

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-28414-1 — Judgment under Uncertainty
Edited by Daniel Kahneman , Paul Slovic , Amos Tversky
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

**Judgment under uncertainty:
Heuristics and biases**

Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases

Edited by

Daniel Kahneman

University of British Columbia

Paul Slovic

*Decision Research
A Branch of Perceptronics, Inc.
Eugene, Oregon*

Amos Tversky

Stanford University

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-28414-1 — Judgment under Uncertainty
Edited by Daniel Kahneman , Paul Slovic , Amos Tversky
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521284141

© Cambridge University Press 1982

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1982

26th printing 2017

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

ISBN 978-0-521-28414-1 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

List of contributors	page viii
Preface	xi
Part I: Introduction	
1 Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases <i>Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman</i>	3
Part II: Representativeness	
2 Belief in the law of small numbers <i>Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman</i>	23
3 Subjective probability: A judgment of representativeness <i>Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky</i>	32
4 On the psychology of prediction <i>Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky</i>	48
5 Studies of representativeness <i>Maya Bar-Hillel</i>	69
6 Judgments of and by representativeness <i>Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman</i>	84
Part III: Causality and attribution	
7 Popular induction: Information is not necessarily informative <i>Richard E. Nisbett, Eugene Borgida, Rick Crandall, and Harvey Reed</i>	101
8 Causal schemas in judgments under uncertainty <i>Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman</i>	117

vi Contents

9	Shortcomings in the attribution process: On the origins and maintenance of erroneous social assessments <i>Lee Ross and Craig A. Anderson</i>	129
10	Evidential impact of base rates <i>Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman</i>	153
Part IV: Availability		
11	Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability <i>Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman</i>	163
12	Egocentric biases in availability and attribution <i>Michael Ross and Fiore Sicoly</i>	179
13	The availability bias in social perception and interaction <i>Shelley E. Taylor</i>	190
14	The simulation heuristic <i>Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky</i>	201
Part V: Covariation and control		
15	Informal covariation assessment: Data-based versus theory-based judgments <i>Dennis L. Jennings, Teresa M. Amabile, and Lee Ross</i>	211
16	The illusion of control <i>Ellen J. Langer</i>	231
17	Test results are what you think they are <i>Loren J. Chapman and Jean Chapman</i>	239
18	Probabilistic reasoning in clinical medicine: Problems and opportunities <i>David M. Eddy</i>	249
19	Learning from experience and suboptimal rules in decision making <i>Hillel J. Einhorn</i>	268
Part VI: Overconfidence		
20	Overconfidence in case-study judgments <i>Stuart Oskamp</i>	287
21	A progress report on the training of probability assessors <i>Marc Alpert and Howard Raiffa</i>	294
22	Calibration of probabilities: The state of the art to 1980 <i>Sarah Lichtenstein, Baruch Fischhoff, and Lawrence D. Phillips</i>	306
23	For those condemned to study the past: Heuristics and biases in hindsight <i>Baruch Fischhoff</i>	335

Part VII: Multistage evaluation

- | | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 24 | Evaluation of compound probabilities in sequential choice
<i>John Cohen, E. I. Chesnick, and D. Haran</i> | 355 |
| 25 | Conservatism in human information processing
<i>Ward Edwards</i> | 359 |
| 26 | The best-guess hypothesis in multistage inference
<i>Charles F. Gettys, Clinton Kelly III, and Cameron R. Peterson</i> | 370 |
| 27 | Inferences of personal characteristics on the basis of
information retrieved from one's memory
<i>Yaacov Trope</i> | 378 |

Part VIII: Corrective procedures

- | | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 28 | The robust beauty of improper linear models in decision
making
<i>Robyn M. Dawes</i> | 391 |
| 29 | The vitality of mythical numbers
<i>Max Singer</i> | 408 |
| 30 | Intuitive prediction: Biases and corrective procedures
<i>Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky</i> | 414 |
| 31 | Debiasing
<i>Baruch Fischhoff</i> | 422 |
| 32 | Improving inductive inference
<i>Richard E. Nisbett, David H. Krantz, Christopher Jepsen,
and Geoffrey T. Fong</i> | 445 |

Part IX: Risk perception

- | | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 33 | Facts versus fears: Understanding perceived risk
<i>Paul Slovic, Baruch Fischhoff, and Sarah Lichtenstein</i> | 463 |
|----|--|-----|

Part X: Postscript

- | | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 34 | On the study of statistical intuitions
<i>Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky</i> | 493 |
| 35 | Variants of uncertainty
<i>Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky</i> | 509 |

- | | |
|------------|-----|
| References | 521 |
| Index | 553 |

Contributors

- *Marc Alpert *Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University*
Teresa M. Amabile *Department of Psychology, Brandeis University*
Craig A. Anderson *Department of Psychology, Stanford University*
Maya Bar-Hillel *Department of Psychology, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem*
Eugene Borgida *Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota*
Jean Chapman *Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin*
Loren J. Chapman *Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin*
*E. I. Chesnick *Department of Psychology, University of Manchester, England*
John Cohen *Department of Psychology, University of Manchester, England*
Rick Crandall *University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana*
Robyn M. Dawes *Department of Psychology, University of Oregon*
David M. Eddy *Center for the Study of Health and Clinical Policy, Duke University*
Ward Edwards *Social Science Research Institute, University of Southern California*
Hillel J. Einhorn *Center for Decision Research, University of Chicago*
Baruch Fischhoff *Decision Research, A Branch of Perceptronics, Inc., Eugene, Oregon*
Geoffrey T. Fong *Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan*
Charles F. Gettys *Department of Psychology, University of Oklahoma*
*D. Haran *Department of Psychology, University of Manchester, England*
Dennis L. Jennings *Department of Psychology, New York University*
Christopher Jepson *Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan*
Daniel Kahneman *Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia*
Clinton Kelly III *Advanced Research Projects Agency, Arlington, Virginia*
David H. Krantz *Bell Laboratories, Murray Hill, New Jersey*
Ellen J. Langer *Department of Psychology, Harvard University*

*Asterisk indicates affiliation when article was originally published.

- Sarah Lichtenstein *Decision Research, A Branch of Perceptronics, Inc., Eugene, Oregon*
Richard E. Nisbett *Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan*
Stuart Oskamp *Department of Psychology, Claremont Graduate School*
Cameron R. Peterson *Decisions & Designs, Inc., McLean, Virginia*
Lawrence D. Phillips *Decision Analysis Unit, Brunel University*
Howard Raiffa *Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University*
Harvey Reed *Department of Psychology, University of Michigan at Dearborn*
Lee Ross *Department of Psychology, Stanford University*
Michael Ross *Department of Psychology, University of Waterloo, Ontario*
Fiore Sicoly *Department of Psychology, University of Waterloo, Ontario*
Max Singer *Hudson Institute, Arlington, Virginia*
Paul Slovic *Decision Research, A Branch of Perceptronics, Inc., Eugene, Oregon*
Shelley E. Taylor *Department of Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles*
Yaacov Trope *Department of Psychology, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem*
Amos Tversky *Department of Psychology, Stanford University*

Preface

The approach to the study of judgment that this book represents had origins in three lines of research that developed in the 1950s and 1960s: the comparison of clinical and statistical prediction, initiated by Paul Meehl; the study of subjective probability in the Bayesian paradigm, introduced to psychology by Ward Edwards; and the investigation of heuristics and strategies of reasoning, for which Herbert Simon offered a program and Jerome Bruner an example. Our collection also represents the recent convergence of the study of judgment with another strand of psychological research: the study of causal attribution and lay psychological interpretation, pioneered by Fritz Heider.

Meehl's classic book, published in 1954, summarized evidence for the conclusion that simple linear combinations of cues outdo the intuitive judgments of experts in predicting significant behavioral criteria. The lasting intellectual legacy of this work, and of the furious controversy that followed it, was probably not the demonstration that clinicians performed poorly in tasks that, as Meehl noted, they should not have undertaken. Rather, it was the demonstration of a substantial discrepancy between the objective record of people's success in prediction tasks and the sincere beliefs of these people about the quality of their performance. This conclusion was not restricted to clinicians or to clinical prediction: People's impressions of how they reason, and of how well they reason, could not be taken at face value. Perhaps because students of clinical judgment often used themselves and their friends as subjects, the interpretation of errors and biases tended to be cognitive, rather than psychodynamic: Illusions, not delusions, were the model.

With the introduction of Bayesian ideas into psychological research by Edwards and his associates, psychologists were offered for the first time a fully articulated model of optimal performance under uncertainty, with which human judgments could be compared. The matching of human

xii Preface

judgments to normative models was to become one of the major paradigms of research on judgment under uncertainty. Inevitably, it led to concerns with the biases to which inductive inferences are prone and the methods that could be used to correct them. These concerns are reflected in most of the selections in the present volume. However, much of the early work used the normative model to explain human performance and introduced separate processes to explain departures from optimality. In contrast, research on judgmental heuristics seeks to explain both correct and erroneous judgments in terms of the same psychological processes.

The emergence of the new paradigm of cognitive psychology had a profound influence on judgment research. Cognitive psychology is concerned with internal processes, mental limitations, and the way in which the processes are shaped by the limitations. Early examples of conceptual and empirical work in this vein were the study of strategies of thinking by Bruner and his associates, and Simon's treatment of heuristics of reasoning and of bounded rationality. Bruner and Simon were both concerned with strategies of simplification that reduce the complexity of judgment tasks, to make them tractable for the kind of mind that people happen to have. Much of the work that we have included in this book was motivated by the same concerns.

In recent years, a large body of research has been devoted to uncovering judgmental heuristics and exploring their effects. The present volume provides a comprehensive sample of this approach. It assembles new reviews, written especially for this collection, and previously published articles on judgment and inference. Although the boundary between judgment and decision making is not always clear, we have focused here on judgment rather than on choice. The topic of decision making is important enough to be the subject of a separate volume.

The book is organized in ten parts. The first part contains an early review of heuristics and biases of intuitive judgments. Part II deals specifically with the representativeness heuristic, which is extended, in Part III, to problems of causal attribution. Part IV describes the availability heuristic and its role in social judgment. Part V covers the perception and learning of covariation and illustrates the presence of illusory correlations in the judgments of lay people and experts. Part VI discusses the calibration of probability assessors and documents the prevalent phenomenon of overconfidence in prediction and explanation. Biases associated with multistage inference are covered in Part VII. Part VIII reviews formal and informal procedures for correcting and improving intuitive judgments. Part IX summarizes work on the effects of judgmental biases in a specific area of concern, the perception of risk. The final part includes some current thoughts on several conceptual and methodological issues that pertain to the study of heuristics and biases.

For convenience, all references are assembled in a single list at the end of the book. Numbers in boldface refer to material included in the book,

identifying the chapter in which that material appears. We have used ellipses (. . .) to indicate where we have deleted material from previously published articles.

Our work in preparing this book was supported by Office of Naval Research Grant N00014-79-C-0077 to Stanford University and by Office of Naval Research Contract N0014-80-C-0150 to Decision Research.

We wish to thank Peggy Roecker, Nancy Collins, Gerry Hanson, and Don MacGregor for their help in the preparation of this book.

Daniel Kahneman
Paul Slovic
Amos Tversky