

JUDGMENT / DECISION MAKING

1989 J/DM MEETING. . .

The Annual Meeting of the Society for Judgment and Decision Making will be held November 19-20 in Atlanta (note the date change from the December announcement). Mark your calendars now and plan to attend the best J/DM Meeting yet.

1989 DIRECTORY. . .

With this issue of the *J/DM Newsletter* you will receive the 1989 membership directory. Please take a few moments to check your entry for accuracy. If any corrections are necessary, send them to Steve Edgell.

A COLUMN RETURNS. . .

With this issue we are pleased to announce the return of Jay Christensen-Szalanski's *Recent Developments in ...* which is published with permission from the journal *Medical Decision Making*. We understand that Jay has been serving on the Iowa City School Board which has taken a great deal of his time. Perhaps we will soon have an article on applied decision making.

1989 DUES NOW DUE. . .

If you have not paid your dues for 1989, now is the time to do so. Check your mailing label: *If the number in the upper right hand corner is a 7 or 8, then you have NOT paid for 1989. If the number is a 9, then you are O.K.* Dues are \$10.00 (\$5.00 for students) this year. Please use the form on the last page of the newsletter when paying your dues.

--Steve Edgell

WE GOOFED. . .

In the December issue we announced a new book, *Thinking and Deciding* by J/DMer Jonathan Baron who is a regular contributor to this *Newsletter* with his reviews of *Recent Philosophical Literature*. In the announcement, we failed to include the name of the publisher -- Cambridge University Press.

JUDGMENT UNDER UNCERTAINTY. . .

Nor is the people's judgment always true:
The most may err as grossly as the few.

--John Dryden, ca. 1670

NEWSLETTER

Vol. VIII

Number 1

FEBRUARY 1989

CONTENTS

From the Editor.....	2
Chairperson's Report on Federation Meeting.....	3
Recent Philosophical Literature.....	5
New Books.....	6
Recent Developments in the Psychology of Judgment and Decision Making.....	7
Decision Research Student Paper Competition.....	8
Recent Developments in Medical Decision Making.....	9
ORSA Student Paper Competition.....	11
Positions Available.....	12
J/DM Dues Form and Address Change.....	13

SUBMISSION DEADLINE FOR THE NEXT J/DM NEWSLETTER: MARCH 31, 1989

SOCIETY FOR JUDGMENT AND DECISION MAKING

Executive Board

Robyn Dawes, Chairperson
 Lola Lopes, Chairperson-Elect
 Kenneth R. Hammond, Past-Chairperson
 Baruch Fischhoff, 1989-91
 Duncan Luce, 1987-89
 Paul Slovic, 1988-90
 Stephen E. Edgell, 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

Addresses & Corrections:

Stephen E. Edgell
 Department of Psychology
 University of Louisville
 Louisville, Kentucky 40292

(502) 588-5948

BITNET: seedge04@ULKYVX

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.

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 Stephen Edgell.

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 Stephen Edgell.

Mailing Labels: Some readers may wish to send reprint lists or other material to people listed in the directory. Contact Stephen Edgell 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.

Report to JDM Society ... from Robyn Dawes

Re: Board Meeting of the Federation of Behavioral, Psychological and Cognitive Sciences
Washington, DC--12/3-4/88)

There were two major topics at the meeting.

First, Diane Zuckerman gave a presentation concerning scientific misconduct and led a discussion afterwards. A former APA congressional fellow, she is currently a member of the professional staff of the House Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations, chaired by representative Ted Weiss (Democrat, New York), and she is in charge of conducting her subcommittee's hearings on the topic of scientific misconduct. Currently she is preparing a report based on the subcommittee's hearings, a report that will recommend legislation and other remedies needed to control the problem. She believes it is quite serious; she is particularly appalled by the somewhat cavalier attitudes--which she described in some detail--of administrators who find out that the researchers they supervise or fund have on rare occasions been guilty of fabricating data, and on somewhat more common ones of having failed to provide information about potential conflicts of interest--particularly financial connections with businesses that could profit from positive evaluations of their products. She welcomes written comments from people in the scientific community; she can be reached at the Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations; B 372 Rayburn House Office Building; Washington, DC 20515-6148.

Let me insert an editorial comment. It was not clear to me whether she felt that the problem necessitates firmer administrative action to make sure the current rules were followed, mandating new administrative procedures to enhance compliance with these rules, or developing new rules. I think these distinctions are important. For example, there are sections in many research grant applications--even on national committee forms--requiring researchers or members who serve on these committees to specify any potential conflicts of interest. According to Zuckerman, many people don't (although her evidence is largely anecdotal). One solution to this problem would be to take action against people who do not provide the required information. Another would be to change the procedure from asking for a simple written statement on a standard form to some other one that is more likely to provide the requisite information. A third would be to change the rule itself--as the public health service is proposing to do--to

prohibit not only what an individual (or a "reasonable person") would categorize as a conflict of interest, but to prohibit the "appearance of a conflict of interest" as well. I see these as three quite distinct measures. (I am particularly concerned about "appearance" rules, which were historically used as justification for anti-nepotistic policies that most often discriminated against women.) The problem with arguing that the choice should be made between the first two remedies (or some combination) rather than between the second two is that such an argument is easily interpreted as self-serving, or at the very least as support of the "old-boy" mentality. I am concerned, however, that in order to fight the Breuning's of this world--whose falsification of data could have horrendous effects on other people--a new set of rules may be erected to be administered by bureaucratic "purists," when in fact current rules quite clearly prohibit behavior such as Breuning's. He is, after all, the subject of criminal prosecution. For example, should "data dredging" to find a (pseudo) "significant" result be a matter that should lead to organizational sanctions, or is it just bad science? I'm concerned because I have seen what can happen.

The other main topic concerned money. The financial state of the American Psychological Association (APA) is terrible. For example, after having been forced to sell its 6-floor Washington building, it can now afford to rent back only 2 floors of it. Despite optimistic words, there is a possibility that additional deficits may be discovered, or (my bet) that there will be substantial underpayment of expected dues this year. The relationship between the APA and the Federation has been "cozy" (actual word agreed upon), by which I do not mean to imply any illegitimacy, but rather mutual support. For example, 80.5% of the Federation's budget goes in direct payment to APA for space and personnel services, and according to APA bookkeeping, it provides much more in service to the Federation than that amount, where the excess is considered to be APA's contribution.

Given the state of the APA's books, it is not clear exactly what impact lessening that contribution will have on the Federation, except that it will be negative. The leaders of the Federation believe that a raise in Federation dues from \$7.00 to \$10.00 per person will be necessary. Many of us, especially from smaller organizations, expressed concern--particularly given that the bookkeeping of the Federation lists only a single lump payment to APA, with the result that only 19.5% of its expenditures are "visible" to those of us asked to support a dues increase. Some of us succeeded in obtaining an agreement that the treasurer's report would be changed to reflect the actual activities that the APA engages in for the Federation; for example, a major share of the personnel costs go to APA people who arrange the Federation seminars. Also, there is a possibility that groups that have recently joined will not be asked to raise the dues. Again, some of us expressed concern that we had just obtained support for the older dues, and that an immediate raise without detailed justification or a grace period might be met with justifiable opposition.

RECENT PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE. ; .

Hardin, R. (1988). **MORALITY WITHIN THE LIMITS OF REASON.**
University of Chicago Press. Pp. 234.

Utility theory often amounts to a form of utilitarian calculus. When we apply utility theory to policy decisions about bypass surgery, we trade off the gains to those who benefit against the loss (often death) to those who are hurt. Laboratory questions about flu epidemics and the like also presuppose some form of utilitarianism.

Utilitarianism is under attack, however. One line of attack holds that interpersonal comparison of utility -- or of utility differences -- is impossible, so the theory is meaningless. Hardin takes the view that precise comparisons are indeed impossible, but many of the consequences of utilitarian theory for social choices require only the crudest sort of interpersonal comparison, if any.

The "limits of reason" are mostly the limits of knowledge of the utilities of others and perhaps ourselves. I think Hardin exaggerates our limits. Applied decision analysis makes interpersonal comparisons routinely, for example, when it is used to set medical policies. Surely, estimates of utility are subject to error, but so are estimates of more "objective" quantities such as future profits and losses. Hardin provides no account of the process of utility estimation or why that process is limited.

Putting this quibble aside, I admit that interpersonal comparison can be difficult. Chapter 3, the most enlightening chapter, makes the case for the unimportance of strong interpersonal comparison for institutional choice. For example, a society creates an "inalienable right" by preventing certain voluntary exchanges. If all such exchanges were allowed, I could sell you my vote, and this exchange would be Pareto efficient, helping us both and hurting no-one. If a society allows such exchanges, however, those in a position to buy votes would gain political power, and the society would be worse off than if such exchanges were prohibited. To draw this conclusion, we need only a crude comparison of utilities of buyers and sellers as classes. At least, when the decision is made by an institution rather than by a dyad, the option to allow vote selling is no longer Pareto efficient: it will help some (the buyers) and hurt others (the sellers).

This institutional perspective also helps to solve the problem of exceptions to institutional rules. A policeman who decides to punish a suspect on the spot, or to let her go free, can maximize utility by providing swift and sure punishment (which is more likely to deter others), or by excusing a crime that ought to be excused. But the question we face as a society is not whether or not to take such action in individual cases but whether to allow it or to protect the rights of suspects. We prohibit such actions because we think that allowing them will lead to too many errors. A utilitarian detective, like Sherlock Holmes, might still decide to set free a legally guilty but morally innocent suspect, but no institution can condone such behavior.

Chapters 1 and 2 serve as a useful review of relevant game theoretic concepts, such as cooperation and coordination, and their application to moral questions. One point I had not appreciated before was that ordinary dyadic exchanges are prisoner's dilemmas, in which making the exchange is cooperation. Chapter 4 discusses additional issues from the institutional perspective. Chapter 5 discusses the major issues in the theory of values but, so far as I can tell, says nothing new about them. Readers familiar with the general issues could begin with chapter 3.

--Jonathan Baron

ADDITIVE REPRESENTATIONS OF PREFERENCES
A NEW FOUNDATION OF DECISION ANALYSIS
Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp.203, \$60.

By Peter Wakker

University of Nijmegen

Nijmegen Institute of Cognition and Information technology (NICI)

Department of Mathematical Psychology

Nijmegen, The Netherlands

This book presents a new foundation of decision analysis. Starting point is a new foundation for subjective expected utility maximization which, contrary to the usual foundation of decision analysis, does not need any lotteries or 'objective', 'given', probabilities. The main tool in the derivations is a tradeoff-idea from multiattribute-utility theory, leading to the result that subjective expected utility is appropriate if and only if no 'contradictory tradeoffs on consequences' are revealed. From the introduction we quote:

'It is common use in economic analyses that scientists, using subjective expected utility without lotteries available, for a justification refer to Savage (1954, Foundations of Statistics). We are however not aware of an economic analysis in which actually the restrictive conditions of Savage (1954) are verified. The restrictive condition of our set-up, continuity of utility, usually is satisfied.'

Chapter I shows how to relate ('revealed') preferences to choice making, Chapter II introduces the tradeoff-idea from multiattribute-utility theory and studies implications of the 'sure-thing principle'. Chapter III gives a self-contained presentation of additive representations of preferences, made accessible through many illustrations; this also shows how to construct the additive representation from data. Chapter IV gives the 'Central Theorem' of the book, showing that SEU is appropriate if and only if no contradictory tradeoffs on consequences are revealed. Chapter V generalizes this result. For instance, contrary to Savage's result, our result does not require boundedness of utility. Chapter VI gives an introduction into the nowadays popular approach which deals with probabilities in a nonlinear way, enabling the description of optimism and pessimism in a way excluded by expected utility. Chapter VII shows that in the new approach classical results concerning attitudes towards risk can still be obtained. As compared to the work of Pratt and Arrow, not any quantification, given in advance, is needed. No probabilities have to be known, and no quantifications of the consequences that may result from decisions are needed. In the Appendix, a concise presentation is given of the 'classical' derivations of expected utility.

-- from the author

NEW BOOK. . .

The European Group for Process Studies of Decision Making has met annually over the past few years. We are now publishing a volume edited by H. Montgomery and O. Svenson entitled *Process and Structure in Human Decision Making*. According to Wiley, the publisher of the book, it will be available in February or March of 1989. The content spans theory and methods for the study of individual decision making processes to societal decision making.

--Ola Svenson

Recent Developments in the Psychology of Judgment and Decision Making

Compiled by JAY CHRISTENSEN-SZALANSKI, PhD, MPH

Journal Articles

ABELSON RP, Leddo J, Gross PH: The strength of conjunctive explanations. *Pers Soc Psy Bull* 13:141-155, 1987. Derives a formula which can be used to calculate the strength of conjunctive explanations.

AFFLECK G, Tennen H, Pfeiffer C, Fifield J: Appraisals of control and predictability in adapting to a chronic disease. *J Pers Soc Psy* 53:273-279, 1987. Shows that perceiving greater personal control over one's medical care and treatment was associated with positive mood and psychological adjustment.

ALBA JW, Marmorstein H: The effects of frequency knowledge on consumer decision making. *J Cons Res* 14:14-25, 1987. Proposes that knowledge about the mere number of positive and negative attributes possessed by a brand name has a strong impact on a consumer's decision making.

BISHOP GD: Lay conceptions of physical symptoms. *J Appl Soc Psy* 17:127-146, 1987. Concludes that people sort physical symptoms into four dimensions and that these dimensions are related to their predicted behavioral responses to symptoms.

BISHOP GD, Briede C, Cavazos L, et al: Processing illness information. The role of disease prototypes. *Basic Appl Soc Psy* 8:21-43, 1987. Proposes that information about physical symptoms is interpreted by relating those symptoms to pre-existing disease prototypes.

BURDESCU DV, Weiss W: Reflection of transitive and intransitive preferences. A test of prospect theory. *Organ Behav Human Decis* 39:184-202, 1987. Provides empirical support for the

reflection effect and shape of the value function hypothesized by prospect theory.

CONLON EJ, Parks JM: Information requests in the context of escalation. *J Appl Psy* 72:344-350, 1987. Observes that people who were responsible for a failure will be more retrospectively oriented than those who were not responsible for a failure.

CONNOLLY T, Thorn B: Predecisional information acquisition. Effects of task variables on suboptimal search strategies. *Organ Behav Human Decis* 39:397-416, 1987. Observes that people consistently underpurchase and mispurchase information prior to making a decision.

DAVIES MF: Reduction of hindsight bias by restoration of foresight perspective. Effectiveness of foresight-encoding and hindsight retrieval strategies. *Organ Behav Human Decis* 40:50-68, 1987. Examines the effect of changing the availability of foresight cognitions in hindsight upon reducing the hindsight bias.

FAGLEY NS, Miller PM: The effects of decision framing on choice of risky vs certain options. *Organ Behav Human Decis* 39:264-277, 1987. Concludes that unidentified factors affect whether a framing effect is observed and that the framing effect may not be as robust as has been believed.

GAETH GJ, Heath TB: The cognitive processing of misleading advertising in young and old adults. Assessment and training. *J Cons Res* 14:43-54, 1987. Observes similarities and differences between young and old adults' susceptibilities to misleading advertising.

GILOVICH T: Secondhand information and social judgment. *J Exp Soc Psy* 23:59-74, 1987. Observes that secondhand impressions of other people are more extreme than those based on firsthand information.

HOCH SJ: Perceived consensus and predictive accuracy. The

pros and cons of projection. *J Pers Soc Psy* 53:221-234. 1987. Identifies conditions where perceived consensus diminishes predictive accuracy and where it is a reasonable prediction strategy.

ISAN AM, Geva N. The influence of positive affect on acceptable level of risk. The person with a large canoe has a large worry. *Organ Behav Human Decis* 39:145-154. 1987. Reports that positive affect increases a person's inclinations to take a small risk but reduces the tendency toward risk taking where risk is high and a meaningful loss is possible.

KERLEN G, Wagenaar WA: Violation of utility theory in unique and repeated gambles. *J Exp Psychol [Learn]* 13:387-391. 1987. Demonstrates the need to distinguish between unique and repeated gambles: proposes that violations of utility theory obtained under unique conditions cannot necessarily be generalized to repeated conditions.

LASKER KB, Fischer GW: Estimating utility functions in the presence of response error. *Manage Sci* 33:965-980. 1987. Observes little response error when direct multiattribute utility assessment procedures are used as a basis for modeling preferences for risky multiattribute alternatives.

LOPES LL: Procedural debiasing. *Acta Psy (Amst)* 64:167-185. 1987. Presents two experiments that illustrate how Bayesian inferences can be debiased by analyzing and correcting the cognitive procedures that lead to the biases.

NICKERSON RS, Baddeley A, Freeman B: Are people's estimates of what other people know influenced by what they themselves know? *Acta Psy (Amst)* 64:245-259. 1987. Reports that people are more likely to impute knowledge to other people if they have it themselves.

PARISI N, Katz I: Attitudes toward posthumous organ donation and commitment to donate. *Health Psy* 5:565-580. 1986. Identifies factors that contribute to people's attitudes toward posthumous organ donation.

POLLATSEK A, Well AD, Konold C, Hardiman P, Cobb G: Understanding conditional probabilities. *Organ Behav Human Decis* 40:255-269. 1987. Reports that changes in the wording

of statistical word problems affected whether or not subjects exhibited a bias in judging probabilities.

RAVENHILL A: Research paradigms and expected utility models for the provision of step-level public goods. *Psychol Rev* 94:74-83. 1987. Examines the effects of fear and greed on people's decisions to provide public goods.

ROXIS DL, Yates JF: Components of probability judgment accuracy. Individual consistency and effects of subject matter and assessment method. *Organ Behav Human Decis* 40:193-218. 1987. Examines the effects of three different methods to elicit people's probability judgments upon various components of probability judgment accuracy.

RUTTER CG, Wilke HAM, Messick DM: The effects of framing social dilemmas as give-some or take-some games. *Br J Soc Psy* 26:103-108. 1987. Observes that people were more inclined to relinquish decision-making authority to a leader when they faced a "take-some" social dilemma than a "give-some" social dilemma.

RUTTER CG, Wilke HAM, Messick DM: Scarcity or abundance caused by people or the environment as determinants of behavior in the resource dilemma. *J Exp Soc Psy* 23:208-216. 1987. Observes that people respond differently to people-induced scarcities and abundances of resources than to nature-induced ones.

SHIELDS MD, Solomon I, Waller WS: Effects of alternative sample space representations on the accuracy of auditors' uncertainty judgments. *Account Organ Society* 12:375-385. 1987. Observes no differences in the accuracy of judgments made by auditors given different representations of an audit problem.

SHIFFMAN S, Shurtaker SA, Abrams DB, et al: Models of smoking relapse. *Health Psy* 5(Suppl):13-27. 1986. Offers a framework within which research investigations of smoking relapse might be conceptualized.

WAGENER JJ, Taylor SE: What else could I have done? Patients' responses to failed treatment decisions. *Health Psy* 5:481-496. 1986. Concludes that cognitive factors may play a role in undermining possible self-recrimination following failed treatment decisions in which a patient has been involved.

STUDENT 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 (J/DM) bulletin. Send entries to: Undergraduate Paper Contest, Center for Decision Research, 1101 Esat 58th Street, Chicago, IL 60637.

Recent Developments in Medical Decision Making

Compiled by JAY CHRISTENSEN-SZALANSKI, PhD, MPH

Journal Articles

ANNANDALE EC: Dimensions of patient control in a free-standing birth center. *Soc Sci Med* 25:1235-1248, 1987. Explores the ability of patients to translate a desire for control into controlling behavior.

BARNET GO, Cimino JJ, Hupp JA, Hoffer EP: DXplain. An evolving diagnostic decision-support system. *JAMA* 258:67-74, 1987. Explains a DSS designed for use by the physician who has no computer expertise.

BROOK RH, Fink A, Kosecoff J, et al: Educating physicians and treating patients in the ambulatory setting. Where are we going and how will we know when we arrive? *Ann Intern Med* 107:392-398, 1987. Recommends the addition of programs in ambulatory care and housestaff education to improve the quality of care in the ambulatory setting.

BROWN MS, Brown CA: Circumcision decision. Prominence of social concerns. *Pediatrics* 80:215-219, 1987. Observes that parents base their decision predominantly on social concerns.

CHENEY C, Ramsdell JW: Effect of medical records' checklists on implementation of periodic health measures. *Am J Med* 83:129-136, 1987. Demonstrates that a physician's use of simple checklists can provide an effective means of improving implementation of periodic health measures.

CHOW LP, Rider RV, Su SH, Hou WT: Contraceptive and fertility behavior of family planning clinic dropouts. A Maryland study. *Am J Public Health* 77:975-978, 1987. Observes that women were "protected" from pregnancy risk beyond their last clinic visit but that their contraceptive use was inconsistent and ineffective.

CHRISTENSEN-SZALANSKI JJJ, Boyce WT, Harrell H, Gardner MM: Circumcision and informed consent. Is more information always better? *Med Care* 25:856-867, 1987. Observes that full disclosure of risk information made parents less confident and more dissatisfied with their physician's behavior.

ELSTER AB, Lamb ME, Tavaré J, Ralston CW: The medical and psychosocial impact of comprehensive care on adolescent pregnancy and parenthood. *JAMA* 258:1187-1192, 1987. Suggests that comprehensive care has little effect on pregnancy outcomes for those who are already receiving prenatal services, but does not have an effect on events occurring during the first and second postpartum years.

FITZPATRICK R, Ikkos G, Frost D, Nazeer S: The assessment of patients' distress in genito-urinary medicine clinics. *Soc Sci Med* 25:1197-1203, 1987. Examines several variables that limit the communication of psychological distress between patient and physician.

GLENN JK, Lawler FH, Hoerl MS: Physician referrals in a competitive environment. An estimate of the economic impact

of a referral. *JAMA* 258:1920-1923, 1987. Finds that the average referral to university-based specialists generated more than \$2,900 in combined hospital charges and professional fees within a six-month period after referral.

GORE JM, Goldberg RJ, Alpert JS, Dalen JE: The increased use of diagnostic procedures in patients with acute myocardial infarction. A community-wide perspective. *Arch Intern Med* 147:1729-1732, 1987. Reports on the increased use of various diagnostic procedures from 1975 to 1984.

GREENWALD HP: The specificity of quality-of-life measures among the seriously ill. *Med Care* 25:642-651, 1987. Concludes that the SIP, POMS, and the MPQ measures of quality-of-life measure the specific dimensions their names imply even among individuals with illnesses posing immediate threats to survival.

HAGGMARK C, Theorell T, Ek B: Coping and social activity patterns among relatives of cancer patients. *Soc Sci Med* 25:1021-1025, 1986. Examines the manner in which relatives of cancer patients change their social patterns when they take a more active part in the care of the patient.

HAYNES RB, Walker CJ: Computer-aided quality assurance. A critical appraisal. *Arch Intern Med* 147:1297-1301, 1987. Analyzes 135 studies of computerized information systems: reports that only 11% met minimum criteria for scientific investigations and that patient outcomes were not measured, not affected, or only minimally influenced by the aid.

HILDEN J: Reporting clinical trials from the viewpoint of a patient's choice of treatment. *Stat Med* 6:745-752, 1987. Concludes that investigators should present the outcome of the significance test as a function of inverted inference.

KOSECOFF J, Brook RH, Fink A, et al: Providing primary general medical care in university hospitals. Efficiency and cost. *Ann Intern Med* 107:399-405, 1987. Examines the efficiency and profits of 15 internal medicine outpatient group practices in university hospitals; concludes that it is financially feasible for university hospitals to provide primary care to disadvantaged populations.

LOMAS J, Pickard L, Mohide A: Patient versus clinical item generation for quality-of-life measures. The case of language-disabled adults. *Med Care* 25:764-769, 1987. Demonstrates that language-disabled adults can generate items for a quality-of-life measure and that clinician-generated items are not representative of patient values.

MANCUSO CA, Rose DN: A model for physicians' therapeutic decision making. *Arch Intern Med* 147:1281-1285, 1987. Reports that physicians selected a few facts (focal points), evaluated each fact individually with respect to treatment options, and summed the focal points to make the final therapeutic decision.

MECHANIC D, Angel RJ: Some factors associated with the report and evaluation of back pain. *J Health Soc Behav* 28:131-139, 1987. Reports on emotional and social factors that affect perception of pain and overall health.

Received from the Department of Management Sciences, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242, USA.

O'CONNOR A, Boyd NF, Warde P, et al: Eliciting preferences for alternative drug therapies in oncology. Influence of treatment outcome description, elicitation technique and treatment experience on preferences. *J Chronic Dis* 40:811-818, 1987. Reports that preferences remained stable over time and questions the extent to which patients are willing, at the time of decision making, to trade off survival rate for improved quality of life.

RICH EC, Crowson TW, Harris JB: The diagnostic value of the medical history. Perceptions of internal medicine physicians. *Arch Intern Med* 147:1957-1960, 1987. Concludes that physicians continue to view the patient's history as the preeminent source of diagnostic information.

ROBINSON TN, Killen JD, Taylor CB, et al: Perspectives on adolescent substance use. A defined population study. *JAMA* 258:2072-2076, 1987. Suggests that for many purposes substance use may be considered a single behavior regardless of the specific substances used and that substance use may exist as part of a syndrome of adolescent problem behaviors.

SAUNDERS CE: Patient compliance in filling prescriptions after discharge from the emergency department. *Am J Emerg Med* 5:283-286, 1987. Concludes that about one fifth of prescriptions given to patients in the emergency room are not filled.

SCHMIDT AJM, Arnitz A: Psychological research and chronic low back pain. A stand-still or a breakthrough? *Soc Sci Med* 25:1095-1104, 1987. Proposes several future areas of research for gaining a better insight into chronic lower back pain.

SHORTLIFFE EH: Computer programs to support clinical decision making. *JAMA* 258:61-66, 1987. Summarizes the current status of computer-based medical decision support.

SMITH DG, Wigton RS: Modeling decisions to use tube feeding in seriously ill patients. *Arch Intern Med* 147:1242-1245, 1987. Identifies different patterns among physicians' use of patients' preferences in their decision making.

TIERNEY WA, McDonald CJ, Martin DK, et al: Computerized display of past test results. Effect on outpatient training. *Ann Intern Med* 107:569-574, 1987. Observes that physicians presented with previous test results reduced the ordering of those tests by more than 13%.

WEINSTEIN MC, Coxson PG, Williams LW, et al: Forecasting coronary heart disease incidence, mortality, and cost. The coronary heart disease policy model. *Am J Public Health* 77:1417-1426, 1987. Develops a computer simulation model to project the future mortality, morbidity, and cost of coronary heart disease in the U.S. population.

WILKINSON IF, Darby DN, Mant A: Self-care and self-medication. An evaluation of individuals' health care decisions. *Med Care* 25:965-978, 1987. Reports that a panel of experienced general practitioners evaluated only 2% of patients' self-care and self-medication actions to be inappropriate and potentially harmful.

YOUNG MJ, McMahon LF, Stross JK: Prediction rules for patients with suspected myocardial infarction. Applying guidelines in community hospitals. *Arch Intern Med* 147:1219-1222, 1987. Shows that guidelines established in university

teaching hospitals were not always applicable in community hospitals.

Essays

ADELSTEIN SJ: Uncertainty and relative risks of radiation exposure. *JAMA* 258:655-657, 1987. Discusses means of conveying the magnitude of risks of radiation to patients.

AREEN J: The legal status of consent obtained from families of adult patients to withhold or withdraw treatment. *JAMA* 258:229-235, 1987. Reviews the discrepancies between medical custom and law in obtaining consent from adult patient proxies.

BRENNAN TA: Untangling causation issues in law and medicine. Hazardous substance litigation. *Ann Intern Med* 107:741-747, 1987. Discusses some of the problems faced in courts of law by physicians who cite probabilistic evidence of causation.

BRISKMAN L: Doctors and witchdoctors. Which doctors are which? 1. *Br Med J* 295:1033-1036, 1987. Examines the possible sources from which the medical profession derives its generally acknowledged intellectual status.

DETSKY AS, Redelmeier D, Abrams HB: What's wrong with decision analysis? Can the left brain influence the right? *J Chronic Dis* 40:831-836, 1987. Questions whether decision analysis can change physicians' attitudes and behavior. (Commentary follows—Pauker SG, Kassirer JP: Marchiafava-bignami disease among academicians in Toronto. Can decision analysis help? *J Chronic Dis* 40:837-838, 1987.)

DRUMMOND M, Stoddart G, Labelle R, Cushman R: Health economics. An introduction for clinicians. *Ann Intern Med* 107:88-92, 1987. Outlines several basic notions of health economics.

HARRIS J: QALYing the value of life. *J Med Ethics* 13:117-123, 1987. Argues that the Quality Adjusted Life Years is fatally flawed as a way of priority setting in health care. (Commentary follows—Williams A: Response. QALYing the value of life. *J Med Ethics* 13:123, 1987.)

MOSTELLER F: Assessing quality of institutional care. *Am J Public Health* 77:1155-1156, 1987. Discusses some of the pitfalls associated with assessing the quality of hospital care.

REES J: Take a teaching ward round. *Br Med J* 295:424-425, 1987. Provides "how to" advice on teaching ward rounds.

ROBIN ED: Of hydras, lemmings, and diagnostic tests. *Arch Intern Med* 147:1704-1705, 1987. Argues that risk/benefit analysis should be physicians' primary concern and cost/benefit analysis a secondary concern.

TOOMBS SK: The meaning of illness. A phenomenological approach to the patient-physician relationship. *J Med Philos* 12:219-240, 1987. Notes that physicians and patients encounter the experience of illness from within the context of different "worlds"; discusses central factors that constitute these "worlds."

**The Operations Research Society of America
Special Interest Group on Decision Analysis**

announces the

Fourth Annual Decision Analysis Student Paper Competition

For the fourth consecutive year, the ORSA Special Interest Group on Decision Analysis solicits entries in a competition among papers written by students in decision analysis. In the past, submissions have spanned a wide range of decision analysis topics and research methods, including both theoretical and applied work. We encourage entries from all aspects of decision analysis, as reflected in sessions sponsored by the Special Interest Group at recent ORSA/TIMS meetings.

TO ENTER: Send five copies of a written paper to:

Professor Robert T. Clemen
College of Business Administration
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

The deadline for submissions is **July 15, 1989**. A cover letter should provide the student's current address, telephone number, and current employer. Also list the academic institution attended, degree, graduation date, and major professor.

The paper should be less than thirty double-spaced, typewritten pages. It must be based on work done while a student. Papers co-authored with faculty members will be considered as long as they are based on an earlier sole-authored paper by the student (such as a dissertation or thesis). Those who graduated in June, 1988, or earlier are not eligible.

JUDGING: Professor Clemen is the chair of a panel that will judge the papers. The criteria used in the judging will be the same as those described in the editorial policy of *Operations Research*. If none of the submitted papers are judged to be excellent contributions to decision analysis, the panel of judges may choose not to award the prize. The results of the judging will be announced to the competitors around September 1, 1989.

PRESENTATION: The winner is scheduled to present the winning paper at the Joint National Meeting of the Operations Research Society of America and the Institute of Management Sciences in New York, October 16-18, 1989. It is hoped that the winner's university will provide travel funds to attend the meeting. The winner will also be invited to join representatives of the Special Interest Group Council for a celebratory dinner at the meeting.

Contact Professor Clemen by mail or telephone (503-686-5108) for answers to questions.

POSITIONS AVAILABLE. . .**DECISION ANALYST**

The Program in Clinical Decision Making, Department of Family Medicine, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center seeks a Ph.D. level decision analyst to fill a newly created tenure track faculty position. Candidates should have experience in applying decision analysis to solve medical problems. Applicants should send their resume to:

Stephen J. Spann, M.D.
Department of Family Medicine, OUHSC
800 N.E. 15th Street, Room 503
Oklahoma City, OK 73118

PROJECT MANAGER

To manage large NSF funded cooperative research effort examining decisions surrounding insurance and other risk management behaviors. Primary responsibilities will be in two areas: (1) Coordination and management of the project including budget coordination, supervision of project personnel and dissemination of results, and (2) Facilitating research projects including managing contacts with external parties such as insurance companies and regulators, managing surveys, and assisting in questionnaire design and development.

The ideal candidate would have interest in decision-making or a related area, and have some experience in research. The position is available immediately. Compensation is competitive in the range of \$20,000-\$35,000 depending upon experience. For further information, please contact either Prof. John Hershey, Department of Decision Sciences, or Prof. Eric J. Johnson, Department of Marketing:

The Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA, 19104.

The University of Pennsylvania is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

At the Chicago J/DM meeting Howard Kunreuther and Robin Gregory announced that The National Science Foundation is seeking candidates for the position of Program Director and/or Associate Program Director for the Decision, Risk, and Management Science Program. The two year assignment would begin Fall, 1989 and will involve responsibility for coordinating, encouraging and evaluating research and research proposals; interacting with the research community and other programs within NSF in order to ensure the continued growth and success of this very successful program; and the development of new and creative research directions. They noted that current DRMS research is in the modelling of operational and managerial processes, risk management, design of organizational processes, and studies of behavioral decision making. Kunreuther and Gregory added that a qualified individual must have a proven research record, some administrative experience, and interest in and ability to effect change in the federal research establishment, and the capacity to inspire and develop new research and funding initiatives. An obvious credential is also an acquaintance with members of the decision, risk, operations research, and management science research communities.

Interested individuals should contact Howard or Robin at NSF, DRMS/ 1800 G Street, Room 336, Washington, DC 20050; (202)357-7417.

SOCIETY FOR JUDGMENT AND DECISION MAKING

1989 DUES FORM

Please check your mailing label. If it does not have a "9" in the upper left-hand corner, we have not received your dues for 1989. (If you sent your dues in the last three weeks, we may not have had time to record your payment.)

If your name and/or address on the mail label is incorrect, please make corrections below:

Name _____ Phone _____

Address _____ EMAIL _____

City _____ State _____ ZIP _____

1989 Dues: Member \$10.00, Student \$5.00

Please make checks payable to the JUDGMENT/DECISION MAKING SOCIETY. Checks must be in US dollars and payable through a US bank. Please complete the form and mail it with your check to:

Stephen E. Edgell
Secretary/Treasurer
Department of Psychology
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40292

* Students must have endorsement of a faculty member:

Faculty Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: _____ Institution: _____

