General information

The master's exam at CBDR lasts 30 minutes and consist of two parts. In part 1 (10 minutes) the candidate presents their synopsis of a self-chosen topic from the field of judgment and decision making (see below), followed by a brief Q&A. In part 2 (20 minutes), the examiner will start asking relatively general questions on the *basic literature* (see below) and then zooms in to one or two topics of the "focus literature". The goal of these questions is to examine the candidate's understanding of the foundations of and current trends in judgment and decision-making research. This includes theory, methods, and potential applications. The candidate is expected to have developed a thorough understanding of these concepts, but it is not necessary to memorize all study-specific details (e.g., sample sizes, effect sizes, etc.). Usually, a rough knowledge of such indicators is sufficient for a sound interpretation of study results.

Part 1

- Duration: 5 minutes presentation + 5 minutes Q&A
- Topic: A self-chosen topic from the field of judgment and decision making. The topic must not overlap with the candidate's master's thesis.
- Content: 3 primary articles that address key research questions of the chosen topic.
- Deadline: The topic and list of suggested articles have to be submitted to the examiner at least one month in advance for approval.

Part 2

- Duration: 20 minutes
- Topic: Basic and focus literature

Basic literature

The following two books, and in particular the book chapters indicated, are very helpful in gaining an overview and understanding of the key concepts and models of human decision making. As such they are useful to contextualize the focus literature below, and it is therefore highly recommended to familiarize yourself with the basic topics of the indicated chapters.

- Hastie, R., & Dawes, R. M. (2009). Rational choice in an uncertain world: The psychology of judgment and decision making. SAGE Publications. **Chapters: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7**

- Newell, B. R., Lagnado, D. A., & Shanks, D. R. (2007). Straight choices: The psychology of decision making. Psychology Press. **Chapters: 2, 3, 5, 6, 8**

Focus literature

Risk perception, risk communication, and risk preference:

- Frey, R., Pedroni, A., Mata, R., Rieskamp, J., & Hertwig, R. (2017). Risk preference shares the psychometric structure of major psychological traits. Science Advances, 3, e1701381.

https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1701381

- Slovic, P. (1987). Perception of risk. Science, 236(4799), 280–285.
  https://doi.org/10.1126/science.3563507

- Spiegelhalter, D., Pearson, M., & Short, I. (2011). Visualizing uncertainty about the future. Science,
  333(6048), 1393–1400. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1191181

Bounded rationality:

- Arkes, H. R., Gigerenzer, G., & Hertwig, R. (2016). How bad is incoherence? Decision, 3(1), 20–39.
  https://doi.org/10.1037/dec0000043

- Dawes, R. M., Faust, D., & Meehl, P. E. (1989). Clinical versus actuarial judgment. Science,
  243(4899), 1668–1674. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.2648573

- Hertwig, R., & Grüne-Yanoff, T. (2017). Nudging and boosting: Steering or empowering good
  decisions. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12(6), 973–986.
  https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617702496

Meta-science:

- Agrawal, M., Peterson, J. C., & Griffiths, T. L. (2020). Scaling up psychology via Scientific Regret
  Minimization. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117(16), 8825–8835.
  https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1915841117

- Yarkoni, T., & Westfall, J. (2017). Choosing prediction over explanation in psychology: Lessons from
  machine learning. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12(6), 1100–1122.
  https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617693393

Good to know

- The exam can be taken in German or English; please discuss in advance.
- A second examiner will be present during the exam. This person is responsible for the protocol of the
  exam but will typically not actively participate in the discussion and / or ask any questions.