

An Explanation of The Affect Heuristic for Behavioral Economics, Focusing on The Difference Between Rational Agents and Irrational Fools

Malik Afnan

Assistant Professor at University of Kohat at-malik@875gmail.com

Abstract

The objective of this essay is to present a comprehensive overview of two significant cognitive methodologies. The defining elements of the experiential mode include its intuitive, automatic, and natural nature, as well as its reliance on mental imagery that has acquired positive and negative meanings over time. An inherent characteristic of the alternative mode is its analytical, deliberative, and reasoning-based nature. In this response, I will provide a thorough analysis of the latest empirical data that sheds light on the concept of the affect heuristic. The term "affect heuristic" denotes a cognitive shortcut that assists individuals in making rational decisions across various situations. When individuals can effectively predict the favorable or unfavorable consequences of their decisions based on their prior experiences, it represents a significant achievement. However, we deem it as unsuccessful due to the significant disparity between the findings and our initial estimates. Given the aforementioned circumstances, the rational individual may ultimately transform into a sensible imbecile.

Introduction

This essay presents a theoretical framework for understanding the significance of influencing one's own assessments and decisions by focusing on the perspective of the individual. As will be explained in further depth below, the term "affect" refers to the distinctive "goodness" or "badness" that (i) differentiates between a positive and negative sensory quality and (ii) is experienced as an emotional state (whether consciously or not). Take note of how soon you are able to recognise the emotions that are evoked by the phrases "treasure" and "hate." Instantaneously and unintentionally, emotional responses are triggered. I shall liken the practise of placing an excessive amount of importance on one's emotions to making use of what he refers to as "the affect heuristic." Within the confines of this concise summary, I will make an effort to trace the evolution of the affect heuristic across a variety of research agendas, including those of the people I work with. We will also talk about some of the more far-reaching repercussions that this heuristic has for our day-to-day lives.

Background

Cognitive neuroscience and social psychology research agrees on the existence of two main types of cognitive frameworks: the experiencing and the analytical. Prominent "dual-process" theorist Seymour Epstein (1994) argues that people's everyday experiences provide abundant evidence that we each have two separate ways of experiencing reality. Many people categorise these approaches as either intuitive, automatic, natural, non-verbal, narrative, or experiential; or analytical, deliberative, verbal, or rational. Page 710. Table 1, adapted from Epstein's research, compares these various ways of thinking in greater depth. The emotional underpinnings of the experience system are crucial. Affect and emotion are a faster, simpler, and more efficient way to navigate a complex, unpredictable, and often dangerous environment, despite the importance of analysis in decision making. Some very important and influential academics have contributed to our understanding of what drives human behaviour. Epstein (1994) argues that both systems have substantial rational features. In light of this, I have labelled the right side of Table 1 as the "analytic system," while Epstein labelled it the "rational system." Over the course of humankind's long evolutionary journey, the experience system was important to the species' continued survival. People used their instincts and gut feelings to determine whether or not it was safe to approach an animal or drink the water before the development of probability theory, risk assessment, and decision analysis. In light of the ever-increasing complexity of life and the growing power that individuals have over their surroundings, the development of analytical tools has greatly improved the rationality of human mental processes. Analytical thinking was celebrated as the pinnacle of sanity in the twentieth century. It has been established that affect and emotions can influence reason. The emotional foundation for utility was established by Jeremy Bentham's hedonic calculus of pleasure and pain, which he created in 1789 and explored in his work published in 1948. But modern economics has come to view utility as a dimensionless value that can be maximised by individuals who follow a set of basic rules of rational decision making, including transitivity. In 1947, von Neumann and Morgenstern proposed this viewpoint. Inspired by economics, the field of Behavioural Decision Theory developed in the middle of the twentieth century. Edwards's seminal books (1955, 1961) show how heavily analytical notions like probability theory and statistics were included. Emotional rather than logical considerations were prioritised

in ongoing efforts to improve psychological models of information processing. Simon (1956) changed the field's focus away from utility maximisation principles and towards bounded rationality-based models of information processing and problem solving. Tversky and Kahneman's 1974 study, and a subsequent study by Kahneman et al. in 1982, showed how people with low levels of rationality make decisions through the use of cognitive shortcuts (heuristics) such as availability, representativeness, anchoring, and adjustment. Uses simple decision-making strategies like Tversky's 1972 "elimination by aspects" strategy. Models of constructed preferences (Payne et al., 1993; Slovic, 1995), dominance structure (Montgomery, 1983), and comparative advantages (Shafir et al., 1989) have been established by various studies to analyse the reasoning behind judgement and decision-making. Despite the growing interest in analysis, academics in the field of decisions are beginning to acknowledge the significance of emotions. In the early stages of acknowledging the significance of emotional responses in the decision-making process, Zajonc (1980) was an enthusiastic promoter. According to the author, emotional reactions to stimuli are frequently the first reactions, happening spontaneously and then influencing information processing and the formation of judgements. If Zajonc is wrong, then emotional reactions could act as directional markers that help us quickly and easily find our way around a complex, uncertain, and even dangerous world. Isen (1993), Janine and Mann (1977), Johnson and Tversky (1983), Kahneman and Snell (1990), Kahneman et al. (1998), Loewenstein (1996), Loewenstein et al. (2001), Mellers (2000), Mellers et al. (1997), Rozin et al. (1993), and Wilson et al. (1993) have all made important contributions to the study of emotion and decision-making. There have always been those pupils who are particularly curious about studying topics like self-regulation, education, memory, and social awareness. Mowerer's (1960a, 1960b) studies on conditioned emotions are complementary to Epstein's studies. Fazio (1995) investigates the availability of affect in regard to attitudes, and Schwartz (year) analyses the function of affect as a source of information. Particularly pertinent to this paper's premise is the work of Schwarz and Clore (1988). Prominent neurologist Antonio Damasio developed a comprehensive and influential theory on the role of affect and emotion on decision-making (Damasio, 1994). Damasio, in his study of the mental processes underlying human rational action, proposed that these representations are predominantly visual, incorporating both perceptual and symbolic features to help reasoning. As we learn and grow, the diverse emotions associated with direct or indirect bodily or physiological sensations become

embedded in these pictures. When a negative somatic signal is linked to a graphical representation of a potential outcome, an alarm is triggered. When linked to the desired outcome, positive signs work as motivating forces. According to Damasio's idea, decision-making is more precise and effective when bodily indications are taken into account. However, it is impaired by brain damage and other conditions. The present agreement acknowledges the experiential and analytical elements of cognitive processes, and how these two interact to produce a phenomena known as "the dance of affect and reason" (Finucane et al., forthcoming). The ability to participate in analytical reasoning without external supervision has minimal influence on many components of the process, while it is possible for humans to instinctively react in specific situations, such as avoiding a falling object. Feelings play a crucial role in bringing about logical behaviour. Damasio (1994) asserts that it is extremely unlikely that the processes of human reason evolved or developed only via the efforts of a solitary individual, without the impact of biological regulatory mechanisms. Expressions of these systems, such as emotion and feeling, are vital to the procedure. Furthermore, one must take into account the possibility that intellectual growth alone is insufficient. The extent to which an individual can maintain emotional experiences is thought to be essential in the success of these methods. Page XII, line 12

The affective heuristic

The determination or decision-making process is influenced by qualitative aspects that depend on the characteristics of the individual and the task at hand, as well as the dynamics of their interaction. Individuals exhibit variations in their emotional responses and reliance on personal experiences. The evaluability of information, or its relative emotive salience, varies across different tasks. These variances result in the stimulus image's emotive equality being "mapped" or interpreted in diverse manners. The prominent attributes of the seen stimuli subsequently evoke mental representations (perceptual and symbolic interpretations) that might encompass both practical and emotional components. The process of mapping affective information involves determining the extent to which sensory images contribute to an individual's "affectpool." To varying extents, each mental image within individuals' cognition has been categorised or associated with an emotional state. The affect pool encompasses all positive and negative markers that are consciously or unconsciously associated with an image. The intensity of the markings varies in accordance with the photographs. Consultants often consider the impact of several factors when making judgements. The

concept of effect can function as a cue for several important judgements, such as probability judgements. This is comparable to how imaginability, memorability, and likeness can also serve as cues for probability judgements, as seen in the availability and representativeness heuristics. When making judgements, it may be more efficient and beneficial to rely on a readily available positive image rather than engaging in a comprehensive analysis of multiple options or retrieving relevant examples from memory. The availability of mental resources is limited, and the process of decision-making is intricate. This implies that the utilisation of an emotion can now be recognised as a "heuristic" according to Finucane et al. (2000).

The experiential system did not work.

The affect heuristic has been characterised in this research as the fundamental component of the experiential mode of thought, the most common approach to risk evaluation, and the strategy that has allowed humans to persevere throughout the course of their species' evolution. However, relying on emotions can sometimes lead to incorrect conclusions, just like other heuristics do, which are effective and generally adaptive responses, but can also put us in danger on occasion. It would not have been necessary for the rational, analytical mode of thinking to arise and become so widespread in human affairs if it had always been better to rely on our intuition, whether it be emotional or experiential. Experiential thinking can lead us astray in two major and significant ways. This type of manipulation, which is the consequence of the purposeful manipulation of four emotional emotions by those who desire to control our actions, may be seen in marketing and advertising, to name just two examples of the practise. The other reason is because of the intrinsic limitations of the experience system and the availability of external signals that are not appropriate for verifying an emotional representation. Both of these factors contribute to the problem. The second point is addressed in the following section. Affective aspects of judgements and decisions are not only open to the possibility of being manipulated, but they are also open to the possibility of being influenced by the inherent biases of the experience system. The affective system, for example, seems to be designed to make us more sensitive to minor changes in the environment, such as the difference between 0 and 1 death, at the expense of our ability to recognise and react appropriately to larger changes that are even further from zero, such as the difference between 500 and 600 deaths. This seems to be the case because the affective system seems to be designed to make us more sensitive to changes in the environment that are close to zero, such as

the difference between 0 and 1 death. In their study from 1997, Felton and colleagues referred to this apathy as "psychophysicalnumbing." A different way of putting it was offered by Albert Szent-Gyorgi, who said, "I would risk my life for a man who is in pain." After that, I think of the possibility that four large cities could be reduced to rubble, which would result in the deaths of one hundred million people. I am unable to magnify the anguish of a single person by a factor of one hundred million. When we have to analyse the results of something that is more visceral, we run into similar problems. Arousal states such as antagonism, thirst, sexual desire, emotions, pain, and drug craving are all examples of visceral variables. They exert significant influences, both directly and indirectly, on hedonistic behaviour. Even though they cause strong feelings in the here and now, it is extremely challenging, if not downright impossible, to remember these feelings in a negative light. According to Loewenstein (1999), this is one of the most essential aspects of the phenomenon of addiction.

Conclusion

I have faith that this extraordinarily unique and insightful journey, which was defined by a plethora of evaluations and hypotheses, has successfully represented the excitement that is prevalent among modern behavioural researchers regarding the role of emotion on judgement and decision-making. When investigated, the impact heuristic inspires feelings of both amazement and dread in the observer. It is noteworthy in its capacity to make reasoning easier, as well as to improve efficiency, subtlety, and complexity. However, it is also unsettling because of its dependence on context and personal experiences, both of which can mistakenly or deliberately mislead or manipulate individuals without their understanding. This makes it difficult to generalise about the effects of this phenomenon. The melancholy feeling that comes about when contemplating the inherent evasiveness of meaning is due to the fact that meaning heavily depends on the impression that it has on the individual. Therefore, the assumptions that we typically rely on and use to rationalise the enormous investment of both time and resources in learning and disseminating "significant" knowledge could very well be incorrect. We do this because we believe that these assumptions help us justify the substantial expenditure. As a result, it is essential to recognise that one cannot simply assume that an educated person understands and can apply fundamental numerical concepts such as monetary amounts or human population estimates. This is especially important given the previous point. This remains true even for more abstract measures or statistical data, provided that the numerical values in

question are not endowed with any significant meaning. Understanding the workings of the emotion heuristic can help us better grasp Damasio's (1994) contention that rationality arises as a result of the interaction between the mind's analytical and experiential capabilities. This can be accomplished by gaining an understanding of the operational processes of the emotion heuristic. Under appropriate settings, the sophisticated maximisation process hypothesis is tightly aligned with the perception and integration of emotive experiences by the experience system. Since the time of Jeremy Bentham, economic theories have had an impact on these feelings, which are the physiological and psychological basis of utility. This influence has been felt ever since Bentham's time. A big part of the affect heuristic's function is to operate as a support mechanism for actors in a variety of high-pressure scenarios. But this isn't the case in every circumstance. Effectiveness is demonstrated when our degree of comprehension is sufficient to enable us to precisely foresee the desired effects of four different decisions. If the findings were significantly different from what we had anticipated at the beginning, we would consider the conclusion to be unsuccessful. In the situation described above, the rational actor evolves into what Amartya Sen refers to as the rational idiot, a phrase he developed in 1977. This change was first described by Sen.

References

- Ainslie, G., Haslam, N., 1992. Selfcontrol. In: Loewenstein, G. F., Elster, J. (Eds.), *Choice Over Time*. Russell Sage Foundation Press, New York, pp. 177–209.
- Alhakami, A. S., Slovic, P., 1994. A psychological study of the inverse relationship between perceived risk and perceived benefit. *Risk Analysis* 14(6), 1085–1096.
- Baron, J., 1997. Confusion of relative and absolute risk in valuation. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 14(3), 301–309.
- Bentham, J., 1948. *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Blackwell, Oxford, UK (Original work published 1789).
- Damasio, A. R., 1994. *Descartes' Error: Emotion, Reason, and the Human Brain*. Avon, New York.
- Edwards, W., 1954. The theory of decision making. *Psychological Bulletin* 51, 380–417.

- Edwards, W., 1961. Behavioral decision theory. *Annual Review of Psychology* 12, 473–498.
- Epstein, S., 1994. Integration of the cognitive and psychodynamic unconscious. *American Psychologist* 49, 709–724.
- Fazio, R. H., 1995. Attitudes as Object-Evaluation Associations: determinants, Consequences, and Correlates of Attitude Accessibility. In: Petty, R. E., Krosnick, J. A. (Eds.), *Attitude Strength: Antecedents and consequences* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fetherstonhaugh, D., Slovic, P., Johnson, S. M., Friedrich, J., 1997. Insensitivity to the value of human life: a study of psychophysical numbing. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 14(3), 282–300.
- Finucane, M. L., Alhakami, A., Slovic, P., Johnson, S. M., 2000. The affect heuristic in judgments of risks and benefits. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* 13, 1–17.
- Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., Slovic, P., in press. Judgment and decision making: the dance of affect and reason. In: Schneider, S. L., Shanteau, J. (Eds.), *Emerging Perspectives on Judgment and Decision Research*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Friedrich, J., Barnes, P., Chapin, K., Dawson, I., Garst, V., Kerr, D., 1999. Psychophysical numbing: when lives are valued less as the lives at risk increase. *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 8(3), 277–299.
- Gibbon, J., 1977. Scalar expectancy theory and Weber's law in animal timing. *Psychological Review* 84, 279–325.
- Goldstein, W. M., Einhorn, H. J., 1987. Expression theory and the preference reversal phenomenon. *Psychological Review* 94, 236–254.
- Hsee, C. K., 1995. Elastic justification: how tempting but task irrelevant factors influenced decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 62, 330–337.

Hsee, C.K., 1996a. Elastic justification: how unjustifiable factors influence judgments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 66, 122–129.

Hsee, C.K., 1996. The evaluability hypothesis: an explanation for preference reversals between joint and separate evaluations of alternatives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 67, 242–257.

Hsee, C.K., 1998. Less is better: when low value options are valued more highly than high-value options. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* 11, 107–121.

Isen, A.M., 1993. Positive affect and decision making. In: Lewis, M., Haviland, J.M. (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotions*. Guilford Press, New York, pp. 261–277.

Janis, I.L., Mann, L., 1977. *Decision Making*. Free Press, New York.

Jenni, K.E., Loewenstein, G., 1997. Explaining the “identifiable victim effect”. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 14(3), 235–238.

Johnson, E.J., Tversky, A., 1983. Affect, generalization, and the perception of risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 45, 20–31.

Kahneman, D., 1994. New challenges to the rationality assumption. *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics* 150, 18–36.

Kahneman, D., Slovic, P., Tversky, A., 1982. *Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Kahneman, D., Schkade, D., Sunstein, C., 1998. Shared outrage and erratic awards: the psychology of punitive damages. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 16, 49–86.

Kahneman, D., Snell, J., 1990. Predicting utility. In: Hogarth, R.M. (Ed.), *Insights in Decision Making*. University of Chicago, Chicago, pp. 295–310.

Kahneman, D., Snell, J., 1992. Predicting a changing taste. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* 5, 187–200.

Kahneman,D.,Tversky,A.,2000.Choices,Values,andFrames.CambridgeUniversityPress ,Cambridge.

Loewenstein,G.F.,1996.Outofcontrol:visceralinfluencesonbehavior.OrganizationalBehaviorandHumanDecisionProcesses65,272–292.

Loewenstein,G.F.,1999.Avisceralaccountofaddiction.In:Elster,J.,Skog,O.J.(Eds.),GettingHooked:RationalityandAddiction.CambridgeUniversityPress,Cambridge,MA,pp.235–264.

Loewenstein,G.F.,Elster,J.(Eds.),1992.ChoiceOverTime.RussellSageFoundationPress,NewYork.Loewenstein,G.F.,Schkade,D.,1999.Wouldn'titbenice?Predictingfuturefeelings.In:Diener,E.,Schwartz,N.,Kahneman,D.(Eds.),WellBeing:TheFoundationsofHedonicPsychology.RussellSageFoundation,NewYork,pp.85–105.

Loewenstein,G.F.,Weber,E.U.,Hsee,C.K.,Welch,E.S.,2001.Riskasfeelings.PsychologicalBulletin127,267–286.

Mellers,B.A.,2000.Choiceandtherelativepleasureofconsequences.PsychologicalBulletin126(6),910–924.

Mellers,B.A.,Richards,V.,Birnbbaum,J.H.,1992.Distributionaltheoriesofimpressionformation.OrganizationalBehaviorandHumanDecisionProcesses51,313–343.

Mellers,B.A.,Schwartz,A.,Ho,K.,Ritov,I.,1997.Decisionaffecttheory:emotionalreactionstotheoutcomesofriskyoptions.PsychologicalScience8,423–429.

Montgomery,H.,1983.Decisionrulesandthesearchforadominancestructure:towardsaprocessmodelofdecisionmaking.In:Humphreys,P.,Svenson,O.,Vari,A.(Eds.),AnalysingandAidingDecisionProcesses.North-Holland,Amsterdam,pp.343–369.

- Mowrer, O.H., 1960a. *Learning Theory and Behavior*. Wiley, New York.
- Mowrer, O.H., 1960b. *Learning Theory and the Symbolic Processes*. Wiley, New York.
- Ordóñez III, L., Benson, L., 1997. Decisions under time pressure: how time constraint affects risky decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 71(2), 121–140.
- Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., Tannenbaum, P.H., 1957. *The Measurement of Meaning*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, IL.
- Payne, J., Bettman, J., Johnson, E., 1993. *The Adaptive Decision Maker*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Rozin, P., Haidt, J., McCauley, C.R., 1993. Disgust. In: Lewis, M., Haviland, J.M. (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotions*. Guilford Press, New York, pp. 575–594.
- Schreiber, C.A., Kahneman, D., 2000. Determinants of the remembered utility of aversive sounds. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 129, 27–42.
- Schwarz, N., Clore, G.L., 1988. How do I feel about it? Informative functions of affective states. In: Fiedler, K., Forgas, J. (Eds.), *Affect, Cognition, and Social Behavior*. Hogrefe International, Toronto, pp. 44–62.
- Sen, A.K., 1977. Rational fools: a critique of the behavioral foundations of economic theory. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 6, 317–344.
- Shafir, E., Osherson, D., Smith, E., 1989. An advantage model of choice. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* 2, 1–
- Simon, H.A., 1956. Rational choice and the structure of the environment. *Psychological Review* 63, 129–138.