





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART  
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

**LEVEL II**

12

AD A 099 504

The Simulation Heuristic

Daniel Kahneman

University of British Columbia

Amos Tversky

Stanford University

DTIC  
ELECTE  
JUN 0 1 1981  
S D  
E

May 15, 1981

Preparation of this report was supported by the  
Engineering Psychology Programs, Office of Naval Research

ONR Contract N00014-79-C-0077 Work Unit NR 197-058

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

Reproduction in whole or part is permitted for any purpose  
of the United States Government

DTIC FILE COPY

81 6 01 014



Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

Block 20 continued:

of the rules of undoing and mental simulation to the evaluation of scenarios are discussed.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A	

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

## The Simulation Heuristic

Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky

Our original treatment of the availability heuristic (Tversky & Kahneman, 1973) discussed two classes of mental operations that 'bring things to mind': the retrieval of instances and the construction of examples or scenarios. Recall and construction are quite different ways of bringing things to mind, which are used to answer different questions, and follow different rules. Past research has dealt mainly with the retrieval of instances from memory, and the process of mental construction has been relatively neglected.

To advance the study of availability for construction, we now sketch a mental operation that we label the simulation heuristic. Our starting point is a common introspection: there appear to be many situations in which questions about events are answered by an operation that resembles the running of a simulation model. The simulation can be constrained and controlled in several ways: the starting conditions for a 'run' can be left at their realistic default values, or modified to assume some special contingency; the outcomes can be left unspecified, or else a target state may be set, with the task of finding a path to that state from the initial conditions. A simulation does not necessarily produce a single story, which starts at the beginning and ends with a definite outcome. Rather, we construe the output of simulation as an assessment of the ease with which the model could produce different outcomes,

given its initial conditions and operating parameters. Thus, we suggest that mental simulation yields a measure of the propensity of one's model of the situation to generate various outcomes, much as the propensities of a statistical model can be assessed by Monte Carlo techniques. The ease with which the simulation of a system reaches a particular state is eventually used to judge the propensity of the (real) system to produce that state.

We shall argue that assessments of propensity and probability derived from mental simulations are used in several tasks of judgment, and also that they play a significant role in several affective states. We first list some judgmental activities in which mental simulation appears to be involved. We then describe a study of the cognitive rules that govern the mental undoing of past events, and briefly discuss the implications of these rules for emotions that arise when reality is compared to a favored alternative, which one had failed to reach but could easily imagine reaching. We conclude this brief sketch of the simulation heuristic by some remarks on scenarios, and on the biases that are likely to arise when this heuristic is used.

(1) Prediction. Imagine the first meeting between two persons that you know well, who have never met before. How do you generate predictions such as "they will get on famously" or "they'll grate on one another"?

(2) Assessing the probability of a specified event. How do you assess the likelihood of American armed intervention to

secure the oilfields of Saudi Arabia in the next decade? Note the difference between this task and the preceding one. The simulation in the present case has a specified target-state, and its object is to obtain some measure of the 'ease' with which this target state can be produced, within the constraints of a realistic model of the international system.

(3) Assessing conditioned probabilities. If civil war breaks out in Saudi Arabia, what are the likely consequences? Note that this simulation exercise differs from mere prediction, because it involves a specified initial state, which may diverge more or less from current reality. The assessment of remote contingencies, in particular, involves an interesting ambiguity: what changes should be made in one's current model before the 'run' of the simulation? Should one make only the minimal changes that incorporate the specified contingency (e.g., civil war in Saudi Arabia), subject to elementary requirements of consistency? Or should one introduce all the changes that are made probable by the stipulation of the condition? In that case, for example, one's model of the political system would first be adjusted to make the civil war in Saudi Arabia as unsurprising as possible, and the simulation would employ the parameters of the revised model.

(4) Counterfactual assessments. How close did Hitler's scientists come to developing the atom bomb in World War II? If they had developed it in February 1945, would the outcome of the war have been different? Counterfactual assessments are also used in many mundane settings, as when we judge that "she could

have coped with the job situation if her child had not been ill".

(5) Assessments of causality. To test whether event A caused event B, we may undo A in our mind, and observe whether B still occurs in the simulation. Simulation can also be used to test whether A markedly increased the propensity of B, perhaps even made B inevitable. We suggest that a test of causality by simulation is involved in examples such as "you know very well that they would have quarrelled even if she had not mentioned his mother."

#### Studies of Undoing

Our initial investigations of the simulation heuristic have focused on counterfactual judgments. In particular, we have been concerned with the process by which people judge that an event 'was close to happening' or 'nearly occurred'. The spatial metaphor is compelling and has been adopted in many philosophical investigations: it appears reasonable to speak of the distance between reality and some once-possible but unrealized world. The psychological significance of this assessment of distance between what happened and what could have happened is illustrated in the following example:

"Mr. Crane and Mr. Tees were scheduled to leave the airport on different flights, at the same time. They traveled from town in the same limousine, were caught in a traffic jam, and arrived at the airport 30 minutes after

the scheduled departure time of their flights.

Mr. Crane is told that his flight left on time.

Mr. Tees is told that his flight was delayed, and just left five minutes ago.

Who is more upset?

Mr. Crane

Mr. Tees

It will come as no surprise that 96% of a sample of students who answered this question stated that Mr. Tees would be more upset. What is it that makes the stereotype so obvious? Note that the objective situation of the two gentlemen is precisely identical, as both have missed their planes. Furthermore, since both had expected to miss their planes, the difference between them cannot be attributed to disappointment. In every sense of the word, the difference between Tees and Crane is immaterial. The only reason for Mr. Tees to be more upset is that it was more "possible" for him to reach his flight. We suggest that the standard emotional script for this situation calls for both travelers to engage in a simulation exercise, in which they test how close they came to reaching their flight in time. The counterfactual construction functions as would an expectation. Although the story makes it clear that the expectations of Mr. Tees and Mr. Crane could not be different, Mr. Tees is now more disappointed, because it is easier for him to imagine how he could have arrived 5 minutes earlier than it is for Mr. Crane to imagine how the 30 minutes

delay could have been avoided.

There is an Alice-in-Wonderland quality to such examples, with their odd mixture of fantasy and reality. If Mr. Crane is capable of imagining unicorns -- and we expect he is -- why does he find it relatively difficult to imagine himself avoiding a 30 minute delay, as we suggest he does? Evidently, there are constraints on the freedom of fantasy, and the psychological analysis of mental simulation consists primarily of an investigation of these constraints.

Our understanding of the rules of mental simulations is still rudimentary and we can only present early results and tentative speculations, in a domain that appears exceptionally rich and promising. We have obtained preliminary observations on the rules that govern a special class of simulation activity -- undoing the past. Our studies of undoing have focused on a situation in which this activity is especially common -- the response of surviving relatives to a fatal accident. Here again, as in the case of Mr. Tees and Crane, we chose to study what we call the emotional script for a situation. For an example, consider the following story:

"Mr. Jones was 47 years old, the father of three and a successful banking executive. His wife has been ill at home for several months.

On the day of the accident, Mr. Jones left his office at the regular time. He sometimes left early to take care of home chores at his wife's request, but this was not

necessary on that day. Mr. Jones did not drive home by his regular route. The day was exceptionally clear and Mr. Jones told his friends at the office that he would drive along the shore to enjoy the view.

The accident occurred at a major intersection. The light turned amber as Mr. Jones approached. Witnesses noted that he braked hard to stop at the crossing, although he could easily have gone through. His family recognized this as a common occurrence in Mr. Jones' driving. As he began to cross after the light changed, a light truck charged into the intersection at top speed, and ramed Mr. Jones' car from the left. Mr. Jones was killed instantly.

It was later ascertained that the truck was driven by a teenage boy, who was under the influence of drugs.

As commonly happens in such situations, the Jones family and their friends often thought and often said "If only...", during the days that followed the accident. How did they continue this thought? Please write one or more likely completions."

This version (labeled the 'route' version) was given to 62 students at the University of British Columbia. Another group of 61 students received a 'time' version, in which the second paragraph read as follows:

"On the day of the accident, Mr. Jones left the office earlier than usual, to attend to some household chores at his wife's request. He drove home along his regular route. Mr.

Jones occasionally chose to drive along the shore, to enjoy the view on exceptionally clear days, but that day was just average."

The analysis of the first completion of the "if only" stem is given in Table 1. Four categories of responses were found: (i) Undoing of route; (ii) Undoing of time of departure from the office ; (iii) Mr. Jones crossing at the amber light; (iv) Removing Tom from the scene.

Table 1

	Time Version	Route Version
(i) Route	8	33
(ii) Time	16	2
(iii) Crossing	19	14
(iv) Tom	18	13
(v) Other	1	3

A particularly impressive aspect of the results shown in Table 1 is an event that fails to occur: not a single subject mentioned that if Mr. Jones had come to the intersection 2 or 3 seconds earlier he would have gone through safely. The finding is typical: events are not mentally undone by arbitrary alterations in the values of continuous variables. Evidently, subjects do not perform the undoing task by eliminating that

necessary condition of the critical event which has the lowest prior probability -- a procedure that would surely lead them to focus on the extraordinary coincidence of the two cars meeting at the intersection. Whatever it is that people do, then, is not perfectly correlated with prior probability.

The alterations that people introduce in stories can be classified as downhill, uphill or horizontal changes. A downhill change is one that removes a surprising or unexpected aspect of the story, or otherwise increases its internal coherence. An uphill change is one that introduces unlikely occurrences. A horizontal change is one in which an arbitrary value of a variable is replaced by another arbitrary value, which is neither more nor less likely than the first. The experimental manipulation caused a change of route to be downhill in one version, uphill in the other, with a corresponding variation in the character of changes of the timing of Mr. Jones' fatal trip. The manipulation was clearly successful: subjects were more likely to undo the accident by restoring a normal value of a variable than by introducing an exception. In general, uphill changes are relatively rare in the subjects' responses, and horizontal changes non-existent.

The notion of downhill and uphill changes is borrowed from the experience of the cross-country skier, and it is intended to illustrate the special nature of the distance relation that can be defined for possible states of a system. The essential property of that relation is that it is not symmetric. For the cross-country skier, a brief downhill run from A to B is often

paired with a long and laborious climb from B to A. In this metaphor, exceptional states or events are peaks, normal states or events are valleys. Thus, we propose that the psychological distance from an exception to the norm that it violates is smaller than the distance from the norm to the same exception. The preference for downhill changes is perhaps the major rule that mental simulations obey; it embodies the essential constraints that lend realism to counterfactual fantasies.

A notable aspect of the results shown in Table 1 is the relatively low proportion of responses in which the accident is undone by eliminating the event that is naturally viewed as its cause: the insane behavior of the drugged boy at the intersection. This finding illustrates another property of mental simulation, which we label the focus rule: stories are commonly altered by changing some property of the main object of concern and attention. In the present case, of course, the focus of attention was Mr. Jones, since the subjects had been instructed to empathize with his family. To test the focus rule, a new version of the accident story was constructed, in which the last paragraph was replaced by the following information:

"It was later ascertained that the truck was driven by a teenage boy, named Tom Searler. Tom's father had just found him at home under the influence of drugs. This was a common occurrence, as Tom used drugs heavily. There had been a quarrel, during which Tom grabbed the keys that were

lying on the living room table and drove off blindly. He was severely injured in the accident."

Subjects given this version of the story were asked to complete the stem "If only...", either on behalf of Mr. Jones' relatives or on behalf of Tom's relatives. Here again, we consider the first response made by the subjects. The majority of subjects who took the role of Tom's relatives ( 68%) modified the story by removing him from the scene of the accident -- most often by not allowing the fatal keys on the table. In contrast, only a minority ( 28%) of the subjects identifying with Mr. Jones' relatives mentioned Tom in their responses.

We have described this study of undoing in some detail, in spite of its preliminary character, to illustrate the surprising tidiness of the rules that govern mental simulation, and to demonstrate the existence of widely shared norms concerning the counterfactual fantasies that are appropriate in certain situations. We believe that the cognitive rules that govern the ease of mental undoing will be helpful in the study of a cluster of emotions that could be called counterfactual emotions, because of their dependence on a comparison of reality with what might or should have been: frustration, regret, and some cases of indignation, grief and envy are all examples. The common feature of these aversive emotional states is that one's hedonic adaptation level is higher than one's current reality, as if the unrealized possibilities were weighted into the adaptation level, by weights that correspond to the ease with these

possibilities are reached in mental simulation.

#### Remarks on Scenarios

In the context of prediction and planning under uncertainty, the deliberate manipulation of mental models appears to be sufficiently important to deserve the label of a distinctive simulation heuristic. The clearest example of such activities is the explicit construction of scenarios as a procedure for the estimation of probabilities.

What makes a good scenario? In the terms already introduced, a good scenario is one that bridges the gap between the initial state and the target event by a series of intermediate events, with a general downhill trend and no significant uphill move along the way. Informal observations suggest that the plausibility of a scenario depends much more on the plausibility of its weakest link than on the number of links. A scenario is especially satisfying when the path that leads from the initial to the terminal state is not immediately apparent, so that the introduction of intermediate stages actually raises the subjective probability of the target event.

Any scenario is necessarily schematic and incomplete. It is therefore of interest to discover the rules that govern the selection of the events which are explicitly specified in the scenario. We hypothesize that the 'joints' of a scenario are events that are low in redundancy and high in causal significance. A non-redundant event represents a local minimum in the predictability of the sequence, a point at which

significant alternatives might arise. A causally significant event is one whose occurrence alters the values that are considered normal for other events, in the chain that eventually leads to the target of the scenario.

The elaboration of a single plausible scenario which leads from realistic initial conditions to a specified end state is often used to support the judgment that the probability of the end state is high. On the other hand, we tend to conclude that an outcome is improbable if it can only be reached by invoking uphill assumptions of rare events and strange coincidences. Thus, an assessment of the 'goodness' of scenarios can serve as a heuristic to judge the probability of events. In the context of planning, in particular, scenarios are often used to assess the probability that the plan will succeed and to evaluate the risk of various causes of failure.

We have suggested that the construction of scenarios is used as a heuristic to assess the probability of events, by a mediating assessment of the propensity of some causal system to produce these events. Like any other heuristic, the simulation heuristic should be subject to characteristic errors and biases. Research is lacking in this area, but the following hypotheses appear promising: (i) The search for non-redundant and causally significant 'joints' in scenario construction is expected to lead to a bias for scenarios (and end-states) in which dramatic events mark causal transitions. There will be a corresponding tendency to underestimate the likelihood of events that are produced by slow and incremental changes. (ii) The use of

scenarios to assess probability is associated with a bias in favor of events for which one plausible scenario can be found, with a corresponding bias against events which can be produced in a multitude of unlikely ways. Such a bias could have especially pernicious consequences in a planning context, because it produces overly optimistic estimates of the probability that the plan will succeed. By its very nature, a plan consists of a chain of plausible links. At any point in the chain, it is sensible to expect that events will unfold as planned. However, the cumulative probability of at least one fatal failure could be overwhelmingly high even when the probability of each individual cause of failure is negligible. Plans fail because of surprises, occasions on which the unexpected uphill change occurs. The simulation heuristic, which is biased in favor of downhill changes, is therefore associated with a risk of large and systematic errors.

### Reference

Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability. Cognitive Psychology, 1973, 5, 207-232.

Distribution List

OSD

CDR Paul R. Chatelier  
Office of the Deputy Under Secretary  
of Defense  
OUSDRE (E&LS)  
Pentagon, Room 3D129  
Washington, D.C. 20301

Department of the Navy

Director  
Engineering Psychology Programs  
Code 455  
Office of Naval Research  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217 (5 cys)

Director  
Communication & Computer Technology  
Code 240  
Office of Naval Research  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

Director  
Manpower, Personnel & Training  
Code 270  
Office of Naval Research  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

Director  
Operations Research Programs  
Code 434  
Office of Naval Research  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

Director  
Statistics and Probability Program  
Code 436  
Office of Naval Research  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

Director  
Information Systems Program  
Code 437  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

Department of the Navy

Code 430B  
Office of Naval Research  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

Special Assistant for Marine  
Corps Matters  
Code 100M  
Office of Naval Research  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

Commanding Officer  
ONR Eastern/Central Regional Office  
ATTN: Dr. J. Lester  
Building 114, Section D  
666 Summer Street  
Boston, MA 02210

Commanding Officer  
ONR Branch Office  
ATTN: Dr. C. Davis  
536 South Clark Street  
Chicago, IL 60605

Commanding Officer  
ONR Western Regional Office  
ATTN: Dr. E. Gloye  
1030 East Green Street  
Pasadena, CA 91106

Office of Naval Research  
Scientific Liaison Group  
American Embassy, Room A-407  
APO San Francisco, CA 96503

Director  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Technical Information Division  
Code 2627  
Washington, D.C. 20375 (6 cys)

Dr. Robert G. Smith  
Office of the Chief of Naval  
Operations, OP987H  
Personnel Logistics Plans  
Washington, D.C. 20350

Department of the Navy

Naval Training Equipment Center  
ATTN: Technical Library  
Orlando, FL 32813

Human Factors Department  
Code N215  
Naval Training Equipment Center  
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Alfred F. Smode  
Training Analysis and Evaluation  
Group  
Naval Training Equipment Center  
Code N-00T  
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Gary Poock  
Operations Research Department  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940

Dean of Research Administration  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940

Mr. Warren Lewis  
Human Engineering Branch  
Code 8231  
Naval Ocean Systems Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. A.L. Slafkosky  
Scientific Advisor  
Commandant of the Marine Corps  
Code RD-1  
Washington, D.C. 20380

Mr. Arnold Rubinstein  
Naval Material Command  
NAVMAT 0722 - Rm. 508  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

Commander  
Naval Air Systems Command  
Human Factor Programs  
NAVAIR 340F  
Washington, D.C. 20361

Mr. Phillip Andrews  
Naval Sea Systems Command  
NAVSEA 0341  
Washington, D.C. 20362

Department of the Navy

Commander  
Naval Electronics Systems Command  
Human Factors Engineering Branch  
Code 4701  
Washington, D.C. 20360

Dr. Arthur Bachrach  
Behavioral Sciences Department  
Naval Medical Research Institute  
Bethesda, MD 20014

CDR Thomas Berghage  
Naval Health Research Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. George Moeller  
Human Factors Engineering Branch  
Submarine Medical Research Lab  
Naval Submarine Base  
Groton, CT 06340

Commanding Officer  
Naval Health Research Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. James McGrath, Code 302  
Navy Personnel Research and  
Development Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Navy Personnel Research and  
Development Center  
Planning and Appraisal  
Code 04  
San Diego, CA 92152

Navy Personnel Research and  
Development Center  
Management Systems, Code 303  
San Diego, CA 92152

Navy Personnel Research and  
Development Center  
Performance Measurement &  
Enhancement  
Code 309  
San Diego, CA 92152

Mr. Ronald A. Erickson  
Human Factors Branch  
Code 3194  
Naval Weapons Center  
China Lake, CA 93555

Department of the Navy

Dean of Academic Departments  
U.S. Naval Academy  
Annapolis, MD 21402

LCDR W. Moroney  
Code 55MP  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940

Mr. Merlin Malehorn  
Office of the Chief of Naval  
Operations (OP-115)  
Washington, D.C. 20350

Dr. Carl E. Englund  
Environmental Physiology Department  
Ergonomics Program, Code 8060  
Naval Health Research Center  
P.O. Box 85122  
San Diego, CA 92138

Department of the Army

Mr. J. Barber  
HQ, Department of the Army  
DAPE-MBR  
Washington, D.C. 20310

Dr. Joseph Zeidner  
Technical Director  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Director, Organizations and  
Systems Research Laboratory  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Technical Director  
U.S. Army Human Engineering Labs  
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005

MAJ. Gerald P. Krauger  
USA Medical R&D Command HQ  
SGRD-PLC  
Fort Detrick, MD 21801

ARI Field Unit-USAREUR  
ATTN: Library  
C/O ODCSPER  
HQ USAREUR & 7th Army  
APO New York 09403

Department of the Air Force

U.S. Air Force Office of Scientific  
Research  
Life Sciences Directorate, NL  
Bolling Air Force Base  
Washington, D.C. 20332

Dr. Donald A. Topmiller  
Chief, Systems Engineering Branch  
Human Engineering Division  
USAF AMRL/HES  
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433

Air University Library  
Maxwell Air Force Base, AL 36112

Dr. Gordon Eckstrand  
AFHRL/ASM  
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433

Dr. Earl Alluisi  
Chief Scientist  
AFHRL/CCN  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Foreign Addresses

North East London Polytechnic  
The Charles Myers Library  
Livingstone Road  
Stratford  
London E15 2LJ  
ENGLAND

Professor Dr. Carl Graf Hoyos  
Institute for Psychology  
Technical University  
8000 Munich  
Arcisstr 21  
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Dr. Kenneth Gardner  
Applied Psychology Unit  
Admiralty Marine Technology  
Establishment  
Teddington, Middlesex TW11 0LN  
ENGLAND

Director, Human Factors Wing  
Defense & Civil Institute of  
Environmental Medicine  
Post Office Box 2000  
Downsview, Ontario M3M 3B9  
CANADA

Foreign Addresses

Dr. A.D. Baddeley  
Director, Applied Psychology Unit  
Medical Research Council  
15 Chaucer Road  
Cambridge, CB2 2EF  
ENGLAND

Other Government Agencies

Defense Technical Information Center  
Cameron Station, Bldg. 5  
Alexandria, VA 22314 (12 cys)

Dr. Craig Fields  
Director, Cybernetics Technology  
Office  
Defense Advanced Research Projects  
Agency  
1400 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22209

Dr. Judith Daly  
Cybernetics Technology Office  
Defense Advanced Research Projects  
Agency  
1400 Wilson Blvd  
Arlington, VA 22209

Professor Douglas E. Hunter  
Defense Intelligence School  
Washington, D.C. 20374

Other Organizations

Dr. Robert R. Mackie  
Human Factors Research, Inc.  
5775 Dawson Avenue  
Goleta, CA 93017

Dr. Gary McClelland  
Institute of Behavioral Sciences  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Miley Merkhofer  
Stanford Research Institute  
Decision Analysis Group  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Dr. Jesse Orlansky  
Institute for Defense Analyses  
400 Army-Navy Drive  
Arlington, VA 22202

Other Organizations

Professor Judea Pearl  
Engineering Systems Department  
University of California-Los Angeles  
405 Hilgard Avenue  
Los Angeles, California 90024

Professor Howard Raiffa  
Graduate School of Business  
Administration  
Harvard University  
Soldiers Field Road  
Boston, MA 02163

Dr. T.B. Sheridan  
Department of Mechanical Engineering  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. Arthur I. Siegel  
Applied Psychological Services, Inc.  
404 East Lancaster Street  
Wayne, PA 19087

Dr. Paul Slovic  
Decision Research  
1201 Oak Street  
Eugene, Oregon 97401

Dr. Robert T. Hennessy  
NAS - National Research Council  
JH #819  
2101 Constitution Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20418

Dr. M.G. Samet  
Perceptrics, Inc.  
6271 Variel Avenue  
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Dr. Robert Williges  
Human Factors Laboratory  
Virginia Polytechnical Institute  
and State University  
130 Whittemore Hall  
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Dr. Alphonse Chapanis  
Department of Psychology  
The Johns Hopkins University  
Charles and 34th Streets  
Baltimore, MD 21218

Other Organizations

Dr. Meredith P. Crawford  
American Psychological Association  
Office of Educational Affairs  
1200 17th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. Ward Edwards  
Director, Social Science Research  
Institute  
University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Dr. Charles Gettys  
Department of Psychology  
University of Oklahoma  
455 West Lindsey  
Norman, OK 73069

Dr. Kenneth Hammond  
Institute of Behavioral Science  
University of Colorado  
Room 201  
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Willima Howell  
Department of Psychology  
Rice University  
Houston, TX 77001

Journal Supplement Abstract Service  
American Psychological Association  
1200 17th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036 (3 cys)

Dr. Richard W. Pew  
Information Sciences Division  
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.  
50 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Hillel Einhorn  
University of Chicago  
Graduate School of Business  
1101 E. 58th Street  
Chicago, IL 60637

Mr. Tim Gilbert  
The MITRE Corporation  
1820 Dolly Madison Blvd  
McLean, VA 22102

Dr. Douglas Towne  
University of Southern California  
Behavioral Technology Laboratory  
3716 S. Hope Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Other Organizations

Dr. John Payne  
Duke University  
Graduate School of Business  
Administration  
Durham, NC 27706

Dr. Baruch Fischhoff  
Decision Research  
1201 Oak Street  
Eugene, Oregon 97401

Dr. Andrew P. Sage  
University of Virginia  
School of Engineering and Applied  
Science  
Charlottesville, VA 22901

Dr. Leonard Adelman  
Decisions and Designs, Inc.  
8400 Westpark Drive, Suite 600  
P.O. Box 907  
McLean, VA 22101

Dr. Lola Lopes  
Department of Psychology  
University of Wisconsin  
Madison, WI 53706

Mr. Joseph Wohl  
The MITRE Corp.  
P.O. Box 208  
Bedford, MA 01730

ATE  
MED  
-8