



Newsletter

<http://www.sjdm.org> Volume 26, Number 2 June 2007

Contents

Contents.....	1
2007 Executive Board.....	2
President's Column.....	3
Conferences.....	5
Funding Opportunities.....	8
Jobs.....	9
Prizes.....	12
Miscellaneous.....	13
Contributed Essays.....	13
Online Resources.....	18
Note from the Editor.....	18
Dues and Address Corrections.....	19

2007 Executive Board

Jonathan Baron, baron at psych.upenn.edu, President

Michael Birnbaum, mbirnbaum at exchange.fullerton.edu, President-Elect

Bud Fennema, bfennema at garnet.acns.fsu.edu, Secretary-Treasurer

Terry Connolly, connolly at email.arizona.edu, Elected member, 2004-2007

Craig Fox, craig.fox at anderson.ucla.edu, Elected member, 2005-2008

Barbara Mellers, mellers at haas.berkeley.edu, Elected member 2006-2009

Alan Schwartz, alansz at sjdm.org, Webmaster

Derek Koehler, dkoehler at watarts.uwaterloo.ca, Conference Coordinator

George Wu, wu at chicagogsb.edu, 2007 Program Committee Chair

Dan Goldstein, dgoldstein at london.edu, Newsletter Editor (2007-)

JDM Newsletter Editor

(Submissions & Advertisements)

Dan Goldstein

London Business School

Regent's Park, Sussex Place

London, NW1 4SA

United Kingdom

Voice: +44 (0)20 7000 8611, Fax: +44 (0)20 7000 8601

dgoldstein at london.edu

Secretary/Treasurer

SJDM c/o Bud Fennema

College of Business, P.O. Box 3061110

Florida State University

Tallahassee, FL 32306-1110

Voice: (850)644-8231, Fax: (850)644-8234

bfennema at cob.fsu.edu

The SJDM Newsletter, published electronically four times a year (March, June, September, and December), welcomes short submissions and book reviews from individuals and groups. Essays should: i) be less than 500 words, ii) use inline citations and no reference list, iii) not include a bio (a URL or email is ok). If you are interested in reviewing books and related materials, please email Dan Goldstein. The best way to send your contribution is via email, or as an MS Word email attachment.

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 \$200 per page (\$100 per 1/2 page). Contact Dan Goldstein for details.

Address Corrections: Please keep your mailing and/or email address current. 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.

Society membership: Requests for information concerning membership in the Society for Judgment and Decision Making should be sent to Bud Fennema.

President's Column

Impediments to research

By Jonathan Baron

The World Wide Web is a great way to do research in many areas of our field. The Web provides easy access to subjects from a variety of backgrounds. It can be done all year round, at any hour. Studies can follow one another in quick succession. Although this way of doing this is becoming common, it being held back by two factors. One is that too few researchers have the computer skills to take full advantage of the possibilities. I leave this aside. The other, which is my topic, is excessive regulation by both government and by our own institutions.

Here is a disguised case, a composite. Jane wants to do experiments on the Web. The experiments involve questionnaire studies about hypothetical choices. The task is difficult enough so that subjects cannot be expected to do it for nothing, so she wants to pay them.

First, she must get approval from a human-subjects review committee (called the Institutional Review Board, or IRB, in the U.S.). The IRB requires a consent form, and they must approve the form and the study for each new experiment, even though each experiment is, from their perspective, the same as the last. This kills one of the main advantages of the Web, quick succession. Approval requires several weeks.

The IRB first wants a signature on paper, for the consent form (which is longer than the study itself). Several weeks of emails and phone calls finally convince them to drop this requirement. This is the same IRB that just prevented a treatment researcher from telling her subjects that their treatments would be free (and that both arms were previously found to be effective), on the grounds that such a statement would be "coercive." They also required written consent from illiterate subjects in Africa. This all inspires confidence in their judgment.

Second, Jane must pay the subjects. Her university will not allow PayPal, so she must use gift certificates, or a lottery. The review board considers a lottery to be unethical. The accounting office will, in any case, not transfer money from her research grant to PayPal or Amazon, and the gift certificates she can afford to pay will be eaten up with shipping cost.

The accounting office also requires Social Security Numbers (SSNs). This turns out to violate her university's security policies, so she is prevented from saving them. But it doesn't matter, because the subjects won't provide them anyway (except for the ones who are either trusting or naive, a biased sample at best). The good news is that - although identity theft is by far the greatest risk to her subjects, perhaps the only risk - the IRB does not ask about it.

Of course, if Jane had a large research grant, the kind that takes years of repeated resubmissions to get, she would hire people to deal with these issues. She would be insulated from the difficulty, or just regard it as part of life, but this money could be going to other researchers.

Research should be easy. It is becoming almost impossible for some researchers. The cost of research is multiplied several times by the need to deal with regulations.

The origin of these regulations can sometimes be understood through history. We are all paying for the Tuskegee syphilis study, yet it is not clear that the regulatory apparatus set up in its wake has prevented any harm at all to any subject. The publicity and the resulting changes in social norms might have sufficed to explain improvements over time (and, despite the IRBs, abuses still happen).

In other cases, such as the requirement for SSNs, even history is useless. The origin of this rule is shrouded in mythology. The accounting office says that it is "because we need to make sure we have the right person" (which is irrelevant, with PayPal) and because of "the tax law." But nobody can point to a tax law that requires SSNs for \$5 payments.

The regulatory problems I have discussed are IRBs and the accounting rules. There are others (e.g., HIPAA, in the U.S.). Regulation takes on a life of its own. Thoughtless regulations are strangling economic development in much of the world. And they are on the way to doing the same to medical and behavioral research in the developed world. The people who make these regulations seem to focus on some particular problem and ignore the effects of their rules in other domains.

We are tempted to say, "Oh, it is only a minor inconvenience." But these inconveniences pile up, to the point where their effect is no longer trivial. Moreover, they send two messages to students considering this field. First, they indicate that the research is more difficult than it ought to be. Honors students and graduate students go to seminars now to learn to deal with IRBs. Second, they indicate that we, as researchers, are suspect. We are so tempted to do evil that we must be watched carefully. If research is such a disreputable career, why not (students might think) choose another, one that is surely more lucrative?

What can we do about it? These regulations are the result of human judgments and decisions. If we can get permission, and a little money, we can study these judgments systematically. Why do people make rules like this? Why do people enforce them so willingly? Why do researchers put up with them without protest?

Another thing we can do is attempt to change the situation. Many suggestions have been made about what is wrong with review boards and what changes would fix the situation. (See the note at the end.) As a society, we might work through the Federation of Behavioral, Psychological, and Cognitive Sciences (<http://www.thefederationonline.org/>) and similar organizations in other countries. Note that reducing the cost of research has the same effect as increasing its funding.

One thing that might be worth discussing, at least to solve the accounting problem, is a payment mechanism run by SJDM, which could be used (with some small profit for the Society) by researchers. This might make it easier for researchers whose institutions place arbitrary limits on how they can pay subjects. I welcome further discussion through the SJDM mailing list or by direct email.

Note: A forthcoming issue of the Northwestern University Law Review has some interesting articles, some of which are now available:

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=948739 and numbers 951533, 897322, and 983649. One point raised in some of these articles is that IRBs might be engaging in an

unconstitutional infringement on free speech, e.g., when they prevent researchers from telling the truth. See also

http://www.law.columbia.edu/hamburger?exclusive=filemgr.download&file_id=9386&rtcontentdisposition=filename%3DNewCensorship.pdf And, finally, chapter 7 of "Against bioethics."

<http://mitpress.mit.edu/catalog/item/default.asp?ttype=2&tid=11279&mode=toc>

Conferences

The Society for Judgment and Decision Making (SJDM) invites abstracts for symposia, oral presentations, and posters on any interesting topic related to judgment and decision making. Completed manuscripts are not required.

LOCATION, DATES, AND PROGRAM. SJDM's annual conference will be held at the Westin Hotel & Resort in Long Beach, CA during **November 17-19, 2007**. Early registration and welcome reception will take place the evening of Friday, November 16. Following the format established in the last few years, the schedule includes a full day on Saturday to make room for more presentations and for two keynote speakers.

SUBMISSIONS The deadline for submissions is **July 1, 2007**. Submissions for symposia, oral presentations, and posters should be made through the SJDM website at <http://sql.sjdm.org>. Technical questions can be addressed to the webmaster, Alan Schwartz, at www.sjdm.org. All other questions can be addressed to George Wu, at wu@chicagogsb.edu.

ELIGIBILITY At least one author of each presentation must be a member of SJDM. Joining at the time of submission will satisfy this requirement. A membership form may be downloaded from the SJDM website at <http://www.sjdm.org>. An individual may give only one talk (podium presentation) and present only one poster, but may be a co-author on multiple talks and/or posters.

AWARDS

- The Best Student Poster Award is given for the best poster presentation whose first author is a student member of SJDM.
- The Hillel Einhorn New Investigator Award is intended to encourage outstanding work by new researchers. Applications are due July 1, 2007. Further details are available at <http://www.sjdm.org>.
- The Jane Beattie Memorial Fund subsidizes travel to North America for a foreign scholar in pursuits related to judgment and decision research, including attendance at the annual SJDM meeting. Information and an application form can be found at <http://gsbwww.uchicago.edu/fac/joshua.klayman/more/BeattieInfo06.htm>. Applications are due by July 16, 2007.

PROGRAM COMMITTEE George Wu (Chair), Melissa Finucane, Craig Mackenzie, Ellen Peters, Rebecca Ratner, Yuval Rottenstreich, Alan Schwartz, Gal Zauberman, Jon Baron (SJDM president)

We are pleased to announce that the 11th biennial **Behavioral Decision Research in Management conference** will be held April 24-26, 2008 at the Rady School of Management, University of California, San Diego. The call for papers will come in Fall 2007 and submissions will be due around the end of the year. More information and future updates available at www.bdrm.org.

The 29th Annual Meeting of the **Society for Medical Decision Making** will take place October 20-24, 2007 in the Sheraton Station Square Hotel in Pittsburgh, PA, USA. This year's meeting will focus on exploring the science of decisions and consumer-driven, individualized health care.

Visit <http://www.smdm.org> to learn more:
June 13, 2007 Meeting Registration Opens
October 20-24, 2007 SMDM Annual Meeting

The **Twenty-third Annual Meeting of the Brunswik Society** will be held on Thursday and Friday, November 15-16, 2007 in Long Beach, California, at the Hyatt Regency Hotel. The program begins at 12:00 noon on Thursday afternoon, and ends at 6:00 Friday afternoon. We invite papers and/or panel discussion proposals on any theoretical or empirical/applied topic directly related to Egon Brunswik's theoretical lens model framework and method of representative design, including approaches based on Brunswikian principles. Please send a brief abstract (75-100 words), and indicate whether the paper / discussion is theoretical or empirical, to Jim Holzworth by Friday, July 13th. Kindly respect this submission due date. Due to an increase in number of submissions, we cannot guarantee a presenting slot to those who do not meet the submission deadline. Our time is limited, so we apologize in advance if some papers cannot be scheduled this year. Meeting organizers are Jim Holzworth (jim.holzworth@uconn.edu) and Mandeep Dhani (mkd25@cam.ac.uk). The meeting is held concurrently with the Psychonomic Society Annual Meeting and just before the Judgment and Decision Society meeting. More details about the 2007 meeting, including registration instructions, will be posted on the Brunswik Society website, at <http://brunswik.org>

The **2007 North American Conference of the Association for Consumer Research** will be held at the elegantly refurbished Peabody Hotel in Memphis, Tennessee, from Thursday October 25 through Sunday October 28, 2007.

As in past years, the conference will provide a forum for scholarly presentations, discussions, and collaborations on consumer behavior. There will be six main forums for the presentation and discussion of research and scholarly thought. In addition to the five tracks to which submissions are sought, this year's conference will feature a new forum called "Epistemic Sessions."

A detailed document announcing additional conference highlights is now available on the conference website: <http://www.acrweb.org/acr>

Eric Johnson and Donna Hoffman are co-organizing a Special **Pre-Conference on Online Consumer Behavior** to be held in conjunction with the **2007 Association for Consumer Research** Annual North American Conference. The Special Pre-Conference will be held on Thursday, October 25, 2007, in advance of ACR.

"The Internet in general, and Amazon.com in particular, is still Chapter One. You're asking me about my story, and it's still the very beginning." Jeff Bezos

It has been about 10 years since the first research about consumer behavior in online environments was originally published. What have we learned in that time? What frameworks, theories and facts have emerged? What new questions need to be explored?

The Center for Excellence in E-Business at Columbia Business School and the Sloan Center for Internet Retailing at the University of California, Riverside are jointly sponsoring a pre-conference, in conjunction with the 2007 Association for Consumer Research Annual North American Conference, to address these questions. The goals of this pre-conference are to (1)

summarize existing knowledge (2) present state-of-the-art results, methods and concepts and (3) hopefully set exciting directions for future research.

Program Committee

Randy Bucklin (UCLA)
 John Deighton (Harvard)
 Kristin Diehl (USC)
 Andrew Gershoff (Michigan)
 Dan Goldstein (LBS)
 Gerald Haubl (Alberta)
 John Lynch (Duke)
 Wendy Moe (Maryland)
 Jaideep Sengupta (HKUST)
 Venky Shankar (Texas A&M)

Registration Details: Deadline is October 1, 2007 to register for the conference. The registration fee is \$150.00 and includes breakfast, lunch, all breaks and attendance at the pre-conference. Attendees must register through <http://webpay.ucr.edu/> Conference attendance will be limited to 100 attendees, so please be sure to register well in advance of the deadline.

A limited number of hotel rooms have been set aside at the ACR rate of \$174.00 plus tax for the pre-conference. Please contact the hotel directly to book your room. The Peabody Memphis www.peabodymemphis.com 149 Union Avenue , Memphis , TN 901-529-4000; 1-800-732-2639 Conference Code: 286824

The bi-annual **SPUDM (Subjective Probability Utility and Decision Making) Conference** run by the European Association of Decision Making will take place in Warsaw, Poland between 19th and 23rd August 2007.

The SPUDM Conferences have a long history and one of the earliest meetings – SPUDM 6 was held in Warsaw. After thirty years SPUDM is coming back to Poland.

The organizers of the upcoming meeting are dedicated to continuing the long tradition of SPUDM conferences status as the primary venue for exchanging novel ideas in psychological and economic decision-making and attracting the new generation of researchers to the field. To this end, we have succeeded in inviting a group of the most distinguished researchers from both Europe and the United States to be keynote speakers or to participate in the panel discussion. The opening lecture will be given by Professor Daniel Kahneman. The keynote speakers are: John W. Payne, Alex Kacelnik and Tadeusz Tyszka. For more information <http://www.spudm21.org>

The Association for Consumer Research, in conjunction with the Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth College and the Marketing Science Institute, are sponsoring a conference next July 6 – 8 (2007) entitled **Transformative Consumer Research: Inspiring Scholarship for Collective and Personal Well-Being**.

Its goals are (1) to motivate increased consumer research that begins with, and directly addresses, an important challenge, problem, or opportunity in consumer behavior that has an essential role in the well-being of people and other living beings and (2) to guide consumer researchers in designing, conducting, and communicating their scholarship to maximize the likelihood that consumers, their representatives, and/or other individuals charged with overseeing human and

ecological welfare can learn about and act upon the insights. There is no registration fee, all food and refreshments are provided, and up to 60 attendees (those presenting papers) will receive free accommodations on the Dartmouth campus. For more details, please visit the following website: <http://mba.tuck.dartmouth.edu/pages/faculty/punam.keller/conference/>

Submissions are now being accepted for the **2007 NeuroPsychoEconomics Conference** in Vienna, Austria. The conference will be held from October 14-16, 2007 at the Austrian Academy of Sciences (Oesterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Dr. Ignaz Seipel-Platz 2, 1010 Vienna, Austria).

Deadline for submissions is July 15, 2007. The conference theme of 2007 is: "Research in Neuroscience, Psychology, Business, and Economics – Towards a Discipline of Neuroeconomics"

Manuscripts passing the double-blind review process will be accepted for presentation at the conference. Manuscripts should combine concepts from neuroscience and/or psychology with problems of business and economics. We want to emphasize, that papers can be submitted which are covering all three science fields, but also papers which are combining economical sciences with psychology or with neurosciences are of interest.

Empirical as well as conceptual manuscripts are welcome. Manuscripts can be written in English or German. The conference language will be English. Manuscripts submitted for the conference must not currently be under review, accepted for publication, or published elsewhere.

Further information and the detailed "Call for Papers" is available on our website: http://www.neuropsychoeconomics.org/e_callforpapers.html

Dartmouth's Summer Institute On Informed Patient Choice runs from June 25th to July 6th, 2007. More information here: <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~cecs/siipc/> Decision researchers present will include: Roy Baumeister, Gerd Gigerenzer, Mary Frances Luce, Craig McKenzie, Valerie Reyna, Kathleen Vohs, Timothy D. Wilson, J. Frank Yates

Funding Opportunities

The **National Science Foundation**, in cooperation with the **Department of Homeland Security**, is funding opportunities for original data collection for research that has potential relevance to the concerns of DHS. Three broad substantive areas have been identified as relevant and likely avenues for research:

1) Risk communication and its effects on disaster preparedness 2) Government and individual attributions of responsibility and perceived responsiveness; and 3) Inter-group threat and cooperation Other areas of research with relevance to terrorism, disaster preparedness, or related public health and medical issues will also be considered.

Data collection for these projects will be paid for and conducted with the assistance of Time-sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences (TESS). As with other TESS applications, only a short, 5 page proposal is required. TESS offers researchers opportunities to test their experimental ideas on large, diverse, randomly selected subject populations, or on specific subsamples of the population (based on geographic location, demographics, or other criteria). For more information

on this special call or on TESS opportunities more generally, and for examples of TESS studies completed in the past, please visit our home page at www.ExperimentCentral.org.

PLEASE NOTE: For those with other areas of interest, TESS continues to fund data collection for survey-experimental work in all areas of the social sciences, and for graduate student and faculty investigators in all disciplines. These proposals are accepted on a rolling basis, and we will continue accepting new proposals as our funding allows. SPECIAL CALL DEADLINE: July 1st, 2007

Jobs

Singapore Management University Positions In Organizational Behavior And Human Resources – Rank Open

Singapore Management University is a 7-year-old university, with a charter to become a world-class research and teaching institution. Our new, US\$250 million city campus opened in downtown Singapore in June 2005. This year we hope to add three faculty members in the areas of Organizational Behavior and Human Resources. Singapore Management University's vision is to be a premier university, internationally recognized for its world-class research and distinguished teaching. Incorporated in January 2000, SMU is a young, vibrant, US-style research university. Our faculty publish in the top international journals in their field, and SMU provides them with ample support to do so. As a new university, our present teaching focus is on undergraduates, however it is expected that graduate programs will be added in the next few years. Our teaching has already been recognized as distinctive within Asia, owing to our relatively small class sizes, our emphasis on experiential learning across the entire curriculum, and our emphasis on the building of leadership and organizational skills in addition to more technical skills. In the last three years, the School of Business increased its faculty size by 68% (from 56 to 94), and we expect continued growth over the next several years. The School of Business recently received a grant of US\$120 million from the Lee Kong Chian foundation, and accordingly has been renamed the Lee Kong Chian School of Business.

Our OBHR faculty comprise Michael Benoliel (GWU, 1988), Graham Brown (UBC, 2005), David Day (Akron, 1989), Don Ferrin (Minnesota, 2000), Gary Greguras (Bowling Green, 1998), Wei Hua (UCLA, 2005), Thomas Menkhoff (Bielefeld, 1990), Jochen Reb (Arizona, 2005), and Tan Hwee Hoon (Purdue, 1996). All of us are active researchers, whose interests include organizational trust, leadership, cross-cultural and intercultural management, territoriality within organizations, social networks, negotiations, organizational deviance, performance appraisal, knowledge management, emotions, personnel selection, and decision making. Our research has appeared in *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Journal of Management*, *Leadership Quarterly*, *Organization Science*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, and *Personnel Psychology*, among others. See <http://www.smu.edu.sg/research/orgbehavior.asp> for further details.

We seek to hire talented faculty at any level, ranging from junior to very senior appointments. We invite applications for tenured/tenure-track positions, or contract positions. Successful candidates for tenured or tenure-track appointments will be engaged in interesting and rigorous research, and will have established, high-quality publishing records (for experienced candidates) or will possess demonstrated abilities to publish in top-tier journals (for junior candidates). The teaching load for tenured and tenure-track positions is 3 or 4 courses per year. Successful candidates for contract positions will be scholars who, in addition to having a Ph.D. or D.B.A., are actively involved in practitioner-oriented research and/or consulting. Initial contracts are for 3 years and are renewable. The teaching load for contract positions is 6 courses per year. The starting date is flexible. SMU

offers an internationally competitive compensation package including relocation benefits and child education funding. Further information about the University can be viewed at www.smu.edu.sg

APPLICATION PROCEDURES Review of applications will begin on 1 October 2007, and will continue until the positions are filled. We will also be interviewing at the annual conference of the Academy of Management in Philadelphia. If you wish to be considered for an interview during the AoM conference, please submit your application before 1 August 2007. Interested candidates should send a full set of application materials (cover letter, CV, research and teaching statements, sample publications, reference letters) to Gary Greguras. Candidates should also indicate whether they are applying for a tenured/tenure-track position, or a contract position. Applications can be sent electronically to garygreguras@smu.edu.sg or in hard copy to: Associate Professor Gary Greguras, Lee Kong Chian School of Business, Singapore Management University, 50 Stamford Road, Singapore 178899, Tel: (65) 6828-0747

Be a part of the effort to advance cognitive science and behavioral research affecting the health and well-being of older Americans. The **National Institute on Aging (NIA) at the National Institutes of Health (NIH)** seeks a behavioral scientist with expertise in cognitive psychology or psychology of aging to be a part of the Behavioral and Social Research Program (BSR). As a Program Officer in the extramural BSR you will have the opportunity to influence the direction of aging in such areas as:

- Interventions to maintain or improve cognition in older persons;
- Advances in measuring cognition for studies on aging;
- Impact of cognition on functioning in everyday life;
- Biological and/or genetic processes related to cognition;
- Human factors research such as driving behavior or technology use;
- Decision making including economic behavior; and
- Integrative or multi-level approaches to the study of social, psychological, and physiological influences on cognition over the life course.

Come work in a dynamic and intellectually stimulating environment with a multidisciplinary team that shares your passion for social research on aging processes. We have been most recently involved in highly visible and cutting edge research on maintaining cognitive function, reducing caregiver burden, neuroeconomics of aging, social neuroscience, disability decline and its implications for society, and the implications of Medicare Part D. We are looking for someone able to explore and develop new research initiatives and emphases in consultation with leading experts in the scientific community, identify research areas that warrant increased attention, and represent BSR/NIA to the public, the scientific community, other Federal agencies, and Congress.

NIA is located in Bethesda, MD, accessible by metro and convenient to the exciting restaurants and shopping of Washington DC. We offer a recruitment and relocation bonus and generous federal employee benefits. For more information including application instructions visit our job announcement at www.usajobs.opm.gov (Job Announcement Number NIA-07-186387-CR-DE)

Contact: Cheryl Caponiti
for vacancy/HR questions
Phone: 301-594-2147
Email: Caponitc@mail.nih.gov

Contact: Sidney M. Stahl, Ph.D.
for specific questions regarding this position
Phone: 301-402-4156
Email: Sidney_Stahl@nih.gov

NIA and NIH are equal opportunity employers

University of Plymouth, UK. Lecturer in Psychology Faculty of Science - School of Psychology
Ref: A0198. Salary £27,465 to £39,160 pa - Grade 7/8

The School of Psychology is looking to make a permanent appointment to strengthen its current staffing. The School was ranked 5 in the last RAE and rated excellent in the last Teaching Quality Assessment. You are likely to have a demonstrated track record of research excellence in Psychology.

We welcome applications from strong candidates in any area of psychology. Currently, the School has established research groups in the areas of Thinking and Reasoning, Memory, Health, Vision, Applied Cognition, Language Development and Social Psychology. You would be expected to be able to contribute to one of these research groups, or be involved in the establishment of a new research grouping.

You must be willing and able to join the School by 1 October 2007, at the latest. The interviews will be held on 16 & 17 July 2007.

For an informal discussion, please contact Professor Tim Perfect, Head of School by email tim.perfect at plymouth.ac.uk although applications must be made in accordance with the details shown on the front of this Bulletin.

CLOSING DATE: 12 NOON, MONDAY 25 JUNE 2007

Job description and further particulars may be obtained at:
<http://www.jobs.ac.uk/jobfiles/RH797.html>

Centre for Decision Research, Leeds University Business School. Proposed Lecturer /Senior Lecturer in Decision Sciences

Over the next couple of months Leeds University Business School is proposing to advertise a post in Decision Sciences. The successful candidate should be an active researcher with publications in top-rated journals and able to contribute to teaching in the areas of management decision making and/or quantitative methods. In addition, they will be expected to play a full part in the activities in the Centre for Decision Research and to collaborate with existing colleagues in the development of research and scholarship.

At this stage informal enquiries should be addressed to Professor John Maule, Centre for Decision Research, Leeds University Business School, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK; email- jm at lubs.leeds.ac.uk; telephone +44 (0)113 343 2622.

Max-Planck-Institute for Research on Collective Goods

The independent junior research group "Intuitive Experts" aims to fill several research positions as soon as possible. The interdisciplinary group of psychologists and lawyers investigates intuitive and deliberate processes of decision making and implications for legal institutions. We are looking for a Psychologist (full-time position) with a completed PhD and a research focus on Decision Making to conduct interdisciplinary research on decision processes in legal and economic environments. The position focuses, among other things, on the conceptual development and

empirical evaluation of parallel constraint satisfaction network models for decision making, the empirical analysis of decision-making behavior of both lay persons and decision experts (i.e., professional lawyers and managers), and the analysis of organisations and legal institutions from a psychological perspective.

Applicants should be interested in interdisciplinary research in a dynamic team and should have very good logical, mathematical, and communication skills. Furthermore, expertise in decision research, as well as experimental and statistical methods, is required. Of additional advantage is prior knowledge of social cognition, network modelling, legal psychology, and organizational psychology, as well as law and economics. Fluent English is required. The position is initially limited for a time period of three years.

Furthermore, we are looking for two **Graduate Students** for Doctorate (Scholarships) with a qualifying degree in psychology to conduct research work in decision research in the legal and economic context.

Applicants should be interested in interdisciplinary research in a dynamic team and should have very good logical, mathematical, and communication skills. Knowledge of decision research and expertise in experimental and statistical methods are required. Of additional advantage is prior knowledge of social cognition, legal psychology, and organizational psychology, as well as law and economics. Fluent English is required. The scholarship is initially limited for a time period of two years. Payment and employment benefits are set in accord with the German public service labor contract and the guidelines for the promotion of junior researchers of the Max Planck Society. The Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods aims to increase the proportion of female employees. Thus, woman with the respective qualifications are particularly encouraged to apply for the position. The Max Planck Society also aims to employ severely handicapped persons. Applications from severely handicapped persons are particularly welcome. Applications should preferably be sent electronically. Please send your detailed application documents by June, 20, 2007 to: personal@coll.mpg.de Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods Personnel Department Kurt-Schumacher-Str. 10 D-53113 Bonn Germany

Prizes

Emerald Group Publishing Limited, publisher of the largest collection of international business and management journals, and the European Foundation for Management Development (EFMD), a global membership organization with more than 500 institutional members from academia, business and public services, seek to celebrate excellence in research by sponsoring the **2007 Emerald/EFMD Outstanding Doctoral Research Awards**.

Award-winning entries will receive a cash prize of €1,500 (or currency equivalent), a certificate and an offer of publication in the sponsoring journal, as a full paper, or as an executive summary/research note, at the discretion of the Editor(s). Ten prizes will be awarded to the winners of the following categories: Human Resource Management, Information Science, Interdisciplinary Accounting Research, Knowledge Management, Leadership and Organization Development, Logistics and Supply Chain Management, Management and Governance, Marketing Strategy, Operations and Production Management, Real Estate Management

Eligibility. To be eligible for the Awards, the research must address an issue that is of importance to the various subject areas listed overleaf. The Awards are open to those who have completed and satisfied examination requirements for a Doctoral award, or will do so, between 1 June 2005 and 1 October 2007, and have not applied previously for one of these Awards.

Submission requirements

1. Researchers must apply online using the application form
<http://ww2.emeraldinsight.com/awards/odra.htm>
2. The following documents will be required electronically:
Covering letter; Executive Summary – paper that summarizes his/her Doctoral research. The Executive Summary should not exceed 1,000 words (reference lists and presentation of data, as either Tables or Figures, do not count towards this total); Letter of recommendation/reference from a supervisor/senior faculty member. For short-listed applicants, further contact may be made with the referee; Contact details of external examiner(s).
3. The closing date for receipt of applications is 1 October 2007. For any queries regarding the Awards, please contact Jim Bowden by e-mail at jbowden@emeraldinsight.com or by telephone at +44 (0)1274 777700.
4. Applicants must only submit to one category.

Judging criteria. The entries will be judged by the Editor(s) and at least one Editorial Advisory Board member of the sponsoring journal. Entries will be judged on the following criteria: Significance/implications for theory and practice, Originality and innovation, Appropriateness and application of the methodology, Analysis and presentation of the data, Quality of the literature review.

Short-listed applicants may be required to answer further questions as appropriate from the judging panel. Winners will be required to submit an unpublished paper, sole- or joint-authored, derived from the research, within six months of winning the Award. The Editors reserve the right not to select a winning paper if, in their judgment, none of the entries is considered satisfactory.

Please visit <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/info/researchers/funding/awards/doctoral/index.jsp> for further information.

Miscellaneous

There is a new open-access Economics journal that welcomes papers on judgment and decision making: the **Applied Economics Research Bulletin** at <http://berkeleymath.com/BerkeleyJournal.aspx>

Alan Reifman has put together a compendium of short-term statistics and methodology workshops this summer at <http://reifmanintrostats.blogspot.com>

Contributed Essays

Theoretical and Practical Value of Heuristics and Biases

By [Robert Bordley](#)

When Savage launched his theory of utility-maximizing choice, Herb Simon was almost simultaneously launching a more heuristic theory of goal-oriented choice. The two streams of thinking then diverged. Savage's theory was challenged by Kahneman & Tversky who, among other things, stressed the importance of the reference point (which Heath, Larrick & Wu showed was sometimes a goal). It was similarly challenged by Oden & Lopes' work on fuzzy aspiration levels.

These theories, in addition to being theoretically inconsistent with Savage's theory, also used a language quite different from Savage's, a language much more akin to Simon's original language of targets. This stimulated efforts to reformulate Savage's utility function using the language of targets and aspiration levels (Castagnoli and LiCalzi, *Theory & Decision*, 1996; Bordley and LiCalzi, *Decisions in Economics & Finance*, 2000). The resulting work showed that the utility of a decision can be written as the probability of the decision's being preferable to some uncertain benchmark. Thus Savage's rationality axioms can be interpreted using two very different languages.

This new language of rational choice is useful in many practical contexts, e.g.

- (1) In service research, the widely used theory of gap analysis focuses on minimizing the discrepancy between a product's uncertain performance and the uncertain level of performance required to satisfy the customer. (Bordley, Jr. of *Service Research*, 2001).
- (2) In product design, the widely accepted theory of stress-strength interference advises the engineer to designing a part whose strength exceeds the unknown stresses from the environment (Bordley, Jr. of *Stat. Education*, 2001).
- (3) In large organizations, managers typically present targets (e.g., outperform a benchmark competitor). Since the level of performance required to outperform a competitor in the future is uncertain, this involves maximizing the probability of exceeding an uncertain benchmark (Bordley, Jr. of *Oper. Res. Soc.*, 2001).
- (4) The 2006 best publication in decision analysis (Bordley & Kirkwood, *Operations Research*, 2004) suggests that a rational individual with a multiattribute utility confronts a problem mathematically equivalent to that of the manager of a complex physical system whose successful operations depends on the simultaneous successful operations of several system components.

In many cases, this new language is much more familiar to individuals than the old language of utility (just as people of the Middle Ages found English, French and German much more familiar than the Latin used by scholars.) And it suggests very different ways of thinking about how to apply that theory. Finally, it may provide better understanding of why individuals deviate from rational choice. (Thus many examples of irrational behavior are potentially interpretable in terms of individual benchmarks, aspiration levels, or targets varying with context.)

In short, discovering the right language for expressing a theory can almost be as important as discovering the right theory!

Decision Aiding And JDM

By [Rex Brown](#)

As a professional decision aider (retired), not a descriptive or normative scholar, I am something of an outsider in the JDM community. But I am much beholden to it, much as physicians are beholden to biologists, and engineers to physicists. I think of decision aiding as the normative tempered by the descriptive. Here are some thoughts on how aiders can be still more beholden to JDM. We certainly need all the help we can get, our successes having been so far more modest than the need requires.

Decision research. The most pressing need is for some refocusing of decision research. However, I have addressed this elsewhere, and will not dwell much on it here. Suffice it to say that the priorities of tenure-bound researchers are not those of the decision aider—and the problem is compounded by the fact that so much decision aid is being done by academics. Academic incentives do little to foster neglected inter-disciplinary or practice-oriented seeding research (which other, discipline-oriented, researchers can build on).

Fortunately, limited funding has been available for decision aiding research, notably through the SBIR (Small Business Innovative Research) programs. Decision aiding companies have thereby been able to arrange some fruitful collaboration with complementary scientists, both descriptive and normative .

Decision vocabulary. Even so seemingly minor an issue as vocabulary seriously impedes useful decision aiding . Many established terms confuse and mislead the laymen we try to aid or educate. As a result, these laymen often cannot effectively collaborate with aiders in developing the aid or act on the results.

Take “subjective expected utility” . We do not normally “expect” the probability-weighted average of an uncertain quantity to occur, in the sense that we have confidence (!) that the true value is close. “Subjective” suggests idiosyncratic, even arbitrary, probabilities, even in games resolved by the toss of a coin. . “Utility” is OK, provided we understand that that is what the “subjective” refers to (rather than to the “expectation”). How about “personal mean utility”?

“Prescriptive” analysis is commonly understood to mean “how real people could behave more advantageously with some systematic reflection . Surely a prescriptive endeavor is one that attempts to specify a preferred action (like consulting a Delphic oracle), not necessarily doing it right. “How about “realistic prescription” for taking proper account of behavioral reality?

Even “normative” has some troublesome ambiguity. Statistical decision theory is surely not “normative”, in the sense that this is “how ideally decisions should be made (by super-rational individuals)” It is simply a test of coherence: if these are your judgments, then logically those should also be your judgments. For example, if your prior, likelihoods and posterior do not mesh, Bayes’ theorem does not say which to change or how. I can accept that in a given case a person’s “ideal” judgment exists—one that accommodates all available knowledge and considerations--and that testing for coherence may help him get closer to the ideal. I just don’t know of any normative formulation that will reconcile inconsistency—but that may be my ignorance.

I have my own evolving list of tentative vocabulary suggestions (e.g. “diagnosticity” for “likelihood”), and I use them in my own course for trainee deciders . However, even if the new terms have merit, they may not do students much good, if the old terms are unshakably entrenched.

The problem—perhaps insurmountable—is not in devising better terms, but in getting them adopted. How to emulate the successful adoption of Hebrew in Israel, rather than the fizzle of Esperanto? If the medical profession hasn’t fixed the sometimes fatal confusion between “hypo-” and “hyper-”, what hope have we? The only chance may be for some undisputed authority (Raiffa?) to publicly advocate vocabulary changes—almost any will do—and for some respected organization to promulgate them (SJDM?).

A Decision Aid Society? A professional organization and journal dedicated to practical decision aiding could greatly advance its methods and practice—somewhat akin to the American Medical Association and JAMA. Perhaps SJDM could sponsor something?

The Decision Analysis Society and its journal, *Decision Analysis* go some of the way. However, their orientation is essentially academic. Moreover, the personal decision analysis paradigm, anchored to “Bayesian” decision theory (another misnomer), is only one of many promising decision aiding approaches . I believe a responsible decider should almost never rely on a single perspective, if he wants to account sensibly for all he knows, or can find out.

Legitimate JDM concerns, of course, go much beyond improving decision practice—even in the long run. These are just some musings on enrichments to the JDM enterprise that one decision aider would welcome.

Post Script. Jon Baron comments that, contrary to what I say above, Lindley, Tversky and Brown (1979) proposed a “normative formulation that will reconcile inconsistency”. We had indeed—even earlier—put forward an approach to reconciling incoherent judgments by considering relative confidence in them (to “minimize cognitive strain”, as a colleague put it).

However, this was not really a satisfactory normative solution (although it has worked quite well in decision aiding practice). The problem is that these second-order judgments are themselves vulnerable to incoherence, requiring third-order assessments, and so on. It would be fine if one could show that the series converged on a unique resolution, but philosopher I.J. Good argued, on the contrary, that progressive divergence of higher order assessments was more plausible.

Nevertheless, Lindley suggested that “inside every real person there is a rational person struggling to get out.” Every one of the rational person’s judgments cohere. However, a discussant of our 1979 paper argued persuasively that such a set of ideal judgments need not be unique. And even if it were, how should we set about uncovering it? Is there a normative procedure for digging it out of what Tversky called the person’s “psychological field”? Others have surely worked in this area since then and I would appreciate any references.

Replication Research’s Disturbing Trend

By [J. Scott Armstrong](#)

Since the appearance of Hubbard and Armstrong’s (1994) (H&R) article concerning the need to publish more replications in the managerial sciences, a number of developments have occurred which bode well for their increased presence in the literature. Particularly, important changes have been made in the editorial policies of leading marketing and management science journals such as Journal of Marketing Research, Journal of Consumer Research, and Academy of Management Journal aimed at facilitating the publication of replications.

In light of that, we conducted an extension of Hubbard and Armstrong (1994) to see what has happened to the publication rate for replications and extensions in marketing in the years following their study. We looked at the Journal of Marketing (JM), Journal of Marketing Research (JMR), and the Journal of Consumer Research (JCR) for the period 1990–2004. Results show that whereas H&A estimated that an average of 2.4% of empirical research papers published in JM, JMR, and JCR for 1974–1989 were replications with extensions—a figure they regarded as too low—the average for these same three journals for 1990–2004 has fallen to 1.2% (i.e., only 16 extensions out of 1,389 empirical articles). This downward trend applies to each of the journals: JM (3.4% to 1.2%), JMR (1.9% to 0.6%), and JCR (2.3% to 1.7%). While H&A found that only 15% of extensions confirmed initial outcomes, 25% provided partial support, and 60% conflicted with their predecessors, our follow-up showed that that of the 16 replications, 44% confirmed earlier results, 31% provided partial support, and 25% found no support at all for the results of the original study.

Based on these results, we suggest a number of strategies to promote replication research. These include:

- using footnotes to direct readers to data and methods (in enough detail to permit direct replication) on the Internet,
- inviting replications of important papers,
- evaluating research proposals for replications with an eye to their subsequent publication,
- appointing replications editors, and
- publishing all competent replications.

As things stand now, few results in marketing have been successfully replicated. Given this, we suggest that practitioners should be skeptical about making decisions based on the findings of the

predominantly single-shot studies reported in the leading marketing journals. Teachers, also, should be wary of putting much faith in such results in classroom lectures. Finally, many researchers fail to appreciate that, in the absence of replication research, our discipline rests on weak foundations.

Full text of this paper and of Hubbard & Armstrong (1994) are provided at <http://jscottarmstrong.com>

Online Resources

SJDM Web site

<http://www.sjdm.org>

Judgment and Decision Making – The SJDM journal, entirely free and online

<http://journal.sjdm.org>

SJDM Newsletter – Current and archive copies of this newsletter

<http://www.sjdm.org/newsletters>

SJDM mailing list – List archives and information on joining the email list

<http://www.sjdm.org/mail-archive/jdm-society/>

Decision Science News – Most of the content of this newsletter is released early in blog form here

<http://www.decisionsciencenews.com>

Note from the Editor

I pre-release much of the content of the SJDM newsletter in Web log (blog) form at <http://www.decisionsciencenews.com>. The reasons for this are several. Blogs facilitate: weekly instead of quarterly releases, instant revisions of time-sensitive content (e.g., conference deadline changes), and easy subscription via newsreaders. The newsletter will continue to be published March, June, September, and December on the SJDM site in PDF form, as always.

Dues and Address Corrections

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Country: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

Email: _____

Institution: _____

Student members must have the endorsement of a faculty member:

Faculty Signature: _____ Date: ____/____/____

Current Dues _____ \$35 Member _____ \$10 Student
Past Dues: \$ _____ Amount _____ Year(s)

You may pay by check (must be in US dollars and payable through a U.S. bank) or credit card.
Mail this form and check to:

SJDM c/o Bud Fennema
College of Business, P.O. Box 3061110
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-1110

If paying by credit card (please circle one): **American Express MasterCard VISA Discover**
Total Charge \$ _____

Credit Card Number _____ Expiration Date _____

Or pay electronically by credit card (forward number & expiration date) to bfennema at
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 the journals may be found on the SJDM website (www.sjdm.org) under related links.