



**FRIDAY
MAY
03**

SOBDR CONFERENCE

**SOUTHERN ONTARIO BEHAVIOURAL DECISION RESEARCH CONFERENCE
UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO | SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE**

Welcome to the 2019 Southern Ontario Behavioural Decision Research (SOBDR) Conference!

Each year, the SOBDR Conference brings together researchers and academics from various disciplines with an interest in the study of how people make judgments and decisions. We believe the 2019 list of presentations and posters continues this tradition! We are also grateful to have Dr. Joann Peck from the University of Wisconsin-Madison as our keynote speaker.

We want to thank the University of Waterloo's School of Accounting and Finance (SAF) for hosting the 2019 SOBDR Conference. Established in 1981, the School of Accounting and Finance contributes to Waterloo's innovative landscape through outstanding academic programming, experiential learning, and world-class research and thought leadership. The School offers undergraduate and graduate programs designed to provide students with the competencies, professionalism and practical experience they need to excel in their chosen careers. The School offers undergraduate co-op programs in accounting, finance, and financial management. It also offers masters programs in accounting and taxation and a PhD program in accounting.

We look forward to an engaging conference!

WHEN:

MAY 3, 2019
8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

WHERE:

University of Waterloo
Hagey Hall



**UNIVERSITY OF
WATERLOO**

**SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTING
AND FINANCE**

2019 SOBDR Conference Committee:

Tim Bauer, Derek Koehler, Adam Presslee (chair), Jenny Rothwell, Adam Vitalis

2019 SOBDR Program Committee Co-Chairs:

Julian House, Derek Koehler, Adam Presslee, Nicole Robitaille, Claire Tsai



About the School of Accounting and Finance at the University of Waterloo

University of Waterloo is Canada's top innovation university. With more than 36,000 students we are home to the world's largest co-operative education system of its kind. Our unmatched entrepreneurial culture, combined with an intensive focus on research, powers one of the top innovation hubs in the world. Find out more at uwaterloo.ca.

Established in 1981, the University of Waterloo's School of Accounting and Finance contributes to Waterloo's innovative landscape through outstanding academic programming, experiential learning, and world-class research and thought leadership. The School offers cross-disciplinary programs and a culture that fosters aspiring professionals. Our students learn to think in different ways: as accountants and mathematicians, as investors and psychologists, or as financiers and programmers. As a truly experiential environment, our students work together in courses, case competitions, and extra-curricular activities to learn from each other, tackle real-world problems on co-op work terms, and form championship teams. Find out more at uwaterloo.ca/saf.

NOTICE OF PHOTOGRAPHY

At this public event, a photographer will be taking photos during breaks and at lunch.



UNIVERSITY OF
WATERLOO

SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTING
AND FINANCE

2019 SOBDR CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

Time	Schedule
8:00 – 8:30 a.m.	Registration and light breakfast
8:30 – 8:40 a.m.	Opening remarks: Dean Doug Peers
8:40 – 9:30 a.m.	Keynote: Joann Peck, “From Haptics to Psychological Ownership”
9:30 – 10:00 a.m.	Break – Visit the Poster Presentations
10:00 – 11:45 a.m.	Session 1 Efrim Boritz (p), Katherine Patterson, Kristian Rotaru, Carla Wilkin: “Cognitive Correlates of Professional Skepticism” Robert Collins (p), David Mandel, Christopher Karvetski, Charley Wu, and Jonathan Nelson: “Optimizing Probability Judgment Accuracy: Effects of Information Presentation, Coherentization, and Aggregation” Alex Kaju (p): “Artificially Yours: Algorithmic Prediction and Psychological Distance” Martin Turpin (p), Ethan Meyers, Michal Bialek, Jonathan Fugelsang, and Derek Koehler: “Inducing Feelings of Ignorance Makes People More Receptive to Expert (Economist) Opinion”
11:45 – 1:00 p.m.	Lunch – Visit the Poster Presentations
1:00 – 2:45 p.m.	Session 2 Laurence Ashworth (p) and Nicole Robitaille: “Purchase Reluctance: The Effect of Irrelevant Price Offers” Remi Trudel, Simon Blanchard, and Keri Kettle (p): How Unusual Spending Notifications Affect Debt Repayment

NOTICE OF PHOTOGRAPHY

At this public event, a photographer will be taking photos during breaks and at lunch.



Time	Schedule
	Mathieu Audet, Monica Soliman, Emilie Gravel (p), and Rebecca Friesdorf: “I’m Scared They Won’t Get the Opportunity for Education: Integrating Qualitative and Behavioural Insights to Increase the Take-Up of an Education Savings Program for Low Income Canadians”
	Sarah Molouki, David Hardisty (p), and Eugene Caruso: “The Sign Effect in Past and Future Discounting”
2:45 – 3:15 p.m.	Break – Visit the Poster Presentations
3:15 – 5:00 p.m.	Session 3
	Pat Barclay (p), Andrea Larney, and Amanda Rotella: “Stake Size Effects in Ultimatum Game and Dictator Game Offers: A Meta-analysis”
	David Hardisty, Howard Kunreuther, David Krantz, Poonam Arora, and Amir Sepehri (p): ““Once? No. Twenty Times? Sure!” Uncertainty and Precommitment in Social Dilemmas”
	Leslie Berger, Jonathan Farrar (p), and Linda Thorne: “That’s Outrageous! An Investigation of Deontic Justice and Financial Rewards on Taxpayers' Whistleblowing”
	Michal Bialek (p), Ethan Meyers, Jonathan Fugelsang, Ori Friedman, and Derek Koehler: “Sunk Cost in Moral Decisions”
5:00 – 7:00 p.m.	Reception - Cash bar
	Visit the Poster Presentations

* Presentation format: Presenter will receive 15 minutes, followed by 5 to 10 minutes Q&A

** (p) designates the paper’s presenter

NOTICE OF PHOTOGRAPHY

At this public event, a photographer will be taking photos during breaks and at lunch.



Keynote: Dr. Joann Peck



Dr. Joann Peck is an Associate Professor in the marketing department at the Wisconsin School of Business, University of Wisconsin-Madison. She received her undergraduate degree from the University of Michigan, her MBA from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and her PhD from the University of Minnesota. Broadly, her research delves into the psychology around consumer behavior. She has a research focus on haptics (the sense of touch) including product touch and specifically, on the individual differences in motivation to touch, product category differences and situations that either encouraged or discouraged pre-purchase touch by consumers. A few of her most recent projects focus on interpersonal touch and examine comfort with both initiating and receiving touch. Professor Peck also has an interest in studying psychological ownership and the effects on behavior. In a recent paper, she examines ways to increase the feeling of ownership which results in better care given to taking care of a shared resource. Her research has been published in the *Journal of Consumer Research*, the *Journal of Marketing*, the *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, the *Journal of Business Research*, and the *Journal of Retailing*. Peck's research has been cited in Forbes, U.S. News and World Report, Time.com, the Canadian Broadcast Company, and others



Session abstracts

10:00 – 11:45 a.m. Session 1

Efrim Boritz (p), Katharine Patterson, Kristian Rotaru, and Carla Wilkin: “Cognitive Correlates of Professional Skepticism”

Using an experimental study, we examine neurocognitive characteristics of audit problem solvers (risk taking, cognitive control (specifically, inhibitory control) and social cognition) and correlate these with trait skepticism as measured by the Hurtt Professional Skepticism Scale (HPSS). The measures of the three neurocognitive characteristics include, respectively: the Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART); the Stroop Test; and the Awareness of Social Inference Test - Revisited (TASIT - R). We collect data via two case scenarios involving three audit risk judgments (inherent risk, control risk and fraud risk) that we adapted from the literature. Our findings indicate that the neurocognitive measures interact with the HPSS measure to moderate participants' risk judgments. The direction and magnitude of the moderation effects depend on the context (i.e., case) in which the skepticism is applied to the risk judgments. Therefore, measuring the simple direct relationship between skepticism and audit risk judgments without considering other relevant neurocognitive measures may not provide a complete understanding of auditor behavior in various contexts.

Robert Collins (p), David Mandel, Christopher Karvetski, Charley Wu, and Jonathan Nelson: “Optimizing Probability Judgment Accuracy: Effects of Information Presentation, Coherentization, and Aggregation”

There is a longstanding interest in methods to improve posterior probability judgments through selection of information presentation, recalibrating judgments to improve coherence (or “coherentizing”), and aggregation. Little research has examined how these approaches work together. Reanalyzing a large dataset from Wu et al. (2017), we found that the greatest improvements to accuracy were brought about through coherence-weighted aggregation in which more coherent judges contributed more to a pooled judgment. Unweighted aggregation showed little promise, as did the particular form of Bayesian coherentization we examined. Importantly, some accuracy-boosting methods conflicted with each other, indicating the need for interactionist, prescriptive theory development.

Alex Kaju (p): “Artificially Yours: Algorithmic Prediction and Psychological Distance”

The present research examines how judgments of psychological distance (space, time, social distance, and likelihood) are affected by whether the information being judged is provided by computational algorithms or human recommenders. We also examine how beliefs about data type and expertise affect these judgments. Previous research has examined preferences for human or machine prediction, but not how the source of those predictions affects judgments about the predictions themselves. We find that predictions made by algorithms are judged to be spatially and temporally closer, but socially more distant and less likely than those same predictions made by humans.



Martin Turpin (p), Ethan Meyers, Michal Bialek, Jonathan Fugelsang, and Derek Koehler: “Inducing Feelings of Ignorance Makes People More Receptive to Expert (Economist) Opinion”

People don't respond more to expert economists than to fellow lay people (Johnston & Ballard, 2016). We sought to better understand the factors that make it more likely that people will revise their beliefs in response to expert vs. public opinion. We hypothesized that exposing an illusion of explanatory depth would lead to more belief revision to experts. We found that after exposure, expert opinion was more influential than public opinion. Our results suggest that experts may not be afforded privilege of opinion in their own domains over the public because people think they know more than they do.



1:00PM – 2:45 p.m. Session 2

Laurence Ashworth (p) and Nicole Robitaille: “Purchase Reluctance: The Effect of Irrelevant Price Offers”

The current work examines the effect of irrelevant price offers – for example, a price promotion that one does not qualify for – on purchase intentions. Two studies examine the effect of a wide range of different, but irrelevant, price offers including never-available prices and inapplicable price promotions. We find that irrelevant price offers reduce purchase intentions and that these effects cannot be explained by changes in reference prices or expectations about future prices. Instead, consumers appear to be primarily motivated to avoid making a purchase that would make them feel incompetent.

Remi Trudel, Simon Blanchard, and Keri Kettle (p): “How Unusual Spending Notifications Affect Debt Repayment”

We investigate how interventions that label credit card spending as unusual (de)motivate consumer debt repayment. In a field study of more than 3000 indebted consumers, we show that unusual spending notifications lead to greater debt repayments when the consumer's recent spending is ordinary, but lead to decreased debt repayments when recent spending is extraordinary. In two follow-up experiments, we show this occurs because the notification brings attention to the consumer's past spending behaviour. When recent spending is extraordinary (versus ordinary), it is very different than past spending. Bringing attention to this leads consumers with extraordinary (versus ordinary) spending to believe their future spending is more predictable, and thus demotivates debt repayment.



Mathieu Audet, Monica Soliman, Emilie Gravel (p), and Rebecca Friesdorf: “I’m Scared They Won’t Get the Opportunity for Education: Integrating Qualitative and Behavioural Insights to Increase the Take-Up of an Education Savings Program for Low Income Canadians”

The Canada Learning Bond, a government savings incentive to increase higher education access for low-income children, faces a low take-up rate. Results from previous trials testing promotional letters revealed important limitations in the effectiveness of standard behavioral insights (BI) principles. We conducted mixed method research to address this issue. First, insights from qualitative research were used to improve the letters. They were then tested in a field experiment using a randomized control trial. Results revealed that the letters combining qualitative insights and BI performed best at increasing take-up. Mixed method research can produce more effective BI interventions for social programs.

Sarah Molouki, David Hardisty (p), and Eugene Caruso: “The Sign Effect in Past and Future Discounting”

We compare the extent to which people discount positive and negative events in the future and in the past. We find that the tendency to discount gains more than losses (i.e., the sign effect) emerges for future, but not past, outcomes. We present evidence from four studies that the effect of tense on discounting is mediated by differences in contemplation utility, which we define as the emotional intensity from either anticipating or remembering the event. We also rule out loss aversion, uncertainty, risk preferences, thought frequency, and connection to future/past self as alternative explanations.

3:15PM – 5:00 p.m. Session 3

Pat Barclay (p), Andrea Larney, and Amanda Rotella: “Stake Size Effects in Ultimatum Game and Dictator Game Offers: A Meta-analysis”

Are people more generous when less money is at stake? To test this, we meta-analyzed 31 existing studies manipulating participants’ endowments in the Ultimatum Game (UG) and Dictator Game (DG). We found almost zero effect of stake size on UG offers ($d=0.02$), and a small but significant effect of stake size on DG offers ($d=0.15$). Furthermore, larger differences in stakes did not impact effect sizes in the UG, but had a medium-large impact on the effect sizes in the DG. Thus, higher stakes reduce donations in the DG, albeit not by much, and have no effect in the UG.

David Hardisty, Howard Kunreuther, David Krantz, Poonam Arora, and Amir Sepehri (p):
“Once? No. Twenty Times? Sure!” Uncertainty and Precommitment in Social Dilemmas”

Many social dilemmas require interdependent players to protect against a large loss that has a low annual probability. Decisions on whether to invest in protection may be made year by year, or precommitted. We found that precommitment increases the subjective time horizon and the subjective probability of loss, and thus increases investment rates. This precommitment effect is reduced as the explicit probability of the large loss is increased, and the precommitment effect is eliminated or reversed for gains; both of these findings are consistent with the subjective probability account we propose.

Leslie Berger, Jonathan Farrar (p), and Linda Thorne: “That’s Outrageous! An Investigation of Deontic Justice and Financial Rewards on Taxpayers' Whistleblowing”

We experimentally examine how deontic justice – a desire to hold someone else morally accountable for an unfair action – and financial rewards influence taxpayers’ whistleblowing decisions. We find evidence of a moderated mediation model, such that moral outrage – an emotional reaction to deontic justice – mediates the association between deontic justice and whistleblowing intentions. Furthermore, this mediation effect is conditional on the presence or absence of financial rewards. In situations where individuals’ desire for deontic justice is high (low), financial rewards reinforce (mitigate) taxpayers’ moral outrage and taxpayers are more (less) likely to blow the whistle than in the absence of rewards.

Michal Bialek (p), Ethan Meyers, Jonathan Fugelsang, Ori Friedman, and Derek Koehler:
“Sunk Cost in Moral Decisions”

Moral judgements are affected by two types of considerations: consistency with universal moral rules, and possible consequences of an action. We introduce a third factor that might affect moral judgements. Specifically, when having made a moral transgressions for the greater good (so called utilitarian judgement) one is willing to continue this action also when the potential benefit disappears. We explain this by referring to sunk-cost effect, and show that it affects moral judgements at least to the same extent as it affects economic decisions. Sunk-cost effect affects moral inclinations by boosting utilitarian responding, and increasing permissibility of a moral transgression.



Poster session

Poster Title	Authors
Observation and Ambiguity Matter: A Meta-analysis on Moral Licensing.	Amanda Rotella, Jisoo Jung, Christopher Chinn, and Pat Barclay
The Antecedents of Consistent Behavior: Tracking and Predicting User Engagement on a Mobile Weight Loss Application	Linda Hagen, Yikun Jiang, Barbel Knauper, Kosuke Uetake, and Nathan Yang
The Environmental Malleability of Base rate Neglect	Martin Turpin, Ethan Meyers, Alexander Walker, Jonathan Fugelsang, Jennifer Stolz, and Derek Koehler
Self-fulfilling Futures: How Implicit Theories May Contribute to Satisfaction Over Time	Erin Shanahan and Anne Wilson
The Effect of Pay Secrecy on Manager Bonus Allocations and Employee Cooperation within Homogeneous and Heterogeneous Teams	Lan Guo, Kun Huo, and Theresa Libby
Dominance-Prestige Model can Predict Outcomes in Buyer-seller Interactions that Entail Status Asymmetries.	Shirish Panchal and Tripat Gill
The Tortoise, or the Hare? Influence of Response Fluency on Feelings of Rightness and Reflection	Kaiden Stewart, Evan Risko, and Jonathan Fugelsang
Indigenous Workers of Canada and Conflict Management Preferences	Chloe Addie and Wendi Adair
Examining the Contribution of Executive Functions to Decision-making in the Iowa Gambling Task	Varsha Singh and Vaishali Mutreja
Artspeak: It's Probably Bullshit	Mane Kara-Yakoubian, Martin Harry Turpin, Jonathan Fugelsang, and Jennifer Stolz
Behavioural Economics Applied to Enhance Disclosure Practices and Investor Outcomes	Michelle Hilscher, Kelly Peters, Celia Fidalgo, Pauline Kabitsis, and David Lewis
Leveraging Behavioral Economics to Enhance Response to Dynamic Pricing Programs	Nathaniel Whittingham, David Thomson, and Kelly Peters
Increasing Attendance in Adult Learners Using a Behavioural Messaging Intervention	Monica Zhang, Nathaniel Whittingham, Dave Thomson, Jeremy Gretton, and Kelly Peters
Personal Values in the Identity Congruence-Seeking Process in Career Choice	John Michela and Chris Hyung Bin Lim
Better the Devil you Know Than the Devil you Don't: Predictability Influences Moral Judgements	Alexander Walker, Martin Turpin, Michal Bialek, and Jonathan Fugelsang
An Examination of Cross-Cultural Preference for Apology Moderated by Locus of Control	Alexa Dewhirst and Wendi Adair
Selfish Sharing? The Impact of the Sharing Economy on Tax Reporting Honesty	Berger, Guo, and King
Gender Differences in Cognitive Reflection	Michelle Ashburner, Evan Risko, and Jonathan Fugelsang
Changing How Employers and Employees View Older Workers in the Workplace	Kelly MacDonald
Towards a Psychometric Measure of Ambiguity Attitude	Jacqueline Csonka-Peeren

