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## The 6-dot illusion

- The six dot illusion
- Why?
- Rule: Construct as few light sources as possible
- The dot inversion demonstration
- Rule: Assume light source is overhead
- Overhead literally or away from earth center?
- The head inversion demonstration


## Turn vour head upside down

## Movement perception 1

- Computer demonstrations of phi phenomenon
- PHI2
- F1 Lower, F2 Raise interval
- F10 return to menu
- Look in peripheral vision
- The basic phenomenon: DEMO D1


## Motion demonstration D1 <br> Alternation of screens 1 and 2: fraction of a second between screens: Apparent movement



## Movement perception

- Ignored for a long time, illusions not of interest
- Use of phi in movies, signs
- Using an illusion to study the system


## Movement perception 1

- Rule: if X1 disappears and X2 reappears QUICKLY in another location, assume X moved


## Motion demonstration D1 <br> Alternation of screens 1 and 2: fraction of a second between screens: Apparent movement



## Movement perception 1

- Rule: Disappearance interval must be short (fraction of a second).
- (Otherwise would have seen the movement)
- Demo D2 (overlap squares)
- Demo D3 (only one flashing)


## Motion demonstration D2: Alternation of screens

 1 and 2 but 1 overlaps with 2.No movement perceived

Motion demonstration D3
1 on constantly, 2 blinks on and off: No movement perceived


Screen 2

## Movement perception

- How does it work?
- The eye movement explanation
- When you move eyes to follow object, get sense of movement
- No: Moving eyes while looking at unmoving object
- D9

Motion demonstration D9: Screens alternate: simultaneous motion in opposite directions


## Movement perception

- The eye -movement explanation
- Your eyes can't move in opposite directions at the same time!!


## Movement Perception 3

- Rule: Create the simplest possible motion
- Rule: Construct as few objects as possible and conserve them as much as possible
- Rule: Construct motion to be as uniform as possible
- Demo D6 Bar


## Motion demonstration D9: Screens alternate: Bar appears to fall and rise



## Movement Perception 4

- Rule: Conserve object identity in movement, when possible
- Demo D7


## Motion demonstration D7: Three dots moving together creates a triangle surface



## Movement Perception 5

- Surface demonstrations
- Rule: Create surfaces to simplify movement: entities that move together are attached to the same surface
- Frame of reference and interpretation of motion


## Movement Perception 6

- D5 sm/lg box


## Motion demonstration D5

Alternation of screens. Create third dimension.
Box appears to be moving closer and further


## Movement Perception 7

- Rule: Create third dimension to account for rapid change in size
- D14 midbar


## Motion demonstration D14

Create third dimension. Green square appears to move in front of or behind red bar


## Movement Perception 8

- Rule: Create third dimension to avoid collision (when no sign of collision)
- D15 T

Motion demonstration D15
Shape seems to rotate through the third dimension


## Movement Perception 9

- Rule: Create third dimension to avoid unlikely shape distortion
- Complex situations
- D 16 Tbar

Motion demonstration D15
Shape seems to rotate through the third dimension


- Rule: Create third dimension and surface to create simple interpretation. Surface causes bar to flip into third dimension
- Developing a full set of rules
- Computer vision approximates human vision


## Final demo of motion

- Hans Wallach movement demonstration
- HANS
- F1 change frame
- F10 stop
- Speed $=3$
- Illuminated dot on edge of a wheel rolling on a track: Appears to be a bouncing ball with no back motion
- Illuminate the center of the wheel with a dot, and same original dot seen as rotating around it, with clear backwards motion


## Demonstration

- Even birthday $=\mathrm{E}$
- Odd birthday = O
- EVEN CLOSE EYES

O group


## EVEN OPEN EYES ODD CLOSE EYES

E group


## BOTH GROUPS OPEN EYES

Estimate how old this Woman is


## Results of Age study f09 1

- Group O ages:
- Average:
- Group E ages:
- Average:


## F08 Old or Young Lady Prime

| Group <br> n | Mean age <br> estimate | Standard <br> deviation |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Old Prime | 58.7 | 23.2 |
| Young Prime | 33.7 | 16.7 |

## We see what we expect to see

## Surviving

- Constructing a mental map of the world
- A map that is useful
- The map was useful in our ancestral environment
- The physical environment has changed drastically
- The social environment has changed drastically
- New importance of very small and very large numbers
- The educational environment has changed more slowly
- Science is a process, but is taught as a set of "facts" or "theories"
- Adaptive survival in $21^{\text {st }}$ Century: Understanding statistics, science etc.
- Not used to very small or very large numbers
- Rules or Heuristics
- Conditions where heuristics fail, sometimes described as biases
- Daniel Kahneman
- Amos Tversky
- Basic knowledge (e.g., gravity)
- Heuristics: Guiding principles
- Economics: Assumes full information available and rationality


## Knowledge of probability

- Approximations
- Penn Freshmen: Ivy League
- About $90 \%$ know chance of getting three heads in three penny throws
- About $25 \%$ know chance of getting two heads in three penny throws


## Risks and benefits

- Probabilities
- Paul Slovic
- Rate risks and benefits of modern technologies (e.g., nuclear power, genetic engineering, deep sea drilling)
- Lay people: risks negatively correlated with benefits
- Experts: risks positively correlated with benefits
- Must compare the two


## Lack of understanding of science

- Penn freshmen. What does it mean that finding $X$ is evidence for theory $Y$ ?
- $>\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ use the words: "proof, prove"
- Idea of texture of evidence, converging methods
- How do you know? Course
- $X$ is evidence for $Y$ if $X$ increases the probability that $Y$ is correct


## The Progress of Science

## Lay Model

Actual Events



## Generating "facts" or "claims"



## Misinformation <br> Natural preference
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## Bruce Ames on pesticides

## Process vs Content: survey results from representative Americans ( $0-100$ scale)

|  | \% reduction <br> in natural |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wolf |  |  |  |
| German <br> shepherd | $12 \%$ |  |  |
| Cocker <br> spaniel | $15 \%$ |  |  |
| Wild animal <br> with one gene <br> insert | $54 \%$ |  |  |



## OCHA-CIDIL Project 2001-2002

- Claude Fischler, Paul Rozin and others
- Random telephone sample interviews
- 150 (phase 2) or 1000 (phase 3) telephone interviews per country:
- France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, U.K., U.S.A.


## Additives vs Subtractives (Random Euro-American sample)

| Item | Naturalness (mean) <br> $(0-10$ scale $)$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Milk with natural vitamin D <br> supplement | 5.35 |
| Milk with all fat removed <br> (skim) | 5.88 |

N = 6000: France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, UK, USA

## Natural definition: adding vs subtracting (\% mentioning)

|  | US | France | UK |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Adding | 45 | 32 | 38 |  |
| Subtracting | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |

## Water: Process vs Content

- Logic
- Original Natural Form
- Add or remove something
- Remove what was added or replace what was removed (with same stuff)


## natural spring water with no minerals

|  | Mean <br> Natural <br> $(0-100)$ | Mean <br> acceptable <br> $(0-100)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Spring water with no <br> minerals | $92^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $91^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| Add $.1 \%$ minerals from <br> other spring water | $69^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $86^{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| Remove same minerals | $62^{\mathrm{c}}$ | $83^{\mathrm{b}}$ |

$\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}$ and c are significantly different in each column

## Some important heuristics

- 1. loss aversion (Kahneman and Tversky)


## Kahneman \& Tversky



- Imagine that you win a lovely Cross Pen in a lottery. What is the smallest amount of money that you would accept to sell this pen?
- Imagine a lovely Cross pen. What is the largest amount of money that you would pay to obtain such a pen?


## Endowment effect: <br> Cross pen given and to give up or to buy

|  | Lowest sell \$ for <br> owned (median) | Highest buy \$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| F07 | 25 | 10 |
| F08 | 40 | 10 |
| F09 | 20 | 10 |

## New pill item

- FORM A
- You have to take pill to treat an acute serious disease that you have. You have a choice of two pills which are equally effective in treating your disease. Pill A has a risk of .00002 of inducing cancer and a risk of .00002 of inducing heart disease. Pill B has a risk of .00001 of inducing cancer and a risk of . 00003 of inducing heart disease.
- FORM B
- You have to take pill to treat an acute serious disease that you have. You have a choice of two pills which are equally effective in treating your disease. Pill A has a risk of .00002 of inducing cancer and a risk of .00002 of inducing heart disease. Pill B has a risk of .00001 of inducing heart disease and a risk of .00003 of inducing cancer.

Pill results F08/F09: \% Prefer $=(.00002$ risk for cancer and heart disease:) vs one risk up and one risk down

| Pill \% prefer | 2008 <br> $\%$ prefer <br> equal (A) | 2009 <br> $\%$ prefer <br> equal (A) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| .00001 cancer <br> .00003 heart disease | $48 \%$ | $42 \%$ |
| .00003 cancer <br> .00001 heart disease | $83 \%$ | $82 \%$ |

## Negativity dominance (Rozin \& Royzman, 2001)

- Combinations of negative and positive are more negative than they "should be"
- Negatives are more potent than "equivalent" positives (loss aversion)
- Negative events grow faster in strength as they are approached than do positive events


## Negativity Dominance

- Contamination
- Stigma in politics
- Balancing Murders and Saved lives


## Framing

- Context, interpretation
- Examples of importance of framing


## The wallet question and framing

- You have $\$ 60$ in your wallet. You are going to a theatre and intend to buy a ticket for the admission price of $\$ 20$. As you enter the theatre, you discover that you have lost $\$ 20$; you have only $\$ 40$ in your wallet. Would you pay $\$ 20$ for a ticket?
- Alternate form: $\$ 40$ in wallet and a $\$ 20$ ticket. You find you lost the ticket.
- 1) YES 2) NO


## Wallet-ticket framing

lose $\$ 20$ ticket or lose \$20: \% buy ticket

|  | Lose ticket | Lose \$20 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Literature | 46 | 88 |
| F09 | $64 \%$ | $84 \%$ |

## Jacket-Calculator item

- Imagine that you are about to purchase a jacket for $\$ 125$ and a calculator for $\$ 25$. The salesman informs you that the jacket you wish to buy is on sale for $\$ 115$ at another branch of the store, located 20 minutes drive away (you have a car). Would you make the trip to the other store?
- Alternate: Calculator on sale for $\$ 15$.
- 1) YES 2) NO


## Jacket $\$ 125$ or calculator $\$ 25$ at

 $\$ 10$ discount at 20 min away $\%$ who will drive|  | $\$ 125$ to $\$ 115$ | $\$ 25$ to $\$ 15$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Literature | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 1}$ |

## Framing (Kahneman)

- Economics and Contingent Valuation
- Estimating the cost to society of Exxon Valdez Oil Spill
- How much would you give to clean up 1 mile of the Alaska Coast?
- Times number of people in country or other base
- Problem of framing


## Framing

- Choosing a comparison condition
- How good is your marriage?
- Tegmark: $\$ 100,000,000$ for meteorite warning
- $\$ .33$ per American
- Grant to every poor, deaf American say 100,000: \$1,000 each
- 10X federal expenditures on opera
- Framing a question


## Framing a question

- Do you think the US should (allow/forbid) speech against democracy?
- (very large random sample Americans)
- forbid
allow
- \% yes $25 \%$
\% no
44\%
- Framing
$-5 \%$ fat or $95 \%$ fat free
- Death or estate tax
- Patriot act or limitation of freedom act
- Granola bars

Framing: Presentation of results

## MRFIT STUDY 12,000 middle-aged US males followed for seven years

| Condition | Highest cholest <br> decile $>265$ | Lowest cholest <br> decile $<170$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Fatal heart <br> attacks (\%) | $1.3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |

Mr. Fit: \% Fatal heart attacks by highest vs. lowest decile in blood cholesterol 4 times higher risk!!


## Mr. Fit: \% Fatal heart attacks by highest vs. lowest decile in blood cholesterol



## MRFIT STUDY 12,000 middle-aged US males

| Condition | Highest cholest <br> decile $>265$ | Lowest cholest <br> decile $<170$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Fatal heart <br> attacks (\%) | $1.3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| No fatal heart <br> attack (\%) | $98.7 \%$ | $99.7 \%$ |

## Mr. Fit: \% NO Fatal heart attacks by highest vs. lowest decile in blood cholesterol



## Framing and loss aversion

- Discounts and surcharges
- Risk seeking for losses
- Risk aversion for gains


## Framing 1: Loss

- Imagine that the U.S. is preparing for the outbreak of an unusual infectious disease, which is expected to kill 600 people.
- Two alternative programs to combat the disease have been proposed. Assume that the consequences of the programs are as follows:
- 

If Program 1 is adopted, 400 people will die

- If Program 2 is adopted, there is a $1 / 3$ probability that
- nobody will die, and a $2 / 3$ probability that 600 people will
- die.
- Which of the programs do you favor? 1 or 2
- RISK TO REDUCE LOSS


## Framing 2: Gain

- Imagine that the U.S. is preparing for the outbreak of an unusual infectious disease, which is expected to kill 600 people.
- Two alternative programs to combat the disease have been proposed. Assume that the consequences of the programs are as follows:
- If Program 1 is adopted,
- 200 people will be saved
- If Program 2 is adopted,
- there is a $1 / 3$ probability that 600 will be saved, and a $2 / 3$ probability that nobody will be saved
- 

Which of the programs do you favor? 1 or 2

- RISK TO REDUCE GAIN


## Risk and loss aversion

 200 save or $1 / 3$ all save, $2 / 3$ none vs 400 die or $1 / 3$ no die, $2 / 3$ all die| \% no risk | Save frame | Die frame |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Literature | 76 | 13 |
| F09 | 72 | 33 |

## Short-sightedness

- The ancestral environment
- Succumbing to temptation
- Dominance of the moment:
- Smoking, chocolate, procrastination, going into the cold ocean


## Short sightedness F08: $\$ 100$ vs $\$ 105$

|  | \% choose \$105 | Interest rate |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A. \$100 now or $\$ 105$ <br> in one week | $64 \%$ | $>250 \%$ |
| B. $\$ 100$ in one year <br> $\$ 105$ in one year and <br> one week | $82 \%$ | small |

$$
\mathrm{A} \text { vs } \mathrm{B} \mathrm{p}<.001
$$

## Short-sightedness

- Succumbing to temptation
- Procrastination
- Buying insurance
- Examples of short-sightedness
- Short sightedness in institutions: Singapore
- The problem with democracies and frequent elections
- Capitalism: The problem with stockholders and quarterly returns in public (vs private) corporations


## Mole hill effect

- Putting on a seat belt
- Getting frequent flyer membership
- Filing for rebates


## Enhancers of public concern re disasters (Paul Slovic)

- Low likelihood
- Unpredictable
- Sudden
- Catastrophic
- Human caused


## The response to 9/11

- Low likelihood disaster
- Exaggerated by
- Unpredictable
- Sudden
- Human caused
- (vs. influenza epidemic)
- 1918 FLU killed 10-20 million
- Need for certainty rather than low risk
- Over-reaction re insecurity and security measures (e.g., anthrax scare)


## The mortgage meltdown

- Short sightedness
- Framing as distributed risk (like jacket discount, looking at distributed risk rather than debt ratio)
- Social influence


## Governments

- Made of people
- Problems with frequent elections
- Getting re-elected
- e.g. raising taxes, cutting entitlements
- All points relevant: endowment effect (loss aversion)
- Short sightedness most critical


## Some principles for constructing the world

- Non-random
- Bias to causes
- Correlation to causation
- Monotonicity
- Categorizing continua
- Single variable causation


## Ways to help

- Reframing
- Avoiding short sightedness with:
- Commitment devices
- Incentives
- Default options
- EDUCATION
- How do you know?


## END

