

UC Merced

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society

Title

Does mental simulation of alternative research outcomes reduce bias in predicted results?

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5198g4gf>

Journal

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society, 43(43)

Authors

Munnich, Edward
Schneider, Megan
Merino, Bresh
et al.

Publication Date

2021

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Does mental simulation of alternative research outcomes reduce bias in predicted results?

Edward Munnich

University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California, United States

Megan Schneider

University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California, United States

Bresh Merino

University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California, United States

Dana-Lis Bittner

University of California, Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, California, United States

Milo Martinez

University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California, United States

Marci Adolfo

University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California, United States

Erica Divinagracia

University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California, United States

Abstract

Can mental simulation of alternative research outcomes reduce bias? We attempted to extend Hirt et al.'s (2004) finding of debiasing when alternative basketball standings were easy to simulate and participants were low in need for structure (NFS). Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT) participants explained why taking notes by hand might improve test scores, then three groups of them explained different outcomes: Consider-opposite participants explained benefits of laptop notetaking, and two transfer groups explained either a plausible or an implausible outcome for unrelated research. None of the three groups differed from a baseline group in test score estimates or likelihood that taking notes by hand leads to higher test scores. However, low-NFS participants estimated marginally lower likelihood that notetaking by hand is superior, suggesting less bias to their initial explanation. We consider whether variation in participants' psychology backgrounds might have overwhelmed effects, and discuss a replication with students taking introductory psychology.