

1. 100871; 2. 200062; E-mail: xiaofei@pku.edu.cn

Self-Other Decision-Making Differences Derived from Construal Level

ZHANG Hui¹, LU Jingyi², XIE Xiaofei¹.

1. Department of Psychology, Peking University, Beijing 100871; 2. Institute of Psychology and Cognitive Science, East China Normal University, Shanghai 200062; Corresponding author, E-mail: xiaofei@pku.edu.cn

Abstract The authors review the self-other decision-making differences, and propose that such differences are derived from decision makers' cognitive differences in construal level. The mental construals are low when people make decisions for themselves, whereas the mental construals are high when they decide for others. Theoretically, self-other decision-making differences are illustrations of bounded rationality. Practically, understanding such differences as well as their mechanisms helps to achieve optimal decisions.

Key words self-other decision-making differences; cognitive differences; construal level; psychological weights attached to gains and losses; bounded rationality

1

Main body of the article containing abstract, keywords, and the beginning of the introduction with various punctuation marks and reference markers like [1], [2-3], [4], [5-6].

(71472005, 71172024 91224002)

: 2013 06 ; : 2014 02 ; : 2014

, , V ,

—

, —

,

,

,

“ (bounded rationality)^[7]”

,

() ,

,

—

,

,

,

,

—

“ ” —

—

,

—

“ ”

,

,

—

2 — :

Kray^[8] , , ,

;
 ;
 ,
 ,
 ,
 [29]
 [9,12]
 [17-19]
 (,)
 ,
 , Polman^[30]
 (regulatory focus),
 ;
 ,
 Polman^[31]
 ,
 ;

2.2

, Garcia-Retamero ^[2] – (cost-
 benefit)
 (nega-
 tivity bias)
 [21-24] , (prospect theory)^[25]
 ,

3

[26],
 (promotion focus), **3.1**
3.1.1
 (prevention focus),
 [27-28]
 :

1)

(primary fea

(secondary feature)

[32]

,

)

,

2)

bility)

3.1.2

Polman [38]

[47]

[45-46]

[48-49]

3.2

3.2.1

(loss aversion)^[25,50]

[39]

Polman^[31]

3.1.3

, Pollai [40]

(risk-defusing operator, ROD)

Huber [41]

(pre-event RDOs)

(post-event RDOs)

[51]

[29,42-43]

Sagris-

3.2.2

(status quo bias)

tano [44]

[52]

[53-54]

4 : -

[52-53]

Lu [55]

Polman [31]

Simon [7]

\$25

VISA

\$40

VISA

\$40

Master

VISA

\$40

?

“ ” [4]

3.2.3

(choice overload effect)

[56] Polman [30]

35

8

, Polman [30]

5

()

()

,
:
(/)
, (/)
-
,

- Guilford, 2007: 353–383
- [16] Liviatan I, Trope Y, Liberman N. Interpersonal similarity as a social distance dimension: implications for perception of others' actions. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, 2008, 44: 1256–1269
- [17] Nussbaum S, Trope Y, Liberman N. Creeping dispositionism: the temporal dynamics of behavior prediction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2003, 84: 485–497
- [18] Pronin E, Ross L. Temporal differences in trait self-ascription: when the self is seen as an other. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2006, 90: 197–209
- [19] Wakslak C J, Nussbaum S, Liberman N, et al. Representations of the self in the near and distant future. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2008, 95: 757–773
- [20] Pronin E, Olivola C Y, Kennedy K A. Doing unto future selves as you would do unto others: psychological distance and decision making. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 2008, 34: 224–236
- [21] Baumeister R F, Bratslavsky E, Finkenauer G, et al. Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, 2001, 5: 323–370
- [22] Rozin P, Royzman E B. Negativity bias, negativity dominance, and contagion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2001, 5: 296–320
- [23] Willemssen M C, Böckenholt U, Johnson E J. Choice by value encoding and value construction: processes of loss aversion. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 2011, 140: 303–324
- [24] Yechiam E, Hochman G. Losses as modulators of attention: review and analysis of the unique effects of losses over gains. *Psychological Bulletin*, 2013, 139: 497–518
- [25] Kahneman D, Tversky A. Prospect theory: an analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 1979, 47: 263–291
- [26] Pietri S E, Fazio H R, Shook J N. Weighting positive versus negative: the fundamental nature of valence asymmetry. *Journal of Personality*, 2013: 196–208
- [27] Forster J, Higgins E T. How global versus local perception fits regulatory focus. *Psychological Science*, 2005, 16: 631–636
- [28] Mogilner C, Aaker J L, Pennington G. Time will tell: the distant appeal of promotion and imminent appeal of prevention. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2008, 34: 670–681
- [29] Beisswanger A H, Stone E R, Hupp J M, et al. Risk taking in relationships: differences in deciding for oneself versus for a friend. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 2003, 25: 121–135
- [30] Polman E. Effects of self-other decision making on regulatory focus and choice overload. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2012, 102: 980–993
- [31] Polman E. Self-other decision making and loss aversion. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 2012, 119: 141–150
- [32] Trope Y, Liberman N, Wakslak C. Construal levels and psychological distance: effects on representation, prediction, evaluation, and behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 2007, 17: 83–95
- [33] Danziger S, Montal R, Barkan R. Idealistic advice and pragmatic choice: a psychological distance account. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2012, 102: 1105–1117
- [34] Kray L J, Gonzalez R. Differential weighting in choice versus advice: I'll do this, you do that. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 1999, 12: 207–217
- [35] Polman E. Information distortion in self-other decision making. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 2010, 46: 432–435
- [36] Laran J. Goal management in sequential choices: consumer choices for others are more indulgent than personal choices. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2010, 37: 304–314
- [37] Yan D, Sengupta J. Effects of construal level on the price-quality relationship. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2011, 38: 376–389
- [38] Polman E, Emich K J. Decisions for others are more creative than decisions for the self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 2011, 37: 492–501
- [39] Jia L, Hirt E R, Karpen S C. Lessons from a faraway land: the effect of spatial distance on creative cognition. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 2009, 45: 1127–1131
- [40] Pollai M, Kirchler E. Differences in risk-defusing behavior in deciding for oneself versus deciding for other people. *Acta Psychologica*, 2012, 139: 239–243
- [41] Huber O, Huber O W. Detectability of the negative

- event: effect on the acceptance of pre- or post-event risk-defusing actions. *Acta Psychologica*, 2003, 113: 1–21
- [42] Stone E R, Allgaier L. A social values analysis of self-other differences in decision making involving risk. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 2008, 30: 114–129
- [43] Wray L D, Stone E R. The role of self-esteem and anxiety in decision making for self versus others in relationships. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 2005, 18: 125–144
- [44] Sagristano M D, Trope Y, Liberman N. Time dependent gambling: odds now, money later. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 2002, 131: 364–376
- [45] Fernandez-Duque D, Wifall T. Actor/observer asymmetry in risky decision making. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 2007, 2: 1–8
- [46] Guo X, Zhao N, Wang S, et al. Player-spectator discrepancies on risk preference during decision making. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 2010, 137: 210–224
- [47] Stone E R, Yates A, Caruthers A S. Risk taking in decision making for others versus the self. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 2002, 32: 1797–1824
- [48] Cheung E, Mikels J A. I'm feeling lucky: the relationship between affect and risk-seeking in the framing effect. *Emotion*, 2011, 11: 852–859
- [49] Loewenstein G F, Weber E U, Hsee C K, et al. Risk as feelings. *Psychological bulletin*, 2001, 127: 267–286
- [50] Kahneman D, Tversky A. Choices, values, and frames. *American Psychologist*, 1984, 39: 341–350
- [51] , , . , 2012, 44(3): 369–376
- [52] Samuelson W, Zeckhauser R. Status quo bias in decision making. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 1988, 1: 7–59
- [53] Moshinsky A, Bar-Hill M. Loss aversion and status quo label bias. *Social Cognition*, 2010, 28: 191–204
- [54] Pichert D, Katsikopoulos K V. Green defaults: information presentation and pro-environmental behaviour. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 2008, 28: 63–73
- [55] Lu J, Xie X. To change or not to change: a matter of decision maker's role. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 2014, 124: 47-55
- [56] Iyengar S S, Lepper M R. When choice is demotivating: can one desire too much of a good thing?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2000, 79: 995–1006
- [57] Leonhardt J M, Keller L R, Pechmann C. Avoiding the risk of responsibility by seeking uncertainty: responsibility aversion and preference for indirect agency when choosing for others. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 2011, 21: 405–413