



Society for Judgment and Decision Making

Newsletter

www.sjdm.org

Volume 23, Number 1

March 2004

Contents

2004 Executive Board.....	2
President's column: Ideas as Units of Analysis.....	3
History of JDM – The Transition to a Society.....	5
Teaching decision making: Habits of choice.....	8
Jobs.....	11
Three Calls for Papers.....	12
The role of affect in decision making.....	12
Dedicated to the career of Paul Meehl.....	13
Naturalistic decision making in organizations.....	13
Conferences.....	15
Decade of Behaviour.....	17
2004 Dues and Address Corrections.....	18

“Good judgement comes from experience; experience comes from bad judgement.”

Fred Brooks

***“At the constitutional level where we work, 90 percent of any decision is emotional.
The rational part of us supplies the reasons for supporting our predilections.”***

Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas (1898 - 1980)

2004 Executive Board

Eric Johnson, *President*, ejj3@columbia.edu
 Josh Klayman, *past-President*, joshk@uchicago.edu
 Maya Bar-Hillel, *President-elect*, msmaya@math.huji.ac.il
 Lisa Ordonez, 2004-2006, lordonez@email.arizona.edu
 Peter Ayton, 2002-2004, p.ayton@city.ac.uk
 Rami Zwick, 2003-2005, mkzwick@ust.hk
 Bud Fennema, *Secretary/Treasurer*, bfennema@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
 Richard Coughlan, *Conference Coordinator*, rcoughla@richmond.edu
 Alan Schwartz, *Webmaster*, alansz@sjdm.org
 Warren Thorngate, *Newsletter Editor*, warrent@ccs.carleton.ca

JDM Newsletter Editor
 (Submissions & Advertisements)
 Warren Thorngate
 Psychology Department
 Carleton University
 1125 Colonel By Drive
 Ottawa, Ontario K1S 5B6
 Canada
 (613) 520-2600 x 2706
 fax (613) 520-3667
warrent@ccs.carleton.ca

The *JDM Newsletter*, published four times a year (March, June, September, and December), 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 However, we do not publish substantive papers.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 or email the editor. There are few ground rules for submissions. The best way to send your contribution is via EMAIL or a 3.5" diskette. Send an IBM-compatible text file or word-processed document up to versions WordPerfect 10 or Word 2000. If you must send hard copy (e.g., if you are using special graphics or do not have computer access), the copy should be typed single-spaced on white 8½ by 11 paper. Please mail flat -- do not fold.

Subscriptions: Subscriptions are available on a calendar year basis only with society membership. Requests for information concerning membership

in the Society for Judgment and Decision Making should be sent to Bud Fennema.

Advertising Rates: Advertising can be submitted to the editor. Inclusion of the ad and the space given to the ad is at the editor's discretion. The current charge is \$100 per page (\$50 per 1/2 page). Contact Warren Thorngate for details.

Secretary/Treasurer
 Bud Fennema
 Chairman, Department of Accounting and Ernst & Young Professor
 College of Business
 Florida State University
 Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1110
 Voice: (850)644-8231 Fax: (850)644-8234
bfennema@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

Mailing Labels: Some readers may wish to send reprint lists or other material to people listed in the directory. The current charge is \$125 for a set of labels. A diskette of the database is available for one-time use. The charge is \$50 for commercial use, \$25 for nonprofit use. Contact Bud Fennema for details.

Address Corrections: Please keep your mailing and/or email address current. We often have no way of knowing if you are not receiving the newsletter. Address changes or corrections should be sent Bud Fennema. Reports of problems in receiving or opening the pdf file should be sent to the editor.

President's column: Ideas as Units of Analysis

Eric Johnson

Sometimes, when conversation at an interdisciplinary lunch slows down, I ask people from different fields "What is your favorite popular/trade book about science?" Since I always try to find a good read for myself, this is useful, and I also try to find out what criteria people in other disciplines use to select their recreational reading.

With apologies to Malcolm Gladwell and James Gleick, the most common answer to my question is not a book by a translator or aggregator of ideas, but a book by a scientist: *The Selfish Gene* by Richard Dawkins. This book is a good read, in part because as Eldar Shafir (who, in the terms of diffusion theory was the source of this contagion for me) put it: "You read that book and you are given the illusion that you understand genetics."

The book is based on one simple idea and a radical shift in perspective: That people are not really the unit of analysis, but are just vessels, used by genes for their own propagation. This shift is then used to explain that certain behaviors occur, not because a person (or other living thing) or culture makes a decision, but because it maximized the probability that a certain gene will survive. This shift is subtly subversive. All of a sudden, from the perspective of a gene, we are simply "survival machines", constructed by genes over years of evolution to maximize their survival. Our behavior is determined and best explained, Dawkins argues, by genes' need to propagate. These kinds of shifts of perspective can be very enlightening, bringing light to otherwise ignored aspects of phenomena.

I would like to borrow Dawkins' trick and wonder what happens if we use a different unit of analysis, and suggest that we might be simply be the carriers of ideas, large cumbersome vessels that are necessary for their survival, useful because they need to recombine, mutate, propagate, and spread. Clearly the metaphor of ideas as the unit of analysis is not entirely original. Dawkins talks about memes, pop marketing books talk about 'spreading the idea virus, and Chip Heath, Chris Bell and Emily Sternberg have written about emotion and selection for Urban Legends. However, I wonder what would happen if we were to change our perspective, for a second, from people (who win prizes, are the units of citations, and citation counts) to the lives of academic ideas, how they propagate, survive and prosper.

Wu, Zhang and Gonzales, in their recent chapter for the Blackwell Handbook of Judgment and Decision-Making on Risk, wonderfully trace the origins of some of our most powerful ideas. To quote:

It is a surprise to many people that many of the ideas from prospect theory existed in previous literatures. In a remarkable paper, Markowitz (1952, p. 154) proposed a utility function that defined utility as changes from present wealth as an attempt to capture the observation that individuals at just about every wealth were insurance buying gamblers. Preston & Baratta (1948) investigated choices involving varying probability levels and found a pattern remarkably similar to that captured by prospect theory's weighting function (see also Mosteller & Nogee, 1951; Davidson, Suppes, & Siegel 1957). Edwards (1953) documented

probability preferences, preferences to bet on certain probabilities when faced with bets of equal expected value, and argued that descriptive models needed to take account the nonlinear impact probabilities have on decisions. Finally, MacCrimmon (1968) and MacCrimmon & Larsson (1979) presented similar demonstrations of the common-ratio and common-consequence violations, and Williams (1966) documented rejection of fair gambles, consistent with loss aversion (see, also, Mosteller & Nogee, 1951; Slovic & Lichtenstein, 1968, p.10).

Thus, many of the pieces of Prospect Theory, taken alone, were not novel. However, the reputation of Prospect Theory as one of the most important papers in social science is nevertheless completely deserved. The paper took ideas that had been around, some for as long as 30 years, scattered in different literatures and thought to be unrelated, and constructed a formal model in which all the elements worked together.

Some recombinations are spectacular, like prospect theory, and accompanied by substantial new evidence and integration, other are more mundane. But if the unit of analysis is the idea, we focus more on the propagation, recombination, and mutation of the idea [rather the product of the authors that although brilliant, occurs in context. I have no idea if the many ideas discussed by Wu et al. directly influenced the development of prospect theory, but it is plausible that their existence increased accessibility in either direct or indirect ways.

I am better able to trace how the idea of simulating decision processes was propagated, using me as a carrier. My first presentation at a major JDM conference was in 1979, at the SPUDM conference in Göteborg. This conference was my first chance to meet luminaries like Sarah Lichtenstein, Baruch Fischhoff, Lee Beach, and Ola Svenson, whose work I had devoured as a graduate student. I had been infected at the time with the idea that one could measure the cognitive effort associated with making a decision, using elementary information processes (an idea that I “caught” from the Bill Chase at Carnegie-Mellon), and I used very simple algebra to do some rudimentary estimates of this effort. The idea, I discovered, had infected others: Oswald Huber presented a similar paper in the same session, and afterwards, Baruch Fischhoff sent me a nice note with some questions, and enclosed a paper by Warren Thorngate and Judy Maki, which used simulations to look at accuracy.

From there, John Payne and I (who had also been infected) started talking about simulation to estimate the accuracy and effort of choice heuristics simultaneously. From that sprung a paper with John published in Management Science, from there, adding Jim Bettman, we published a number of papers leading to the book “The Adaptive Decision-Maker.” Memory is terribly unreliable, particularly when recounting events this far in the past, but I wonder what would have happened, if the ‘control Eric Johnson’ had not gone to that SPUDM, met Oswald Huber, received a note from Baruch, and got infected with the idea to use simulation as a tool from the Thorngate and Maki paper.

When I first entered the field in the late 1970s, I remember how it struck me, (and I don’t think I was being entirely naïve) as a surprisingly cordial place, and one in which most people knew each other, and when late night discussions combined a dose of oral transmission of cultural

history, friendly arguments over ideas and glasses of wine. There is a sense now, perhaps understandably, that we a bit more contentious, and argue, occasionally over the ownership of ideas. I think that this ultimately, is wrong. The perspective that ideas own us might be more adaptive. One thing is certain, the good ideas we generate will outlive all of us, and the best, the really useful ones, will survive long after their origins, or carriers, are forgotten.

History of JDM – The Transition to a Society

James Shanteau

As described in the first installment of the history of JDM [SJDM Newsletter, June 2003], the initial JDM meeting (1980) in St. Louis was a surprising success, especially given our lack of organization. It was clear that there was a need for a meeting not owned by any individual or faction that addressed issues of common concern to JDM researchers. In the second installment [SJDM Newsletter, September 2003], I focused on the second meeting in Philadelphia where many of the patterns were laid down for future JDM meetings, e.g., highly-interactive programs consisting of major addresses, workshops, short presentations, etc.

The purpose of this final installment is to describe how we transitioned from the small self-appointed group that coordinated (loosely) the first few meetings to a formal self-sustaining organization that became the leading professional society in the field. The formation of formal organization was one of the many transitions that occurred during the early years of JDM's existence.

Let me briefly describe the highlights of the third, fourth, and fifth meetings, each of which was influential in its own way. The 1982 meeting in Minneapolis was memorable in three respects. First, the keynote address by *Kenneth Hammond* established the tradition of having the founders of JDM open the meeting by offering perspectives on the past, present, and future of JDM research. Ken's talk, "To Whom Does the Future Belong: Is You Is or Is You Ain't my Baby?" elicited a lively discussion led by *Lola Lopes*.

Second, *Daniel Kahneman* and *Amos Tversky* gave the major invited address on "Intentional Reasoning and the Conjunction Fallacy in Probability Judgments." This was the first time most of us learned about the conjunction fallacy. Danny and Amos established a precedent of having important new findings first introduced and debated at the annual JDM meeting.

Third, there was a conscious effort to include young researchers on the program with a special session on "Role of Experience in Judgment and Decision Making." The talks by then-newcomers *Jerry Busemeyer*, *Colleen (Surber) Moore*, *Barbara Mellers*, *Gary Gaeth*, and *Kent Norman* provided their first opportunities to speak at JDM. Of course, these individuals have since become well known, with significant contributions by each. They established the tradition of having young researchers make their mark at the JDM meetings.

The 1983 meeting in San Diego was notable in that *Clyde Coombs* gave the founder's keynote address, "Some Cumulative and Not So Cumulative Research on Decision Making" with discussion by *Kenneth Hammond*. This marked Clyde's only JDM meeting – he unfortunately died a few years later. *Norman Anderson* gave the major invited address on "Judgment and

Decision Making as Goal-Directed Action” with comments by *Jerry Busemeyer* and *John Carroll*. Finally, *Charles Gettys* organized a memorable workshop on “Judgment Research and Psychology: What Was, Is, and Will be Unique?” with presentations by *Jay Christensen-Szalanski*, *Lola Lopes*, and *Robin Hogarth*.

The latter talk deserves special comment. At the early meetings, I tape recorded all the longer talks and workshops. (I now wish that modern video technology had been available then. But at least, I still have the old tape recordings.) In any case, I am still asked today for tapes of Robin’s talk in which he offered a whimsical look back from 20 years in the future. To paraphrase Robin, *following the collapse of economics in 2000 from theoretical self-indulgence, JDM research gained its well-deserved place in the sun*. This remains one of the best tongue-in-check talks ever presented at a JDM meeting.

The San Diego meeting was also notable because of the impact the fledgling group had on the renaming of a major journal. In the preceding year, there had been discussion about whether the available journals provided adequate opportunities for publishing JDM research. The consensus was that *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* provided a strong outlet for our work. However, there was concern that the title was misleading since it did not mention “decision making.” On behalf of the JDM organizing group, *James Shanteau* contacted *James Naylor* (the editor of OBHP) to ask about a name change.

After consulting with his editorial board and Academic Press (the publisher of the journal), Naylor wrote to Shanteau that the title of the journal would be changed, “By and large, the response of the editorial board was supportive of the name change. Only several people voted against it, but even those felt that, if I felt strongly about it, then it was probably the appropriate thing to do. I do so feel, and...my preferred name change is to retitile the Journal *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*.” Thus, our new group had a major impact on establishing OBHDP as an appropriately-named voice for the field.

The 1984 meeting in San Antonio opened with *Howard Raiffa*’s keynote address on “Behavioral Insights for Prescriptive Analysis;” the discussants were *Gerrit Wolf* and *Robin Hogarth*. This talk stands out because of Howard’s call for JDM researchers to focus on understanding the behavior of decision making, as opposed to working on the theory of decision analysis. In the major invited address by *Sarah Lichtenstein* on “Comparable Worth as Multiattribute Utility,” she argued that JDM methods could be used to build a case for, and a means to, implement gender equity in salary. This produced an enlightening (and sometimes heated) discussion lead by *John Payne* and *Lola Lopes*.

The meeting was also notable for workshop on “Teaching of Judgment and Decision Making,” with presentations by *Kenneth Hammond*, *Berndt Brehmer*, *Michael Doherty*, *Arthur Elstein*, *John Payne*, and *James Shanteau*. The reaction was so positive that in later years workshops on teaching became a regular part of JDM meetings. Under *Frank Yates*’ leadership, these workshops let panelists and audience members share experiences about what works, and what doesn’t work, in teaching students about our field.

During the meeting in San Antonio, a major topic for discussion was how best to continue the JDM meetings. Since the first session in St Louis, an ad-hoc group of (alphabetically) *John Castellan*, *John Carroll*, *Steve Edgell*, *Charles Gettys*, *Lola Lopes*, *Gary McClelland*, and *James Shanteau* had done most of the work of organizing the sessions. Two decisions were made: First, the founding group would be responsible for one more meeting to be held in New Orleans the following year.

Second, an ad-hoc subcommittee led by *John Castellan* would investigate options for making JDM a legally organized society. The move to make JDM a legal group was contentious, with arguments both for and against. The primary argument for continuing as an unstructured organization was “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it;” the success of the first five meetings was evidence that a more formal structure was not necessary.

There were two arguments in favor of establishing a formal organization: First, there needed to be some means of passing on responsibility for organizing the meetings to others outside the original circle. Second, because of increasing attendance at the meetings (to over 90), the amount of money flowing in and out of JDM was becoming rather substantial; for tax and legal reasons, it was imperative that we be able to account for the money as a non-profit corporation. In the end, the “pro” arguments carried the day.

Prior to taking on this role for JDM, Castellan had helped the *Society for Mathematical Psychology* become incorporated, including writing a set of bylaws. Based on this experience, he developed a draft proposal for doing the same for JDM. John presented his proposal at the business meeting in New Orleans. After much discussion, it was decided to submit the proposal to a mail vote of those paying dues to JDM.

The subsequent vote was clearly in favor of incorporating JDM. John then handled most of the details of getting this accomplished before the next meeting in Seattle. The *Society for Judgment and Decision Making* (as it became known) is forever indebted to *John Castellan* for his tireless behind-the-scenes work on behalf of our organization.

With the formal establishment of the Society of Judgment and Decision Making, this three-part series about the early days of JDM comes to an end. It will be up to others to write about the evolution of the organization in the years following 1985. However, I would like to end by dedicating this series to two individuals, *Charles Gettys* and *John Castellan*, whose untimely deaths in the 1990s left a hole that will never be filled. Without their efforts, SJDM would not exist today.

John Castellan’s death in 1993 was a sad event for all of us. At his memorial service, the plaque he received from JDM for his efforts (the first ever given by the society) was prominently displayed as he requested. The next plaques were given in 1996 to *Charles Gettys* and *James Shanteau* for their efforts in establishing JDM. Chuck’s plaque from JDM was also a prominent part of his memorial service in 1997. Personally, I will forever be thankful for the inspiration provided by both John and Chuck.

(In preparing these three articles, I had much needed help with my failing memory from *Steve Edgell, Robin Hogarth, Lola Lopes, Gary McClelland, and Warren Thorngate*. Any errors of omission or commission are mine, of course. Prepared by *James Shanteau*, first President and co-founder of JDM; e-mail: shanteau@ksu.edu).

Teaching decision making: Habits of choice

Warren Thorngate

It's an old classroom decision making demonstration but still a good one, requiring only two pencils, a watch with a second hand, a blank sheet of paper, and three photocopies of 10-20 classified ads. The ads might come from a local newspaper, and could be for anything that would interest students, for example, ads for apartments, cars or companions. The same set of ads should appear on each of three pages, but should be randomly shuffled for each page to make the exercise slightly more interesting.

Ask students to form pairs for a study of decision time, one student of each pair playing the role of decision maker and the other playing the role of experimenter. It is best to seat them facing each other across a desk or table. Give the decision maker a pencil and the three photocopies of the ads, face down. Give the experimenter the other pencil, and the blank sheet of paper for recording the decisions made and how many seconds it took to make each. Then ask the experimenter to read aloud the following instructions:

“This is an experiment concerned with how long it takes to make a decision from one occasion to the next. Assume you are looking for an [apartment, car, companion or whatever]. Face down, in front of you, are three copies of a page of classified advertisements for [apartments, cars, companions or whatever]. On each of three trials, I want you to make a decision about your most preferred [apartment, car, companion or whatever] on the list.

“As soon as I tell you to start, please turn over the top copy, look at the ads, and circle with your pencil the ad for the one alternative you most prefer. I will record your choice and how long it takes you to make your decision. When I ask you to start the second trial, please turn over the second copy and, again, circle the ad for the one alternative you most prefer, as I record your choice and decision time. When I ask you to start the final trial, please turn over the third copy and repeat the task while I again time you.”

Some students will doubtless think it odd to make the same choice three times, and a few might do it jokingly, changing their choices from one occasion to the next. No great problem. It is not important what they choose, but how long it takes them.

If the demonstration goes according to plan, the data should show a noticeable reduction in the amount of time it takes for a decision maker to circle the most preferred alternative after turning over each new leaf. The first run might take 60-120 seconds, the second, 20-30 seconds and the third, 10-20 seconds. Students can, and probably should, average choice times for the first, second and third trials across all decision makers in the class. They can even plot the three averages and undertake a one-way, repeated measures ANOVA to exercise their statistical skills

(looking for a free and good statistical package for Windows and Linux? Try OpenStat <http://www.statpages.org/miller/openstat/>).

Students enjoy discussing which ads they selected and why. Yet the serious fun begins when they address questions about the decrease in choice time. Why does the time decline? Do our neurons fire faster with warm-up or practice? Does our decision mechanism accelerate or shift from low to high gear? Or could it be that whatever decision process was used on the first trial was then discarded for another process on a subsequent trial? If so, what are the processes? Where did they come from? And why would we substitute one for another?

Students who claim that their choice time reduction shows their neurons or processes “coming up to speed” might be encouraged to read about neurophysiology. Something else is clearly happening, most likely a shift from cognition to re-cognition as students repeat the same task with the same information. The shift is probably a variation of the one occurring as we learn to read music, first mechanically then fluidly, or when we master the skills of driving by learning what in the chaos of traffic to ignore. Even in the existential world of choice, habits grow.

I believe it was William James who said, “Thought is secreted in the interstices of habits.” Our decision literature abounds with words about thought, but few can be found about habits, fewer still about the difference between good habits and bad (for a refreshing exception, see Svenson, 2003). Memory is sometimes discussed, usually in relation to its deficits, distortions or dangers, paradoxically leaving the impression that decisions would be ever so much better if we could swap the capacities of working and long-term memory, filling the former with litres of logic and bushels of Bayes. Pity. Until the mutants outbreed us, we seem to be stuck with the memory capacities we have, probably for good evolutionary reasons. It is worthwhile to ask students (and ourselves), would we be twice happier in life with a working memory that could handle twice the magic number seven plus or minus two? Or is it quite all right to find the redundancies in our daily life, consign to habit our reactions to them, and leave our thinking to the new stuff?

There is a vast amount of redundancy in the life of most of us -- more for “lumpers” than for “splitters” as the taxonomists would say -- which repeatedly returns us the same or similar decision tasks. Ask students to list all decisions they made in the past 24 hours, and to calculate the proportion of these decisions they have encountered before. Most students must be prodded to list repeated decisions because they do not think of them as such. Included are decisions about which toothbrush to use in the morning, which coat to wear, which route to take to school, who to greet in the hallway, which lecture to attend, when to take notes, and which fast food to buy for lunch. When these decisions enter their list, students easily see that the vast majority of their daily decisions are, if I may coin a term, *recisions*. (They will probably also discover that most of their recisions are inconsequential, leading to another pedagogical gold mine for a future column.)

Ask students how they handle their recisions. If their introspections can be trusted, one very popular heuristic will look something like this (see also, Thorngate, 1975, 1976):

- Does the current decision situation remind me of one or more situations I have previously encountered?

- If it reminds me of one previous situation, can I recall what I have previously decided?
 - If yes, was the decision satisfactory?
 - If yes, repeat it
 - If no, kick-start some conscious processing to pick a better alternative
- If it reminds me of two or more previous situations, did they all lead to the same decision?
 - If yes, was the common decision satisfactory?
 - If yes, repeat it
 - If no, kick-start some conscious processing to determine which past decision should be followed
- If the situation reminds me of nothing I have previously encountered...
 - Stall
 - Punt
 - Pray
 - Ask a friend
 - Or decompose the situation into familiar pieces and use one of them rational calculus formulas I remember from management class to justify whatever I decide

Nothing new here. The heuristic is a variation of the chess master heuristic so elegantly studied by de Groot, Simon, Chase and others. Legal variations of the heuristic lead to what is called *case law*, to the concept of precedent, and to fascinating debates over which cases have precedent over others. Some students might be inspired to read or think about the relation between psychology research on decision making and legal practice. Others might be inspired to read or think about a related question: If we are destined by the fit between environmental and neuroanatomical structures to use recognition of previous decisions in making current ones, then can we find a set of previous decisions to use as precedents that will lead to better choices than other sets? Put another way for class discussion, if students could pick only three of Aesop's Fables, or 19th Century novels, or contemporary films as guides to life choices, which would they be and why?

References

- Svenson, O. (2003). Values, affect, and processes in human decision making: A differentiation and consolidation theory perspective. In S. Schneider & J. Shanteau (Eds.). *Emerging perspectives on judgment and decision research*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Thorngate, W. (1975). Process invariance: Another red herring. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1, 485-488.
- Thorngate, W. (1976). Must we always think before we act? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 2, 31-35.

Jobs

The Center for the Decision Sciences at Columbia University in New York City is seeking applicants for 1 - 3 Postdoctoral Fellowships for one-year (possibly renewable) positions beginning in Fall 2004. Candidates should be interested in decision making in conjunction with one or more of the following topic areas: 1) Medicine (including working with patients), 2) Cognition & Memory, and 3) Environmental Studies & Group Processes. The Medical position will work with Drs. Serge Sevy and Elke Weber. The Cognition & Memory position will work with Drs. Eric Johnson and Elke Weber and seeks a researcher with expertise in computational modeling. The Environmental Studies & Group Processes position will work with Drs. David Krantz and Elke Weber. Salaries range from \$35K to \$43K depending on qualifications, which must include a Ph.D. (or near completion of one) in a discipline within the decision sciences, and related to the targeted topic area. The Center for the Decision Sciences is a vibrant interdisciplinary research center, serving the community of decision making researchers in New York City, and features a speaker series that brings to campus scholars of international renown. Visit CDS online at <http://www.cebiz.org/cds>. Send applications (CV, letters of recommendation, topic area of interest, and up to 3 reprints) by April 15, 2004 to
 Dr. Daniel Goldstein, Associate Director,
 Center for the Decision Sciences, Columbia University
 ISERP IAS #805A MC3355, 420 W. 118th St.
 New York, NY 10027.

Columbia University is an equal opportunity employer. It does not discriminate against employees or applicants for employment on the basis of race, color, sex, gender, religion, creed, national and ethnic origin, age, citizenship, status as a perceived or actual victim of domestic violence, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, status as a Vietnam era or disabled veteran, or any other legally protected status.

The University of Warwick (UK) - Department of Psychology
 Professor of Psychology and
 3 Lecturers (Assistant Professors) in Psychology

The Department of Psychology at the University of Warwick (UK) wishes to appoint one full professor and three lecturers (assistant professors) in psychology. Candidates with research interests in any area of psychology will be considered. Warwick is consistently ranked in the top five of British research universities, and the Psychology Department has a concentration of outstanding researchers.

Further details about the posts can be found at

<http://secure.admin.warwick.ac.uk/webjobs/jobs/academic/job3601.html> and at
<http://secure.admin.warwick.ac.uk/webjobs/jobs/academic/job18991.html>

Koen Lamberts

Professor and Chair

Department of Psychology

University of Warwick

k.lamberts@warwick.ac.uk

Three Calls for Papers

1. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, Special Issue:

The role of affect in decision making

Guest Editors: Tommy Garling, Daniel Vastfjall, Paul Slovic, and Ellen Peters

Submission due date: September 1, 2004

The field of Behavioral Decision Theory originated in the mid-20th century and followed the lead of economics, by focusing predominantly on concepts related to the deliberative system. The field drew heavily from probability theory and statistics. Attempts to derive more psychological models of information processing tended to be analytical, rather than affective. More recently, the importance of affect has been recognized by decision researchers. A strong early proponent of the importance of affect in decision making was Zajonc (1980), who argued that affective reactions to stimuli are often the very first reactions, occurring automatically and subsequently guiding information processing and judgment. If Zajonc is correct, then affective reactions may serve as orienting mechanisms, helping us navigate quickly and efficiently through a complex, uncertain, and sometimes dangerous world. While the research literature also shows many examples of decisions being made through a reason-based approach, many decisions appear to involve affect in some manner. Recent research has differentiated between "types" of affect including integral affect (e.g., affect towards an object) versus incidental affect (e.g., mood states) and positive and negative valence versus specific emotions. What are the "rules" that govern the impact of these different types of affect on judgments and decisions? How are they integrated when more than one type of affect is present? What is the role of anticipated affect such as regret versus experienced/anticipatory affect? Measurement issues also exist. How can affect be measured? How do you know it's affect and not something else (e.g., cognitive evaluation)? Researchers also generally agree that there is a strong interaction between affect and deliberation. What impact does this interaction have on judgments and decisions? Sometimes decision makers are aware of the impact of affect on decisions; other times they are not. What role does awareness of affect play in judgments and decisions? Finally, what is the value of affect in prescriptive decision making? The purpose of this special issue of the *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* is to shed light on the separate roles of various "types" of affect and their interaction with deliberative reason.

Manuscripts should be sent as email attachments to the associate editor, J. Frank Yates (jfyates@umich.edu). Manuscripts should conform to the specifications described in the 'Notes for Contributors' that appear in each issue of the journal and should be accompanied by a cover letter indicating a desire for consideration for the special issue on affect in decision making.

For further information, please contact the guest editors, Tommy Garling (Tommy.Garling@psy.gu.se), Daniel Vastfjall (daniel.vastfjall@psy.gu.se), Paul Slovic (pslovic@darkwing.uoregon.edu), or Ellen Peters (empeters@uoregon.edu), or the associate editor, J. Frank Yates (jfyates@umich.edu).

2. *The Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, special issue:

Dedicated to the career of Paul Meehl

On February 14, 2003, Paul Everett Meehl, a retired Regents Professor of Psychology at the University of Minnesota, died from chronic myelomonocytic leukemia. Fifty years ago, Meehl (1954) summarized 20 studies that found that statistically decomposing a complex problem led to more accurate results than expert holistic judgment.

The underlying principle of Paul Meehl's work has been extended to other areas of judgment and decision making. Decision strategies that capitalize on decision decomposition lead to more accurate answers, contain less random error and enhanced temporal stability. Decision aids in the medical decision making literature often rely on the disaggregation of medical information into smaller parts to help patients and their physicians make informed decisions about the patient's health care. Other aspects of medical decision making have been influenced by the principle of decision decomposition (Swets, Dawes & Monahan, 2000).

This special issue will commemorate the 50th anniversary of Meehl (1954) and the career of Dr. Paul Everett Meehl. Papers that investigate relevant applications of Meehl (1954) are welcomed. Manuscripts can either be full-length manuscripts or shorter research reports. Manuscripts that are not accepted as full-length articles may be considered for publication as shorter research reports. Research reports are not to exceed 17 pages of text (not including title page, abstract, references and tables/figures). As Paul Meehl has extensively written about null hypothesis significance testing, authors who submit a manuscript are strongly encouraged to accompany tests of null hypotheses with confidence intervals. It is anticipated that this special issue will be published in 2005.

Five copies of any manuscript must be submitted by May 1, 2004 to either of the following co-guest editors:

Robyn Dawes, Ph.D.

Charles J. Queenan Jr. University Professor
Department of Social and Decision Sciences
Carnegie Mellon University

208 Porter Hall

Pittsburgh, PA 15213

rd1b@andrew.cmu.edu

Osvaldo F. Morera, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
University of Texas at El Paso

500 West University Ave.

El Paso, TX 79912

omorera@utep.edu

Questions concerning the special issue can also be directed to either of the two co-guest editors.

3. *Organization Studies*, Special Issue:

Naturalistic decision making in organizations

Guest Editors:

Raanan Lipshitz, University of Haifa, Israel.

Gary Klein, Klein Associates, USA.

John S. Carroll, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA

Due Date: 31 January 2005

Rationale

The Naturalistic Decision Making (NDM) framework was initiated in 1989 in a conference in Dayton, Ohio, sponsored by the U. S. Army Research Institute. That conference established three enduring characteristics of NDM theories, research themes and findings: (1) The importance of time pressure, uncertainty, ill-defined goals, high personal stakes, and other complexities that characterize decision making in real-world settings. (2) The importance of studying people who had some degree of expertise pertinent to their decisions. (3) The way people size up and make sense of situations is more critical to how they decide than the way they select between courses of action. The 1989 conference produced an edited volume (Klein, G.A., Orasanu, J., Calderwood, R., & Zsombok C. (Eds.), *Decision making in action: Models and methods*. Norwood, CT: Ablex.) and was followed by five additional conferences that convened every two years, alternating between the USA and Europe. In addition to the edited volumes published following each of these conferences, several NDM researchers published books on the subject, and the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society established a “cognitive engineering and decision making” technical group in 1995. A recent review article documented the progress made by NDM researchers in the decade since the publication of the first edited volume in the areas of recognition, primed decisions, coping with uncertainty, team decision making, and training (Lipshitz, R., Klein, G., Orasanu, J., & Salas, E. (2001), Focus article: Taking stock of naturalistic decision making. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 14, pp.331-352).

Although time-pressured, ambiguous, high-stake and goal-conflicted situations abound in organizations, and even though NDM specifically acknowledges that decision making is influenced by context-specific norms and routines, the study of NDM in organizations has not received the attention that is called for. This Special Issue (SI) is designed to rectify this state of affairs.

In addition, the SI is intended to connect the emerging framework of NDM to the long-standing tradition of studying obligatory action by organizational researchers following a tradition set by J. March. Similar to NDM, obligatory action presumes that decisions are driven by sense-making and satisficing, and rejects the notion that decision processes are uniquely captured by the metaphor of choosing among gambles, which underlies classical and behavioral decision theories. Unlike NDM, the study of obligatory action focuses on the role of normative influences rather than pattern matching in the determination of situation awareness and action.

In pursuit of these objectives, submissions are invited for a special issue of *Organization Studies* that will relate the basic themes of the NDM framework to managerial and organizational behavior. We are interested in theoretical and empirical investigations that link naturalistic and organizational decision making issues. The following questions reflect (although they do not exhaust) the kind of submissions we are inviting:

- How do decision makers in organizations (e.g., managers, team leaders, professionals) negotiate uncertainty, ambiguity, time pressure, and goal conflicts successfully by applying relevant knowledge and expertise in order to make sense of events and to reason about plausible action?
- How does common ground influence distributed decision making and coordinated action at the team and organizational levels?

- What is the nature of cognitive functions, such as decision making, problem detection, sensemaking, and replanning at the level of teams and organizations? What kinds of barriers to these cognitive functions emerge at the team/organizational level?
- How do distributed decision makers synthesize their partial knowledge to enable teams and organizations to understand events? Can we speak of an emergent understanding that is different from and greater than the understanding of any of the individuals?
- What is the role of non-analytical, recognitional, and sensemaking processes in strategy formulation, selection, and implementation?
- What is the nature of team coordination and what are the costs of team coordination? What aspects of coordination emerge in going from the individual to the team level, and to the organizational level?

Submissions

To be considered for publication, papers must be electronically received by the Editor-in-Chief by 31 January 2005. Please submit papers as email attachments (Word files only) to the Editor-in-Chief (OSeditor@alba.edu.gr), indicating in the e-mail the title of the Special Issue. Please prepare manuscripts according to the guidelines shown on the inside cover of any issue of *Organization Studies* (available also on the web at www.egosnet.org/os). All papers will be blindly reviewed following OS's normal review process and criteria. Up to seven papers will be accepted for publication in the Special Issue. The Special Issue is scheduled to be published in February 2006. Any papers which may be accepted but will not be included in the Special Issue will be published in an ordinary issue at a later point in time. For further information on the Special Issue, please contact Professor Raanan Lipshitz (raanan@psy.haifa.ac.il).

Conferences

2004 Family Group Decision Making Conference and Skills-Building Institutes Hilton. Harrisburg & Towers. June 6-9, 2004. Sponsored by American Human's National Center on Family Group Decision Making. http://www.americanhumane.org/site/PageServer?pagename=pc_fgdm_conference

Ninth International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning. June 2 - 5, 2004. http://magic.it.uts.edu.au/KR2004/call_papers.html

Call for Papers: **2004 IFIP International Conference on Decision Support Systems (DSS2004)** "Decision Support in an Uncertain and Complex World" in Prato, Tuscany, Italy, 1-3 July 2004 <http://dssresources.com/news/news2003/december/ifip8312092003.html>

The Fifth International Conference on Thinking, will be held in the Department of Psychology of the University of Leuven, Belgium, 22-24 July 2004. It should be of special interest to those interested in the "J" of JDM. <http://www.psy.kuleuven.ac.be/schaeken/ICT2004/>

The 17th International Conference of the International Society on Multiple Criteria Decision, 6-11 August, 2004, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. <http://www.mit.jyu.fi/MCDM/conf.html>

The 9th Behavioral Decision Research in Management Conference, Duke University's Fuqua School of Business Durham, North Carolina, 15-18 April 2004. Proposals due 12 January 2004.
<http://faculty.fuqua.duke.edu/bdrm/>

RUD (Risk, Uncertainty and Decisions) 2004 Conference, June 24-27, 2004 at the Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University.
http://www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/research/risk/risk_conf.htm

International Society for Bayesian Analysis, World Meeting, Vina del Mar, Chile, 23-27 May 2004. <http://isba.mat.puc.cl/>

The 11th conference on the foundations and applications of utility, risk and decision theory, Paris, June 30 - July 3 2004. <http://www.grid.ensam.estp.fr/furxi/>

ESF-TED Workshop (CMP'04): Multiple Participant Decision Making
 May 12-14, 2004. Institute of Information Theory and Automation, Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech Republic.
http://www.utia.cas.cz/user_data/scientific/AS_dept/CMP04/index.html.

9th Biennial Meeting of the European Society for Medical Decision Making
 June 6-8, 2004. Rotterdam, the Netherlands.
<http://www.eur.nl/fgg/emco/esmdm>.

11th International Conference on the Foundations & Applications of Utility, Risk and Decision Theory (FUR XI)
 June 30 - July 3, 2004. Paris, France.
<http://www.grid.ensam.estp.fr/furxi/>.

5th International Conference on Thinking
 July 22-24, 2004. Leuven, Belgium.
<http://www.psy.kuleuven.ac.be/schaeken/ICT2004/>.

Summer Institute on Bounded Rationality in Psychology and Economics
 August 24 - September 1, 2004. Center for Adaptive Behavior and Cognition, Berlin, Germany
<http://www.mpib-berlin.mpg.de/SummerInstitute>.

15th Mini-EURO Conference on Managing Uncertainty in Decision Support Models
 September 22-24, 2004. Coimbra, Portugal.
<http://www.inescc.pt/mudsm2004>.

Decade of Behaviour



safety health education prosperity democracy

In a time when it appears that most societal concerns could be minimized or alleviated through behavior change, this initiative offers an excellent opportunity to showcase the exceptional research of today's behavioral and social scientists. The **DECADE OF BEHAVIOR (2000-2010)** wants the input of behavioral and social scientists just like you to help us identify significant breakthroughs, discoveries or applications in the behavioral and social science fields.

- ❖ The intention of the initiative is to increase awareness among the public and policy makers about the importance of behavioral and social science research in addressing societal concerns and issues.
- ❖ The goal of this initiative is to compose a publishable list of the Top 10 breakthroughs in the behavioral and social sciences.

We invite concrete examples that answer the following question:

What recent breakthroughs, discoveries, or new applications from behavioral and social science research are likely to change lives in the 21st century?

Send your suggestions to dob@apa.org and please be sure to include the following information:

1. Example of research example (with citations, if possible), and how this research will affect people's lives
2. Your Name
3. Your Email Address
4. Discipline with which you are affiliated

Examples that showcase multidisciplinary research are encouraged and welcomed

Deadline for submission is July 15th, 2004

**Society for Judgment and Decision Making
2004 Dues and Address Corrections**

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State/Prov: _____ Zip: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

Email: _____

Institution: _____

Student members must have the endorsement of a faculty member:

Faculty Signature: _____ Date: ____/____/____

2004 Dues _____ **\$35 Member** _____ **\$10 Student**
Past Dues: \$ _____ **Amount** _____ **Year(s)**
Hard Copy Directory _____ **# copies (\$10 each)**

METHOD OF PAYMENT:

Check/Money Order (Please, no cash); Make checks payable to: Society for Judgment and Decision Making

MasterCard VISA American Express

Account Number:

Signature _____ Expiration Date /____/____

If paying by credit card:

Name on credit card: _____

Home Address: _____

Mail the form and check to: SJDM c/o Bud Fennema, College of Business, Florida State University,
Tallahassee, FL 32306-1110

Or pay electronically by credit card (forward number & exp date) to: sjdm@cob.fsu.edu

Journal Note: SJDM Members are entitled to discounts on the following journals: *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, and *Risk, Decision and Policy*. Contact the publishers for details. Links to journal websites may be found on the SJDM website (www.sjdm.org) under related links.