Lab and Field	Oktar - How Beliefs Persist Amid Controversy: The Paths to Persistence Model
<b>10:25 AM</b>	Lee - The Interplay of Equality and Financial Needs in Parental Bequests	Yang - Beyond the consideration set: The dynamics of memory-based decisions	Geiser - People Underappreciate the Aggregate Impact of Unlikely Events
<b>Session #3</b>	<b>Experience and Exploration</b>	<b>Misperceptions in Measurement and Intervention</b>	<b>Diversity in Organizations</b>
<b>11:00 AM</b>	Rao - Deconstructing human algorithms for exploration in complex environments with opportunities for social learning	Moon - When Zero Feels Less Informative in Willingness-to-Pay (WTP): Market Price Perception Influences WTP	Munguia Gomez - How interpretations of socioeconomic advantage and disadvantage influence college admissions
<b>11:20 AM</b>	Kim - Let's Try Something New: People Prefer Sharing Novel Experiences with Others	De la Rosa - Improving Income Elicitation Methods to Increase Income Reporting: Evidence from Two Large-Scale Field Experiments Among Government Benefit Applicants	Chang - Evaluating the effect of shortlist quotas on gender diversity
<b>11:40 AM</b>	Luckman - Choosing between experienced or described information in risky choice: what causes preference for descriptions?	Reiff - On the Conditional Effects of Appealing to Impact	Liao - Leaky Pipeline: Failing to Promote Women Does Not Harm Perceptions of Diversity Efforts

**SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 2024**

**Rooms - Marriott Marquis - Soho Complex, Empire Complex, Duffy & Columbia**

	<b>Track I Soho Complex</b>	<b>Track II Empire Complex</b>	<b>Track III Duffy &amp; Columbia</b>
<b>Session #4</b>	<b>Modeling Choice Patterns</b>	<b>Nudges</b>	<b>Confidence and Calibration</b>
<b>2:30 PM</b>	Silverman - A Computational Model for Encouraging Flow through Streaks	Ekstrom - Creating pro-environmental behavior change: Economic incentives or norm-nudges?	Spiller - Widely-Used Measures of Overconfidence Are Confounded With Ability
<b>2:50 PM</b>	Bugbee - A Theoretical Integration for Sequential Decisions from Experience in Optimal Stopping Tasks and Beyond	Linós - Testing the limits of behavioral nudges	Chin - How Should I Know? Lack of Confidence Biases Stock Market Expectations Downward
<b>3:10 PM</b>	Wang - A Dual-Threshold Theory of Choice Deferral: Experimental Insights, Quantitative Modeling, and Algorithmic Choice Architecture Design	Briscese - Why and when nudges work? Experimental evidence on College Savings Accounts	Ryan - People are (Shockingly) Bad at Valuing Hedges
<b>Session #5</b>	<b>Well-being and Prosocial Behavior</b>	<b>Interactions and Heterogeneity</b>	<b>Temporal Framing</b>
<b>3:45 PM</b>	Kang - Massive field quasi-experiments reveal inverted-U causal links between mood and prosocial decisions	Montealegre - GAMify Spotlight and Floodlight: How Assuming Linearity Partially or Totally Broke Probed Interactions in Four Recent Published Papers	Fang - Revealing Your Past vs. Unveiling Your Future: Which Elicits Greater Interest?
<b>4:05 PM</b>	Fiedler - Assessing the Impact of Basic Income on Well-Being: Evidence from a RCT in a High-Income Country	Krefeld-Schwalb - Using Cognitive Variables to Explain Why Effect Sizes Differ in the Behavioral Sciences.	Zhang - Medium Induces Patience in Intertemporal Choices
<b>4:25 PM</b>	Jaroszewicz - A Randomized Controlled Trial on the Provision of Financial and Social Capital to Low-Income Households in the United States	Banerjee - Heterogeneity in Reader Engagement: Analyzing the Impact of Language-Based Constructs Across Multiple News Types	Faro - Temporal Frames of Life Expectancy
<b>Session #6</b>	<b>Beliefs and Biases</b>	<b>Risk and Rewards</b>	<b>Gender Differences</b>
<b>5:00 PM</b>	Mertes - Information Partitioning, Learning, and Beliefs	Evangelidis - The Multiplicity Effect	Moore - Beliefs about Gender Differences in Social Preferences
<b>5:20 PM</b>	Chen - Sticky Intuition: Following your intuition makes you less likely to change your mind than following a structured process	Chen - Windfall, similarity, and mental accounting	Townsend - A Preference for Women Negotiation Partners: An Examination of Gender-Based Partner Effects
<b>5:40 PM</b>	Suchow - Are Cognitive Biases Relevant To Everyday Judgment and Decision Making?	Zhao - Making rewards uncertain increases recycling behavior	Chang - When Women Self-Promote: The Hidden Consequences

<b>SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 2024</b>			
<b>Rooms - Marriott Marquis - Soho Complex, Empire Complex, Duffy &amp; Columbia</b>			
	<b>Track I Soho Complex</b>	<b>Track II Empire Complex</b>	<b>Track III Duffy &amp; Columbia</b>
<b>Session #7</b>	<b>Influencing Beliefs</b>	<b>Human and AI Decisions</b>	<b>Social and Moral Judgment</b>
<b>9:45 AM</b>	Geers - The Political (A)Symmetry of Metacognitive Insight Into Detecting Misinformation	Wertebroch - How to Explain Unexplainable Algorithmic Decisions to Consumers	Le Pargneux - Moral Judgment is Sensitive to Bargaining Power
<b>10:05 AM</b>	Voelkel - Megastudy identifying effective treatments to strengthen American's democratic attitudes	Berger - Hybrid Confirmation Trees: A Cost-Effective Approach to Combining Human and AI Decisions	Schlund - You Knew What You Were Getting Into: Perspective Differences in Perceiving Informed Consent
<b>10:25 AM</b>	Zhang - The Power of Meta-Prediction: Leveraging Meta-Prediction Accuracy to Enhance Collective and Individual Intelligence	Kim - Does AI diminish people's sense of entitlement to work-related rewards?	Kray - Not all powerful people are created equal: An examination of gender and pathways to social hierarchy through the lens of social cognition
<b>Session #8</b>	<b>Moral Judgment</b>	<b>Multi-attribute Choice</b>	<b>Race and Gender</b>
<b>1:15 PM</b>	Erensoy - Glass Half Empty: How Pessimism Is Seen as a Moral Failing	Cai - Where are the context effects?	Madanay - Love them or hate them, female physicians' personalities matter: A large-scale text analysis of online physician written reviews
<b>1:35 PM</b>	Roberts - Disclosing shortcomings in morality, sociability, and competence: Differing effects on trust	Bhatia - The Structure of Everyday Choice: Insights from 100K Real-life Decision Problems	Singh - Rationing by Race
<b>1:55 PM</b>	Yudkin - A Large-Scale Investigation of Everyday Moral Dilemmas	Pink - Superstar neglect: Choices reflect a focus on averages at the expense of outliers	Daniels - Racial Discrimination in Online Job Negotiations
<b>Session #9</b>	<b>Framing Aid and Benefits</b>	<b>Advice</b>	<b>Over- and Under-estimation</b>
<b>2:30 PM</b>	Brody - Striving to Survive or to Thrive? The Effect of Agency Frames on Aid Seeking	Bigman - Advice in Moral Dilemmas Increases Blame	Eskreis-Winkler - The Failure Gap
<b>2:50 PM</b>	Sun - A Co-Branding Conundrum: Consumers Underuse Co-Branded Credit Cards Outside of Their Featured Brands	Plonsky - Learning to be algorithm averse: People follow advisors that align with their biases	Kardosh - The Illusion of Diversity
<b>3:10 PM</b>	Shine - Consumer Evaluations of Corporate Altruism: The Role of Company Cost and Social Benefit	Kausel - Gender and Advice Taking: A Meta-Analytic Path Model	Schaumberg - Are frogs more forgiving than acorns anticipate?

<b>MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 2024</b> <b>Workshops and Panel Discussions</b> <b>Rooms - Marriott Marquis - Soho Complex, Empire Complex, Duffy &amp; Columbia</b>			
	<b>Track I</b> <b>Soho Complex</b>	<b>Track II</b> <b>Empire Complex</b>	<b>Track III</b> <b>Duffy &amp; Columbia</b>
<b>9:45 am</b>	Lupoli, Albarracín, Spiller, Kouchaki - Beyond Open Science: Innovations to the Publication Process to Improve the Quality of Published Work	Hackenburg, Rand, Hewitt, Schroeder - How to use large language models (LLMs) in JDM research	Krajbich, Yang, Desai, Aka - Windows into the choice process: A workshop on online eye-tracking, mouse- tracking, and text analysis with LLMs (Part 1)
<b>11:00 am</b>	Weber, Peters, Bruine de Bruin, Sleboda - Insights from Judgment and Decision-Making for Climate Change Communications	Hu, Bhatia, Yeomans - Making Robust Inferences from Text Data: LLMs and the Natural Language Processing Toolkit	Krajbich, Yang, Desai, Aka - Windows into the choice process: A workshop on online eye-tracking, mouse- tracking, and text analysis with LLMs (Part 2)

**Workshop and panel discussion abstracts are available on pages 9-11.**

## 2024 SJDM Conference Announcements & Special Events

### GUIDE TO NEW YORK CITY

Psychonomics' guide to New York City and the local area can be found here:  
<https://www.psychonomic.org/page/2024exploreny>

### FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22<sup>nd</sup>

4:30-6:30 pm **Registration**  
*7<sup>th</sup> Floor Foyer*

3:45-5:00 pm **Underrepresented Scholars (US) in SJDM Networking Event**  
*Skylobby; 16<sup>th</sup> Floor*  
*Check-in for the US in SJDM event begins at 3:45 pm. Programming begins promptly at 4:00 pm.*

\*All\* are welcome to join our fifth 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 David Munguia Gomez, Erika Kirgios, and Avni Shah.*

**Thank you to the Generous Sponsors of the 2024  
Underrepresented Scholars in SJDM Event!**

 <p><b>Yale SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT</b> <i>Center for Customer Insights</i></p>	 <p><b>CHICAGO BOOTH</b> <small>THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO BOOTH SCHOOL OF BUSINESS</small></p>
 <p><b>BEAR</b> Behavioural Economics in Action at Rotman</p>	 <p><b>Yale SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT</b> <i>Initiative on Leadership and Organization</i></p>

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

5:00-7:00 pm **Welcome Reception**  
*Astor Ballroom; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*

### SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 23<sup>rd</sup>

7:45-9:00 am **Registration**  
*7<sup>th</sup> Floor Foyer*

12:00-1:15 pm **Lunch Break**

*On your own. Conference resumes at 1:15 pm in the Astor Ballroom.*

1:15-2:15 pm **Keynote Address: Fairness is Not a Program but a Way of Doing Things**

*Astor Ballroom; 7<sup>th</sup> Floor*

*Algorithmic fairness is the process of ensuring that algorithms and their outcomes are unbiased and don't discriminate against individuals or groups based on a common definition of equity in AI. As important as working towards more algorithmic fairness is (very!), more scrutiny is also required to assess the many practices and procedures that impact fairness at work not (exclusively) based on AI, including interview, performance appraisal or pay setting processes, or even the design of resumes, the organization of a meeting or the selection of Nobel Laureates. Instead of focusing on how to debias these processes, most organizations have tried to debias employees' mindsets through diversity and similar training programs instead—to little avail. In this talk, I present evidence, whenever possible collected in randomized controlled trials, on how equity can be embedded into everything we do, and what impact this has on outcomes such as pay, representation, and career advancement.*

**Iris Bohnet**, Harvard University

*Iris Bohnet is the Albert Pratt Professor of Business and Government and the co-director of the Women and Public Policy Program at Harvard Kennedy School. She is a behavioral economist, combining insights from economics and psychology to improve decision-making in organizations and society, often with a gender perspective. Her most recent research examines behavioral design to embed equity at work. She is the author of the award-winning book *What Works: Gender Equality by Design* and co-author of the forthcoming book *Make Work Fair*. She presently serves as the faculty director of the social sciences at Harvard Radcliffe Institute and on a number of boards and advisory boards. She is the recipient of several awards and honorary degrees and was named one of the Most Influential Academics in Government and one of the most Influential People in Gender Policy by *apolitical*. Iris received her PhD in economics from the University of Zurich, is married, and the mother of two children.*

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

*Skylobby; 16<sup>th</sup> Floor*

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!

## **SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 24<sup>th</sup>**

8:30-9:30 am **Poster Session 1** w/ Continental Breakfast

*Broadway Ballroom North, South, Majestic, Shubert, 6th Floor*

(Note: The ballroom will be open to Poster presenters only from the morning of 11/24)

8:30-9:30 am **Meet the Directors of Decision, Risk, and Management Sciences at the NSF**

*Poster Session 1, Broadway Ballroom North, South, Majestic, Shubert, 6th Floor*

*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 the 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 advancing knowledge of judgment and decision-making, decision aids, risk analysis and communication among many other topics. 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. DRMS also supports Doctoral*



*Dissertation Research Improvement Grants (DDRIGs), CAREER, and Mid-Career Advancement grants.*

11:00-12:00 pm **Presidential Address: It's Been Crazy**  
*Astor Ballroom; 7th Floor*

*Fifteen years ago, researchers rarely shared their materials, almost never shared their data, and actually never pre-registered their studies. Today, many researchers do these things. The field is better. Which is great. But now that we have gotten good(ish) at transparency, it's time to get better at knowing what to do with that transparency, at understanding how to evaluate (both published and unpublished) research. In this presentation, I'll share some of the lessons we've learned about how to do this, along the way discussing markers of truth and un-truth, of credibility and craziness.*

**Joseph Simmons**, Dorothy Silberberg Professor of Applied Statistics / Professor of Operations, Information, and Decisions, University of Pennsylvania

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

3:45-4:25 pm **Awards and Einhorn Award Address**  
*Astor Ballroom; 7th Floor*  
Winners of the *Best Student Poster Award*, *Best Paper Award*, and *Einhorn Award* will be announced. The *Einhorn Award* winner will present their research.

4:30-5:30 pm **Poster Session 2 w/ Cash Bar**  
*Broadway Ballroom North, South, Majestic, Shubert, 6th Floor*

4:30-5:30 pm **Meet the Directors of Decision, Risk, and Management Sciences at the NSF**  
*Poster Session 2, Broadway Ballroom North, South, Majestic, Shubert, 6th Floor*

## **MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25<sup>th</sup>**

8:30-9:30 am **Business Meeting** with Complimentary Breakfast  
*Astor Ballroom; 7th Floor*

9:45-10:45 am **Workshops and Panel Discussions #1**  
*Soho Complex; Empire Complex; Duffy & Columbia; 7th Floor*

**Beyond Open Science: Innovations to the Publication Process to Improve the Quality of Published Work** (*Soho Complex*)

*Matt Lupoli (Monash University), Dolores Albarracín (University of Pennsylvania), Stephen Spiller (University of California, Los Angeles), Maryam Kouchaki (Northwestern University)*

*Open science practices are currently elevating the quality of published work in our field. However, some would argue that more can and should be done in this regard. In this panel, we will hear from individuals with power to catalyze such changes: editors at top journals in major constituent fields of JDM. Panelists will first review recent and upcoming innovations to the publication process at their respective journals that may help ensure the quality of published papers. A discussion will follow about other possible innovations to the publication/review process, their potential advantages and drawbacks, and how they might be implemented. The session will close with audience Q&A.*

## **How to use large language models (LLMs) in JDM research**

*Kobi Hackenburg (Oxford University), David Rand (MIT), Luke Hewitt (Stanford), Hope Schroeder (MIT) (Empire Complex)*

*This special session explores how JDM researchers can leverage large language models (LLMs) like GPT to enhance their research. Leading experts will present research findings as well as practical "how-to" demonstrations and Q&A. Kobi Hackenburg (Oxford) will showcase using LLMs to generate persuasive messages. David Rand (MIT) will demonstrate how LLMs can be integrated into survey platforms like Qualtrics for real-time participant interaction, quality control, and content evaluation. Luke Hewitt (Stanford) will show how LLMs can be used to predict treatment effects in experiments. Hope Schroeder (MIT) will discuss how LLMs can be best used for analyzing qualitative free-text response data.*

## **Windows into the choice process: A workshop on online eye-tracking, mouse-tracking, and text analysis with LLMs (Part 1) (Duffy & Columbia)**

*Ian Krajbich (University of California, Los Angeles), Xiaozhi Yang (University of California, Los Angeles), Nitisha Desai (Duke), Ada Aka (Stanford)*

*Judgment and decision-making research is often concerned with the process by which people make decisions, and process models deserve process data. In the past, process data has been costly and challenging to acquire. But times are changing. In this workshop, we will introduce three affordable ways to quickly and easily collect (and analyze) process data online, including webcam-based eye-tracking, mouse-tracking, and large language models (e.g., for analyzing think-aloud protocols). Each topic will feature a different speaker who will introduce the tool and provide a hands-on tutorial with example code (available at [https://github.com/krajbichlab/sjdm\\_process\\_tracing\\_workshop](https://github.com/krajbichlab/sjdm_process_tracing_workshop)).*

11:00-12:00 pm

## **Workshops and Panel Discussions #2**

*Soho Complex; Empire Complex; Duffy & Columbia; 7th Floor*

## **Insights from Judgment and Decision-Making for Climate Change Communications (Soho Complex)**

*Elke Weber (Princeton University), Ellen Peters (University of Oregon), Wändi Bruine de Bruin (University of Southern California), Patrycja Sleboda (Baruch College, City University of New York)*

*Climate scientists have long warned that climate change is a serious threat, but their communication strategies have not always been successful. Research in judgment and decision-making (JDM) offers valuable tools for understanding how people respond to risks and how to design effective communications. Our panelists Elke Weber, Ellen Peters, Wändi Bruine de Bruin, and Patrycja Sleboda will discuss their JDM research on climate change, what motivated them to work on this topic, and what impacts they have had on climate change communications. The insights shared should be useful for JDM-ers who want to work on climate change, as well as other policy topics.*

## **Making Robust Inferences from Text Data: LLMs and the Natural Language Processing Toolkit (Empire Complex)**

*Xinlan Emily Hu (University of Pennsylvania), Sudeep Bhatia (University of Pennsylvania), and Michael Yeomans (Imperial College London)*

*Many of our judgment and decision-making processes unfold through language - as individuals, we use words to introspect and reason; in groups, we debate and reach verbal agreements. The JDM field is thus rich with text data, including verbal protocols, survey responses, social media posts, and conversations. This workshop aims to equip JDM scholars with the necessary tools to study text data with rigor. Techniques covered include lexicons, topic models, sentence embeddings, and best practices for using large language models (LLMs) to extract psychological concepts. Discussion will include validity, reproducibility, and applications at both the individual and collective levels.*

**Windows into the choice process: A workshop on online eye-tracking, mouse-tracking, and text analysis with LLMs (Part 2)** (Duffy & Columbia)

*Ian Krajbich (University of California, Los Angeles), Xiaozhi Yang (University of California, Los Angeles), Nitisha Desai (Duke), Ada Aka (Stanford)*

*SJDM is committed to diversity, equity, the professional exchange of ideas, and respectful treatment of all members. Please see our code of conduct: [tinyurl.com/c9w42pmp](https://tinyurl.com/c9w42pmp)*

*SJDM encourages reporting of all perceived incidents of harassment, discrimination, retaliation, or other prohibited behaviors taking place at the conference. If you believe you have been the victim of or witnessed such misconduct, we urge you to fill out the following form: [tinyurl.com/3yxxzux3](https://tinyurl.com/3yxxzux3)*

**Please note that SJDM has access to the following:**

**Wellness Room**

**7<sup>th</sup> floor in Harlem**

A wellness room is available at the hotel for meditation, administering self-injections, or other quiet needs during the meeting. The room will be open daily per the following times. The room is equipped with refrigeration. Attendees may not use this room for babysitting purposes and should respect a quiet environment in this space.

Fri 7 AM – 6 PM

Sat 7 AM – 6 PM

Sun 7 AM – 7 PM

Monday 7 AM – 11 AM

---

**Nursing Mothers Room**

**6<sup>th</sup> floor near North Registration Desk**

*Note: The room will be locked so guests should go to the main registration desk, which is located on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor, to ask for access.*

This is a single occupancy room equipped with a chair, cleaning supplies, and a refrigerator. Any items stored in the refrigerator are the sole responsibility of guests, and neither the hotel nor Psychonomics Society/SJDM accepts liability for refrigerated items.

# SATURDAY NOVEMBER 23, 2024

Rooms - Marriott Marquis - Soho Complex, Empire Complex, Duffy & Columbia

## **Session #1 Track I: Beliefs and learning - Marriott - Soho Complex - Saturday 8:30 am - 9:30 am**

### **How does new information influence the uncertainty of individual's beliefs?**

Langer, Thomas (University of Muenster); Mohrschladt, Hannes (University of Muenster); Selimaj, Edona (University of Muenster)

Individuals' belief updating has been extensively examined in experimental settings with two states of the world. However, focusing on two states only does not allow to disentangle the effect of newly received information on (1) the expected state of the world and (2) the dispersion of state probability distribution. To address this research gap, we conducted two experiments with multi-state settings to examine the normative and behavioral implications of new information for the formation of beliefs with respect to state probability dispersion. We demonstrate that individuals do not adequately account for the variance of the prior or the volatility-reducing effect of the signal sets. Contact: edona.selimaj@wiwi.uni-muenster.de

### **(Mis)perceptions of stability and learning**

Hirshman, Samuel (Norwegian School of Economics); Imas, Alex (University of Chicago)

Expectations are critical inputs to behavior. We study how people update their beliefs in stable vs. unstable environments. We document two novel empirical facts using learning experiments with simple data generating processes. People in stable environments update their beliefs "as-if" the environment is unstable. They update their beliefs too much in response to new signals. People in simple unstable environments underreact to change. When told about the possibility of change, people do not update their beliefs enough. They also update more accurately in an environment calibrated to prior participants' perceptions of stability. Our results suggest a fundamental misperception of stability. Contact: samuel.hirshman@nhh.no

### **How Information Homogeneity and Unknown Unknowns Suppress the Confidence-Accuracy Correlation**

Zhang, Yunhao (University of California - Berkeley); Moore, Don (University of California - Berkeley)

Why does past literature tend to find a weak confidence-accuracy correlation? Expanding upon the necessary and sufficient conditions for confidence to predict accuracy, we theoretically characterize (and experimentally verify) four general paradigms showing how heterogeneity of expertise stemming from known unknown versus unknown unknown determines the correlation. In particular, we demonstrate that unknown unknowns could suppress this correlation, even among cognizant agents without self-serving bias. In addition, we show that the weight on advice measure could predict accuracy more robustly. Contact: dm@berkeley.edu

## **Session #1 Track II: Risk and uncertainty - Marriott - Empire Complex - Saturday 8:30 am - 9:30 am**

### **Recalculating Ambiguity Aversion: How Numerical Cognition Determines Preferences for Precise versus Imprecise Probabilities and Outcomes**

Lenkovskaya, Marina (Erasmus University Rotterdam); Sweldens, Steven (Erasmus University Rotterdam)

We argue that two principles of numeric cognition underlie ambiguity aversion, the tendency for people to prefer precise options over imprecise ranges with the same expected value. First, we outline how the progressive compression of the mental number line can explain the emergence of ambiguity aversion. Second, we show how left-digit effects on range boundaries can significantly moderate ambiguity aversion. Seven studies (29 experiments; N = 9,531), show how these principles jointly predict ambiguity attitudes across various contexts (lotteries, vaccines, product reviews, lifespans, investment products, etc.), domains (gains, losses), and numerical formats (probabilities, outcomes). Contact: lenkovskaya@rsm.nl

### **Range as Variability**

Liu, Tianwei (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology); Scheibehenne, Benjamin (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology)

Variance and SD are common metrics of variability, but range is more often used in daily life and easier to understand. We hypothesize that people rely more on range than SD when judging variability. Based on 4 experiments (n = 828) and a cognitive model, we find that decision makers used range over SD when the two metrics disagree (Ex. 1). Range increases with sample size, affecting perceived variability and risky decisions (Ex. 2 and 3). Mental simulations of samples are confined by experienced range, so that too fewer mentally simulated cases lied outside the experienced range (Ex. 4). Our

findings have implications for research on overconfidence, risk perception, and communication. Contact: [scheibehenne@kit.edu](mailto:scheibehenne@kit.edu)

### **Reference-Point Theory: An Account of Preferences for Ambiguity and Risk**

Mellers, Barbara (University of Pennsylvania); Li, Yingqi (University of Pennsylvania)

We investigate risky and ambiguous preferences in gain and loss domains. When participants make incentivized choices under just risk or just ambiguity, patterns are similar; people are risk averse and ambiguity averse with gains and risk seeking and ambiguity seeking with losses. When participants make incentivized choices between risky and ambiguous options, their preferences reflect; people are ambiguity seeking with small probabilities of gains and large probabilities of losses and ambiguity averse with large probabilities of gains and small probabilities of losses. Results can be described by a new account of preferences called reference-point theory. Contact: [liyingqi@wharton.upenn.edu](mailto:liyingqi@wharton.upenn.edu)

### **Session #1 Track III: Communication strategies - Marriott - Duffy & Columbia - Saturday 8:30 am - 9:30 am**

#### **Too Slow to Hire: Reply Speed Penalties in Hiring Decisions**

Hart, Einav (George Mason University); VanEpps, Eric (Vanderbilt University); Sezer, Ovul (Cornell University); Amir, On (University of California - San Diego)

Employers and service providers increasingly engage in pre-purchase communication. Existing work suggests that people overestimate how fast they are expected to reply. In three experiments (N=2,655) and marketplace transaction data (N~6.5 million), we show that responders are in fact punished for slower replies. Though senders report that they do not expect immediate replies, providers who reply slowly (vs. faster) are perceived as less warm and less competent, and are less likely to be hired. In our marketplace data, even delays of 5-10 minutes reduce a provider's likelihood of being hired. These findings have implications for decisions of service providers, managers, and market designers. Contact: [einavi@gmail.com](mailto:einavi@gmail.com)

#### **Write Shorter Messages**

Dorison, Charlie (Georgetown University); Rogers, Todd (Harvard University)

Life involves a lot of writing and reading. Yet writing often fails to achieve its goals. We study the consequences of writing shorter messages (i.e., reducing words by eliminating supportive details). Across three field experiments (N=836,927) and five survey experiments (N=2,278), people were more likely to read and act in response to shorter written messages, though they did not predict this. At the same time, shorter written messages were perceived as less important. Put differently, people were more likely to read and respond to precisely the messages they believed were less important. We discuss theoretical implications for the cognitive psychology of written communication. Contact: [charles.dorison@georgetown.edu](mailto:charles.dorison@georgetown.edu)

#### **Government outreach and resident decision-making: Does the modality or message matter more?**

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

A large body of research examines methods of increasing the effectiveness and persuasiveness of government communications by testing different behaviorally-informed messages. We extend this literature by testing the effect of different communication design choices - specifically message length, simplicity, and modality - on resident engagement and behavior. In two randomized field experiments across distinct policy contexts (total N = 395,889), we demonstrate that variations in communication design have a greater impact on resident behavior than message content. These findings have immediate implications for policymakers and point to a number of promising directions for future research. Contact: [jessica\\_lasky-fink@hks.harvard.edu](mailto:jessica_lasky-fink@hks.harvard.edu)

### **Session #2 Track I: Resource allocation - Marriott - Soho Complex - Saturday 9:45 am - 10:45 am**

#### **Should I Take a Pay Cut for My Partner to Get a Raise? Partners' Decisions Increase Inequality**

Su, Tong (University of Chicago); Choshen-Hillel, Shoham (Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Fishbach, Ayelet (University of Chicago)

This paper explores how couples navigate competing priorities between maximizing joint income and achieving income equality. Six pre-registered studies (N=1,965) find that the more unequal romantic partners are in income, the more likely they are to make decisions that further increase inequality (e.g., less equal couples are more likely to accept a pay cut for the lower earner to secure a raise for the higher earner). Moreover, once couples choose joint income over equality, they become more inclined to continue accepting such tradeoffs, leading to an escalation of inequality between partners. Our findings reveal that perceived joint ownership underlies the escalation of inequality. Contact: [tong.su@chicagobooth.edu](mailto:tong.su@chicagobooth.edu)

### **Are random devices fair for allocating resources? Why people use them less for losses than gains**

Nahari, Yair (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Shaw, Alex (University of Chicago); Choshen-Hillel, Shoham (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

The literature has concluded that when resources cannot be allocated equally, decision-makers opt to use random allocation devices. Here we argue that this tendency is limited to the domain of allocating benefits. When inflicting losses, however, decision-makers are hesitant to use randomization procedures. In four studies (N = 819), we show that participants are less likely to use random devices for losses (e.g., pay cuts) than gains (e.g., bonuses). This different approach is mediated by participants' concerns with dissatisfaction and complaints of the disadvantaged party. We discuss these findings in light of fairness theories and highlight their implications. Contact: yair.nahari@mail.huji.ac.il

### **The Interplay of Equality and Financial Needs in Parental Bequests**

Lee, Chang-Yuan (University of Toronto); Hossain, Tanjim (University of Toronto)

We propose that parents' bequest decisions reflect a combination of two conflicting forces: the tendency to divide the assets equally between children and the desire to bequeath more to a child in greater financial need. In a series of experiments manipulating children's incomes, we find that parents bequeath more to the lower-income child when the income difference between children is larger and when children's incomes are lower, due to a greater difference in perceived financial needs between children. The level of unequal bequests diminishes as parents' total assets increase. Lastly, we explore potential discrepancies between parents' bequests and children's preferred distributions. Contact: leecy@bu.edu

### **Session #2 Track II: Consideration sets - Marriott - Empire Complex - Saturday 9:45 am - 10:45 am**

#### **Coping with complexity: A selective sampling account of how people form consideration sets of product bundles.**

Vanunu, Yonatan (Tel Aviv University); Urminsky, Oleg (University of Chicago); Bartels, Daniel (University of Chicago)

How do people choose among a large variety of complex options? We propose that selective attention, influenced by both goals and display format, plays a critical role in forming consideration sets of complex product bundles. Experimental and computational-model evidence suggests that bundles providing high-value on less important items are often excluded from consideration unless these items are listed first, while the impact of the important items is less affected by display format. Bundles in the consideration set are then more likely to be chosen over similar novel options. Strategically placing attractive offers on less important items in distinctive locations may prove advantageous. Contact: yyv1984@gmail.com

#### **Consideration Set Entry Order is Crucial: Theory and Evidence from the Lab and Field**

Fridman, Ariel (ESADE Business School); Liu, Wendy (University of California - San Diego); Amir, On (University of California - San Diego); Hansen, Karsten (University of California - San Diego); Simonson, Itamar (Stanford Graduate School of Business)

Well-established decision-making theory involves a critical stage of consideration set formation, though how the process works and affects choice is not well-understood. This work proposes and tests a theory positing that consumers form consideration sets in a by-alternative holistic manner, where alternatives added to the consideration set earlier increase the acceptance threshold for adding subsequent alternatives to the consideration set. Evidence from two laboratory studies and a large-scale field dataset provide converging support for the theory, which greatly increases the ability to predict choice, offering important implications for decision theorists and choice architects. Contact: oamir@ucsd.edu

#### **Beyond the consideration set: The dynamics of memory-based decisions**

Yang, Xiaozhi (Ohio State University); Zhang, Zhihao (University of Virginia); Hsu, Ming (University of California - Berkeley); Krajbich, Ian (University of California - Los Angeles)

In open-ended decisions, options are often ill-defined and must be generated by the decision maker. How do people make decisions without predefined options? Our study explored this question using 30 consumer products under both time-free and time-pressure conditions. We found that while people prioritize early-generated options under time pressure, their decision quality remains as good as in time-free conditions. Additionally, computational modeling showed that decision makers decide while generating the options from memory. Together, our behavioral and model-based findings shed light on the cognitive mechanisms of memory-based decisions, advancing the understanding of open-ended decisions. Contact: [yang.5173@osu.edu](mailto:yang.5173@osu.edu)

## **Session #2 Track III: Belief and intuition - Marriott - Duffy & Columbia - Saturday 9:45 am - 10:45 am**

### **Conveying frequency distributions: When most is stronger than average**

Kuang, Jinyi (University of Pennsylvania); Dannals, Jennifer (Yale University)

Social norm interventions often use quantifiers like most and average to influence behavior, but theory suggests they are not as interchangeable as prior research assumes. In three pre-registered experiments (n=1300) using a graphic Distribution Builder, we found: 1) a significant difference in central density estimation with eight quantifiers (Study 1); 2) generalizability of the effect of most vs. average across seven scenarios (Study 2); 3) k-means clustering showed perceived distribution linked to behavioral intentions via mediation (Study 3). These findings underscore the importance of carefully choosing quantifiers in crafting messages to influence behavior effectively. Contact: [jkuang@sas.upenn.edu](mailto:jkuang@sas.upenn.edu)

### **How Beliefs Persist Amid Controversy: The Paths to Persistence Model**

Oktar, Kerem (Princeton University); Lombrozo, Tania (Princeton University)

Why do people persist in their beliefs in the face of large-scale disagreement? We developed a four-factor framework called the Paths to Persistence Model, and tested it in a pre-registered experiment (N = 1,250) investigating responses to societal disagreement on 96 issues across domains. We find that most participants persist in their beliefs amid controversy even when they learn that they vastly underestimated the extent of societal disagreement with their view. Moreover, we find that the factors of our model jointly predict whether people persist, and that the paths have important social implications, from willingness to befriend disagreeing others, to interest in silencing dissent. Contact: [keremoktar1@gmail.com](mailto:keremoktar1@gmail.com)

### **People Underappreciate the Aggregate Impact of Unlikely Events**

Geiser, Amanda (University of California - Berkeley); Evers, Ellen (University of California - Berkeley)

How do people value a set of opportunities? In seven preregistered studies (N=4,004), we find that people give more weight to the probability of success per opportunity than to the total number of opportunities, frequently preferring to invest in fewer higher-probability opportunities (e.g., 2 investments, each with a 50% chance of succeeding) over larger sets of lower-probability opportunities that are more valuable in expectation (e.g., 15 investments, each with a 10% chance of succeeding). Our findings suggest that people underappreciate the aggregate impact of low-probability opportunities. We identify two psychological processes that help to explain this tendency. Contact: [ageiser@berkeley.edu](mailto:ageiser@berkeley.edu)

## **Session #3 Track I: Experience and exploration - Marriott - Soho Complex - Saturday 11:00 am - 12:00 pm**

### **Deconstructing human algorithms for exploration in complex environments with opportunities for social learning**

Rao, Kariyushi (Frankfurt School of Finance and Management)

Extant research suggests that people employ uncertainty-driven exploration strategies when searching for the best option in an uncertain environment. But, most of this research employs simplistic experimental paradigms with small choice sets and no opportunities for social learning. The present research examines the types of strategies people engage when confronted with more realistically complex conditions, including a large number of options and opportunities to learn vicariously from others. The results of the present research suggest that people's search strategies under these conditions are better characterized by uncertainty avoidance than by uncertainty reduction. Contact: [kariyushi.rao@chicagobooth.edu](mailto:kariyushi.rao@chicagobooth.edu)

### **Let's Try Something New: People Prefer Sharing Novel Experiences with Others**

Kim, Hyebin (Washington University in St Louis); Williams, Elanor (Washington University in St Louis); Scott, Sydney (Washington University in St Louis)

People often make trade-offs between new and unfamiliar experiences and more familiar and tried-and-true experiences. Using a variety of experiences and both hypothetical and real choices, we show that people prefer novel experiences when they will share them with other people versus alone. Doing something with others, as opposed to alone, reduces the perceived downsides associated with trying something new and leads people to prefer novel options over familiar ones. Further, this preference for novelty is amplified when the option is new to the self but familiar to the consumption partner, and strongest when the experience is to be shared with a close other. Contact: [adjf11025@gmail.com](mailto:adjf11025@gmail.com)

### **Choosing between experienced or described information in risky choice: what causes preference for descriptions?**

Luckman, Ashley (University of Exeter); Olschewski, Sebastian (University of Basel); Cohen, Leonardo (University of Nottingham); Spektor, Mikhail (University of Warwick); Konstantinidis, Emmanouil (University of Warwick)

Extensive research in risky choice has explored why people's risk-preference differ depending on whether they are given descriptive summaries of risks (e.g. warning labels on medication) or learn about them from direct experience (e.g. prior adverse reactions). However, interest has grown in situations where both types of information are potentially available. In a series of four experiments we ask people to choose between receiving descriptions of or sampling from risky lotteries. We find a consistent preference for descriptive information, that is partially dependent on the time taken to acquire descriptions, and implied completeness of the two information sources. Contact: a.luckman2@exeter.ac.uk

### **Session #3 Track II: Misperceptions in measurement and intervention - Marriott - Empire Complex - Saturday 11:00 am - 12:00 pm**

#### **When Zero Feels Less Informative in Willingness-to-Pay (WTP): Market Price Perception Influences WTP**

Evangelidis, Ioannis (ESADE Business School); Jung, Minah (New York University); Moon, Alice (Georgetown University); Luo, Mercy (New York University)

Six studies (N=5,730) reveal that willingness-to-pay (WTP) often reflects perceived market prices rather than personal valuations. Specifically, participants often respond with a non-zero WTP as if they were buyers even when \$0 would better reflect their personal valuations (e.g., vegetarians asked about WTP for steak). This is because participants believe a \$0 WTP is less informative than a non-zero WTP. However, we find that offering a separate \$0 WTP option reduces this tendency and better aligns WTP with personal valuation. This research highlights novel insights about participants' interpretation of WTP and a simple intervention that shifts WTP closer to personal valuation. Contact: alice.moon@georgetown.edu

#### **Improving Income Elicitation Methods to Increase Income Reporting: Evidence from Two Large-Scale Field Experiments Among Government Benefit Applicants**

De La Rosa, Wendy (University of Pennsylvania); Bechler, Christopher (Notre Dame University); Hersfield, Hal (University of California - Los Angeles)

A series of preregistered experiments, including two field experiments among food assistance applicants (N=58,507), demonstrate that a common income elicitation method (in the last 30 days, how much did you get paid?) is incongruent with people's mental representations of their income and may be harmful to benefit applicants. This common elicitation method increases abandonment of the application, the likelihood of requesting help, and time spent reporting income relative to a congruent intervention that elicits income based on how individuals earn and think about their income (hourly or annually). Contact: wendyde@wharton.upenn.edu

#### **On the Conditional Effects of Appealing to Impact**

Reiff, Joseph (University of Maryland); Dai, Hengchen (University of California - Los Angeles); Gallus, Jana (University of California - Los Angeles)

To increase compliance, firms often highlight the impact people can make by taking action. While positive mechanisms from prior research support the use of such impact appeals we identify a negative mechanism, perceived inauthenticity, that impedes their effectiveness. Leveraging our theoretical account, we identify moderators at the individual-, situation-, and stimulus-level that mitigate perceived inauthenticity, thereby improving the effectiveness of impact appeals. Our work underscores the importance of attending to inferences people draw from interventions, which may explain why the same interventions have varying effects across implementations, contexts, and subpopulations. Contact: josephsreiff@gmail.com

### **Session #3 Track III: Diversity in organizations - Marriott - Duffy & Columbia - Saturday 11:00 am - 12:00 pm**

#### **How interpretations of socioeconomic advantage and disadvantage influence college admissions**

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

We propose that the way in which admissions officers and lay people evaluate college applicants, upon learning about their socioeconomic (SE) circumstances, skews admitted college classes towards the SE advantaged. Fewer people adjust their evaluations of a college applicant upon learning that the applicant is SE advantaged than disadvantaged. This asymmetry in adjustment stems from people's beliefs about what SE advantage and disadvantage reveal about the effort applicants must exert to achieve equivalent outcomes. We illustrate how this asymmetry can undermine SE diversity by simulating how



different ways of evaluating college applicants lead to more versus less unequal college outcomes. Contact: david.munguiagomez@yale.edu

### **Evaluating the effect of shortlist quotas on gender diversity**

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

Shortlist quotas require organizations to include a minimum number of candidates with a given demographic identity (e.g., women) in the pool of finalists for a job, and are widely used to increase diversity. But do they work? In four, preregistered, incentive-compatible experiments (N=6,000) including a shortlist and a hiring stage in a real hiring game, we test the impact of a shortlist quota requiring the inclusion of at least one woman in the finalist set considered for an opening, and disentangle the mechanical and signaling effects of such a policy. We find this policy increases the selection of women both mechanically and by signaling pro-diversity norms and organizational values. Contact: iamlindachang@gmail.com

### **Leaky Pipeline: 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); Tinsley, Catherine (Georgetown University)

Despite the growing emphasis on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion and increased hiring in male-dominated industries, women remain underrepresented in leadership roles. We conducted five experiments (N = 4260) to explore this discrepancy. Findings reveal that people perceive gender balance at entry-level positions as a sign of a company's commitment to diversity while neglecting gender disparities in promotions. Even when highlighting promotion disparities, participants still view companies that hire more women but promote fewer as more diversity-focused. It suggests that companies may prioritize hiring over promoting women to appear committed to DEI without addressing promotion biases. Contact: liaoyitsen0221@gmail.com

### **Session #4 Track I: Modeling choice patterns - Marriott - Soho Complex - Saturday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm**

#### **A Computational Model for Encouraging Flow through Streaks**

Silverman, Jackie (University of Delaware); Melnikoff, David (Stanford University)

We develop and validate a computational model of how streakification - framing binary outcomes (e.g., make/miss a basket) in terms of streaks (e.g., make a basket 3 times in a row) - affects engagement and performance. Our model uniquely predicts that streakification boosts these outcomes (i) for easy, but not hard, tasks; and (ii) when streaks are framed continuously (e.g., achieve the longest streak possible), but not in binary terms (e.g., achieve a streak of three). Also, loss-based streakification (e.g., minimize how many tries until success) should be more effective for hard tasks (vs. easy tasks). Four pre-registered incentive-compatible experiments support these predictions. Contact: jasilv@udel.edu

#### **A Theoretical Integration for Sequential Decisions from Experience in Optimal Stopping Tasks and Beyond**

Bugbee, Erin (Carnegie Mellon University); Gonzalez, Cleotilde (Carnegie Mellon University)

Sequential decision making involves evaluating alternatives one by one and deciding when to stop searching. Current behavioral models suggest humans adjust their aspirations during sequential search using thresholds. These models assume specific functional shapes for thresholds and agree on deviations from optimal but lack consensus on their form. We propose that people learn to approximate optimal thresholds through a common cognitive process. Using Instance-Based Learning Theory, we present a framework explaining decisions from individual experiences. Empirical validation shows that our model mirrors human decision making, enhancing our understanding and prediction of stopping points. Contact: erin\_bugbee@icloud.com

#### **A Dual-Threshold Theory of Choice Deferral: Experimental Insights, Quantitative Modeling, and Algorithmic Choice Architecture Design**

Wang, Feiyi (University of Pennsylvania); Bhatia, Sudeep (University of Pennsylvania); Mellers, Barbara (University of Pennsylvania)

Past research often treats choice deferral as a single no-choice option. However, deferral can represent two distinct behaviors: postponement (preferring to delay the choice) vs. refusal (rejecting all options). We show that choice set size and attractiveness divergently affect postponement and refusal. Furthermore, we offer a new theory explaining these effects through two utility thresholds: a higher one for selection and a lower one for rejection. Four pre-registered experiments (one incentive-compatible) support this theory. We subsequently integrate the theory with machine learning to algorithmically design choice sets that minimize deferral from millions of possible combinations. Contact: feiyiw@sas.upenn.edu

## **Session #4 Track II: Nudges - Marriott - Empire Complex - Saturday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm**

### **Creating pro-environmental behavior change: Economic incentives or norm-nudges?**

Ekström, Mathias (Norwegian School of Economics); Bjorvatn, Kjetil (Norwegian School of Economics); Sjøstad, Hallgeir (Norwegian School of Economics)

To stop global warming, long-term behavior change is needed. But which tools should be prioritized: economic incentives, psychology-informed nudges, or a combination? We present causal evidence from a two-year field experiment, comparing how a small economic incentive and a social norm-nudge affects the actual recycling behavior of more than 2,000 households. We find a persistent positive effect of incentives, but absolutely no effect of the norm-nudge. However, incentives reduced customer satisfaction, unless it was combined with the norm-nudge, suggesting that norm-appeals can make climate incentives more acceptable. Contact: mathias.ekstrom@nhh.no

### **Testing the limits of behavioral nudges**

Linos, Elizabeth (Harvard University); Lasky-Fink, Jessica (Harvard University); Rothstein, Jesse (University of California - Berkeley)

Behavioral science has become an influential tool for motivating residents to take up government programs, but empirical evidence on the impact of behavioral interventions in this context is mixed. Across three field experiments (N = 791,467), we directly address two common criticisms of this literature: we test the relative impact of better targeting, as well as the relative impact of higher-touch interventions. We demonstrate that better targeting does seem to lead to larger effects of light-touch interventions, but - perhaps counterintuitively - higher-touch outreach does not have a significant impact on behavior over and above light-touch outreach. Contact: elizabeth\_linos@hks.harvard.edu

### **Why and when nudges work? Experimental evidence on College Savings Accounts**

Briscese, Guglielmo (University of Chicago); Liu, Sabrina (University of Chicago)

Nudge interventions can be cost-effective tools to improve policy outcomes, but mixed results have led to skepticism. This study posits that nudges are effective when relevant to individuals' prior beliefs, updating them to prompt behavioral change. Previous studies used nudge interventions as both diagnostic and solution tools, leading to hypothesis bending; and weak replicability opportunities. We conduct a theory-driven survey-based field experiment to help parents save for college. We find that nudge efficacy varies with individuals' biased beliefs, highlighting the need for a data-driven hypothesis formulation to enhance nudge replicability. Contact: gubri@uchicago.edu

## **Session #4 Track III: Confidence and calibration - Marriott – Duffy & Columbia - Saturday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm**

### **Widely-Used Measures of Overconfidence Are Confounded With Ability**

Spiller, Stephen (University of California - Los Angeles)

Individual differences in overconfidence at various tasks have been associated with a number of different correlates. I show that much of this evidence may merely indicate that there are associations with ability, not overconfidence. Because (1) observed performance is an imperfect measure of latent ability, and (2) self-evaluations ought to incorporate ability directly due to inherent ambiguity regarding performance, typical measures of overconfidence are confounded with ability. I quantify the magnitude of this confound analytically in a simple model. Using two published datasets, I find this confound is plausibly practically important in real applications. Contact: stephen.spiller@anderson.em.ucla.edu

### **How Should I Know? Lack of Confidence Biases Stock Market Expectations Downward**

Chin, Alycia (Securities and Exchange Commission); VanEpps, Eric (Vanderbilt University); Scholl, Brian (Securities and Exchange Commission); Nash, Steven (NORC at the University of Chicago)

Consumers' expectations of stock market movements consistently appear pessimistic, failing to predict the likelihood of stock market increases. In three studies, including two using nationally representative samples, we provide a novel explanation for this apparent pessimism: respondents lack confidence about their ability to forecast stock market movements, and this lack of confidence biases reported probabilities downward. The bias yields a framing effect counter to most research on valence framing, and suggests that low respondent confidence in one's ability to answer questions may lead to reversals of traditional framing effects. Contact: readlinga@sec.gov

## **People are (Shockingly) Bad at Valuing Hedges**

Ryan, William (University of California - Berkeley); Baum, Stephen (Washington University in St Louis); Evers, Ellen (University of California - Berkeley)

People often plan for the worst, purchasing product warranties, insuring their homes, and proactively making backup plans. People should be willing to pay more to hedge against bad outcomes that are more likely. Across 14 studies (N = 5,591) we find that decision-makers instead behave as though they almost fully ignore probabilities when hedging against bad outcomes. People focus almost solely on the bad outcome being hedged against, while ignoring how likely it is to occur. However, the same decision makers are sensitive to probabilities when investing to improve a good outcome. Reframing hedges as investments makes hedging decisions better calibrated to the likelihood of an outcome. Contact: williamhryan@gmail.com

## **Session #5 Track I: Well-being and prosocial behavior - Marriott - Soho Complex - Saturday 3:45 pm - 4:45 pm**

### **Massive field quasi-experiments reveal inverted-U causal links between mood and prosocial decisions**

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

We use 3 revelation-curves (massive field quasi-experiments with plausibly exogenous continuous treatment variables) to reveal full natural continuous causal relationships between three mood triggers (sunlight amount, news valence, stock market returns) and prosocial behavior without assuming anything about the shapes of these relationships. All 3 revelation-curves find inverted-U continuous causal relationships: as mood triggers become more positive, they first boost prosocial behavior, and then reduce prosocial behavior. Laypeople were unable to predict these results. Our findings resolve a 50-year controversy, and uncover insights that policymakers can use to boost prosocial behavior. Contact: kang.polly@gmail.com

### **Assessing the Impact of Basic Income on Well-Being: Evidence from a RCT in a High-Income Country**

Fiedler, Susann (Vienna University of Economics and Business); Schwerter, Frederik (Frankfurt School of Finance and Management); Kasy, Max (University of Oxford); Bohmann, Sandra (DIW); Schupp, Jurgen (DIW)

This study explores whether a basic income—a monthly, guaranteed, unconditional cash transfer can enhance well-being in high-income countries. Conducted as a preregistered randomized controlled trial (RCT), the research involved 107 participants receiving 1200 monthly for three years, while 1580 served as controls. Key measures included mental health, purpose in life, life satisfaction. Results showed significant improvements in these areas, consistent unaffected by baseline income. Perceived autonomy mediated the improvements. The findings suggest basic income enhances well-being autonomy, challenging assumptions about limited impacts of income gains in high-income contexts. Contact: susann.fiedler@gmail.com

### **A Randomized Controlled Trial on the Provision of Financial and Social Capital to Low-Income Households in the United States**

Jaroszewicz, Ania (University of California - San Diego); Hauser, Oliver (University of Exeter); Jachimowicz, Jon (Harvard University)

We randomized 1,486 US households in poverty to one of four treatments: (1) receiving \$500/month for 18 months (\$9,000 total), (2) developing social capital by engaging with a group of other participants, (3) both, or (4) neither. Using a mix of self reports, behavioral measures, and administrative panel data, we study the effects on participants' financial, psychological, health, and family well-being over the 18 months. Surprisingly, we find no average effects of either financial or social capital based on our preregistered analyses. However, exploratory analyses uncover considerable variation, with cash resulting in positive effects on some outcomes and negative effects on others. Contact: jaroszewicz.ania@gmail.com

## **Session #5 Track II: Interactions and heterogeneity - Marriott – Empire Complex - Saturday 3:45 pm - 4:45 pm**

### **GAMify Spotlight and Floodlight: How Assuming Linearity Partially or Totally Broke Probed Interactions in Four Recent Published Papers**

Montealegre, Andres (Cornell University); Simonsohn, Uri (ESADE Business School)

Testing and probing interactions is common in the papers we write and read. Typically (always, really), interactions are studied assuming linearity (e.g., with Simple Slopes). In this paper, we develop tools to probe interactions without assuming linearity. We re-analyze data from four recent marketing papers and show that the traditional (linear) approach leads to partially or totally broken conclusions. The alternatives we propose rely on GAMs (generalized additive models) instead of

regression. We show that GAM Simple Slopes and GAM Johnson-Neyman are as easy-to-run, interpretable, and statistically powerful as their linear counterparts, but are more informative, robust, and sensical. Contact: am2849@cornell.edu

### **Using Cognitive Variables to Explain Why Effect Sizes Differ in the Behavioral Sciences.**

Krefeld-Schwalb, Antonia (Erasmus University Rotterdam); Sugerman, Eli (Columbia University); Johnson, Eric (Columbia University)

We examine the heterogeneity of text-based behavioral interventions through five preregistered studies using one in-person panel and 10 online panels, totaling over 11000 respondents. We observe large heterogeneity across settings and paradigms. To model the heterogeneity, we introduce a framework that measures typically omitted moderators: Fluid Intelligence, Attention, Crystallized Intelligence, and Experience. Variation in these factors is associated with different effect sizes and explains variations across samples. Moderators are associated with effect sizes through two paths, moderating both the intensity of the received manipulation and the direct effect of the manipulation. Contact: a.krefeldschwalb@gmail.com

### **Heterogeneity in Reader Engagement: Analyzing the Impact of Language-Based Constructs Across Multiple News Types**

Banerjee, Akshina (University of Michigan); Urminsky, Oleg (University of Chicago)

Our paper tests the impact of language on online news engagement, highlighting the significant heterogeneity across news sites. Using ChartBeat's extensive dataset, we uncover minimal correlation with prior predictions, challenging the generalizability of existing theories. This necessitates a nuanced, individual-centric approach in behavioral research to understand digital news consumption dynamics. Contact: abanerj1@chicagobooth.edu

### **Session #5 Track III: Temporal Framing - Marriott – Duffy & Columbia - Saturday 3:45 pm - 4:45 pm**

#### **Revealing Your Past vs. Unveiling Your Future: Which Elicits Greater Interest?**

Huang, Yang (University of Pennsylvania); Fang, David (Stanford Graduate School of Business); Yu, Ding (Stanford Graduate School of Business)

Does revealing information about our past or future more effectively elicit audiences' interest? Through analyzing 3,185 A/B experiments of first-person news headlines, the conversation history of 686 Tinder users, and the transcripts of 155 dyadic Zoom conversations, along with three pre-registered experiments (N = 1,637), we find that sharing our past evokes more interest. This heightened interest is driven by audiences' ability to better construct narratives through past information. Our research underscores the importance of temporal focus in shaping social judgments, emphasizing the past's potency in narrative formation and providing practical insights for raising audience engagement. Contact: yanghuan@sas.upenn.edu

#### **Medium Induces Patience in Intertemporal Choices**

Zhang, Yan (National University of Singapore); Labroo, Aparna (Northwestern University); He, Daniel (National University of Singapore)

Research finds that people tend to be impatient in intertemporal choices, yet effective strategies to promote patience are sparse. We find that compared to asking people to choose between a smaller-sooner reward and a larger-later reward, giving people a medium that is redeemable for such rewards effectively increases patience. Contact: yan.zhang.nus@gmail.com

#### **Temporal Frames of Life Expectancy**

Faro, David (London Business School); Tetik, Ozlem (London Business School); Shu, Stephen (Cornell University); Hershfield, Hal (UCLA); Benartzi, Shlomo (UCLA)

Population statistics on how long a person is expected to live, or live in good health, are typically presented in future-age frame (e.g., until the age of 84) or in time-left frame (e.g., 34 more years). We show that time-left frame makes the total interval feel shorter than future-age frame. This effect can occur because time-left frame leads people to assess whether the remaining time would suffice to achieve one's goals. When people learn about the interval in time-left (vs. future-age) frame, they are more interested in improving their health. Contact: dfaro@london.edu

## **Session #6 Track I: Beliefs and biases - Marriott - Soho Complex - Saturday 5:00 pm - 6:00 pm**

### **Are Cognitive Biases Relevant To Everyday Judgment and Decision Making?**

Suchow, Jordan (Stevens Institute of Technology); Ashrafimoghari, Vahid (Stevens Institute of Technology)

We explore the relevance of cognitive biases to everyday judgment and decision-making. Human respondents provided relevancy ratings of 235 cognitive biases to samples from a corpus of 7 million real-world advice-seeking scenarios. With transformer-based models and hierarchical clustering, we used these ratings to map cognitive bias clusters to scenario clusters. Key findings include natural groupings of biases into categories and many cross-cluster linkages from bias types to scenario types. This study offers a structured framework for understanding cognitive biases impact on decision-making, bridging theoretical knowledge with practical application. Contact: [jws@stevens.edu](mailto:jws@stevens.edu)

### **Sticky Intuition: Following your intuition makes you less likely to change your mind than following a structured process**

Jeong, Martha (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Chen, Amanda Zaidan (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology)

Relying on our faulty intuition and persisting with bad decisions are common decision pitfalls. Extensive research has focused on these biases as independent phenomena. Our research is theoretically and empirically novel as it demonstrates that how we make decisions affects our likelihood of persisting with our beliefs. Our studies show that when people use their intuition, they are more likely to disregard contradictory opinions; dismiss additional information; and stick to their decisions, compared to people who use a structured process. Even though intuitive decision-makers do not feel any more confident than process-led decision-makers, they remain reluctant to abandon their decisions. Contact: [zchengj@connect.ust.hk](mailto:zchengj@connect.ust.hk)

### **Information Partitioning, Learning, and Beliefs**

Mertes, Lukas (University of Mannheim); Kieren, Pascal (Heidelberg University); Weber, Martin (University of Mannheim)

We experimentally study how information partitioning affects learning and beliefs. Observing small pieces of information at higher frequency (narrow brackets) causes beliefs to become overly sensitive to recent signals compared to observing larger pieces of information at lower frequency (broad brackets). Hence, partitioning information in narrow or broad brackets causally affects judgements. Observing information in narrow brackets also leads to less accurate beliefs and to worse recall. As mechanism, we show that partitioning information into narrower brackets shifts attention from the macro-level to the micro-level, which leads people to overweight recent signals when forming beliefs. Contact: [lukasmertes@googlemail.com](mailto:lukasmertes@googlemail.com)

## **Session #6 Track II: Risk and rewards - Marriott – Empire Complex - Saturday 5:00 pm - 6:00 pm**

### **The Multiplicity Effect**

Evangelidis, Ioannis (ESADE Universitat Ramon Llull)

Eight preregistered experiments demonstrate a novel multiplicity effect, whereby people choose a prospect more frequently when it features multiple probabilistic gains (e.g., 20% chance to win \$14 and 20% chance to win \$15) compared with a single probabilistic gain (e.g., 40% chance to win \$15). The effect persists even when the expected value, utility, and cumulative prospect theory value of the prospect is relatively lower. The effect is traced to sequential dynamics in the reasons that people invoke when making decisions under risk. The effect extends to decisions in the domain of losses and to decisions that involve valuations of human lives. Contact: [prof.ioannis.evangelidis@gmail.com](mailto:prof.ioannis.evangelidis@gmail.com)

### **Windfall, similarity, and mental accounting**

Chen, Vincent (University of California - Berkeley); Evers, Ellen (University of California - Berkeley)

Windfall effects, well documented in the marketing and economics literature, challenge the assumption of fungibility of money by showing that people spend money differently depending on its source. However, little is known about the factors driving this phenomenon; two different theoretical perspectives make diverging predictions of spending in response to different windfalls. We conceptualize mental accounts as spending-categories and demonstrate that higher similarity between windfall sources and targets boosts purchase intentions. To avoid circular reasoning when explaining category formation using human-rated similarity, we utilize semantic similarity measured by word embedding models. Contact: [vincentpmchen@berkeley.edu](mailto:vincentpmchen@berkeley.edu)

### **Making rewards uncertain increases recycling behavior**

Zhao, Jiaying (University of British Columbia); Radke, Jade (University of British Columbia); Dunn, Elizabeth (University of British Columbia)

Of the 2 trillion beverage containers produced globally, only 27% are recycled. To increase recycling, we leveraged a classic risk preference phenomenon and turned a current certain reward (100% chance of getting \$0.10) into an uncertain one (e.g., 0.01% chance of getting \$1000). We conducted three pre-registered field and lab studies (N=975) where people could recycle beverage containers and choose between five reward options with the same expected payoff. We found participants preferred an uncertain reward (0.01% chance of getting \$1000) over the certain one, and brought more bottles to recycle when the uncertain reward was offered. We discuss implications for the current recycling policy. Contact: [jiayingz@psych.ubc.ca](mailto:jiayingz@psych.ubc.ca)

### **Session #6 Track III: Gender differences - Marriott – Duffy & Columbia - Saturday 5:00 pm - 6:00 pm**

#### **Beliefs about Gender Differences in Social Preferences**

Exley, Christine (University of Michigan); Hauser, Oliver (Exeter University); Moore, Molly (Washington University in St Louis); Pezzuto, John-Henry (University of California - San Diego)

While there is a vast (and mixed) literature on gender differences in social preferences, little is known about believed gender differences in social preferences. This project documents robust evidence for believed gender differences in social preferences across 15 studies using three participant pools (total N=8,979), in contexts which vary in terms of strategic considerations, selfish motives, fairness concepts and applications. Despite the robustness of these beliefs, the believed gender gap in social preferences is largely inaccurate. These findings have important implications for how men and women are viewed--rewarded and punished--across work, social, and personal domains. Contact: [mollym@wustl.edu](mailto:mollym@wustl.edu)

#### **A Preference for Women Negotiation Partners: An Examination of Gender-Based Partner Effects**

Townsend, Charlotte (Cornell University); Kray, Laura (University of California - Berkeley); Delecourt, Solene (University of California - Berkeley)

The research examines gender differences in subjective value in negotiations, an area less explored compared to objective outcomes. Across multiple samples, we find a preference for women as negotiation partners. Evaluations of women are more positive, leading to a greater desire for future interactions. This preference persists even when negotiations are anonymous, ruling out the influence of knowing the partner's gender. Structural topic modeling reveals gender-specific negotiation behaviors contributing to this gap. We leverage the stereotype content model to examine perceptions of negotiators and whether gender differences in warmth and competence contribute to this gender gap. Contact: [cht45@cornell.edu](mailto:cht45@cornell.edu)

#### **When Women Self-Promote: The Hidden Consequences**

Chang, Jenny (Carnegie Mellon University); Saccardo, Silvia (Carnegie Mellon University)

There are widespread perceptions that self-promotion has negative consequences for women, but limited behavioral evidence on its impact on career-relevant outcomes. Across two incentive-compatible laboratory experiments, we investigate the downstream consequences of self-promotion across different stages of the career. In our study context, self-promotion equally increases the likelihood of being hired for men and women. However, our results suggest that women face penalties for advertising their abilities in later stages if their performance does not meet expectations. Our work highlights the various ways in which women may benefit from, or be penalized for, self-promoting in their career. Contact: [jaeyeonc@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:jaeyeonc@andrew.cmu.edu)

## SUNDAY NOVEMBER 24, 2024

Rooms - Marriott Marquis - Soho Complex, Empire Complex, Duffy & Columbia

### **Session #7 Track I: Influencing beliefs - Marriott - Soho Complex - Sunday 9:45 am - 10:45 am**

#### **The Political (A)Symmetry of Metacognitive Insight Into Detecting Misinformation**

Geers, Michael (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Fischer, Helen (Other); Lewandowsky, Stephan (University of Bristol); Herzog, Stefan (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)

Political misinformation poses a major threat to democracies worldwide. Here, we investigate people's metacognitive insight into their own ability to detect political misinformation using data from a 12-wave, 6-month longitudinal study of a representative U.S. sample (N = 1,191) on the most viral political (mis)information online. Using signal detection theory, we found that both the political left and right were aware of their ability to distinguish true from false information. However, conservatives showed lower metacognitive insight than liberals when the information challenged their ideologies. These findings highlight the role of metacognition in exacerbating ideological divides. Contact: geersm@sas.upenn.edu

#### **Megastudy identifying effective treatments to strengthen American's democratic attitudes**

Voelkel, Jan Gerrit (University of Pennsylvania); Stagnaro, Michael (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Chu, James (Columbia University); Druckman, James (University of Rochester); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Willer, Robb (Stanford University)

Deep partisan conflict in the mass public threatens the stability of American democracy. We conducted a megastudy (n=32,059) testing 25 treatments designed by academics and practitioners. We found nearly every treatment reduced partisan animosity. The most effective treatments highlighted sympathetic individuals with different political beliefs or emphasized cross-partisan identities. Several treatments reduced anti-democratic attitudes. The most effective treatments corrected misperceptions of outpartisans' anti-democratic views or highlighted the threat of democratic collapse. Taken together, our findings identify promising strategies for reducing attitudes undermining American democracy. Contact: jvoelkel@stanford.edu

#### **The Power of Meta-Prediction: Leveraging Meta-Prediction Accuracy to Enhance Collective and Individual Intelligence**

Zhang, Yunhao (University of California - Berkeley); Jahani, Eaman (University of Maryland); Guilbeault, Douglas (University of California - Berkeley); Schroeder, Juliana (University of California - Berkeley)

Decision-makers often rely on advisors, but how do they determine advisors' accuracy? We identify a novel and useful cue for ascertaining advisors' accuracy: their ability to predict others' responses (meta-prediction accuracy). Across three empirical contexts, we found reliable, positive correlations between prediction accuracy and meta-prediction accuracy. Discovering this correlation helps enhance Wisdom of Crowds in binary classification problems. In an experiment testing different forms of social influence, telling participants about advisors' meta-prediction accuracy led to the largest improvement in participants' own estimates (vs. providing other cues, like advisors' confidence). Contact: yunhao.jerry.zhang@gmail.com

### **Session #7 Track II: Human and AI decisions - Marriott – Empire Complex - Sunday 9:45 am - 10:45 am**

#### **How to Explain Unexplainable Algorithmic Decisions to Consumers**

Tomaino, Geoff (University of Florida); Wertenbroch, Klaus (INSEAD); Abdulhalim, Hisham (Other); Kireyev, Pavel (London School of Economics and Political Science)

Firms are increasingly making consequential decisions about consumers using algorithms. Yet, many of these algorithms are mechanistically unexplainable, meaning the firm cannot explain the process through which an algorithm reached its decision, if it even wanted to. In a field and several lab experiments, we show when, from a consumer's perspective, teleological explanations, or those which account for an outcome through referring to the purpose it was intended to serve, can act as acceptable substitutes for mechanistic explanations. In particular, we find that teleological explanations can make an outcome appear more justified, enhancing consumer acceptance of that outcome. Contact: klaus.wertenbroch@insead.edu

#### **Hybrid Confirmation Trees: A Cost-Effective Approach to Combining Human and AI Decisions**

Berger, Julian (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Analytis, Pantelis P. (University of Southern Denmark); Andersen, Frederik (University of Southern Denmark); Lorenzen, Kristian P. (Aarhus University); Kurvers, Ralf HJM (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)

We propose hybrid confirmation trees, a heuristic for hybrid intelligence in melanoma classification. Hybrid confirmation trees elicit decisions from one human expert and one algorithm. When they agree, a decision is made. In case of disagreement, a second expert breaks the tie. We apply this to skin cancer detection in three data sets across two studies. Study 1 shows our approach is a powerful alternative to human baselines, outperforming up to three humans at lower costs. Study 2 finds humans using AI advice perform worse than hybrid confirmation trees. Our results highlight the potential of combining independent human and AI decisions compared to humans using AI advice. Contact: julian.berger94@gmail.com

### **Does AI diminish people's sense of entitlement to work-related rewards?**

Kim, Jin (Northeastern University); Cusimano, Corey (Northeastern University)

Use of AI can affect people's sense of responsibility, effort, and performance regarding their work, and consequently, their sense of entitlement to work-related rewards. Across 4 studies, we manipulated the use of AI and measured people's subjective responsibility, effort, performance, and entitlement (choice of how much real monetary reward to give oneself). We find that using AI reduces subjective effort and responsibility but that it can boost performance. Importantly, when people judge what they deserve for their work, they focus on their performance to the neglect of effort and responsibility. Thus, people who use AI can feel like they deserve more because they perform better. Contact: jin.kim1@northeastern.edu

### **Session #7 Track III: Social and moral judgment - Marriott – Duffy & Columbia - Sunday 9:45 am - 10:45 am**

#### **Moral Judgment is Sensitive to Bargaining Power**

Le Pargneux, Arthur (University of Warwick); Cushman, Fiery (Harvard University)

A strong test of contractualist theories of moral judgment and decision making is whether moral judgments take bargaining power into account. We explore this in six preregistered experiments (n = 3,025). Consistent with contractualist accounts, we find that, in various social contexts, participants tend to give more moral leeway to parties with higher bargaining power, and to hold disadvantaged parties to stricter moral standards. These results are at odds with several influential conceptions of justice. Contact: arthur.lepargneux@gmail.com

#### **You Knew What You Were Getting Into: Perspective Differences in Perceiving Informed Consent**

Schlund, Rachel (University of Chicago); Bohns, Vanessa (Cornell University)

We examine perspective differences in assessments of whether someone has consented across domains (medical, legal, organizational). We find solicitors of consent overestimate consenters' subjective experience of consent by overestimating how fully informed consenters feel. We present support for these findings across 5 pre-registered studies (N = 2,484), including a live interaction design, vignette experiments, and a recall paradigm, which establish causal and mediation evidence, downstream consequences, and real-world relevance. This research suggests that even when an agreement meets the legal criteria for consent, there may be misaligned perceptions of individuals' feelings of consent. Contact: rjs542@cornell.edu

#### **Not all powerful people are created equal: An examination of gender and pathways to social hierarchy through the lens of social cognition**

Townsend, Charlotte (Cornell University); Mishra, Sonya (Dartmouth College); Kray, Laura (University of California - Berkeley)

Across four studies, we uncover a gender stereotype about dual pathways to social hierarchy: men are associated with power and women are associated with status. We detect this pattern explicitly and implicitly in perceptions of individuals drawn from Forbes' powerful people lists. We explore social cognitive implications, how society recognizes prominent figures and how men's and women's self-concepts are formed. Men are more recognized for power, while women are more recognized for status. Women internalize the stereotype, implicitly and explicitly linking women with status more than power. Men report less status and more power than women but implicitly associate the self with both equally. Contact: laurakray@berkeley.edu

### **Session #8 Track I: Moral judgment - Marriott - Soho Complex - Sunday 1:15 pm - 2:15 pm**

#### **Glass Half Empty: How Pessimism Is Seen as a Moral Failing**

Erensoy, Eda (Yale University); Small, Deborah (Yale University)

Across seven studies in which participants made different types of predictions, we find that pessimists are judged as less moral than optimists. This pattern persists regardless of the forecasters' relative accuracy, their control over the circumstances, and the level of deliberation in their judgment. Even pessimists themselves judge other pessimists as less moral than they judge optimists. Pessimists appear to desire good outcomes less than optimists do, which in turn undermines



impressions of their morality. We discuss consequences of pessimism for social image, as well as potential processes and implications. Contact: le.erensoy@gmail.com

### **Disclosing shortcomings in morality, sociability, and competence: Differing effects on trust**

Roberts, Annabelle (University of Texas - Dallas); Landy, Justin (Nova Southeastern University); Levine, Emma (University of Chicago)

What are the consequences of sharing flaws about the self with others? Across six studies (N=2,306), we find that disclosing morality flaws (e.g., dishonest, unfair) reduces trust compared to disclosing competence (e.g., unintelligent, incapable) or sociability flaws (e.g., cold, introverted) in a variety of professional and social settings. We explore the underlying mechanism and find that people who disclose morality flaws are perceived as having worse intentions compared to other types of flaws. These results qualify prior research about the benefits of self-disclosure and provide new insights into the consequences of sharing personal information with others. Contact: arobert5@chicagobooth.edu

### **A Large-Scale Investigation of Everyday Moral Dilemmas**

Yudkin, Daniel (University of Pennsylvania); Goodwin, Geoff (University of Pennsylvania); Reece, Andrew (Other); Gray, Kurt (University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill); Bhatia, Sudeep (University of Pennsylvania)

We conducted a data-driven analysis of everyday moral dilemmas by combining state-of-the-art tools in machine learning with survey-based methods. In Study 1, we extracted and analyzed 369,161 descriptions (posts) and 11M evaluations (comments) of dilemmas from the largest known online repository of everyday moral dilemmas: Reddit's Am I the Asshole? Users described a variety of dilemmas, ranging from broken promises to judgmentalness. Dilemmas involving relational obligations were the most frequently reported, while those pertaining to honesty were most broadly condemned. Results show many moral experiences that are underexplored in psychological science are common in everyday life. Contact: dyudkin@sas.upenn.edu

### **Session #8 Track II: Multi-attribute choice - Marriott – Empire Complex - Sunday 1:15 pm - 2:15 pm**

#### **Where are the context effects?**

Cai, Xiaohong (Indiana University Bloomington); Fang, Jun (Indiana University Bloomington); Pleskac, Tim (Indiana University Bloomington)

Context effects, including attraction, similarity, and compromise effects, occur when the relative choice share (RCS) for one alternative compared to another is impacted by adding new alternatives to the choice set. We report a meta-analysis of three effects asking how reliably, across 23 papers with 29,538 observations, these effects impact the RCS. The results revealed that the attraction and compromise effects are robust while the similarity effect is less robust. Results further showed that the context effects depend on the configuration of attributes across the choice set, yet nearly all the studies to date have focused on a very specific configuration. Contact: cai14@iu.edu

#### **The Structure of Everyday Choice: Insights from 100K Real-life Decision Problems**

Bhatia, Sudeep (University of Pennsylvania); van Baal, Simon (University of Vienna); Walasek, Lukasz (University of Warwick)

We construct a dataset of over 100K real-life decision problems based on a combination of social media and large-scale survey data. Using LLMs for automated coding, we extract hundreds of choice attributes at play in these problems and map them onto a common representational space. This allows us to quantify both the broader themes and specific tradeoffs inherent in everyday choices. We also present these problems to survey participants, and find consistency in choice patterns, allowing us to predict naturalistic choices. Our research provides new insights into the attributes that underpin life choices and shows how LLM-based structure extraction can be used to study real-world behavior. Contact: bhatiasu@sas.upenn.edu

#### **Superstar neglect: Choices reflect a focus on averages at the expense of outliers**

Pink, Sophia (University of Pennsylvania); Mullainathan, Sendhil (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania)

We propose and test a novel decision-making bias called superstar neglect. In general, when evaluating people, places, and opportunities with many evaluable attributes, people focus on the average of these attributes. But in many cases, the relevant metric is not the average, but the best e.g. when a pharmaceutical company tests different types of malaria drugs, success depends on the best-performer (not the average) because the company will invest in only the best and set aside lesser performers. We show that across many contexts including consumer, personnel, and investment decisions people systematically neglect superstars in favor of the average, leading to suboptimal decisions. Contact: sophialpink@mac.com

### **Session #8 Track III: Race and gender - Marriott – Duffy & Columbia - Sunday 1:15 pm - 2:15 pm**

#### **Love them or hate them, female physicians' personalities matter: A large-scale text analysis of online physician written reviews**

Madanay, Farrah (University of Michigan); Ubel, Peter A. (Duke University); Bundorf, M. Kate (Duke University)

Evidence suggests gender biases in workplace assessments of physicians, but little is known about physician gender differences in patients' online written reviews. Using a machine-learning algorithm, we analyzed patients' interpersonal manner and technical competence judgments in 345,053 written reviews received by 167,150 U.S. physicians on Healthgrades.com. Female physicians were more likely than males to receive interpersonal manner comments, but whether they were more likely to receive patient praise or criticism depended on their specialty (PCP vs. surgeon). Regardless of specialty, female physicians were penalized disproportionately in star ratings in response to patients' criticisms. Contact: [madanaf1@med.umich.edu](mailto:madanaf1@med.umich.edu)

#### **Rationing by Race**

Singh, Manasvini (Carnegie Mellon University); Venkataramani, Atheendar (University of Pennsylvania)

We hypothesize, and provide evidence, that deepening resource scarcity results in race-based rationing in a high-stakes setting: health care. Using EMR data on 107,000 admissions to a large health system, we find that in-hospital mortality increases for Black, but not White, patients as hospitals reach capacity (a state of resource scarcity that may intensify decision-making biases). As a mechanism, we identify rationing by wait times, documenting that sick Black patients always wait longer for care than healthy White patients, likely because of systematic misvaluation of medical need. Text analysis of provider notes suggests another mechanism: differential effort allocation by race. Contact: [msingh01@cmu.edu](mailto:msingh01@cmu.edu)

#### **Racial Discrimination in Online Job Negotiations**

Daniels, David (National University of Singapore); Kang, Polly (INSEAD); Neale, Margaret (Stanford University)

We test for racial discrimination in online job negotiations where candidates negotiate their hourly wages for freelance jobs. Controlling for a rich set of observable covariates, including scores on tests of job-relevant skills and first offers, we show that negotiators' economic outcomes are 9% lower if they are non-White (vs. White). This discrepancy seems to occur because employers treat identical information from non-White (vs. White) negotiators differently; e.g., a +1 standard deviation improvement in a negotiator's job-relevant skills is linked to 6% higher economic outcomes for White negotiators ( $p < 0.0001$ ), but only 1% higher economic outcomes for non-White negotiators ( $p = 0.300$ ). Contact: [bizdpd@nus.edu.sg](mailto:bizdpd@nus.edu.sg)

### **Session #9 Track I: Framing aid and benefits - Marriott - Soho Complex - Sunday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm**

#### **Striving to Survive or to Thrive? The Effect of Agency Frames on Aid Seeking**

Brody, Ilana (University of California - Los Angeles); Wu, Sherry (University of California - Los Angeles); Caruso, Eugene (University of California - Los Angeles); Caruso, Heather (University of California - Los Angeles)

Using mixed methods, we identified and tested motives for aid seeking among eligible recipients, and found contrasting predictions from the general public ( $N = 7,615$ ). Our interventions improved aid-related attitudes and behaviors for eligible recipients immediately and six months later. While people predicted that the most effective message would emphasize how aid can fulfill physical needs (i.e., hunger), we found that aid seekers were most motivated when aid was framed as advancing interdependent psychological needs (i.e., the need to strengthen community ties). Promoting aid as central to survival may fall short of the benefits of promoting aid as the key to thrive. Contact: [ilana.brody@gmail.com](mailto:ilana.brody@gmail.com)

#### **A Co-Branding Conundrum: Consumers Underuse Co-Branded Credit Cards Outside of Their Featured Brands**

Sun, Chengyao (Yale University); Cryder, Cynthia (Washington University in St Louis); Rick, Scott (University of Michigan)

We find that people are reluctant to use co-branded credit cards outside those cards' featured brands, even if those credit cards maximize rewards. We identify two mechanisms. First, co-branding produces assumptions about rewards, limiting people's attention to a card's actual rewards. Without attention, users are less aware of a co-branded card's reward advantages outside its brand and thus less likely to use it broadly. Second, co-branding makes potential purchases outside the brand feel like a bad fit with the card, discouraging card use that doesn't match the brand. We discuss both consumer and managerial implications. Contact: [chengyao.sun14@gmail.com](mailto:chengyao.sun14@gmail.com)

## **Consumer Evaluations of Corporate Altruism: The Role of Company Cost and Social Benefit**

Shine, Aaron (University of Bath); Johnson, Samuel (University of Waterloo); Simonyan, Yvetta (University of Bath)

When evaluating a company's corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities, what information drives consumers' judgements and choices is it the cost of the initiative, or its impact on society? Across a series of experiments, we find that consumers consider both information on cost and societal benefit, however, cost is more predictive of behavioural intentions. In fact, consumers even prefer companies' CSR initiatives that cost more and actually achieve less societal good. Contact: aaron.shine54@gmail.com

### **Session #9 Track II: Advice - Marriott - Empire Complex - Sunday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm**

#### **Advice in Moral Dilemmas Increases Blame**

Bigman, Yochanan (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Sezer, Ovul (Cornell University)

This paper investigates the impact of seeking and using advice in moral decision-making. Contrary to common belief, seeking advice does not generally improve perceptions of the advice seeker and often leads to worse reputational outcomes. Eight studies reveal that people ask for advice in moral dilemmas, believing it will reduce how much they are blamed for their decisions. However, following advice almost never reduces blame, while ignoring advice consistently leads to harsher judgments. The studies suggest that advice-seeking in moral contexts can signal a lack of morality, challenging the perceived benefits of such behavior. Contact: ybigman@gmail.com

#### **Learning to be algorithm averse: People follow advisors that align with their biases**

Plonsky, Ori (Technion); Hertz, Uri (University of Haifa); Roth, Yefim (University of Haifa)

In 3 preregistered experiments, we explore when people learn to prefer human expert over algorithmic advice and vice versa. We first find that people who develop experience-based task expertise often provide biased advice, reflecting biases in decisions from experience. When these biased advices are provided to advisees who also receive unbiased algorithmic advice, algorithm aversion emerges: People prefer biased human experts over unbiased algorithms. Yet, when human advisors are contrasted with algorithms that provide even more consistently biased advice, the pattern reverses, and people follow algorithms more than humans. Thus, people favor advisors that align with their own biases. Contact: oplonsky@gmail.com

#### **Gender and Advice Taking: A Meta-Analytic Path Model**

Kausel, Edgar (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile); Ventura, Santiago (Warwick University); Reyes, Valentina (University of Chile)

Decision-making often involves weighing personal judgment against advice, a dynamic encapsulated by the Weight of Advice (WOA) measure. This paper examines gender differences in WOA through a meta-analysis of 134 studies (n = 29,829). A random-effects model found that women take more advice than men, but the effect was small (Hedge's  $g = .103$ ) and heterogeneous ( $I^2 = 54\%$ ). A meta-analytic path model showed that (a) the gender-advice relationship was partly explained by overconfidence; (b) women's post-advice estimates are slightly more accurate than men's due to taking more advice. Primary data revealed that gender differences are driven by the number of men who completely ignore the advice. Contact: ekausel@uc.cl

### **Session #9 Track III: Over- and under-estimation - Marriott - Duffy & Columbia - Sunday 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm**

#### **The Failure Gap**

Eskreis-Winkler, Lauren (Northwestern University); Woolley, Kaitlin (Cornell University); Kim, Minhee (Columbia University); Polimeni, Eliana (University of Chicago)

Across 13 studies, lay people and experts in the lab and the field underestimated the frequency of failure at the personal, national, and international level across 30+ life domains. For every two surgeons who do not wash their hands, the public is aware of one; for every five weapons undetected by airport security, the public thinks one sneaks by. The failure gap was driven by the relentless positivity of public discourse (N=2,522,338 news articles). Apprising citizens of the true rate of failure closing the failure gap spurred support for policy reform (e.g., gun control, family leave) among citizens and global leaders. The failure gap is common, crippling, and encouragingly, correctable. Contact: lauren.eskreis-winkler@kellogg.northwestern.edu

### **The Illusion of Diversity**

Kardosh, Rasha (New York University); Victor, Kalman (New York University); Hassin, Ran (Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Trope, Yaacov (New York University)

We explore a novel and consequential social bias: people consistently believe that their social environments are more diverse than they truly are. Through experimental designs and field studies, we find that because cognition is tuned to the uncommon and unexpected, the presence of individuals from minority groups is highlighted across perception, memory, and visual awareness. As a result we overestimate the prevalence of the minority group. Conversely, because cognition is tuned to what is present and is unlikely to dwell on absences of unexpected occurrences, the absence of a minority group is less likely to be noticed. Together, these two processes create an illusion of diversity. Contact: rasha.kardosh@mail.huji.ac.il

### **Are frogs more forgiving than acorns anticipate?**

Schaumberg, Rebecca (University of Pennsylvania); Simmons, Joseph (University of Pennsylvania)

Meta-perception research shows that people often overestimate the negative impact of their bad actions on others and underestimate the positive impact of their good actions. Our studies demonstrate that these biases can arise from response pressure confounds baked into the questions used. Across eight preregistered studies, we show that different response pressures between "How I think others would judge me" and "How I would judge others" can generate these biases and produce seemingly absurd effects, such as people overestimating how negatively a frog would judge them if they were an acorn that fell on its head. Contact: rlschaumberg@gmail.com

## SJDM Poster Session #1

**Sunday, November 24th 8:30am-9:30am**

Meet the Directors of Decision, Risk, and Management Sciences at the NSF, González Vallejo, Claudia (NSF); O'Connor, Robert (NSF)

- 1) The Education Paradox: Taking a Class Can Lead Learners to Overestimate What They Know, Atir, Stav (University of Wisconsin); Rosenzweig, Emily (Ascension Healthcare); Dunning, David (University of Michigan)
- 2) Consequential inconsistency in dynamic decision making, Sztajnkrzyca, Luke (University of Illinois); Hotaling, Jared (University of Illinois)
- 3) A gut feeling: Exploring the Effects of Probiotics on Risk-Taking Behavior using TMS and EEG, Dantas, Aline (Maastricht University); Bruggen, Elisabeth (Maastricht University); Jiao, Peiran (Maastricht University); Sack, Alexander (Maastricht University); Schuhmann, Teresa (Maastricht University)
- 4) Why We Risk It: Cognitive and Affective Pathways Behind Increased Risk-Taking Under Sexual Arousal, Ehmann, Nina (University of Konstanz); Tump, Alan Novaes (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Genc, Sura (University of Konstanz); Lenggenhager, Bigna (Other); Gaissmaier, Wolfgang (University of Konstanz)
- 5) Daring to Be Happy: A Meta-Analytic Investigation of the Relationship Between Risk-Taking and Happiness, Mellor, Gabrielle (Louisiana State University); Mouton, Colette (Louisiana State University); Reeves, Katelyn (Louisiana State University); Zhang, Don (Louisiana State University)
- 6) A Cross-cultural Investigation of Luck Beliefs: How would past experience influence the future?, Wei, Claire (Queen's University); Ji, Li-Jun (Queen's University); Wang, Xin-Qiang (Jiangxi Normal University)
- 7) Mental imagery shapes emotions in people's decisions related to risk taking, Smieja, Joanna (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities); Zaleskiewicz, Tomasz (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities); Gasiorowska, Agata (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities)
- 8) Performance expectations and risk-taking: A large-scale analysis of gambits in tournament chess, Zak, Uri (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Vishkin, Allon (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology); Yechiam, Eldad (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology)
- 9) Same Odds Different Story: How Odds Formats Affect Sports Bettors' Comprehension and Judgments, Wang, William (University of British Columbia); Griffin, Dale (University of British Columbia)
- 10) When very low probabilities matter: the impact of probability formats on risk perception and preventive action, Idzikowska, Katarzyna (Kozminski University)
- 11) Risk preferences in guaranteed-loss versus non-guaranteed-loss environments., Festjens, Anouk (Maastricht University)
- 12) Banks' Risk-Taking, Stability, and Competition: Evidence from GCC countries, Abu-Abbas, Bassam (Qatar University)
- 13) The role of overall probability of winning and losing in the probability of winning heuristic, Yoon, Sangsuk (University of Dayton)
- 14) Does Performance on the Cognitive Reflection Test Indicate Cognitive Miserliness? Evidence from Response Times, Warnings, and Working Memory Capacity, Rachev, Nikolay (Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski); Peycheva, Ekaterina (Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski); Kamburidis, Julia (Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski); McElroy, Todd (Florida Gulf Coast University)
- 15) Who Gave You This Bad Advice? A Multinomial Processing Tree Modeling Approach to the Role of Source Memory in Advice Taking, Höhs, Johanna M. (Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen); Rebholz, Tobias R. (Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen); Hütter, Mandy (Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen)

- 16) Metacognitive Myopia: Missing Coherence in a Novel Paradigm Combining Advice Taking and Implicit Directed Forgetting, Scholten, Florian (Tubingen University); Fiedler, Klaus (Heidelberg University); Hütter, Mandy (Tubingen University)
- 17) Order-Constrained Analyses of Eyewitness Memory Accuracy, Cui, Andrea Yaoyun (University of Illinois); Chen, Meichai (University of Illinois); Regenwetter, Michel (University of Illinois)
- 18) Differential Memory Decay Across Information Types Affects Belief Formation, Connolly, Daniel (Carnegie Mellon University); Loewenstein, George (Carnegie Mellon University)
- 19) I Knew I Was In Trouble On Day 3: The effect of systematic metacognitive reflection on personal goal achievement in a real-world setting, Johnson, Olivia (Delta State University); Westfall, Jonathan (Delta State University)
- 20) The Role of Memory in Multi-alternative, Multi-attribute Context Effects, Doh, Hoyoung (Indiana University Bloomington); Trueblood, Jennifer (Indiana University Bloomington)
- 21) The Interaction of Memory Imperfections, Quint, Marcel (Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich); Maier, Johannes (Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich)
- 22) The Power of Presentation: Sequential vs. Simultaneous Presentation and Choices from Memory, Moore, Natalie (University of Chicago); Urminsky, Oleg (University of Chicago)
- 23) The Impact of Message Framing on Sleep Quality and Quantity: A Pre-Post Test Study, McElroy, Todd (Florida Gulf Coast University); McCormick, Michael (Florida Gulf Coast University); Vale, Stephen (Florida Gulf Coast University); Bourgeois, Martin (Florida Gulf Coast University)
- 24) Risky Labels: How Disease Severity Labels Impact Risk Awareness in a Public Health Context, Logemann, Hannah Timna (Robert Koch Institute); Gubernath, John (Freie Universität Berlin); Gellrich, Leon (Robert Koch Institute); Daschowski, Yvonne (Robert Koch Institute)
- 25) Behavioral Science Strategies to Improve Return to Work Outcomes Among Short Term Disability Claimants, Shah, Kahini (Duke University); Torre, Jianna (Duke University); Hopkins, Shaye-Ann (Duke University)
- 26) How Strict Self-Isolation Impacts Affect and Behaviors: A Longitudinal Study on Mandatory Quarantine, Yang, Minwen (University of Toronto); Tsai, Claire (University of Toronto); Zeng, Ying (University of Colorado Boulder)
- 27) How the use of texting abbreviations affects impression management, Fang, David (Stanford Graduate School of Business); Zhang, Yiran (Eileen) (Stanford Graduate School of Business); Maglio, Sam (University of Toronto)
- 28) Municipal Food Waste Collection Reduces Food Waste in Landfill and Promotes Positive Behavioral Spillovers., Sherlock, Joseph (Duke University); Gavin, Lyndsay (City of Durham); Johnson, Matthew (Duke University); Szczesiul, Adelaide (Duke University)
- 29) Selection Neglect: Consumers Believe That Large Assortments Reduce Consumption, Yoon, Heeyoung (Bocconi University); Meyvis, Tom (New York University); Vosgerau, Joachim (Bocconi University)
- 30) Aspirational Consumption, Xiao, Angela (Carnegie Mellon University); Golman, Russell (Carnegie Mellon University); Loewenstein, George (Carnegie Mellon University)
- 31) Consumption Portfolio Management: Very Good Stuff Is Best Enjoyed by Itself, Shen, Luxi (CUHK Business School); Meyer, Andrew (CUHK Business School); Li, Wenfeng (CUHK Business School)
- 32) Immediate vs. Delayed Benefits: Impact on Pro-Environmental Product Choices, Doshi, Shemal (INSEAD); Lin, Stephanie (INSEAD); Plassmann, Hilke (INSEAD)
- 33) Sullied Yet Satisfied: Consumption Enjoyment with Pristine and Sullied Products, Lee, Jamie (University of Michigan); Burson, Katherine (University of Michigan); Doering, Tim (Maastricht University)

- 34) Repair = Frugal or High-Status? Uncovering Status Inferences Associated with Product Repair Decisions, Tatavarthy, Aruna (Norwegian School of Economics); Agrawal, Nidhi (University of Washington); Thorbjørnsen, Helge (Norwegian School of Economics)
- 35) Green or Healthy? The Health Halo Effect of Eco-Labels on Consumer Food Choices, Bettiga, Debora (Politecnico di Milano); Mauri, Chiara (LIUC - Università Cattaneo); Pellini, Edoardo (Politecnico di Milano)
- 36) Global Evidence on the Motives for Sustainable Behaviors, Wei, Shuangyuan (RSM Erasmus University Rotterdam); Krefeld-Schwalb, Antonia (RSM Erasmus University Rotterdam); Gabel, Sebastian (RSM Erasmus University Rotterdam)
- 37) Date vs. Duration: The Impact of Best-Before Dating Format on Food Consumption and Waste Reduction, Yi, Shangwen (University of British Columbia); Sirwani, Deepak (University of British Columbia); Cornil, Yann (University of British Columbia)
- 38) From Mood to Food: How One's Emotional Environment Predicts Food Purchases., Sun, Rui (University of Chicago); Chen, Jieyi (University of Chicago); Urminsky, Oleg (University of Chicago)
- 39) Binding the Future: Long-sighted altruism boosts intergenerational sustainability, Halali, Eliran (Bar-Ilan University); Perez, Oren (Bar-Ilan University)
- 40) Single Farm-to-Table: Preference for Products with a Single Source of Origin, Shin, Sally MyungJin (Yale University); Fulmer, Alexander G. (Cornell University)
- 41) Formalizing Long-Term Human Decision-Making: Addressing the Gap Between Theoretical Knowledge and Technical Implementation in Social Simulations for Sustainable Transitions, Schutera, Stefanie (Freie Universität Berlin); Wolf, Sarah (Freie Universität Berlin)
- 42) Modelling subjective value for environmental and health outcomes under delay and risk, Fitch, Anderson (University of Florida); Kvam, Peter (Ohio State University)
- 43) Consumer Attachment and Anthropomorphism in the Secondhand Market, Pagan, Brendan (Southern Illinois University Edwardsville); Hair, Michael (Southern Illinois University Edwardsville)
- 44) Exploring souvenir purchasing decisions, Chen, Skyler Yumeng (University of California - Berkeley); Evers, Ellen (University of California - Berkeley)
- 45) Consumption share neglect: replacing vs. adding mindset, Raffaelli, Carolina (University of California - San Diego); Liu, Wendy (University of California - San Diego)
- 46) Sustainable Initiatives, Unsustainable Outcomes: When a Firm's Green Action Backfires, Huang, Yu-Shan (University of Central Florida); He, Xin (University of Central Florida)
- 47) Clean vs. Cruelty-Free: Beneficiary Packaging Cues' Influence on Consumption, Bharadwaj, Anupama (University of St. Thomas); Sackett, Aaron (University of St. Thomas)
- 48) Employees as Machines: Positive Perceptions of Dehumanized Service Providers, Wi, Jee Hyuk (Wilfrid Laurier University); Kim, Hae Joo (Wilfrid Laurier University)
- 49) To be a human? The effect of anthropomorphism on consumer willingness to buy, Wang, Yihan (Shanghai Jiao Tong University)
- 50) Pain and prejudice: Sex bias in pain management decisions, Guzikevits, Mika; Gordon-Hecker, Tom; Choshen-Hillel, Shoham; Gileles-Hillel, Alex; Israel, Salomon; Perry, Anat; Shayo, Moses; Gozal, David; Rekhman, David; Salameh, Shaden
- 51) Bullshit (Sometimes) Makes the Art (Slightly) More Attractive: A Field Study in Gallery-Goers, Borkowska, Anna (University of Wrocław); Urbanek, Arkadiusz (University of Wrocław); Milczarski, Wojciech (University of Wrocław); Zagrobelny, Jarosław (University of Wrocław); Luty, Jerzy (University of Wrocław); Białek, Michał (University of Wrocław)

- 52) If It Hurts, It Works: The Role of Political Ideology and Maximization in Shaping Preferences for Painful Self-Improvement Experiences, Barchetti, Alberto (University of Cincinnati); Clarkson, Joshua (University of Cincinnati); Otto, Ashley (Baylor University)
- 53) Social and Professional Costs of Gender Bias Confrontation Depend on Who is Confronting in What way, Ni, Minghui (Cornell University); Tian, Grace (Stony Brook University); Zayas, Vivian (Cornell University)
- 54) Sender–Recipient Preference Discrepancy for Message Sidedness in a Referral Context, Deng, Huixin (Royal Holloway, University of London); Xu, Mengran (Fudan University); Jin, Liyin (Fudan University)
- 55) The effects of tragic artist biography on artwork evaluation, Sung, Yeonjin (University of Michigan); Lee, Seojin Stacey (Pusan National University); Park, Kiwan (Seoul National University)
- 56) “Pulling Up the Ladder” and the Role of Adversity in the Construction of Value, Kim, Michelle (University of California - San Diego); Gneezy, Ayelet (University of California - San Diego); Imas, Alex (University of Chicago)
- 57) Whispered Words and Organizational Dynamics: The Nuanced Evaluation of Gossipers’ Personality and its Effect on Workplace Advice Seeking, Zhang, Lijun (Shirley) (University of Leeds); Ibrahim, Nahid (University of Leeds); Basu, Shankha (University of Leeds)
- 58) My bad or your bad? The reputational impacts of claiming blame after joint failures, Chen, Eva (University of Chicago); Chaudhry, Shereen (University of Chicago); VanEpps, Eric (Vanderbilt University)
- 59) Asymmetry in Preference, but Symmetry in the Outcome: A Study on Conversation Delaying Behaviors, Sun, Qianwen (University of California - Los Angeles); Slepian, Michael (Columbia University)
- 60) “What doesn’t kill you makes you stronger”: Lay beliefs about life adversity impact judgments of climate vulnerability and resilience, Hua, Xuwen (Columbia University); Pearson, Adam (Pomona College)
- 61) To blame or apologize? The role of second-order beliefs about relative blame in discussions of conflict, Chen, Eva (University of Chicago); Chaudhry, Shereen (University of Chicago)
- 62) Gossip, Power, and Advice: Gossipers Are Conferred Less Expert Power, Gordon, Alexis (University of Pennsylvania); Schweitzer, Maurice (University of Pennsylvania)
- 63) Authenticity in comedy: Is a fictionalized premise worth the punchline?, Gorenz, Drew (University of Southern California); Schwarz, Norbert (University of Southern California)
- 64) Does Gender Difference Affect the Threatening Communication?, Kim, Moon-Yong (Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)
- 65) Portrayal of cancer patients' emotion and belief systems; How do they relate to medical judgments?, Choi, SoeYoon (SUNY-New Paltz)
- 66) The Echo of Victimhood: Workplace Victim Signaling and its Impacts on Employee Relationships, Huang, Hsuan-Che (University of British Columbia)
- 67) Reasoning Ability and the Discrimination of Verified vs. Unverified Conspiracies, Robson, Samuel (University of New South Wales); Martire, Kristy (University of New South Wales); Faasse, Kate (University of New South Wales); Hornsey, Matthew (University of Queensland); Pearson, Samuel (University of Queensland); Cosgrove, Tylor (University of Queensland); Spence, Jessica (University of Queensland); Jetten, Jolanda (University of Queensland)
- 68) Understanding the Behavioral Underpinnings of Assessment Center Role-Play Judgments: A Machine Learning Approach, Grunenberg, Eric (University of Muenster); Klinz, Johannes L. (University of Muenster); Breil, Simon M. (University of Muenster); Stachl, Clemens (University of St. Gallen); Schaeppers, Philipp (University of Muenster); Back, Mitja D. (University of Muenster)
- 69) Exploring Deliberate Ignorance in Childhood: The Role of Future-Oriented Cognition, Kerbl, Linda (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Rahwan, Zoe (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Hertwig, Ralph (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Ciranka, Simon (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)



- 70) Testing the logical intuitions' automatization assumption: The effect of training for early and late adolescents, Boissin, Esther (Cornell University); Charbit, Laura (Paris Cité University); Caparos, Serge (Paris 8 University); De Neys, Wim (Paris Cité University)
- 71) System 2 and Cognitive Transparency: Deliberation helps to Justify Sound Intuitions during Reasoning, Beauvais, Nicolas (Université de Paris); Voudouri, Aikaterini (Université de Paris); Boissin, Esther (Cornell University); De Neys, Wim (Université de Paris)
- 72) Can a 30-minute graph training lecture reduce biases and promote risk literacy?, Cho, Jinhyo (University of Southern California); Cokely, Edward (University of Oklahoma); Feltz, Adam (University of Oklahoma); Rocio-Retamero, Garcia (University of Granada)
- 73) Reformulating Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Using Order-Constrained Inference, Chen, Meichai (University of Illinois); Line, Emily (University of Illinois); Jekel, Marc (University of Cologne); Regenwetter, Michel (University of Illinois)
- 74) The Relationship Between Executive Functions and Decision-Making in Childhood: A Systematic Review, Mendes, Angelica (University of Luxembourg); Tekampe, David (University of Luxembourg); Greiff, Samuel (Goethe University Frankfurt); Bobrowicz, Katarzyna (University of Luxembourg)
- 75) The Decision Blueprint: Exploring the Decision-Making Criteria for Parenting Interventions in Family Court, Lay, Gabriela (Arizona State University); Parker, Sydney (Arizona State University); O'Hara, Karey (Arizona State University)
- 76) Entrepreneurial just world beliefs and perceptions of success are predicted by your entrepreneurial community (and social dominance)., Wilhelms, Evan (Hiram College); Clevenger, Morgan (Hiram College); Fortunato, Michael (Authentic Redevelopment)
- 77) The Influence of Numeracy and Risk Literacy on Vulnerability to Online Deceptions, Baldwin, Alantis (Clemson University); Allan, Jinan (Clemson University); Sarno, Dawn (Clemson University)
- 78) Information sequencing: Misalignment between actual and perceived efficacy of a blind disaggregate versus holistic approach, Zhang, Xingruo (Cornell University); Fath, Sean (Cornell University); Larrick, Richard (Duke University)
- 79) Cognitive Sophistication and Scientific Beliefs: Testing Magnification Hypothesis and Its Mechanisms, Czarnek, Gabriela (Jagiellonian University); Dudek, Iwona (Jagiellonian University); Piotrowska, Maja (Jagiellonian University)
- 80) The Limits of Repetition: Distrust Dampens the Power of Repeated Claims, Orchinik, Reed (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Bhui, Rahul (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
- 81) Scientific Reasoning Ability and Science Literacy Amongst Undergraduate Students, Drummond Otten, Caitlin (Arizona State University); Anglin, Stephanie (Hobart and William Smith Colleges); Broomell, Stephen (Purdue University)
- 82) Sound Intuiting In Intelligence Tests: System 1 Intelligence?, Charbit, Laura (Université de Paris); Boissin, Esther (Cornell University); De Neys, Wim (Université de Paris)
- 83) Validating a combinatorial set of 3,125 cartoon characters based on five attributes for research on categorization, judgment and decision making, Broeder, Arndt (University of Mannheim); Undorf, Monika (TU Darmstadt); Gututui, Mihail (University of Applied Sciences Mannheim)
- 84) Experiments In Reflective Equilibrium Using The Socrates Platform, Byrd, Nicholas (Geisinger Health System); Chapkovski, Philipp (University of Bonn); Michalska, Kalina (University of California - Riverside)
- 85) A Meta-Analysis Synthesizing 20 Years of Evidence on the Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART), Frey, Renato (University of Zurich); Pantoja, Maué (University of Zurich); Lob, Aaron B. (University of Zurich)
- 86) Do We Know What We Are Doing? A Multi-Method Mapping of Intuitive and Analytic Thought and Cognitive Strategies., Collsiö, August (Uppsala University); Ericsson, Sarah (Umeå University); Juslin, Peter (Uppsala University)

- 87) Follow the fast: A simple algorithm for selecting accurate answers, Efendic, Emir (Maastricht University); P.F.M. Van de Calseyde, Philippe (Eindhoven University of Technology)
- 88) Cognitive processes and judgmental strategies in belief updating, Sommer, Joseph (Princeton University); Pernille, Hemmer (Rutgers University)
- 89) Creativity, Fast and Slow, Beucler, Jérémie (Université de Paris); De Neys, Wim (Université de Paris)
- 90) Assimilation or Comparison? Subjective Knowledge Judgment Formation, Light, Nicholas (University of Oregon); Fernbach, Philip (University of Colorado)
- 91) Belief Bias: The Role of Epistemic Values and Analytic Thinking, yilmaz, sinem (University of Illinois); staaht, tomas (University of Illinois)
- 92) Deliberation bias?: Humans and machines prefer deliberation over intuition, De Neys, Wim; Raelison, Matthieu
- 93) Our Usual Approach to Political Belief Formation Resembles a Juror Reaching a Verdict after the Prosecutor's Opening Statement: The U.S. Trial System as a Comparison Model for both Epistemically Rational and Heuristics-based Political Belief Formation, Sawyer, Timothy (Epistemic Crossroads)
- 94) Examining how prior knowledge and multiple variables reasoning relate to one's susceptibility to misinformation and ability to engage in critical evaluation, Iordanou, Kalypso (UCLan Cyprus)
- 95) The Millionaires' Club: 29 Millionaire Alums of My Behavioral Finance Class, Rude, Dale (University of Houston)
- 96) The Influence of Team Personality Composition on Team Leadership Structure and Performance: A Longitudinal Study, Breaux, Jacob (Montclair State University); Offermann, Lauren (Montclair State University); Skovera, Isabel (Montclair State University); Shelley, Loren (Montclair State University); Bixter, Michael (Montclair State University); Sessa, Valerie (Montclair State University)
- 97) The End is in Sight: The Impact of Contract End-Type on Leader Perceptions of Contract Workers, Somerville, Kaylee (Queen's University); Pupco, Shani (Carleton University); Barling, Julian (Queen's University)
- 98) CEOs narcissistic behavior, decision-making and firms' outcomes, Hassan, Mostafa (Qatar University); Lahyani, Fathia (Qatar University)
- 99) CEO Career Ceiling and Environmental Governance: Evidence from a Regression Discontinuity Design, Song, Jiazhen (University of Science and Technology of China); Huang, Jiashun (University of Science and Technology of China)
- 100) The Impact of Preference Expression Modality on Post-Taste Satisfaction, Peng, Wanxin (University of Chicago); Grant, Leigh (University of Chicago); Geipel, Janet (University of Exeter); Henly, Anne (University of Chicago); Keysar, Boaz (University of Chicago)
- 101) Efficiency Ratios: Causal Interpretations and Implications for Economic Decisions, Pan, Archer Yue (Cornell University); Sterckx, Jean-Louis (KU Leuven); De Langhe, Bart (KU Leuven); van Osselaer, Stijn (Cornell University)
- 102) The compromise effect for prosocial and consumption decisions: cost-benefit trade-offs underlying multiattribute choices, Vacondio, Martina (University of Trento); Rubaltelli, Enrico (University of Padova); Pittarello, Andrea (Stony Brook University); Dickert, Stephan (Queen Mary University of London)
- 103) Self-Other Differences in Women's Risk-Taking When Making Relationship Decisions, Shi, Sijia (Wake Forest University); Yi, Ye Dam (Unaffiliated); Poulton, Katie (Wake Forest University); Stone, Eric (Wake Forest University)
- 104) Sticky Minds: Why arguments fail to change beliefs, Boland, Katelynn (Columbia University); Mastroianni, Adam (Experimental History); Davidai, Shai (Columbia University)
- 105) Reverse the Curse of Failure: Learning Cues Increase Preferences to Seek (and Share) Experience of Overcoming Failure, Dong, Xiawei (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Jeong, Martha (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Ma, Shaocong (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology)

- 106) Correlation of Numeracy and Other Individual-Difference Factors with Attraction and Compromise Effects in Multi-Alternative Decision Making, Tsuzuki, Takashi (Rikkyo University); Takeda, Yuji (National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology); Tsuzuki, Kazuyo (Kansai University)
- 107) Advice in the presence of tradeoffs, Fadayomi, Ibitayo (University of Chicago); Kirgios, Erika (University of Chicago); Levine, Emma (University of Chicago)
- 108) Maximizing the Impact of CSR Investments: Individuals' Preferences for Internal versus External CSR Depend on Perceived Responsibility, Powell, Emily (Ipsos Behavioral Science Center); Wang, Yusu (University of Chicago); Sussman, Abigail (University of Chicago)
- 109) Perceptions of Maximizers vs. Satisficers in Consumer and Work Contexts, Jun, Young Joo (University of California - Berkeley); Schwartz, Barry (University of California - Berkeley); Cheek, Nathan N. (University of Maryland)
- 110) Avoid, Shift or Improve? How Types of Change Shape Willingness to Be Sustainable, Tedaldi, Elisa (University of Padova); Sparkman, Gregg (Boston College)
- 111) Advisor Performance Distorts Perceived Advice Quality and Utilization, Levari, David (Brown University); Feffer, Jacqueline (Harvard University)
- 112) "I'd Like Anything But Anchovies": Rejecting Unappealing Options Reduces Decision Difficulty in Joint Decision Making, Wang, Qingyang (University of California - Los Angeles); Donnelly, Grant (Ohio State University)
- 113) Justification aversion: The road to more effective defaults, Banki, Daniel (Pompeu Fabra University); Navarro-Martinez, Daniel (Pompeu Fabra University)
- 114) More Correlations Signal Causation: The Number of Correlations Affects Judgments of Causality, Zhang, Yue (RSM Erasmus University Rotterdam); Paolacci, Gabriele (RSM Erasmus University Rotterdam)
- 115) The Relative Importance of the Contrast and Assimilation Effects in Decisions Under Risk, Heilprin, Eden (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology); Erev, Ido (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology)
- 116) Fewer Voters Opt Out of Decisions to Reject the Worst Candidate, Su, Yi-Hsin (University of California - Berkeley); Shenhav, Amitai (University of California - Berkeley)
- 117) Trust mediates intent to opt out of defaults, Kleiman-Lynch, Leo J. (University of California - San Diego); McKenzie, Craig R.M. (University of California - San Diego)
- 118) Responses to Missed Opportunities: The Effects of Phantom Decoys and Inaction Inertia on Consumer Choice, Zhang, Grace (University of Chicago); Urminsky, Oleg (University of Chicago)
- 119) The Effects of Arbitrary Social Comparison on Trust and Risk, Yue, Shulang (University of Minnesota); Vilares, Iris (University of Minnesota)
- 120) The Role of Social Distance in Surrogate Decision Making Involving Risks, Wu, Xiaotong (Eva) (Northeastern University); Stone, Eric (Wake Forest University)
- 121) The Epistemic Potential of Adversarial Cooperation, Molnar, Almos (Brown University)
- 122) Not all pleasures are created equal: the inspiring effect of edifying activities., Kim, Olivia (Norwegian School of Economics)
- 123) Relational Models and Incentives in Entrepreneurship, Zhang, Weishan (University of California - Los Angeles); Gallus, Jana (University of California - Los Angeles); Kim, Tami (Dartmouth College); Zollikofer, David (ETH Zurich); Ash, Elliott (ETH Zurich)
- 124) Forbidden, permissible, or required?: Task effects in moral judgments of deontic statuses., Hamblen, Kaylee (Nova Southeastern University); Vazquez, Kasandra (Nova Southeastern University); Lemli, Benjamin (Miami University); Landy, Justin (Nova Southeastern University)

- 125) Noticing negligence or noticing numbers? Task effects in punishment judgments of moral luck cases, Vazquez, Kasandra (Nova Southeastern University); Lemli, Benjamin (Miami University); Hamblen, Kaylee (Nova Southeastern University); Landy, Justin (Nova Southeastern University)
- 126) Understanding Appointment Decisions: Do Material Interests Trump the Ethical Imperatives?, Bahník, Štěpán (Prague University of Economics and Business); Hudík, Marek (Prague University of Economics and Business); Houdek, Petr (Prague University of Economics and Business); Say, Nicolas (Prague University of Economics and Business)
- 127) Moral Dilemma Judgments by Individuals and Groups: Are Many Heads Really More Utilitarian than One?, Bialek, Michal (University of Wrocław); Rokosz, Marta (University of Wrocław); Stefańczyk, Michał (University of Wrocław); Gawronski, Bertram (University of Texas - Austin)
- 128) How do organizational structures shape corrupt collaborations? Exploring the role of diffusion and displacement of responsibility, Tonnesen, Mathilde H. (Aarhus University); Michael, John A. (University of Milan); Mitkidis, Panagiotis (Aarhus University)
- 129) An Eye and a Half for an Eye: Cognitive Approaches to the Selection of Punishment Types and Amounts, Brady, Daniel (Georgia State University); Alexander, Caelan (Georgia State University); Aharoni, Eyal (Georgia State University)
- 130) The Hidden Cost of the Death Penalty: Effects of Cost Salience on Sentencing Judgments, Alexander, Caelan (Georgia State University); Brady, Daniel J. (Georgia State University); Aharoni, Eyal (Georgia State University)
- 131) Moral decision-making: how do people solve the conflict between material incentives and moral norms, Markiewicz, Lukasz (Kozminski University); Malawski, Marcin (Kozminski University); Tyszka, Tadeusz (Kozminski University)
- 132) How to React in the Case of Powerful Transgressors: Kill Them With Kindness Or Punishment?, Houdek, Petr (Prague University of Economics and Business); Bahník, Štěpán (Prague University of Economics and Business); Zielina, Martin (Other)
- 133) Penalties for Wrong Answers Increase the Socioeconomic Achievement Gap in Academic Aptitude Tests, Hadar, Britt (Reichman University); Nimrodi, Shai (Tel Aviv University); Tureci, Esin (Princeton University)
- 134) Differential Morality: Ethical and Business Frames Make Different Moral Values Salient, Loo, Charis (Boston University); Smith-Crowe, Kristin (Boston University)
- 135) Sacred Investments: The Influence of Framing on Investment Decisions, Kim, Hyoseok (Southern Connecticut State University); Sloman, Steven (Brown University)
- 136) Revisiting Gino et al.'s (2009) Contagion and Differentiation in Unethical Behavior: A Registered Replication and Extension, Martuza, Jareef (Norwegian School of Economics); Aslan, Esra (Norwegian School of Economics)
- 137) Revisiting the Moral Forecasting Error – A Preregistered Replication and Extension of “Are We More Moral Than We Think?”, Boe, Simen (Norwegian School of Economics); Sjaastad, Hallgeir (Norwegian School of Economics)
- 138) What Is Categorized as a War Crime Depends On Who Commits It: An Asymmetry in Moral Judgments of Acts of War, Lass, Alexis (Nova Southeastern University); Landy, Justin (Nova Southeastern University)
- 139) Do Explanations Matter? The Hiring of Ex-Offenders, Manning, Josie (University of Minnesota); Luong, Alexandra (University of Minnesota)
- 140) How we judge tax decisions? Legality and situational proximity of tax behavior among employees and entrepreneurs, Kolodziej, Sabina (Kozminski University)
- 141) Network interventions to reduce hate speech on social media networks using digital ads, Hause, Lin (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Jahani, Eaman (University of Maryland); Kolic, Blas (Universidad Carlos III de Madrid); Tonneau, Manuel (University of Oxford); Barkoczi, Daniel (World Bank Group); Malhotra, Niyati (New York University); Orozco, Victor (World Bank Group); Fraiberger, Fraiberger, Sam (New York University)

- 142) Certifiably True: The Impact of Self-Certification on Misinformation, Nichols, Aaron (Boston University); Mazar, Nina (Boston University); Parker, Tejovan (Boston University); Pennycook, Gordon (Cornell University); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Van Alstyne, Marshall (Boston University)
- 143) Shared partisanship drives political assortment on Twitter, Martel, Cameron (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Mosleh, Mohsen (University of Exeter); Eckles, Dean (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Yang, Qi (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Zaman, Tauhid (Yale University); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
- 144) A New Framework for Understanding and Intervening on False News Sharing, Gollwitzer, Anton (BI Norwegian Business School); Tump, Alan (Max Planck Institute); Martel, Cameron (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Sultan, Mubashir (Max Planck Institute); Kurvers, Ralf (Max Planck Institute); Hertwig, Ralph (Max Planck Institute)
- 145) Boosting individuals to reduce decisions to engage with distorted content online, Hasan, Eeshan (Indiana University Bloomington); Epping, Gunnar (Indiana University Bloomington); Lorenzo-Luaces, Lorenzo (Indiana University Bloomington); Bollen, Johan (Indiana University Bloomington); Trueblood, Jennifer (Indiana University Bloomington)
- 146) Inside Partisan Environments: the Effects of Congruent and Incongruent News Environments on Veracity Judgments, Sharing Decisions, and Partisan Attitudes, Pit, Ilse L. (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Sultan, Mubashir (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Tump, Alan N. (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Oswald, Lisa (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Kurvers, Ralf (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
- 147) Messaging to Improve Understanding Overcomes Vaccine Hesitancy, Han, Jee Hoon (University of Washington); Joslyn, Susan (University of Washington); Qin, Chao (University of Washington); Savelli, Sonia (University of Washington); Agrawal, Nidhi (University of Washington)
- 148) Psychological inoculation is ineffective when deployed in social media contexts, Phillips, Samantha (Carnegie Mellon University); Wang, Sze Yuh Nina (Cornell University); Lin, Hause (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Pennycook, Gordon (Cornell University)
- 149) People Overestimate How Many Social Media Users Are Toxic, Neumann, Eric (Stanford University); Lee, Angela (Stanford University); Zaki, Jamil (Stanford University); Hancock, Jeff (Stanford University)
- 150) Social norms elevate vaccination intentions, Arellano, Jose (Carnegie Mellon University); Saccardo, Silvia (Carnegie Mellon University); Chapman, Gretchen (Carnegie Mellon University)
- 151) How Causal Arguments Shape Public Attitudes to Nuclear Weapons, Vranka, Marek (Charles University); Rosendorf, Ondrej (Charles University); Smetana, Michal (Charles University)
- 152) Beyond extremity: Underestimating the ideological complexity of outgroup members' opinions drives partisan animosity, Spohn, Max (Harvard University); Dorison, Charles (Georgetown University); Minson, Julia (Harvard University)
- 153) The Overabundance of Extremity in the Online World: How Social Media Distorts Perceptions of Norms, Robertson, Claire (New York University); Ashokkumar, Ashwini (New York University); Van Bavel, Jay (New York University)
- 154) Skepticism in Social Norm Interventions, Salim, Aya (Princeton University); Composto, Jordana (Princeton University); Weber, Elke (Princeton University)
- 155) How do social norm interventions work? A cognitive process theory, Composto, Jordana (Princeton University); Salim, Aya (Princeton University); Weber, Elke (Princeton University)
- 156) When Tweets Attack: Identity-Threatening Comments Undermine Scientific Reasoning in Social Media, Atamer, Atakan (University of Michigan); Mutaf, Sila (University of Michigan); Molnar, Andras (University of Michigan)
- 157) How to debunk misinformation? An experimental online study investigating text structures and headline formats, Kotz, Johannes (University of Konstanz); Giese, Helge (Heisenberg Chair for Medical Risk Literacy and Evidence-based Decisions, Charite - Berlin); Koenig, Laura M. (University of Vienna)

- 158) The role of trust in (behavioural) public policy, Ventura, Santiago (University of Warwick); Chater, Nick (University of Warwick); Mullett, Tim (University of Warwick)
- 159) 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)
- 160) Impact of uncertainty communication on public trust: the role of prior beliefs, Dries, Charlotte (Harding Center for Risk Literacy, University of Potsdam); Rebitschek, Felix G. (Harding Center for Risk Literacy, University of Potsdam)
- 161) Group meta-perceptions and perceived social polarization, Bruck, Amy (Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Ritov, Ilana (Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
- 162) Whoever is Not With Me is Against Me: The Moderate as Out-Group Effect, Maimone, Giulia (University of California - Los Angeles); McKenzie, Craig (University of California - San Diego)
- 163) Derogating Dissenters: Partisan Differences in Responses to Ingroup Dissent, Digby, Nathan (University of Illinois); Stahl, Tomas (University of Illinois)
- 164) Incentivizing Accuracy-Related Motivations Using Myside Bias, Katz, Austin (University of South Florida); Schneider, Sandra (University of South Florida)
- 165) No Logo: The Effect of Brand Attribution on Partisan News Consumption, Longmire-Monford, Ty (University of Colorado Boulder); Howard, Chuck (University of Virginia)
- 166) Re-sharing Misinformation with Impunity, Ceylan, Gizem (Yale University); Small, Deborah (Yale University)
- 167) Beyond Use-Free: A Performance-Linked Approach to Human-AI Collaboration, Xia, Qiong (INSEAD); Choudhary, Vivek (Nanyang Technological University); Shrestha, Yash (Université de Lausanne); Sharma, Rajat (Indian Institute of Management)
- 168) Do Large Language Models Essentialize Human Groups (Like Humans Do)? Using Cognitive Psychology to Probe AI Social Bias in GPT-4, Xu, Yian (Kennesaw State University); Zhou, Yingzhao (Red Hat, Inc.); Manasreh, Nancy (Kennesaw State University); Li, Run (University of California - Santa Barbara)
- 169) Large language models have not yet closed the human-machine behavioural gap: Evidence from Prisoner's Dilemma games, Niszczoła, Paweł (Poznań University of Economics and Business); Grzegorzczak, Tomasz (Poznań University of Economics and Business); Pastukhov, Alexander (Bamberg University)
- 170) Impressions of employees who use AI at work, Reif, Jessica (Duke University); Soll, Jack (Duke University); Larrick, Rick (Duke University)
- 171) Understanding Trust and Reliance Development in AI Advice: Assessing Model Accuracy, Model Explanations, and Experiences from Previous Interactions, Willemsen, Martijn (Eindhoven University of Technology); Kahr, Patricia (Eindhoven University of Technology); Snijders, Chris (Eindhoven University of Technology)
- 172) Is decision-making of medical professionals beneficial for the patients if supported by AI? A systematic review., Wilhelm, Christoph (Harding Center for Risk Literacy, University of Potsdam, Faculty of Health Sciences); Steckelberg, Anke (Institute for Health and Nursing Science, Medical Faculty of the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg); Rebitschek, Felix (Harding Center for Risk Literacy, University of Potsdam, Faculty of Health Sciences)
- 173) Artificial Influence: How AI Impacts Decision Disparities in Personal Finance, Barrafreem, Kinga (Linköping University); Tinghög, Gustav (Linköping University); Västfjäll, Daniel (Linköping University)
- 174) Implicit bias in LLMs: Can seeking advice from LLMs (unintentionally) increase the gender gap?, Etgar, Shir (Tel Aviv University); Oestreicher-Singer, Gal (Tel Aviv University); Yahav, Inbal (Tel Aviv University)
- 175) Human-Automation Collaboration, Overreliance, and the Operator's Dilemma, Cohen, Doron (University of Basel); Roth, Yefim (University of Haifa); Schöbel, Markus (University of Basel)

- 176) How Does AI Moderation Influence Individuals' Information Search And Accuracy During Decision-Making?, Cremen, Eoin (University of Bath); Hoffmann, Janina (University of Bath); Katsikopoulos, Konstantinos (University of Southampton)
- 177) Made with AI: Consumer Engagement with Media Containing AI Disclosures, Carney, Stephan (University of Southern California); Riveros, Ignacio (University of Southern California); Tully, Stephanie (University of Southern California)
- 178) Advice Taking from Interactive, Self-Explanatory Generative AI, Rebholz, Tobias R. (University of Tuebingen); Koop, Alena (University of Tuebingen); Hütter, Mandy (University of Tuebingen)
- 179) Influence of alleged AI involvement on the perception of digital medical advice, Reis, Moritz (University of Wuerzburg); Reis, Florian (Pfizer Pharma GmbH); Kunde, Wilfried (University of Wuerzburg)
- 180) Human training of artificial intelligence, Treiman, Lauren (Washington University in St Louis); Ho, Chien-Ju (Washington University in St Louis); Kool, Wouter (Washington University in St Louis)
- 181) Sender identity impacts customers' perception of a suitable response in a mortgage application process, Bortne, Oeystein (University of Stavanger); Arnestad, Mads (BI Norwegian Business School)
- 182) Controllable Complementarity: Investigating Preferences in Human-AI Teaming, McDonald, Chase (Carnegie Mellon University); Gonzalez, Cleotilde (Carnegie Mellon University)
- 183) Can LLMs tell you when they might be wrong? Evaluating the accuracy of LLMs' confidence judgments, Cash, Trent N. (Carnegie Mellon University); Oppenheimer, Daniel M. (Carnegie Mellon University)
- 184) Personalized Evidence-Based Risk Communication for Supporting Doctor-Patient Decisions on Alzheimer's Predictive Testing, Zitzmann, Michael (Universität Potsdam); Rebitschek, Felix (Universität Potsdam)
- 185) Me vs. the Machine? Evaluations of self- and AI-generated advice, Osborne, Merrick (University of California - Berkeley); Bailey, Erica (University of California - Berkeley)
- 186) From Fear to Trust: Transforming Passenger Perceptions of Autopilots with Human-Machine Collaboration, Wynns, Paul (University of California - San Diego); Amir, On (University of California - San Diego)
- 187) Does Explanation of Statistical vs. AI-Based Medical Risk Calculators Affect Trust and Acceptance of Risk Estimates?, Ramasubramanian, Madhuri (University of Michigan); Zikmund-Fisher, Brian (University of Michigan)
- 188) The Language of Machine versus Human Morality: Expectations and Reality, Fernandes, Sharlene (University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill); Gray, Kurt (University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill)
- 189) Need for explanation: Exploring the role of explanation in algorithmic advice in the case of hiring people with disabilities., Trivedi, Kartik (Brandeis University)
- 190) Robot that cares, Procházka, David Anthony (Charles University)
- 191) Polarization and policy relevance of climate change beliefs among citizens and politicians from 9 advanced democracies, Kotz, Johannes (University of Konstanz); Giese, Helge (Charite University Medicine Berlin); Breunig, Christian (University of Konstanz); Sterba, Maj-Britt (University of Konstanz); Brack, Nathalie (Universite libre de Bruxelles); Gaissmaier, Wolfgang (University of Konstanz)
- 192) Carbon Competence: Investigating Consumers' Ability to Judge the Emissions Reduction Potential of Climate Policy, Ludwig, Jonas (Technische Universitaet Berlin); Trieb, Arian (Technische Universitaet Berlin); Sugerman, Eli R. (Columbia University); Johnson, Eric J. (Columbia University)
- 193) When Do People Underappreciate and Overappreciate Low-Emission Products?, Huang, Yvonne (University of Florida); Yang, Yang (University of Florida); Wang, Wenbo (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Affonso, Felipe (Oklahoma State University)

- 194) Popularity, Misperception, and Influence of Narratives for Climate (In)Action in the United States, Ginn, Joel (Boston College); Sparkman, Gregg (Boston College); Attari, Shahzeen (Indiana University Bloomington); Weber, Elke (Princeton University)
- 195) Do-more-good frames outperform do-less-bad frames for climate action and happiness, Radke, Jade (University of British Columbia); Guan, Sophia (University of British Columbia); Dunn, Elizabeth (University of British Columbia); Zhao, Jiaying (University of British Columbia)
- 196) Exploring the cognitive and motivational influences underlying individuals' judgments of the mitigation potential of climate actions, Herberz, Mario (University of Geneva); Engel, Lukas (University of Basel); Brosch, Tobias (University of Geneva)
- 197) The role of responsibility and behavior change on support for climate policies, Yagnaraman, Dhvani (Carnegie Mellon University); Loewenstein, George (Carnegie Mellon University)
- 198) Can Motivated Reasoning Increase Support for a Carbon Tax?, Sung, Wen-chien (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Hagmann, David (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology)
- 199) Behavioural observation and decision making on the face of climate change, Bhatia, Nidhi (Indian Institute of Technology - Delhi); Parida, Biswajita (Indian Institute of Technology - Delhi)
- 200) Positive versus Negative Emotion Induction Increasing Decisions to Support Climate Policy, Bao, Yun (New York University); Vlasceanu, Madalina (Stanford University)
- 201) Differences in Discounting Across Climate Sectors, Orzach, Shelli (University of California - Los Angeles); Hershfield, Hal (University of California - Los Angeles)
- 202) Climate policy attitudes may be more strongly influenced by perceived status quo threat than personal cost, Kim, Taek (University of Missouri); Hennes, Erin (University of Missouri)
- 203) Nudging Teachers: A Megastudy To Increase Math Achievement Among 3 Million Elementary School Students, Duckworth, Angela; Ko, Ahra; Milkman, Katherine; Kay, Joseph; Dimant, Eugen; Van den Bulte, Christophe; Gromet, Dena M.; Halpern, Aden; Jung, Youngwoo; Paxson, Madeline K.; Rothschild, Jake; Silvera Zumaran, Ramon A.; Berman, Ron; Brody, Ilana; Camerer, Colin F.; Canning, Elizabeth A.; Dai, Hengchen; Gallo, Marcos N.; Hershfield, Hal; Hilchey, Matthew D.; Kalil, Ariel; Kroeper, Kathryn M.; Lyon, Amy; Manning, Benjamin S.; Mazzar, Nina; Michelini, Michelle; Mayer, Susan E.; Murphy, Mary C.; Oreopoulos, Philip; Parker, Sharon E.; Rondina, Renante; Soman, Dilip
- 204) Do planning prompts suggesting a default plan increase follow-through? Two, 1-million person field experiments, Kuan, Robert (University of Pennsylvania); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania); Ellis, Sean (University of Pennsylvania); Gromet, Dena (University of Pennsylvania); Van den Bulte, Christophe (University of Pennsylvania); Dimant, Eugen (University of Pennsylvania); Jung, Youngwoo (University of Pennsylvania); Paxson, Madeline (University of Pennsylvania); Silvera Zumaran, Ramon (University of Pennsylvania); Berman, Ron (University of Pennsylvania); Duckworth, Angela (University of Pennsylvania)
- 205) Encouraging pension savings: A Nationwide reminder megastudy, Reinson, Heidi (University of Tartu); Post, Thomas (Maastricht University); Mazar, Nina (Boston University); Reeck, Crystal (Temple University); Shah, Avni (University of Toronto); Uusberg, Andero (University of Tartu); Reinson, Heidi (University of Tartu); Post, Thomas (Maastricht University); Reeck, Crystal (Temple University); Mazar, Nina (Boston University); Syropoulos, Stylianos (Boston College); Shah, Avni (University of Toronto); Saulitis, Andris (Collegio Carlo Alberto); Uusberg, Andero (University of Tartu)
- 206) Evaluating the Impact of Timely Email Nudges on Patient Portal Enrollment and Long-Term Engagement: A Randomized Controlled Trial, Brietzke, Sasha (Geisinger Health System); Shermohammed, Maheen (Geisinger Health System); Goren, Amir (Geisinger Health System); Rosenbaum, Gail (Geisinger Health System); Meyer, Michelle (Geisinger Health System); Chabris, Christopher (Geisinger Health System)
- 207) A simple pre-appointment patient portal prompt increases flu vaccinations, Goren, Amir (Geisinger Health System); Rosenbaum, Gail (Geisinger Health System); Santos, Henri (Geisinger Health System); Doyle, Joseph (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Chabris, Christopher (Geisinger Health System); Meyer, Michelle (Geisinger Health System)



- 208) Nudging proximal but not distal outcomes: Evidence from five RCTs of behavioral interventions in health care, Rosenbaum, Gail (Geisinger Health System); Goren, Amir (Geisinger Health System); Meyer, Michelle (Geisinger Health System); Chabris, Christopher (Geisinger Health System)
- 209) The Impact of Reminders on Health-Seeking Behavior, Kotrba, Vojtěch (J. E. Purkyně University); Stachoň, Martin (J. E. Purkyně University); Minárik, Pavol (J. E. Purkyně University)
- 210) Inferring Categorical Emotion from Self-Report Affect during Monetary Reward Processing, Wu, Xinzhe (Stanford University); Yan, Ryan (Stanford University); Srirangarajan, Tara (Stanford University); Knutson, Brian (Stanford University)
- 211) Corrupt Collaboration Around the Globe, Weisel, Ori (Tel Aviv University); Ludwig, Jonas (Berlin Institute of Technology); Schulz, Jonathan (George Mason University); Shalvi, Shaul (University of Amsterdam); Soraperra, Ivan (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
- 212) Can I Make the Time or is it Running Out? Inferences from Metacognitive Experiences, Choi, Su Young (University of Southern California); Oyserman, Daphna (University of Southern California)

## SJDM Poster Session #2

**Sunday, November 24th 4:30pm-5:30pm**

Meet the Directors of Decision, Risk, and Management Sciences at the NSF, González Vallejo, Claudia (NSF); O'Connor, Robert (NSF)

- 1) CHOICE: Active Choice and Patient Preferences in Clinical Trials, Sobolev, Michael (University of Southern California); Salvy, Sarah-Jeanne (Cedars-Sinai)
- 2) Mapping the research landscape of experience-based learning and decision making, Thoma, Anna (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Bolenz, Florian (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Yang, Yujia (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Tiede, Kevin (University of Erfurt); Palminteri, Stefano (École Normale Supérieure); Hertwig, Ralph (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Wulff, Dirk (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
- 3) Leveraging cognitive models of decision-making to effectively allocate limited resources, Seow, Roderick (Carnegie Mellon University); Zhao, Yunfan (Harvard University); Wood, Duncan (Carnegie Mellon University); Tambe, Milind (Harvard University); Gonzalez, Cleotilde (Carnegie Mellon University)
- 4) A multi-country test on regulation preferences for online choice architectures, Stock, Friederike (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Ruggeri, Kai (Columbia University); Hertwig, Ralph (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Lorenz-Spreen, Philipp (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
- 5) Predicting decisions based on verbal descriptions and experience, and the value of a multi-layer application of cognitive and machine learning models, EREV, Ido (Technion); Plonsky, Ori (Technion); Roth, Yefim (University of Haifa); Marantz, Eyal (Technion)
- 6) How people make the most important decisions in their life around the globe, Hechtlinger, Shahar (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Zimmerman, Tahira (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Hertwig, Ralph (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Schulze, Christin (University of New South Wales)
- 7) Development and Validation of an Individual-Differences Measure of k-Level Strategic Anticipation, Xu, Wenzhuo (Carnegie Mellon University); Cash, Trent (Carnegie Mellon University); Downs, Julie (Carnegie Mellon University)
- 8) Broadening the Assessment Toolbox for Depth of Information Processing, Chen, Sarah (Shih-Hua) (Harvard University); Baumann, Christiane (Harvard University); Lerner, Jennifer (Harvard University)
- 9) Understanding responses of people with ASD in decision making tasks: A formal study, Ghosh, Aishwarya (University of Utah); Braüner, Torben (Roskilde University); Ghosh, Sujata (Indian Statistical Institute)
- 10) Building Idiosyncratic Models of Preference and Judgment, Albohn, Daniel (University of Chicago); Uddenberg, Stefan (University of Chicago); Todorov, Alexander (University of Chicago)
- 11) Decisions among shifting alternatives falsify option-specific models of choice, Kvam, Peter (Ohio State University); Sokratous, Konstantina (University of Florida); Fitch, Anderson (University of Florida)
- 12) Modeling strategies in dynamic decision making, Hotaling, Jared (University of Illinois); Kellen, David (Syracuse); Deng, Will (University of Illinois)
- 13) Model-based foraging in structured environments, Zalabak, Thea (Washington University in St Louis); Bustamante, Laura (Washington University in St Louis); Kool, Wouter (Washington University in St Louis)
- 14) Expanding Behavioral Reasoning Theory (BRT) to Account for Depth-of-Processing Concepts: Predicting Important Personal Decisions and Subsequent Satisfaction, Westaby, James (Columbia University); Rosemarino, Nicholas (Columbia University)
- 15) Integrating Behavioral Reasoning Theory and Dynamic Network Theory to Predict Group Decisions: A Multi-level Analysis of Observable Discussions, Mah, Elisabeth (Columbia University); Westaby, James (Columbia University)

- 16) Informing Decision-Making through Evidence-Based Design: A Case Study of Three Shanghai Parks, Sant'Anna, Marcus (Shanghai Jiao Tong University); Santanna, Ekaterina (Shanghai Jiao Tong University)
- 17) Individual differences in strategy use in multi-attribute forced choice, Banavar, Nidhi (University of California - Berkeley); Bansak, Kirk (University of California - Berkeley)
- 18) Re-assessing the role of operational definitions in psychology, Alaukik, Abhay (University of Florida); Kvam, Peter (University of Florida)
- 19) Complexity in Multiple-stage Decision Making, Le, Trung (University of Illinois); Hotaling, Jared (University of Illinois)
- 20) Thinking Styles and their Relation to Decision-Making Self Efficacy, Miesel, Anthony (West Virginia University); Best, Ryan (West Virginia University)
- 21) Mapping Consumption Experiences and Purchase Decisions: Extracting Quantitative Insights From Qualitative Interviews with Large Language Models, Aka, Ada (Stanford Graduate School of Business)
- 22) Decision Making: Analytics, Cognition, and Application, Langholtz, Harvey (The College of William & Mary)
- 23) Uncertainty prompts similar social information search across partisans but ingroup social information is weighted more heavily, Sultan, Mubashir (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Gradassi, Andrea (University of Amsterdam); Slagter, Scarlett (University of Amsterdam); van den Bos, Wouter (University of Amsterdam); Kurvers, Ralf (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Molleman, Lucas (University of Amsterdam)
- 24) Awareness and alignment in multi-attribute choice, Morris, Adam (Princeton University); Carlson, Ryan (University of Chicago); Kober, Hedy (University of California - Berkeley); Crockett, Molly (Princeton University)
- 25) Eye Gaze in Base Rate Neglect, Chesney, Dana (St. John's University); Giannicchi, Anna (St. John's University); Howell, Jordan (St. John's University); Radola, Rina (St. John's University)
- 26) Searching High and Low - The Influence of Value Magnitude on Search Behavior, Munz, Danielle (Tel Aviv University); Roth, Yefim (University of Haifa); Teodorescu, Andrei (University of Haifa); Teodorescu, Kinneret (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology)
- 27) THE POSITIVE NON-LINEAR EFFECT OF KNOWLEDGE ON PRODUCT RATINGS, Hydock, Chris (Tulane University); Thompson, Debora (Georgetown University); Malaviya, Prashant (Georgetown University)
- 28) Perceptual stimuli with difficult-to-trade-off attribute values show a positive attraction effect., Rath, Tapas (Indian Institute of Technology - Kanpur); Srivastava, Nisheeth (Indian Institute of Technology - Kanpur); Srinivasan, Narayanan (Indian Institute of Technology - Kanpur)
- 29) Negative Reviews Predict Cinematic Success, Chen, Sijin (National University of Singapore); Fishbach, Ayelet (University of Chicago); Eskreis-Winkler, Lauren (Northwestern University)
- 30) Review Rating Paradox: When Higher Review Ratings Backfire, Kim, Junha (Rutgers University); Park, Joowon (University of Utah); Goodman, Joseph K. (Ohio State University)
- 31) Paradigm Blindness: Three Overlooked Effects of Predecisional Information Distortion in Multi-attribute Decision Making in the Stepwise Evolution-of-preference Paradigm, Häffner, Carolin (University of Cologne); Marc, Jekel (University of Cologne); Daria, Lisovoj (University of Cologne)
- 32) Sex sells, but do consumers buy into reviews for sex-related products?, Blythe, Paul (University of Colorado Boulder); Barasch, Alixandra (University of Colorado Boulder); Bhattacharjee, Amit (University of Colorado Boulder)
- 33) Convenience at a Cost: How Filtering Services Diminish Shopping Pleasure, Lim, Mikyoung (University of South Florida); Romero, Marisabel (University of Tennessee); Palmeira, Mauricio (University of South Florida)
- 34) On the Economics of Information Search: Why Incentive Structure Matters, Tran, Alina (Georgia Institute of Technology); Illingworth, David (California State University, Long Beach)

- 35) A novel computational theory of information demand and probabilistic reasoning, Jiwa, Matthew (Columbia University); Gottlieb, Jacqueline (Columbia University)
- 36) The Potential Benefits of Junk Fees, Harvey, Joseph (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau); Cohen-Harding, Noah (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau)
- 37) Computations and the role of attention differ when the same multi-attribute options are presented using different frames., Kim, Hyejin (Cornell University); Fisher, Geoffrey (Cornell University)
- 38) Something Missing? The Impact of Presenting a Vertical Attribute in a Single- versus Multiple-Attribute Format on Consumer Choices, Zhang, Yue (RSM Erasmus University Rotterdam); Tu, Yanping (Hong Kong Polytechnic University)
- 39) It Takes Much More to Understand Me Than to Understand You: An Asymmetry in the Perceived Informativeness of Self vs. Others' Preference Expression, Luo, Mercy (University of California - Los Angeles); Jung, Minah (New York University)
- 40) Pre- and post-commitment exploration in dynamic environments, Palmon, Noa (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology); Teodorescu, Kinneret (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology)
- 41) Search Filter Format and Consideration Set Formation, Rosmalen, Carlie (Tilburg University); Sokolova, Tatiana (Tilburg University)
- 42) When Stating the Obvious Backfires: Consumers Dislike Products That Advertise Positive But Obvious Attributes, Cho, Kristine (University of California - Berkeley); Evers, Ellen (University of California - Berkeley)
- 43) People opt for more attribute upgrades when selecting among preconfigured products as opposed to configuring the product themselves, Bharti, Soaham (University of Chicago); Dietvorst, Berkeley (University of Chicago)
- 44) Evidence Accumulation Rate Mediates the Links between Decision Strategy and Decision Maker's Reward Sensitivity and Trait Emotional Intelligence, Yang, Yi (Temple University); Sazhin, Daniel (Temple University); Wyngaarden, James (Temple University); Clithero, John (University of Oregon); Smith, David (Temple University)
- 45) Bayesian Persuasion: Evaluating a receiver's decision making strategy under persuasion contexts, Line, Emily (University of Illinois); Chen, Meichai (University of Illinois); Bastopcu, Melih (University of Illinois); Velicheti, Raj (University of Illinois); Regenwetter, Michel (University of Illinois)
- 46) Does overconfidence undermine misinformation interventions?, Binnendyk, Jabin (Cornell University); Wang, Sze Yuh (Nina) (Cornell University); Phillips, Samantha (Carnegie Mellon University); Pennycook, Gordon (Cornell University)
- 47) I Know When to Sell: The Overoptimism Bias and Debiasing in Stock Market Decisions, Gu, Emma (University of California - San Diego); Gao, Randy (Yale University); Huang, Simon (Stanford Graduate School of Business); Jung, Minah (New York University)
- 48) Effects of Trends in Information on Predictive Judgments, Sazhin, Daniel (Temple University); Helion, Chelsea (Temple University); Murty, Vishnu (Temple University); Smith, David (Temple University)
- 49) Debiasing intuitions through short video training, Franiatte, Nina (Université Paris Cité); Boissin, Esther (Cornell University); Delmas, Alexandra (onepoint); De Neys, Wim (Université Paris Cité)
- 50) Bias Awareness and Urgency in Behavioral Interventions: Implications for Trust and Engagement, Low, Andrea (University of California - Los Angeles); Dai, Hengchen (University of California - Los Angeles); Saccardo, Silvia (Carnegie Mellon University)
- 51) Trusting the Algorithm: A Decision Under Ambiguity, Diecidue, Enrico (INSEAD); GUECIOUEUR, Ahmed (INSEAD); XIA, Qiong (INSEAD)
- 52) Probability-based Loyalty Programs Increase Engagement, Camilleri, Adrian R. (University of Technology Sydney); Jin, Liyin (Fudan University); Zhang, Ying (Peking University)

- 53) Is overconfidence an individual difference?, Moore, Don (University of California - Berkeley); Li, Sophia (University of California - Berkeley); Hale, Randall (University of California - Los Angeles)
- 54) Inferring Ability from Randomly Determined Performance, Roberts, Russell (University of Chicago); Todorov, Alex (University of Chicago); Hastie, Reid (University of Chicago)
- 55) Wisdom of the Algorithmic Crowd: Encouraging Algorithm Adoption by Leveraging Intuitions of Crowd Wisdom, Xue, Jiani (University of Pennsylvania); Puntoni, Stefano (University of Pennsylvania); Mellers, Barbara (University of Pennsylvania)
- 56) Beyond Algorithm Aversion: The Impact of Conventionality on Error Evaluations, Tariq, Hamza (University of Waterloo); Fugelsang, Jonathan (University of Waterloo); Koehler, Derek (University of Waterloo)
- 57) A taxonomy of state-specific psychological mechanisms underlying decisions under risk and uncertainty, Lob, Aaron (University of Zurich); Fischer, Olivia (University of Zurich); Frey, Renato (University of Zurich)
- 58) Lab and life: Differences in risky choices and relevant psychological mechanisms, Fischer, Olivia (University of Zurich); Lob, Aaron (University of Zurich); Frey, Renato (University of Zurich)
- 59) Will People Use the Inner Crowd? Testing Whether People Choose the Superior Strategy when Making Numeric Estimates, Riddell, Chase (Appalachian State University); Smith, Andrew (Appalachian State University)
- 60) Decision Making with Data Visualizations: A Discrepancy between Performance and Preference, Witt, Jessica (Colorado State University); Pleskac, Timothy (Indiana University Bloomington)
- 61) Recalibrated Wisdom of Crowds in Detection of AI-Generated Images, Hegeman, Phillip (Indiana University Bloomington); Trueblood, Jennifer (Indiana University Bloomington)
- 62) Reevaluating Social Responses to Miscalibration: Disentangling the effect of Overconfidence and the Impact of Elicitation, Wallmueller, Peter (INSEAD); Lawson, M. Asher (INSEAD)
- 63) Consumer Preference for Algorithmic vs. Human Evaluation, Liu, Qiao (University of Alberta); Haeubl, Gerald (University of Alberta)
- 64) Prescriptions Under Uncertainty for the Climate Crisis, Miller, Jane (Vanderbilt University); Windschitl, Paul (University of Iowa)
- 65) Hindsight and Confidence: Influences on Decision Processes, Silverstein, Michael (University of Oregon); Peters, Ellen (University of Oregon)
- 66) Learning from adviser confidence, Woo, So Young (University of Oxford); Yeung, Nick (University of Oxford)
- 67) Crowds, Certainty, and Choice: The Emergence of Metawisdom in Dynamic Information Environments, Atwell, Jon (Stanford Graduate School of Business); Twyman, Marlon (University of Southern California)
- 68) Determinants of Confidence in our Metacognitive Beliefs, Simionescu, Isabelle (University of Waterloo); Risko, Evan (University of Waterloo)
- 69) Modeling the Subjective Perception of Uncertainty, Lob, Aaron (University of Zurich); Frey, Renato (University of Zurich)
- 70) Explainable heterogeneity in decision making under uncertainty, Lawson, Asher (INSEAD)
- 71) Temporal Dynamics of Emotion: Biometric Insights Into Decision-Making Under Uncertainty, Lindsay, Kellie (University of Michigan)
- 72) Sequential versus Simultaneous Belief Updating, Bogard, Jonathan (Washington University in St Louis)
- 73) Scarcity and borrowing behavior: from opening a new line of credit to repayment strategy, Caserotti, Marta (University of Padova); Girardi, Paolo (University of Venice); Sellaro, Roberta (University of Padova); Gavaruzzi, Teresa

(University of Bologna); Lotto, Lorella (University of Padova); Rubaltelli, Enrico (University of Padova); Tasso, Alessandra (University of Ferrara); Roux, Caroline (Concordia University)

- 74) Beyond Taxis: Reference Dependence in Rideshare Labor Supply, Kukavica, Anthony (Stanford Graduate School of Business); McKenna, Sean (California Institute of Technology); Shum, Matthew (California Institute of Technology); Chen, Keith (University of California - Los Angeles); Camerer, Colin (California Institute of Technology)
- 75) The Role of Stock-Flow Reasoning in Understanding the Social Security Trust Fund, Weber, Megan (University of California - Los Angeles); Spiller, Stephen (University of California - Los Angeles); Hershfield, Hal (University of California - Los Angeles); Shu, Suzanne (Cornell University)
- 76) Spreading Roots: How Making Things Yourself Increases Groundedness and Decreases Anxiety, Monnier, Arnaud (Universidade Nova de Lisboa); Leao, Leonor (Universidade Nova de Lisboa); Schreier, Martin (Vienna University of Economics and Business); van Osselaer, Stijn (Cornell University)
- 77) Free is always better? On the likelihood of acquiring a premium service under freemium vs. paymium models, Dorfman, Anna (Bar-Ilan University); Danziger, Shai (Tel Aviv University); Ash, David (Tel Aviv University); Ben Shahaar, Danny (Tel Aviv University)
- 78) Willingness to Pay for Perfectly Complementary Goods, Li, David (Carnegie Mellon University); Olivola, Chris (Carnegie Mellon University); Liang, Yucheng (Carnegie Mellon University)
- 79) Managing Finances in Recurring Budgets: Anticipating a Future Budget Refresh Increases Current Spending, Wang, Yusu (University of Chicago); Sussman, Abigail (University of Chicago); , (Other)
- 80) Green For the Rich But Not For the Poor: How Income Bias Affects Green Credit, Sahin, Ceren (Tilburg University); Stuppy, Anika (Tilburg University); Smith, Robert (Tilburg University)
- 81) Demand is finite and anchored to price: How microeconomic models misrepresent consumer decisions, Corredor, Javier (Universidad Nacional de Colombia); Sánchez-Mora, Johanna (Universidad Nacional de Colombia); Jerez-García, Daniel (Universidad Nacional de Colombia)
- 82) When She Makes More, He Pays Just as Much: Gender of the Higher Earner Affects How Couples Split Shared Expenses, Kim, Lena (Cornell University); Garbinsky, Emily (Cornell University); Johnson, Alicia (University of Massachusetts)
- 83) The Strategic Use of Payment Methods to Buffer the Pain of Paying, Huang, Emily (Washington University in St Louis); Cryder, Cynthia (Washington University in St Louis); Baum, Stephen (Washington University in St Louis)
- 84) How Pricing Granularity Impacts Investing Preferences, Ding, William (Southern Connecticut State University); Sprott, David (Claremont Graduate University)
- 85) The impact of surcharges on consideration set formation and choice, Althenayyan, Abdullah (Columbia University); Morwitz, Vicki (Columbia University)
- 86) Do People with Multiple Jobs Spend Labor Income Differently?, Tsai, Paige (Harvard University); Buell, Ryan (Harvard University)
- 87) The Image of Thrifting: Observer Reactions to Frugal Shopping Tactics, Grabke, Jocelyn (Northwestern University); Roese, Neal (Northwestern University)
- 88) WHAT MAKES CATEGORY-LEVEL SPENDING ORDINARY VERSUS EXCEPTIONAL?, Kettle, Keri (University of Ottawa); Tremblay, Camille (University of Ottawa)
- 89) The Impact of Income Volatility on Subjective Wealth and Financial Behaviors, Goncharova, Ekaterina (University of Pennsylvania); De La Rosa, Wendy (University of Pennsylvania)
- 90) The rise (and fall) of decision making during increasing physical exercise, Notebaert, Wim (Ghent University); Held, Leslie (Ghent University); Van de Walle, Marie (Ghent University); Denul, Ayala (Ghent University); Colosio, Alessandro (Ghent University); Vermeylen, Luc (Other)

- 91) Information Search Shapes Consumer Patience: A Novel Process-informed Model for Intertemporal Choice, Reeck, Crystal (Temple University); Lee, Byung Cheol (University of Houston); Krefeld-Schwab, Antonia (RSM Erasmus University Rotterdam); Xu, Simon (Columbia University); Johnson, Eric (Columbia University)
- 92) Lagging Behind: How Brief Loading Delays Harm Learning, Mazar, Asaf (University of Pennsylvania); Tomaino, Geoff (University of Florida); Abdolsaheb, Ahmad (freeCodeCamp); Carmon, Ziv (INSEAD); Duckworth, Angela (University of Pennsylvania)
- 93) Happiness, Meaning, and Psychological Richness: People Have Time-Inconsistent Preferences for the Good Life, Martuza, Jareef (Norwegian School of Economics); Thorbjørnsen, Helge (Norwegian School of Economics); Dahlén, Micael (Stockholm School of Economics); Sjastad, Hallgeir (Norwegian School of Economics)
- 94) Procrastination : Human vs Machines, Sokratous, Konstantina (University of Florida); Hintze, Arend (Dalarna University); Fitch, Anderson (University of Florida); Kvam, Peter (Ohio State University)
- 95) How Relative Task Completion Affects Mundane Experience, Zeng, Ying (University of Colorado Boulder); Tsai, Claire (University of Toronto); Zhao, Min (Boston College); Robitaille, Nicole (Queen's University)
- 96) Power makes people more prone to take financial risks, but not under cognitive load, Sekścińska, Katarzyna (University of Warsaw); Jaworska, Diana (University of Warsaw); Rudzinska-Wojciechowska, Joanna (Kozminski University)
- 97) Time-discounting and preference reversal dynamics: An experience sampling experiment on the subjective value of time, Miccoli, Maria Rosa (University of Konstanz); Shevchenko, Yury (University of Konstanz); Reips, Ulf-Dietrich (University of Konstanz)
- 98) Lacking Power Leads to Reduced Sunk Cost Bias, Yu, Jack Xinhao (Hong Kong Polytechnic University); Savani, Krishna (Hong Kong Polytechnic University)
- 99) Perceived time mediates the effect of uncertainty on inter-temporal choices, Mitra, Arjun (Indian Institute of Technology - Kanpur); Srivastava, Nisheeth (Indian Institute of Technology - Kanpur)
- 100) Exploring a Cognitive Explanation of the Planning Fallacy: Unpacking effects on individual and group planning estimates, Kannan, Anusha (Michigan Technological University); Veinott, Elizabeth (Michigan Technological University)
- 101) The Curvilinear Relation between Entrepreneur Temporal Discounting and New Venture Performance, Dalal, Dev K. (SUNY - University at Albany); Kausel, Edgar E. (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile)
- 102) Is escalation socially rational? Exploring social influence in sunk cost decisions, Radvick, Tracy (Stony Brook University); Echelbarger, Margaret (Stony Brook University)
- 103) Response times in intertemporal choice: Meta-dataset and meta-analysis, Pongratz, Hannah (Universität Mannheim); Schoemann, Martin (TU Dresden)
- 104) Evaluations of what is a good or bad use of time, Tsang, Shelly (University of Virginia)
- 105) Unequal and Unforgiving: The Link Between Economic Inequality and Moral Condemnation, Kirkland, Kelly; Van Lange, Paul A. M.; Gorenz, Drew; Blake, Khandis; Amiot, Catherine E.; Ausmees, Liisi; Baguma, Peter; Barry, Oumar; Becker, Maja; Bilewicz, Michal; Boonyasiriwat, Watcharaporn; Booth, Robert W.; Castelain, Thomas; Costantini, Giulio; Dimdins, Girts; Espinosa, Agustín; Finchilescu, Gillian; Fischer, Ronald; Friese, Malte; Gómez, Ángel; González, Roberto; Goto, Nobuhiko; Halama, Peter; Hurtado-Parrado, Camilo; Ilustrisimo, Ruby D.; Jiga-Boy, Gabriela M.; Kuppens, Peter; Loughnan, Steve; Mastor, Khairul A.; McLatchie, Neil; Novak, Lindsay M.; Onyekachi, Blessing N.; Rizwan, Muhammad; Schaller, Mark; Serafimovska, Eleonora; Suh, Eunkook M.; Swann, William B. Jr.; Tong, Eddie M. W.; Torres, Ana; Turner, Rhiannon N.; Vauclair, Christin-Melanie; Vinogradov, Alexander; Wang, Zhechen; Yeung, Victoria Wai Lan; Bastian, Brock
- 106) People Who Need People (and Some Who Think They Don't): On Compensatory Personal and Social Means of Goal Pursuit, Milyavsky, Maxim (Ono Academic College); Kruglanski, Arie W. (University of Maryland); Gelfand, Michele (Stanford University); Chernikova, Marina (University of Maryland); Ellenberg, Molly (University of Maryland); Pierro, Antonio (University of Rome)

- 107) The Advantage of Periodic Donations in Corporate Social Responsibility: Consumers View Consistency as a Diagnostic Cue of Donor Commitment, Leng, Yanyi (Washington University in St Louis); Park, Alexander (Indiana University Indianapolis); Gonzalez, Fausto (Washington University in St Louis); Watson, Jared (New York University); Valsesia, Francesca (University of Washington); Cryder, Cynthia (Washington University in St Louis)
- 108) AI-induced Indifference: Unfair AI Reduces Prosociality, Zhang, Raina (New York University); Kyung, Ellie (Babson College); Longoni, Chiara (Bocconi University); Cian, Luca (University of Virginia); Mrkva, Kellen (Baylor University)
- 109) How Angry Are You About Societal Inequity? People Underestimate Minority Groups' and Overestimate Majority Groups' Anger Toward Inequity, Fa-Kaji, Naomi (Darden School of Business); Brown, Derek (Columbia University); Mittal, Aastha (Columbia University); Schroeder, Juliana (University of California - Berkeley); Belmi, Peter (Darden School of Business)
- 110) Does Indirect Reciprocity Motivate People to Give Money and Time to Organizations? Evidence from Two Field Experiments, Mandel, Graelin (University of Chicago); Kirgios, Erika (University of Chicago); Rai, Aneesh (University of Maryland); Chang, Edward (Harvard University); Milkman, Katy (University of Pennsylvania)
- 111) Does adding an egoistic motive to altruistic cheating contaminate the "good deed"?, Shuster, Shaked (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Eyal, Tal (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Ayal, Shahrar (Reichman University); Moran, Simone (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
- 112) The Do-Gooder Dilemma: A Self/Other Asymmetry in the Shame and Embarrassment of Self-Reporting Good Deeds, Richardson, Jeremy (Cornell University); Bloom, Paul (University of Toronto); Nichols, Shaun (Cornell University); Pizarro, David (Cornell University)
- 113) Moral Judgement of the Racist Altruist, Meyers, Samuel (Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Choshen-Hillel, Shoham (Hebrew University of Jerusalem); Wilks, Matti (University of Edinburgh); Bigman, Yochanan E. (Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
- 114) Effects of Time as a Resource in a Modified Dictator Game, Kelly, Tyler (Indiana University Bloomington); Todd, Peter (Indiana University Bloomington); Kurosky, Nathan (Indiana University Bloomington); Teodorescu, Kinneret (Technion-Israel Institute of Technology)
- 115) How Increasing Preschoolers' Self-Esteem Affects Their Materialism: An Experimental Study, Trzcińska, Agata (University of Warsaw); Wieleśzczyk, Jowita (University of Warsaw); Podsiadłowski, Wojciech (University of Warsaw); Sekścińska, Katarzyna (University of Warsaw)
- 116) Individual differences may require time to shape prosocial behaviors, Gordon-Hecker, Tom (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Pittarello, Andrea (Stony Brook University); Bereby-Meyer, Yoella (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
- 117) Witnessing rudeness impact on prosociality toward uninvolved others, Zigdon, Ido (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Morvinski, Coby (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Efrat-Treister, Dorit (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
- 118) Harnessing Fear for Charity: The Impact of Fear and Cause Specificity on Charitable Giving, Marinoni, Veronica (Concordia University); Sobol, Kamila (Concordia University); Roux, Caroline (Concordia University)
- 119) The competitive risk-reward ecology of economic scarcity, Ciranka, Simon (Max Planck Institute); Chevallier, Coralie (Ecole Normale Superior); Nettle, Daniel (Ecole Normale Superior)
- 120) Branded Money: The psychological impact of contingent financial benefits, Van den Bergh, Bram (Erasmus University Rotterdam); Posner, Nathaniel (Columbia University); Krefeld-Schwab, Antonia (Erasmus University Rotterdam)
- 121) Money talks? How different incentive schemes influence prosocial behavior in economic games, Koppel, Lina (Linköping University); Lindkvist, Amanda (Linköping University); Tinghög, Gustav (Linköping University)
- 122) Relationship between Benign Envy and Enhanced Evaluation of Others' Possessions from the Endowment Effect Perspective, Onuki, Yutaro (Hitotsubashi University); Otaki, Yurina (Hitotsubashi University); Ueda, Kazuhiro (The University of Tokyo)



- 123) 3rd party allocation and merit judgments, Nichols, Thomas (University of Michigan); Molnar, Andras (University of Michigan); Preston, Stephanie (University of Michigan)
- 124) Unfairness Across Contexts: Investigating Generalized Reciprocity Across Different Tasks and Domains, Rudzińska-Wojciechowska, Joanna (Kozminski University); Wojciechowski, Jerzy (University of Warsaw); Sekścińska, Katarzyna (University of Warsaw)
- 125) Monetary sacrifices (or gains) to change one's relative social rank, de La Trobe, Alexandra V. T. (University of Warwick); Walasek, Lukasz (University of Warwick); Brown, Gordon D. A. (University of Warwick)
- 126) The importance of representing economic inequality saliently and to scale, Elbaek, Christian T. (Aarhus University); Mitkidis, Panagiotis (Aarhus University)
- 127) Social desirability bias self-reported motivation, Arnestad, Mads (BI Norwegian Business School); Andvik, Christian (BI Norwegian Business School)
- 128) Personalized, simple defaults using a positive deviance approach optimized financial decisions, Ruggeri, Kai (Columbia University); Ashcroft-Jones, Sarah (Columbia University)
- 129) Selective attention can bias moral learning from consequences, Spiteri, Glen (University of California - Los Angeles); Lieder, Falk (University of California - Los Angeles)
- 130) Cheap Talk in Celebrating Positive Change, Zaw, Samantha (University of Chicago); O'Brien, Ed (University of Chicago)
- 131) Impatient for Impact: Intertemporal preferences for earlier donation impact timing, Chen, Jieyi (University of Chicago); Urminsky, Oleg (University of Chicago)
- 132) How the statistical information of others' donation influences individual donation behavior, Jin, Tao (University of Minnesota); Vilares, Iris (University of Minnesota)
- 133) Organ Donation Decisions: When deviating from the status quo heightens perceived vulnerability, Kogut, Tehila (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev); Motsenok, Marina (University of Toronto)
- 134) Competing Motivations: Adding Prosocial Incentive Reduces Effort, Gibson, Kieran (The University of Queensland)
- 135) Motivation to earn rewards provides unique reputational benefits, Cusimano, Corey (Yale University)
- 136) The description-experience gap generalizes across paradigms, but not necessarily its mechanisms, Tiede, Kevin E. (University of Erfurt); Pachur, Thorsten (Technical University of Munich); Spektor, Mikhail S. (University of Warwick); Hertwig, Ralph (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Wulff, Dirk U. (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
- 137) Expectation-experience gap and its impact on future expectations, Johnson, Joseph (Temple University); Mistry, Minal (Temple University); Musser, Diavionne (Temple University); Stinson, Carly (Temple University); Venkatraman, Vinod (Temple University)
- 138) Using Reward Ratings of Liking and Wanting to Predict Choice: Integrating Economic Models with Fuzzy Trace Theory, Liu, Alan (Cornell University); Reyna, Valerie (Cornell University); Edelson, Sarah (Cornell University); Roue, Jordan (Cornell University)
- 139) On the nature of recency in decisions from experience, Yang, Yujia (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Thoma, Anna (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Hertwig, Ralph (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Wulff, Dirk (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
- 140) Negative-Sum Competition and Internequine Behavior, Hsee, Christopher (University of Chicago); Zeng, Ying (University of Colorado Boulder); Li, Xilin (China Europe International Business School); Imas, Alex (University of Chicago)

- 141) A Diffusion Model Decomposition of the Wishful Thinking Effect in Stochastic Events, Strueder, Jeremy (University of Iowa); Park, Inkyung (University of Iowa); Mordkoff, J. Toby (University of Iowa); Windschitl, Paul (University of Iowa)
- 142) Learning to Win by Fearing to Lose: Exploring the Positive Effects of Loss Aversion on Academic Achievement and Motivation in Education, Bako, Barna (Corvinus University of Budapest); Ertl, Antal (Corvinus University of Budapest); Holb, Éva (Corvinus University of Budapest)
- 143) Do Losses Promote More Reflection Than Gains?, Rey, Carlos (University of the Balearic Islands); Lejarraga, Tomás (University of the Balearic Islands); Rubí-Barceló, Antoni (University of the Balearic Islands)
- 144) The Lemonade Effect: The unexpected upside of negative consumption experiences, MacDonald, Tyler (Boston University); Keinan, Anat (Boston University)
- 145) People Demand Less Per-person Compensation When Waiting in A Nominal Group than Alone, Cheng, Zipeng (Peking University); Tu, Yanping (Hong Kong Polytechnic University)
- 146) Risky-choice framing effects result partly (but only partly) from mismatched option descriptions in gains and losses, DeKay, Michael (Ohio State University); Dou, Shiyu (Ohio State University)
- 147) Is there a description-experience gap in loss aversion? A meta-analysis with cumulative prospect theory, Busch, Nuno (Technical University of Munich); Pachur, Thorsten (Technical University of Munich)
- 148) Individual Differences in Orange Juice Evaluation, Champlin, Elizabeth (University of Toledo); Jasper, J.D. (University of Toledo)
- 149) Loss Aversion Across Adulthood: The Context Matters, Horn, Sebastian (University of Zurich); Freund, Alexandra (University of Zurich)
- 150) The Effect of the Endpoint Bias on Predictions of Glacier Ice Decline., Kühne, Swen J. (Zurich University of Applied Sciences); Hartmann, Cathérine (Zurich University of Applied Sciences)
- 151) How Direct Experience Affects Causal Inference: theory and implications, Ramaswami, Seshan (Singapore Management University)
- 152) Loss prevention goal orientation: Age associated with preference to avoid rather than minimize losses, Best, Ryan (West Virginia University)
- 153) Measuring beliefs about transgender people, Wang, Sze Yuh Nina (Cornell University); Perfors, Andrew (University of Melbourne); Pennycook, Gordon (Cornell University); Rand, David (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Costello, Thomas (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); McLamore, Quinnehtukqut (University of Missouri)
- 154) Can Feedback Promote Diversity? It Depends on the Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice, Cervantez, Jose (University of Pennsylvania); Pink, Sophia (University of Pennsylvania); Chang, Linda (University of Pennsylvania); Rai, Aneesh (University of Maryland); Mosleh, Mohsen (Exeter University); Milkman, Katherine (University of Pennsylvania)
- 155) High Minority Population Increases the Odds of Mortgage Approval for Couples of Color, Zambrotta, Nicholas D. (Columbia University); Germano, Adriana L. (Yale University); Zou, Linda X. (University of Maryland); Carter, James T. (Cornell University); Akinola, Modupe (Columbia University)
- 156) 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, Shenzhen); Nelson, Leif (University of California - Berkeley)
- 157) East-West differences in intuitions about critical feedback, Kim, Yena (University of Chicago); Zhu, Raye (Northwestern University); Bitterly, T. Bradford (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology); Talhelm, Thomas (University of Chicago); Levine, Emma (University of Chicago)

- 158) Fear of Missing Out (FoMO) in the Workplace: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Poland, China, and the USA, Jaworska, Diana (University of Warsaw); McKee, Paul C. (Duke University); Tang, Honghong (Beijing Normal University); Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter (Duke University); Sekścińska, Katarzyna (University of Warsaw)
- 159) Intergroup Bias in the Evaluation of Government Performance, Wu, Baizhou (Chinese Academy of Sciences); Li, Yugang (Chinese Academy of Sciences); Huang, Yuqi (Chinese Academy of Sciences); Luan, Shenghua (Chinese Academy of Sciences)
- 160) “I Am” Versus “I Do”: How Identity-Expressive Language Affects Identity Reinforcement and Identity-Congruent Behavior, Tinlin, Vanessa (University of Ottawa); Kettle, Keri (University of Ottawa); Reed II, Americus (University of Pennsylvania); Morgan, Carter (University of South Florida)
- 161) Self-sacrificial moral judgments are robust to the foreign language effect, Milczarski, Wojciech (University of Wrocław); Muda, Rafał (University of Wrocław); Borkowska, Anna (University of Wrocław); Białek, Michał (University of Wrocław)
- 162) Foreign language use shapes our choices but only when preferences are not well-established, Muda, Rafał (University of Wrocław); Białek, Michał (University of Wrocław); Milczarski, Wojciech (University of Wrocław); Borkowska, Anna (University of Wrocław)
- 163) Large-Scale Field Experiment Testing Discrimination Against Non-Binary People, Kealoha, Caleb (Harvard University); Kirgios, Erika (University of Chicago); Chang, Edward (Harvard University)
- 164) Diverse group composition means higher-level social judgments, Victor, Kalman (New York University); Kardosh, Rasha (New York University); Trope, Yaacov (New York University)
- 165) The Power of Diversity: The impact of different diversity representation strategies on consumers with and without stigma, Martinez Moraleda, Rocio (IESE Business School); Reutskaja, Elena (IESE Business School); Lambertson, Cait (University of Pennsylvania)
- 166) Expanding Financial Inclusion for Marginalized Communities: Implementing Warm Handoffs and Strategic Messaging, Hopkins, Shaye-Ann (Duke University); Shah, Kahini (Duke University)
- 167) Cognitive Processes Across the Globe: Webcam-based Eye-tracking Analysis of Ingroup Bias in 20 Societies, Rahal, Rima-Maria (Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods); Schulze Spüntrup, Frederik (Institute for Globally Distributed Open Research and Education (IGDORE))
- 168) The Zero Bias in Linguistic Framing, Zhang, Hui (Iowa State University); Raju, Sekar (Iowa State University)
- 169) Impact of Stereotypes on Decision-Making in Cross-Cultural Recognition of Chinese Artifacts and Individuals, Santanna, Ekaterina (Shanghai Jiao Tong University); Sant'Anna, Marcus Vinicius (Shanghai Jiao Tong University)
- 170) It's not Me, it's Them: Anticipating Discrimination by Others Causes Discrimination, Owsley, Nicholas Calbraith (University of Chicago)
- 171) The Forecasting Proficiency Test: A Practical Forecaster Evaluation Tool, Himmelstein, Mark (Georgia Institute of Technology); Petrov, Nikolay (University of Cambridge); Zhu, Sophie Ma (University of British Columbia); Helmer, Jessica (Georgia Institute of Technology); Karger, Ezra (Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago); Livnat, Sivan (Georgia Institute of Technology); Page, Hedley (Forecasting Research Institute); Bennett, Amory (Quorum Research); Tetlock, Philip (University of Pennsylvania)
- 172) Metapredictions as Tools for Identifying Talented Forecasters and Improving Accuracy of Forecasts, Helmer, Jessica (Georgia Institute of Technology); Zhu, Sophie (University of British Columbia); Petrov, Nikolay (University of Cambridge); Karger, Ezra (Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago); Himmelstein, Mark (Georgia Institute of Technology)
- 173) The Psychometric Properties of Probability and Quantile Forecasts, Zhu, Sophie Ma (University of British Columbia); Petrov, Nikolay (University of Cambridge); Budescu, David (Fordham University); Karger, Ezra (Forecasting Research Institute); Himmelstein, Mark (Georgia Institute of Technology)

- 174) Constructing wiser crowds: Identifying cognitive traits to increase collective accuracy in geopolitical forecasting, Urs, Medhini (Stony Brook University); Luhmann, Christian C (Stony Brook University)
- 175) The Pick-the-Winner-Picker Heuristic: Preference for Categorically Correct Forecasts, Naborn, Jay (Washington University in St Louis); Bogard, Jon (Washington University in St Louis)
- 176) Comparison of Data Quality for Scientific Participant Pools, Wang, Chenyu (University of California - Berkeley); Zhang, Weishan (University of California - Los Angeles); Mittal, Aastha (Columbia University); Limbhasut, Khongkwan (Harvard University); Schroeder, Juliana (University of California - Berkeley); Moore, Don (University of California - Berkeley); Wang, Liman (Fudan University)
- 177) A field experiment on how highlighting patterns of use affects social media app visits, Hillegass, Kathryn (University of California - San Diego); Silverman, Jackie (University of Delaware); Gershon, Rachel (University of California - Berkeley); Grüning, David (Heidelberg University); Riedel, Frederik (one sec); Wolf, Donatus (University of Potsdam)
- 178) Group Identity and Recycling Behavior: Enhancing Sustainability at Stadium Events Using Identity-Based Nudges, Landsvik, Hege (Norwegian School of Economics); Martuza, Jareef Bin (Norwegian School of Economics); Skard, Siv (Norwegian School of Economics); Jørgensen, Sveinung (Norwegian School of Economics); Tynes Pedersen, Lars Jacob (Norwegian School of Economics)
- 179) Measuring stress at scale in complaining behavior, Martin, Rebecca (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau); Kirvan, Lewis (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau); Harvey, Joseph (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau); Lee, Maxwell (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau)
- 180) Aversion to Publicly Sharing Quantified Diversity Goals in Organizational Communications, Smith, Austin (University of Chicago); Kirgios, Erika (University of Chicago); Chang, Edward (Harvard University); Silver, Ike (Northwestern University)
- 181) Drivers of Smart meters adoption, Schulte-Mecklenbeck, Michael (University of Bern); Zurbrügg, Cedric (University of Bern); Höchli, Bettina (University of Bern); Chatelain, Gilles (University of Bern)
- 182) College Football Fan Sentiment Predicts Team Performance, Meister, Matt (University of San Francisco); Rose, William (University of Colorado Boulder); Reinholtz, Nicholas (University of Colorado Boulder); Lichtenstein, Donald (University of Colorado Boulder)
- 183) Experimental Aversion and Adoption of Adaptive Experiments in Digital Education Policy, Musabirov, Ilya (University of Toronto); Sushevskiy, Vsevolod (Northwestern University); Kulzhabayeva, Dana (University of Toronto); Song, Haochen (University of Toronto)
- 184) Social Favorites Are Seen as More Exclusive Than Reality in Face-to-Face Interactions, Lee, Randy (Cornell University); Surenkok, Gizem (Cornell University); Zayas, Vivian (Cornell University)
- 185) Drivers of Behavioral Quantification, Pan, Jacqueline (Duke University); Reiff, Joseph (University of Maryland); Etkin, Jordan (Duke University)
- 186) Why People Post, Nitsch, Felix Jan (INSEAD); Wertenbroch, Klaus (INSEAD); Plassmann, Hilke (INSEAD)
- 187) Small talk builds shared context to handle unforeseen circumstances, Cashman, Matthew (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Maciejovsky, Boris (University of California - Riverside); Wernerfelt, Birger (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
- 188) People Discount Digital Social Information in Social Sampling, Hecht, Marlene (Max Planck Institute for Human Development); Pachur, Thorsten (Technical University of Munich); Schulze, Christin (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
- 189) Waste Aversion as an Individual Difference, Cheng, Andong (University of Delaware); Xu, Felix (University of Kentucky); Ross, Gretchen (Texas Christian University)
- 190) Better than All the Rest: How Being Part of a Large Audience Influences Self-Control and Motivation, Jia, Zhisui (Northwestern University); Touré-Tillery, Rima (Northwestern University); Wang, Lili (Zhejiang University)

- 191) The Impact of Cuteness, Goal Importance and Private Self-Awareness on Self-Regulation, Walsh, Darlene (Concordia University); Wu, Xiu (Concordia University)
- 192) Improving Practical Design Choices in Financial Well-Being Measurement, Heck, Patrick (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau); Ratcliffe, Caroline (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau)
- 193) Boomerasking: Answering your own question, Yeomans, Michael (Imperial College London); Wood Brooks, Alison (Harvard University)
- 194) Open science practices at conferences, Schoemann, Martin (Technische Universität Dresden); Schulte-Mecklenbeck, Michael (University of Bern)
- 195) Optimal Binging: Perceived Media Momentum in Clumped Consumption, Ciulli, Rachele (University of Pennsylvania); Lamberton, Catherine (University of Pennsylvania)
- 196) The Effect of Accountability on Cancel Decisions, Marshall, Connor (University of South Florida); Pezzo, Mark (University of South Florida)
- 197) Does goal salience increase effective donation decisions? A plan for an online experiment, Männik, Sille-Liis (University of Tartu); Uusberg, Andero (University of Tartu)
- 198) How do people perceive fairness metrics of algorithmic decision support?, Rebitschek, Felix G. (Max Planck Institute for Human Development)
- 199) Response Modes for Assessing Ethical Product Considerations, DePaoli, Alexander (Northeastern University)
- 200) Why do individuals self-quantify?, Turetski, Daniella (University of Toronto)
- 201) Breaking Barriers: An Analysis Of Biases Hindering Progress Towards The 17 United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, Merrill, Gill (Utrecht University of Applied Sciences)
- 202) Psychological and Organizational Mechanisms of Status Quo Bias: A Scoping Review and Meta-Analysis, Dorais, Stephanie (William & Mary); Gutierrez, Daniel (Virginia Commonwealth University)
- 203) Stop frowning, it's true: Reduced corrugator activity indicates increased positive affect after judging information as true, Stump, Annika (University of Freiburg); Wuestenberg, Torsten (Heidelberg University); Voss, Andreas (Heidelberg University)
- 204) Don't Leave Me on Read! How Avoidance-Based vs. Busyness-Based Attribution of Read Receipts Influences Relationship Outcomes, Wan, Yige (Boston University); Fang, David (Stanford Graduate School of Business)