

RoS

# JUDGMENT / DECISION MAKING

## newsletter

April 1984

Vol. III, No. 4

### IF THIS BE APRIL. . .

As some of you have informed me, April was some time ago. I regret that this issue of the J/DM Newsletter has been delayed so long. We do not expect similar delays in the future.

### CHANGES IN THE NEWSLETTER. . .

When the J/DM Newsletter began, we tried to bill people for their subscriptions on the anniversary of the date on which they first subscribed. This system worked very well when the number of subscribers was small. Unfortunately, when there are many subscribers, the system doesn't work very well. Perhaps the biggest problem is that some people fail to renew in a timely manner, with the result that they get copies of the Newsletter for some time without paying for them. Therefore, we are moving to a system in which all renewals become due at the same time. In this way, it will be easier to keep track of who has not paid, and send timely reminders. In order to get things into proper sequence, Volume III of J/DM Newsletter will have six (6) issues rather than four.

Also, due to increased costs, the price of the J/DM Newsletter must increase. Effective immediately, the cost of the J/DM Newsletter will be \$5.00 per year. Because some renewals are due now, we are pro-rating the cost of a renewal. If your J/DM Newsletter subscription is up for renewal, the cost will be \$2.50 for the balance of 1984 and \$5.00 for 1985, for a total of \$7.50. Anyone renewing at the old rate of \$2.00 before June 1st will be credited for the balance of 1984 only. I realize that this may be confusing to some folks, but by the time of the J/DM Meeting in November, everything should be straightened out.

### J/DM DIRECTORY IN JULY. . .

Because of the difficulties this Spring, the directory issue has been delayed. The next issue of the J/DM Newsletter will include a directory. The directory will include current subscribers only. Will you be included? Check the mailing label on this issue. If it contains an "X" or an "O", this is your last issue. If your label has an "R" on it, it is time to renew."

Please check the mailing label to ensure that your address is as you want it to appear. Please send any corrections or changes to Gary McClelland (his address is on p. 2). Also, if you would like to have your telephone number included but have not sent it to him, please do so as soon as possible.

#### INSIDE THIS ISSUE

In January, Paul Slovic spoke at the Science and Public Policy Seminar in Washington, DC. The seminar was sponsored by the Federation of Behavioral, Psychological and Cognitive Sciences. The Federation is a coalition of 11 scientific societies with interests in research on behavioral, psychological and cognitive processes and their physiological bases, including health, human development, and education. The seminars are attended by influential decision makers including representatives from legislative offices in the Congress. See the Press Release on Page 3.

Amos Tversky wrote recently suggesting that some J/DM'ers might be interested in the Law and Society Association. Information is on Page 10.

#### CONTENTS

From the Editor.....	2
Contribution Honor Roll.....	2
How Safe is Safe Enough?.....	3
Decision Making and Expert Systems.....	4
Recent Developments in the Psychology of Judgment and Decision Making.....	5
Recent Papers in Medical Decision Making..	7
Reprints Available.....	9
New Books.....	8, 11
Law and Society.....	10
J/DM Newsletter Subscription Form.....	11

DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSIONS FOR NEXT J/DM NEWSLETTER: July 10, 1984

Editor:

N. John Castellan, Jr.  
 Department of Psychology  
 Indiana University  
 Bloomington, Indiana 47405

(812) 335-4261

Addresses & Corrections:

Gary McClelland  
 Department of Psychology, CB 344  
 University of Colorado  
 Boulder, Colorado 80309

(303) 492-8122

**FROM THE EDITOR. . .**

The J/DM Newsletter 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 the editor.

There are few ground rules for submissions. In order to make the cost of the J/DM Newsletter as low as possible, please submit camera-ready copy. This means that the copy should be typed single-spaced on white 8 1/2 by 11 paper. Please leave good margins--1 inch at the sides and bottom and 2 inches at the top. If possible, use a carbon or film ribbon. Please mail flat--do not fold.

Subscriptions: The current rate for the J/DM Newsletter is \$5.00/year. This should cover the cost of about 4 issues. (Please see Page 1 about rates for the remainder of 1984.) We are dedicated to keeping the cost at a minimum, but must emphasize that recent increases in postage rates will cause problems unless as many readers as possible pay. Please send your subscription to the editor. If you do not know whether or not your subscription has been paid or is current, check your mailing label. If it has an X or a 0, you have not paid; if it has an R, it is time to renew.

Checks should be made payable to the Indiana University Foundation.

Foreign Subscriptions: The cost of foreign subscriptions is necessarily higher than domestic subscriptions. Copies will be sent airmail to foreign addresses for \$7.00 (U. S.) per year if drawn on a U. S. bank. (If payable in U. S. dollars, but not drawn on a U. S. bank, the cost is \$25.00 per year. Note that many foreign banks have accounts with a U. S. bank and draw checks on that account.)

Address Correction: Please check your mailing label carefully. Because the J/DM Newsletter is sent by bulk mail, copies with incorrect addresses or otherwise undeliverable are neither forwarded nor returned. Therefore we have no way of knowing if copies are delivered. Any changes or corrections in addresses should be reported to Gary McClelland. (Address changes may also be sent to the editor with subscription payments.)

Mailing Labels: Some readers may wish to send reprint lists or other material to people listed in the directory. Gary McClelland has agreed to provide sets of mailing labels for \$5.00 to individuals employed by non-profit institutions.

**CONTRIBUTION HONOR ROLL...**

Several J/DM'ers have made contributions to support the cost of sending the J/DM Newsletter to foreign readers who might not otherwise be able to receive it. While we make every effort to send the J/DM Newsletter to all interested foreign readers, we cannot do it without some support. We are grateful to the following J/DM'ers have made contributions of \$5.00 or more so that our foreign readers may continue to receive it.

Ola Svenson

Kenneth R. Hammond

William Stillwell

## How safe is safe enough ?

"How safe is safe enough?" That may be one of the major policy questions facing government in the next 10 years, says Psychologist Paul Slovic, Ph.D., of Eugene, Oregon, a leading authority on risk analysis.

In a world becoming increasingly hazardous, the most important function of government regulatory agencies such as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration may be the control of risk. New technologies, new medicines and treatments, bigger cities, and even such back-to-nature activities as mountain climbing and scuba diving all entail varied elements of risk.

Dr. Slovic believes that the main problem lies in the gap between the known percentage of risk and individuals' understanding of how that risk might affect them personally.

In a seminar for Congressional and Government agency staff given at the U.S. Capitol, Dr. Slovic said that three factors are crucial to the individual's perception of risk. The first is how much fear the risk provokes. The second is the amount of knowledge and understanding the individual has about the risk. And the third factor is the dramatic, sensational causes of death make the individual believe that the risk is greater than it really is, Dr. Slovic said. Individuals underestimate the risk of the silent, undramatic killers. Also, if an individual already holds a strong belief about a hazard, then new information will have little effect on the perception of risk. But persons without opinions about a hazard are at the mercy of the way information is presented. Most people when told that 13 percent died, view the risk as greater than when told that 87 percent lived, even though those are two ways of saying the same thing.

"Regulatory decisions made in Washington affect millions of American lives. One of Government's most difficult tasks is to protect and inform Americans without unduly interfering with their lives," said Psychologist Cynthia Null, Ph.D., Executive Director of the Federation of Behavioral, Psychological, and Cognitive Sciences, the organization sponsoring the seminar. Dr. Null continued, "These seminars give psychologists an opportunity to provide information beneficial to the legislative process.

We can't leave risk problems to the experts," Slovic said. Risk means different things to different people. Experts judge risk based on technical estimates of annual fatalities. Laypeople judging risk are also influenced by how a hazard will influence future generations, how potentially catastrophic the event could be, and how much control they have over the outcome. Furthermore, the greater the possible benefit from risk taking, the greater the risk people are willing to take.

Programs to educate and inform people about risk are important, but research is needed to determine what people know and want to know, and how best to communicate technical information, Dr. Slovic said.

Dr. Slovic concluded, "In a democratic society such as ours, we must try to enlighten the public in order that they may participate more intelligently and effectively in the political and policymaking process."

## DECISION MAKING AND EXPERT SYSTEMS

By Mark Chignell

Anyone in the J/DM group who is writing a research proposal in 1984 should seriously consider using the terms 'expert systems' and 'knowledge-based' wherever possible. The emergence of fads and 'buzzwords' in scientific disciplines is an important research topic in its own right, but there can be no doubting the potency of buzzwords in getting nonexperts interested in a research topic. I will not attempt to summarize expert systems research here, but those interested can refer to journals such as ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE and COMPUTER, as well as recent texts in artificial intelligence.

Expert systems come in varying shapes and forms, but they can be characterized as computational techniques which perform as well as human experts in a particular task. Expert systems can be distinguished from numerical procedures such as regression or discriminant analysis in that they utilize explicit representations of task-relevant knowledge. Expert systems often utilize heuristic knowledge which may or may not be derived from models of human behavior. Expert systems have been involved in decision making (e.g., MYCIN which assists in making diagnostic decisions) and they often compare the probabilities or relative merits of alternative choices. When described in this way, expert systems are shown to incorporate computational models of judgment and decision making.

Expert systems researchers and J/DMers have overlapping interests, but no signs of fruitful communication have appeared so far. Models of human decision making should be very useful in building expert systems, but until now behavioral scientists have had little input into expert systems research. Conversely, expert systems often incorporate testable models of human behavior. The performance of expert systems provides useful data for decision making researchers, to the extent that the expert systems represent simulations of human behavior. Pitz and Sachs (in their 1984 Annual Review of Psychology article on judgment and decision) emphasize the role of knowledge in decision making, and they also consider the application of decision making principles in the design of decision aids. Current trends in judgment and decision making seem to be compatible with the expert systems approach.

While it is easy to criticize the 'hype' that has been associated with expert systems, the performance of some of these systems indicates that they may incorporate useful decision making principles. My suggestion is that decision makers become acquainted with the serious literature on expert systems and consider developing computational models of decision making. If we think that our own models of judgment and decision making approximate the truth, then we should see to it that they become incorporated in expert/decision-support systems. The development of functioning expert systems provides a fertile testing ground for theories of judgment and decision making. It is my own opinion that expert systems are more than a passing fad, but, in any case, the current infatuation with expert systems can be capitalized on and may lead to increased interest in judgment and decision making.

For those who are interested in pursuing the topic, I have constructed a bibliography of knowledge-based systems which can be obtained by writing to me at the following address:

The Human Performance Laboratory  
The Ohio State University  
404-B West 17th Ave  
Columbus, Ohio 43210.

## PAPERS PLEASE...

Operations Research is interested in publishing some good applications-oriented decision analysis papers, particularly if they introduce or validate new methodology. Case studies are fine, provided they carry with them some generalized implications for the state-of-the-art, for example if they are used as a testbed for some technical innovation or inspire innovations still to come. Feedback on impact on the real world of decision makers would be interesting. Manuscripts or ideas to:

Rex V. Brown,  
Associate Editor  
Operations Research  
c/o Decision Science Consortium, Inc.  
7700 Leesburg Pike, Suite 421  
Falls Church, VA 22043

(703) 790-0510

## RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PSYCHOLOGY OF JUDGMENT AND DECISION MAKING

### Journal Articles

1. BEACH LR: Muddling through. A response to Yates and Goldstein. *Organ Behav Hum Perform* 31:47-53, 1983. Recounts the development of a decision aid for birth-planning decisions; proposes that deviations from formal decision theory are sometimes necessary to develop a decision aid that people will use.
2. BELL DE: Regret in decision making under uncertainty. *Oper Res* 30:961-981, 1982. Explores reasons why expected utility theory fails as a predictor of human behavior; suggests that by explicitly incorporating regret, expected utility becomes a better predictor of human behavior.
3. BEYTH-MAROM R, ARKES HR: Being accurate but not necessarily Bayesian. Comments on Christensen-Szalanski and Beach. *Organ Behav Hum Perform* 31:255-257, 1983. States that an earlier study's claim that people used prior probabilities when assessing posterior probabilities is unfounded; presents an alternative explanation to account for the results.
4. CHRISTENSEN-SZALANSKI JJJ, BEACH LR: Believing is not the same as testing. A reply to Beyth-Marom and Arkes. *Organ Behav Hum Perform* 31:258-261, 1983. Suggests that people can make inferences that are optimal even though they may not use normative rules in laboratory settings; questions reliance on quantitative word problems to test human inference.
5. CHRISTENSEN-SZALANSKI JJJ, BECK DE, CHRISTENSEN-SZALANSKI CM, KOEPEL TD: Effects of expertise and experience on risk judgments. *J Appl Psychol* 68:278-284, 1983. Reports that physicians gave more accurate judgments of risks associated with different diseases than did college students; shows that physicians and students made differently biased risk judgments; suggests that two possible sources for physicians' biases are the amount of coverage the diseases receive in medical journals and the number of encounters physicians have with people suffering from the disease.
6. CONNOLLY T, GILANI N: Information search in judgment tasks. A regression model and some preliminary findings. *Organ Behav Hum Perform* 30:330-350, 1982. Presents a model to predict the amount of information that should be obtained prior to making a decision; focuses on situations in which the information is quite costly and imperfect and the decision is extremely important; reports that information acquisition and use are influenced by several irrelevant task characteristics, as well as by appropriate normative factors.
7. DALY GG, MAYOR TH: Reason and rationality during energy crises. *J Political Econ* 91:168-181, 1983. Reports that consumers appeared to act rationally during energy crises; questions the wisdom of policies based on the assumption that people are unable to make rational choices for complex decisions.
8. DARLEY JM, GROSS PH: A hypothesis-confirming bias in labeling effects. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 44:20-33, 1983. Suggests that "stereotype" information creates hypotheses that are then tested in a biased manner, which leads to false confirmation of the hypotheses.
9. EVANS JSBT, POLLARD P: Statistical judgment. A further test of the representativeness construct. *Acta Psychol (Amst)* 51:91-103, 1982. Reports that individuals differ in their use of the representativeness heuristic; claims that even a modified form of the representativeness heuristic lacks empirical support.
10. FISCHHOFF B: Predicting frames. *J Exp Psychol [Hum Percept]* 9:103-116, 1983. Explores different ways of predicting individuals' frames, as defined by "prospect theory"; reports difficulty in predicting individual choices, but moderate success in predicting group choices.
11. HAGAFORS R, BREHMER B: Does having to justify one's judgments change the nature of the judgment process? *Organ Behav Hum Perform* 31:223-232, 1983. Examines the effect of justification on people's judgment policies; suggests that justification leads to an analytic mode of thinking.
12. ISEN AM, PATRICK R: The effect of positive feelings on risk taking when the chips are down. *Organ Behav Hum Perform* 31:194-202, 1983. Shows that elated subjects bet more than control subjects on low-risk bets, but wagered less than controls on high-risk bets; reports differences in the results of hypothetical versus real life risk-taking situations; relates the findings to other research that suggests people's feelings influence their cognitive processes.
13. JONES CJ, HARRIS PL: Insight into the law of large numbers. A comparison of Piagetian and judgment theory. *Q J Exp Psychol* 34A:479-488, 1982. Suggests that people may have limited understanding of the law of large numbers that they use when primed by the decision task.
14. LEVIN IP, LOUVIERE JJ, SCHEPANSKI AA, NORMAN KL: External validity tests of laboratory studies of information integration. *Organ Behav Hum Perform* 31:173-193, 1983. Claims that laboratory studies are meaningfully related to decisions outside the laboratory; suggests how researchers can increase the generalizability and external validity of their results.
15. LOOMES G, SUGDEN R: Regret theory. An alternative theory of rational choice under uncertainty. *Econ J* 92:805-824, 1982. Examines the evidence

for prospect theory and presents an alternative theory to account for the data; claims the alternative theory is simpler than prospect theory and has greater intuitive appeal.

16. LOPES LL: Some thoughts on the psychological concept of risk. *J Exp Psychol [Hum Percept]* 9:137-144, 1983. Suggests that the psychological concept of risk has been limited by experimenters' reliance on simple lotteries; presents several aspects of risk from the economic literature that have not been addressed by psychologists.

17. MACHINA MJ: "Expected utility" analysis without the independence axiom. *Econometrica* 50:277-323, 1982. Demonstrates that the basic concepts and results of expected utility analysis do not depend on the independence axiom.

18. MEHLE T: Hypothesis generation in an automobile malfunction inference task. *Acta Psychol (Amst)* 52:87-106, 1982. Compares expert and novice subjects' abilities to generate hypotheses; reports that both groups had difficulty generating complete sets of hypotheses and were overconfident in their subjective probabilities.

19. MORRIS PA: An axiomatic approach to expert resolution. *Manage Science* 29:24-32, 1983. Proposes a set of axioms for combining expert probability assessments.

20. SAMPSON AR, SMITH RL: Assessing risks through the determination of rare event probabilities. *Oper Res* 30:839-886, 1982. Considers the problem of evaluating the probability of occurrence of rare but potentially catastrophic events; provides an information-theoretic model for merging a decision maker's opinion with expert judgment; provides a methodology for reconciling conflicting expert judgments.

21. TOMASSINI LA, SOLOMON I, ROMNEY MB, KROGSTAD JL: Calibration of auditors' probabilistic judgments. Some empirical evidence. *Organ Behav Hum Perform* 30:391-406, 1982. Reports that auditors exhibited less overconfidence than expected; suggests that auditors may be prone to gathering more evidence than is necessary.

22. WHITE CC, WILSON EC, WEAVER AC: Decision aid development for use in ambulatory health care settings. *Oper Res* 30:446-463, 1982. Presents an approach, using interactive microcomputers, for the development of diagnostic decision aids; evaluates an application of the approach to diarrhea of recent onset in adults.

23. WRIGHT G: Changes in the realism and distribution of probability assessments as a function of question type. *Acta Psychol (Amst)* 52:165-174, 1982. Reports that calibration and overconfidence differ between sets of past and future event questions.

24. YATES JF, GOLDSTEIN WM: Personal decision aiding. Some observations about the Beach birth-planning procedure. *Organ Behav Hum Perform* 31:26-46, 1983. Reviews the decision-aiding procedure developed

by Beach for birth planning; claims that the procedure cannot rely on standard utility theory for its justification; suggests how to address the theoretical shortcomings of the technique.

#### Journal Review Articles

1. KEENEY RL: Decision analysis. An overview. *Oper Res* 30:803-838, 1982. Explains decision analysis for those who are not decision analysts; presents an overview of decision analysis; provides additional sources for its foundation, history, and applications.

2. WALLSTEN TS, BUDESCU DV: Encoding subjective probabilities. A psychological and psychometric review. *Manage Science* 29:151-173, 1983. Shows that theories from measurement can provide a general framework for evaluating and assessing subjective probability estimates; distinguishes between studies conducted with nonexperts and with experts.

3. WINKLER RL: Research directions in decision making under uncertainty. *Decision Sci* 13:517-533, 1982. Considers the modeling of decision making problems under uncertainty; indicates current gaps in knowledge; suggests future research directions that cover the spectrum from theory to applications. Peer commentary follows on pages 534-553.

JAY J.J. CHRISTENSEN-SZALANSKI  
*Department of Family and Community Medicine*  
*University of Arizona*  
*Tucson, Arizona 85724, USA*

Recent Articles in  
The Journal of Medical Decision Making

Compiled by Jay J.J. Christensen-Szalanski

Beck JR, Pauker SG: The Markov process in medical prognosis. Med Decis Making 3: 419-458, 1983. Describes a general purpose model of medical prognosis based on the Markov process; shows how the model can be used to generate detailed and accurate assessments of life expectancy and health status.

Chang RW, Fineberg HV: Risk-benefit considerations in the management of polymyalgia rheumatica. Med Decis Making 3:459-475, 1983. Employs decision analysis and derived risk-benefit ratios to evaluate possible PMR management strategies.

Doubilet P, McNeil BJ, Weinstein MC: Optimal strategies for the diagnosis and treatment of coronary artery disease. Analysis using microcomputers. Med Decis Making 3: 23-28, 1983. Presents a computer program that aids in diagnostic and therapeutic decisions concerning a patient with chest pain; examines the effect of uncertainty in the data on the stability of the choice of optimal strategy.

Eddy DM: A mathematical model for timing repeated tests. Med Decis Making 3: 45-62, 1983. Presents a model to estimate the clinical and economic outcomes of monitoring patients with periodic examinations.

Elliot DL, Watts WJ, Reuler JB: Management of suspected temporal arteritis. Med Decis Making 3:63-68, 1983. Constructs a decision analysis of management strategies for suspected temporal arteritis.

Greenes RA: Interactive microcomputer-based graphical tools for physician decision support. Med Decis Making 3: 15-21, 1983. Presents three computer programs that aid physicians in assessing the usefulness of a diagnostic test, and in interpreting the result after the test has been obtained; uses different representations for transforming pretest to post-test probabilities.

Lau J, Kassirer JP, Pauker SG: Decision Maker 3.0: Improved decision analysis by personal computer. Med Decis Making 3: 39-43, 1983. Describes a computer program for performing clinical decision analysis that permits the specification of both recursive decision trees and structural sensitivity analyses.

Plante DA, Pauker SG: Enterococcal endocarditis and penicillin allergy. Which drug for the bug? Med Decis Making 3: 80-109, 1983. Considers how to treat a patient who has a disease that is best treated by a drug to which the patient is allergic; illustrates the use of recursive decision tree structure and the problems that short-term morbidities raise in terms of rational utility assignment.

Pliskin JS, Tell EJ: A dialysis need-forecasting model. Med Decis Making 3:489-500, 1983. Evaluates a model to forecast the need for dialysis beds.

Ravitch MM, Rovner DR, Jennett PA, et al: A chart audit study of the referral of obese patients to endocrinologists. Med Decis Making 3:69-79, 1983. Identifies factors in primary care physicians' decisions to refer obese patients to an endocrine clinic; discusses the usefulness of patient charts for studies of physicians' decision making.

Silverstein MD: A clinical decision analysis program for the apple computer. Med Decis Making 3: 29-37, 1983. Presents a computer program to assist physicians in using decision analysis to solve clinical problems.

Smyth-Staruch K, Littenberg B: Using microcomputers to teach sensitivity analysis to medical students. Med Decis Making 3: 9-13, 1983. Describes a package of computer programs which promotes understanding of sensitivity analysis.

Sutherland HJ, Dunn V, Boyd NF: Measurement of values for states of health with linear analog scales. Med Decis Making 3:477-487, 1983. Reports that the quantitative values assigned to health states by patients are strongly influenced by the context in which the measurement is made.

Zagoria RJ, Reggia JA: Transferability of medical decision support systems based on Bayesian classification. Med Decis Making 3: 501-509, 1983. Tests the hypothesis that probabilities derived from a large, geographically distant data base of stroke patients could be used in a Bayesian analysis to accurately predict the local causes of strokes.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT...

Recent Developments in the Psychology of Judgment and Decision Making, and Recent Developments in Medical Decision-Making, prepared by Jay J. J. Christensen-Szalanski, are reprinted from MEDICAL DECISION MAKING with the permission of Birkhauser Boston, Inc.

MEDICAL DECISION MAKING is an international Journal of The Society For Medical Decision Making (SMDM) published quarterly by Birkhauser Boston, Inc., 380 Green Street, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA.

The Journal is devoted to the analysis of decision making as it applies to clinical practice, to the establishment of health care policies, and to the administration of health care programs. SMDM annual membership dues of US \$60.00 include a Journal subscription. For libraries, non-SMDM members, etc., the annual subscription rate is US \$78.00.

For information concerning SMDM membership or journal subscriptions, please write to Lee B. Lusted, M.D., Editor-in-Chief, MEDICAL DECISION MAKING, Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation, 10666 North Torrey Pines Road, La Jolla, CA 92037, USA.

\*\*\*NOW AVAILABLE AT 20% DISCOUNT\*\*\*

### Inside the Jury

REID HASTIE, STEVEN D. PENROD, and  
NANCY PENNINGTON

"This is the best and most complete study of juries and their deliberations done to date."  
— Phoebe Ellsworth,  
Stanford University

The Sixth Amendment guarantees every American the right to trial by jury, but there can be no guarantee that a jury will deliberate wisely or decide well. Just how good are American juries, and what can be done to make them better? These are among the many questions extensively probed in this study of the way juries really work.

*Inside the Jury* provides a direct assessment of the quality of jury deliberation, the nature of the decision process, the biases of different types of jurors, and the level of agreement reached with different types of juries. On the basis of their observations Hastie, Pennington, and Penrod show how well jurors remember crucial trial information, interpret the law and the judge's instructions, and handle internal problems of dissension as they move toward consensus. The authors also test the possibility that the quality of jury performance changes with modifications in the jury's size or the decision rule used (unanimous versus majority rule).

The jury system is one of the foundation stones of American democracy. *Inside the Jury* offers a unique evaluation of how well our system functions. This is a book not only for lawyers and social scientists, but for anyone with a stake in the courts or a fascination with human decisions of the most difficult kind.

"There is a superb blend of basic and applied psychology in this book. It is destined to become a classic."  
— David Kenny

Reid Hastie is Professor of Psychology, Northwestern University; Steven D. Penrod is Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Wisconsin; and Nancy Pennington is Assistant Professor of Behavioral Sciences, Center for Decision Research, University of Chicago.

January 6 1/8 x 9 1/4 19 line illus., 33 tables 288 pp.  
ISBN 0-674-45525-8 \$20.00t

### Harvard University Press

79 Garden Street • Cambridge, MA 02138

## SAVE 20%

Please send me *INSIDE THE JURY* at the special 20% discount price.

I understand that if for any reason I am not entirely satisfied with the book, I may return it for a full refund.

41-040

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Check or money order enclosed



\_\_\_\_\_

Exp. Date \_\_\_\_\_

Card number, expiration date, and signature must accompany charge orders

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Please send me the following:

Qty.	Book Code	Author/Title	List Price	My Price
	HASINS	Hastie, et al., INSIDE THE JURY	\$20.00	\$16.00
			Subtotal	
			Postage & Handling	1.50
			TOTAL DUE	

Payable in U.S. Funds



The following decision related reprints and working papers are available from Max Bazerman at the Sloan School of Management (E52-562), MIT, Cambridge, Ma. 02139.

1. Bazerman, M.H., & Neale, M.A. Improving negotiation effectiveness under final offer arbitration: The role of selection and training. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1982, 67, 543-548.
2. Bazerman, M.H., Beekun, R.I., & Schoorman, F.D. Performance evaluation in a dynamic context: A laboratory study of the impact of a prior commitment to the ratee. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1982, 67, 873-876.
3. Neale, M.A., & Bazerman, M.H. The role of perspective taking ability in negotiation under different forms of arbitration. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 1983, 36, 378-388.
4. Bazerman, M.H., & Schoorman, F.D. A limited rationality model of interlocking directorates: An individual, organizational, and societal decision. Academy of Management Review, 1983, 8, 206-217.
5. Bazerman, M.H. Negotiator judgment: A critical look at the rationality assumption. American Behavioral Scientist, 1983, 27, 211-228.
6. Bazerman, M.H., & Samuelson, W.F. I won the auction but don't want the prize. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1983, 27, 618-634.
7. Brockner, J., Nathanson, S., Friend, A., Harbeck, J., Samuelson, C., Houser, R., Bazerman, M.H., & Rubin, J.Z. The role of modeling processes in the "Knee Deep in the Big Muddy" phenomenon. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, in press.
8. Bazerman, M.H., Giuliano, T., & Appelman, A. Escalation in individual and group decision making. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1984, 33, 141-152.
9. Bazerman, M.H. The relevance of Kahneman and Tversky's concept of framing to organizational behavior. Journal of Management, in press.
10. Neale, M.A., & Bazerman, M.H. Systematic deviations from rationality in negotiator behavior: The framing of conflict and negotiator overconfidence. Academy of Management Journal, in press.
11. Bazerman, M.H., & Neale, M.A. Heuristics in negotiation: Limitations to dispute resolution effectiveness. In M.H. Bazerman and R.J. Lewicki (Eds.), Negotiating in Organizations, Sage Publications, Inc., 1983.
12. Bazerman, M.H., Magliozzi, T., & Neale, M.A. Integrative bargaining in a competitive market. Working paper.

13. Bazerman, M.H. Judicial decision making in interest arbitration: Equity, equality, or anchoring? Working paper.
14. Bazerman, M.H., & Farber, H.S. Arbitrator decision making: When are final offers important? Working paper.
15. Samuelson, W.F., & Bazerman, M.H. Negotiating under the winner's curse. Working paper.

Please circle the number(s) of the desired papers:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

Name and address:

---



---



---



---



---

Preprint Available

**Expert Judgment and Climate Forecasting: A Methodological Critique of "Climate Change to the Year 2000"** by Thomas R. Stewart and Michael Glantz

"Climate Change to the Year 2000" is a widely distributed study based on expert judgment regarding climate change and its implications for world agricultural and economic policy. Since the designers of the study were apparently unfamiliar with the literature on judgment and decision making, the methods used to elicit and aggregate subjective probability distributions may have introduced a bias toward underestimating uncertainty about future climate. Tom Stewart, NCAR, P.O. Box 3000, Boulder, CO 80307.

Page 10  
 April 1984  
 J/DM Newsletter

J/DM Newsletter  
 April 1984  
 Page 10

MEMBERSHIP INFORMATION

The Association is an interdisciplinary organization made up of lawyers and social scientists - including anthropologists, economists, historians, political scientists, psychologists, and sociologists. Formed in 1964, the Association has grown from its incorporation members to approximately 1300 individual members and 1300 institutional subscribers. The aim of the Law and Society Association is to advance knowledge about the connection between legal systems and the social settings of which they are a part. This field of scholarship is premised on the assumption that laws do not exist in a vacuum. They respond to social, economic and political structures in society and in turn influence formation and change in those structures.

The Association has held independent annual meetings in June for 10 years. The LAW & SOCIETY REVIEW, the Journal of the Association, is published on a quarterly basis and has just completed its 17th volume. The Journal welcomes articles that bear on the relationship between law and the normative ordering in society. The Review's purpose is to stimulate and support research and teaching on the cultural, economic, political, psychological and social aspects of the law and the legal system.

The current dues for membership are \$25 per year and include a subscription to the REVIEW. In addition we accept subscriptions to the REVIEW by non-members or institutions at the rate of \$40.00 per year.

**MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION**

Please enter my membership as checked below in the Law and Society Association. Enclosed is my check or a bank money order in the amount as indicated in payment of my membership dues and contributions. This membership is for the fiscal year indicated above and includes a subscription to the LAW & SOCIETY REVIEW.

Please Print

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

MAILING ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

Is this a business or home address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Business  Home  Street \_\_\_\_\_  
 City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION \_\_\_\_\_ PHONE ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PRIMARY FIELD OF STUDY:

\_\_\_\_\_ Anthropology    \_\_\_\_\_ Economics    \_\_\_\_\_ Psychology    \_\_\_\_\_ Law  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Political Science    \_\_\_\_\_ History    \_\_\_\_\_ Sociology    \_\_\_\_\_ Law & Society    Other \_\_\_\_\_

**MEMBERSHIP DUES**  
 1 Year (\$25) \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 Years (\$47) \_\_\_\_\_  
 3 Years (\$65) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Life (\$400) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Student (\$10) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Contributing (\$50) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Sustaining (\$100) \_\_\_\_\_

**CONTRIBUTIONS**  
 J. Willard Hurst Fund \_\_\_\_\_  
 Harry Kalven Fund \_\_\_\_\_  
 Total Amount \_\_\_\_\_

RETURN THIS FORM WITH YOUR CHECK OR BANK MONEY ORDER PAYABLE IN U.S. DOLLARS TO THE LAW AND SOCIETY ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVE OFFICES.

NEW BOOK. . .

Kunreuther, H. & Linnerooth, J., et al. Foreword by Mary Douglas. (1983). Risk Analysis and Decision Processes: The Siting of Liquefied Energy Gas Facilities in Four Countries. New York: Springer-Verlag, Pp. 290, \$19.00.

The intent of this book is threefold: First, to fill a gap in the growing literature on "risk," "risk analysis," and "technology assessment" by examining the political, institutional, and social processes underlying public policies on questions such as siting large-scale technologies involving health and safety risks to the public. Second, to add some clarity to the analyst's role and show how this role might be improved with selected institutional and procedural reforms. Finally, to provide a cross-national approach to these questions which will highlight various aspects of national procedures that otherwise might go unnoticed.

A careful review of the quantitative evidence on the risks of transporting and storing liquid energy gas in the four countries covered reveals that analysts tend to present an overconfident picture of the accuracy of their estimates by the way in which they choose the data, couch the assumptions, and present the results. The authors show, however, that these analytic practices, are to a large extent, the product of institutional and procedural arrangements in the countries studied. The book concludes by suggesting reforms that might lead to the analyst playing a more useful role in social conflicts involving risks to the public.

J/DM NEWSLETTER SUBSCRIPTION FORM. . .

If the address label on the cover is marked "X" or "0", you have not paid. If the address label is marked "R", it is time to renew. The subscription cost of the J/DM Newsletter is based on the following schedule:

- \$7.50 U. S. (Remainder of 1984 and all of 1985)
- \$7.00 per year Foreign (drawn on U. S. banks)
- \$25.00 per year Foreign (not drawn on U. S. banks)

Please make checks payable to Indiana University Foundation. See Page 2 for details.

Please return this form and note any corrections to your address. (This form may be used for address change or correction.)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Be sure to include ZIP CODE.

Telephone \_\_\_\_\_

Send completed form and check to N. John Castellan, Jr., Editor  
Department of Psychology  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

Copies of this page may be given to interested colleagues for their use.

## NEW AND RECENT BOOKS. . .

Gasparski, W. & Pszczolowski, T. (1983). Praxiological Studies: Polish Contributions to the Science of Efficient Action. Dordrecht (Holland): Kluwer Academic Publishers Group. Pp. 417, \$78.00 ISBN: 90-277-1258-1

Praxiology -- the science of efficient action -- covers a wide area of research, and in a comparatively short history, has proved its theoretical and practical usefulness. It is a discipline with a growing number of followers in many countries but the largest group comes from Poland, and one of the most important contributors to that group is Tadeusz Kotarbinski, the principal representative of the famous Polish school of logic, as well as a philosopher and methodologist.

Kotarbinski set out to devise a grammar and logic of actions which would serve individuals and groups as a guide to action, in the same way grammar and logic serve as a guide to speech. In 1958, when President of the Polish Academy of Science, he organized the first research unit for praxiology, and served as the Chairman of its Advisory Council, setting out its future development.

This book includes the main contributions made to praxiology by Kotarbinski and his pupils -- praxiologists or praxiology oriented scientists including Oskar Lange and Zbigniew Wasiutynski. It serves as a broad review of the subject, pointing to the convergence/congruence of various approaches and the possibility of their applications in the sciences, technology, and society.

-- from the publisher's flyer

J/DM Newsletter  
Department of Psychology  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, IN 47405

Nonprofit Organization U.S. Postage PAID Bloomington, Indiana Permit No. 2
--

--time dated material--

Rob Hamm  
Ctr Res Judgment and Policy  
Psychology, CB 344  
Univ of Colorado  
Boulder, Colorado 80309