ANNUAL J/DM MEETING IS DRAWING NEAR...

The 1991 J/DM Meeting will be held in San Francisco, November 24-25. On Page 5-6 you will find a preliminary copy of the program, and on Pages 7-12 you will find information about the Poster Session on November 24. You will be receiving a separate mailing with hotel reservation and meeting registration information. We hope to see you there. The Program Committee members are Colin Camerer, Reid Hastie, George Lowenstein (Chair), and Barbara Mellors.

SPECIAL ATTRACTION AT J/DM MEETING...

DINNER AND BOAT CRUISE ON SAN FRANCISCO BAY

Spend Sunday evening on an elegant dining yacht with fellow J/DMers and friends. The boat will leave from an SF Pier at 8:15 p.m. following the poster sessions. A 2½ hour cruise around the SF Bay (with dinner included) will give you a chance to see the San Francisco skyline, Golden Gate Bridge, Bay Bridge, Alcatraz, and Treasure Island! The price for the cruise and dinner is $50 per person. Unfortunately, there is no opportunity to sign up at the meeting because the boat line cannot accommodate additional people. Sign up when you register, and don't miss out on this FANTASTIC evening!

CHANGES AT NSF...

In late July, N. John Castellan, Jr., was named Director of the Decision, Risk, and Management Science program at the National Science Foundation. He joins Robert Bordley in directing the program. L. Robin Keller has returned to academic life and is now at the University of California, Irvine. The DRMS program funds basic research in the general areas of decision making, risk, and management science. J/DMers interested in learning more about funding opportunities at the National Science Foundation can contact either John (jcastell@NSF, 202-357-7569) or Bob (rbordley@NSF, 202-357-7417).
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FROM THE EDITOR...

The J/DM Newsletter welcomes submissions from individuals and groups. However, we do not publish substantive papers. Book reviews will be published. If you are interested in reviewing books and related materials, please write to the editor.

There are few ground rules for submissions. In order to make the cost of the J/DM Newsletter as low as possible, please submit camera-ready copy. This means that the copy should be typed single-spaced on white 8½ by 11 paper. If possible, use a carbon or film ribbon. Please mail flat—do not fold. A better alternative is to submit your contribution via EMAIL.

Subscriptions: Subscriptions are available on a calendar year basis only. Requests for information concerning membership in the Society for Judgment and Decision Making should be sent to Terry Connelly.

Address corrections: Please check your mailing label carefully. Because the J/DM Newsletter is usually sent by bulk mail, copies with incorrect addresses or which are otherwise undeliverable are neither forwarded nor returned. Therefore, we have no way of knowing if copies are delivered. Address changes or corrections should be sent to Terry Connelly.

Mailing Labels: Some readers may wish to sent reprint lists or other material to people listed in the directory. Contact Terry Connelly for details.

Electronic Mail: The editor may be reached through BITNET at 'castellan@IUBACS'. [Some users may find it either necessary (or more convenient) to address the editor using only the first 8 characters (castell).] BITNET addresses also can be reached from most of the university and research networks.

J/DM Electronic Mail Directory: The Society maintains an EMAIL directory. To add your name to the J/DM Electronic Mail Directory (or to receive a copy of the electronic directory) contact Terry Connelly.

President's Column...

On the morning of Monday, May 20, the US National Red Cross announced a dramatic overhaul of its blood-supply management system. Over the preceding decade, it had been the target of recurrent attacks and embarrassing admissions regarding contamination problems. The most visible have concerned transmission of the AIDS virus, although hepatitis and other problems have also been implicated. The new program involved systematic closing of blood centers, installation of new computers, and centralization of testing.

In the afternoon of Monday, May 20, I received a phone call from a reporter on a national daily (one that uses a lot of color), asking what I thought about the public's undue alarm over what was estimated to be a very small risk. Here's roughly what I replied (or at least what I tried to say; it's always a little hard to know exactly what comes out of the mouth, much less what is heard by a reporter, often with a very different perspective on life). Let me ask the reader what I should have said:

"I don't really know anything about this particular risk, beyond what I have read in the paper. However, the first question that occurs to me is what gives us the right to say that people are over-reacting to a small risk? Does the public have any basis for thinking that the risk is, in fact, small? It's pretty unusual that the news media to give numerical risk estimates. I wouldn't be surprised if they haven't heard anything more than vague descriptions such as that 'the risk is not worth worrying about.'

"What most citizens probably have to go on in this situation is the fact that somebody in a position of responsibility views this as a serious enough problem to call a press conference announcing dramatic actions -- and that you media people have decided that this event is important enough to cover. Why shouldn't people infer that there is a real problem here?

"Furthermore, even if people had seen numbers claiming that the probability of getting a bad transfusion was pretty small, they could still be pretty worked up by it because it is this happening that is so disheartening that estimates couldn't be trusted. From my casual following of this issue, it seems as though every year or so some big problem arises with the blood supply, after which we are told that it has been solved and everything is now under control. Why shouldn't members of the public worry that the experts are either lying to them or lying to themselves? Whether an underestimate of risk reflectshubris or misrepresentation, it can still get me into trouble if I trust it.

"Now, of course, this could be a situation where people are lying to me 'for my own good.' That is, they may fear that I will so overreact to the risk that I will stop donating blood or refuse transfusions in situations that imperil my health. In their eyes, they are not so much lying as shading the truth, so as to achieve the right effect, helping me to reach the right decisions, albeit with a little manipulation in the process.

"There would be at least two risks to such a well-intentioned effort to put the right spin on the reporting of blood supply risks. One is that these short-term goals may conflict with long-term goals. As people perceive that officials have repeatedly been caught shading the truth or failing to deliver on promises regarding the safety of transfusions, then it is hard for them to know what to believe. For example, why should they trust assurances about the safety of donating blood (where, as far as I understand it, the risk really is vanishingly small)?

(Continued on next page)
The second risk is that there is no single right way to shade the facts that will serve all listeners. The same risk level may be intolerable for someone facing cosmetic surgery, but acceptable for someone with severe bleeding from an auto accident. Trying to minimize the risk might lead one person to the right choice and the other to the wrong one, just as magnifying the risk might do the opposite. By 'right' choice, I mean one that is in an individual's own, self-defined best interests. Several years ago, my father faced a knee-replacement operation. He was in great pain and hardly able to walk. However, his physician was sufficiently concerned about the blood supply to offer him the option of waiting two months while he banked some units of his own blood. Who is to say that my father would have been served by anything other than a frank disclosure of the best available risk estimates, and just how good those estimates were?

"You also run into people who shade the truth about risks in order to serve their own self-interest. This may sound naive, but even here, I think that honesty is the best policy. Tell it like you think it is, with all the attendant uncertainty. Even if you don't accept honesty as a central ethical principle, risk situations are just too complex to anticipate the effects that a particular manipulation is going to have."

Anyway, something like that came out over the phone. One might ask: (a) Is it good advice (at least as far as it goes)? (b) Despite my initial disclaimer, did I come across as though I really did know something about this particular case? (c) Did raising the possibility that the risks had been misrepresented carry too strong an implication that I really thought (even knew) that this was the case? (d) Did my conditional defense of the public's reaction do it a disservice, by implying too high or too low a level of sophistication? (e) Is it wrong to argue that people should not be pushed to make certain choices? (f) Should I have deferred to some other expert who had evidence regarding public reactions to this particular problem? Whom? (g) Should I have insisted that I couldn't say anything without direct empirical evidence? (h) Should I have sent the reporter a selection of published studies, allowing her to draw her own conclusions regarding the appropriate implications?

Any thoughts would be appreciated.

As a postscript, I got a similar call the next day from a reporter for a newsweekly (the one that, in my youth, we used to say was for people who couldn't think, in contrast to a photographic weekly for people who couldn't read). I got about 90 seconds into this spiel before she wrapped up the interview, thanking me for being so helpful.

--- Baruch Fischhoff

---

UNDERGRADUATE PAPER WINNER

The Center for Decision Research, the University of Chicago, is pleased to announce the winner of its 1991 Undergraduate Paper Competition. The winner is Anthony V. Bastardi, a senior at Princeton University, who submitted a paper "Inferring Preferences: Some Implications for Avoiding Decisional Conflict," written under the direction of Eldar Shafir.

--- Elke Weber

---

PRELIMINARY PROGRAM
ANNUAL MEETING

SOCIETY FOR JUDGMENT AND DECISION MAKING

November 24-25, 1991
Hyatt Regency Hotel
San Francisco

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 24:

1:00-2:30 Symposium: "Loss Aversion: Origins and Implications"
Organizer: Eric Johnson, University of Pennsylvania.
"Is there risk aversion beyond loss aversion?" Daniel Kahneman & Amos Tversky.
"Sources of loss aversion," Gretchen Chapman & Eric Johnson.
"Predicting encoding processes, endowment effects, and buyer-seller gaps," Jeff Casey
"Framing, loss aversion, and insurance decisions," Jacqueline Meszaros, Eric Johnson, John Hershey, Howard Kunreuther & Penny Pollliser.

2:30-2:45 break


3:45-4:45 Individual Papers:

4:45-5:45 Business Meeting

5:45-7:30 Poster Session (see separate announcement)

8:15 Boat Cruise

(continued on next page)
Jon M. Barnes and Stephen E. Edgell, University of Louisville

Salience of Irrelevant Information in a Probabilistic Environment

N. Elizabeth Beckett, Gary McClelland, William Schulze, and
Michael McKee
University of Colorado

Incentive Effects in Auction Experiments

Jacob Bimberg, Sangho Do, and Donald V. Moser, University of Pittsburgh

Choice Strategies for Decisions Involving Sequential Events

Terry L. Boles, Northwestern University
David M. Messick, University of California, Santa Barbara

The Evaluation of Outcomes Under Reference Point Conflict

F. Borgers, University College London
G. Wright, Strathclyde Graduate Business School
J. Gammack, Bristol Polytechnic
G. Rowe, Bristol Business School

Effects of Expertise and Task on Risk Judgment

Brian H. Bornstein, University of Pennsylvania

David vs. Goliath: The Effect of Defendant's Wealth on Liability Attributions

Timothy Buckley and Janet A. Snieszek, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Passion vs. Preference: Motivation Factors Affecting Forecast Accuracy and Confidence

Adam B. Butler and Lisa L. Scherer, University of Nebraska at Omaha

A Test of Prospect Theory's Value Function in Riskless Contexts

N. John Castellan, Jr, Indiana University

Opportunities for Research Funding at the National Science Foundation

Goutam Chakraborty and Gary J. Gaeth, University of Iowa

The Joint Effect of Information and Personal Experience

Shi-Jie Chang, University of California, Berkeley

Competitive Utility Choice Theory

James M. Conley and Shawn P. Curley, University of Minnesota

Using Dempster-Shafer Belief Functions to Represent Degrees of Belief
Vicky Helman-Hoffman, University of Pittsburgh

The Effect of Prior Expectations on Accuracy of Correlation Judgments

Julie R. Irwin, University of Colorado
Paul Slovic and Sarah Lichtenstein, Decision Research
Gary H. McClelland, University of Colorado

Commodity-Type Preference Reversals: Is Willingness to Pay a Good Measure of Environmental Value?

Alice M. Izen, Cornell University
Andrew S. Rosensweig, University of Michigan Medical School
Mark J. Young, Henry Ford Medical Center

Influence of Positive Affect on Clinical Problem Solving

Eric J. Johnson and Gretchen B. Chapman, University of Pennsylvania

Anchoring and Adjustment: Uncertainty and Extremity Lead to Insufficiency

Nancy L. Johnson and J. Frank Yates, University of Michigan

Is a Bad Theory Better Than No Theory at All?

Richard D. Johnson, G. Douglas Olsen, and Jordan J. Louviere

University of Alberta

Robustness of Judgments and Choices for Different Presentation Formats

Steven K. Jones, Kristine Taylor, and Deborah Frisch, University of Oregon

Processes Involved in the Construction of Probability Judgments

Cynthia A. Joyner, Ohio University

Debiasing Group Decision-Making Overconfidence with Devil’s Advocacy

Lynda M. Kilbourne and Ramona L. Paetzold, Texas A & M University

Chance Occurrences and Hindsight Bias

Sanjiv Kumar, Dale Rude, and David M. Nicol, University of Houston

Cross-Cultural Decision Making: Theoretical Frameworks and a Research Agenda

Margaret Langford, Sanjiv Kumar, and Kenneth Rediker,
University of Houston

Decision Making in a Dynamic and Complex Task Environment

Harvey Langholtz, United Nations

Charles Gettys and Bobbie Foote, University of Oklahoma

Resource-Allocation Behavior When Gains and Losses are Possible
Macchi Laura, University of Milan
The Base-Rate Fallacy: Cognitive Heuristics and Role of the Discourse Organization

Michael Lawrence, University of New South Wales
Peter Ayton, City of London Polytechnic
Forecasting in the Presence of an Asymmetric Loss Function

Irwin P. Levin, Shu-Fang Kao, and Edward A. Wasserman
University of Iowa
Learning Effects and Cell Information Use in Contingency Judgments

Josef C. Lualhati and Janet A. Sniezek, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Group Performance Forecasting in a Judge-Adviser Social Decision System

Nicholas P. Maxwell, University of Pennsylvania
Reference-Price Preference Reversals

Charles G. McClintock, University of California, Santa Barbara
Michael J. Platow, University of Dunedin
Wim G. Liebrand, University of Groningen
Resource Allocation Decision Times as a Function of Value Orientation

David M. Nicol, Dale Rude, and Sanjiv Kumar, University of Houston
Is JIDM Research Culturally Constrained?

Orlando J. Olivares, Texas A & M University
John E. Sawyer, University of Delaware
The Effects of Choice and Cue on Confidence in Judgments in Difficult and Easy Tasks

Lisa Ordóñez and Barbara Mellers, UC Berkeley
Equality-Efficiency Tradeoffs: Differences Between Fairness and Preference Judgment

Ramona L. Paetzold, Texas A & M University
H. Fenwick Huss, George State University
Judicial Decisionmaking and Accountant Liability

Scott Ploos and Matthew Badger, Wesleyan University
A Comparison of Three Practical Techniques for Reducing Overconfidence

Richard E. Potter and Lee Roy Beach, University of Arizona
Decision Making When Acceptable Options Become Unavailable

Mary E. McLaughlin, University of Texas at Arlington
Choice Models of Behavioral Direction Versus Models of Behavioral Intensity

Larry P. Menke, Gary J. Gaeth, Irwin P. Levin, and Goutam Chakraborty
University of Iowa
Consumer Information Processing in Judging Product Bundles

Richard G. Miller, Ohio University
Thomas A. Darling and Jeryl L. Mumpower, SUNY at Albany
Effects of Issue Labels on the Efficiency of Negotiated Agreements

Deborah J. Mitchell, Temple University
Uses and Effects of Imagery in Individual Decision Making

Ignacio Montero and Orfello G. León, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
Risk Seeking and Achievement Motivation

Douglas A. Moore and Lucian Smith, Temple University
Choice Among Decision Aids: A Strategy to Increase Usage

Donald V. Moser, University of Pittsburgh
Does Memory Affect Judgment?

Paul C. Price and J. Frank Yates, University of Michigan
An "Illusion of Control" in Contingency Judgment

Kenneth J. Rediker, University of Houston
Terence R. Mitchell, University of Washington
Lee Roy Beach, University of Arizona
Donald W. Beard, University of Washington
The Influence of Strength of Belief Structure on Decision Processes

Barbara A. Reilly, Clemson University
Michael E. Doherty, Bowling Green State University
Teaching Brunswikian Theory: The Use of the Lens Model in a JIDM Class Exercise

Richard D. Rennie, University of Regina
Richard D. Johnson, University of Alberta
Anchoring-and-Adjustment in Partial Lists of Possible Causes

J. Carlos Rivero, George Washington University
The Dynamic Nature of Decision Strategy Properties

Sandra L. Schneider and Tracy L. Blankenship, University of South Florida
Prediction Ability: The Impact of Skill Change and Random Error
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NEW BOOK...

Knowledge Acquisition for the Construction of Full and Contradiction-Free Knowledge Bases.


The interest in knowledge-based systems is still growing. The initial expectations concerning knowledge bases, however, turned out to be too optimistic, and the problem of knowledge elicitation was strongly underestimated. This book focuses on the specific classification problems, including diagnostic problems, involved in knowledge elicitation. A method for constructing complete and consistent bases is proposed, and an interactive system based on this method is described.

The opening chapters define the problem area and give an outline of the method for eliciting the expert's knowledge, as well as the computational procedures involved. Subsequently, the systems ARIADNA, CLASS, and MEDICS are described. The final three chapters provide an example of a knowledge-based medical diagnostic system, a discussion of the verification of knowledge-based systems and a general conclusion.

The book can be ordered for $18.00 (US) through

iec ProGAMMA
P. O. Box 841
9700 A.V. Groningen
The Netherlands.

Further details can be obtained via email gamma@RUG.NL

POSITION AVAILABLE...

Worcester Polytechnic Institute's Department of Social Science and Policy Studies seeks to fill a tenure track faculty position in economic psychology. The rank and salary for this position are negotiable and will depend on individual qualifications. The applicant must have a Ph.D. and be able to pursue publishable research on topics of economic psychology such as behavioral decision theory and motivation, consumer psychology or the psychology of the firm. The person selected will teach two sections of introductory general or social psychology annually, and will advise undergraduate theses on topics related to his/her research. One to two other course offerings per year in economics or psychology are expected, but the subjects are open. Competency in computer and quantitative skills are also desirable. WPI is a private college of engineering with undergraduate and graduate programs in science and management as well as engineering. Please send a letter of application, vita, and letters of recommendation together with undergraduate transcripts and summaries of teaching evaluations if appropriate to: Dr. D. W. Woods, Department of Social Science and Policy studies, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, 100 Institute Road, Worcester, MA 01609. 'EOE.'
UNDERGRADUATE PAPER COMPETITION
Center for Decision Research
University of Chicago

The Center for Decision Research at the University of Chicago announces its 1992 Undergraduate Paper Competition for the best undergraduate paper on behavioral decision making.

A prize of $100 will be awarded to the winning entry.

The paper can be an integrative review of existing work or an original theoretical or empirical contribution. Papers previously submitted for courses, independent studies, or honors theses are appropriate. The papers will be judged by a panel or researchers at the Center for Decision Research.

The deadline for submissions is May 31, 1992. The winner will announced in the J/DM Newsletter. If you are teaching courses or supervising undergraduate students in the area of decision making, would you please alert them to this opportunity?

Please send entries to Professor Elke Weber, Undergraduate Paper Contest, Center for Decision Research, University of Chicago, 1101 East 58th Street, Chicago, IL 60637.