

JUDGMENT / DECISION MAKING

J/DM ANNUAL MEETING. . .

The J/DM Annual meeting will be held in Seattle on November 8-9, 1987. Unlike the majority of past meetings, this meeting will take place on Sunday and Monday. Currently, the meeting is scheduled to start at 1 p.m. on Sunday, and will conclude at about 3:30 p.m. on Monday. As in earlier years, we hope that the Psychonomics Society will schedule a decision making session on Sunday morning.

THE PROGRAM...

The program for the annual meeting is in its final stages of organization. Tentative speakers and topics are Amnon Rapoport on the provision of public goods and Glen Shafer on the problem of small worlds. Three symposia are being organized: Ola Svenson is organizing a session on Cognitive Processes in Decision Making, Richard Thaler is organizing one on Behavioral Economics, and Mary Kay Stevenson and George Loewenstein are organizing one on Time Discounting in Decision Making. And of course we will have a chairperson's address by James Shanteau. Full details will be in the next Newsletter.

-- Tom Wallsten

LOCAL ARRANGEMENTS...

Unlike previous meetings, J/DM will not be meeting in the same hotel as Psychonomics. The bad news is that the Seattle Sheraton, which is hosting Psychonomics, was completely booked by another group. The good news is that we have been able to arrange for space at a nearby hotel, the Holiday Inn Crowne Plaza. The Crowne Plaza is a short, 2 block walk from the Sheraton. It is an attractive, comfortable hotel with excellent facilities and a full range of hotel services. The Crowne Plaza has also offered us what appears to be very attractive rates: \$55 per night for a single room, \$65 for a double (plus 12.9% room tax). We have reserved a block of rooms starting on Saturday, November 7. For those of you attending Psychonomics who wish to avoid changing hotels, the Crowne Plaza indicated that they can probably make this rate available to you at an earlier date. We do need to take a minimum number of rooms in order to avoid additional costs for using the facilities. Therefore, if you have a choice of hotels, please consider staying at the Crowne Plaza.

We will be sending more complete information, including hotel reservation cards, in late August or early September. See you in Seattle!

-- Don Kleinmuntz

CONTENTS

From the Editor.....	2
Announcement: Hillel Einhorn New Investigator Award.....	3
Recent Philosophical Literature -- J. Baron.....	4
New Journal: Behavioral Decision Making.....	5
Israeli Conference on Judgment and Decision Making.....	7
Book Review.....	9
New Book.....	10
Recent Developments in Medical Decision Making.....	11
Call for Papers: Audit Judgment Symposium.....	15
J/DM Address Change and Dues Form.....	15
New Software: Policy PC.....	16

SUBMISSION DEADLINE FOR THE NEXT J/DM NEWSLETTER: AUGUST 21, 1987

NEWSLETTER

Vol. VI
Number 3
July 1987

SOCIETY FOR JUDGMENT AND DECISION MAKING

Executive Board

James C. Shanteau, Chairperson
 Kenneth R. Hammond, Chairperson-elect
 Lola Lopes, 1986-87
 John Carroll, 1986-88
 R. Duncan Luce, 1986-89
 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) 335-4261

BITNET: castellan@IUBACS

Addresses & Corrections:

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

(502) 588-5948

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 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: 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 otherwise undeliverable are neither forwarded nor returned. Therefore we have no way of knowing if copies are delivered. Address changes or corrections should be reported to Steve Edgell.

Mailing Labels: Some readers may wish to send reprint lists or other material to people listed in the directory. Contact Steve 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 the J/DM Electronic Mail Directory) contact the Editor.

HILLEL EINHORN MEMORIAL FUND

HILLEL EINHORN NEW INVESTIGATOR AWARD

The Executive Board of the Judgment/Decision Making Society is pleased to announce the Hillel Einhorn New Investigator Award. To honor Hilly's contributions to judgment and decision making research, a Hillel Einhorn Memorial Fund is being established. The fund will be used to institute an annual award to be given for the best original contribution by a new investigator in the judgment and decision making area.

The J/DM board felt that this award was in keeping with Hilly's emphasis on encouraging young researchers. The award recognizes the help and guidance that Hilly gave to new investigators at the University of Chicago throughout his career.

An Einhorn Award Committee has been formed with Gary McClelland (chair) and Robin Hogarth and Irwin Levin (members). The committee is in the process of establishing ground rules for the award. Formal announcement of the award and solicitation of nominations will appear in a forthcoming issue of the J/DM Newsletter.

The recipient of the award each year, if any, will be invited to make a formal presentation at the annual J/DM meeting. The recipient's name will be inscribed on a permanent plaque. Other tangible forms of recognition will also be given.

Funds to establish the award are now being solicited. Anyone wishing to make a contribution should make a check out to the "Einhorn Memorial Fund" and mail it to:

Judgment/Decision Making Society
c/o Stephen E. Edgell, Secretary/Treasurer
Department of Psychology
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky 40292
(Phone: 502/588-5948)

Any questions or comments about the establishment of the Einhorn Memorial Fund should be addressed to: James Shanteau, Executive Board Chair, Department of Psychology, Bluemont Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506-7095 (Phone: 913/532-6850).

Suggestions or ideas for the New Investigator Award Committee should be addressed to: Gary McClelland, Award Committee Chair, CRJP, Department of Psychology, CB 344, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309-0344 (Phone: 303/492-8122).

RECENT PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE - Jonathan Baron

Note: The study of judgment and decision making often touches on - or crashes into - philosophical questions. My purpose here is to review some important work on these questions from the last few years, to show that progress is being made in philosophy, and to show that the borders of disciplines are breaking down as quickly in the "decision sciences" as in the "cognitive sciences." - JB

Moral Thinking: Its levels, method, and point, by R.M. Hare. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981. 242 pp.

This book develops Hare's ideas as expressed in The language of morals (1952) and Freedom and reason (1963). Hare develops and defends the idea that truly moral statements are prescriptive, meaning that they are like imperative statements and therefore cannot be inferred from descriptive statements alone, and that they are universal, meaning that they are intended to apply to anyone in the same circumstances. He applies these criteria to the difficult question of fanaticism and other issues. He argues that "universal prescriptivism" leads to a kind of utilitarianism in which preferences of different people (at different times) are traded off as if they were those of a single person.

The most important contribution of this book is its development of the idea of two-level utilitarianism: act-utilitarianism at the "critical" level (the level of the "Archangel") and rule-utilitarianism at the "intuitive" level (that of the "Prole"). Critical thinking steps back and analyzes a situation thoroughly and dispassionately. It is presumably what is approximated by multiattribute utility analysis (provided that only consequences for preference satisfaction are included), and it is part of what we call "normative" theory. Intuitive thinking corresponds to the rules we try to follow in our daily lives: don't lie; do your job; give the other guy the benefit of the doubt; etc. These rules are the "heuristics" of moral life; we feel guilty when we knowingly violate them. Critical thinking is not always possible, and it may be self-defeating if attempted at the wrong time.

The critical-intuitive distinction provides a defense of utilitarianism against objections that appeal to moral intuitions. Such intuitions are correct only if they can be justified at the critical level. They cannot themselves be used as arguments against a theory of critical moral thinking. However, if they can be justified, we usually ought to follow them even if a utilitarian analysis seems to say otherwise.

Hare does not discuss decision theory as such, but arguments analogous to his may apply to such issues as the normative status of utility theory and the sorts of things that should count as utility attributes. His conclusions about utilitarianism, and related issues such as interpersonal comparison of utility, bear directly on normative models of games, social dilemmas, and intertemporal choice. He does not spell these out (except the last, in 5.6), but his book is an essential first step for anyone who wants to do so.

No special background is required to understand the arguments, although Hare spends a lot of space answering criticisms of his earlier work. I urge the reader who is interested in the topic to damn these torpedoes and push ahead. This book has influenced my own thinking considerably, and, although some criticisms have been made (e.g., in R.G. Frey (Ed.), Utilitarianism and Rights, 1984), I do not believe they have stuck.

Journal of

BEHAVIORAL DECISION MAKING

First issue due to be published January 1988

Editor

George Wright,
Bristol Business School, Coldharbour Lane,
Frenchay, Bristol BS16 1QY, England

Associate Editor

J. Frank Yates,
Department of Psychology,
University of Michigan, 136 Perry Building,
330 Packard Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48104,
USA

Submission of Papers

Authors wishing to submit papers for publication should send 4 copies of the manuscript to the Editor, George Wright, at the address given above. Since it is cheaper, American authors should send their cover letters and manuscript copies separately via airmail.



To be published quarterly by
John Wiley & Sons Ltd
Baffins Lane, Chichester, West Sussex
PO19 1UD, England

Aims and Scope

The Journal of Behavioral Decision Making is a multidisciplinary journal with a broad base of content and style. It will publish original empirical reports, theoretical analyses, methodological contributions and critical review papers. The Journal will also feature book and software reviews, abstracts of important articles published elsewhere and teaching suggestions.

The objective of the Journal is to present and stimulate behavioral research on decision making and to provide a forum for the evaluation of complementary, contrasting and conflicting perspectives. These perspectives include experimental psychology, differential psychology, management science, sociology, political science and behavioral economics. Studies of behavioral decision making in naturalistic and applied settings are encouraged.

Articles on specialist topics should aim for wider readability by including fully referenced introductions on the background to a particular study and, where possible, should discuss the broader implications of the work.

The Journal especially welcomes manuscripts that deal with issues that have cross-disciplinary impact. Such manuscripts will be considered for publication together with a selection of commentaries from members of the editorial board.

Reviews will be "collaborationist" in the sense that reviewers will be asked to do more than point out flaws and will suggest design improvements, new ideas, relevant references and follow-up studies. Reviewers will be offered the opportunity to publish comments alongside the article.

Papers published in the Journal of Behavioral Decision Making will encompass, but not be limited to, the following areas:

- individual decision making, emphasising situational and cognitive-style orientated research
- management science and decision aids, emphasising the role of judgment and behavioral factors in the implementation of decision technologies
- interpersonal and small group decision making
- organizational decision making
- social and political structuring of decision making, providing a wider account of the social context and its constraints on decision making
- behavioral economics
- expert systems, emphasising the modeling of judgment and behavioral issues in evaluation and implementation
- consumer decision making
- behavioral accounting
- medical and clinical decision making
- strategic decision making

Journal of Behavioral Decision Making**Editorial Board**

Paul Anand,
Darwin College, Cambridge, UK

Hal R. Arkes,
Ohio University, Athens, USA

Peter Ayton,
City of London Polytechnic, London, UK

Maya Bar-Hillel,
Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel

F. Hutton Barron,
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA

Lee Roy Beach,
University of Washington, Seattle, USA

David Bell,
Harvard University, Massachusetts, USA

Charles J. Brainerd,
University of Arizona, Tucson, USA

Steven J. Brams,
New York University, USA

Berndt Brehmer,
University of Uppsala, Sweden

Rex V. Brown,
Decision Science Consortium, Virginia,
USA

Derek Bunn,
London Business School, UK

Gibson Burrell,
University of Lancaster, UK

N. John Castellan,
Indiana University, Bloomington, USA

Jay Christensen-Szalanski,
University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

Clyde Coombs,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA

James H. Davis,
University of Illinois, Champaign, USA

Jack Dowie,
Open University, Milton Keynes, UK

Ward Edwards,
University of Southern California, Los Angeles,
USA

Johnathan St. B.T. Evans,
Plymouth Polytechnic, UK

William R. Ferrell,
University of Arizona, Tucson, USA

James W. Gentry,
University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA

David M. Grether,
California Institute of Technology, Pasadena,
USA

Kenneth R. Hammond,
University of Colorado, Boulder, USA

John Hershey,
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA

Frank A. Heller,
The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations,
London, UK

John D. Hey,
University of York, UK

Patrick Humphreys,
London School of Economics, UK

John W. Hunt,
London Business School, UK

Alice Isen,
University of Maryland, Catonsville, USA

Irving Janis,
University of California at Berkeley, USA

Michael Jones-Lee,
University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, UK

Helmut Jungermann,
Technische Universität, Berlin, West Germany

Roger P. King,
Humboldt College of Higher Education, Hull,
UK

Martin Landau,
University of California at Berkeley, USA

Richard Lebow,
Cornell University, New York, USA

Alan Lewis,
University of Bath, UK

Robert Libby,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA

Andrew Lock,
Kingston Polytechnic, Kingston-Upon-Thames,
UK

Graham Loomes,
University of York, UK

Lola L. Lopes,
University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA

Leon Mann,
The Flinders University of South Australia,
South Australia

James G. March,
Stanford University, California, USA

David M. Messick,
University of California at Santa Barbara, USA

Herbert Moskowitz,
Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana,
USA

Richard Nisbett,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan,
USA

John Payne,
Duke University, Durham, North Carolina,
USA

Alan D. Pearman,
University of Leeds, UK

Lawrence D. Phillips,
London School of Economics, London, UK

Gordon Pitz,
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, USA

Eugene A. Rosa,
Social and Economic Sciences Research
Center, Pullman, Washington, USA

Graeme Salaman,
Open University, Milton Keynes, UK

Richard Sease,
University of Kent at Canterbury, UK

Nils-Eric Sahlin,
Lund University, Sweden

Guje Sevon,
Swedish School of Economics and Business
Administration, Finland

James Shanteau,
Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

Lennart Sjoberg,
Stockholm School of Economics, Sweden

Paul Slovic,
Decision Research, Eugene, Oregon, USA

Ola Svenson,
University of Stockholm, Sweden

Karl H. Teigen,
University of Bergen, Norway

Philip Tetlock,
University of California at Berkeley, USA

Richard Thaler,
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, USA

Reinhard Tietz,
Johann Wolfgang-Goethe Universität, Frankfurt,
West Germany

Masanao Toda,
Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan

Tadeusz Tyszka,
Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland

Steven R. Watson,
University of Cambridge, UK

Alexander J. Wearing,
University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

David Weeks,
City of London Polytechnic, UK

Dan Zakay,
Tel-Aviv University, Israel

Journal of Behavioral Decision Making**Sample Copy/Notes for Contributors Request**

Please send me a free sample copy when published

Please send me full notes for contributors

Please return to:

Dept AC, John Wiley & Sons Ltd, Baffins
Lane, Chichester, West Sussex
PO19 1UD, England

Name _____

Organization _____

Address _____



המכון לעיבוד מידע וקבלת החלטות
 The Institute of Information Processing and Decision Making

The Second Israeli Conference on
 Judgment and Decision Making

The conference was held on June 10 and 11, 1987 at the Technion and the University of Haifa, and it was attended by 60 researchers and students. Following is a list of the 25 papers presented at the conference:

Session 1 Provision of public goods

1. Matching behavior and collective action:
 Theory and experiments -- J. Guttman
 (Economics, Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan).
2. Provision of public goods with continuous contributions and random provision threshold -- R. Suleiman
 (Institute of Information Processing and Decision Making, University of Haifa).
3. Public goods, consumption externalities and noncooperative theory of bargaining -- M. Gradstein
 (Industrial Engineering and Management, Technion, Haifa).
4. The effect of communication on the provision of public goods in an inter group competition -- G. Borenstein
 (Psychology, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem).

Session 2 Decisions in business organizations

1. Ethics in the business decision process: A systems view --
 R. Rosenberg
 (Industrial Engineering and Management, Technion, Haifa).
2. Risk in managerial decision making -- Z. Shapira
 (School of Business Administration, Hebrew University of Jerusalem).

Session 4. Applications

1. Problem in evaluation of information in decision making --
N. Ahituv
(School of Business Administration, Tel Aviv University)
2. Clinical algorithms -- C. Margalit
(Medical School, Ben Gurion University in Beer Sheva).
3. Mathematical modelling in public policy analysis --
A. Breiner
(Industrial Engineering and Management, Technion, Haifa)

Session 5 Judgment under uncertainty and social judgment

1. Prediction of various biases by a simple inference model --
Y. Klar
(Psychology, Tel Aviv University).
2. Combining probabilistic uncertainty with fuzzy imprecision in a
probability encoding task -- R. Zwick
(Industrial Engineering and Management, Carnegie-Mellon
University, Pittsburgh, USA).
3. Judgments of distributive justice -- M. Bar-Hillel
(Psychology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem).

Session 6 Revealing the structure of preferences

1. Revelation in auctions and the structure of preferences --
Z. Safra
(Economics, Tel Aviv University).
2. A metric axiomatic approach to the scaling of pairwise comparisons
-- M. Kress
(Industrial Engineering and Management, Technion, Haifa).
3. A comparison of the Analytic Hierarchy Process and the Multi-
Attribute Utility Theory in project evaluation -- Z. Sinuani-Stern
(Industrial Engineering and Management, Ben Gurion University,
Beer Sheva).

4. Intransitive preferences as a function of the decision process,
presentation mode and context -- D. Zakay
(Psychology, Tel Aviv University).

Session 7 Individual decision making

1. Discount rates inferred from decisions : An experimental study --
U. Ben Zion
(Industrial Engineering and Management, Technion, Haifa).
2. Solution of conflicts -- S. Satath (PILAT, Jerusalem).
3. The compatibility principle and the reversal of preferences --
- A. Tversky
(Psychology, Stanford University, USA).

Session 8 Public choice and group decision making

1. Covert cooperation in noncooperative voting games : A new model of
sophisticated voting -- D. Felsenthal
(Political Sciences, University of Haifa)
2. Attitudes and voting behavior : How does the voter decide? --
M. Katz
(Psychology, University of Haifa).
3. On the nonexistence of prisoner's dilemma in a prison setting --
S. Maital
(Industrial Engineering and Management, Technion, Haifa).
4. Application of the theory of social situations to a veto voting
game -- E. Weg
(Institute of Information Processing and Decision Making,
University of Haifa).
5. Sensitivity of limited majority decision rules to the size of the
group -- D. Krotkin
(Economics, Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan).

BOOK REVIEW

Brehmer, B, Jungermann, H., Lourens, P., and Sevón, G. New Directions in Research on Decision Making. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1986.

It is instructive to compare this book, which contains the proceedings of the 1985 Helsinki Subjective Probability, Utility, and Decision Making (SPUDM) conference, with the earlier proceedings of this bi-annual conference. The earliest volume of proceedings that I own is for the 1975 conference, exactly 10 years earlier. The emphasis in 1975 was on subjective probability, featuring risk in a minor role, and multi-attribute utility. The unstated assumption seems to have been that the decision process in all of its ramifications is captured by expected utility maximization (although dissent was evident), but that if left on their own, decision makers tend to use faulty probabilities and utilities in executing this normatively correct decision strategy. In contrast, 10 years later risk took on a starring role, the influence of cognitive psychology was pervasive, and expected utility was hardly mentioned.

The book begins with four papers that tie judgment and decision to motivation, economics, and cognition. Each paper contains an implicit criticism of the parochialism of judgment and decision research by insisting on a broader view. These four papers are followed by a series of empirical studies which also tie judgment and decision to other disciplines or to various applied areas.

The next section of the book focuses on risk research, and the last section contains studies of decision aiding. As one might expect, both of these two sections have a strong applied flavor. Of particular interest are measurement precision and judgmental accuracy, and their practical implications (or lack of them); eternal problems.

The change in contents of the SPUDM conferences over the years seems to me to suggest that a uniquely European perspective on judgment and decision making has come into its own. While many of the issues that interest American researchers also are of interest to European investigators, the former no longer set the agenda. If I were to characterize this European perspective, I would say that it favors integration of judgment and decision into theoretical and applied psychology in general and into cognitive psychology in particular. While empirical evidence is valued highly, it is not seen as the sole criterion for the worth of ideas; compatibility with theory and research in cognate areas of inquiry also is important. In my opinion, this perspective is likely to contribute more than the data-driven American perspective to the eventual emergence of judgment and decision from its comparative isolation and to its integration into the mainstream of psychology and the allied disciplines.

Lee Roy Beach, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

NEW BOOK...

JUDGMENTAL FORECASTING

Published by John Wiley & Sons

£29.95

Edited by
George Wright

\$53.00

Bristol Business School

and

Peter Ayton

Psychology Department, City of London Polytechnic

How good is human judgment? Are judgments made by groups better than those made by individuals.

This book focuses on the role of judgment in the forecasting process. It evaluates the worth of human judgment in forecasting and assesses the potential value of judgments made by groups. It also examines the possibility of using mathematical modelling to aid or replace judgmental forecasts and explores the issues in the generation and evaluation of scenarios.

Of interest to cognitive psychologists, forecasting practitioners and academics, this specially commissioned volume brings together original contributions from business schools and psychology departments and will stimulate further research into the role of judgmental forecasting.

Contents

I THE PSYCHOLOGY OF INDIVIDUAL JUDGMENT: 1 On the Adequacy of Judgmental Forecasts L.D. Phillips; 2 Beliefs and Expectations as Causes of Judgmental Bias J.St.B.T. Evans; 3 Assessing Human Judgment: Has it Been Done, Can it Be Done, Should it Be Done? L.R. Beach, J. Christensen-Szalanski and V. Barnes; 4 Subjective Estimation of Precise and Vague Uncertainties. D.V. Budescu and T.S. Wallsten; 5 The Psychology of Forecasting. G. Wright and P. Ayton; II JUDGMENT FROM GROUPS OF INDIVIDUALS: 6 Integrating Group Judgments in Subjective Forecasts A. Lock; 7 Delphi Inquiry Systems F.J. Parente and J.K. Anderson-Parente; 8 Forecasting Methods for Conflict Situations J.S. Armstrong; 9 Bridging the Gap Between Forecasting and Action G.A. Geistauts and T.G. Eschenbach; III USE OF MULTIPLE REGRESSION TECHNIQUES: 10 Social Judgment Theory and Forecasting B. Brehmer; 11 Linear Models as Decision Aids in Insurance Decision-making: The Case of Estimation of Automobile Insurance Claims D. Samson and H. Thomas; 12 Expert Use of Forecasts: Bootstrapping and Linear Models D. Bunn; IV THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SCENARIOS: 13 The Use of Mental Models for Generating Scenarios H. Jungermann and M. Thuring; 14 Judgmental Handling of Energy Scenarios: A Psychological Analysis and Experiment C. Vlek and W. Otten.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT...

Recent Developments in the Psychology of Judgment and Decision Making and Recent Developments in Medical Decision Making, are prepared by Jay J. Christensen-Szalanski, and 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 St., Cambridge, MA 02139.

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 administrations of health care programs. SMDM annual membership dues of \$60.00 (U.S.) includes a journal subscription. For libraries, non-SMDM members, etc., the annual subscription rate is \$88.00 (U.S.).

For information concerning SMDM membership or journal subscriptions, contact Dennis G. Fryback, Editor-in-Chief, Medical Decision Making, University of Wisconsin, 1513 University Avenue, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.

Recent Developments in Medical Decision Making

Compiled by JAY CHRISTENSEN-SZALANSKI, PhD, MPH

Journal Articles

- ALEXANDER JA, Fennell MI: Patterns of decision making in multihospital systems. *J Health Soc Behav* 27:14-27, 1986. Develops and tests a model to explain variations in the locations of decision-making authority in multihospital systems.
- ANCONA-BERK VA, Chalmers TC: An analysis of the costs of ambulatory and inpatient care. *Am J Public Health* 76:1102-1104, 1986. Presents data that show that home care is less costly than hospital care because fewer services are provided the patients and the market value of relatives' support services is not included.
- ASCIONE FJ, Kirscht JP, Shimp LA: An assessment of different components of patient medication knowledge. *Med Care* 24:1018-1028, 1986. Suggests that one explanation for inconsistencies of research about drug knowledge may be the way the concept is measured.
- BALABAN DJ, Sagi PC, Goldfarb NI, Nettler S: Weights for scoring the quality of well-being instrument among rheumatoid arthritics. *Med Care* 24:973-980, 1986. Concludes that the weights used in the quality of well-being scale may be used for populations with a specific condition as well as for general populations.
- BAZZOLI GJ: Does educational indebtedness affect physician speciality choice? *J Health Econ* 4:1-19, 1986. Reports that an increase in a physician's educational debt has a statistically significant but small effect on reducing the likelihood of the physician's becoming a primary care physician.
- BAZZOLI GJ, Culler SD: Factors affecting residents' decisions to moonlight. *J Med Educ* 61:797-802, 1986. Reports that economic reasons are the main motivating factors behind residents' decisions to moonlight.
- BEGG CB, Greenes RA, Iglewicz B: The influence of uninterpretability on the assessment of diagnostic tests. *J Chronic Dis* 39:575-584, 1986. Distinguishes between uninterpretable and indeterminate results; demonstrates that the cause and frequency of uninterpretability can affect the degree of bias in reading the test and the cost-effectiveness of the test.
- BERGMAN DA, Pantell RH: The impact of reading a clinical study on treatment decisions of physicians and residents. *J Med Educ* 61:380-386, 1986. Finds that physicians have difficulty in using probability data and appear to base estimates of serious disease on intuition rather than calculation.
- BLANCHARD CG, Ruckdeschel JC, Fletcher BA, Blanchard EB: The impact of oncologists' behaviors on patient satisfaction with morning rounds. *Cancer* 58:387-393, 1986. Lists physician behaviors that affect the satisfaction of hospitalized patients with cancer.
- BRAHAM RL, Weisel MJ, Charlson ME, Douglas RG Jr: Closing the clinics. Would it close the teaching hospital? *Am J Med* 80:71-76, 1986. Concludes that major reductions of clinic size will result in severe contraction of the inpatient service.
- COOPER GS: An analysis of the costs of infertility treatment. *Am J Public Health* 76:1018-1019, 1986. Compares the costs of receiving care at an infertility clinic with the costs of adoption and surrogate mother arrangements.
- CURCHFIELD GC, Willard KE, Connelly DP: Probabilistic sensitivity analysis methods for general decision models. *Comput Biomed Res* 19:254-265, 1986. Generalizes the use of probabilistic sensitivity analysis to a wide range of decision problems.
- CULLER SD, Bazzoli GJ: The moonlighting decisions of resident physicians. *J Health Econ* 4:283-292, 1985. See the Bazzoli and Culler reference cited above.
- DETSKY AS, McLaughlin JR, Abrams HB, et al: Do interns and residents order more tests than attending staff? Results of a house staff strike. *Med Care* 24:526-534, 1986. Suggests that the volume of tests performed in teaching hospitals is more likely to be related to the case mix and severity of illness of patients admitted to these institutions than to a pure "teaching effect."
- DIAMOND GA, Rozanski A, Forrester JS, et al: A model for assessing the sensitivity and specificity of tests subject to selection bias. *J Chronic Dis* 39:343-355, 1986. Presents a probabilistic model to estimate sensitivity and specificity of diagnostic tests for coronary artery disease without reference to angiography. Commentaries follow (Hlatky MA: Evaluation of diagnostic tests. *J Chronic Dis* 39:357-358, 1986, and Diamond GA: Selection bias and the evaluation of diagnostic tests. A meta-dissent. *J Chronic Dis* 39:359-360, 1986).
- DIAMOND GA, Rozanski A, Steuer M: Playing doctor. Application of game theory to medical decision-making. *J Chronic Dis* 39:669-677, 1986. Shows that whenever the patient is free to accept or reject the physician's advice, game theory provides a prescriptive decision-making model which is qualitatively and quantitatively different from decision analysis. Commentaries follow (Eckman MH, Pauker SG: Let's decide who's playing, doctor! *J Chronic Dis* 39:679-680, 1986, and Diamond GA: Fair game and foul play. *J Chronic Dis* 39:681-682, 1986).
- DIENH P, Price K, Williams SJ, Martin DP: Factors related to the use of ambulatory mental health services in three provider plans. *Soc Sci Med* 23:773-780, 1986. Reports on the correlates of the use of mental health services in three different provider plans.
- DISEBENS D, Schwartz MW, Guenin M, Taylor LA: Measuring the problem-solving ability of students and residents by microcomputer. *J Med Educ* 61:461-466, 1986. Suggests that there is not a "type" of person who is better at medical problem-solving on a microcomputer.

ECKHOFF L, Lebrum T, Saily JC: Risk-aversion and physicians' medical decision-making. *J Health Econ* 4:273-281, 1985. Examines a physician's optimal therapeutic decisions in a risky environment; analyzes the value of diagnostic information and its relationship with risk-aversion.

ELLIS RP, McGuire TG: Provider behavior under prospective reimbursement. Cost sharing and supply. *J Health Econ* 5:129-151, 1986. Shows that a reimbursement system in which hospital reimbursements are paid partly prospectively and partly cost-based is superior to prospective-only or cost-based-only reimbursement policies.

EPSTEIN AM, McNeil BJ: Relationship of beliefs and behavior in test ordering. *Am J Med* 80:865-870, 1986. Suggests that "high-usage" physicians may know who they are, and that evaluations of technology must consider more than contributions to immediate treatment decisions.

FETIHE CC, Smith IM, Johnson N: "Risk" factors affecting readmission of the elderly into the health care system. *Med Care* 24:429-437, 1986. Identifies a set of non-disease-specific characteristics available prior to discharge that help identify elderly patients at risk for re-hospitalization.

FRANKS P, Dickinson JC: Comparisons of family physicians and internists. Process and outcome in adult patients at a community hospital. *Med Care* 24:941-948, 1986. Finds little evidence of interspecialty differences in processes and outcomes of care given to adult hospitalized patients.

GEERTSMA RH, Romano J: Relationship between expected indebtedness and career choice of medical students. *J Med Educ* 61:555-559, 1986. Reports that total indebtedness and not academic indebtedness was related to anticipated career choices of physicians.

GERBERT B, Hargreaves WA: Measuring physician behavior. *Med Care* 24:838-847, 1986. Reports that four different methods of obtaining information about physician behavior are equally reliable, but that interview methods tend to have greater content validity.

GERSON LW, McCord G, Wiggins SL: A strategy to increase appointment keeping in a pediatric clinic. *J Comm Health* 11:111-121, 1986. Reports on the successful use of a questionnaire to assess the likelihood that a patient will need reminding about a future appointment.

GOLDBERGER AL, O'Konski M: Utility of the routine electrocardiogram before surgery and on general hospital admission. *Ann Intern Med* 105:552-557, 1986. Concludes that ECG should routinely be used only in selected subsets of hospitalized patients, including those with cardiac signs or symptoms and those at risk for occult heart disease.

GOTTLIEB NH, Baker JA: The relative influence of health beliefs, parental and peer behaviors and exercise program participation on smoking, alcohol use and physical activity. *Soc Sci Med* 22:915-927, 1986. Specifies a model for life style health behavior which includes socialization, social environmental and cognitive influences on smoking, alcohol use, and exercise; reports that peer modeling variables had the strongest relationship of any of the model elements.

GRACE JF, Armstrong D: Reasons for referral to hospital. Extent of agreement between the perceptions of patients, general practitioners, and consultants. *Fam Pract* 3:143-147, 1986. Observes considerable disagreement among the three parties for the referral to a hospital.

GREER S, Dickerson V, Schneiderman LJ, Atkins C, Bass R: Responses of male and female physicians to medical complaints in male and female patients. *J Fam Pract* 23:49-53, 1986. Observes little difference in the workups by male and female physicians.

HAUCK WW, Anderson S: A proposal for interpreting and reporting negative studies. *Stat Med* 5:203-209, 1986. Proposes the application of equivalence testing methods to interpret studies that do not find statistically significant differences.

HAYNES DE REGT R, Minkoff HL, Feldman J, Schwarz RH: Relation of private or clinic care to the cesarean birth rate. *N Engl J Med* 315:619-624, 1986. Reports that private physicians perform more cesarean sections than house officers and attending physicians; identifies situations when private patients are more likely to undergo cesarean delivery than clinic patients.

HORN SD, Horn RA, Moses H: Profiles of physician practice and patient severity of illness. *Am J Public Health* 76:532-535, 1986. Observes that 37% of physicians may be wrongly identified as over- or under-utilizers when physician profiles are based on DRGs that are unadjusted for patients' severity of illness.

JAMISON RN, Lewis S, Burish TG: Psychological impact of cancer on adolescents. Self-image, locus of control, perception of illness and knowledge of cancer. *J Chronic Dis* 39:609-617, 1986. Finds some support for the theory that cancer diagnosis does influence a patient's health perception but not self-image.

JOHNSON SR, Elkins TE, Strong C, Phelan JP: Obstetric decision-making. Responses to patients who request cesarean delivery. *Obstet Gynecol* 67:847-850, 1986. Observes little agreement among physicians' responses to a patient's request for a cesarean section when the physician recommends vaginal delivery or continued delivery.

JONES L, Baker MR: The application of health economics to health promotion. *Comm Med* 8:224-229, 1986. Analyzes the requirement for research into cost-benefit models in health promotion.

KNAUS WA, Draper EA, Wagner DP, Zimmerman JE: An evaluation of outcome from intensive care in major medical centers. *Ann Intern Med* 104:410-418, 1986. Concludes that the degree of coordination of intensive care significantly influences its effectiveness.

KONG A, Barnett GO, Mosteller F, Youtz C: How medical professionals evaluate expressions of probability. *N Engl J Med* 315:740-744, 1986. Reports general agreement among the median values assigned to different qualitative expressions of probability by physicians, medical students, and other professionals.

LANDMAN GB, Meade ED, Landman PF: Increasing the 'show rate' in a school problems clinic. *Am J Dis Child* 140:1197-1198, 1986. Finds that requiring parents to fill out forms prior to giving a student an appointment results in improved show rate, reduced waiting period, and increased number of patients seen each month.

LEE KL, Pryor DB, Harrell Jr FE, et al: Predicting outcome in coronary disease. Statistical models versus expert clinicians. *Am J Med* 80:553-568, 1986. Concludes that statistical models are more accurate than experienced clinicians at providing prognostic predictions.

LEVEY LA, MacDowell NM, Levey S: Health care of poverty and nonpoverty children in Iowa. *Am J Public Health* 76:1000-1003, 1986. Reports that utilization of health care services by poverty children with Medicaid coverage was comparable to that of nonpoverty children, although the characteristics of the health care differed.

LUFF HS, Hunt SS: Evaluating individual hospital quality through outcome statistics. *JAMA* 255:2780-2784, 1986. Discusses some limitations of case abstract data to assess the quality of individual hospitals and physicians.

MANNING PR, Lee PV, Clintworth WA, et al: Changing prescribing practices through individual continuing education. *JAMA* 256:230-232, 1986. Shows that individualized teaching in response to real events in practice is a practical and effective method of improving physician prescription behavior.

MARQUIS MS: Cost-sharing and provider choice. *J Health Econ* 4:137-157, 1985. Observes little effect of cost-sharing on the costliness of the medical provider selected by patients.

MARSHALL EI: Waiting for the doctor. *Br Med J* 292:993-995, 1986. Presents a model to assess the best time interval between appointments in general practice surgery.

MCCLURE CL, Gall EP, Meredith KE, et al: Family practice and internal medicine clinical judgment in a university setting. *J Fam Pract* 22:443-448, 1986. Identifies some differences in practice patterns of family practice and internal medicine.

MONTANO DE: Predicting and understanding influenza vaccination behavior. Alternatives to the Health Belief Model. *Med Care* 24:438-453, 1986. Suggests that the Triandis model was better than the Fishbein model and the Health Belief Model in predicting intention and behavior.

PARK RE, Fink A, Brook RH, et al: Physician ratings of appropriate indications for six medical and surgical procedures. *Am J Public Health* 76:766-772, 1986. Reports on the use of a panel of expert physicians to assess the appropriateness of different procedures.

POSES RM, Cebul RD, Colins M, Fager SS: The importance of disease prevalence in transporting clinical prediction rules. The case of streptococcal pharyngitis. *Ann Intern Med* 105:586-591, 1986. Demonstrates the need to adjust prediction rules when they are applied in different settings with different disease prevalences.

PUPA LE JR, Coventry JA, Hanley JF, Carpenter JL: Factors affecting compliance for general medicine consultations to non-internists. *Am J Med* 81:508-514, 1986. Reports that compliance can be improved when the consultant clearly identifies the critical recommendations and makes contact with the referring physician within 24 hours.

RAMSEY PG, Shannon NF, Fleming L, et al: Use of objective examinations in medicine clerkships. Ten-year experience. *Am J Med* 81:669-674, 1986. Observes little relationship between students' clerkship ratings and performances on a written examination; suggests that both clerkships and written exam should be used when assessing student performance.

RIEGELMAN RK: Effects of teaching first-year medical students skills to read medical literature. *J Med Educ* 61:454-460, 1986. Observes that a course on study design and statistics can have a beneficial but temporary effect on students' competence.

RUBB P, Price MG, Graham LE, et al: Consequences of worksite hypertension screening. Differential changes in psychosocial function. *Am J Med* 80:853-860, 1986. Concludes that worksite hypertension screening produces minimal adverse psychosocial changes, reassurance debriefing may be beneficial, and unspecified worksite characteristics may determine consequences of similar preventive medicine efforts.

SASCO AJ, Day NE, Walter SD: Case-control studies for the evaluation of screening. *J Chronic Dis* 39:399-405, 1986. Presents typical situations where case-control studies of screening efficacy are the method of choice.

SHORE BE, Franks P: Physician satisfaction with patient encounters. Reliability and validity of an encounter-specific questionnaire. *Med Care* 24:580-589, 1986. Presents a scale that can reliably assess the physician's satisfaction with a patient encounter.

SIMES RJ: Application of statistical decision theory to treatment choices. Implications for the design and analysis of clinical trials. *Stat Med* 5:411-420, 1986. Explores the application of statistical decision theory to treatment choices in cancer that involve difficult value judgments in weighting outcomes of treatment.

SIMON R: Confidence intervals for reporting results of clinical trials. *Ann Intern Med* 105:429-435, 1986. Discusses the usefulness of confidence intervals to assess the results of clinical investigations; presents formulas for calculating confidence intervals with types of data commonly found in clinical trials.

SIMPSON DE, Dalgaard KA, O'Brien DK: Student and faculty assumptions about the nature of uncertainty in medicine and medical education. *J Fam Pract* 23:468-472, 1986. Concludes that to improve the effectiveness of teaching problem solving, faculty must challenge the assumptions held by medical students about the certainty of medical knowledge while teaching the process of clinical diagnosis.

SOX HC JR, Liang MH: The erythrocyte sedimentation rate. Guidelines for rational use. *Ann Intern Med* 104:515-523, 1986. Identifies conditions when ESR results have little diagnostic value.

SPIEGELHALTER DJ: Probabilistic prediction in patient management and clinical trials. *Stat Med* 5:421-433, 1986. Argues that the provision of accurate and useful probabilistic assessments of future events should be a fundamental task for the biostatistician; explores two aspects of obtaining and evaluating such predictions.

STILLMAN PL, Swanson DB, Smee S, et al: Assessing clinical skills of residents with standardized patients. *Ann Intern Med* 105:762-771, 1986. Reports little correlation between standardized-patient-based measures of clinical skills and other evaluation techniques; suggests that standardized patients provided unique information.

STRAUSS MJ, Conrad D, LoGerfo JP, et al: Cost and outcome of care for patients with chronic obstructive lung disease. Analysis by physician speciality. *Med Care* 24:915-924, 1986. Concludes that differences in characteristics of primary care physicians do not appear to affect significantly the total cost or outcome of care for patients with moderate to severe chronic lung disease.

TAUB HA, Baker MT, Sturt JF: Informed consent for research. Effects of readability, patient age, and education. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 34:601-606, 1986. Suggests that ensuring informed con-

sent may be difficult for elderly patients with low education, and that simplifying informed consent materials may not, by itself, be sufficient to improve comprehension.

TENNIS CK, Cummings KM, Zevon MA, et al: Compliance of pediatric and adolescent cancer patients. *Cancer* 58:1179-1184, 1986. Explores several factors that contribute to pediatric and adolescent cancer patients' compliance with self-administered therapy.

TIERNEY WM, Hui SL, McDonald CJ: Delayed feedback of physician performance versus immediate reminders to perform preventive care. Effects on physician compliance. *Med Care* 24:659-666, 1986. Reports that physician compliance with suggested preventive care protocols can be increased by both delayed feedback and immediate reminders.

TORRANCE GW: Measurement of health state utilities for economic appraisal. *J Health Econ* 5:1-30, 1986. Presents a comprehensive description of the tools available to measure a patient's utility for different health states.

TYMCHUK AJ, Ouslander JG, Rader N: Informing the elderly. A comparison of four methods. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 34:818-822, 1986. Concludes that elderly people can benefit from an informed consent procedure that provides information clearly and simply.

WEISS BD: The effect of malpractice insurance costs on family physicians' hospital practices. *J Fam Pract* 23:55-58, 1986. Reports that family physicians frequently restricted their obstetrical and surgical activities because of the cost of insurance.

WIGTON RS, Patil KD, Hoellerich VL: The effect of feedback in learning clinical diagnosis. *J Med Educ* 61:816-822, 1986. Reports that students who receive information comparing their apparent weighting of clinical information and the correct weighting learned to diagnose UTM more accurately than students who received information on the outcomes of their diagnoses only.

WOLF FM, Cornell RG: Interpreting behavioral, biomedical, and psychological relationships in chronic disease from 2 x 2 tables using correlation. *J Chronic Dis* 39:605-608, 1986. Suggests that correlation coefficients be interpreted as binomial effect size displays in order to assess the clinical importance of a given correlation coefficient; demonstrates that a correlation of 0.2 may correspond to a BESD in which the success rate is improved from 40 to 60%.

YAFFE MJ, Stewart MA: Patients' attitudes to the relevance of nonmedical problems in family medicine care. *J Fam Pract* 23:241-244, 1986. Reports that most physicians rarely ask patients about nonmedical problems even though most patients want to be asked about nonmedical problems.

ZELLEN M, Parker RA: Case-control studies and Bayesian inference. *Stat Med* 5:261-269, 1986. Outlines the methods of Bayesian inference for applications to case-control studies; shows how one may conduct 'case-control studies' without having a control group.

Essays

CAPLAN G: Preventing psychological problems in children of divorce. General practitioner's role. *Br Med J* 292:1431-1434, 1986. Discusses the effects that divorce can have on children.

DOUBLET P, Weinstein MC, McNeil BJ: Use and misuse of the term "cost effective" in medicine. *N Engl J Med* 314:253-256, 1986. Discusses several of the different meanings given the term "cost effective" in the medical literature; presents recommendations on how the term should be used.

FUCHS VR: Has cost containment gone too far? *Milbank Q* 64:479-488, 1986. Offers a framework for thinking about the direct effects of current reimbursement policies on different aspects of the health care system.

KROENKE K: Ambulatory care. Practice imperfect. *Am J Med* 80:339-342, 1986. Proposes several guidelines for physicians practicing medicine when "perfect" care is not always possible.

LO B: The Bartling case. Protecting patients from harm while respecting their wishes. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 34:44-48, 1986. Discusses the physicians' obligations to benefit patients as well as to respect patients' wishes.

LUFT HS: Health services research as a scientific process. The metamorphosis of an empirical research project from grant proposal to final report. *Health Serv Res* 21:563-584, 1986. Describes a project that underwent major changes because of problems discovered in the basic data and threats to the valid interpretation of econometric results uncovered by qualitative case studies.

NATELSON BH: Need for an integrative approach in medical diagnosis. *Am J Med* 80:1017-1018, 1986. Presents a case report that demonstrates the need for physicians to adopt less of a systems approach to problems and more of a mixture of expertise across different disciplines.

PASCOE JM: Use of the likelihood ratio in the management of the young child with fever. *J Fam Pract* 22:349-352, 1986. Explains how to use the likelihood ratio in the interpretation of diagnostic data.

PAULY MV: Reflections on using physician agents to minimize the cost of health. *J Health Econ* 4:79-81, 1985. Discusses reasons for physicians choosing the cost minimization of their and other inputs.

PETERS DA: Protecting autonomy in organ procurement procedures. Some overlooked issues. *Milbank Q* 64:241-270, 1986. Discusses shortcomings in the application of the Model Uniform Anatomical Gift Act.

PLANTE DA, Kassirer JP, Zarin DA, Pauker SG: Clinical decision consultation service. *Am J Med* 80:1169-1176, 1986. Summarizes evidence that decision analysis can be carried out effectively on a consultative basis for individual patients.

ROTHMAN KJ: Significance questing. *Ann Intern Med* 105:445-447, 1986. Calls for the use of confidence intervals instead of p-values in scientific testing.

SHERLOCK R: Reasonable men and sick human beings. *Am J Med* 80:2-4, 1986. Cites the need to incorporate physician-patient trust when discussing informed consent and patient rights.

SMITH R: When things go wrong. *Br Med J* 293:461-462, 1986. Discusses the inevitability of accidents in medical care and the advantages of a no-fault scheme for accident compensation.

SIXKIN C, Mooney G, Maynard A: Teaching health economics. *Br Med J* 292:785, 1986. Cites the need to provide more education in health economics in medical schools.

CALL FOR PAPERS...

1988 USC/DH&S AUDIT JUDGMENT SYMPOSIUM

AUDIT JUDGMENT IN THE YEAR 2000

The Center for Accounting Research at the University of Southern California will host the sixth annual Audit Judgment Symposium February 15 & 16, 1988. The Symposium which is supported by a grant from the Deloitte Haskins & Sells Foundation will consider papers, panels and presentations which focus on cognitive and decision support aspects of audit judgment research. We are interested in possible effects of future technology, research and development on auditing and especially the role of artificial intelligence and expert systems research. The symposium will follow the 26th Bayesian Conference hosted by Ward Edwards which is scheduled for February 12 & 13.

OVERVIEW OF SYMPOSIUM

The primary objective of the Symposium is to explore research issues, problems, and opportunities with respect to the role of judgment in auditing. Traditionally the symposium has included plenary sessions which overview current research in cognitive psychology, behavioral decision theory, and artificial intelligence/expert systems. In addition, we intend to include sessions on current audit judgment research panels discussing current development and research opportunities within auditing, and demonstrations of current expert systems and other promising technologies. Anyone interested in participating in the Symposium should send a copy of your paper, abstract, or presentation idea by October 31 to:

Professor Theodore J. Mock (213) 743-8725
Center for Accounting Research
School of Accounting
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1421

SOCIETY FOR JUDGMENT AND DECISION MAKING
1987 DUES FORM

Please check your mailing label. If it has a "?" in the upper left-hand corner, we have not received your dues for 1987. (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 on the reverse side of this page is incorrect, please make corrections below:

Name _____ Phone _____
Address _____ BITNET _____
(or other computer network mail address)
City _____ State _____ ZIP _____

Please complete the following and return this form with your check as soon as possible:

MEMBER \$10.00
STUDENT \$5.00

1987 Dues (Includes Newsletter)

Please make checks payable to JUDGMENT/DECISION MAKING SOCIETY.

Return this form and your check to:

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

I- Students must have endorsement of a faculty member:

Faculty Signature: _____ Date: _____
Printed Name: _____
Institution: _____

POLICY PC 2.1
Software for Judgment Analysis

POLICY PC is personal computer software to support judgment analysis or "policy-capturing." POLICY PC uses regression statistics to analyze how experts, or other individuals, make judgments as they integrate available information. The program:

- o performs judgment analyses for up to 8 individuals, 8 information cues, and 50 cases;
- o computes statistics for
 - each task (cue means, standard deviations, and inter-correlations),
 - each judge (judgment mean, standard deviation and correlations between judgments and cues), and
 - each policy (regression coefficients, multiple R, and predicted judgments);
- o performs statistical comparisons for up to 8 policies at a time;
- o graphically displays relative weights and function forms for each judge and allows up to 3 judges to be compared on one graph; and
- o allows the judgment policies to be specified via a menu of utility functions.

POLICY PC version 2.1 operates on the IBM PC and compatible computers. Student editions are available at reduced rates. For more information write to:

POLICY PC, P.O. Box 9102, Albany, NY 12209

J/DM NEWSLETTER
Department of Psychology
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

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



TIME-DATED MATERIAL

Bob Hann
Institute of Cognitive Sci
Box 345
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80302