

3rd EADM Summer School

Amsterdam 11-16 July 2016 | final report

The European Association for Decision Making (EADM) third Judgment and Decision Making (JDM) Summer School for PhD Students, took place between **11-16 July 2016 at the University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands**. The Summer School consisted of a weeklong program of courses covering issues of methodology in Judgment and Decision Making (JDM) research including theory building (Martijn van Zomeren, Groningen), cognitive modeling (Ido Erev, Technion), open science (Daniel Lakens, Eindhoven; Susann Fiedler, MPI Bonn), panel data analysis (Andreas Glöckner and Marc Jekel, Hagen), games (Ori Weisel, Nottingham; Shaul Shalvi, Amsterdam), and process tracing (Michael Schulte-Mecklenbeck, Bern; Martijn Willemsen, Eindhoven).

Invited talks were given by leading JDM experts who are (current or previous) associate editors of some of the main outlets for JDM research (*JDM*, *OBHDP*; *JESP*; *J of Risk and Uncertainty*; *Management Science*; *Theory and Decision*; *J of Mathematical Psychology*; *Emotion*; and more). Those include EADM president Barbara Summers (Leeds), Astrid Homan (Amsterdam), Marcel Zeelenberg (Tilburg), Michel Handgraaf (Wageningen), Bernard Nijstad (Groningen), Peter Wakker (Erasmus), Susann Fiedler (MPI Bonn), Ilana Ritov (Hebrew Jerusalem), and Wilco van Dijk (Leiden). Participants will have the opportunity to discuss their research with the speakers and teaching staff. Please find the full program and abstract in Appendix 1 below.

The Summer School was generously funded by the European Association for Decision Making, European Research Council, and Research Priority Areas Behavioral Economics and Brain and Cognition at the University of Amsterdam. It was organized by Shaul Shalvi (University of Amsterdam), Susann Fiedler (MPI Bonn), Andreas Glöckner (University of Hagen), and Michael Schulte-Mecklenbeck (University of Bern).

Due to the altruistic commitment of all presenters and the funding raised based on EADM seed money, participation at the summer school was free of charge. Also it is noteworthy that the summer school was so attractive that less than half of all applicants could be accepted. We further point out that the €6000 provided by EADM were used to request matching from the other groups who were kind enough to provide matching funding. This allowed us to offer coffee breaks, lunch, several dinners to all participants, as well as covering travel, accommodation, and dinners for all invited speakers. We feel that it is worth highlighting to future organizers that the EADM funding can cover a basic Summer School program, but importantly can be used to raise additional funding from local institutes.

Overall, the 3rd JDM EADM Summer School was a successful continuation of the first two summer school initiated and organized by Prof. Tim Rakow at the University of Essex, and later by Prof.

Susann Fiedler and Prof. Andreas Glöckner at MPI Bonn. The tradition will be continued with a fourth summer school, which will be organized by Prof. Schulte-Mecklenbeck in 2018.

In the closing event, we asked and received student evaluation of the summer school. Overall, they were enthusiastic about the week they spent in Amsterdam. They further raised some important points that future organizers may want to incorporate into their programs:

- Size of group is great!
- The last sessions [17.00-19.00] are harder- maybe something more engaging or lighter. Maybe advice for young scholars? Maybe one session less
- Include dinner, and more food in general ☺
- Food restrictions- consider that and ask before hand
- Have time to discuss about what we can do with what we learn in our work
- Methodological lectures can be placed earlier in the week so people can think how to implement it in their work and rest of the week
- More collaborative dinners/hang outs with students and speakers so that students can interact with speakers even more
- Have a morning social activity
- Include a poster session / blitz presentations by student to share what they are working on
- Change a scenery at the end of the day (location/drinks)
- Have time to reflect on how the lectures helps own work. Time to discuss or write or replace the last lecture with a class discussion.
- Ask speakers to give tips for career / leave open questions / growing up in science lectures

On behalf of the organizing committee (Prof. Fiedler, Prof. Glöckner, and Prof. Schulte-Mecklenbeck), I would like to thank EADM for the great opportunity to host the Summer School at the University of Amsterdam. I would also like to thank Ms. Margarita Leib (PhD student at UvA) and the UvA administrative staff for ongoing help with local arrangements. The Summer School was an intense week, but as can be seen by the pictures below, a very memorable and enjoyable one.

Sincerely yours,

Shaul Shalvi

Summer School pictures





Overview | 11-16 July 2016

Time	Session	Monday 11/7	Tuesday 12/7	Wednesday 13/7	Thursday 14/7	Friday 15/7	Saturday 16/7
09:00 - 10:30	1	WELCOME	Theory building (Glöckner)	Cognitive modelling (Erev)	Panel data analysis (Glöckner/ Jekel)	Games (Weisel / Shalvi)	Process tracing (Willemsen & Schulte)
10:30 - 11:00	Break						
11:00 - 12:30	2	Theory building (Van Zomeren)	Cognitive modelling (Erev)	Open Science (Fiedler/ Lakens)	Panel data analysis (Glöckner/ Jekel)	Games (Weisel / Shalvi)	Process tracing (Willemsen & Schulte)
12:30 - 13:30	Lunch						
13:30 - 15:00	3	Theory building (Van Zomeren)	Cognitive modelling (Erev)	Open Science (Fiedler/ Lakens)	Panel data analysis (Glöckner/ Jekel)	Games (Weisel / Shalvi)	Process tracing (Willemsen & Schulte)
15:00 - 15:30	Break						
15:30 - 16:30	4	Theory building (Van Zomeren)	Cognitive modelling (Erev)	Open Science (Fiedler/ Lakens)	Panel data analysis (Glöckner/ Jekel)	Process tracing (Willemsen & Schulte)	Closing, drinks, & goodbye
16:30 - 17:00	Break						
17:00 - 19:00	5	Homan & Zeelenberg	Handgraaf & Nijstad	Wakker & Summers	Amsterdam Brain & Cognition: Ritov Discussant: Sonnemans	Fiedler & Wilco van Dijk	
19:00 - 20:00		Drinks - CREA			ABC reception		
20:00 Social Events			Dinner		ABC dinner		

(I) How to Theorize: A One-day Workshop

Graduate school curricula typically focus on teaching students how to *do* research, but fail to include training on how to theorize. However, the latter is absolutely pivotal because theorizing is essential to interpreting any research finding. Specifically, being trained in creative theory generation and critical thinking will make one's research designs stronger and the resulting findings more meaningful. This one-day workshop introduces the question of how to theorize through a focused, creative, and interactive approach. Its main message is that, much like doing research, theorizing is something that is fun, interactive, and inherently social. As such, it can be learned through exercise and training. In the workshop, we will focus on the value of theorizing (e.g., Kruglanski, 2001), on introspectively and collectively defining core concepts (through the Socratic Dialogue technique), and on using helpful heuristics to creatively generate hypotheses from different perspectives (based on McGuire's (1973, 1997) approach). Through this hands-on approach, this workshop should not just lead to more knowledge and understanding of how to theorize, but also to a more creative and critical approach to theory and research. Specifically, the workshop aims to offer useful tools toward further exploring the value of theorizing in the process of doing research.



Martijn van Zomerén
University of Groningen

Martijn van Zomerén (University of Groningen, the Netherlands) specializes in the psychology of collective action and social change. He publishes in empirical and theoretical journals, as well as in review and meta-analytical journals. Recently, his first book (*From self to social relationships*) came out at Cambridge University Press, in which he proposes an integrative relational perspective on social motivation, as a feasible alternative and contrast to the individualistic motivational theories that dominate contemporary psychology. He has received Early Career Awards from the European Association for Social Psychology (2011) and the International Society for Political Psychology (2016), which, if anything, makes one wonder about the definition of an early career. Furthermore, he is an associate editor of the *European Journal of Social Psychology* and of *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*.

- Gergen, K. J. (1973). Social psychology as history. *J of Personality and Soc. Psych.*, 26, 209-320
- Kruglanski, A. W. (2001). "That vision thing": The state of theory in social and personality psychology at the edge of the new millennium. *J. of Personality and Soc. Psych.*, 80, 871-875
- McGuire, W. J. (1973). The Yin and Yang of progress in social psychology: Seven koan. *J. of Personality and Soc. Psych.*, 26, 446-456
- McGuire, W. J. (1997). Creative hypothesis generation in psychology: Some useful heuristics. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48, 1-30

Optional readings:

- Slife, B. D. & Williams, R. N. (2005). *What's behind the research? Discovering hidden assumptions in the behavioral sciences*. Sage: London.
- Van Lange, P. A. M. (2013). What we should expect from theories in social psychology: Truth, Abstraction, Progress, and Applicability as Standards (TAPAS). *Personality and Soc. Psych. Review*, 17, 40 - 55
- Yanchar, S. C & Slife, B. (2004). Teaching critical thinking by examining assumptions. *Teaching of Psychology*, 31, 85-90
-

(II) Cognitive modeling | Teacher Assistant: Michel Sobolev

Behavioral decision research is often criticized on the grounds that it highlights interesting choice anomalies, but rarely supports clear forecasts. The main reason for the difficulty in deriving clear predictions is that the experimental results imply contradicting deviations from maximization, and it is not easy to predict the joint effect of the different deviations. The current 4-lecture course reviews research that tries to address this critique by developing cognitive models that allow clear forecasts. In addition, interested participants will practice the use of computer simulations (in R, Excel or their favorite tool) to develop simple models.



Ido Erev
Technion

Ido Erev (PhD in quantitative psychology from UNC in 1990) is a professor of Behavioral Sciences and Economics at the Technion and a research environment professor at Warwick Business School. His research tries to clarify the conditions under which wise incentive systems can solve behavioral and social problems. In order to achieve this goal, Dr. Erev and his coauthors study choice behavior in the laboratory, develop and compare alternative models, and evaluate the implications of the results in intervention studies. Their research reveal a robust experience-description gap: People exhibit oversensitivity to rare events when they decide based on a description of the incentive structure, but experience reverses this bias and lead to underweighting of rare events. Comparison of alternative models favors the assumption that people tend to select the option that led to the best outcome in a small sample of similar past experiences. These observations imply that incentives are most effective when they insure that the socially desirable behavior maximizes payoff, and minimizes the probability of regret.

Recommended Literature:

Mandatory:

Erev, I., Ert, E., Plonsky, O., Cohen, D., & Cohen, O. (under review). From Anomalies to Forecasts: Toward a Descriptive Model of Decisions under Risk, under Ambiguity, and from Experience

Optional:

Erev, I., & Roth, A. E. (2014). Maximization, learning, and economic behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(Supplement 3), 10818-10825.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 263-291.

Plonsky, O., Teodorescu, K., & Erev, I. (2015). Reliance on small samples, the wavy recency effect, and similarity-based learning. *Psychological review*, 122(4), 621.

Simon, H. A., Langley, P. W., & Bradshaw, G. L. (1981). Scientific discovery as problem solving. *Synthese*, 47(1), 1-27.

(III) Evaluating the evidential value of research and designing studies with high informational value.

Recent events have led researchers to acknowledge that the inherent uncertainty encapsulated in an inductive science is amplified by problematic research practices. In this workshop, I provide a practical introduction to recently developed statistical tools that can be used to deal with these uncertainties when performing and evaluating research. I'll argue for statistical pragmatism, where multiple methods of statistical inference (p-values, effect sizes, confidence intervals, Bayes Factors) are used depending on the research question. When evaluating the literature, I will highlight benefits of novel meta-analytic tools to control for the effects of publication bias. In addition, I will illustrate how, given uncertain effect size estimates, well-powered studies can be designed with sequential analyses. Finally, I will explain the benefits of open science, and provide some examples of how this can be accomplished. The aim of this presentation is to provide researchers with an introduction to the tools that allows researchers to differentiate among all possible truths on the basis of their likelihood.



Daniel Lakens

*Eindhoven University of
Technology*

Daniel Lakens received his PhD at Utrecht University in 2010, and currently works as an assistant professor of applied cognitive psychology at the department of human-technology interaction at Eindhoven University of Technology. His empirical work focusses on how concrete concepts influence the mental representation of abstract concepts, social consequences of behavioral synchrony, and color psychology. In recent years he has developed an interest in research methods and statistics. His main goal is to provide practical recommendations to improve the evidential value of research. He received the teacher of the year award at Eindhoven in 2014, and teaches good research practices workshops at universities around the world.

Mandatory Literature:

- Lakens, D. (2014). Performing high-powered studies efficiently with sequential analyses: Sequential analyses. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(7), 701–710. <http://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2023>
- Lakens, D., & Evers, E. R. K. (2014). Sailing From the Seas of Chaos Into the Corridor of Stability: Practical Recommendations to Increase the Informational Value of Studies. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 9(3), 278–292. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614528520>
- Nosek, B. A., Spies, J. R., & Motyl, M. (2012). Scientific Utopia II. Restructuring Incentives and Practices to Promote Truth Over Publishability. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(6), 615–631. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612459058>
- Simonsohn, U., Nelson, L. D., & Simmons, J. P. (2014). P-curve: A key to the file-drawer. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(2), 534–547.
-

(IV) Panel Data Analysis / Complex Regression Models (Andreas Glöckner & Marc Jekel)

Generalized regression models provide many possibilities for an improved analysis of data and panel data analysis based on these models has become an important approach in many areas of psychology. In this course we will refresh the mathematical basis of this approach and teach how it could be applied to analyze complex data sets such as panel data. The course will include practical applications to real data sets, which can be worked on in the course either by using R or STATA.

Lecture 1: Regression Basics

In this first lecture, we aim to bring all participants on the same level concerning regression basics and refresh matrix notation, OLS and ML implementations as well as assumptions. Calculation examples in R and STATA will be provided to practice and deepen the understanding of the basic concepts.

Lecture 2: Complex Regression Models

In this lecture we will introduce how the standard regression approach can be extended to account for violations of the assumptions introduced in the previous lecture. We will cover (among other things) dichotomous outcome variable, heteroscedasticity and dependencies due to repeated measurement. Again concepts will be practiced with sample data sets in R or STATA.

Lecture 3: Panel Data Analysis

In this lecture we will cover specifics of analyzing panel data including multi-level models and cluster corrected standard errors. The application of these methods to standard cases from various fields of psychology will be discussed and practiced.

Lecture 4: Further Extensions and Practice

In this lecture, further extensions of generalized regression models, their relation to cognitive models in judgment and decision making and their implementations in R and STATA will be discussed and practiced.



Dr. Andreas Glöckner
*University of Hagen & Max Planck
Institute for Research on Collective
Goods, Bonn*

Prof. Andreas Glöckner has a research focus on decision making and social dilemmas and is particularly interested in investigating and modelling cognitive processes. Furthermore, he has contributed to methodological developments in the field and is interested in application of concepts and methods from decision making to legal and economic domains.

He is member of the executive board of the EADM and action editor for the societies journal Judgment and Decision Making and the Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics.



Dr. Marc Jekel
University of Hagen

Dr. Marc Jekel has a research focus on probabilistic inferences and risky choice. He uses cognitive modelling to test formal process-models in both areas. Besides research on judgment and decision making, he is also interested in methods, statistics, and item response theory.

Mandatory:

Chapter 1 and 2 in Finch, W. H., & Bolin, J. E. (2014). *Multilevel modeling using R*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Optional:

Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. *An R companion to applied regression (second edition)*. London: Sage.

Gelman, A., & Hill, J. (2006). *Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical models*. Cambridge: University Press.

Searle, S. R. (1982). *Matrix algebra useful for statistics*. New York: Wiley.

Online Resource:

University of Bristol, Center for Multilevel Modelling: LEMMA (Learning Environment for Multilevel Methods and Applications). <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/cmm/learning/online-course/index.html>

(V) Team Games: Intra- and Intergroup Conflict

Intergroup conflict is—by definition—an intergroup phenomenon, but it is ultimately made possible by the actions of individuals who take part in the conflict. What are the motivations associated with individual participation in intergroup conflict? How does the intragroup structure affect the way that intergroup conflict unfolds? The course will introduce a class of economic games—Team Games—that model intergroup conflict while taking into account the intragroup structure of the conflicting teams, and survey recent work that investigates the underlying motivations and moderators of individual participation in intergroup conflict.



Ori Weisel
University of Nottingham

Ori Weisel is a research fellow at the Centre for Decision Research and Experimental Economics in the University of Nottingham. His research bridges social psychology and experimental economics to better understand human cooperation. A lot of his work highlights negative aspects of cooperation, which are often overlooked in the literature. Such negative aspects include the willingness to forfeit moral standards in order to establish mutually beneficial cooperative relations; the willingness to spend resources to punish alleged non-cooperators, even when the detection of non-cooperators is error-prone; and the negative effects of cooperation within groups on the welfare of other groups in the context of inter-group conflict.



Shaul Shalvi
University of Amsterdam

Shaul Shalvi studies ethical decision making. Currently, he seeks to unfold the psychological processes underlying the roots of corruption and the institutional economic settings most likely to make corrupt behavior emerge, spread, and importantly curbed. He obtained a PhD at the University of Amsterdam, and after working at Ben-Gurion University, he is now an Associate Professor at the Center for Research on Experimental Economics and political Decision Making and the Psychology Department at the University of Amsterdam. He is an Associate Editor at *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* and *Comprehensive Results in Social Psychology*.

Bornstein, G. (2003). Intergroup conflict: Individual, group, and collective interests. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 129-145.

Halevy, N., Weisel, O., & Bornstein, G. (2012). “In-group love” and “out-group hate” in repeated interaction between groups. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 25, 188-195.

Weisel, O., & Böhm, R. (2015). “Ingroup love” and “outgroup hate” in intergroup conflict between natural groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 60, 110-120

Weisel, O., & Shalvi, S. (2015). The collaborative roots of corruption. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, 112, 10651-10656

(VI) Process tracing with MouselabWeb

Decision research often focuses on building models that solely predict what people choose. However, models that start from different assumptions about the underlying processes, can predict the same outcomes arising from clearly different mechanisms. How people make decisions can be understood much better if we distinguish between such competing models by collecting richer sets of data that also reflect (part of) the underlying processes.

Such process tracing studies require more work in terms of equipment, experimental design, procedures, data collection and analysis. Especially when using dedicated hardware such as an eye-tracker, participants need to visit the lab and researchers often need to fall back on typical student participant pools that have lower ecological validity.

One solution that we will discuss and practice with in this class is MouselabWEB. With this tool the information acquisition process is captured when a person hovers the mouse over an information box, revealing the information behind it. As it is web-based we can capture rich information acquisition data in online studies from heterogeneous groups of participants of all education levels and ages. In several earlier studies we have shown that these studies can provide insights into the mechanisms behind heuristics when choosing between gambles (Johnson, Schulte-Mecklenbeck and Willemsen, 2008) and the processes behind loss aversion (Willemsen, Johnson and Bockenholt, 2011).

In this course we want to demonstrate and give hands-on practice with designing and running a process tracing study, as well as providing insights and practice in the actual data processing and analysis in R.

Learning goals: **understand** (1) what questions can profit from process data, (2) which tools are available, (3), where MouselabWEB is beneficial; **can** (1) design simple stimulus using the mouselabWEB designer tool, (2) collect data, (3) use datalyser tool for export; **handle data** (1) import and process mouselab data into R, (2) analyze mouselab data in R



Martijn Willemsen
*Eindhoven University of
Technology*

Martijn Willemsen (www.martijnwillemsen.nl) researches the cognitive aspects of Human-Technology Interaction, with a strong focus on judgment and decision making in online environments. He has a special interest in process tracing technologies to capture and analyze in detail information processing of decision makers. For this purpose he developed MouselabWEB. His applied research focuses on how online decisions can be supported by recommender systems, and includes domains such as movies, health related decisions and energy-saving measures. He also has a strong interest in evaluation of user experience, and co-developed with Bart Knijnenburg a user-centric evaluation framework (Knijnenburg et al., UMUAI 2012).



Michael Schulte-
Mecklenbeck
University of Bern

Michael Schulte-Mecklenbeck (www.schulte-mecklenbeck.com) is a lecturer in Consumer Behavior at the University of Bern, Switzerland and an Adjunct Researcher at the Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany. He worked in industrial consumer research at a large food company as well as multiple academic institutions in Europe and the US. His research focuses on process tracing methods and measures investigating economic gambles and heuristic choice behavior. On the more applied side he studies consumer food choices and knowledge of nutrition facts in experts and lay people.

Literature

Mandatory

check: www.mouselabweb.org

Willemsen, M. C., & Johnson, E. J. (2011). Visiting the decision factory: Observing cognition with mouselabWEB and other information acquisition methods. In M. Schulte-Mecklenbeck, A. Kühberger, & R. Ranyard (Eds.), *A handbook of process tracing methods for decision research* (pp. 21–42). Psychology Press.

Schulte-Mecklenbeck, M., Sohn, M., De Bellis, E., Martin, N., & Hertwig, R. (2013). A lack of appetite for information and computation. Simple heuristics in food choice. *Appetite*, *71*, 242–251.

Optional

Johnson, E. J., Schulte-Mecklenbeck, M., & Willemsen, M. C. (2008). Process models deserve process data: Comment on Brandstätter, Gigerenzer, and Hertwig (2006). *Psychological Review*, *115*(1), 263–272. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.115.1.263>

Willemsen, M. C., Böckenholt, U., & Johnson, E. J. (2011). Choice by value encoding and value construction: Processes of loss aversion. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *140*(3), 303–324. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0023493>

Invited Speakers

Towards an Economic Psychology of Greed

Greedy is an important economic motive: it is seen as both productive (a source of ambition; the motor of the economy) and destructive (undermining social relationships; the cause of the late 2000s financial crisis). However, relatively little is known about what greedy is and does. I will present recent research in which we first tried to establish what greedy is, using a prototype analysis (Seuntjens, Zeelenberg, Breugelmans, & Van de Ven, 2015), and follow-up research in which we developed and tested the 7-item Dispositional Greedy Scale (DGS) (Seuntjens, Zeelenberg, Van de Ven & Breugelmans, 2015). I discuss evidence for the construct and discriminant validity of the DGS in terms of positive correlations with maximization, self-interest, envy, materialism, and impulsiveness, and negative correlations with self-control and life satisfaction. I also present further evidence that Dispositional Greedy predicts economic behavior in various dilemma situations. Our findings shed light on the importance of greedy in economic behavior and provide directions for future studies.



Prof. Marcel Zeelenberg
Tilburg University

Marcel Zeelenberg (PhD University of Amsterdam, 1996) is a professor of economic psychology at Tilburg University. He studies emotions, decision making, and how the two interact. Marcel has published about regret, disappointment, shame, guilt, envy, anger, pride and greedy. In more recent years he became interested in financial behavior and finding ways to help people improve them.

Decision-making in Teams: Harvesting the Value in Diversity

Diversity is a fact of (organizational) life. The complex nature of the relationship between team diversity and team outcomes has spurred research and theoretical models addressing this multifaceted relationship (van Knippenberg, De Dreu, & Homan, 2004; van Knippenberg, van Ginkel, & Homan, 2013). On the one hand, team diversity has been associated with better team decision-making due to a greater variety of information available within the team. On the other hand, it has been shown that diversity can categorize groups into smaller subgroups. People tend to judge others within their own subgroup more positively than others of different subgroups, which in turn can harm information exchange and processing within the group as a whole and thus harm decision-making quality. As such, effective management of diversity deals with illuminating the contextual factors that limit categorization processes and promote information elaboration within diverse teams.

I will provide an overview of research focusing on a variety of moderating factors that can aid in harvesting the value in diversity by creating more positive judgments about team diversity (e.g., Homan et al., 2007; 2008; 2010; 2015; Rosenauer et al., 2015) and by promoting information elaboration (e.g., Greer et al., 2012; Homan et al., 2013; 2016). I will integrate the current knowledge on a myriad of moderators such as leadership behaviors (e.g., consideration, visionary leadership), training, personal competencies (e.g., emotion management, cultural intelligence) and experiences (e.g., internship/work abroad). In this respect, it is important to acknowledge that functional diversity management does not only require effectively addressing (different types of) diversity, but that it should also be attuned other contextual factors that potentially limit or enhance their influence (e.g., task interdependence, task complexity, attitudes and beliefs).



Astrid Homan
University of Amsterdam

Dr. Astrid Homan is mainly interested in team dynamics and team performance, with a strong focus on diversity, leadership, power, and emotions. She has published her work in the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, and *Psychological Science*. Dr. Homan is, among other journals, on the board of the *Journal of Applied Psychology* and *Social Psychology and Personality Science*.

What makes decisions difficult?

As compared to other questions in decision making research, the question “what makes a decision difficult” has not received much attention. However, (subjectively perceived) decision difficulty has important consequences for the resources invested in a decision (e.g., time), emotional costs associated with making the decision (stress), for confidence in a final decision, for choice processes, and for decisional outcomes themselves (e.g., procrastination). In this talk, I will discuss research at both the individual and group level that addresses the question of what makes decisions difficult. At the individual level, I will present evidence that decisions can become difficult when options are close in attractiveness or when even the best option is unattractive, but that this critically depends on certain moderators (e.g., decision importance). At the group level, I will focus on the effects of disagreement, and show that disagreement makes consensus decision making difficult, in particular when group members are committed to their original opinions or when shared decision goals are lacking.



Bernard Nijstad
University of Groningen

Prof. Nijstad is full professor of decision making and organizational behavior at the Faculty of Economics and Business of the University of Groningen (Netherlands). He received his PhD from Utrecht University (2000), and has previously worked at the University of Amsterdam. His research examines individual and group creativity and innovation, and individual and group decision making. In his work on decision making, he focuses mainly on difficult decisions that tend to be associated with stress, indecisiveness, and conflict. He is currently associate editor for *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*.

Saving energy when others pay the bill:

how to change energy behavior in organizations, student housing and hotels

Financial incentives are often used to motivate people to decrease their energy consumption. However, in some situations, such financial incentives are irrelevant. In these instances, other approaches, for example giving public feedback, asking people to commit or creating a reciprocal response, may offer promising alternatives in motivating individuals to act pro-environmentally. In this talk, I want to give a flavour of the literature on this topic, but will also dig more deeply into one of our own projects. In collaboration with a chain of hotels (the Student Hotel), we have installed detailed measurement equipment in 156 rooms, which measures electricity, hot water, and thermostat use on a minute to minute basis. The hotel allows us to run extensive field experiments combined with surveys to test energy conservation interventions. I will discuss the results of field experiments in which we manipulated commitment, reciprocity and level of construal of the energy conservation intervention. The results involve individual difference predictors, and effects of our manipulations on different types of energy use, perception of the hotel, environmental attitude, and more. Besides these findings I will elaborate on the complexities involved in such an extensive long-term field experimental setup in a private-public partnership project, and discuss future directions of the project in our ‘living lab’.



Michel Handgraaf
Wageningen University

Michel Handgraaf received his Master's degree in Psychology from the University of Amsterdam and his Ph.D in Social Psychology at Leiden University. Most of his research uses (field) experimental methods, can be described as ‘economic psychology’ or ‘behavioral economics’, and mainly deals with differences between what rational economic theories would predict and the psychology behind deviations from such predictions. Handgraaf's current research takes place in both lab and field and focuses on decisions in the environmental domain. These decisions typically feature uncertainty, temporal tradeoffs and social tradeoffs. Recent research focuses on the effects of feedback and reward – particularly the difference between social and monetary feedback and rewards - on energy consumption and environmental behavior more generally.

Meeting EADM's president

Taxing Decisions...and Some Issues in doing Research in Real World Contexts

Attitudes to tax avoidance have changed substantially over time, from seeing such behavior as a sensible approach through to a recent UK Chancellor describing some of this behavior as morally repugnant. The latter view is often echoed in the press, and companies like Amazon, Starbucks, Vodafone and Google have drawn public protest about their tax behaviour, including demonstrations with banners such as “They’re our bucks not Starbucks – Close tax loopholes”. I will talk about work I have been involved in which explores ethical behavior in tax practitioners, who would be involved in preparing tax returns for companies, and also about some of the issues and ambiguities that can arise in doing research in the real world.



Barbara Summers
University of Leeds

Barbara Summers studies individual decision making from both cognitive and emotional perspectives, with application areas in finance and health, where she collaborates with experts and organizations in those fields in the UK and abroad. Her work benefits from her previous commercial experience as Head of Systems Development at Equifax Europe UK. She is currently Professor of Human Judgment and Decision Making at the University of Leeds. Her current projects include work on the psychology of consumer debt; moral reasoning and motivations in the tax context; and the nature of financial risk preference and risk perception.

An Historical Account of the Present State of the Art in Decision under Risk and Ambiguity, Resulting from Interactions between Economists and Psychologists

The new behavioral approach pervades in intertemporal choice, social choice, game theory, and more and more in every discipline of decision theory. It is characterized by combining empirical insights from psychology with theoretical insights from economics. Its historical start, and most advanced development up to today, is in decision under risk and uncertainty, or ambiguity as is the fashionable term today. Here it started with the introduction of nonexpected utility models in the first FUR conferences, from which it spread more and more, to become what is called the behavioral approach nowadays. It involves more sophisticated theories and better empirical predictions than in the classical approach.

This lecture describes how the current state of the art could only come about from interactions between empirically oriented psychologists and theoretically oriented economists. At several stages in history, the next step forward could be made only by empirical intuitions from psychologists, and then the next step only by theoretical inputs from economists. Modern views on the proper modeling of utility, beliefs, risk, and ambiguity attitudes could only arise from the merger of ideas from the two disciplines. The lecture ends with speculations on future directions of risk and ambiguity theories and their implications for other disciplines.



Peter Wakker
Erasmus University

Peter Wakker is a Full Professor Erasmus School of Economics, Erasmus University, Rotterdam. BA in maths (with honors) March 1979; Ph.D. Economics (with honors) June 1986 (Tilburg University). Worked in departments of mathematics, statistics, psychology, business, medicine, & economics. He published with Nobel prize winners (D. Kahneman & D. McFadden) and in prominent outlets in many domains: *American Economic Review*, *Annals of Statistics*, *Econometrica*, *Management Science*, *Medical Decision Making*, *Operations Research*, *Psychological Review*, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. Ranked 1st in economics in the Netherlands in quality-weighted publications in 1994, 1998, 2003, 2007 and 90th ISI-Thomson most-cited scientists in economics and business 1993 - 2003 worldwide. He received many awards including the Frank P. Ramsey Medal: Highest award of INFORMS Decision Analysis Society.

Target-oriented ethics: The role of identifiability

Decisions concerning others can be oriented towards abstract, statistical targets or towards identified individuals. Even when all normatively relevant factors are identical, choices concerning identified individuals may yield systematically different outcomes from choices concerning unidentified individuals. The decision contexts we study vary greatly, including on the one hand choices that affect the decision maker herself, such as altruistic giving at one extreme and competitive behavior at the other, and choices regarding social policies (Affirmative Action, in particular) that do not personally affect the decision maker. The wide scope of identifiability effects suggests that different processes are at work when a specific individual, rather than an abstract entity, is being considered.



Ilana Ritov
Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Prof. Ilana Ritov's research focuses on judgment and decision making in social contexts, including pro-social choice, identifiable other effects, moral judgment, and unethical behavior. She is also interested in exploring the implications of behavioral biases to public policy and legal questions. Professor Ritov has been president of EADM. She is currently the director of the Center for Empirical Studies of Decision Making and the Law (I-Core center for excellence) at the Hebrew University. Professor Ritov is an associate editor of Judgment and Decision Making.



Joep Sonnemans
University of Amsterdam

Prof. Joep Sonnemans's research focuses on (experimental) research in which insights from economics and other social sciences (e.g. psychology) are combined or contrasted: expectation formation, bargaining, social behavior, law & economics and individual search behavior. He is further interested in behavioral finance and behavioral economics. I am a member of the editorial board of Quantitative Finance and the Journal of Economic Psychology and I have been an Associate Editor of the European Economic Review from 2006-2012. Joep is the director of the Center for Experimental Economics and political Decision making (CREED) at the University of Amsterdam.

Looking into the crystal ball of our emotional lives: some studies on affective forecasting

Predicting how we will feel in response to future events is a central component of our self-knowledge. Small and big decisions – whether to drink another beer, whom to marry, whether to have children – often depend on our predictions about how pleasant or unpleasant these events would make us feel, specifically our *affective forecasts*. Given their prominence and potential importance in determining future behavior and well-being, one would expect these affective forecasts to be accurate, but often they are not. In this talk, I will present a series of lab and field studies in which we examined people’s accuracy in predicting their future emotions (e.g., anger, disappointment, guilt, happiness, sadness, and shame) and, moreover, investigated the role of time, experience, and emotion regulation on forecasting accuracy.



Prof. Wilco van Dijk focuses in his research on emotions and how these affect decision making and behaviour. He published on a variety of topics, including disappointment, regret, schadenfreude, affective forecasting, and power. At Leiden University he holds the chair Psychological Determinants of Economic Decision Making, a chair supported by the National Institute for Family Finance Information (Nibud) and he is currently associate editor of Cognition and Emotion.

Prof. Wilco van Dijk,
Leiden University

Understanding social preference construction by means of process-tracing

Previous research mainly investigated the influence of social preferences on choices and largely ignored the underlying processes. Findings by Liebrand and McClintock (1988), however, suggest that individualist's process information regarding payoffs faster than cooperators. In this talk I will present a set of eye-tracking studies showing that differences in social preferences are accompanied by consistent differences in information search (i.e., number of fixations, transitions and proportion of attention) in social dilemma situations as well as ethical decisions. To investigate this relationship further the temporal dynamics of the information search were analyzed and showed distinct patterns of information acquisition for different social preferences over the course of decision making. Eye-tracking proved to be a great tool to investigate information weights for particular outcomes and motives during the decision making process. This line of research informs how to model decisions making and thereby bridges the gap between economic models and cognitive processes.



Dr. Susann Fiedler
*MPI for Research on Collective
Goods*

The research interests of Dr. Susann Fiedler lay in the emerging field of behavioral economics and decision making. Her recent work has been examining the influence of social value orientation on information search and integration in social dilemma situations. She is also interested in the underlying cognitive and affective processes involved in risky choices and has been conducting research centered on measuring physiological components which reflect such processes.

In addition to process tracing research, she is also interested in the methodological challenges present in psychological research and the problem of publication bias in various research fields.
