

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. This year's meeting should be an exciting meeting at which you will be challenged to think anew about all aspects of judgment and decision making. Watch the next J/DM Newsletter for full details concerning the meeting. And don't forget the Psychonomic Society Meeting which is held just prior to the J/DM Meeting. As in previous years, there will be several sessions of interest to J/DMers.

DON'T FORGET TO VOTE...

By the time you receive this newsletter, you should have returned your ballot for officers for the J/DM Society for 1990. If you have not mailed your ballot yet, please take a few minutes to do so.

--Steve Edgell

SHANTEAU AND KELLER NAMED PROGRAM OFFICERS AT NSF...

The Decision, Risk, and Management Science Program at the National Science Foundation has named James Shanteau, from Kansas State University, to be Program Director, and Robin Keller, from the University of California at Irvine to be Associate Program Director. In the words of the announcement from NSF concerning these appointments, "we are confident that, under their leadership, the DRMS program will both continue and strengthen its tradition of funding research directed at understanding and effectiveness of problem solving, information processing, and decision making by individuals, groups, and society." We wish them well.

ONR SOLICITS RESEARCH PROPOSALS...

The Office of Naval Research is soliciting proposals for research coordination in hierarchical team decision making. Particular interest is in the identification and characterization of variables that enhance coordination and enables teams to maintain coordinated action under stress conditions characteristic of tactical environments. The naval context for the research is the command and control of tactical units in a battleground where the commands team members are located on different platforms.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 14

CONTENTS

From the Editor.....	2
A J/DM Perspective on APS vs. APA.....	3
Recent Philosophical Literature.....	6
Recent Developments in the Psychology of Judgment and Decision Making.....	7
Forthcoming Meeting.....	8
Papers & Reprints Available.....	9
Decision Aiding Software.....	12
Forthcoming Meeting.....	13
J/DM Dues Form and Address Change.....	13

SUBMISSION DEADLINE FOR THE NEXT J/DM NEWSLETTER: AUGUST 28, 1989

RESEARCH NEWS

Vol. VIII
Number 3
JULY 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.

A J/DM PERSPECTIVE ON APS VS APA

James Shanteau

What follows is one person's perspectives on the split between the traditional American Psychological Association (APA) and the newly formed American Psychological Society (APS). Although this controversy may appear to be a little interest to non-Americans or non-psychologists, I believe there may be important ramifications for all behavioral researchers.

The sources of the material which follows are newsletters from Divisions 1, 3, 8, and 23, material from APA, a Science article on the APA-APS split, material from APS, and personal communication with APS personnel.)

History. Last spring, a plan to reorganize APA was widely debated and voted down by the membership. The plan, developed after years of effort and negotiation, would have produced a degree of autonomy for the academics/scientists and clinicians/practitioners. Although the clinicians outnumber the scientists by 3/1, the reorganization plan was approved by 43% of the 26,000 who voted. That was far short, however, of the 2/3 needed for approval.

Last summer, the group supporting the reorganization (ASAP) became a separate society -- APS. The group is incorporated with a set of bylaws. The first president is Janet T. Spence (former president of APA); the second president will be James L. McGaugh. A new APS journal, Psychological Science, will appear next January with William K. Estes as editor. A newsletter, the APS Observer, comes out several times a year; for copies contact APS at the Dept. of Psychology, University of Nevada - Reno, Reno, NV 89557. APS also established a free phone number -- 1-800-950-4APS.

At latest count (June, 1989), the society had 6,000 members, including 22 of the past 24 APA presidents. The first annual convention was just completed in Alexandria, Virginia with over 1,000 in attendance. At the convention, the formation of a Washington, D.C. office was announced. The Executive Director will be Alan G. Kraut (formerly the Executive Director of the Scientific Directorate at APA).

Summit Meeting. In January, a three-day meeting was organized by APS with 62 representatives from 40 different organizations. The Judgment/Decision Making Society was represented officially by James Shanteau. Also in attendance were Duncan Luce, representing the Federation of Behavioral, Psychological and Cognitive Sciences, and Robyn Dawes, a member of the APS Steering Committee.

The following comments on the meeting are drawn from the February, 1989 issue of the Federation News: "Discussion was focused on the theme 'Strengthening Psychology's Research Base.' The meeting was meant both to be a general discussion of the status of the science of psychology and direction-setting meeting for the then 23-week old APS. Discussion was wide-ranging, but a number of tentative resolutions were made. APS will be a membership organization primarily, but it was agreed that a mechanism is needed for regular interchange between APS and subdisciplinary organizations. Robyn Dawes was appointed to chair a committee to determine an effective way to accomplish the interchange."

"Advocacy was deemed a key function of APS, and a committee is being formed to determine how APS efforts can supplement current advocacy in Washington. Attendees considered public education about the science of psychology to be an important focus of APS advocacy. There are many outstanding questions about the structure and content of education in psychology. A committee will look at the issues in this area. The fragmentation of the field of psychology was identified as a phenomenon, and there was discussion about how to return coherence to the field. It is likely that a group will be formed around this issue, and that among their considerations may be changing the name of APS and perhaps ultimately the field."

APA's Reaction. The response of APA has been simultaneously to hold out a carrot and a stick to scientific/academic psychologists. On the positive side, an ad hoc Science Advisory Committee was appointed to develop recommendations on how APA can become more responsive to scientific psychologists. Members of the panel include Gordon Bower, Frances Graham, Edward Jones, James McGaugh, Neal Miller, Richard Thompson, and Frances Horowitz.

In addition, APA has taken a number of concrete steps to appeal to scientists. A series of research conferences have been funded over the last two years. The papers from these conferences will be published as part of a monograph series by APA. A research funding bulletin board has been established; users can issue a SUBSCRIBE command to APASD-L LIST at VTVM2 on bitnet. APA is publishing a Science Agenda Newsletter on a periodic basis. The newsletter is free to any scientific psychologist by writing the APA Science Directorate at 1200 17th St, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

On the other side, APA has made it clear that they will continue to control the well-respected APA journals. These journals are a major source of funds and APA could ill-afford to lose them. APA needs the journals to subsidize its other, less profitable activities. Consequently, dues increases have been implemented for 1989 and additional increases may be in the offering.

Moreover, APA's lawyer has issued an opinion that all assets of the various divisions belong to APA -- even if those divisions are separately incorporated and decide to become independent of APA. A number of divisions have non-APA members, run their own journals, and operate on substantial budgets. However, APA controls the mailing lists and collects the dues for the divisions. A major legal battle appears imminent over the control of the divisions and particularly their assets.

Future Prospects. My personal opinion is that APS is necessary at this time. The concerns of APA are not the concerns of behavioral scientists and academics. APA has become increasingly concerned with "guild" issues, such as reimbursement, prescription privileges, licensing, hospital privileges, and certification. Science and research are given lip service, but are otherwise ignored. This led Robyn Dawes, a member of the APA Council of Representatives, to resign recently.

Less than 40% of academics/scientists belong to APA, and the number is falling. Some divisions, e.g., Division 23, are losing APA members so fast that they are in danger of being dissolved. In contrast, 75% of mental-health psychologists join APA and their numbers are growing steadily. Without drastic changes, APA is doomed as a scientific organization. The question for most of us who are still members is not if we will quit, but when.

At the same time, independent societies such as J/DM are experiencing rapid growth. Our membership has grown from less than 100 in 1980 to near 1,000 today. So why should we worry about the APS - APA controversy? The answer is that without some central organization, psychologists and allied behavioral researchers may become too fragmented to be effective. APS is probably the last best chance for a single voice for academics/scientists. And there is still the possibility that APS and APA will merge at some future time, with academics/scientists once again having a major voice in their own affairs.

For those interested in joining APS, membership is \$75. Applications are available from: APS, Box 1553, Norman, OK 73070. Charter memberships are available up to September 1, 1989.

(Note: James Shanteau is a Fellow of APA and a member of four Divisions. He is a Charter Member of APS.)

RECENT PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE. . .

Seanor, D., & Fotlon, N., Eds. (1988). Hare and Critics: Essays on MORAL THINKING. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Pp. 307, \$50.

One major dispute in moral theory is between "intuitionists" and those who seek a more basic foundation. The analogy with utility theory and probability theory is clear. Do we count our intuitions about ambiguity, for example, as evidence against these theories? Or do we seek some other justification of the theories and then use them to beat down our intuitions?

Richard Hare has argued that the roots of moral theory are to be found in the logic of moral terms such as "ought" in its most fundamental sense. Moral terms are universal (independent of point of view), prescriptive (expressing preferences), and overriding (expressing preferences all told, not just "other things equal"). In MORAL THINKING (1981), Hare argued that these properties lead to a form of utilitarianism, in which the best moral decision is the one that maximizes the total satisfaction of preferences of all affected parties. Utilitarianism (like utility theory) conflicts with many intuitions, such as our feeling that we ought to care more for our own children than for others' children. Hare argues that such intuitions have a utilitarian justification (e.g., promoting efficient use of natural affection), and that we can usually come closer to the utilitarian ideal by following our intuitions than by attempting to maximize utility (preference satisfaction) directly. Because we learn intuitions early, we resist utilitarian theory itself.

In this collection (originally titled "Hare and hounds"), several major philosophers react to Hare's recent book, the main argument of which is summarized in an introductory essay. Hare replies (literally) point by point, and I recommend reading his replies with the essays.

Many of the essays are either off the mark or irrelevant to the interests of decision theorists. I found the most interesting to be those of Gibbard, Singer, Williams, and Scanlon. Gibbard's essay, although difficult, repays rereading, if only for its system for classifying preferences. It tries to state Hare's argument as a kind of theorem, thus exposing exactly what is assumed and what additional assumptions are required to derive utilitarianism from the meaning of moral terms. The issue hinges on our treatment of personal ideals, such as Cheops's preference for a large funeral, and universal idiosyncratic preferences such as the average person's preference that actions be avoided under conditions of ambiguity, or the preferences of the fanatic that homosexuals be persecuted (whether he knows about it or not).

Singer examines Hare's idea of universalizability, with particular attention to the (mis)treatment of foreigners and animals. Williams asks, among other questions, how substantive conclusions can follow from premises about the meaning of our terms. Scanlon, in the course of examining other issues, suggests an answer in his idea (developed elsewhere) of a hypothetical contract as a basis for moral theory. Hare accepts this approach, arguing that it will support his conclusions, but Scanlon thinks otherwise. All of the essays and replies help to clarify Hare's theory and the nature of moral theory in general.

--Jonathan Baron

My list
959 709 4572u
764 342 14572c
177.4 M 177u
959.70434 P 375u
355-1334 U 568u

1724
14277e

Recent Developments in the Psychology of Judgment and Decision Making

Compiled by JAY CHRISTENSEN-SZALANSKI, PhD, MPH

ANDERSON U, Wright WF. Expertise and the explanation effect. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process*. 1988;42:250-9. Reports that novices but not expert auditors judged an event to be more likely when they generated an explanation of the event.

ARKE HR, Faust D, Guilmette TJ, et al. Eliminating the hindsight bias. *J Appl Psychol*. 1988;73:305-7. Shows that fewer people exhibit the hindsight bias when they are required to list one reason why each of the possible alternatives could have occurred.

ARKE HR, Herren LT, Isen AM. The role of potential loss in the influence of affect on risk-taking behavior. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process*. 1988;41:181-93. Concludes that positive feelings can foster both risk-prone and risk-adverse behavior.

BARON J, Beattie J, Hershey JC. Heuristics and biases in diagnostic reasoning. II. Congruence, information, and certainty. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process*. 1988;42:88-110. Concludes that various biases exist in diagnostic reasoning.

BOTTGER PC, Yetton PW. An integration of process and decision scheme explanations of group problem solving performance. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process*. 1988;42:234-49. Develops a model of group problem solving in which performance is a function of group resources and strategies for their use.

BUDESCU DV, Weinberg S, Wallsten TS. Decisions based on numerically and verbally expressed uncertainties. *J Exp Psychol (Human)*. 1988;14:281-94. Concludes that people presented with a vague probability word focus on an implied probability interval and sample values within it to resolve the vagueness.

CONNOLLY T, Wholey DR. Information mispurchase in judgment tasks. A task-driven causal mechanism. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process*. 1988;42:75-87. Examines the reasons that account for people's inappropriately purchasing information when making a decision.

DIRTO PH, Jemmott JB III, Darley JM. Appraising the threat of illness. A mental representational approach. *Health Psychol*. 1988;7:183-201. Describes and tests a model that explains how people initially evaluate the threat of illness signs.

GIGERENZER G, Hall W, Blank H. Presentation and content. The use of base rates as a continuous variable. *J Exp Psychol (Human)*. 1988;14:513-25. Concludes that representativeness is neither an all-purpose mental strategy nor even a tendency, but rather a function of the content and the presentation of crucial information.

HEGARTY M, Just MA, Morrison IR. Mental models of mechanical systems. Individual differences in qualitative and quantitative reasoning. *Cogn Psychol*. 1988;20:191-236. Identifies different rules of mechanical reasoning that accounted for individual differences in mechanical ability.

HINSZ VB, Tindale RS, Nagao DH, et al. The influence of accuracy of individuating information on the use of base-rate

information in probability judgment. *J Exp Soc Psychol*. 1988;24:127-45. Reports that the base-rate information was neglected in situations when the accuracy of the source was relatively high.

HIRT ER, Castellan NJ Jr. Probability and category redefinition in the fault tree paradigm. *J Exp Psychol (Human)*. 1988;14:122-31. Rejects the availability hypothesis as the reason for people's insensitivity to omissions in fault trees.

JOHNSON EJ, Payne JW, Bettman JR. Information displays and preference reversals. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process*. 1988;42:1-21. Suggests that decision makers shifted information processing strategies as a function of information format.

KENRICK DT, Funder DC. Profiting from controversy. Lessons from the person-situation debate. *Am Psychol*. 1988;43:23-34. Concludes that the identification of personality traits is not an illusory result of cognitive limitations in the observer.

KEREN G. On the ability of monitoring non-veridical perceptions and uncertain knowledge: some calibration studies. *Acta Psychol*. 1988;67:95-119. Suggests that people are less likely to be overconfident in a perceptual task than in a judgment task.

KRYAK HA, Vitaliano PP, Crinean J. Patients' expectations as predictors of orthognathic surgery outcomes. *Health Psychol*. 1988;7:251-68. Observes that patients who anticipate fewer problems report better psychological outcomes than those who expect numerous problems.

KOSLOWSKY M, Kluger AN, Yinon Y. Predicting behavior: combining intention with investment. *J Appl Psychol*. 1988;73:102-6. Suggests that personal investment can increase attitude-behavior consistency.

KUIPERS B, Moskowitz AJ, Kassirer JP. Critical decisions under uncertainty. Representation and structure. *Cogn Sci*. 1988;12:177-210. Explains heuristics in human decision making in terms of the mental processes that manipulate descriptions of likelihood and that construct plans of action.

LARICHEV OI, Moshkovich HM. Limits to decision-making in direct multiattribute alternative evaluation. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process*. 1988;42:217-33. Concludes that people's ability to process information in classification problems is limited by task complexity.

LEHMAN DR, Lempert RO, Nisbett RE. The effects of graduate training on reasoning. Formal discipline and thinking about everyday-life events. *Am Psychol*. 1988;43:431-42. Reports that graduate training in psychology and medicine produced large effects on statistical and methodological reasoning, and on people's ability to reason about problems requiring the use of conditional probabilities.

MEDIN DL, Edelson SM. Problem structure and the use of base-rate information from experience. *J Exp Psychol (General)*. 1988;117:68-85. Proposes a model to account for people's inconsistent use of base-rate information that is based

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS (Continued)

on ideas of symptom competition and context-sensitive retrieval.

MIYAMOTO JM, Eraker SA. A multiplicative model of the utility of survival duration and health quality. *J Exp Psychol (General)*. 1988;117:3-20. Observes that most subjects use a multiplicative model to determine the utility of survival duration and health quality.

MYLES-WORSLEY M, Johnston WA, Simons MA. The influence of expertise on x-ray image processing. *J Exp Psychol (Learn)*. 1988;714:553-7. Documents the effect that expertise has on processing radiographic information; suggests that expert radiologists develop the ability to detect abnormalities while apparently losing the ability to detect variants in normal features.

PAYNE JW, Bettman JR, Johnson EJ. Adaptive strategy selection in decision making. *J Exp Psychol (Learn)*. 1988;14:534-52. Observes that actual behavior generally corresponded to the patterns of efficient processing of information.

PENNINGTON N, Hastie R. Explanation-based decision making. Effects of memory structure on judgment. *J Exp Psychol (Learn)*. 1988;14:521-33. Concludes that decision makers begin the decision process by constructing a causal model to explain the available facts and then base subsequent decisions on the causal interpretation that they imposed on the evidence.

PETERSON DK, Pitz G. Confidence, uncertainty, and the use of information. *J Exp Psychol (Learn)*. 1988;14:85-92. Proposes determinants for a person's beliefs about possible values for an unknown quantity and a person's beliefs that a given prediction is correct.

TEIGEN KH. When are low-probability events judged to be "probable"? Effects of outcome-set characteristics on verbal probability estimates. *Acta Psychol*. 1988;68:157-74. Examines variations in people's interpretation of verbal probabilistic phrases.

WAGENAAR WA, Keren G, Lichtenstein S. Islanders and hostages. Deep and surface structures of decision problems. *Acta Psychol*. 1988;67:175-89. Demonstrates that the representation of a story problem by subjects may be very different from that actually presented in the story.

WEINSTEIN ND. The precaution adoption process. *Health Psychol*. 1988;7:355-86. Reviews a variety of factors that are usually overlooked in models of preventive behavior.

WHITE PA. Knowing more about what we can tell. "Introspective access" and causal report accuracy 10 years later. *Br J Psychol*. 1988;79:13-45. Concludes that there is a little empirical support for the notion that people lack introspective access to their mental processes or are unable accurately to provide retrospective causal reports about those processes.

Gray
Box

Announcing Eleventh Annual Meeting Society for Medical Decision Making

Radisson University Hotel ♦ Minneapolis, Minnesota

October 15 - 18, 1989

The Society's Eleventh Annual Meeting will include a symposium entitled "**Medical Decision Making and Public Policy**". Dr. Donald Berwick of Harvard Community Health Plan, Senator David Durenberger of Minnesota and Dr. Paul Ellwood, a major innovator in measuring quality of care will be invited speakers.

The core of the program will be presentations of current scientific work offered under seven separate categories by invited medical decision making researchers. Two poster sessions will be included. Several special activities will be offered including a popular format of

discussion for special interest groups.

Additional talks will be given by Dr. Lee B. Lusted, Co-founder and Historian of the Society for Medical Decision Making, and by Dr. J. Sanford Schwartz, President of the Society.

Several one-day courses in Medical Decision Making will be offered on Sunday, October 15. They will include "Practical Applications of Medical Decision Making", "Advanced Decision Psychology", "Confidence Profiles" and "Influence Diagrams".

Early registration is advised.

Mailing of Scientific Programs and Registration Materials will begin in July.

Please contact SMDM's Administrative office to request registration materials.

Write: SMDM, P.O. Box 447, West Lebanon, NH 03784 ♦ Phone: 603/298-9929 ♦ E-mail: SMDM@Eloazar.Dartmouth.edu

CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON JUDGMENT AND POLICY
University of Colorado, Boulder

Three of the publications listed below may be obtained free of charge. Additional reprints are available at the rate of \$1.00 each. If you wish the reprints/papers sent by First Class Mail, the cost will be \$1.50 per copy.

- 294 Pennington, N., & Hastie, R. (1989). *Practical implications of psychological research on juror and jury decision making*. Center Report No 294.
- 293 Hastie, R., & Pennington, N. (in press). Cognitive and social processes in decision making. In J. Levine & L. Resnick (Eds.), *Socially shared cognition*. Arlington, VA: American Psychological Association.
- 292 Thompson, L., & Hastie, R. (in press). Social perception in negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*.
- 291 Hastie, R., & Pennington, N. (in press). Notes on the distinction between memory-based versus on-line judgments. In J. Bassili (Ed.), *On-line social judgments*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- 290 Hastie, R. (1988). A computer simulation model of person memory. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 24, 423-447.
- 289 Pennington, N., & Hastie, R. (1988). Explanation-based decision making: The effects of memory structure on judgment. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 14, 521-533.
- 288 Lusk, C. M., & Hammond, K. R. (1989, May). *Judgment in a dynamic task: Nowcasting the microburst*. Center Report No. 288.
- 287 Lusk, C. M., Hammond, K. R., & Mross, E. F. (1989, May). *Judgment and decision making under stress: A preliminary study of convection forecasts*. Center Report No. 287.
- 286 McClelland, G. H., Schulze, W. D., & Hurd, B. (1989, March). *The effect of risk beliefs on property values: A case study of a hazardous waste site*. Center Report No. 286.
- 285 Lusk, C. M., Smith, D. L., & Neal, M. (1988, December). *A coding scheme for medical student and physician verbal protocols*. Center Report No. 285.
- 284 Lusk, C. M., Stewart, T. R., Hammond, K. R., & Potts, R. J. (1988). *Judgment and decision making in dynamic tasks: The case of forecasting the microburst*. Center Report No. 284.
- 283 Stewart, T. R. (1988). Judgment analysis: Procedures. In B. Brehmer & C. R. B. Joyce (Eds.), *Human judgment: The SJT view* (pp. 41-74). Amsterdam: North Holland.
- 282 Hammond, K. R. (1988). Judgment and decision making in dynamic tasks. *Information and Decision Technologies*, 14, 3-14.

Change
info

- 281 Hammond, K. R. (in press). Information models for intuitive and analytical cognition. In A. Sage (Ed.), *Concise encyclopedia of information processing in systems and organizations*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- 280 Hammond, K. R., Frederick, E., Robillard, N., & Victor, D. (1988). Application of cognitive theory to the student-teacher dialog. In D. Evans & V. L. Patel (Eds.), *Cognitive science in medicine*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- get → 279 Brunner, R. D., Fitch, S. J., Grassia, J., Kathlene, L., & Hammond, K. R. (1987). Improving data utilization: The case-wise alternative. *Policy Sciences*, 20, 365-394.
- 278 Nickerson, C. A., McClelland, G. H., & Victor, D. M. (1988). *Predicting contraceptive preferences from contraceptive perceptions and values*. Center Report No. 278.
- see → 277 Nickerson, C. A., & McClelland, G. H. (1988). *Across-persons vs. within-persons tests of expectancy-value models: A methodological note*. Center Report No. 277.
- ✓ 276 Nickerson, C. A., & McClelland, G. H. (1987). Beliefs and values and the sterilization decision. *Population and Environment*, 9(2), 74-95.
- 275 Nickerson, C. A., McClelland, G. H., & Victor, D. M. (1988). *Measuring contraceptive values: An alternative approach*. Center Report No. 275.

Please circle the numbers of reprints requested; make checks payable to the Center for Research on Judgment and Policy; and address requests to:

Pat Armstrong
 CRJP/Campus Box 344
 University of Colorado,
 Boulder, CO 80309-0344.

294	293	292	291	290	289	288
287	286	285	284	283	282	281
280	279	278	277	276	275	

Name _____

Address _____

Report: THE LEIDEN CONFERENCE ON UNIQUE VERSUS REPEATED DECISIONS: THINKING THE UNTHINKABLE ABOUT CLASSICAL DECISION THEORY

Prepared by Lee R. Beach, Charles Vlek, and Willem A. Wagenaar

On Page 7 of the July 1988 *SPUDM Newsletter* and on Page 4 of the August 1988 *J/DM Newsletter* you may have seen a one-page summary of a conference report issued by the Psychological Institute of the University of Leiden. On April 21-23, 1988, a small-scale international conference was held at Leiden to examine the question of whether classical decision theory can deal adequately with unique decision problems, and to explore the implications that follow from how the question is answered. Among other things, participants discussed the nature of unique versus repeated decision situations, the strong assumptions and requirements of classical decision theory, the need for a taxonomy of decision tasks, and the implications of alternative decision theories for practical decision aiding. The conference revealed a strong strain of discontent and uneasiness of the classical perspective. Given their large investment in classical decision theory, behavioral decision researchers may themselves be faced with some difficult decision about the future of their discipline.

Single copies of the conference report may be obtained by writing to:

Mrs. L. L. Brak-Tjen
Unit of Experimental Psychology
Psychological Institute
University of Leiden
P. O. Box 9509,
2300 RA Leiden, THE NETHERLANDS

BRIEF REPORT. . .

CONFORMITY AND CONFIDENCE, Orlando J. Olivares

The general findings in the conformity/confidence literature is an inverse relationship between conformity and confidence. Because confidence has always been measured as an amount, the relationship between conformity and confidence has been examined only in a limited sense.

This study sought to examine the relationship between both the amount and accuracy of confidence with conformity. Additionally, it was hypothesized that there will be a pervasive finding of overconfidence across subjects, and conformists will have less confidence than independents.

This study using predominantly Hispanics, all undergraduates (N=54), found no relationship between calibration and conformity, or the amount of confidence and conformity. The finding of no relationship between the amount of confidence and conformity is inconsistent with previous findings: previous findings indicate an inverse relationship between conformity and amount of confidence. A pervasive finding of overconfidence in this study is consistent with previous findings. Males were found to be significantly more confident, and significantly more inaccurate in their assessment of confidence, than females; although, males and females had almost identical conformity scores.

Correspondence and requests should be addressed to Orlando J. Olivares, Department of Behavioral Sciences, New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas, New Mexico 87701.


DECISION TREE ANALYSIS SOFTWARE

Craig Kirkwood has a new decision tree analysis program available for IBM compatible personal computers. The program, EXPRESSION TREE, is primarily intended for use in decision analysis instruction. It runs on IBM-compatible personal computers with any type of display and at least 256K memory.

The program allows rapid construction and analysis of trees through use of decision variables and random variables as well as algebraic expressions. Specifically, it includes capabilities for (1) use of algebraic expressions to calculate the values of end points, (2) use of algebraic expressions to calculate branch probabilities, (3) automated sensitivity analysis, and (4) full-screen field-oriented editing for data input. Exponential and linear single-attribute utility functions are supported.

A single user license is \$25.00 and includes one copy of the software and one bound copy of the manual. An instructional license is \$50.00 and includes one copy of the software, one bound copy of the manual, and one unbound copy of the manual for use in copying. An instructional license grants permission for the license holder to make copies of the program and documentation for direct instructional use provided that no fee is charged for these copies (other than a nominal amount to cover copying expenses) and that no financial gain accrues to the license holder, either directly or indirectly. Thus, this license generally grants the right to make copies for use in regular academic instruction.

Make checks payable to "DIS Department Gifts and Grants Account." (Sorry, no credit cards or purchase orders.) Indicate if you need a 3.5" diskette. Order from:

Craig W. Kirkwood
Department of Decision and Information Systems
College of Business
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-4206

1990 USC/DH+S AUDIT JUDGMENT SYMPOSIUM. . .

The Center for Accounting Research at the University of Southern California will host the eighth annual Audit Judgment Symposium February 19 and 20, 1990. The Symposium, which is supported by a grant from the Deloitte Haskins + Sells Foundation, will consist of papers, panels and presentations which focus on behavioral, cognitive and decision support aspects of audit judgment research. The symposium will be held at The Newporter Resort in Newport Beach, California.

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, there will be sessions on current audit judgment research and panels discussing current developments and research opportunities within auditing. Anyone interested in participating in the Symposium should send a copy of your paper, abstract, or presentation idea by October 1, 1989 to:

Professor Karen V. Pincus (213) 743-0626 or
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

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: _____

ONR SOLICITS RESEARCH PROPOSALS (Continued)

Situation assessment and resource allocation decisions are made on the basis of incomplete and uncertain information, with limited intra-team communication in fast-tempo, high-risk threat scenarios. A central scientific issue is the development of measures of indices of coordination. Among the variables potentially contributing to enhanced coordination are team organizational structure, degree of overlap in team member "mental models," design of display interfaces common to the team members, access to global vs. local databases, role of the team leader as coordinator, adaptive coordinations strategies, and tradeoffs, between explicit (communication) and implicit (computation) coordination. Proposals should include theory development, variable definition and measurement approaches, modeling, analysis, and experimentation to deepen understanding of how coordination is achieved and maintained by hierarchical decision-making teams in stressful environments.

For further information contact:

Dr. W. S. Vaughan
Cognitive and Neural Sciences Division
ATTN: URI '90
Office of Naval Research
800 North Quincy Street
Room 823
Arlington, VA 22217-5000
Telephone: (202) 696-4505

J/DM NEWSLETTER

Department of Psychology
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

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

9
Rob Hamm
Institute of Cognitive Sci
Box 345
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309-0345

TIME-DATED MATERIAL