

# JUDGMENT / DECISION MAKING

## NEW J/DM OFFICERS. . .

At the Annual Meeting of the Society for Judgment and Decision Making the results of the 1989 election of officers were announced. **Baruch Fischhoff** is the President-Elect, **Daniel Kahneman** was elected to a three-year term on the Executive Board, and **Thomas Wallsten** was named to fill Baruch Fischhoff's unexpired term on the Executive Board. **Lola Lopes** is our new President. We wish them well and encourage members to contact any officers of the Society with your comments, suggestions, and concerns about the organization. (The full membership of the Executive Board is listed on page 2 of the Newsletter.)

## ANNUAL MEETING. . .

The annual meeting of the J/DM Society was a success. There were 176 paid registrants at the meeting. All of the sessions were well attended and the innovative Poster Session provided an excellent opportunity to talk about J/DM research with old friends and new colleagues. Special thanks are due **Reid Hastie**, **Thomas Wallsten**, and **Frank Yates** who assembled and organized the program for the meeting, and to **Steve Edgell**, our retiring Secretary/Treasurer, who handled local arrangements and registration. Although that meeting is still fresh in our memories, plans are being laid for the meeting next November in New Orleans.

## SPECIAL JOURNAL OFFER. . .

In this issue we are pleased to include special journal subscription rates for members of the Society for Judgment and Decision Making. The *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* again has an offer for our members that is simply too good to turn down. Information on the special rates is inside. J/DMers are reminded of the special subscription rates for *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* which were announced in the September 1989 issue of the *J/DM Newsletter*.

## CONTENTS

From the Editor . . . . .	2
News from NSF . . . . .	3
Call for Papers . . . . .	6
Call for Abstracts . . . . .	7
Special Subscription Rate: <i>Behavioral Decision Making</i> . . . . .	8
J/DM Book Series . . . . .	9
Undergraduate Paper Competition . . . . .	10
Brunswikian Young Investigator Prize . . . . .	10
Positions Available . . . . .	10
Book Reviews . . . . .	12
J/DM Dues and Address Change Form . . . . .	15
ORSA Student Award Winner . . . . .	16

SUBMISSION DEADLINE FOR THE NEXT J/DM NEWSLETTER: FEBRUARY 1, 1990

Vol. VIII  
Number 5

DECEMBER 1989

BRUNSWIKIAN  
YOUNG  
INVESTIGATOR  
PRIZE

## SOCIETY FOR JUDGMENT AND DECISION MAKING

### EXECUTIVE BOARD

Lola Lopes, *Chairperson*  
 Baruch Fischhoff, *Chairperson-Elect*  
 Robyn Dawes, *Past-Chairperson*  
 Daniel Kahneman, *1990-92*  
 Paul Slovic, *1988-90*  
 Thomas S. Wallsten, *1989-91*  
 Gary McClelland, *Secretary/Treasurer*  
 N. John Castellan, Jr., *Newsletter Editor*

### J/DM NEWSLETTER

#### Editor:

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

(812) 855-4261

BITNET: castellan@IUBACS

INTERNET:

castellan@gold.iubacs.indiana.edu

#### Dues, Addresses & Corrections:

Gary McClelland  
 Center for Research on Judgment and  
 Policy  
 Institute of Cognitive Science  
 Campus Box 344  
 University of Colorado  
 Boulder, Colorado 80309-0344

(303) 492-8122

BITNET: mcclella@COLORADO

INTERNET:

gmcclella@clipr.colorado.edu

### 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 8½ by 11 paper. If possible, use a carbon or film ribbon. Please mail flat – do not fold. A better alternative is to submit your contribution via EMAIL.

**Subscriptions:** Subscriptions are available on a calendar year basis only. Requests for information concerning membership in the Society for Judgment and Decision Making should be sent to Gary McClelland.

**Address correction:** Please check your mailing label carefully. Because the *J/DM Newsletter* is usually sent

by bulk mail, copies with incorrect addresses or which are otherwise undeliverable are neither forwarded nor returned. Therefore, we have no way of knowing if copies are delivered. Address changes or corrections should be sent to Gary McClelland.

**Mailing Labels:** Some readers may wish to sent reprint lists or other material to people listed in the directory. Contact Gary McClelland for details.

**Electronic Mail:** The editor may be reached through BITNET at "castellan@IUBACS." [Some users may find it either necessary (or more convenient) to address the editor using only the first 8 characters (castella).] BITNET addresses also can be reached from most of the university and research networks. I check for mail several times a day, and a prompt reply to electronic messages is assured. To add your name to the *J/DM Electronic Mail Directory* (or to receive a copy of the electronic directory) contact the Editor.

**NEWS FROM THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION  
DECISION, RISK, AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE PROGRAM**

**James Shanteau and L. Robin Keller**

The Decision, Risk, and Management Science (DRMS) program at the National Science Foundation (NSF) invites submission of grant proposals. The DRMS program supports research directed at increasing the understanding and effectiveness of problem-solving, information processing, and decision making by individuals, groups, organizations, and society. The target dates for 1990 are January 15 and August 15.

To assist members of the DRMS community prepare proposals, the program directors James Shanteau and L. Robin Keller are available to answer questions, provide information on proposal content, etc. First time proposal writers especially are encouraged to contact Jim or Robin. They can be reached by phone, mail, electronic mail, or facsimile:

Dr. James Shanteau, Program Director  
Telephone: 202/357-7417  
Bitnet: jshantea@nsf

---

Dr. L. Robin Keller, Associate Program Director  
Telephone: 202/357-7569  
Bitnet: lkeller@nsf

Facsimile: 202/357-7745 (include Shanteau or Keller, DRMS, and room 336)

Mail: Decision, Risk, and Management Science Program  
National Science Foundation  
1800 G St, N.W., Room 336  
Washington, D.C. 20550

The following describes the DRMS content areas, a checklist for grant submission, the list of evaluation criteria, an overview of the review process, and a partial list of supported research areas.

**DRMS Content Areas.** The program supports research that explores fundamental issues in management science, risk analysis, public policy decision making, judgmental processes, behavioral decision making, organizational design, and decision making under uncertainty. Unlike most funding agencies, NSF relies on investigators to define specific research directions - DRMS does not solicit proposals on any particular topic.

**Checklist for Proposal Submission.** Before submitting a formal proposal to DRMS, investigators are encouraged to do the following:

- (1) Get a copy of **Grants for Research and Education in Science and Engineering** (NSF 83-57, rev. 03/89). This document contains relevant forms, instructions, and other materials. Copies can be obtained at most universities or from the DRMS program officers. Also, obtain a copy of the **DRMS Program Description** either from the DRMS office or from NSF. Read the material carefully.
  - (2) Contact Jim Shanteau or Robin Keller if you have any questions about your research idea or proposal content. New investigators are encouraged to submit a preproposal of one to two pages to either Jim or Robin. We can generally suggest ways that your final proposal can be improved, e.g., to meet program criteria.
  - (3) Secure all supporting materials, such as letters from cooperating organizations or consultants, well before the submission deadline. It is very difficult for us to incorporate such materials once formal processing begins.
  - (4) Prepare a reasonable, but complete budget for the proposed research. Provide budget justification and/or explanation for any large amounts or unusual items. We can't approve it if we don't understand why it was included.
- 
- (5) Write the text of the proposal so that it provides a clear and convincing case for the proposed research. Be specific about what you plan to do and how you plan to do it. Address any limitations or shortcomings - don't just assume them away. Also, the project description must not exceed the 15 single-spaced limit imposed by NSF; we will be enforcing this in 1990 and returning any proposals which exceed the spirit of the limit.
  - (6) If you are resubmitting a proposal that has been evaluated previously, be sure that you have addressed the concerns of previous reviewers. Although proposals are not necessarily sent back to the same reviewers, it is likely that different reviewers will have the same concerns.
  - (7) Have someone experienced in grant proposal writing look over your submission. Ask them to check for omissions, unstated assumptions, and lack of clarity. Don't send us a proposal until it has been read and reread several times.
  - (8) At the same time the final copies are being submitted to NSF, send one additional copy directly to DRMS c/o either Jim or Robin. In that way, we will know to expect your proposal once it clears the Proposal Processing Unit at NSF. Also, it can be useful in a cover letter to include names and addresses of possible outside reviewers. We are always open to suggestions for expanding our list of reviewers for a specific project or for DRMS in general.

**Program Criteria.** Research supported by DRMS should incorporate social, behavioral, or organizational aspects of operational processes and decision making. Research should satisfy the following criteria: (a) have relevance to an operational context; (b) be grounded in theory; (c) be based on empirical observation or subject to empirical validation; and (d) be generalizable. Although a single project may not satisfy all the criteria equally, its contribution toward these ends must be clear.

In addition, NSF lists four general criteria for the selection of research projects: 1) research performance competence; 2) intrinsic merit of the research, 3) utility or relevance of the research, and 4) the effect of the research on the infrastructure of science and engineering.

**Review Process.** The review and evaluation process for submitted proposals requires about six months. It includes ad-hoc evaluations by outside reviewers selected for their substantive knowledge and methodological expertise. It also includes the recommendations of an advisory panel consisting of senior researchers in the field.

Members of the DRMS Advisory Panel for 1989-90 are: Dr. Janice M. Beyer, Dr. Warren H. Hausman, Dr. Ralph L. Keeney, Dr. Kenneth R. MacCrimmon, Dr. M. Granger Morgan, Dr. Donald G. Morrison, Dr. John W. Payne, and Dr. Stephen M. Pollock.

Whether your project is recommended for funding or not, you will receive blind copies of the evaluations from outside reviewers and the DRMS panel. Although these evaluations are provided without comment, it should be kept in mind that we do not rely on a numerical average of the reviewer's ratings.

**Research Topics.** The following is a partial list of research supported by DRMS:

Modeling of operational and managerial processes, e.g., incorporating uncertainty in production planning models, decision making in public settings, design of marketing information systems, and modeling managerial financial planning systems.

Risk management, e.g., perception of risk levels, risk communication, managing low-probability/high-consequence events, and siting potentially hazardous facilities.

Design of organizational processes, e.g., information requirements for design and coordination of distributed decision making systems, collective decision making, group decision support systems, and design of manufacturing systems.

Studies of decision making, e.g., heuristic theories of problem structuring and preferences, learning from experience, evaluating decision aids, and integrating normative and behavioral decision theory frameworks.

## Call for Papers

# Probabilistic Safety Assessment and Management (PSAM)

*An International Conference Devoted to the Advancement of System-based Methods for the Design and Operation of Technological Systems and Processes*

**Sponsored by the Society for Risk Analysis**

**February 4-7, 1991 • The Beverly Hilton • Beverly Hills, California, USA**

### **SCOPE**

The purpose of PSAM is to provide a forum for the presentation of scientific papers covering both methodology and applications of system-based approaches to the design and safe operation of technological systems and processes. These include nuclear plants, chemical and petroleum facilities, defense systems, aerospace systems, and the treatment and disposal of hazardous wastes.

The following is a list of topics within the scope of the meeting:

1. Safety management and decision making.
2. Risk-based regulation.
3. Qualitative and quantitative design objectives.
4. Evaluation of alternate technologies and processes.
5. Probabilistic and non-probabilistic models for safety assessment.
6. Uncertainty analysis.
7. Uncertainties in physical and chemical phenomenology.
8. Expert judgment in safety studies.
9. Human reliability.
10. Risk-based methods for improving operator training.
11. Computerized control systems and operator aids.
12. Artificial intelligence in support of safety management.
13. Software system safety.
14. Implications of advances in computer power.
15. Earthquakes, fires, tornadoes, and natural phenomena.
16. Multi-hazard analysis, e.g., fires following earthquakes.
17. Vulnerability and safeguards analysis.
18. Aging of systems, structures, and components.
19. Reliability-based design.
20. Accident management.
21. Communicating the results of risk assessment and management to peers, decision makers, and the public.

### **INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUMMARY SUBMISSION**

Four copies of a summary (800 - 1,200 words; typed, single-spaced) should be submitted to the General Chairman not later than Friday, April 6, 1990. Summaries should contain a title and include all authors' names, affiliations, and telephone, Telex, and FAX numbers. Authors should indicate the primary and one alternate category with which their papers are most closely identified using the numbering scheme in the Scope section of this announcement. Full papers will be due August 15, 1990.

### **GENERAL CHAIRMAN**

Professor George Apostolakis  
 Mechanical, Aerospace, and Nuclear Engineering Dept.  
 University of California  
 405 Hilgard Avenue  
 Los Angeles, CA 90024-1597 USA  
 Telephone: (213) 825-1300  
 FAX: (213) 825-0761  
 TELEX: 3716012 UCLA LSA

---

**BEHAVIORAL DECISION RESEARCH IN MANAGEMENT****Call for Abstracts**

---

The 4th BEHAVIORAL DECISION RESEARCH IN MANAGEMENT Conference will be held at the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania from Friday, June 8, to Sunday, June 10, 1990. This conference is intended to continue the series of meetings held at Cornell, Texas, and Chicago. The emphasis is on original research in decision making and its application to business disciplines, especially managerial economics, marketing, accounting, finance, decision support, organization behavior, and business strategy.

Speakers are invited to submit abstracts of 200 words or less by March 1, 1990, to either of the conference organizers, Colin Camerer and Eric Johnson. Selections will ~~be made by the organizers and an ad-hoc program committee.~~ Speakers will be notified whether their abstracts have been selected by April 1, 1990.

The tentative plan is to begin with dinner and cocktails Friday night (June 8), have three or four sessions on Saturday (June 9), and conclude with two sessions on Sunday (June 10).

Colin Camerer

(215) 898-3597  
camerer@wharton.upenn.edu

Department of Decision Sciences

Eric Johnson

(215) 898-5404  
johnson00@wharton.upenn.edu

Department of Marketing

The Wharton School  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia PA 19104 USA

11/89

## JOURNAL OF BEHAVIORAL DECISION MAKING

The Journal of Behavioral Decision Making is entering its third successful year. Members of the Society for Judgment and Decision Making may avail themselves of a special member subscription rate of US\$40 for Volume 3, 1990. Alternatively, or in addition, they might request that their institutional libraries take out subscriptions at the regular subscription rate of US\$120. Appropriate forms are below.

-----  
JUDGMENT AND DECISION MAKING SOCIETY MEMBER ORDER FORM

Please enter my subscription to the Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 1990, Volume 3.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_  
-----

Enclose personal check or money order for US\$40.

Send to: Subscription Department C, John Wiley & Sons Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158, USA.

-----  
JOURNAL OF BEHAVIORAL DECISION MAKING ORDER FORM

Please enter my institutional subscription to the Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 1990, Volume 3.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_  
-----

Enclose payment for US\$120.

Send to: Subscription Department C, John Wiley & Sons Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158, USA.



**J/DM SOCIETY BOOK SERIES. . .**

J/DM has negotiated an agreement with Cambridge University Press to publish a series of books called the Cambridge Series on Judgment and Decision Making. The Society will provide editorial assistance to locate editors and authors, develop appropriate volumes, and provide useful editorial comments to authors and Cambridge Press. Cambridge will produce and advertise the books, provide substantial discounts (20%) to J/DM members, and give all royalties to the Society.

The intent of this series is to promote our discipline and our Society. Each book will be high quality, to build the best possible image of J/DM as an intellectual field and as a Society. The royalties will provide substantial resources for the Society, as the Arkes and Hammond book already has demonstrated. Each book will be attractive to J/DM members, but also accessible to an audience beyond J/DM. For example, edited volumes are in various stages of planning and preparation dealing with topics of legal decision making, policy decision making, medical decision making, and several other topics. These books should appeal not only to our traditional audience of J/DM-types and their students, but also to academics in professional schools, their students, and possibly research-minded practitioners.

J/DM has appointed a Publications Committee consisting of John Carroll (Chair), Jim Shanteau, and Don Kleinmuntz. An Editorial Board of about a dozen J/DM members has agreed to assist the Publications Committee. Julia Hough is the editor at Cambridge with responsibility for the Series. Ken Hammond has stepped down as Head of the Publications Committee, having seen us through the negotiation with Cambridge and the initiation of our first book ideas.

The book development process consists of several steps: (1) prospective editors contact John, Jim, or Don with an idea for a book, probably an edited book since authors receive no royalties; (2) the Publications Committee reacts and requests a 2-page description of the book's purpose, topics, and possible authors; (3) if the description is on target, we ask for a longer prospectus explaining why such a book is needed, how it will advance the field, and what audiences would use it; (4) the Publications Committee approves the prospectus and the authors go to work; we also notify Cambridge Press of this activity; (5) a draft manuscript is received and assigned to one member of the Publications Committee, who is responsible for getting two reviews (using the Editorial Board and/or others where appropriate); (6) a revised manuscript is approved and sent to Cambridge Press for their own review (shorter than normal since it will rely in part on the J/DM reviews); (7) a contract is executed between the editor/author and Cambridge, and the book is produced.

The Publications Committee invites your ideas, suggestions, and participation as editors, authors, reviewers, and buyers.

-- John Carroll

**UNDERGRADUATE PAPER COMPETITION. . .**

The Center for Decision Research at the University of Chicago announces a competition for the best undergraduate paper on behavioral decision making. A prize of \$200 will be awarded to the winning entry.

If you are teaching courses or supervising undergraduate students in the area of decision making, would you please alert them to this opportunity?

The paper can be an integrative review of existing work or an original theoretical or empirical contribution. Papers submitted for courses, independent studies, or honors theses are appropriate. The paper will be judged by a panel of researchers at the Center for Decision Research.

The deadline for submission is December 31, 1989. The winner will be announced in the *Judgment/Decision Making Newsletter*. Send entries to: Prof. Elke Weber, Undergraduate Paper Content, Center for Decision Research, 1101 East 58th Street, Chicago, IL 60637.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF YOUNG INVESTIGATOR PRIZE. . .**

The Brunswik Society is pleased to announce that a prize of \$250 will be awarded to a "Young Investigator" (less than five years beyond advanced degree) for the best journal style article written from a Brunswikian point of view. The paper may be either theoretical or empirical in nature. Application to a substantive field, such as medicine, business, etc, is encouraged but not required.

Criteria for evaluating the paper include: a) exhibition of a grasp of Brunswikian principles, b) consistent application of Brunswikian theory and/or methodology, and c) innovative extension of these.

Four copies of the paper should be submitted to Thomas R. Stewart, Center for Policy Research, Milne 300, State University of New York, Albany, NY 12222, by July 1, 1990. Submissions should be accompanied by four copies of a summary or extended abstract of the paper not to exceed two pages. Submissions in dissertation form will not be considered. The award will be presented at the November 1990 meeting of the Brunswik Society, and the winner will be invited to make a presentation at the annual meeting.

**POSITIONS AVAILABLE. . .**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY** has an opening in the area of decision making, broadly defined. Candidates may have research interests in such areas as basic cognitive processes in decision making strategies, decision making relevant to social, health, legal, or policy decisions, mathematical models of decision making, etc. Send vita, three or more letters of recommendation, and copies of papers to: Chair, Decision Making Search Committee, Department of Psychology, 102 Gilmer Hall, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903-2477. Deadline for receipt of application is January 10, 1990. The University of Virginia is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. Applications from women and minorities are encouraged.

## POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Risk Communication Program (RCP) is looking for qualified people to join its staff for 1-3 years as part of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) Program. The RCP's activities are designed to help people

- put risks in context,
- understand trade-offs between risks and costs,
- become informed participants in individual and community risk reduction decisions, and
- understand residual risks that remain after action.

The RCP has four components. Research is oriented toward understanding how people form their risk perceptions and how alternative forms of communication change these perceptions. Consulting and analysis assists program offices involved in specific risk communication activities, especially in evaluating their effectiveness. Training helps agency staff to incorporate the results from the research and analysis in their ongoing risk communication activities. Outreach for regional and program offices includes a risk communication library and a hotline. Conferences, articles, speakers, and seminars (such as for the media) reach broader audiences.

Under the IPA Program, an employee of a state or local government, a college or university, or other nonprofit organization can be temporarily assigned to (in this case) the RCP. Qualified people could come from several disciplines, such as psychology, communications, marketing, decision sciences, and economics. For further information, please contact Ann Fisher, Manager, Risk Communication Program, PM-221, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460, 202/382-5500.

**CENTER FOR DECISION RESEARCH, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO:** The Center is seeking to fill a tenure-track position at the Assistant Professor level. The ideal candidate will have a strong background in group processes, decision making, and social cognition. Applicants should have a strong research orientation. Teaching responsibilities include basic courses in group decision making and negotiations and the development of more advanced courses that could be closely related to ongoing research interests. All interested applicants should send a curriculum vitae, one written example of recent research, and the names and telephone numbers of three references. *Do not send letters of reference.* Send application materials to: R. M. Hogarth, University of Chicago, Graduate School of Business, Center for Decision Research, 1101 East 58th Street, Chicago, IL 60637. An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

**BOOK REVIEWS. . .**

MacCrimmon, K. R. & Wehrung, D. A. (1986). **TAKING RISKS: THE MANAGEMENT OF UNCERTAINTY**. New York: Free Press. Pp. 380. (Hardback \$25.00; Paperback \$13.95)

*"Consistency is the last refuge of the unimaginative."*

-- Oscar Wilde

Oscar Wilde implies that only the bold of mind embrace the new, while the meager are left to suffice with the old. His sentiment has been expressed by many people in many fashions. Pundits of human behavior might replace "guarantee" for "consistency," and "risk-averse" for "unimaginative." This latter reading is relevant in the context of MacCrimmon and Wehrung's *Taking Risks: The Management of Uncertainty*, recently reissued in paperback.

The question of whether it is better to be risk-taking or risk-averse is a pervasive one. Theology, psychodynamics and literary criticism are among the many fields in which this theme has emerged. However, empiricists are seldom thoroughly persuaded by the arguments of rationalists. The systematic investigation of which strategy is better suited to navigate a complex world is the possession of the sciences, not the humanities. Further, what better arena to begin the investigation than business, where the structure of situations often facilitates the objective assessment of outcomes. It is considerably easier to evaluate a business decision to purchase stocks than it is to evaluate interpersonal strategies of self-presentation. Therefore, I was pleased to receive a request to review the scientific treatment of this issue.

In the Preface, MacCrimmon and Wehrung outline three major objectives: 1) Develop a framework for understanding risk taking; 2) Present a Risk Portfolio capable of measuring individual risk taking propensity, and; 3) Report a comprehensive study on managerial risk taking. If scientific progress can be gauged by accomplishing stated objectives, this book succeeds admirably.

*Taking Risks* is divided into four major sections. In the first section, Chapter 1 is concerned with the conceptual formulation of risk taking, culminating in the REACT model (recognize; evaluate; adjust; choose; track). This chapter suffered from the overstatement to which many introductions, in their desire to capture attention, succumb. Chapter 2 provides a brief but good review of the relevant literature, and outlines the study which follows in chapters 3-7. The outline is clear and concise, and builds nicely on the previous chapter.

The second section details the responses of 375 Canadian and 96 American managers. Participants received the Risk Portfolio, which consisted of four standardized questionnaires of a personal and business nature, designed to facilitate comparison. An attitude and a general questionnaire were also included to provide a source of differentiation. Results appeared in prose as opposed to the traditional *F*-ratio's and probabilities. The decision to present results "informally" undoubtedly stemmed from the wish to appeal to managers and practitioners of risk. I appreciated the attempt to be vernacular, but felt that the precise statistical analysis should also have been provided. Many of the research "details" were chronicled in a series of reasonably comprehensive and well

referenced technical notes. Tables and figures were liberally employed and instructive. I was, however, distracted by the use of questions as section headings and discursive page arrangements.

The third section compares risk propensity between standardized measures, including relationships derived from the attitude and general questionnaires. It is in this section that the most provocative questions are addressed. The authors interpret the results cautiously, with only occasional conjecture. Such caution is understandable, as cross-sectional designs necessarily cloud causal conclusions. However, the reluctance to speculate on the role of psychological mechanisms was somewhat disappointing. This section was replete with results which begged for inter or intra-personal explanation. While the study was not designed to explore such issues, as a psychologist, I couldn't help feeling a little unsatisfied.

The fourth section allows the reader to measure their own risk-oriented status. This assessment could play a useful role in understanding one's own behavior vis a vis risk propensities or similarly as a managerial technique for ascertaining reasons behind other's risk-related behavior.

*Taking Risks* is not an easy book to read. The authors sacrificed an engaging writing style in an attempt to satisfy a diverse readership. For a fulfilling reading experience, follow the advice offered in the Preface. Further, the REACT model was not thoroughly integrated, leaving theoretical development wanting. Still, even with the problems outlined in this review, *Taking Risks* is the most definitive source of risk-related research I've encountered. I can't imagine a study on managerial risk taking being conducted in the next decades without frequent reference to this volume.

Academicians may mourn the absence of theory in this book, and while certain patterns suggest the success of risk takers, the prescriptive advice alluded to earlier was not forthcoming. However, the authors never intended to advance theory, nor to offer counsel. Rather, they report a comprehensive description of managerial risk behavior which will serve to compliment and augment the existing literature. As a result of MacCrimmon and Wehrung's efforts, theory and practice may more quickly and deftly progress. In that way, *Taking Risks* is a genuine advance.

-- James Bailey  
Washington University

Fotion, N., and Elfstrom, G. (1986). **MILITARY ETHICS: GUIDELINES FOR PEACE AND WAR.** Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 280 pages plus notes.

In developing a utilitarian military ethics, Fotion and Elfstrom face a double challenge. Early utilitarianism was marked by simplistic formulas such as "the greatest good for the greatest number", which on analysis provided little coherent guidance for practical action. Current advocates must defend utilitarianism against rights-based ethics. The authors' approach goes beyond any particular rules of calculation, and they take pains to show utilitarian solutions to the weaknesses of the rights approach.

The second challenge is that war is often thought to be beyond morality. Pacifists, in response, have rejected war, while "realists" have abandoned morality in war; but the authors hold that the utilitarian approach makes a military ethics possible. They treat issues of peacetime (standing

armies, military personnel, codes of military ethics), of the period immediately preceding a war (just causes of war, the role of third parties), of fighting war (the enemy, weapons, civilians, and guerrilla warfare), and of the post-war period (ending war, war crimes, demobilization and the treatment of veterans).

In the utilitarian view, military actions should be evaluated in terms of people's preferences for their consequences. The preferences of all concerned should be considered, though the preferences of any can be outweighed (in contrast with rights theories, where some rights are inalienable). Some "base" preferences are not acceptable, e.g., the desire to make the enemy suffer. They adopt R. M. Hare's view (see review of *Hare and Critics: Essays on MORAL THINKING*, reviewed in *J/DM Newsletter*, VIII(3), July 1989) that most moral judgments are made using learned rules, but some situations require critical analysis.

The critical utilitarian analysis requires not only consideration of the preferences of the various parties, but also their comparison and combination. A moral agent does not just add up the parties' preferences, but rather forms a new preference based on information about them, taking into consideration how much the various parties have at stake and how strong their preferences are. For example, "The kind of response [third-party nations] make to a war involving others must be the result of a complex calculation involving the seriousness of what is at stake for themselves and for others, the extent to which they can hope to cause effective change in a constructive direction, the extent of their vulnerabilities, and the extent to which a given war is likely to involve great hazard for them" (p 126). Since war involves great harm, it can only be justified "if employing it achieves something of such great value as to outweigh its harm", most obviously "forestalling death and destruction" (p 109). But, the reader will wonder, how exactly are these preferences to be combined? Is it through subjective judgment, or through a formal method to be selected for each situation? There are, of course, problems with each.

The authors conclude that if people's capacities to make judgments in these ways are nurtured and supported then individuals will be "capable of upholding [moral standards that restrain war]... under even the most constrained conditions" (p 109).

Fotion and Elfstrom's application of utilitarian ethics to the military makes important assumptions about human capabilities: that people can learn rules of moral behavior and remember and follow these rules while under stress; and that they can recognize when their rules don't fit the situation well, and then perform creative, critical, formal utilitarian analysis. These assumptions raise answerable questions: Can such rules be followed under stress? How should preferences for war outcomes be measured? Can the preferences be communicated accurately to the moral agent who will combine them? Can such agents make fair and accurate subjective judgments? How should they be trained or aided to do so?

At a time when the triggers of conventional war are being set more sensitively [see box on Page 15], the answers to these questions are important. The book renders a service by laying out a rational standard against which to compare actual military behavior. And being a citizen's description of the judgment tasks that need to be understood and aided, it can cover a different and wider set of military judgments than appears in RFP's from the military research organizations.

-- Robert Hamm