

## Investigating Intuition Automatic and Deliberate Processes in Quick Decisions

Andreas Glöckner  
Research Group Intuitive Experts  
Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods, Bonn, Germany

Behavioral decision research has intensively explored deliberate processes in decision making. Accordingly, individuals are often viewed as bounded rational actors who, because of cognitive limitations, use simple heuristics that are successful in certain environments (Gigerenzer, 2004; Simon, 1955). In recent work, however, it has been shown that human cognitive capacity is less severely limited than has previously been assumed. When automatic processes are considered, one finds that cognitive capacity is not a binding constraint for many decision problems (Glöckner, 2007, 2008; cf. Kahneman & Frederick, 2002). It is argued that in order to describe decision making comprehensively, models have to account for the interaction between automatic and deliberate processes. Based on the parallel constraint satisfaction (PCS) approach to decision making (Holyoak & Simon, 1999), the PCS model is delineated, which specifies this interaction (Glöckner & Betsch, 2008). The model shifts the bounds of rationality considerably and has further evolutionary advantages. Evidence from empirical studies on different probabilistic inference decisions shows that choices, decision times, and confidence judgments are in line with the predictions of the PCS model (Glöckner & Betsch, in press-b). Corresponding results have been found in risky decisions (i.e., standard gambling decisions, Glöckner & Betsch, in press-a). The findings speak against the application of simple heuristics (i.e., Priority heuristic, Brandstätter, Gigerenzer, & Hertwig, 2006). It is argued that intuitive processes like the ones postulated by the automaticity-based PCS model allow individuals to approximate expected utility models (i.e., cumulative prospect theory, Tversky & Kahneman, 1992) without calculating weighted sums of utilities and probabilities.

The core background papers for the talk are (free of charge) available at SSRN:  
[http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/cf\\_dev/AbsByAuth.cfm?per\\_id=905123](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/cf_dev/AbsByAuth.cfm?per_id=905123)

### References

- Brandstätter, E., Gigerenzer, G., & Hertwig, R. (2006). The Priority Heuristic: Making Choices Without Trade-Offs. *Psychological Review*, 113(2), 409-432.
- Gigerenzer, G. (2004). Fast and frugal heuristics: The tools of bounded rationality. In D. J. Koehler & N. Harvey (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of judgment and decision making* (pp. 62-88). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Glöckner, A. (2007). Does intuition beat fast and frugal heuristics? A systematic empirical analysis. In H. Plessner, C. Betsch & T. Betsch (Eds.), *Intuition in judgment and decision making* (pp. 309-325). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Glöckner, A. (2008). How evolution outwits bounded rationality: The efficient interaction of automatic and deliberate processes in decision making and implications for institutions. In C. Engel & W. Singer (Eds.), *Better than conscious? Decision making, the human mind, and implications for institutions* (pp. 259-284). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Glöckner, A., & Betsch, T. (2008). Modeling option and strategy choices with connectionist networks: Towards an integrative model of automatic and deliberate decision making. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 3(3), 215-228.
- Glöckner, A., & Betsch, T. (in press-a). Do people make decisions under risk based on ignorance? An empirical test of the Priority Heuristic against Cumulative Prospect Theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*.
- Glöckner, A., & Betsch, T. (in press-b). Multiple-reason decision making based on automatic processing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*.
- Holyoak, K. J., & Simon, D. (1999). Bidirectional reasoning in decision making by constraint satisfaction. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 128(1), 3-31.
- Kahneman, D., & Frederick, S. (2002). Representativeness revisited: Attribute substitution in intuitive judgment. In T. Gilovich, D. Griffin & D. Kahneman (Eds.), *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment* (pp. 49-81). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioural model of rational choice. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 69, 99-118.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1992). Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 5, 297-323.