



Society for Judgment and Decision Making

# Newsletter

[www.sjdm.org](http://www.sjdm.org)

Volume 25, Number 2 June 2006

## Contents

2006 Executive Board	2
SJDM Call for Abstracts	3
The Hillel Einhorn New Investigator Award for 2006	4
Help wanted for JDM (the journal)	4
A Judgmental Perspective on Student Evaluations	5
Film review	7
New Publication: Judgments Over Time	10
From our Colleagues in Communication and Social Psychology	11
New Journal: Media Psychology	11
SPSP 2007: Call for Proposals	12
SPSP Theory Prize	13
Conferences	14
Job	15
Icelandic chefs illustrate that two heads are better than one	16
2006 Dues and Address Corrections	17



**Persian sculptors illustrate that two heads are better than one  
Takht-e Jamshid (Persepolis)**

### 2006 Executive Board

John Payne, *President*, [jpayne@mail.duke.edu](mailto:jpayne@mail.duke.edu)  
Maya Bar-Hillel, *Past President*, [msmaya@math.huji.ac.il](mailto:msmaya@math.huji.ac.il)  
Jon Baron, *President-elect*, [baron@psych.upenn.edu](mailto:baron@psych.upenn.edu)  
Craig Fox, *board member 2005-2007*, [craig.fox@anderson.ucla.edu](mailto:craig.fox@anderson.ucla.edu)  
Lisa Ordonez, *board member 2004-2006*, [lordonez@email.arizona.edu](mailto:lordonez@email.arizona.edu)  
Terry Connolly, *board member 2004-2006*, [connolly@email.arizona.edu](mailto:connolly@email.arizona.edu)  
Bud Fennema, *Secretary/Treasurer*, [bfennema@garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:bfennema@garnet.acns.fsu.edu)  
Derek Koehler, *Conference Coordinator*, [dkoehler@watarts.uwaterloo.ca](mailto:dkoehler@watarts.uwaterloo.ca)  
Alan Schwartz, *Webmaster*, [alansz@sjdm.org](mailto:alansz@sjdm.org)  
Warren Thorngate, *Newsletter Editor*, [warrent@ccs.carleton.ca](mailto:warrent@ccs.carleton.ca)

JDM Newsletter Editor  
(Submissions & Advertisements)  
Warren Thorngate  
Psychology Department  
Carleton University  
1125 Colonel By Drive  
Ottawa, Ontario K1S 5B6  
Canada  
(613) 520-2600 x 2706  
fax (613) 520-3667  
[warrent@ccs.carleton.ca](mailto:warrent@ccs.carleton.ca)

Secretary/Treasurer  
Bud Fennema, Chairman, Department of Accounting  
and Ernst & Young Professor  
College of Business  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1110  
Voice: (850)644-8231 Fax: (850)644-8234  
[bfennema@garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:bfennema@garnet.acns.fsu.edu)

The *JDM Newsletter*, published electronically four times a year (March, June, September, and December), welcomes submissions from individuals and groups. However, we do not publish substantive papers. Book reviews will be published. If you are interested in reviewing books and related materials, please write to or email the editor.

There are few ground rules for submissions. The best way to send your contribution is via e-mail, or as an MS Word e-mail attachment.

**Advertising Rates:** Advertising can be submitted to the editor. Inclusion of the ad and the space given to the ad is at the editor's discretion. The current charge is \$100 per page (\$50 per 1/2 page). Contact Warren Thorngate for details.

**Address Corrections:** Please keep your mailing and/or email address current. We often have no way of knowing if you are not receiving the newsletter. Address changes or corrections should be sent Bud Fennema. Reports of problems in receiving or opening the pdf file should be sent to the editor.

**Society membership:** Requests for information concerning membership in the Society for Judgment and Decision Making should be sent to Bud Fennema.

### **Annual Meeting of the Society for Judgment and Decision Making: SJDM Call for Abstracts**

The Society for Judgment and Decision Making (SJDM) invites abstracts for symposia, oral presentations, and posters on any interesting topic related to judgment and decision making. Completed manuscripts are not required.

#### **Location, dates and program**

SJDM's annual conference will be held at the Hilton Americas in Houston, TX, from November 18-20, 2006. Early registration and welcome reception will take place the evening of Friday, November 17. As in 2004 and 2005, the schedule includes a full day on Saturday to make room for more presentations and for two keynote speakers:

- Philip Tetlock, Mitchell Professor of Leadership, University of California, Berkeley, and award-winning author of numerous books and articles about political judgments, accountability, and counterfactual thinking
- John Allen Paulos, Professor of Mathematics, Temple University, and bestselling author of several books including *Innumeracy* and *A Mathematician Plays the Stock Market*

#### **Submissions**

The deadline for submissions is **July 15, 2006**. Submissions for symposia, oral presentations, and posters should be made through the SJDM website at <http://sql.sjdm.org>. Technical questions can be addressed to the webmaster, Alan Schwartz, at [www@sjdm.org](mailto:www@sjdm.org). All other questions can be addressed to Megan Hinkel, at [megan@decisionresearch.org](mailto:megan@decisionresearch.org).

#### **Eligibility**

At least one author of each presentation must be a member of SJDM. Joining at the time of submission will satisfy this requirement. A membership form may be downloaded from the SJDM website at <http://www.sjdm.org>. An individual may give only one talk (podium presentation) and present only one poster, but may be a co-author on multiple talks and/or posters.

#### **Awards**

- The **Best Student Poster Award** is given for the best poster presentation whose first author is a student member of SJDM.
- The **Hillel Einhorn New Investigator Award** is intended to encourage outstanding work by new researchers. Applications due July 15, 2006. Further details are available at <http://www.sjdm.org>
- The **Jane Beattie Memorial Fund** subsidizes travel to North America for a foreign scholar in pursuits related to judgment and decision research, including attendance at the annual SJDM meeting. Information and an application form can be found at:  
<http://gsbwww.uchicago.edu/fac/joshua.klayman/more/BeattieInfo06.htm>

Applications are due by July 16, 2006.

**Program Committee**

Ellen Peters (Chair), Dan Ariely, Rachel Croson, Melissa Finucane, Rebecca Ratner, Yuval Rottenstreich, Alan Schwartz, George Wu  
Derek Koehler (conference coordinator)  
John Payne (SJDM president)

**The Hillel Einhorn New Investigator Award for 2006**

The Society for Judgment and Decision Making is soliciting submissions for the Hillel Einhorn New Investigator Award. The purpose of this award is to encourage outstanding work by new researchers. Individuals are eligible if they have not yet completed their Ph.D. or if they have completed their Ph.D. within the last five years (on or after July 1, 2000). To be considered for the award, please submit four copies of a journal-style manuscript on any topic related to judgment and decision making. Submissions should be accompanied by (1) four copies of a summary or extended abstract of the paper, not to exceed four pages in length and (2) a cover letter that includes the name of the investigator's graduate advisor and the date that the Ph.D. was awarded (if applicable). In the case of co-authored papers, if the authors are all new investigators they can be considered jointly; otherwise, the new investigator(s) must be the primary author(s) and should be the primary source of ideas. Submissions in dissertation format will not be considered, but articles based on a dissertation are encouraged. Both reprints of published articles and manuscripts that have not yet been published are acceptable. Submissions will be judged by a committee appointed by the Society and chaired by Mike Doherty. To be considered, submissions must be received by July 15, 2006. The committee will announce the results to the participants by September 15, 2006. The award will be announced and presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Judgment and Decision Making, which will be held in Houston, TX November 18-20. The winner will be invited to give a presentation at that meeting. If the winner cannot obtain full funding from his/her own institution to attend the meeting, an application may be made to the Society for supplemental travel needs.

**Materials should be submitted by July 15, 2006 to:**

Professor Michael Doherty  
Department of Psychology  
Bowling Green State University  
Bowling Green, OH 43403

**Help wanted for JDM (the journal)**

The first issue of Judgment and Decision Making (<http://journal.sjdm.org>) should be out soon, if authors cooperate in making requested revisions promptly. If you are interested in helping, write me ([baron@psych.upenn.edu](mailto:baron@psych.upenn.edu)). Here is where help is needed now:

1. Research the question of whether we want a DOI (digital object identifier) system, given the cost of getting it. (I have some starting points for research, if you write me.) Then write a short summary and recommendation.
2. Formatting and aesthetics. I need a couple of arty types to critique layout (both html and pdf).
3. Articles for the second issue, or third. (Some are in the pipeline, but we have room for more.)

Jonathan Baron, Professor of Psychology, University of Pennsylvania

Home page: <http://www.sas.upenn.edu/~baron>

Editor: Judgment and Decision Making (<http://journal.sjdm.org>)

### **A Judgmental Perspective on Student Evaluations**

David J. Weiss

Since their appearance on the academic scene some thirty years ago, student ratings have become the primary means by which instructional performance is evaluated in most institutions. Their evils are well known; among the documented, probably unavoidable, biases are the effects of the teacher's attractiveness and the student's expected grade. The positive side is that students get a venting opportunity that makes them feel valued by the institution. I doubt if anyone would seriously assert that the ratings system has met its avowed goal of improving instructional practice by providing useful feedback. A rather balanced, brief discussion by Michael Heumer is available at <http://home.sprynet.com/~owll/sef.htm>

In this essay, I hope to add a JDM perspective to the discussion. I shall offer a simple modification that might alleviate one of the difficulties. Then, because I know that changing a methodology that is deeply entrenched within a large bureaucracy is virtually impossible, I include a practical recommendation showing how an instructor might game the current system to personal advantage.

Biases notwithstanding, student ratings are judgments of professional performance. In many domains, ratings of performance are carried out by subject matter experts. These folks have earned that label by doing the job for years; the arguable presumption is that experience implies expertise. For example, veteran air traffic controllers observe their junior colleagues at work. Jim Shanteau and I have been considering ways to evaluate expert performance for a while now, and one of our thrusts is that such subjective evaluations are theoretically dubious. The main objection is that expertise in doing something is quite distinct from expertise in judging how well others do it. Student ratings go even further in the wrong direction. Raters with essentially no knowledge of what they should be taught are asked to judge how well the instructor has transmitted the relevant information. All students have relatively little experience with university-level education; freshmen have only high-school courses as standards. To be sure, students can report on whether the instructor has shown up on time and treated class members with courtesy. But beyond a generally vague catalog description, the student has little knowledge of what the course should include and at what level it should be taught. One of the acknowledged negative contributions of student evaluations,

the dumbing-down of the curriculum, has likely occurred because instructors have figured out that students seldom appreciate complexities or ambiguities. In my own department, I am the only one who includes a heavy dose of probability in the elementary statistics course; my colleagues emphasize computerized calculations. It would be imperious of me to claim that my view of what to teach is more correct than that of my peers, but there is no doubt that my version demands more of the students.

From a technical perspective, there are flaws inherent in the rating system. (1) Students take different courses, but deviations from department means are generally used to compare individual faculty members. Michael Birnbaum, among others, has cogently demonstrated how between-subject effects can generate absurd comparisons under similar circumstances. At some institutions, this problem is mitigated somewhat by using absolute ratings, in effect letter grades assigned to the faculty by the students, rather than relative scores. (2) The ratings are heavily skewed toward favorable evaluations. This probably occurs because most instructors are in fact conscientious, although more cynical explanations do come to mind. As a consequence, students with negative opinions have greater impact on the ratings than those with positive views. (3) There are too many questions. The excess inspires halo effects within the raters and reliance upon one item by overburdened personnel committee members. Fortunately, the laziness has little impact, because the halo effects make the various ratings highly correlated.

Why do we as faculty members, particularly those in the JDM field, put up with this system? I believe the answer is that academics, like other titled professionals, do not really want to be evaluated accurately. What do we have to gain? By virtue of being hired as a professor, one automatically gains the status of an expert teacher. Evaluation can only detract from that status, not enhance it. So we are content to maintain a system we purport to scorn.

Suppose we did want to improve things. After all, many of us feel that teaching is an important aspect of the academic profession. Although you and I are great teachers, what about those folks down the hall? We want them to shape up or ship out, don't we? Peer review has become an addition to the evaluation system on some campuses. The apparent advantage is that instruction is observed by experienced teachers who do have some knowledge of course content. In practice on my campus, though, one observer visits one pre-designated class session, a sample that is hardly meaningful although the observers generally feel this uncompensated labor is already too much to donate. If the faculty is small, one may have to impersonate a subject matter expert in a domain only tangentially connected to one's own. The discussion of peer review of instruction has been considerably expanded by Dan Bernstein of the University of Kansas, who is not a JDM member but has good friends who are ([http://www.psych.ku.edu/faculty\\_Daniel\\_Bernstein.html](http://www.psych.ku.edu/faculty_Daniel_Bernstein.html)).

Could we replace ratings with objective measures of performance, as Shanteau and I have been propounding for other expert domains? Evaluating the teachers via student achievement on standardized exams has become the rage in California public schools. The faculty would have to agree on course goals; I suspect we would grudgingly abandon

our personal views in favor of ETS's, if only to avoid the work of constantly constructing, validating, and grading the exams. Moreover, to do the job fairly, we would have to test the students prior to entering the course, so that we could measure value-added rather than final product. Although it is conceivable that such a system might be imposed from above, I cannot envision the faculty adopting it willingly.

My own view is that the most practical solution is to use retrospective ratings, made as part of the graduation package. The advantage is that the students would have seen a comparable variety of courses and instructors, and would thereby be able to utilize similar anchors on the rating scale. One might expect teachers from the distant past to have faded in memory, but the extremes at either end of the quality continuum will stand out. That's really what the rating system ought to be catching. Students who drop out prior to graduation will not have a vote, which is probably a good thing although we might worry that the worst teachers promote attrition among their victims.

Young instructors who have read this far deserve a reward. I am going to tell you how to beat the system. This advice may be worth what you're paying for it, but at least it comes from a voice with experience. I have probably taught more classes than any other member of the Society. I work at a university with a very high teaching load, and have been at it forever. So although like all of you, I have no proof that I am an expert instructor, I am certifiably an experienced one.

The trick is simple. At the beginning of the course, inform the students that this will be one of the most challenging, but important, courses they have ever taken. Scare them, but provide a smidgeon of hope that they can get excellent grades if they study hard. The threat may induce the least talented students to drop the course, but that's OK because they are likely to evaluate you unfavorably. Then make sure the exams prior to evaluation day are easy (don't have too many exams, lest your threat lose its effect; I give only one). Praise students individually for their success; do not discuss how other students did. Under these conditions, the students will correctly infer that you must have done a great job teaching them this difficult material. They will feel good about themselves, and attribute part of that glow to your efforts.

Please do not share this "teaching tip" with your departmental colleagues (let's think of it as a JDM secret). Like the grass in the commons, adulation from students is a limited resource.

### **Film review**

David Hardman

Dept of Psychology, London Metropolitan University

#### **Enron: The smartest guys in the room (directed by Alex Gibney)**

*In the following article, I review some of the factors behind the rise and fall of Enron, as depicted in Alex Gibney's movie. What I find interesting (and sobering) to reflect on, is how clearly unethical decisions could be made by intelligent and educated individuals. As many readers of this newsletter will know, traditional measures of intelligence correlate with normative*

*performance on well-known reasoning and decision making tasks (Stanovich, 1999). Nonetheless, it doesn't take a genius to know that smart people can also do dumb things (Sternberg, 2002; for a personal account, see Paulos, 2003). However, there is a difference between plain dumb and unethical. Smart people with a distorted set of values can be a dangerous combination, as the movie shows. Since the collapse of Enron, Harvard Business School has introduced a required course in ethics for its MBA students (Weisman, 2003; though for a wider critique of MBA courses, see Mintzberg, 2004). This is surely to be welcomed, and one can only hope that the example is adopted more widely.*

In Oliver Stone's movie *Wall Street*, the infamous Gordon Gekko, in his speeches, actually makes a very strong case for capitalism. The problem is that he is a crook, due to his insider trading activities (also, the movie – rather simplistically - seems to suggest that capitalism must be bad because it can lead to people losing their jobs). The question then arises as to whether unfettered capitalism makes such illegality inevitable or whether the Gordon Gekkos of the world are simply 'bad apples'. *Enron: The smartest guys in the room*, based on the book by Bethany McLean and Peter Elkind, shows that truth is even more extraordinary than fiction. Enron began life as a regional natural gas pipeline company, run by Kenneth Lay, who had obtained a PhD in economics from the University of Houston's night school. Lay was an enthusiast for the opportunities afforded by innovations and deregulation in the financial markets. He found a kindred spirit in the figure of Jeffrey Skilling, a Harvard MBA (during his Harvard admissions interview he was asked: "Are you smart?", to which he replied "I'm *fuckin* smart"). Together, they set about transforming Enron from a dull bricks and mortar operation into an energy trading company.

*Enron* shows the business approach of Lay and Skilling to be flawed right from the start. When Lay discovers that two individuals at Enron Oil have been engaged in insider trading at considerable risk to the company he does not fire them; on the contrary, because they have been generating profits for the organisation during a lean period he allows them to continue in their activities. Later, when the creative accounting of these two people is unravelled, the resultant losses almost destroy the firm. Nonetheless, this early combination of risk-taking and dubious accounting practices is merely a foretaste of what is to come.

Skilling is portrayed as an overweight, bespectacled geek, who transforms himself into a fit macho risk-taker. A day out with the boys means engaging in high-adrenaline dangerous sports. This would be fine in itself (and possibly the film's argument is somewhat *ad hominem* at this point, though I write as a contact lens-wearing rock-climber!), but the same macho attitude becomes the prevailing culture within Enron. Skilling's favourite book is reported to be *The Selfish Gene*, whose central theme he perverts into an obscene social Darwinism: Enron's Employees are ranked on an annual basis, and the lowest fifteen percent are fired.

As time progresses, Lay, Skilling, and Andrew Fastow (a recent graduate of Northwestern's MBA program, knowledgeable in the new technique of "structured finance", and promoted by Skilling) expand Enron's operations, but often without success. A huge gas production facility is built in India, but overlooks the fact that Indians cannot afford the output. Nonetheless, huge bonuses are paid to those involved (the site now lies derelict). The company is allowed to use "mark-to-market" accounting, meaning that expected profits can be added to the company's balance sheets. The absurdity of this practice is even satirised in a home-made Enron video skit. Subsequent deals in derivatives allow Enron to borrow money, but without recording the debt. As the movie points out, any high school pupil could identify the problem with this practice.



When Enron move into the California energy market, they discover that they can manipulate the prices simply by cutting off the power. The subsequent power cuts play a role in the downfall of California's governor, Gray Davis, and the rise of Arnold Schwarzenegger. Milgram's famous studies of obedience to authority are cited to explain why traders would be willing to do something that is so clearly wrong. I think this is only part of the explanation. Asch's studies of conformity are surely also relevant. People often take their behavioural cues from others. Something that is wrong may nonetheless be perceived as normal, if that is what everybody else is doing. Indeed, towards the end of the movie it is clear that the traders are becoming the dominant power within the company. On audio tapes they are even heard to be laughing as they pull the plug on California's energy supply. As one interviewee puts it: "The inmates were taking over the asylum".

Ultimately, Enron's success is shown to be entirely reliant on smoke-and-mirrors. The company piles up huge losses, whilst appearing to be massively profitable. Fastow himself sets up companies that deal with Enron, thus helping to cover up Enron's debt. The financial magazines write flattering profiles of Enron and its leading executives. The company's financial records are completely impenetrable, but analysts buy into the success story that Lay and Skilling present to the world. Stock analysts are bullied into compliance: Skilling tells analysts that he will not deal with their companies if they produce negative reports on Enron. Merrill Lynch fire one of their employees who does dare to ask critical questions.

However, as the top executives begin to realise that their castle is built on sand, they begin to unload their stock. One higher-up, Lou Pai, actually forsee the future at an earlier stage and bails out with a whopping \$353m to his name (highlighting Pai's penchant for entertaining clients at strip joints may be seen as an ad hominem attack, or as an example of Enron's macho culture, according to taste). In 2001, employees report that Skilling seems permanently stressed and often turns up to the office looking tired and unshaven. During a recorded conference call, a Wall Street analyst asks Skilling why Enron is the only company that is unable to release a balance sheet with its earnings statement, to which Skilling replies: "Well, thank you very much, we appreciate that . . . asshole." Whilst this breach of etiquette astounds the press and public, it elicits mirth among many Enron employees, illustrating how divorced from reality they have become. Eventually, one reporter, Bethany McLean writes an article about Enron that reveals problems with its finances. McLean herself says that it didn't dawn on her at that time that a major fraud might have been occurring. However, by asking the right questions she set in train the events that led to the truth being revealed, and to the convictions this May of both Lay and Skilling on charges of fraud and conspiracy.

What is quite remarkable is that many of the dubious practices that Enron executives engaged in were actually legal, as a result of deregulation of the financial markets. The film was released prior to the convictions of Lay and Skilling in May this year and I am not sure exactly which of their activities have led to those convictions. However, in offloading their own stock whilst encouraging others to buy, it is quite clear that they deceived their employees and investors. It may be the case that the market will ultimately 'out' massive frauds such as Enron, but it is tragic that so many ordinary men and women must lose their savings and pensions along the way.

Capitalism, in my view, is the least bad form of social organisation that we know of. However, democratic countries can decide to what extent they wish to regulate their markets. *Enron*, much more than Stone's *Wall Street*, suggests to me that extreme deregulation will almost inevitably lead to corrupt practices occurring (see also Partnoy, 2003). This movie adds a vivid dash of colour to the already fairly-lurid story that has been described in books and the press. I heartily recommend it.

### References

- Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers not MBAs: A hard look at the soft practice of managing and management development*. NJ: Pearson.
- Partnoy, F. (2003). *Infectious greed: How deceit and risk corrupted the financial markets*. US and London: Henry Holt.
- Paulos, J.A. (2003). *A mathematician plays the market*. London: Penguin, Allen Lane.
- Stanovich, K. E. (1999). *Who is rational? Studies of individual differences in reasoning*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sternberg, R.J. (2002). *Why smart people can be so stupid*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Weisman, R. (Dec 30<sup>th</sup>, 2003). Harvard raises its hand on ethics. *The Boston Globe*. Downloaded on 6<sup>th</sup> June 2006 from [http://www.boston.com/business/globe/articles/2003/12/30/harvard\\_raises\\_its\\_hand\\_on\\_ethics/](http://www.boston.com/business/globe/articles/2003/12/30/harvard_raises_its_hand_on_ethics/)

### New Publication: Judgments Over Time

We are pleased to announce the publication of our new book, "Judgments Over Time: The Interplay of Thoughts, Feelings, and Behaviors," by Oxford University Press:  
<http://www.us.oup.com/us/catalog/general/subject/Psychology/Cognitive/?view=usa&ci=0195177665>

Copies can be obtained via the Oxford web site or by other means such as Amazon.com. From the Oxford web site, the brief description of the book, as well as its table of contents, is below.

Best,  
Larry Sanna & Ed Chang  
Lawrence J. Sanna  
Department of Psychology  
CB# 3270 Davie Hall  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3270  
Phone: 919.962.2538  
Fax: 919.962.2537  
E-mail: [sanna@unc.edu](mailto:sanna@unc.edu)  
Web: <http://www.unc.edu/~sanna>

**From our Colleagues in Communication and Social Psychology**

***New Journal: Media Psychology***

I would like to call your attention to the journal, *Media Psychology*, of which I recently took over as editor (along with Mary Beth Oliver and Peter Vorderer). The journal (published by Lawrence Erlbaum Associates) is an interdisciplinary one devoted to publishing theoretically-oriented empirical research that is at the intersection of psychology and media communication. Thus, any research that focuses on the psychological antecedents, consequences, and underlying processes of mediated communication would be appropriate.

Because this focus clearly spans disciplines, we expect and encourage submissions from many different research areas, including but not limited to communication, psychology, business, political science, sociology, anthropology, and public opinion.

Although *Media Psychology* is a relatively new journal (it began in 1999), it is currently ranked second in impact factor (Communication) in the most recent edition of *Journal Citation Reports*. Currently, most of our submissions come from scholars in the field of communication. However, we are very interested in receiving submissions from scholars in other fields, hence our posting of this announcement on this listserv.

You can get more details on the journal at our website (<http://www.mediapsychology.ws>), including information on journal scope, editorial board, submission procedures (now all electronic), and subscriptions. You can also view abstracts of recently accepted papers to get an idea of the types of articles that have accepted by the journal (the list is currently incomplete, but will be updated soon).

Finally, I would like to note that the journal is committed to not only quality reviews and feedback to authors, but timely ones as well. Our stated goal is a 28-day turnaround from submission by authors to decision letter from the editor, and we have been right around that standard over the past six months (29.2 days average for manuscripts sent out for review).

If you have any questions about the journal, please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

L. J. Shrum, Ph.D.  
Professor of Marketing  
College of Business  
University of Texas at San Antonio  
6900 North Loop 1604 West  
San Antonio, TX 78249-0632

210.458.5374 (office)

210.458.6335 (fax)

210.545.6386 (home)

email: [lj.shrum@utsa.edu](mailto:lj.shrum@utsa.edu)

web page:

<http://faculty.business.utsa.edu/ljshrum/>><http://faculty.business.utsa.edu/ljshrum/>

### ***SPSP 2007: Call for Proposals***

The Society for Personality and Social Psychology Program Committee invites proposals for symposia and posters to be presented at the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP), which will be held on January 25-27, 2007, in Memphis, Tennessee. The submission deadline is July 21, 2006.

Submissions may be in the form of symposia or poster presentations and must be submitted electronically via the conference organizer's web site beginning May 26, 2006:

<http://www.taramillerevents.com/spsp2007/>

#### **Presentation Formats**

##### *Symposia*

Symposia will be 75-minute sessions that include three or more talks on a common topic, printed as symposia abstracts in the Proceedings. Symposium proposals must include a title, abstracts of up to 250 words for each talk, and a 250-word (maximum) summary describing and justifying the symposium theme. Please include audio/visual requirements.

##### *Poster Sessions*

Poster sessions will involve standard poster presentations, which will also be printed as poster abstracts in the Proceedings. Poster submissions must include the title, the authors' affiliations, and an abstract of up to 250 words.

#### **Submission Content**

Abstracts must contain the specific goals of the study, the methods used, a summary of the results, and conclusions.

- Data must be collected prior to abstract submission. We will not consider abstracts for studies that have not been conducted.
- The title of the abstract should clearly define the work discussed.
- After listing authors' names, give the name of each author's institutional affiliation.
- Use only standard abbreviations.

Submissions will be reviewed with regard to: scholarly/theoretical merit, soundness of methodology, relevance to social and personality psychology, clarity of presentation, significance, and originality. Final selection among submissions deemed meritorious will be made with an eye toward achieving a balanced and broadly representative program.

#### **General Submission Information**

An individual may be first author on only ONE submission (symposium or poster) and may serve only ONCE in a symposium speaking role (as speaker or discussant). Individuals may, however, be co-authors on more than one paper (symposia and poster). It is incumbent on symposia organizers to verify that speakers in their symposia have not submitted their names as speakers in other symposia. Failing to do so may result in a symposia being rejected. Individuals are not allowed to switch who fills the speaker role after submission.

The first author must be a SPSP member or student member paid up through 2006. Before registering to attend the conference at member rates, the first author must also have paid his/her dues for calendar year 2007. This can be done after learning whether or not a submission has been accepted. All submissions must be in final form, ready for publication in the convention program. Please check your work carefully. No typos or other errors will be corrected.

**Confirmation**

When you submit electronically, you will receive a "Receipt of Submission" confirmation page. Submitting authors will also receive an email notification in mid-July, confirming receipt of their abstract. The program committee will review all submissions in August. Notification of acceptance or rejection will be emailed in late August or early September to the submitting author only.

**Deadline**

All submissions must be received by **July 21, 2006**.

**2007 Program Committee**

Monica Biernat (chair), Henk Aarts, Ximena Arriaga, Niall Bolger, Jennifer Richeson, Linda Skitka, Sheldon Solomon, Gary Stasser, and Jean Twenge

***SPSP Theory Prize***

The SPSP Theoretical Innovation Prize recognizes an article or book chapter judged to provide the most innovative theoretical contribution to social/personality psychology within a given year. Any kind of innovative theoretical contribution can be considered for the prize, including presentations of new theories, new theory-based integrations of disparate areas of inquiry, and significant extensions of existing theories to new areas of inquiry. Theoretical contributions are eligible for the prize regardless of the format of their presentation, whether in stand-alone theoretical papers, within conceptually based literature reviews, or in some other written format that highlights conceptual innovation.

The prize recognizes theoretical articles that are especially likely to generate the discovery of new hypotheses, new phenomena, or new ways of thinking about the discipline of social/personality psychology. Theoretical contributions may be judged innovative and generative even before they have accumulated substantial empirical support. Therefore an article may be judged worthy for the prize even if it runs the risk of empirical invalidation in the future. The emphasis of the prize is on a contribution's

conceptual innovation and potential to motivate new research and further conceptual investigation, rather than on its current level of empirical support.

Eligible articles are those published as papers in peer-reviewed journals or as book chapters during calendar year 2005. Books and unpublished manuscripts are not eligible.

The committee this year consists of Timothy Wilson (Chair), Marilynn Brewer, John Jost, Julie Norem, and Eliot Smith. The prize recipient will receive a cash award of \$750. The Prize Committee has the option of not awarding a prize.

Eligible articles may be nominated by their authors or by other members of SPSP. To nominate an article or chapter for consideration, individuals should send an electronic file (PDF or Microsoft Word format) of the nominated piece to the Chair of the Prize Committee, Timothy Wilson, at [twilson@virginia.edu](mailto:twilson@virginia.edu), along with a brief (e.g., one-page) nominating letter, also in electronic format, describing how the nominated article excels on the prize criteria. The Prize Committee may also consider additional eligible papers even if not nominated by their authors or other individuals.

The deadline for nominations is **July 1, 2006**.

Timothy D. Wilson  
Sherrell J. Aston Professor  
Department of Psychology  
University of Virginia  
102 Gilmer Hall  
P.O. Box 400400  
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4400  
e-mail: [tdw@virginia.edu](mailto:tdw@virginia.edu)  
Office Phone: 434-924-0674 Fax: 434-982-4766  
Homepage: <http://www.people.virginia.edu/~tdw/>

### Conferences

The 18th International Conference on Multiple Criteria Decision Making. Chania, Greece, 19-23 June 2006. <http://www.dpem.tuc.gr/fel/mcdm2006/>

12th International Conference on the Foundations and Applications of Utility, Risk and Decision Theory (FUR XII), 22-26 June 2006. Libera Università Internazionale degli Studi Sociali, Rome, Italy. <http://www.luiss.it/fur2006>

Advice and Trust in Decision Making, 29-30 June 2006. Department of Psychology, University College London, UK. <http://else.econ.ucl.ac.uk/ATDM/>

In Two Minds: Dual-Process Theories of Reasoning and Rationality, 5-7 July 2006. The Open University at Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge, UK. <http://www.open.ac.uk/arts/dualprocess>

International Conference: Taking Climate into Account when Making Decisions, 7-21 July 2006. Espoo, Finland. <http://www.livingwithclimate.fi/>.

Summer Institute on Bounded Rationality in Psychology and Economics, 10-18 August 2006. Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany. <http://www.mpib-berlin.mpg.de/SummerInstitute>

48th Annual Operational Research Conference. 11-13 September 2006. University of Bath, UK. [http://www.orsoc.org.uk/conf/or48/or48\\_main.htm](http://www.orsoc.org.uk/conf/or48/or48_main.htm)

Towards e-Democracy: Participation, Deliberation, Communities (TED 2006) 24-26 October 2006. Mantova, Italy. <http://www.mi.imati.cnr.it/conferences/ted06.html>

Judgment and decision making as a skill: An exploratory workshop. 9-11 July 2006, Cambridge, England. <http://www.crim.cam.ac.uk/ESF/index.html>

28<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Society for Medical Decision Making, 14-18 October 2006, Cambridge, MA. <http://www.smdm.org/>

22nd Annual International Meeting of the Brunswik Society, 16-17 November 2006. Houston, Texas. <http://brunswik.org>

### **Job**

**Queen's University, Department of Psychology.** A tenure-track position at the Assistant Professor level is available starting **1 July 2007** or as soon as possible thereafter, in Cognitive Psychology/Cognitive Science. Applications will be accepted until **15 November 2006**, or until the position is filled. For information about the Department see our website at <http://psyc.queensu.ca/>

We seek applicants with a strong program of research and teaching in Cognitive Psychology broadly construed. We are open to applicants with interests including, but not limited to, high level language and discourse processing, memory, attention, and cognitive aspects of perception and action.

The successful candidate must hold a Ph.D. in psychology and have a high-quality research program with the potential to link with other strengths within the Department including language and communication, memory and attention, perception and action, and cognitive neuroscience. The candidate will also be expected to provide first-rate instruction within our undergraduate and graduate programs, and to supervise undergraduate and graduate students. Decisions will be made on the basis of demonstrated research and teaching excellence, complementarity of research interests with existing strengths, and potential for effective collegial service. Salary will be commensurate with qualifications and experience. Queen's academic staffs are governed by a collective agreement, the details of which are posted at <http://www.qufa.ca/>

The Department has excellent facilities for interdisciplinary research through its links with the Queen's School of Computing and their Cognitive Science undergraduate stream, the Queen's Centre for Neuroscience with its new imaging facility ([www.queensu.ca/neurosci/](http://www.queensu.ca/neurosci/)), the Queen's Biological Communication Centre ([www.queensu.ca/qbcc/](http://www.queensu.ca/qbcc/)), and the High Performance Computing Virtual Laboratory ([www.hpcvl.org](http://www.hpcvl.org)). Queen's University is strongly committed to the Behaviour, Brain, and Cognitive Science (BBCS) Program in Psychology. To that end, the University has recently filled two Canada Research Tier II Chairs in the BBCS program.

All qualified candidates are encouraged to apply; however, Canadian citizens and permanent residents will be given priority. The University invites applications from all qualified individuals. Queen's University is committed to employment equity and diversity in the workplace and welcomes applications from women, visible minorities, aboriginal people, persons with disabilities, and persons of any sexual orientation or gender identity. Please send a letter of application, a curriculum vitae, copies of recent publications, and letters from three referees to Dr. V. L. Quinsey, Head, Department of Psychology, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario K7L 3N6. Tel (613) 533-2492; fax (613) 533-2499. e-mail: <[psychead@post.queensu.ca](mailto:psychead@post.queensu.ca)>.



**Icelandic chefs illustrate that two heads are better than one**



**Society for Judgment and Decision Making  
2006 Dues and Address Corrections**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
City: \_\_\_\_\_ State/Prov: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_  
Email: \_\_\_\_\_  
Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Student members must have the endorsement of a faculty member:

Faculty Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

<b>2006 Dues</b> _____ <b>\$35 Member</b> _____ <b>\$10 Student</b>
<b>Past Dues: \$</b> _____ <b>Amount</b> _____ <b>Year(s)</b>
<b>Hard Copy Directory</b> _____ <b># copies (\$10 each)</b>

**METHOD OF PAYMENT:**

- Check/Money Order (Please, no cash); Make checks payable to: Society for Judgment and Decision Making
- MasterCard       VISA       American Express

Account Number:

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Expiration Date /

**If paying by credit card:**

Name on credit card: \_\_\_\_\_

Home Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Mail the form and check to: SJDM c/o Bud Fennema, College of Business, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306-1110

Or pay electronically by credit card (forward number & exp date) to: [sjdm@cob.fsu.edu](mailto:sjdm@cob.fsu.edu)

**Journal Note:** SJDM Members are entitled to discounts on the following journals: *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, and *Risk, Decision and Policy*. Contact the publishers for details. Links to journal websites may be found on the SJDM website ([www.sjdm.org](http://www.sjdm.org)) under related links.