

Overprecision again

Kevin Dorst

Q: Does overprecision provide better evidence for overconfidence than the result of estimation and placement tasks?

I. Findings

- 1) Interval-estimates are almost always overprecise; never under-precise. No hard-easy effect or easy-hard effect
- 2) Interval width is relatively insensitive to confidence level
- 3) When asked about their own 90%-CIs, people think fewer than 9 of 10 of them will contain the true value.
- 4) Two-point method generates less overprecision than interval method.

II. Hypothesis 1: Accuracy-Informativity Tradeoff

Guesses. Informativity is question-sensitive.

Recall: 'Where will Latif go?' vs. 'Will he go to Yale or not?'

'What interval does the population of the UK fall within?' vs.
'How confident that population is at least 60 million?'

Could this explain (1)–(4)?
What's the best objection?

III. Hypothesis 2: Selection effect

Selection effects in general.

Random 90%-intervals vs. 90%-CIs
→ the latter is, by definition, *narrower*.

Miscalibration \approx true rate don't vary perfectly with confidence-level

So if miscalibrated, expect to be *more* overprecise on narrower intervals.

What can/can't this explain?