



*Society for Judgment and Decision Making*

# Newsletter

[www.sjdm.org](http://www.sjdm.org)

Volume 22, Number 4

December 2003

## Contents

2004 Executive Board.....	2
Minutes of the Executive Board Meeting.....	3
Financial Report & Discussion.....	3
Conference Coordinator's Report.....	3
Webmaster's Report.....	3
New Business.....	4
Minutes of the Annual Business Meeting.....	5
Election Results.....	5
Bylaws Changes.....	6
Federation Report.....	6
A brief message from our new president.....	8
Notes from Niavaran: Teaching decision making in Iran.....	9
Survey Spots.....	11
Why Not "Why Not?"?.....	12
Generic Multi-Attribute Analysis (GMAA) System.....	15
Jobs.....	16
Decision Education Foundation.....	18
Conferences.....	19
2004 Dues and Address Corrections.....	20

Scenes from the SJDM conference, Vancouver, British Columbia 9-10 November 2003:  
John Payne, Duncan Luce and Robyn Dawes



## 2004 Executive Board

Eric Johnson, *President*, [ejj3@columbia.edu](mailto:ejj3@columbia.edu)  
 Josh Klayman, *past-President*, [joshk@uchicago.edu](mailto:joshk@uchicago.edu)  
 Maya Bar-Hillel, *President-elect*, [msmaya@math.huji.ac.il](mailto:msmaya@math.huji.ac.il)  
 Lisa Ordonez, 2004-2006, [lordonez@email.arizona.edu](mailto:lordonez@email.arizona.edu)  
 Peter Ayton, 2002-2004, [p.ayton@city.ac.uk](mailto:p.ayton@city.ac.uk)  
 Rami Zwick, 2003-2005, [mkzwick@ust.hk](mailto:mkzwick@ust.hk)  
 Bud Fennema, *Secretary/Treasurer*, [bfennema@garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:bfennema@garnet.acns.fsu.edu)  
 Richard Coughlan, *Conference Coordinator*, [rcoughla@richmond.edu](mailto:rcoughla@richmond.edu)  
 Alan Schwartz, *Webmaster*, [alansz@sjdm.org](mailto:alansz@sjdm.org)  
 Warren Thorngate, *Newsletter Editor*, [warrent@ccs.carleton.ca](mailto: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](mailto: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 However, we do not publish substantive papers.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](mailto: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.

## **Minutes of the Executive Board Meeting**

Society for Judgment and Decision Making  
November 8, 2003

### **Attendees**

Hal Arkes, Peter Ayton, Maya Bar-Hillel, Bud Fennema, Reid Hastie, Julie Irwin, Eric Johnson, Ralph Keeney, Josh Klayman, Lisa Ordonez, Sandy Schneider, Warren Thorngate

### **Announcements**

President Elect: Maya Bar-Hillel  
New member of Executive Board: Lisa Ordonez

### ***Financial Report & Discussion***

#### **Current Finances**

Sandy Schneider reported that the finances of the Society were in good shape. The 2002 book auction brought in about \$700. Conference audio/visual costs were again obtained through the generosity of several members who brought LCD projectors for use in the sessions. The cost of preparing the paper newsletter, however, has increased this year.

#### **Membership Count**

Based on those members who had paid dues in the past three years, there were 907 total members at the end of 2002, compared to 871 at the end of 2001.

#### **Expenditures for Secretary/Treasurer, Newsletter Editor, Webmaster, and Conference Manager**

Annual budgets of \$5,000 for Secretary/Treasurer, \$3,000 for Newsletter Editor, and \$500 for Webmaster were agreed upon. The Society will also pay the airfare and hotel expenditures for a conference assistant.

### **Auditing of SJDM Finances**

The SJDM financial records have never been audited. Bud Fennema will examine the possibility of such a service. A \$200 budget for such service was agreed upon.

### ***Conference Coordinator's Report***

#### **Separating Secretary/Treasurer and Conference Responsibilities**

Sandy Schneider reported that the separation of the conference coordinator and secretary/treasurer functions was going smoothly so far. It was agreed that Richard Coughlan will take over the conference coordinator position starting with the 2004 conference. It was also agreed that Sandy will work with Richard to ensure a smooth transition.

#### **Pre-Registration Count**

About 210 individuals pre-registered for the 2003 conference. This is somewhat of an increase from the previous year.

#### **Coordination with Psychonomics**

It was agreed that there was a need for increased conference coordination with Psychonomics. It will be the conference coordinator's responsibility to work more closely with Psychonomics to increase the level of coordination between the two conferences.

### ***Webmaster's Report***

#### **Online Statistics**

There are currently 690 mailing list subscribers, which is an increase of 44 from last year. A total of 951 members currently receive the newsletter by email and others read it on the web. Since December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2002, there have been 46,000 hits on the home page by 25,000 unique hosts. There are over 500 sites that have links pointing to our website.

### **Services**

This was the fourth year of online abstract submission and review. It was the first year of online nominations and elections, with 29 members nominating 48 distinct candidates. A total of 182 members voted in the election. Some minor problems concerning password assignment are to be corrected by next election.

### **Future Directions**

It would be useful to move toward a real-time membership database, with members being responsible for the online maintenance of their contact information instead of relaying that information to the secretary/treasurer. This would involve centralizing the membership database and the development of significant controls. There are also some possible improvements to the online abstract submission/review system.

### **Webmaster Performance**

The board noted the tremendous job that Alan Schwartz was doing with respect to our website and its maintenance.

### ***New Business***

#### **Bylaw Changes**

Two proposed changes will be submitted to the membership for approval. First, changes in the annual voting procedures will be proposed. Also, a possible society name change will be discussed.

#### **Proposed Study**

Ralph Keeney asked the society to consider sponsoring a study to inventory and appraise decision programs in U.S. universities. The board decided to respond to Ralph following email discussions of the proposal.

#### **Evaluation of the Conference Program**

The board wished to start a discussion about several aspects of the annual conference,

including the paper acceptance rate, the length and days of the conference, the affiliation with Psychonomics. It is possible that some web surveys of the members could be used to generate ideas and measure opinions concerning alternate conference formats.

### **Federation News**

Hal Arkes presented his report which will appear in the December newsletter. The board wished to thank Hal for his liaison work between the Society and the Federation. Also, the board agreed that the Society will stay in the Federation.

### **Ongoing Committees: Personnel and Reports**

#### ***Program Committee***

Members include:

Julie Irwin (through 2004) 2003 chair  
 Craig Fox (through 2005) 2004 chair  
 Dan Ariely (through 2006)  
 Rachel Croson  
 Michael DeKay  
 Alex Wearing  
 Jennifer Lerner  
 Ellen Peters

It was suggested that the committee be expanded considerably and that there should be diversity of research interests on the committee. It was agreed that the board be expanded to eight members with a chair and a vice chair. It was also suggested that a checklist should be developed to be passed on from year to year.

#### ***Publications Committee***

Members include:

Barbara Mellers (through 2004) chair 2003  
 Terry Connolly (thought 2005) chair 2004  
 John Payne  
 Gretchen Chapman

It was agreed that the Society will have a contract with Lawrence Erlbaum instead of Cambridge University Press. Bill Goldstein

will clarify the royalties policy. The need to add two additional members to the publications committee was discussed. Reid Hastie agreed to be a member and suggestions for the other should be emailed to Eric Johnson.

### ***Student Poster Committee***

John Jasper is the chairman with ad hoc committee members solicited annually. There were 68 poster submissions for the 2003 conference which was a significant increase over the usual 45 to 55 submissions. More raters will be needed if that level of submissions continues. John would like to step down if a replacement could be found.

### ***Beattie International Travel Award Committee***

Members include:

Peter Ayton  
Josh Klayman (chair)  
Martin Weber

This year's awardee is Liat Hadar. There are enough funds in this account to award another three \$600 awards.

### ***Einhorn Award Committee***

Members include:

Rick Larrick (through 2004) 2004 chair  
Mike Doherty (through 2006) 2006 chair  
A new member is needed and a new chair must be appointed.

### **Adjourn**

## **Minutes of the Annual Business Meeting**

Society for Judgment and Decision Making  
November 10, 2003

Approximately 60 members attended the meeting.

### ***Election Results***

President Elect: Maya Bar-Hillel  
New Member of Executive Board: Lisa Ordonez

### ***Acknowledgments/Committee Membership***

Sandy Schneider was thanked for her service as secretary/treasurer and conference manager. Bud Fennema is the new secretary/treasurer and Richard Coughlin will be conference manager. John Payne and Gretchen Chapman will serve on the publications committee and the program committee will be expanded to eight members.

### ***Report of the Secretary/Treasurer***

The Society is financially sound. There were a record number of 334 conference attendees this year, and there are 839 members who have paid dues in at least one of the past three years. In order to facilitate registration next year, members who pre-register will receive a receipt that they should bring to the conference as proof of pre-registration.

### ***Report of the Program Director***

There were 150 paper submissions, 127 from individuals who had not presented last year. There were 64 acceptances. There were 9 symposia submissions of which 2 were accepted.

### ***Federation Report***

Hal Arkes reported that the topic of the Federation Forum on 11/21/2003 will be decision making. He also reminded members that the Federation is paid \$11 annually for each member by the Society and that this is money well spent.

### ***Publications Committee Report***

Lawrence Erlbaum will replace Cambridge University Press as the Society's publisher. Erlbaum will not reprint previous

publications. Members are asked to consider using the Society's book series as an outlet.

### ***Bylaws Changes***

*Elections* – A motion was made to extend the approval voting system to the nomination process. It was suggested that each logon would display a new random order of candidates. It was also suggested that at least two votes would be required for a nomination. The greatest concern was that just a few votes could determine who is elected. A motion for a one-stage approval voting process failed. A motion for a two-stage approval voting process passed.

*Society Name Change* – A motion was made to vote on two possible new names for the Society. The name "Society for Research and Judgment and Decision Making" received 29 votes, and the name "Society for Judgment and Decision Research received 18 votes. A motion was then made to change the name of the Society to Society for Research and Judgment and Decision Making. There were 25 votes for the change and 22 against. The motion failed to meet the required two thirds approval level so the current name remains.

### ***Initiatives***

*Popular Press Articles* – It was suggested that members write articles on judgment and decision making for publication in popular press outlets such as airline magazines. Mike Dougherty and Jim Shanteau are to head up this effort. It was suggested that the Society hire a copy editor for these types of articles. Concern was voiced concerning the ability to publish research articles that will also appear in these popular press outlets, but it was believed that this was not a significant problem.

*Annual Meeting Format* – The Society will perform some "market research" to identify possible alternative formats for the annual meeting including discussions of the length and days of the conference and the affiliation with Psychonomics. This will most likely involve web-based surveys of members.

### ***NSF Update***

There were several NSF announcements. There is a new priority area called "Human and Social Dynamics." There is a need for more dissertation enhancement proposals. Members were encouraged to not hesitate to ask questions about proposals.

### ***Other Announcements***

Robyn Dawes will send messages to members concerning two special journal issues. Bob Clemen has copies of a new journal called Decision Analysis. There is a new society concerning high school children called the Decision Education Foundation. There will be information about the society on the SJDM website.

### **Adjourn**

## **Federation Report**

The annual meeting of the Federation of Behavioral, Psychological, and Cognitive Sciences was held on November 22 this year. However preceding the meeting on November 21 was a Federation Forum, "Decision-Making: Making Good Decisions Under Conditions of Uncertainty." Two notable features of this Forum were the speakers from our Society and the record-breaking attendance; I assume that these features might be closely linked.

Speakers included the following:

1. Eric Johnson ("Constructing Constructive Preferences")

2. Annette O'Connor ("Progress and Prospects in Developing and Evaluating Patient Decision Aids")
3. Marc Schwartz ("Decision Support for BRCA1/BRCA2 Mutation Carriers")
4. Baruch Fischhoff ("Integrating Normative, Descriptive, and Prescriptive Decision Research")
5. Paul Slovic ("Risk as Analysis and Risk as Feelings: Some Thoughts about Affect, Reason, Risk, and Rationality")

In addition, Michael Stefanik and Ellie Ehrenfeld from NIH spoke about prospects of funding from various programs within NIH.

The Federation's annual meeting was convened the following morning. James A. Griffin, who is the Assistant Director-Social, Behavioral, and Education Sciences in the White House Office of Science & Technology Policy, was the first speaker. The primary things he mentioned which are of interest to our Society were the following:

1. The Homeland Security Workforce Act (not the original Homeland Security Act) excluded social, behavioral, and economic sciences from some of its goodies, such as scholarships for research. However Griffin said that this was apparently an oversight, because the original Homeland Security Act had no such exclusion. He assumed that some staffer just copied some language from an inappropriate place, and this language is currently residing in the House bill. The companion bill has not passed in the Senate, and Griffin hopes/assumes that the appropriate language will be restored.
2. 9/11 stalled some other initiatives that were on the front burner. They would have to be resurrected by his successor; he leaves his post at the end of 2003.

The second speaker was Norman Bradburn, who is the outgoing head of the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Science Directorate at NSF. His talk centered on human subjects IRBs. Among the problems facing our membership is one of hyper-enthusiastic IRBs who are exercising more scrutiny than the law requires. Bradburn listed some web sites which contain some ammunition capable of restraining such IRBs.

1. [Http://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dga/policy/hsfaqs.htm](http://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dga/policy/hsfaqs.htm)

This web site lists NSF's requirements for IRBs. More stringent behavior than this is not required for IRBs to meet NSF's demands.

2. [Http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10638.html](http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10638.html)

This web site lists the National Research Council's requirements, beyond which your local IRB need not go.

In general, it is important that our research not be subjected to the same requirements to which biomedical research is subjected. The White House Office of Science & Technology Policy's Committee on Science has a Human Subjects Research Subcommittee which has had a social science co-chair. This person is leaving, so it is important that a social scientist replace this person.

Dr. Bradburn also mentioned that during the last Congressional session Senator Kennedy introduced a bill which would have changed IRB regulations to law, which would really have made them rigid. Fortunately that bill was not acted upon, but a representative from Michigan introduced the bill into the House this year. There's no word on its fate, but Dr. Bradburn was very negative about its potential consequences if it somehow were to be enacted.

Most of the afternoon was spent listening to Drs. Thomas Insel and Richard Nakamura

from NIMH. Although there has been a huge increase in the NIMH budget, there has been an equivalent increase in the number of applications sent to that institute. As a result the success rate has remained constant. Because the size of each grant has gone up, the “pay line” will be around the 16<sup>th</sup> percentile next year. Almost all of the discussion pertained to the fear that many society representatives felt that NIMH was too “disease-oriented,” which diminishes the likelihood of NIMH’s funding of basic research. The general response from Insel and Nakamura was that they would fund basic research, but it is important for the principal investigator to justify the potential importance of the basic research, and this would usually entail some linkage to health. After all, NIMH is in the National Institutes of Health.

Part of the concern related to NIMH’s funding of basic research is that NSF’s social science budget is only around 2% of that agency’s expenditures. As a result, NSF doesn’t fund much basic social science research. It was pointed out that a “Friends of NSF” meeting is held every year at which time research posters from various NSF advocates are presented. Apparently this event is well attended by House, Senate, and agency staffers plus other inside-the-Beltway folks. I suggest that the SJDM Board consider creating such a poster. Two problems are (1) the expense of such a poster, and (2) how do you present the research of an entire society’s membership? Obviously some decision needs to be made on whose research to highlight. The APA’s rep, Merry Bullock, said that the most successful posters contained snazzy toys, such as virtual reality goggles, which could entice the staffers who mingled around the area.

Much of the rest of the afternoon was spent discussing the Federation’s financial condition, which is barely satisfactory. Note from Hal: I’ve agreed to re-enlist for this year (my fourth) as your Society’s representative to the Federation, but I would like the next meeting (November or December of 2004) to be my last. (I am in favor of term limits.) Anyone who might be interested in replacing me as the Society’s representative to the Federation should contact Eric Johnson. If you are considering this post, feel free to contact me about its duties, the annual meeting, etc. I can be reached at [arkes.1@osu.edu](mailto:arkes.1@osu.edu) or 614-292-1592.

**A brief message from our new  
president**  
Eric Johnson

As anyone who has read the JDM listserve knows, there has been some discussion of the timing of the annual meeting. At the last board meeting, the board approved an idea that Josh Klayman and I had, which was to do a survey of the preferences of the membership. This is NOT a referendum, just an attempt to do some customer research to see how people value the various aspects of the meeting. Our idea is to do a web based survey of the entire membership. If anyone is interested in helping in this exercise in preference measurement, please contact me at [ejj3@columbia.edu](mailto:ejj3@columbia.edu).

## Notes from Niavaran: Teaching decision making in Iran

Warren Thorngate

Twenty senior managers from companies affiliated with Iran's Industrial Development and Reconstruction Organization (<http://www.idro.org/english/themeb/index.htm>) sit around a table in the Rahbaran Petrochemical Company Training Centre (<http://www.rahbaran-ir.com/>) Niavaran, Northern Tehran, copies of Scott Plous' wonderful text in hand. They are politely waiting for me to start a workshop on the Psychology of Decision Making. My task: to teach the managers how research in our discipline could improve their decision making skills. Five, exhausting days later, when the workshop ends, I doubt I have met the challenge. But the managers have kindly taught me much about their challenges, and prompted me to wonder strenuously about the links between life and lab.

It would be preferable for an Iranian professor to teach such a workshop, but in a decade of visits to teach in Iran, I have yet to meet a professor with decision research expertise. Iranian university psychology departments are embedded in faculties of education, and most psychological research in the country is related to pedagogy or individual differences. There is a small group of psychologists and psychiatrists doing cognitive research at the Institute of Cognitive Science Studies (<http://www.ircss.org/Main.htm>), but not of the decision making kind. As in most developing countries, scientists have little time or money for the sort of research you and I do.

Henry Mintzberg (e.g., 1989) has often noted that managers make far fewer managerial decisions than their Executive MBA training would imply. Most of their

time is spent in meetings, ceremonies or crises. Much of their crisis time is spent trying to find just one solution to a pressing problem, rather than trying to choose the best solution among a multitude. Managerial life in Iran seems no different. Research on limits of the Rational Calculus, cognitive deficits, emotional correlates, risk aversion and the like prompt mild curiosity among my captive Iranian audience, but offer no pragmatic panacea to ease the burdens of their job. What can we tell someone to do after we expose their heuristics and biases? Can we prescribe anything more than "Stop"?

One way to determine which aspects of decision making are important to Iranian managers is to watch which workshop topics capture their attention. Defining a decision as a choice among two or more solutions to a problem, we proceed down a standard list of problem solving phases: problem recognition and definition, conception and evaluation of alternative solutions, choice, implementation and feedback. Two phases catch most of the managers' attention: problem definition and solution implementation. Problem definition interests the managers because so many industrial problems are exceedingly complex, and include the usual matrix of personalities, politics and vested interests. Recursive attribution of the causes of these problems soon muddles the distinction between what and who. One workshop exercise to draw boxes and arrows representing causes, and causes of causes, of pollution in Tehran yields as many different causal maps as causal cartographers. Yet all maps show a paucity of people in the causal mix. I can only speculate why. Diplomacy in Iran, as elsewhere, attenuates public accusations of *who* caused problems and directs attention to *what* caused them. The result leads to choices among technical solutions, even

when the best solutions might be social or political. Ian Mitroff (1974) calls this an Error of the Third Kind. Another cultural universal is found.

Solution implementation interests the Iranian managers because, though senior, they are regularly expected to enforce decisions from above. Most Iranian industrial companies are affiliated with the government, and many decisions are influenced or made beyond the level of senior company management. Senior managers are informed of such decisions and told to implement them. New decisions are often contrary to previous decisions or established practices. So there is considerable interest in learning ways to implement with least harm what may be a bad decision about solving an important problem.

A key component of implementation is delegation. To delegate effectively, a manager must obtain the cooperation of those who do the job. How is it possible to convince 10,000 plant workers to change their habits, schedules and social relations for the good of the company? Western research and practice points to the importance of “buy-in” a silly term for problem ownership. People who believe they own part of a problem are usually willing to be part of the solution. A sense of problem ownership seems to increase when those who implement a solution believe they have been involved in its choice. This is, of course, a primary social psychological argument for democracy. In the West, struggles for such involvement are often expressed through trade unions. There are no trade unions in Iran. Still, the managers in my workshop have a very sophisticated cultural sensitivity to workers’ opinions, and a desire to involve them in the tactics of

implementing a strategic decision, even a bad one.

I ended the workshop with three impressions. First, Iran has some very good managers. Second, the managers are less concerned with increasing the purity or sophistication of their personal decision processes than with properly defining the causes of a problem and coordinating a solution to it. Perhaps their muted interest in improving decision skills simply reflects their lack of involvement in the decisions they must enforce. If so, the next workshop should be offered to their bosses. In the meantime, it seems quite reasonable for managers to attend to phases of the choice process more relevant to their position and fate. As one good Iranian manager told me, “I like to study problem definition and solution implementation because I spend most of my time ensuring there is Plan B when Plan A fails.” Indeed, perhaps our own research should reconnect with problem solving in the Newell-Simon tradition, and pay more attention to the other phases of the decision making as well.

#### References

- Mintzberg, H. (1989). *Mintzberg on management: Inside our strange world of organizations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Mitroff, I. (1974). On Systemic Problem Solving and the Error of the Third Kind, *Behavioral Science*, 19 (6), 383-393.

## Survey Spots

Daniel M. Oppenheimer  
Stanford University  
Dept. of Psychology  
Building 420 -- Jordan Hall  
Stanford, Ca 94305  
650-725-5487

Many JDM researchers use surveys. For example, in the most recent edition of the *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 80% of the articles involved survey research. Thus, JDMers are always searching for "survey spots" - good places to gather survey data. In the interest of efficient data collection, I have compiled a list of such survey spots, and the benefits and drawbacks of each (thank you to everybody who provided suggestions; word constraints prohibit individual acknowledgements).

One popular survey spot is the jury waiting room. Juries provide a diverse and representative sample of the population, especially in larger cities. Potential jurors often spend hours in a centralized room while waiting to be called to service. This means a large pool of bored participants who are eager for a distraction such as filling out surveys. The jury pool refreshes weekly, so there are always new subjects who are untainted by participation in earlier studies. The downside to jury pools is the difficulty in getting permission from the court. The decision ultimately lies with the judge, and some judges are reluctant to allow research to occur in their courtrooms. Persuading a local court to allow you to run jurors as participants is challenging, but the payoff can be substantial.

Many other live venues can be effective survey spots. Local libraries often have people who might temporarily forestall reading to fill out a questionnaire. However, libraries are frequented by a limited

demographic, which may lead to sampling biases. In cities with trains, subways, ferries, and busses, transportation services can be great survey spots. Subjects can be recruited while waiting for transport to arrive, or while in transit. Unfortunately, some transit systems restrict solicitation, so ask transit employees for permission before distributing surveys. Government services, such as the post office or DMV also often have long lines. Sometimes people waiting for service are willing to take part in a study. The main downside is that the lines tend to refresh slowly, making this method of survey collection somewhat inefficient. Be sure to check on the legality of soliciting in government agencies in your area.

Stores and malls can also be good survey spots. Obviously the demographics vary depending on the type of store/mall from which you recruit. Many stores are surprisingly open to allowing you to recruit subjects so long as you do so outside the store. Suggestion: if you are paying subjects for participation, paying in store gift certificates increases the odds of getting permission to solicit for participants nearby.

Hospitals, especially VA hospitals, have been a good source of data for many researchers. Many people waiting to be seen by doctors, have lab tests done, or have prescriptions filled are willing to fill out questionnaires. However, hospitals yield a disproportionately large number of elderly participants and participants may be under significant stress and cognitive load as they fill out surveys. Be aware that if you use a hospital population, you will undoubtedly have to go through hospital IRB to gain permission to run studies.

Recreational locations and events can be good survey spots but have significant problems. Concerts and sporting events,

especially pre-game tailgate parties, can yield lots of data but some of your participants may be drug or alcohol impaired. Museums, zoos, and amusement parks, can be effective places to recruit subjects. However some of these venues prohibit soliciting and yield low response rates because visitors prefer the attraction to filling out surveys. Although Friday night movie lines get long, most moviegoers are on dates or with friends, neither of which make them amenable to filling out questionnaires. For those of you in coastal cities, beaches can be great places to recruit participants. Sunbathers are often doing nothing but tanning and are willing to fill out surveys. Plus, sending research assistants to the beach can be a great way to boost morale. However, depending on the time of year participants can be scarce.

A final place to recruit participants is on campus. Student centers, dining halls, and bookstores have the advantage of being convenient. However, the subject pool is easy exhausted, especially at smaller schools, as it partially refreshes only once a year. Further, there is a chance you will contaminate the psychology subject pool, making it harder to recruit subjects for non-survey research. You are also limiting your sampling to young, educated people.

Another way to gather survey data is online. This method has the potential to gather lots of information quickly and inexpensively. However, a review of online survey methodology is beyond the scope of this article. For an excellent resource on internet experiments, I recommend "Psychological Experiments on the Internet" edited by Michael Birnbaum.

This is by no means an exhaustive list but hopefully it will make data collection easier and more efficient.

## **Why Not “Why Not?”? Ingenuity and Creativity in Problem Solving à la Nalebuff and Ayres**

A review of:

Barry Nalebuff & Ian Ayres, *Why Not? How to Use Everyday Ingenuity to Solve Problems Big and Small* (Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press, 2003).

By Gregory Todd Jones<sup>†</sup>

Until relatively recently, judgment and decision making literature has focused on the information processing phases of these tasks, paying little attention to the role of creativity in the development of alternative solution sets and the design of innovative processes. Much of the new work related to innovation and creativity is either built around ex post exploration of cases or collections of problems designed to highlight particular algorithms or lessons of logic. Barry Nalebuff and Ian Ayres have done one better by offering to teach us “how to use everyday ingenuity to solve problems big and small.” Indeed, this highly accessible new book lays out a simple program built around four tools for generating new ideas.

The book is logically organized into three sections. The first, comprised of chapters one and two, states the broad Platonic thesis

---

<sup>†</sup> Gregory Todd Jones is Senior Research Fellow at the Consortium on Negotiation and Conflict Resolution, Georgia State University College of Law. He earned a B.A. in Philosophy from the University of the South, a M.B.A. in Decision Sciences & Information Systems from Auburn University, a J.D. from the Georgia State University College of Law, and a M.P.A. in Policy Analysis and Evaluation from the Georgia State University Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. He is a Ph.D. Candidate in Decision Sciences at the Georgia State University Robinson College of Business.

of the book, that innovations are everywhere just waiting to be discovered, and outlines the four tools for discovery which are detailed in subsequent chapters (and by this review in what follows). These two chapters can be read as a condensed version of the book without fear of losing the essential message, but I would encourage you to read on.

Chapters three through six address each of the four tools in order, unfortunately duplicating much of the material, including examples, offered in chapter two. Save for my wish that new examples had been offered to expand upon previous ideas, I was not disappointed by these four core chapters. The first, chapter three, explores the value of a perspective unconstrained by resource limitations, asking the question “What Would Croesus Do?” This tool capitalizes on a version of nominal thinking, allowing ideas to be expressed and explored without regard to feasibility or cost benefit. Chapter four reveals the authors’ predilection for thinking focused by economic incentives, reminding us of the inefficiencies associated with decision making externalities and the value in identifying internalizing mechanisms. “Why Don’t You Feel My Pain?” the authors ask. Having now explored two tools that facilitate “problems in search of solutions,” the authors turn to tools that assist in finding problems for a priori solutions. In chapter five, they legitimize plagiarism, in a sense, by suggesting that existing good solutions to vexing problems can often be creatively applied to new problems. Looking for opportunities for arbitrage, they ask “Where Else Would It Work?” Finally, in chapter six, the authors are inspired by Edward de Bono’s *Lateral Thinking* to ask “Would Flipping It Work?” For example, by flipping “By calling a 900 number, you trigger a payment that will be charged to

your phone bill” they arrive at “By *receiving a call* from a 900 number, you trigger a payment that will be *credited* to your phone bill,” and their idea for reverse 900 numbers where telemarketers pay you to listen to their pitch.

The third section of the book is somewhat of a loose collection of odds and ends. Chapter seven describes the authors approach for “Principled Problem Solving,” or “thinking inside the box,” which is not much more than a layman’s guide for restricting solution space and therefore making problem solving more efficient. Chapter eight sets out an idea case study for Honest Tea, a beverage company founded and partly owned by Nalebuff. A bit self-aggrandizing, to be honest. Chapter nine makes the case that “Why Not?” can be applied to matters of public interest as well as the commercial endeavors that monopolize most of the rest of the book. Chapter ten offers some guidance on implementing “Why Not?” ideas once you’ve found them.

After the last page has been read, the authors promise not to leave readers to find their own way through the additional sources of problem solving reading material and relevant online materials. Nor do they intend to leave readers alone in their formulation and development of new “Why Not?” ideas of their own. In an effort to maintain real-time currency as well as provide a platform for exchange and collaboration, the authors have created what they bill as the “open-source movement” of ideas, a web site located at <http://www.whynot.net>. The web site is a collection of threaded discussions, each initiated by a proposed “Why Not?” idea. Other users can respond to these ideas and give them ratings. The site also maintains links to other recommended readings, both books and periodicals, and other web sites.

Finally, they couldn't resist the temptation to sell us some "Why Not?" merchandise, maybe a case of tea or two, and promote this book and others.

The web site is an excellent idea, albeit in a nascent stage of development. The user base needs a larger critical mass in order to reach full potential. And the links to secondary resources deserves more attention to insure that the site goes beyond what the

book already offers and that new additions are regularly made.

Overall, I'd ask why not "Why Not?"? Leave it to this dynamic duo of crossover hits, both on the academic and popular charts, to create a open-source movement of ideas that delivers value to lay readers without any particular prerequisites, while still offering plenty of insights for judgment and decision making scholars and professionals.



Vancouver conference participant browses book bargains...



while Josh Klayman presides over annual meeting

## Generic Multi-Attribute Analysis (GMAA) System

Prof. Sixto Rios-Insua, [srios@fi.upm.es](mailto:srios@fi.upm.es)  
Department of Artificial Intelligence  
Technical University of Madrid  
Spain

The Generic Multi-Attribute Analysis (GMAA) System is a *Decision Support System* (DSS) based on an additive multi-attribute utility model that accounts for incomplete information concerning the inputs and is intended to allay many of the operational difficulties involved in the *Decision Analysis* cycle.

The user can interactively create or delete nodes and branches to build or modify an objectives hierarchy. Alternatives and their consequences, in terms of the attributes associated with the lowest-level objectives, can be easily entered by hand or loaded from file. The system admits uncertainty about consequences.

The system also admits incomplete information about the DM's preferences through value intervals as responses to the probability questions the DM is asked, which leads to classes of utility functions and weight intervals. This is less demanding for a single DM and also makes the system suitable for group decision support.

The different alternatives under consideration can be evaluated by means of an additive multiattribute utility function. The additive model is used to assess, on the one hand, average overall utilities, on which the ranking of alternatives is based and, on

the other, minimum and maximum overall utilities, which give further insight into the robustness of this ranking. It is also possible to select another objective to rank by. The system provides different displays of ranking results: *Stacked Bar Ranking*, *Measure Utilities for Alternatives*, *Compare Alternatives Graph* and *Paired Attributes Correlation*.

Finally, the system provides several types of Sensitivity Analysis (SA), like classical SA, which involves changing the parameters and observing their impact on the ranking of alternatives, or the assessment of *weight stability intervals*. The assessment of *non-dominated* and *potentially optimal* alternatives and the application of *Monte Carlo* simulation techniques take advantage of the useful imprecise information collected during the assignment of the component utilities and weights and the uncertain alternative consequences entered.

In some cases, the information obtained from the alternatives evaluation is not meaningful enough so as to definitively recommend an alternative. In these cases, the above techniques play a very important role. They may provide more meaningful information, and an iteration process can be carried out by tightening the respective imprecise alternative consequences, component utilities and weights and reassessing the non-dominated and potentially optimal alternatives or performing the Monte Carlo simulation techniques again, until a dominant strategy is found.

Email: [ajimenez@fi.upm.es](mailto:ajimenez@fi.upm.es), [srios@fi.upm.es](mailto:srios@fi.upm.es), [amateos@fi.upm.es](mailto:amateos@fi.upm.es),  
Web: <http://www.dia.fi.upm.es/~ajimenez/GMAA>

## Jobs

### **Anesthesia /CHOP**

#### **Position Announcement:**

The Department of Anesthesia at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine invites applicants for a faculty position at the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor in the non-tenured Research or Clinician-Educator Track. Academic rank and track will be commensurate with credentials and experience. A Ph.D. degree is required, with the disciplinary background open, and may include psychology, sociology, anthropology, public health or an equivalent. Expectations and opportunities for teaching and clinical work will be matched to the goals of the Center for Research Integrity (CRI), as well as the selected track.

The Department is recruiting an outstanding researcher with interest in decision-making, child development, research ethics, and mixed qualitative and quantitative methods. The researcher will join a multidisciplinary team in the CRI at The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia.

The CRI is dedicated to advancing our knowledge and practice of the responsible conduct of pediatric research through empirical research on the institutions, processes, and values that affect integrity in research. The research conducted at the CRI focuses on informed consent, parental permission and child assent, risk perception, decisionmaking, and research ethics, policy and regulations. The CRI serves as a resource in research ethics and integrity to investigators at the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia and at the University of Pennsylvania.

The successful candidate will collaborate with other faculty associated with the Center and spearhead grant-generating research that takes full advantage of the interdisciplinary environment at the CRI. A track record of funded and published research using qualitative and/or quantitative methods is preferred. The position will involve qualitative and quantitative research, including interviews, instrument development and data analysis.

Enclose full curriculum vitae and list three professional references to.

Robert M. Nelson, M.D., Ph.D.,  
Director, Center for Research Integrity,  
Room 1513/CHOP North,  
34<sup>th</sup> St. and Civic Center Blvd,  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-4399  
nelsonro@email.chop.edu

The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia and the University of Pennsylvania are Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employers. Minorities and women are strongly encouraged to apply.



### **THE CCMF/ MARCEL DESAUTELS CHAIR IN INTEGRATIVE HEALTH MANAGEMENT**

The McGill Initiative for the Integrative Management of Health is a strategic alliance between the Faculties of Management and Medicine at McGill University. Formed in 2001 to establish at McGill a world class centre for the innovative study of modern health challenges, the McGill Health Initiative pushes simultaneously the frontiers of both the health and management disciplines. As the Initiative has now grown into well funded research programs and innovative educational and knowledge transfer activities, we are recruiting for an outstanding scholar to serve as a catalyst in furthering this undertaking.

Applications are invited for the newly created CCMF (Canadian Credit Management Foundation)/ Marcel Desautels Chair in Integrative Health Management at the Faculty of Management. This Chair, paired with a Canada Research Chair, can be offered either at Tier 1 (Senior) or Tier 2 (Junior) level.

Applications are invited from scholars who meet the following criteria:

- (a) Demonstrate outstanding research and teaching abilities;
- (b) Possess solid grounding in both health and management disciplines (ie. Health scholars with expertise in one of the management disciplines: finance, strategy, information systems, accounting, management science, organizational behaviour, marketing, general management, etc., or Management scholars with expertise in health);
- (c) Demonstrate leadership in organizing scholarly and pedagogical initiatives;
- (d) View health management in its broadest sense, beyond traditional administration, policy and programs;
- (e) Able to work effectively with practicing managers and leaders in the health field.

Interested candidates are invited to submit a CV, a statement of research goals and plans, and a statement of teaching interests and philosophy before January 15, 2004.

**Please send applications to:**

Search Committee, CCMF-Marcel Desautels Chair in Integrative Health Management,  
Faculty of Management, McGill University, 1001 Sherbrooke St. West, Montreal, Quebec,  
Canada,

H3A 1G5, or via email to [CCMF-Chair.mgmt@mcgill.ca](mailto:CCMF-Chair.mgmt@mcgill.ca). Further information is available at:  
[www.management.mcgill.ca/healthconsortium](http://www.management.mcgill.ca/healthconsortium) .

*In accordance with Canadian Immigration requirements, priority consideration will be given to Canadian citizens and permanent residents of Canada. McGill University is committed to equity in employment.*

## Decision Education Foundation

### Decision Education Foundation

To: Members of the Society for Judgment and Decision-Making  
 From: Dave Reiter, Executive Director, Decision Education Foundation  
 Date: 12/17/2003

#### About Decision Education Foundation (DEF)

Good decision-making is an essential life skill, but most people only acquire it through a process of trial and error – if at all. Decision Education Foundation (DEF) equips teenagers with powerful decision-making skills to help them better shape their futures in an uncertain world.

Teens often are told **what** to decide; DEF teaches them **how** to decide. A nonprofit organization founded in 2001, DEF has strong ties to the Decision Analysis community, and relies heavily on a team of expert volunteers. Based in the San Francisco Bay Area, DEF uses curriculum development and teacher training to deliver a variety of programs, including:

- Intensive summer workshops for high school teachers
- In-depth partnerships with high schools in Philadelphia (PA), San Jose (CA), and Sioux Rapids (IA)
- Partnerships with leading youth-service organizations
- And more.

For more information, see [www.decisioneducation.org](http://www.decisioneducation.org).

#### DEF and JDM

We at DEF see members of the JDM community as natural allies. We invite you to join us in our mission to teach teens how to make better decisions so they can lead better lives. There are several ways that you can get involved:

- Volunteer within a DEF program. Expert volunteers drive all aspects of our programs, from curriculum development to teacher training to evaluation. We currently need volunteers for our programs in the San Francisco Bay Area, Philadelphia, and Sioux Rapids, Iowa.
- Connect DEF to other organizations. We are always looking for partner organizations that share our vision: “Better decisions – better lives.”
- Help our fundraising efforts. As a nonprofit organization, we rely on grants, donations, and fees-for-service to support our work. We need volunteers to help with all aspects of fundraising – and if you or someone you know would like to make a tax-deductible donation to DEF, so much the better!
- Sign up for our quarterly email newsletter.

#### To get involved...

If you would like to learn more about DEF and ways to get involved, please contact our Chief Development Officer Melissa McClaren at [melissa@decisioneducation.org](mailto:melissa@decisioneducation.org), 650-233-6732.

## 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](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](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 **Behaviorial 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](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/>

**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: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

<p><b>2004 Dues</b> _____ <b>\$35 Member</b> _____ <b>\$10 Student</b></p> <p><b>Past Dues:</b> \$ _____ <b>Amount</b> _____ <b>Year(s)</b></p> <p><b>Hard Copy Directory</b> _____ <b># copies (\$10 each)</b></p>
---

**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](mailto: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](http://www.sjdm.org)) under related links.