

MouselabWeb with Food and Gambles

Michael Schulte-Mecklenbeck
@EADM Summer School 2016

What happens today?

Session 1: (9-10.30)

Intro Process Tracing - Group work [Michael]

Why we think process tracing is useful (Gambles and Food) [Michael]

Why we think process tracing is useful (Context effects) [Martijn]

Session 2: (11-12.30)

Repetition: Designer, counterbalancing etc. more sophisticated things [Martijn]

Intro: Datalyser, and data structure [Michael]

Import into R [Michael]

Session 3 (13.30-15)

Analysis 1: simple analysis (task time/frequency, cell time/frequency, choices) [Michael]

Icon graphs [Martijn]

Analysis 2: first acquisition, last acquisition, all cells opened [Michael]

Analysis 3: Contrast analysis in regression [Martijn]

Why should we care about Processes?

Groups of 4 / 20 Minutes

Outcome: one slide - send to schultem@gmail.com

Select a presenter

- Generate 3 research questions that could be interesting to look at with process tracing methods.
- Identify for each of the questions an appropriate method and explain your choice.
- What is the one thing you want to learn today when you think about the data we collected with MouselabWeb?




2000

How does food choice work?

'Integration through the weighting of various food choice motives',
of taste, sensory, price

all available information


convenience
the decision will depend
upon how that food scales
on each of three criteria:
ethics
health, pleasure and
weight control
convenience



Eertmans, Victoir, Vansant, & Van den Bergh (2005)

Rapoport, Peters, Downey, McCann, & Huff-Corzine (1993)

Predictions + Results





Research report

Fast and frugal food choices: Uncovering individual decision heuristics

Benjamin Scheibehenne^{a,*}, Linda Miesler^a, Peter M. Todd^b^a*Center for Adaptive Behavior and Cognition, Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Lentzeallee 94, 14195 Berlin, Germany*^b*Cognitive Science Program, Indiana University, 1100 E. 10th Street, Bloomington, IN 47405 USA*


Received 16 January 2007; received in revised form 1 March 2007; accepted 26 March 2007

'based on our results we do not see much reason to believe that people's daily food decisions are made by the weighing and adding of several aspects.' (p. 586)

Input – Data

Weighted Additive Model (73%)
against
Lindemannic Heuristic (72%)

Predictions + Results





Available online at www.sciencedirect.com



Appetite 49 (2007) 578–589

Appetite

www.elsevier.com/locate/appet

Research report

Fast and frugal food choices: Uncovering individual decision heuristics

Benjamin Scheibehenne^{a,*}, Linda Miesler^a, Peter M. Todd^b

^aCenter for Adaptive Behavior and Cognition, Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Lentzeallee 94, 14195 Berlin, Germany

^bCognitive Science Program, Indiana University, 1101 E. 10th Street, Bloomington, IN 47405 USA

Received 16 January 2007; received in revised form 23 March 2007; accepted 26 March 2007

Abstract

Research on food decision making is often based on the assumption that people take many different aspects into account and weight and add them according to their personally assessed importance. Yet there is a growing body of research suggesting that people's decisions can often be better described by simple heuristics—rules of thumb that people use to make choices based on only a few important pieces of information. To test empirically whether a simple heuristic is able to account for individual food decisions, we ran a computerized experiment in which participants ($N = 50$) repeatedly chose between pairs of 20 lunch dishes that were sampled from a local food court. A questionnaire assessed individual importance weights as well as evaluation ratings of each lunch dish on nine different factors. Our results show that a simple lexicographic heuristic that only considers each participant's most important factors is as good at predicting participants' food choices as a weighted additive model that takes all factors into account. This result questions the adequacy of weighted additive models as sole descriptions of human decision making in the food domain and provides evidence that food choices may instead be based on simple heuristics.

© 2007 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

What are strategies one can find in food choice?
Comparison between LEX and WADD.



Available online at www.sciencedirect.com



Appetite 49 (2007) 578–589

Appetite

www.elsevier.com/locate/appet

Research report

Fast and frugal food choices: Uncovering individual decision heuristics

Benjamin Scheibehenne^{a,*}, Linda Miesler^a, Peter M. Todd^b

^aCenter for Adaptive Behavior and Cognition, Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Lentzeallee 94, 14195 Berlin, Germany

^bCognitive Science Program, Indiana University, 1101 E. 10th Street, Bloomington, IN 47405 USA

Received 16 January 2007; received in revised form 23 March 2007; accepted 26 March 2007

Abstract

Research on food decision making is often based on the assumption that people take many different aspects into account and weight and add them according to their personally assessed importance. Yet there is a growing body of research suggesting that people's decisions can often be better described by simple heuristics—rules of thumb that people use to make choices based on only a few important pieces of information. To test empirically whether a simple heuristic is able to account for individual food decisions, we ran a computerized experiment in which participants ($N = 50$) repeatedly chose between pairs of 20 lunch dishes that were sampled from a local food court. A questionnaire assessed individual importance weights as well as evaluation ratings of each lunch dish on nine different factors. Our results show that a simple lexicographic heuristic that only considers each participant's most important factors is as good at predicting participants' food choices as a weighted additive model that takes all factors into account. This result questions the adequacy of weighted additive models as sole descriptions of human decision making in the food domain and provides evidence that food choices may instead be based on simple heuristics.

'based on our results we do not see much reason to believe that people's daily food decisions are made by the weighting and adding of several aspects.' (p. 586)

Weighted Additive Model (73%) against Lexicographic Heuristic (72%)



Available online at www.sciencedirect.com



Appetite 49 (2007) 578–589

Appetite

www.elsevier.com/locate/appet

Research report

Fast and frugal food choices: Uncovering individual decision heuristics

Benjamin Scheibehenne^{a,*}, Linda Miesler^a, Peter M. Todd^b

^aCenter for Adaptive Behavior and Cognition, Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Lentzeallee 94, 14195 Berlin, Germany

^bCognitive Science Program, Indiana University, 1101 E. 10th Street, Bloomington, IN 47405 USA

Received 16 January 2007; received in revised form 23 March 2007; accepted 26 March 2007

Abstract

Research on food decision making is often based on the assumption that people take many different aspects into account and weight and add them according to their personally assessed importance. Yet there is a growing body of research suggesting that people's decisions can often be better described by simple heuristics—rules of thumb that people use to make choices based on only a few important pieces of information. To test empirically whether a simple heuristic is able to account for individual food decisions, we ran a computerized experiment in which participants ($N = 50$) repeatedly chose between pairs of 20 lunch dishes that were sampled from a local food court. A questionnaire assessed individual importance weights as well as evaluation ratings of each lunch dish on nine different factors. Our results show that a simple lexicographic heuristic that only considers each participant's most important factors is as good at predicting participants' food choices as a weighted additive model that takes all factors into account. This result questions the adequacy of weighted additive models as sole descriptions of human decision making in the food domain and provides evidence that food choices may instead be based on simple heuristics.

© 2007 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Do participants use heuristic strategies when making food choices? Which strategies can be identified?

Process data!



Available online at www.sciencedirect.com



Appetite 49 (2007) 578–589

Appetite

www.elsevier.com/locate/appet

Research report

Fast and frugal food choices: Uncovering individual decision heuristics

Benjamin Scheibehenne^{a,*}, Linda Miesler^a, Peter M. Todd^b

^aCenter for Adaptive Behavior and Cognition, Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Lentzeallee 94, 14195 Berlin, Germany

^bCognitive Science Program, Indiana University, 1101 E. 10th Street, Bloomington, IN 47405 USA

Received 16 January 2007; received in revised form 23 March 2007; accepted 26 March 2007

Abstract

Research on food decision making is often based on the assumption that people take many different aspects into account and weight and add them according to their personally assessed importance. Yet there is a growing body of research suggesting that people's decisions can often be better described by simple heuristics—rules of thumb that people use to make choices based on only a few important pieces of information. To test empirically whether a simple heuristic is able to account for individual food decisions, we ran a computerized experiment in which participants ($N = 50$) repeatedly chose between pairs of 20 lunch dishes that were sampled from a local food court. A questionnaire assessed individual importance weights as well as evaluation ratings of each lunch dish on nine different factors. Our results show that a simple lexicographic heuristic that only considers each participant's most important factors is as good at predicting participants' food choices as a weighted additive model that takes all factors into account. This result questions the adequacy of weighted additive models as sole descriptions of human decision making in the food domain and provides evidence that food choices may instead be based on simple heuristics.

© 2007 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

What are heuristics?

A heuristic is a strategy that ignores part of the information, with the goal of making decisions more quickly, frugally, and/or accurately than more complex models.



Gerd Gigerenzer



Daniel Kahneman
Amos Tversky



Herbert Simon



| Dish name | Veal meatball | Duck breast |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| Picture |  |  |
| Price | 7.20 CHF | 8.80 CHF |
| Calories | 680 kcal | 1020 kcal |
| Protein | 27 g | 43 g |
| Fat | 25 g | 50 g |
| Carbohydrate | 67 g | 98 g |
| Cholesterol | 10 mg | 318 mg |
| Sodium | 1205 mg | 90 mg |
| choose this dish | | choose this dish |

complex strategies

WADD - Weighted Additive

| Dish name | Veal meatball | Duck breast |
|-----------|---------------|-------------|
| Picture | | |
| Price | 7.20 CHF | 8.80 CHF |
| Calories | 680 kcal | 1020 kcal |

heuristic strategies

TTB – Take the Best

| Dish name | Veal meatball | Duck breast |
|-----------|---------------|-------------|
| Picture | | |
| Price | 7.20 CHF | 8.80 CHF |
| Calories | 680 kcal | 1020 kcal |

Tandoori végétarien, pot-pourri de pommes de terre végétarien

| Catégorie | Menu 3 | | | | Dale | | | | 08.04.2010 | | | |
|--|------------------|---------|---------|----------|-------------|----------|--------|-----------|--------------|-----------|---------|--------|
| Pour | 80 personnes | | | | Préparateur | | | | Jaquier P.A. | | | |
| Mets | Matières grasses | Energie | Energie | Protides | Lipides | Glucides | fibres | Cholester | Sodium | Potassium | Calcium | Eau |
| | | kJ | kcal | en g | en g | en g | en g | en g | mg | mg | mg | mg |
| Tandoori végétarien, avec escalope corne | | 194 | 46 | 2.9 | 0.4 | 7.3 | 1.1 | 0.47 | 25.72 | 135.84 | 76.14 | 63.15 |
| Pot-pourri de pommes de terre végétarien | | 946 | 226 | 9.3 | 1.1 | 43.9 | 12.4 | 0.00 | 135.95 | 1661.40 | 203.20 | 412.13 |
| Total | | 1140 | 273 | 12.2 | 1.5 | 51.1 | 13.5 | 0.47 | 161.67 | 1797.24 | 27934 | 475.27 |

414 Dishes

Pairing so that distance between attributes is maximized

$$d = |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i - y_i|^2} .$$



Company restaurant

~ 800 visitors every day



414 dishes

picked pairs of dishes

Rapport du menu

Tandoori végétarien, pot-pourri de pommes de terre végétarien

| Catégorie | Menu 3 | | Dale | 08.04.2010 | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|-------|
| Pour | 80 personnes | | Préparateur | Jacquier P.A. | | | | | | | |
| Mets / Mélange / Préparation | Energie kJ | Energie kcal | Protides en g | Lipides en g | Glucides en g | fibres en g | Cholesterol en mg | Sodium en mg | Potassium en mg | Calcium en mg | Eau |
| Tandoori végétarien, avec escalope corne | 194 | 46 | 2.9 | 0.4 | 7.3 | 1.1 | 0.47 | 25.72 | 135.84 | 76.14 | 63.15 |
| Pot-pourri de pommes de terre végétarien | 946 | 226 | 9.3 | 1.1 | 43.9 | 12. | | | | | |
| Total | 1140 | 273 | 12.2 | 1.5 | 51.1 | 13. | | | | | |

Decision 1

Nom du Plat

| | |
|-------------|--|
| | |
| | |
| |  |
| | |
| Lipides | |
| Glucides | |
| Prix | |
| Sodium | |
| Energie | |
| Cholesterol | |
| Protides | |

[choisir ce plat](#)

[choisir ce plat](#)

Frequency (30570)
Length
Sequence

Decision (1625)

Definition and Selection of Strategies



Metric I: Searchtype (SM)

| Dish name | Veal meatball | Duck breast |
|-----------|---|---|
| Picture |  |  |
| Price | 7.20 CHF | 8.80 CHF |
| Calories | 680 kcal | 1020 kcal |

OT

| Dish name | Veal meatball | Duck breast |
|--------------|---|---|
| Picture |  |  |
| Calories | 680 kcal | 1020 kcal |
| Protein | 27 g | 42 g |
| Fat | 25 g | 50 g |
| Carbohydrate | 87 g | 98 g |
| Cholesterol | 110 mg | 218 mg |
| Sodium | 1200 mg | 90 mg |

Name

Picture

Price

Fat

Carbohydrates

Salt

Energy

Cholesterol

Protein



Metric 3: Weighting (CV)

- Weighted additive linear model (WADD): decision maker has to multiply each attribute value with its subjective weight, then the decision maker sums up these weighted attribute values. This process is repeated for each option. Finally the decision makers chooses the option with the highest resulting sum (Payne et al., 1993).
- Equal weights (EQW): decision maker sums up attribute values with all attributes being equally important. Decision makers choose the option with the highest resulting sum. EQW is similar to WADD, but ignores the attributes' weights (Dawes, 1979).
- FrugalWADD / FrugalEQW same as WADD/EQW but without looking at all available information

- Take the Best (TTB): decision maker has to multiply each attribute value with its subjective weight. Then the decision maker chooses the option with the highest value on the most important attribute. When the values on the most important attribute do not differ, decision makers switch to the second most important attribute and so on (Gigerenzer & Goldstein, 1996).
- Minimalist (MIN): decision maker selects one attribute randomly and chooses the option with the highest value on this attribute. When the values on the selected attribute do not differ, decision makers randomly switch to the next attribute and so on. MIN is similar to TTB but ignores the attributes' ranking (Gigerenzer & Goldstein, 1996).
- Majority of conforming dimensions (MCD): decision maker counts the number of superior attributes on each alternative, chooses the winner (Russo & Dosher, 1983)

MI: The value of the Search Metric is...

positive
optionwise

negative
attributewise

M2: All information acquired?

M2: All information acquired?

yes

no

M3: weighting

M3: weighting?

M3: weighting

M3: weighting

yes

no

yes

no

yes

no

yes

no

WADD

EQW

F
WADD

F
EQW


MISC

MCD

TTB

MIN

Predictions + Results



Percent classified as ...

40

30

20

10

0

WADD

EQW

FWADD

FEQW

MCD


TTB


MIN

Strategies

| Dish name | Veal meatball | Duck breast |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| Picture | | |
| Price | 7.20 CHF | 8.80 CHF |
| Calories | 680 kcal | 1020 kcal |
| Protein | 27 g | 43 g |
| Fat | 25 g | 50 g |
| Carbohydrate | 67 g | 98 g |
| Cholesterol | 10 mg | 318 mg |
| Sodium | 1205 mg | 90 mg |
| choose this dish | | choose this dish |

Process data







Emanuel de Bellis



Ralph Hertwig



Matthias Sohn

Schulte-Mecklenbeck, M., Sohn, M., de Bellis, E., & Hertwig, R. (2013). A lack of appetite for information and computation. Simple heuristics in food choice.

Gambles

The Priority Heuristic (Brandstatter, Hertwig & Gigerenzer, 2006) describes a set of rules to solve two-(multiple) option gambles

Additionally a detailed description of a process model is provided.

We ran a Mouselab study to test the predictions of this process model (Johnson, Schulte-Mecklenbeck & Willemse, in press)

‘The Priority Heuristic is intended to model both choice and process . . . As a consequence it can be tested on two levels: choice and process.’ (Brandstatter et al., 2006)

‘We need to open the black box of decision making and come up with some completely new and fresh modeling devices.’ (Rubinstein, 2003)

‘We believe that process models of heuristics are key to opening up this black box.’ (Johnson, et al., 2007)

Priority rule: Consider reasons in the order:
minimum gain, probability of minimum gain,
maximum gain

| | | | | |
|-----------|--------|-----|--------|-----|
| Gamble A: | \$3000 | .75 | \$7000 | .25 |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| Gamble B: | \$2800 | .80 | \$5000 | .20 |

Priority rule: Consider reasons in the order:
minimum gain, probability of minimum gain,
maximum gain

| | | | | | |
|-----------|--------|-----|--------|--------|-----|
| Gamble A: | \$3000 | .75 | \$7000 | .25 | |
| Gamble B: | \$2800 | 1 | .80 | \$5000 | .20 |

Priority rule: Consider reasons in the order:
minimum gain, probability of minimum gain,
maximum gain

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------|---|-----|---|--------|-----|
| Gamble A: | \$3000 | | .75 | | \$7000 | .25 |
| Gamble B: | \$2800 | 1 | .80 | 2 | \$5000 | .20 |

Priority rule: Consider reasons in the order:
minimum gain, probability of minimum gain,
maximum gain

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------|---|-----|---|--------|---|-----|
| Gamble A: | \$3000 | | .75 | | \$7000 | 3 | .25 |
| Gamble B: | \$2800 | 1 | .80 | 2 | \$5000 | | .20 |

- 1** CALCULATE $\frac{1}{10} * W_a^{max}$
[aspiration level]
- 2** ESTIMATE DIFFERENCE W_a^{min}, W_b^{min}
[1 reason]
- 3** IF $(2) \geq (1)$ THEN stop ELSE
[stopping rule]
- 4** ESTIMATE DIFFERENCE P_a^{min}, P_b^{min}
[2 reasons]
- 5** IF $(4) \geq .10$ THEN stop ELSE (6)
[stopping rule]
- 6** CHOOSE based on attractiveness (W_a^{max}, W_b^{max})
[3 reasons]

Our sample


Seventy-seven participants, each made 8 choices
Everything that could be counterbalanced, was
Horizontal and vertical formats

Trained in interface, definition of a gamble, tested for
understanding

Participants studied each gamble 21 seconds (on average)
Opened boxes 26.7 times (per gamble)

| | Amount to Win | Probability of that amount | | Amount to Win | Probability of that amount |
|-------------------|---------------|----------------------------|-------------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| Gamble A: | V_{a1} | P_{a1} | | \$4000 | P_{a2} |
| Gamble B: | V_{b1} | P_{b1} | | V_{b2} | P_{b2} |
| I choose Gamble A | | | I choose Gamble B | | |

Combining Clicks and Time:



READING PHASE

CHOICE PHASE

Gamble A:

1 reason

Gamble B:



Gamble A:

3 reasons

Gamble B:

Three Hypotheses

- . 1 Reasons
 - (a) For 1 reason choices: W mins should receive more attention, more comparisons
 - (b) For 3 reason choices: Pmin, Wmax should receive more attention than in (a)
- . 2 Transitions
between Ps and Ws should be rare
- . 3 Reading
more attention to Ws (number, time); more transitions comparing Ws

READING PHASE

CHOICE PHASE

Gamble A:

1 reason


Gamble B:



Gamble A:

3 reasons

Gamble B:




READING PHASE

Gamble A:




CHOICE PHASE




1 reason

Gamble B:




Gamble A:



3 reasons

Gamble B:



Reasons

- (a) For 1 reason choices, W mins should receive more attention: no support
- (b) For 3 reason choices, Pmin, Wmax should receive more attention: supported

Transitions: no support

3 Reading

More attention to Wins (number, time): supported

More transitions comparing Wins: no support

The probability-payoff transition is the single strongest feature of this data

The priority heuristic posits a process model for choice and suggests specific steps - we find mixed evidence for this model

Process tracing methods enables us to get a better understanding of human decision making and build better models

Datalyser

MouselabWEB Datalyser

Part of MouselabWEB, version 1.00beta

This screen enables you to download data in CSV (comma separated values) format. This is a textfile format in which each field is enclosed in brackets ("") and separated by commas. Such a file can be read by most statistical programs. If the **unpack events** box is checked, the program will unpack the process data (whether it is in XML or CSV format in the database) into a list of events.

The **download and process selected** button allows to download processed data that can be analyzed directly. It will delete acquisitions below the threshold, will calculate time and frequency columns for each box on the screen, and will summarize data in divisions.

Disclaimer: The processing module has not been checked extensively for the 1.00beta version! Check whether the output is consistent with the event files.

The **Show Table** button allows you to look at the data in one table, either unpacked or as is. The **Playback** allows for playback of participants in one of the experiments. This button wil open a new page in which you can select a participant from the list.

Password: For any action you do on this page, a password is required. Type the password before pressing a button. This prevents unauthorized users that browse to this page from actually reading your data!

| Experiment name | Download | Show data | Play back |
|-------------------------|--|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Lego | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Show Table | Replay |
| | sel all Reset sel Invert sel | | |
| | download selected <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unpack events | | |
| Password: | download and process selected Threshold (ms): 0 divisions (1=all, 2=halfs ect.): 1 | | |

| Experiment name | Download | Show data | Play back |
|-----------------|---|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Lego | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Show Table | Replay |
| | sel all Reset sel Invert sel | | |
| | download selected <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unpack events | | |
| Password: | download and process selected | | |
| | Threshold (ms): 0 | | |
| | divisions (1=all, 2=halves ect.): 1 | | |