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A B S T R A C T

Social information enables individuals to reduce uncertainty and increase decision accuracy across a broad range of domains. Intriguingly, individuals and populations consistently differ in social information use. Understanding the underlying causes of this variation has proven challenging due to the lack of a standardized paradigm to quantify social information use. Here we introduce the BEAST (Berlin Estimate Adjustment Task), a brief (~5-min), simple, and incentive-compatible behavioural task to quantify individuals' propensities to use social information. In the task, participants observe an image with a number of animals and estimate the total number. Next, they receive another person's estimate, after which they provide a second estimate. An individual's average adjustment quantifies their propensity to use social information. We found that individuals' propensity to use social information is consistent within the task, has considerable test-retest reliability over 9 months, generalizes to other social learning tasks, and correlates with established self-reported measures of social conformity and social proximity. The BEAST thus reliably captures individual variation in social information use. We conclude by highlighting the BEAST's potential to serve as a flexible framework to assess the determinants of human social information use.

1. Introduction

Social information plays a central role in human behaviour. Observing others can help individuals make effective decisions and rapidly adjust to novel and changing environments (Boyd, Richerson, & Henrich, 2011; Hoppitt & Laland, 2013; Tomasello, 2009). Individuals' social information use (i.e., when and how the behaviour of others influences decision making) impacts social interactions and the performance of groups (Lorenz, Raubut, Schweitzer, & Helbing, 2011; Torney, Lorenzi, Couzin, & Levin, 2015; Van den Berg, Molleman, & Weissing, 2015; Wolf, Kuvers, Ward, Krause, & Krause, 2013) and drives the spread of skills, knowledge, and social norms through populations (Boyd & Richerson, 1985; Cavalli-Sforza & Feldman, 1981; Henrich, 2015; Whiten, Caldwell, & Mesoudi, 2016). Moreover, it directly affects key social and economic outcomes in domains ranging from voting (Bond et al., 2012) to consumption (Moretti, 2011) and health decisions (Centola, 2011).

While theoretical models have traditionally assumed that social information use does not differ between individuals (reviewed in Aoki & Feldman, 2014), recent empirical research has documented substantial variation in social information use between societies (Jayles et al., 2017; Mesoudi, Chang, Murray, & Lu, 2015; Molleman & Gächter, 2018), individuals (Efferson, Lalive, Richerson, McElreath, & Lubell, 2008; McElreath et al., 2005; Molleman, Van den Berg, & Weissing, 2014; Toelch, Bruce, Newson, Richerson, & Reader, 2014), and across the life span (Legare, 2017; Mesoudi, Chang, Dall, & Thornton, 2016; Morgan, Laland, & Harris, 2015; van Leeuwen et al., 2018). Despite its importance for human decision making across a range of domains, the causes of this variation in social information use remain poorly understood.

The use of social information is known to be affected by the external environment. For example, social information use has been shown to increase with task difficulty and environmental variability (Derex, Beugin, Godelle, & Raymond, 2013; Derex & Boyd, 2016; Efferson et al., 2008; McElreath et al., 2008, 2005; Mesoudi, 2008; Mesoudi et al., 2015; Molleman et al., 2014; Morgan, Rendell, Eh, Hoppitt, & Laland, 2012; Muthukrishna, Morgan, & Henrich, 2016; Toelch et al., 2014; Van den Berg et al., 2015). A few studies have explored potential links between individual characteristics and the use of social information. Muthukrishna et al. (2016) showed that individuals with higher IQ scores used less social information. Toelch et al. (2014) showed that individuals who self-reported as more collectivist than others used more social information. These studies, however, primarily used between-individual differences to correct for individual-specific responses to different environmental conditions, and these differences explained only a small proportion of variation in social information use. Furthermore, it is unclear to what extent the various paradigms used in the literature robustly identify individual differences in social information use, and whether their behavioural measures generalize to other decision-making settings. Although standardized tasks for quantifying...
individual differences have been developed in other domains of decision making (e.g., risk taking and social preferences (Chuang & Schechter, 2015; Lejuez et al., 2002)), at present, there is no standardized behavioural paradigm to measure social information use.

We address this gap by introducing a standardized behavioural task measuring individuals’ propensities to use social information: the BEAST (Berlin Estimate AdjuStment Task). We designed the task to be simple, brief, incentive-compatible, and flexible. Simplicity is important to make the task accessible to participants from different cultural and demographic backgrounds and with a wide range of cognitive capacities. Brevity facilitates the adoption of the task in large cohort studies. Incentive-compatibility enables researchers to measure actual behaviour (with monetary consequences) rather than relying on self-reports. Finally, flexibility accommodates a range of possible extensions to address more specific research questions (e.g., how is social information use affected by task difficulty, demonstrator identity, or group size?).

To establish whether the BEAST reliably measures individual differences in social information use, we conducted two sets of experiments examining three key aspects of its validity: (i) test–retest reliability (Experiment 1); (ii) convergence with social information use in other decision-making settings (Experiment 2); and (iii) correlations with established questionnaire-based constructs plausibly linked to individual differences (Experiment 2). Finally, we show that the BEAST has considerable convergent validity (Experiment 2). Finally, we show that S correlates with self-reported social conformity and social proximity (Experiment 1 + 2).

2. Methods

2.1. General procedures

We recruited 324 participants (mean age: 35.3y, SD = 10.6; 57.5% male) from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), who completed the experiments through their web browsers. We restricted participation to MTurk workers from the United States and with a minimum approval rating of 90%. Participation was by informed consent, and the Ethics Committee of the Max Planck Institute for Human Development Berlin approved the studies (ref: ARC 2017/18). After completing the experimental tasks and questionnaires, participants received a unique code to receive their payment via MTurk. The experimental software was programmed in LIONESS Lab (Giamattei, Molleman, Seyed Yahosseini, & Gaechter, 2019; https://lioness-lab.org) and is available upon request from the corresponding author.

We conducted two experiments, each consisting of a set of behavioural tasks and questionnaires. We also recorded participants’ age and gender. Each task started with instructions, followed by compulsory control questions to ensure participants’ understanding. During the behavioural tasks, participants could earn points, which were converted into bonus earnings upon completion. The bonus came on top of a guaranteed participation fee.

Experiment 1 examined the temporal stability of the BEAST, by repeating the same experiment in three waves. In the first wave, we recruited 102 participants from MTurk (mean age ± SD = 35.7 ± 11.0; 54% male) from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), who completed the BEAST (Section 2.2). We re-invited participants of Wave 1 two weeks (Wave 2) and nine months later (Wave 3), to complete the same task again. We followed

![Fig. 1](https://arc.mpib-berlin.mpg.de/BEAST)

**Fig. 1.** Anatomy of the BEAST. a, Participants observe an image of a group of animals for 6 s and are asked to estimate the number of animals. b, Participants then enter their first estimate ($E_1$). c, Next, they observe social information ($X$; the first estimate of another participant who had already completed the task) and enter their second estimate ($E_2$). This procedure is repeated for five rounds. d, For each round, we define social information use ($S$) as the adjustment from $E_1$ to $E_2$ as a fraction of the distance between $X$ and $E_1$. We characterize each individual’s propensity to use social information as the mean value of $S$ across the five rounds (denoted $S$). e, Distribution of $S$, illustrating that participants in our sample ranged from keeping their first estimate (i.e., $S = 0$) to moving 90% towards the social information ($S = 0.9; N = 102$ participants). See Fig. S1 for screenshots of the experiment; for a demo, see https://arc.mpib-berlin.mpg.de/BEAST.
the same procedures as in Wave 1 (e.g., participants observed the same images in the same order).

In each of the three waves, participants completed the BEAST and an unrelated sampling task (not reported here). On average, participants took about 10 min to complete the experimental sessions and earned $1.50 (including their participation fee), corresponding to an average hourly wage of $9.00. We invited all 100 participants who submitted a completion code to participate again in Wave 2 and 3 (in Wave 1, two of the 102 participants completed the task but did not submit a code). Participants received a message from MTurk stating that they ‘qualified’ for a follow-up experiment and that they would have two weeks to complete it. In Wave 2 (two weeks after Wave 1), 69 participants returned to complete the experiment; 47 returned in Wave 3 (nine months after Wave 1). Thirty-five participants completed all three waves.

Experiment 2 was designed to test whether social information use in the BEAST generalizes to other settings of social information use. To this end, we extended the set of tasks and questionnaires from Experiment 1 with the moving dots and bandit tasks (Sections 2.3 and 2.4). These tasks have been used to study social information use (Głowacki & Molleman, 2017; McElreath et al., 2005; Moussaid, Herzog, Kämmer, & Hertwig, 2017; Newsome & Pare, 1988). The order of the three behavioural tasks was randomized. For Experiment 2, we recruited 222 participants from MTurk (mean age: 35.2, SD 10.4; 59% male). On average, participants took about 25 min to complete the experimental session and earned $4.25 (including participation fee), corresponding to an average hourly wage of $8.50.

2.2. Experimental task: the BEAST

The BEAST is a perceptual judgment task designed to measure individuals’ social information use (Fig. 1). The task lasts for five rounds. In each round, participants observe an image with 50–100 animals (Fig. 1a; see Fig. S1 for screenshots). After 6 s, the image disappears and participants have to submit their estimate of the number of animals (Fig. 1b). The range of numbers of animals and the viewing time provides participants with a general impression of the total, but prevents them from actually counting the animals. The value the participants enter after viewing the image is their first estimate in a round (denoted E1). We impose a time limit on submitting this estimate (30 s in the first round and 15 s thereafter) to avoid the possibility of participants taking a screenshot of the image and counting the animals at their leisure.

After submitting their first estimate (E1), participants receive social information (X, the estimate of another person who already completed the same task; see below for details). Participants then make a second estimate (E2, Fig. 1c). When making their second estimate, the screen shows the participant’s first estimate and the social information alongside each other, as well as a timer that enforces participants to submit their second estimate within the time limit of 45 s. The BEAST operationalises social information use as the extent of participants’ initial estimate adjustment (Fig. 1d). For each round, we calculate the relative distance a participant moves towards the social information as s = (E2 − E1) / (X − E1). Reordering this formula as E2 = (1 − s) · E1 + s · X shows that the second estimate (E2) in a round is a weighted average of an individual’s initial estimate (E1) and the social information (X), where s determines the relative weight put on social information (assuming that E2 is a convex combination of E1 and X over s).

We characterize an individual’s propensity for social information use (S) as the average value of s across all five rounds. So, S is the central outcome measure of the BEAST. Prior to averaging, we excluded data from rounds in which a participant moved in the opposite direction of the social information (s < 0; 31 of 2200 cases in the full data set) or moved beyond the social information (s > 1; 57 cases). These adjustments outside the range of 0 ≤ s ≤ 1 represent qualitatively different types of behaviour; that is, putting negative weight on social information (for s < 0) or not determining one’s second estimate as a weighted average of the first estimate and social information (for s > 1). Including these cases (or treating them as the nearest value in the range [0, 1]) in the analyses did not change any of the main results presented in this paper. Furthermore, we excluded eight cases in which a participant’s first or second estimate was > 100 animals off the true value, assuming that these were due to typos in their estimates.

Participants do not receive feedback about their performance during the five rounds. This setup implies that participants could not learn about their own skill or the accuracy of the social information. Note that in many decision-making settings, such information might be available (e.g., in the bandit task; cf. Section 2.4). Performance feedback during the task potentially introduces substantial levels of noise into measurements of social information use as people dynamically update the value they ascribe to social information relative to other sources of information (Kurvvers, Wolf, & Krause, 2014; Tump, Wolf, Krause, & Kurvers, 2018). After completing the five rounds (typically within 5 min), one of the 10 estimates was randomly selected for payment. When the selected estimate was correct, a participant received the maximum of 100 points (equalling $1.00). For each animal off the true value, 5 points were subtracted. Earnings could not fall below 0 points. Participants are thus incentivised to adjust their first estimate only when they think it will lead to an improvement in accuracy.

We controlled the distance between E1 and X by selecting social information from a pre-recorded dataset of 100 MTurkers who completed the task without social information—a common procedure in advice-taking research (e.g., Yaniv, 2004). In particular, we selected social information 15–25% away from an individual’s first estimate (see below for implementation details). Controlling the distance ensured that participants would have a relatively constant room for adjustment. We chose a moderate distance of social information because social information that is either very close or far from initial estimates tends to lead to little adjustment. (Hütter & Ache, 2016; Jayles et al., 2017; Moussaid et al., 2017; Moussaid, Kämmer, Analytis, & Neth, 2013; Schultz, Rakotoarisoa, & Schulz-Hard, 2015; Yaniv, 2004; Yaniv & Milyavsky, 2007).

In each round, we chose a specific piece of social information based on a participant’s first estimate, using the true (correct) value as a reference point. In particular, we first calculated a ‘target’ value (X) of social information, using X’ = E1 · (1 + ∆) if the first estimate was below the correct value, and X’ = E1 · (1 − ∆) if the first estimate was above the correct value. The displayed value of X was the value in the pre-recorded sample closest to that ‘target’ value. When the first estimate was exactly correct, a random device determined whether the displayed social information was lower or higher than the first estimate. Social information could thus be lower or higher than a participant’s first estimate. Furthermore, it was often (but not always) closer to the true value than a participant’s first estimate. For rounds 1–5 of Experiment 1, ∆ took the respective values of 0.25, 0.15, 0.20, 0.15, and 0.25. We collected the data for Experiment 2 in two sessions: In one session (N = 99) participants entered their estimates by filling out a numeric input box on their screen (as in Experiment 1); in the other (N = 123), participants entered their estimates with a slider. As regressions fitted to s in Experiment 1 revealed that the value of ∆ had no systematic effect on the amount of adjustment, we kept ∆ constant at 0.20 for the ‘slider’ session.

2.3. Moving dots task

The moving dots task is a well-studied perceptual estimation task in which participants have to estimate the main direction of 50 dots moving across their computer screen (Fig. 3a; Moussaid et al., 2017; Newsome & Pare, 1988). The majority of dots move in random directions, but some move in a similar direction (the ‘main direction’). This main direction is represented as an angle θ, taking a value between 0 and 360 degrees. We chose the parameters of the task such that, like in the BEAST, participants could get an overall impression of the true
value while still being sufficiently uncertain of their own estimate. Based on Moussaïd et al. (2017), we chose 70% of the dots moving at random and 30% moving in the main direction, adding noise to the angle of each of these dots (avoiding identical parallel trajectories for dots moving in the main direction, which renders the task too easy). In particular, we added a value randomly chosen from a uniform distribution between −45 and 45 to the main direction θ (emulating the ‘intermediate’ difficulty level from Moussaïd et al. (2017)).

Participants completed five rounds of this task. In each round, after 10 s, the grid with the moving dots disappeared and participants had to estimate the main direction. After submitting their estimate, they were shown social information consisting of the estimate of another person. As in the BEAST, we had pre-recorded a sample of 100 MTurkers who completed the task without social information. For each round we chose social information by first calculating a ‘target’ value which was in the direction of the true value of θ, and differed from a participant by Δ degrees. The displayed social information was the value in the pre-recorded sample closest to that ‘target’ value. For rounds 1–5, Δ took the respective values of 25, 15, 20, 15, and 25. After observing the social information (displayed as a red arrow on their screen alongside their own first estimate, shown as a blue arrow; Fig. 3a), participants submitted a second estimate.

As in the BEAST, we measured a participant’s social information use (M) as the distance between their second and first estimate, divided by the distance between the first estimate and the observed social information, averaged across the five rounds. Again, participants were rewarded for accuracy. At the end of the experimental session, one estimate was randomly selected for payment. If that estimate was exactly correct, participants would receive 100 points ($1.00). For each degree away from the true value, 1 point was subtracted, with the constraint that earnings could not become negative.

2.4. Bandit task

Two-armed bandit tasks, in which participants have to find out which of two options has a higher payoff, are commonly used to study individual and social learning (Figs. 3c; Efferson et al., 2008; Glawacki & Molleman, 2017; McElreath et al., 2008; Molleman et al., 2014). Our task was based on a seminal social learning study by McElreath et al. (2005), but adjusted it such that in each round, participants had to choose between individual or social information rather than having the option to gather social information in addition to their individual payoff information (Glawacki & Molleman, 2017).

In the task, participants repeatedly had to choose between two noisy options, one of which was associated with a higher expected payoff (38 points) than the other (30 points). We implemented noise by adding a stochastic term to the payoffs: an integer drawn—for each participant in each round separately—from a normal distribution with a mean of 0 and a SD of 12. This stochastic component was truncated such that actual payoffs in any given round were an integer value between 1 and 69 points (McElreath et al., 2005). This noise level implies that the option with the higher expected payoff yields higher payoffs in 67% of the cases (and a lower payoff in 31% of the cases, with the remaining 2% yielding the same payoff).

In each round (after the first), participants could collect information about the previous round. They could either observe the choices of three people who had previously completed the task (social information), or the payoff of their own choice (individual information). We operationalized social information use in the bandit task (B) as the number of rounds (out of 14) in which a participant chose social information (Glawacki & Molleman, 2017). As in the other tasks, participants’ earnings depended on their performance. At the end of the task, the point earnings for all 15 rounds were added up and converted into money (500 points = $1.00). We used this conversion rate to keep the task close to the studies it was adapted from (Glawacki & Molleman, 2017; McElreath et al., 2008, 2005) while keeping the expected earnings in line with the BEAST and the moving dots task.

2.5. Questionnaires

At the end of Experiment 1 and 2, participants completed a set of questionnaires, aimed at measuring four constructs: social conformity, social proximity, individualism, and collectivism. (i) We measured social conformity using the Conformity Scale from Mehrabian and Stefel (1995) in which participants indicate their agreement with 11 statements (e.g., ‘I often rely on, and act upon, the advice of others’) on a 9-point scale. (ii) To measure social proximity, we used the ‘Inclusion of the Other in the Self’ scale (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992), which has been validated for a wide range of classes of relationships (from close friends to distant relationships; Gächter, Starmer, & Tufano, 2015). In this task, participants are shown seven pairs of circles with varying degrees of overlap and asked to indicate which of the pairs best describes their relationship with others. In our implementation, these ‘others’ were the MTurkers whose estimates they could observe in the task. (iii + iv) In order to measure individualism and collectivism, participants indicated their agreement with a set of statements on a 9-point scale (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Both constructs had four associated statements (e.g., individualism: “I often do ‘my own thing’”; collectivism: ‘I feel good when I cooperate with others’). In all questionnaires, participants could leave items open if they preferred not to answer (for each of the reported correlations in Fig. 4, we omitted participants who left open an item for the respective questionnaire scale; out of our 324 participants, this procedure led to exclusion of 10 participants for the conformity scale, 10 for social proximity, 10 for individualism, and 11 for collectivism). We expected positive correlations between the BEAST’s S and social conformity, social proximity, and collectivism, and a negative correlation with individualism.

2.6. Statistical analyses

All analyses were conducted in R v. 3.5.1 (R Core Team, 2015). Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression lines with confidence bands (Figs. 2, 3 and 4) were created using the package visreg (Breheny & Burchett, 2013). Repeatability was calculated using the rptR package (Stoffel, Nakagawa, & Schielzeth, 2017). Data and code associated with this paper can be found at https://github.com/LucasMolleman/Molleman_Kurvers_vandenBos_EHB2019_BEAST.

3. Results

3.1. General results and internal consistency

In Wave 1 of experiment 1, participants, on average, moved approx. 1/3 of the distance towards the observed social information when providing their second estimate (average S = 0.318; median S = 0.298; Fig. 1e), implying that people put about twice as much weight on their own estimate than on the estimates of others. The magnitude of this ‘egocentric bias’ is in line with earlier studies on social information use and advice taking (Bednarik & Schulze, 2015; Jayles et al., 2017; Madirolas & de Polavieja, 2015; Minson, Ross, & Liberman, 2011; Soll & Larrick, 2009; Soll & Mannes, 2011; Yaniv, 2004; Yaniv & Kleinberger, 2000).

Individuals’ social information use, on average, ranged from keeping their own first estimate (S = 0) to moving 90% towards the observed social information (S = 0.9). The majority of participants put more weight on their own first estimate than on the observed social information. About 4% of participants did not adjust at all (S = 0). The majority of participants (82.4%) tended to move towards the social information (S = 0.318; median S = 0.298; Fig. 1e), implying that people put about twice as much weight on their own estimate than on the estimates of others. The magnitude of this ‘egocentric bias’ is in line with earlier studies on social information use and advice taking (Bednarik & Schulze, 2015; Jayles et al., 2017; Madirolas & de Polavieja, 2015; Minson, Ross, & Liberman, 2011; Soll & Larrick, 2009; Soll & Mannes, 2011; Yaniv, 2004; Yaniv & Kleinberger, 2000).
individual rounds, adjustments were overwhelmingly in the expected range of $0 \leq s \leq 1$ (Fig. S2).

To test the internal consistency of the BEAST (that is, whether participants' social information use showed a consistent pattern across rounds) we calculated correlations in $s$ across the five rounds of the task. We observed significant positive correlations for each pair of rounds (with Pearson’s $r$ ranging from 0.220 to 0.493; $P < .001$ for most pairwise correlations; max. $P = .033$; Table S1). In addition, a principle component analysis reveals that a single factor accounts for 52% of the variation across all rounds. Mixed model analyses further corroborated internal consistency, revealing that the random term ‘individual’ accounts for a substantial proportion of variation in (i) the likelihood of keeping one’s own estimate versus moving towards the social information (Table S2), and (ii) the relative magnitude of the adjustment in cases where an adjustment was made (Table S3). Taken together, these results indicate that individuals tend to use social information in a consistent manner, and that individuals consistently differ from each other in their social information use.

On average, participants underestimated the number of animals by approx. 10.0% in their first estimate (Fig. S3). This underestimation is significantly lower than social information use in Wave 2 (approx. 10.0% in their first estimate (Fig. S3). This underestimation is consistent with earlier studies on numerical estimation tasks (Izard & Dehaene, 2008; Jayles et al., 2017; Kao et al., 2018; Krueger, 1984). Importantly, individuals’ mean accuracy in their first estimate did not reflect their social information use in Wave 1 (Wave 2: $r = 0.346$, $t = 6.462$, d.f. = 308, $P < .001$), and, albeit weakly, with collectivism (Fig. 4c; $r = 0.118$, $t = 2.101$, d.f. = 310, $P = .036$). A regression analysis predicting $S$ including all four measures detected significant effects only for social conformity and social proximity (Table S4).

### 3.4. Social information use in the BEAST correlates with social conformity and proximity

To further gauge the convergent validity of the BEAST, we examined correlates of $S$ with four individual psychological constructs plausibly related to social information use: social conformity, social proximity, collectivism, and individualism. $S$ correlated positively with social conformity (Fig. 4a; $r = 0.346$, $t = 6.462$, d.f. = 308, $P < .001$), social proximity (Fig. 4b; $r = 0.241$, $t = 4.385$, d.f. = 311, $P < .001$), and, albeit weakly, with collectivism (Fig. 4c; $r = 0.118$, $t = 2.101$, d.f. = 310, $P = .036$). A regression analysis predicting $S$ including all four measures detected significant effects only for social conformity and social proximity (Table S4).

### 4. Discussion

We have introduced and validated the BEAST, a brief behavioural task measuring people’s propensity to use social information. We showed that individuals behave consistently across rounds of the BEAST, that individuals consistently differ from each other, and that the task’s central measure $S$ has substantial test–retest reliability over a 9-month period. Moreover, the correlations with social information use in different experimental paradigms and self-reported social conformity and proximity provide strong support for the convergent validity of $S$. In sum, the BEAST emerges as a robust and reliable measure for quantifying individual differences in social information use.

The BEAST provides a measure of individuals’ social information use with substantial within-individual consistency (Tables S1, S2, and S3) and considerable time stability (Fig. 2). This suggests that the task measures a relatively invariant ‘trait-like’ form of behaviour. Individuals’ performance in behavioural tasks often varies with their temporary state, such as motivation, mood, or fatigue level. This is one reason why behavioural measures tend to have lower levels of test–retest reliability than self-report measures (in which participants are often asked to describe themselves in general terms, or can base their responses on retrieving episodes of their own past behaviours from memory). Indeed, while self-report measures often have test-retest reliabilities of $> 0.8$ (e.g., Gnambs, 2014), behavioural tasks measuring impulsivity, risk taking, temporal discounting, and social preferences report test–retest correlations ranging from 0 to 0.7, with the majority on the lower end of this range (Chuang & Schechter, 2015; Frey, Pedroni, Mata, Rieskamp, & Hertwig, 2017; Pedroni et al., 2017; Weafer, Baggott, & de Wit, 2013). Comparing test–retest reliabilities between behavioural measures is not straightforward, as these measures can differ in many respects (e.g., methodology; number of observations, number of items or behavioural decisions underlying the measure; amount of individual variation measured by the task; time lag between test and retest; cognitive abilities of the sample population;
and the domain of decision making). That said, the BEAST’s test–retest correlation of ~0.6 after nine months (based on 5 data points per individual per wave), appears to compare favourably to behavioural measures from other domains.

On average, participants’ first estimates were approx. 10.0% lower than the actual number of animals (Fig. S3). The distribution of deviations from first estimates from the true value shown in Figure S3 suggests that the current task settings (e.g., viewing time and number of animals) give participants a fairly accurate impression of the true value. At the same time, participants were not completely sure of their first estimates, since the majority of participants tended to adjust their first estimates, a preference for consistency, or a desire to maintain one’s self-image.

The consistency in social information use across decision-making settings (Fig. 3) and positive correlations with self-reported social conformity and proximity (Fig. 4) provide support for the BEAST’s convergent validity. Individuals’ social information use in the BEAST and the moving dots task strongly correlated (Fig. 3b). This is perhaps unsurprising given that both tasks are perceptual estimation tasks with a single piece of social information and the possibility of financial reward. It is perhaps more surprising that the BEAST’s S also correlates (albeit weakly) with the inclination to rely on social information in the bandit task (Fig. 3d). Gathering social information and responding to it are different components of social information use, and our results suggest that these two components are not independent. Future research could assess the predictive value of the BEAST for behaviour in other domains where social information plays a key role, such as cooperation (Van den Berg et al., 2015), rule-following (Gächter & Schulz,
2016), and compliance to social norms (Bicchieri, 2005), as well as its predictive validity for people’s social information use outside of the controlled environment of a decision-making experiment.

We designed the BEAST to be intuitive and simple. Participants from our MTurk sample readily completed the task. Alongside the convenience sample from MTurk, we administered the BEAST in subject pools of varying backgrounds and cognitive abilities. These include Colombian indigenous fishermen and farmers, German and Indian school children, and British adolescents with conduct problems. We will report the results of these studies in separate papers (in preparation). In all samples tested thus far, participants rapidly and easily comprehended the instructions and completed the task within a few minutes. Across all these samples, individuals were overwhelmingly (>95%) in agreement with each other; (ii) to investigate how social information use is shaped by characteristics of the decision maker, the observed peer(s), and their relationship (e.g., in terms of their performance, reputation or dominance rank, in terms of social proximity, or with the peer being a parent, teacher, or stranger); (iv) to provide a systematic and quantitative assessment of how the use of social information depends on its distance to a participant’s own estimate, and (v) to test how people learn to use social information over time as they gain more experience with and knowledge about the accuracy of social information relative to their own personal estimates.

To conclude, we believe that the BEAST can be a valuable complement to researchers’ data-collection process. When time and resources are limited, researchers can readily append this brief task to their experimental sessions. A widespread adoption of the BEAST for collecting data in different participant samples would make it possible to explore how social information use is shaped by people’s local (social) ecology, socio-demographics, conditions during development, cognitive capacities, and personality characteristics. Ultimately, this would facilitate a comprehensive understanding of the key determinants of people’s social information use.
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