

Does a present bias influence exploratory choice?

Alexander S. Rich Todd M. Gureckis

Does a present bias influence exploratory choice?

Experiment

Methods

Participants.

Design and procedure.

Barratt Impulsiveness Scale

Prior to reading the experiment instructions, participants completed the 30-item Barratt Impulsiveness scale (Patton, Stanford, & Barratt, 1995) on the computer.

Consumption tasks.

Participants were informed that there were two types of tasks, a “slider task” and a “video task,” that they would complete during 30-second “work periods.” The number of remaining work periods in the experiment was shown at the top of the screen, as was the number of seconds left in the current work period.

The slider task was based of a task previously used by (Gill & Prowse, 2012). In each period of the slider task, five horizontal sliders appeared on the screen (Figure XXX). Each started at a random setting between 0 and 100, with the slider’s value shown to its right, and with a random horizontal offset so that the sliders were not aligned. The participant’s task was to use the mouse to move each slider to “50” before the work period ended. When a participant released the mouse at the correct setting, the slider turned green to show it had been completed. To ensure that the task took close to the allotted 30 seconds, at the beginning of the task only the top slider was enabled, and the other four were grayed out. Additional sliders were enabled at five-second intervals, such that all five sliders were available after 20 seconds. To make the slider task

more unpleasant, a short static noise was played through the computer speakers intermittently at a moderate volume during the task.

The video tasks consisted of simply watching one of four videos: an episode of “Planet Earth”, an episode of “The Great British Bakeoff”, an episode of “Unchained Reactions”, or an Ellen Degeneres comedy special. Participants watched the video through a player on the computer screen. They were free to fast forward or rewind the video at will, and could also switch among the videos at any time by clicking one of four tabs above the player.

To incentivize participants to attend to and perform the slider task, they were penalized if they missed more than 10% of the sliders. For each percentage over 10% of sliders that were not set to 50 over the course of the experiment,

Choice task.

Participants completed a total of 56 work periods. The first eight were automatically spent performing the slider task. For the remaining 48, participants made a choice prior to each work period that determined whether the work period would be devoted to the slider task or the video task.

For the choice task, participants were shown a “machine” that could create slider or video tasks. The machine consisted of a black-and-gold “best” spinner and a panel of possible new spinners. Participants selected either “run best spinner” or “run new spinner”.

If the participant selected “run best spinner”, the spinner would visually rotate on the screen. If it landed on gold, the machine created a video task; if it landed on black, the machine created a slider task. Thus, the probability of producing a video task was equal to the proportion gold of the spinner.

If the participant selected “run new spinner”, the new spinners in the panel were covered up and randomly shuffled. The participant then clicked one of the gray squares, revealing the new spinner underneath. As was explained to the participants, and is visually apparent, one third of the possible new spinners are completely black, while the remaining two thirds range from 5% to 100% gold, in even increments of 5%.

After revealing a new spinner, it was spun, producing a video or slider task in the same manner as the “best spinner”. Critically, if the new spinner selected had a higher proportion gold than the best spinner, it would replace the best spinner for future choices. Thus, choosing “run new spinner” was an exploratory action that could lead to the discovery of a better option that could be exploited in later choices.

Participants were also informed that after every work period there was a one in six chance that the machine would reset itself. In fact, the experiment was designed so that there was exactly one reset in every set of 6 trials (i.e., trials 1–6, 7–12, etc.). When the machine reset, the “best spinner” was set to a new

starting value. The starting values following resets (including the initial starting value) were {20%, 25%, ... 55%, 60%}, randomly ordered.

Immediate and delayed conditions.

Participants were pseudorandomly assigned to one of two conditions. In the Immediate condition, participants completed the task produced by a choice in the work period immediately following the choice. In the Delayed condition, participants completed the task produced by a choice after eight intervening work periods had passed, which was about five minutes after making the choice. This means that participants in the Delayed condition began making choices during the initial eight slider task work periods, in order to have outcomes determined when they reached the ninth and later work periods.

To make this delay intuitive, participants were shown a work queue at the bottom of the screen that contained eight tasks. In the Delayed condition, upon making a choice a new slider or video task icon was added to the right of the queue, and then the leftmost task on the queue was performed and removed. In the Immediate condition, participants were still shown the cue, but upon adding an icon to the right of the queue that outcome was performed immediately. This means that in the Immediate condition the queue acted simply as a history of the past eight outcomes.

Post-task questions.

Following the final work period, participants were asked to rate their enjoyment of the slider task and of the video task on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 indicated extremely unenjoyable and 7 indicated extremely enjoyable.

References

- Gill, D., & Prowse, V. (2012). A Structural Analysis of Disappointment Aversion in a Real Effort Competition. *The American Economic Review*, 102(1), 469–503.
- Patton, J. H., Stanford, M. S., & Barratt, E. S. (1995). Factor structure of the barratt impulsiveness scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 51(6), 768–774. [http://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679\(199511\)51:6<768::AID-JCLP2270510607>3.0.CO;2-1](http://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(199511)51:6<768::AID-JCLP2270510607>3.0.CO;2-1)