i fcha bi c m nmb Ch qpc o f p fch cmi hmlig r lc h

Neha Sharma (neha724@gmail.com)

Varun Dutt (varun @iitmandi.ac.in)

Abstract

an "observation." Also, all model parameters have been

ion as a test of a model's ability to account for data

Prime Sampler (PS) Model

k *k*

k

N *N*

models'

The Technion Calibration Dataset

( ) =
( )/(( ) + ( ))

( )

( )

subjected to an experimental setup, the "e
condition." In this condition, participants sampled the two

( )

Option X

Natural Mean Heuristic (NMH) Model

n

n

k = an observation's sample size. There are no free

Instance Based Learning (IBL) Model

instance

d $\gamma_{i\,t}$

t_i

i

d σ d

d

d

(< 1.0). The σ paramet
sample variability in an instance's activation.

$V_{j,t}$

The Coin Toss (CT) Model

j

t

$$, = \sum_{=1} , ,$$ (2)

$x_{i,t}$ i

t $p_{i,t}$

participants' individual choice

$x_{i,t}$

I t

j

n j

j

n

Method

Model Execution

n

t i

evaluate an "error ratio" (i.e., the ratio of incorrectly

$$, = \frac{, /}{\sum , /}$$ (3)

τ . $\sqrt{2}$ σ

e's the outcome's

t

i

$$A_{i\,t} = \sigma \left(\frac{-\gamma_{i\,t}}{\gamma_{i\,t}} \right) + \sum_{t_i \varepsilon}^{n} t - t_i^{-d}$$

Across the 5 runs, the model's averag

(5)

Results

N

N

N *N*

N

N *N*

number of UN cases, the poorer is the corresponding model's

N

N

N

N

N

N

N

model's calibration

out of 2,370 observations. The PS model's best average error

d

σ

Combinations from Human Data and Model h/m	Number of Observations	Percentage of 2370 Observations

d σ

Table 2 shows the results from this model. The model's

eters d=13.6 and σ=0.22. The

Choice Combinations from Human Data and Model	Average Number of Observations across 5 Runs	Percentage of 2370 Observations

Combinations from Human Data and Model H/M	Average Number of Observations	Percentage of 2370 Observations

's

Next, we evaluated the IBL model's ability to account for

d and σ in the IBL model were found to be 13.6 and
d

small σ value exhibited lesser sample

Model	Parameters	UN Observations	Error ratio
	N		
	d=13.6,σ=0.22		

statistics, the IBL model's performance was better than the

Model	UN Observations	Error ratio

Discussions& C onclusion

model's ma

model's strength is in its

Acknowledgments

' research fellowship to Neha Sharma

References

The atomic components of thought

Journal of Mathematical Psychology –

Journal of Risk Uncertainty –

Journal of Behavioral Decision Mak –

Psychological Review Vol

Psychological Review

Trends in Cognitive Sciences

Synthese

?. Cognition –

–

Paper presented at the 6th Annual ACT–R Workshop at George Mason University

Journal of Behavioral Decision Making