

**MGMT 760: Current Topics in Judgment and Decision Making**  
**-- PhD Seminar | Fall 2024 --**

**Instructor:** Gal Zauberman, [gal.zauberman@yale.edu](mailto:gal.zauberman@yale.edu)

**Course Support:** Charlee Grady, [charlee.grady@yale.edu](mailto:charlee.grady@yale.edu), P: (203) 436-4981

**Schedule:** Thursdays 2:30-5:30 (Evans Hall, 4230)

**Canvas:** Additional information on Canvas; check regularly for updates.

**Course Overview:**

This doctoral level seminar is centered on current topics in Judgment and Decision research as well as the related fields of Behavioral Economics, Cognitive Psychology, and Social Psychology. In particular, the goal is to have in-depth discussions about behavioral research addressing contemporary issues that are of interest to academics and / or that society is facing.

My inspiration for this seminar is the classic work of Stanley Milgram and Solomon Asch that addressed the questions of obedience and conformity following the horrors of WWII. Their work was (in part) motivated by observing human behavior that they could not comprehend (e.g., the civilized Germans engaging in savagery, implicitly or explicitly supported by others throughout Europe, neighbor turning on neighbor, etc.). Importantly, their work not only helped us better understand how people and groups behave, but also expanded our theoretical knowledge, and in many ways, paved the path for the behavioral sciences towards emphasizing the effects of context on behavior.

While maybe not as dramatically as in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, we also are currently facing significant social change in norms, values, and behaviors that generated interest by behavioral scientists and led to new (and renewed) interest in relevant questions.

In this seminar, we will focus on work that answer questions pertaining to the present-day combination of:

1. Social changes (e.g., political polarization, conflict, economic inequality, etc.).
2. Technological changes (e.g., mobile smartphones, social media, AI, Augmented and Mixed reality, etc.)

We will discuss whether we can use the behavioral sciences to inform us about the facts, the processes, and the perspectives we can take to answer these questions? What is the relationship between social advocacy and the social sciences? How can we (and do we) ensure that science is an objective process centered on truth rather than a tool intended to push a particular perspective?

This is a big set of questions, and this seminar will only scratch the surface. Within this broad focus on societal relevant issues, I have few key (a bit more modest) objectives:

1. **Facts (and logic) over dogma:** Discuss what we know (and don't know) about some of the most important questions relevant to society. That is, this seminar is not based on a

particular methodological focus or conceptual focus within the behavioral sciences, but rather on a selected set of contemporary questions that our society faces.

2. **Evidence-guided dispassionate intellectual discussion:** Learn to engage in a respectful evidence-based discussion of sensitive issues.
  - a. We might very well conclude that the data we have is insufficient to draw any strong conclusions.
  - b. The challenge will then be to outline the evidence needed (or concede that this is not a question for the behavioral sciences).
3. **The Scientist vs. the Social Activist:** Discuss how we as researchers conduct research that centers on objective knowledge rather than values-based advocacy.
4. **The research process:** Demonstrate how to begin to study a topic that you are unfamiliar with. How to evaluate what was done, what we know, and how to generate new research questions.

The format of the seminar will require high engagement and preparation. It will be co-led by me and different students in each session. That is, all students are expected to read all required papers, but in each session some students will be responsible for leading the discussion of specific papers (and provide written papers) that will be assigned in advance.

For each topic we will cover, articles have been selected and we will discuss those in detail (although this list of articles will very likely be revised). Each session will include 3 to 6 required articles, as well as additional readings marked with an asterisk (\*). These optional readings are provided for your reference and offer extra perspective; you do not need to read them in depth for class.

Note that one main goal is to help students develop the skill of critiquing academic papers. While some topics will require more reliance on lecturing, this class is designed to be heavily discussion based, and students are expected to lead some of the discussions.

Each student will be expected to prepare the following:

- (1) **Each Week:** Prior to class (*no later than then 6:00 pm, the day before class*), you are required to submit two short assignments:
  - a. You will be asked to answer a particular question about the reading (marked by \*\* in each week's reading list),
  - b. Provide a short "reflection" based on the current set of reading. This can be your own reaction to a concept or a study in the paper, or an idea for a follow-up study.

➤ Being concise is an important skill and so these assignments are intended to be brief (a short paragraph, or a few bullet points, no more than 150 words for each). We will discuss some of your answers / reflections in class.
- (2) One goal of this seminar is to help you develop your skills to generate and test a specific research question, and to be able to communicate the key ideas, methods, findings,

conclusions, and yes, weaknesses of research papers. To this end, students will help lead a discussion of a paper, and will circulate a **1-page summary of that paper** [hardcopies in class, and also by email to us the evening before (*no later than 6:00 pm, the day before class*)]. Each student will do this several times during the semester, depending on class size.

(3) **Research Proposal.** The topic needs to be around the theme of the seminar, which is ‘socially relevant’ issues, preferably related to the general topics we discussed. This assignment includes three components:

- a. A 1-2 page double-spaced outline of your research question and the study(s) you designed to test it. This outline should include all of the main aspects of the research proposal described below.
- b. Presentation of your research idea and the study (or studies) you designed to test that question on the final meeting. This (short) presentation should include all of the aspects of the research proposal described below.
- c. Research Proposal (6-8 pages double spaced) due before December 24. The proposal must include the following: clear statement and logic of your hypothesis, a plan to test your hypothesis (the experiment(s) you will conduct), and how you plan to analyze the data. You will need to be explicit about exactly what you intend to do.

\* More details will be provided in class.

### **Grading Components:**

- 40% Class contribution
- 20% Short homework assignments
- 40% Research proposal
  - 10%: Proposal outline
  - 10%: In-class presentation
  - 30%: Final proposal

**Course Schedule**  
**-- Subject to Change --**

*Revised: August 2, 2024*

Date	Topic	Exercises / Deadlines
1. August 29	Seminar Introduction: objectives and approach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Science vs advocacy</li> <li>- Fast moving technological changed</li> </ul>	
2. September 5	Political Ideology	
3. September 12	Belief in free will and the effect of context	
4. September 19	Inequality and redistribution	
5. September 26	Taxes	[Reschedule due to ACR]
6. October 3	Money and Well Being	[Rosh Hashanah]
7. October 10	Algorithms and AI	
	<b><i>Fall break - No meetings on October 17</i></b>	
8. October 24	Technology: Accessibility, Sharing, and Misinformation	
9. October 31	Photography	[Halloween]
10. November 7	New technologies (AR / VR / Etc.) and consumer experiences	

<b>11.</b> November 14	TBA: Topic based on students' interests [Possible topics: Dishonesty, Misinformation, Implicit Bias, Social Mobility, others, including expanding on one of the topics covered.]	
<b>12.</b> December 4	Student presentations	Student presentations due
	<i>Thanksgiving week - No meetings - November 27</i>	
<b>13.</b> December 11	Wrap-Up Discussion topics will be provided Student presentations (Continued, if needed)	
	Paper due	

## Detailed Course Schedule and Reading List

*-- Subject to Change --*

### Session 1: Course Introduction & Discussion of Science vs advocacy

Class overview and student introductions.

Discussion of format and content.

Discussion of science vs advocacy and the role of the scientist.

#### Session readings:

##### On How to be a Scientist:

1. Cunningham, William A., Jay J. Van Bavel, and Leah H. Somerville (2020). How to be an ethical scientist. *Science*.

<https://www.sciencemag.org/careers/2020/08/how-be-ethical-scientist>

##### The Scientist is a human:

2. Cusimano, Corey & Tania Lombrozo (2011). Reconciling scientific and commonsense values to improve reasoning, *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, Volume 25, Issue 11, Pages 937-949, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2021.06.004>.

##### On science and Activism:

3. Büntgen, U. The importance of distinguishing climate science from climate activism. *npj Clim. Action* 3, 36 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44168-024-00126-0>

##### On self-censorship in Science:

4. Clark, C. J., Fjeldmark, M., Lu, L., Baumeister, R. F., Ceci, S., Frey, K., Miller, G., Reilly, W., Tice, D., von Hippel, W., Williams, W. M., Winegard, B. M., & Tetlock, P. E. (2024). Taboos and Self-Censorship Among U.S. Psychology Professors. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916241252085>

##### Discussion Topics: What's the role of the behavioral scientist?

- What is our obligation as behavioral scientists within academic institutions?
- How do we study socially sensitive issues?
- Should the social implications of the findings enter the publication process?
- Should behavioral scientists (and universities) be involved in promoting policy. Should that include using scientific principles to lead to 'behavioral change'?

Here is one blog on the topic:

- <https://heterodoxacademy.org/blog/university-professors-after-the-us-capitol-riot-when-becoming-part-of-the-solution-is-part-of-the-problem/>

**\*\* Assignment Part 1:** (a) In general, should the consideration of the societal implications of findings (rather than methods) be grounds for publication? (b) Are there topics (or findings) that we should not investigate empirically (or findings that should not be published) because they are

too sensitive? (c) Should behavioral scientists and universities be involved in promoting policy? What are the benefits? What are the risks?

### **Optional readings:**

\* Readings distributed for your record / extra perspective. No need to read in depth for class. This is the case for all readings in the syllabus identified with \*.

\* Haslam, S. A., Reicher, S. D., & Birney, M. E. (2016). Questioning authority: new perspectives on Milgram's 'obedience' research and its implications for intergroup relations. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 11, 6-9.

### On self-censorship:

\* Clark, C. J., Jussim, L., Frey, K., Stevens, S. T., Al-Gharbi, M., Aquino, K., Bailey, J. M., Barbaro, N., Baumeister, R. F., Bleske-Rechek, A., Buss, D., Ceci, S., Del Giudice, M., Ditto, P. H., Forgas, J. P., Geary, D. C., Geher, G., Haider, S., Honeycutt, N., Joshi, H., ... von Hippel, W. (2023). Prosocial motives underlie scientific censorship by scientists: A perspective and research agenda. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(48), e2301642120. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2301642120>

\* Ben Darlow and Ben Gray (2024) Censorship or inclusion?, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121, 21, (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2321261121>

\* Cory J. Clark, Musa al-Gharbi, Roy F. Baumeister, April Bleske-Rechek, David Buss, Stephen Ceci, Joseph Forgas, Komi Frey, David C. Geary, Glenn Geher, Marco Del Giudice, Lee S. Jussim, Anna I. Krylov, Chris Martin, Geoffrey Miller, Pamela Paresky, Catherine Salmon, Steve Stewart-Williams, Anne E. Wilson, Wendy Williams, Bo M. Winegard, William von Hippel, Reply to Darlow and Gray: Censorship is exclusion, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121, 21, (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2404156121>

### Editorials were published in response to prominent retractions:

\* Massey, Douglas S. and Mary C. Waters (2020) Editorial: Scientific versus public debates: A PNAS case study. *PNAS* | August 4, 2020 | vol. 117 | no. 31 | 18135–18136.

\* Bauer, P. J. (2020). Editorial: A Call for Greater Sensitivity in the Wake of a Publication Controversy. *Psychological Science*, 31(7), 767–769. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620941482>

## Session 2: Political Ideology

### Session readings:

1. Van Boven, L., Ehret, P. J., & Sherman, D. K. (2018). Psychological Barriers to Bipartisan Public Support for Climate Policy. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 13(4), 492–507. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617748966>
2. Ditto, P. H., Liu, B. S., Clark, C. J., Wojcik, S. P., Chen, E. E., Grady, R. H., ... Zinger, J. F. (2019). At Least Bias Is Bipartisan: A Meta-Analytic Comparison of Partisan Bias in Liberals and Conservatives. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 14(2), 273–291. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617746796>
3. Baron, J., & Jost, J. T. (2019). False Equivalence: Are Liberals and Conservatives in the United States Equally Biased? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 14(2), 292–303. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691618788876>
4. Kim, Jin, & Gal Zauberman, (2024). The relationship between political ideology and judgements of bias in distributional outcomes. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 8(2), 228–242. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-023-01779-3>
5. Galak, Jeff Jeff & Clayton R. Critcher (2023). Who sees which political falsehoods as more acceptable and why: A new look at in-group loyalty and trustworthiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 124(3), 593–619. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000264>

\*\* Assignment: Can we make generalized statements about how ideology influences judgments? Where do you stand on the relative bias of liberals vs. conservatives?

### Optional readings:

- \* Shanto Iyengar, Yphtach Lelkes, Matthew Levendusky, Neil Malhotra, Sean J. Westwood (2019). [The Origins and Consequences of Affective Polarization in the United States](#). *Annual Review of Political Science* 2019 22:1, 129-146

\* Readings distributed for your record / extra perspective. No need to read in depth for class. This is the case for all readings in the syllabus identified with \*.



### Session 3: Beliefs in free will and the effects of context

#### Session readings:

1. Liane Young, Jonathan Phillips (2011). The paradox of moral focus, *Cognition*, Volume 119, Issue 2, Pages 166-178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2011.01.004>.
2. Monroe, A. E., Brady, G. L., & Malle, B. F. (2017). This Isn't the Free Will Worth Looking For: General Free Will Beliefs Do Not Influence Moral Judgments, Agent-Specific Choice Ascriptions Do. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 8(2), 191-199. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550616667616>
3. Everett, J. C. , Clark, C. J. , Meindl, P. , Luguri, J. B. , Earp, B. D. , Graham, J. , Ditto, P. H. & Shariff, A. F. (2021). Political Differences in Free Will Belief Are Associated With Differences in Moralization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 120 (2), 461-483. doi: 10.1037/pspp0000286.
4. Cusimano, C., Zorrilla, N., Danks, D., & Lombrozo, T. (2024). Psychological freedom, rationality, and the naive theory of reasoning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 153(3), 837–863. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0001540>

\*\* Assignment: Do you think that the belief in free will is the opposite of the belief in the power of the environment when it comes to human decision making? Consider this on the construct level and its operationalization.

#### Optional readings

- \* Cory J. Clark, Roy F. Baumeister, Peter H. Ditto, (2017). Making punishment palatable: Belief in free will alleviates punitive distress, *Consciousness and Cognition*, Volume 51, Pages 193-211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2017.03.010>.
- \* Vohs, Kathleen D., and Jonathan W. Schooler (2008). "The value of believing in free will: Encouraging a belief in determinism increases cheating." *Psychological science* 19, no. 1, 49-54.  
Doesn't replicate: Thomas Nadelhoffer, Jason Shepard, Damien L. Crone, Jim A.C. Everett, Brian D. Earp, Neil Levy (2020). Does encouraging a belief in determinism increase cheating? Reconsidering the value of believing in free will, *Cognition*, Volume 203, 104342,
- \* Clark, Cory J., Jamie B. Luguri, Peter H. Ditto, Joshua Knobe, Azim F. Shariff, and Roy F. Baumeister. "Free to punish: a motivated account of free will belief." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 106, no. 4 (2014): 501.  
Evidence is questionable.
- \* Alicke, M. D. (2000). Culpable control and the psychology of blame. *Psychological bulletin*, 126(4), 556.
- \* Baumeister, R. F., & Brewer, L. E. (2012). Believing versus disbelieving in free will: Correlates and consequences. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 6(10), 736-745.

\* Zheng, Yanmei, Stijn MJ Van Osselaer, and Joseph W. Alba. "Belief in free will: implications for practice and policy." *Journal of Marketing Research* 53.6 (2016): 1050-1064.

.

## Session 4: Inequality

1. Starmans, C., Sheskin, M., & Bloom, P. (2017). Why people prefer unequal societies. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1(4), 0082.
2. Nishi, Akihiro, Hirokazu Shirado, David G. Rand and Nicholas A. Christakis (2016). Inequality and visibility of wealth in experimental social networks. *Nature* volume 526, pages 426–429.
3. Sznyccera, Daniel, Maria Florencia Lopez Seale, Aaron Sellf, Julian Limb,, Roni Poratg, Shaul Shalvii, Eran Halpering, Leda Cosmidesb,, and John Tooby (2017). Support for redistribution is shaped by compassion, envy, and self-interest, but not a taste for fairness. *PNAS*, vol. 114(31), p. 8420–8425.

### On the measurement of Inequality perceptions

4. Michael I. Norton and Dan Ariely (2011). Consensus on building a better America—one wealth quintile at a time. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6, 9–12.

\*\* What are your thoughts about the relationship between fairness and equality?

### **Optional reading** (background; long list):

Short Review article:

- \* Hauser, Oliver P., and Michael I. Norton. (Mis)perceptions of Inequality. Special Issue on Inequality and Social Class. *Current Opinion in Psychology* 18 (December 2017): 21–25.

Follow-up on Norton and Ariely (2011):

- \* Eriksson, Kimmo and Brent Simpson (2012). What do Americans know about inequality? It depends on how you ask them. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 7, 741–745.
- \* Michael I. Norton and Dan Ariely (2013). American's desire for less wealth inequality does not depend on how you ask them, *Judgment and Decision Making*, Vol. 8, No. 3, May 2013, pp. 393–394

Review chapter on efficiency vs. equity:

- \* Allocation Decisions: When Do We Sacrifice Efficiency in the Name of Equity?," in *Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Fairness, Equity, and Justice*, ed. Meng Li and David P. Tracer, Cham: Springer International Publishing, 93-105

Income vs. Consumption:

- \* Heathcote, Jonathan, Fabrizio Perri, Giovanni L. Violante (2009) Unequal We Stand: An Empirical Analysis of Economic Inequality in the United States, 1967-2006. *NBER Working Paper* No. 15483. Issued in November 2009

- \* Gordon, Robert J. (2009). Misperceptions About the Magnitude and Timing of Changes in American Income Inequality. *NBER Working Paper* No. 15351. Issued in September 2009.
- \* Kraus, M. W., Onyeador, I. N., Daumeyer, N. M., Rucker, J. M., & Richeson, J. A. (2019). The Misperception of Racial Economic Inequality. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 14(6), 899–921. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619863049>
- \* DeCelles, K. A., and Michael I. Norton. "[Physical and Situational Inequality on Airplanes Predict Air Rage.](#)" *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 113, no. 20 (May 17, 2016): 5588–5591.
- \* Nishi, Akihiro, Hirokazu Shirado, David G. Rand and Nicholas A. Christakis (2016). Inequality and visibility of wealth in experimental social networks. *Nature* volume 526, pages 426–429.
- \* Kraus, Michael W., Julian M. Rucker, and Jennifer A. Richeson (2017). Americans misperceive racial economic equality, *PNAS* September 26, 2017. 114 (39) 10324-10331. [Article and SM]  
<http://www.pnas.org/content/pnas/114/39/10324.full.pdf>  
<http://www.pnas.org/content/pnas/suppl/2017/09/13/1707719114.DCSupplemental/pnas.201707719SI.pdf>

An interesting experiment in Kenya:

- \* Haushofer, Johannes, James Reisinger, and Jeremy Shapiro. Your Gain Is My Pain: Negative Psychological Externalities of Cash Transfers (October 31, 2015). Retrieved from [https://www.princeton.edu/~joha/publications/Haushofer\\_Reisinger\\_Shapiro\\_Inequality\\_2015.pdf](https://www.princeton.edu/~joha/publications/Haushofer_Reisinger_Shapiro_Inequality_2015.pdf)

## Session 5: Taxes

### Session readings:

1. Hardisty, David J., Eric J. Johnson, and Elke U. Weber (2010). A dirty word or a dirty world?: Attribute framing, political affiliation, and query theory. *Psychological Science*, 21(1), 86–92. doi:10.1177/0956797609355572
  2. Sussman, Abigail B, and Christopher Y Olivola (2011). Axe the Tax: Taxes Are Disliked More than Equivalent Costs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 48(SPL), S91–S101. doi:10.1509/jmkr.48.SPL.S91
  3. Kessler, Judd B. and Michael I. (2014). Tax aversion in labor supply. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 124, 15–28. doi:10.1016/j.jebo.2015.09.022
  4. Rick, Scott, Gabriele Paolacci, and Katherine A. Burson (2015). Income Tax and the Motivation to Work. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*. 2018;1–13.
- In addition to the discussion of the above paper, Gal will share some work in progress on taxes and redistribution.

\*\* Do you think that one can study the effects of taxation in the lab? What are the strengths and limitations? What is the relevance of such findings on policy?

### Optional Reading

\* Fochmann Martin and Eike B. Kroll (2016). The effects of rewards on tax compliance decisions, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Volume 52, Pages 38-55, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2015.09.009>.

\* Fochmann, Martin, Joachim Weimann, Kay Blaufus, Jochen Hundsdoerfer, and Dirk Kieseewetter. "Net wage illusion in a real-effort experiment." *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 115, no. 2 (2013): 476-484.

## Session 6: Money and Well Being

### Session readings:

1. Kahneman, Daniel and Angus Deaton (2010). High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being. *PNAS* | September 21, 2010 | vol. 107 | no. 38 | 16489–16493
2. Stevenson, Betsey and Justin Wolfers Subjective Well-Being and Income: Is There Any Evidence of Satiation? (2013). *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings*, 101(3) 598-604, May 2013.
3. Killingsworth, M. A. (2021), ‘Experienced well-being rises with income, even above 75,000 per year’, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118**(4).
4. Klein Teeselink, Bouke and Gal Zauberman (2023). The Anna Karenina Income Effect: Well-being Inequality Decreases with Income. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. **212**(August), 501-513.

\*\* How do the findings about the relationship between money and well-being inform our understating about policy emphasis on economic inequality?

### Optional Reading

- \* Diener, Ed, Martin E.P. Seligman (2004) Beyond money: Toward an economy of well-being *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*. 5 (1), 1-31
- \* Diener, Ed (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist*, Vol 55(1), Jan 2000, 34-43

## **Session 7: Algorithms and AI**

### **Session Readings:**

#### Background papers:

1. Dawes, R. (1979). The robust beauty of improper linear models in decision making. *American Psychologist*, 34, 571-582.
2. Dawes, R. M., Faust, D., & Meehl, P. E. (1989). Clinical versus actuarial judgment. *Science*, 243(4899), 1668-1674.

#### More recent and consumer-relevant papers:

3. Dietvorst, B. J., Bharti, S. (2020). People Reject Algorithms in Uncertain Decision Domains Because They Have Diminishing Sensitivity to Forecasting Error. *Psychological Science*, 31(10):1302-1314.
4. Longoni, C., Bonezzi, A., & Morewedge, C. K. (2019). Resistance to medical artificial intelligence. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 46(4), 629-650.
5. Shin, Minkyu, Jin Kim, Bas van Opheusden, Thomas L. Griffiths (2023). Superhuman Artificial Intelligence Can Improve Human Decision-Making by Increasing Novelty. *PNAS*, Volume 120 (12). Pages e2214840120. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2214840120>

\*\* This question is relevant to the study of algorithms as well as new technology more broadly: how can you assess the 'half-life' of your findings? That is, are these papers studying judgments about algorithms, or our current judgments about current technology?

### **Optional Readings:**

- \* Einhorn, H. J. (1986). Accepting error to make less error. *Journal of personality assessment*, 50(3), 387-395.
- \* Castelo, N., Bos, M. W., & Lehmann, D. R. (2019). Task-dependent algorithm aversion. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 56(5), 809-825.

## Session 8: Technology: Accessibility, Sharing, and Misinformation

### Session readings:

#### Technology accessibility and information sharing

1. Kushlev, K., Dwyer, R., & Dunn, E. W. (2019). The Social Price of Constant Connectivity: Smartphones Impose Subtle Costs on Well-Being. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 28(4), 347-352. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721419847200>
2. Nicholas Fitz, Kostadin Kushlev, Ranjan Jagannathan, Terrel Lewis, Devang Paliwal, Dan Ariely, (2019). Batching smartphone notifications can improve well-being, *Computers in Human Behavior*, Volume 101, 2019, Pages 84-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.07.016>.
3. Barasch, Alixandra (2020). The Consequences of Sharing. *Current Opinion in Psychology*.

#### Misinformation

4. Ecker, U. K., Lewandowsky, S., Cook, J., Schmid, P., Fazio, L. K., Brashier, N., ... & Amazeen, M. A. (2022). The psychological drivers of misinformation belief and its resistance to correction. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 1(1), 13-29.
5. Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2019). Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning. *Cognition*, 188, 39-50.
6. Ceylan, G., Anderson, I. A., & Wood, W. (2023). Sharing of misinformation is habitual, not just lazy or biased. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(4), e2216614120

\*\* How do researchers define what is and what isn't misinformation? Is this susceptible to ideological bias? How can a researcher ensure a fair test?

### Optional Reading

- \* Ryan J. Dwyer, Aaron X. Zhuo, Elizabeth W. Dunn (2023). Why do people turn to smartphones during social interactions? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Volume 109, 2023, 104506, ISSN 0022-1031. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2023.104506>.
- \* Kostadin Kushlev, Jason Proulx, and Elizabeth W. Dunn. 2016. "Silence Your Phones": Smartphone Notifications Increase Inattention and Hyperactivity Symptoms. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '16)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1011–1020. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858359>
- \* Anna C.M. Queiroz, Angela Y. Lee, Mufan Luo, Géraldine Fauville, Jeffrey T. Hancock, Jeremy N. Bailenson (2023). Too tired to connect: Understanding the associations between



video-conferencing, social connection and well-being through the lens of zoom fatigue,  
*Computers in Human Behavior*, Volume 149, 107968, ISSN 0747-5632

\* Barasch, Alixandra, Gal Zauberma, and Kristin Diehl (2018). How the Intention to Share Can Undermine Enjoyment: Photo-Taking Goals and Evaluation of Experiences. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 44 (6), 1220–1237

Kozyreva, A., Lorenz-Spreen, P., Herzog, S. M., Ecker, U. K., Lewandowsky, S., Hertwig, R., ... & Wineburg, S. (2024). Toolbox of individual-level interventions against online misinformation. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1-9.

➤ General review

## Session 9: Photography

### Session readings:

#### For General Discussion:

Diehl, Kristin and Gal Zauberman. (2022). Capturing life or missing it: How mindful photo-taking can affect experiences. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 46:101334

#### Discussion papers:

Diehl, Kristin, Gal Zauberman, and Barasch, Alixandra (2016). How Taking Photos Increases Enjoyment of Experiences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. **111** (2), 119-140.

Henkel, L. A. (2014). Point-and-shoot memories: The influence of taking photos on memory for a museum tour. *Psychological science*, 25(2), 396-402.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0956797613504438>

Barasch, Alixandra, Kristin Diehl, Jackie Silverman, and Gal Zauberman (2017). Photographic Memory: The Effects of Photo-Taking on Memory for Auditory and Visual Information. *Psychological Science*. **28** (8), 1056-1066.

**\*\*** What do you see is the next key question about the effect of photography? How would you approach this question empirically?

### Optional readings:

\* Zauberman, Gal, Kristin Diehl, and Alixandra Barasch (2020). Memory Pointers and Identity. In Americus Reed and Mark Forehand, Eds., *The Handbook of Identity Research in Marketing*.

\* Soares, J. S., & Storm, B. C. (2022). Does taking multiple photos lead to a photo-taking-impairment effect?. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 29(6), 2211-2218.

## Session 10: New Technologies and Consumer Experiences

### Session readings:

1. Tan, Yong-Chin, Sandeep R. Chandukala, and Srinivas K. Reddy (2022), “Augmented Reality in Retail and Its Impact on Sales,” *Journal of Marketing*, 86(1), 48–66.
2. Jessen, Alexander, Tim Hilken, Mathew Chylinski, Dominik Mahr, Jonas Heller, Debbie Isobel Keeling, and Ko de Ruyter (2020), “The Playground Effect: How Augmented Reality Drives Creative Customer Engagement,” *Journal of Business Research*, 116, 85–98.
3. Pauline Pfeifer, Tim Hilken, Jonas Heller, Saifeddin Alimamy, Roberta Di Palma (2013). More than meets the eye: In-store retail experiences with augmented reality smart glasses, *Computers in Human Behavior*, Volume 146, 2023, 107816, ISSN 0747-5632
4. Fritz, William, Rhonda Hadi, and Andrew Stephen (2023), “From Tablet to Table: How Augmented Reality Influences Food Desirability,” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 51(3), 503–29. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11747-022-00919-x>

A WSJ short piece about Zoom:

Why Does Zoom Exhaust You? Science Has an Answer [By Betsy Morris. May 27, 2020, WSJ]  
<https://www.wsj.com/articles/why-does-zoom-exhaust-you-science-has-an-answer-11590600269>

\*\* As I asked in a previous session, how stable do you think are the findings and conclusions from current research? That is, how much is it about human interactions with AR and VR technology in general vs. its current form for mostly novice consumers?

### Optional readings:

- \* Li, Hairong, Terry Daugherty, and Frank Biocca (2002), “Impact of 3-D Advertising on Product Knowledge, Brand Attitude, and Purchase Intention: The Mediating Role of Presence,” *Journal of Advertising*, 31(3), 43–57.  
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00913367.2002.10673675>
- \* Hilken, Tim, Ko de Ruyter, Mathew Chylinski, Dominik Mahr, and Debbie I. Keeling (2017), “Augmenting the Eye of the Beholder: Exploring the Strategic Potential of Augmented Reality to Enhance Online Service Experiences,” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45(6), 884–905. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11747-017-0541-x>
- \* Schlosser, Ann E. (2003), “Experiencing Products in the Virtual World: The Role of Goal and Imagery in Influencing Attitudes versus Purchase Intentions,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30(2), 184–98. <https://academic.oup.com/jcr/article/30/2/184/1831632?login=true>
- \* Smink, Anne R., Eva A. van Reijmersdal, Guda van Noort, and Peter C. Neijens (2020), “Shopping in Augmented Reality: The Effects of Spatial Presence, Personalization and Intrusiveness on App and Brand Responses,” *Journal of Business Research*, 118, 474–85.  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0148296320304586>

\* Hadi, Rhonda, Shiri Melumad, and Eric S. Park (2024), “The Metaverse: A New Digital Frontier for Consumer Behavior,” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 34(1), 142–66.  
<https://myscp.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/jcpy.1356>

**Theory paper with good references**

## **Session 11: Students' choice**

Topic(s) and papers based on students' interests.

[Possible topics: Dishonesty, Implicit Bias, Religion, Social Mobility, other topics, including expanding on one of the topics covered.]

## **Session 12: Student Presentations**

All student presentations are due. Order of presentation will be determined randomly.

More details will be provided in class.

### **Session 13: Course Wrap-up / (Student Presentations continued, if needed)**

#### Agenda for last class:

1. Student idea presentations (continued, as needed).
  2. Continue discussion of open issues from previous classes, if any.
  3. Wrap-Up and Review.  
Discussion of key concepts, how they all fit together, and where we go from here.
- \*\* Assignment: How should the behavioral sciences inform our discussion about socially sensitive issues? Should these questions direct what we study? What should we do when the results go against our personal values? How to we put a system in place that protect against (researcher) bias?
- Lastly, how did the readings and discussions change (or not change) your perspective?