

Numerical Reasoning in Judgments and Decision Making about Health

Every day thousands of individuals need to make critical decisions about their health based on numerical information, yet recent surveys have found that over half the population of the USA is unable to complete basic math problems. How does this lack of numerical ability (also referred to as low numeracy, quantitative illiteracy, or statistical illiteracy) impact healthcare? What can be done to help people with low numeracy skills? *Numerical Reasoning in Judgments and Decision Making about Health* addresses these questions by examining and explaining the impact of quantitative illiteracy on healthcare and in specific healthcare contexts, and discussing what can be done to reduce these healthcare disparities. This book will be a useful resource for professionals in many health fields including academics, policy makers, physicians, and other healthcare providers.

Britta L. Anderson is a Research Associate at the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

Jay Schulkin is the Senior Director of Research in the Division of Practice at the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. He is also a Research Professor of Neuroscience at Georgetown University and Research Professor in the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology at the University of Washington.

Numerical Reasoning in Judgments and Decision Making about Health

Edited by

Britta L. Anderson & Jay Schulkin



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom
 One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
 477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
 314-321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi - 110025, India
 79 Anson Road, #06-04/06, Singapore 079906

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/9781107040946

© Cambridge University Press 2014

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 2014

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

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data

Numerical reasoning in judgments and decision making about health / [edited by] Britta L. Anderson & Jay Schulkin.

p. ; cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-1-107-04094-6 (hardback)

I. Anderson, Britta L., editor of compilation. II. Schulkin, Jay, editor of compilation.

[DNLM: 1. Health Literacy – United States. 2. Decision Making – United States. 3. Judgment – United States. 4. Mathematical Concepts – United States. WA 590]

RA427

362.1–dc23

2013043959

ISBN 978-1-107-04094-6 Hardback

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.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-04094-6 — Numerical Reasoning in Judgments and Decision Making about Health
Edited by Britta L. Anderson , Jay Schulkin
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

Britta L. Anderson would like to dedicate this book
to Bo Peery and to her grandparents.

Jay Schulkin would like to dedicate this book to
Jonathan Baron and George Loewenstein.

Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	<i>page</i> ix
<i>List of tables</i>	xii
<i>List of contributors</i>	xiv
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xvi
Introduction	1
BRITTA L. ANDERSON & JAY SCHULKIN	
1 Measuring numeracy	11
EDWARD T. COKELY, SAIMA GHAZAL, & ROCIO GARCIA-RETAMERO	
2 Collective statistical illiteracy in health	39
JAN MULTMEIER, WOLFGANG GAISSMAIER, & ODETTE WEGWARTH	
3 Physicians' understanding and use of numeric information	59
BRITTA L. ANDERSON & JAY SCHULKIN	
4 Patient numeracy: what do patients need to recognize, think, or do with health numbers?	80
BRIAN J. ZIKMUND-FISHER, GILLIAN MAYMAN, & ANGELA FAGERLIN	
5 Application of numeracy in diabetes mellitus chronic disease care	105
JILLIAN BERKMAN & KERRI L. CAVANAUGH	
6 Numeracy and genetic screening	130
STEPHANIE DUKHOVNY & LOUISE WILKINS-HAUG	
7 Using visual aids to help people with low numeracy make better decisions	153
ROCIO GARCIA-RETAMERO & EDWARD T. COKELY	
	vii

viii	Contents	
8	Anticipating barriers to the communication of critical information ELLEN PETERS	175
9	Rational healthcare RONALD PAULUS & WALTER F. STEWART	193
10	A review of theories of numeracy: psychological mechanisms and implications for medical decision making VALERIE F. REYNA & PRISCILA G. BRUST-RENCK	215
11	Do the numbers help patients decide? Ethical and empirical challenges for evaluating the impact of quantitative information PETER H. SCHWARTZ	252
	Conclusion BRITTA L. ANDERSON & JAY SCHULKIN	281
	<i>Name index</i>	284
	<i>Subject index</i>	287

Figures

Figure 1.1. The structure of the Computer Adaptive Berlin Test.	<i>page 23</i>
Figure 1.2. Theoretical differences in distributions of the NUMi, abbreviated numeracy test, and the Berlin Numeracy Test.	34
Figure 1.3. Estimated difficulty ranges for various numeracy tests.	34
Figure 2.1. Arithmetic operations which need to be carried out with conditional probabilities (left) or natural frequencies (right) in order to determine the likelihood that a woman with a positive mammography screening result actually has breast cancer.	47
Figure 2.2. Lead-time bias.	49
Figure 2.3. Overdiagnosis bias.	50
Figure 3.1. Example of a Bayesian problem and an explanation of how to calculate the correct answer.	65
Figure 3.2. The way physicians draw information about their patient population (by thinking about future patients or past experiences) will impact their reasoning and their accuracy in their Bayesian inferences.	67
Figure 3.3. Patterns of numeric benefit and risk information in two scenarios.	68
Figure 3.4. Characteristics of statistics in selected volumes of <i>Pediatrics</i> , 1952–2005.	70
Figure 4.1. Percentage of women choosing chemotherapy in a hypothetical scenario regarding choice of adjuvant therapies following breast cancer surgery, by incremental benefit of chemotherapy (1% vs. 5%), by whether options were presented all-at-once versus sequentially, and by numeracy level.	88

x	List of figures	
Figure 4.2.	Predicted ability to interpret nutrition labels by literacy or numeracy status.	90
Figure 4.3.	Anticoagulation control according to literacy grade level and numeracy level.	95
Figure 5.1.	Examples of items from the Diabetes Numeracy Test.	110
Figure 5.2.	Construct validity model for the Diabetes Numeracy Test.	111
Figure 5.3.	Examples of pages from the Diabetes Literacy and Numeracy Education Toolkit (DLNET).	120
Figure 6.1.	A comparison of ethnicity-based carrier screening guidelines between ACOG and ACMG.	133
Figure 7.1.	Icon arrays presented in addition to numerical information about risk reduction when they represent affected individuals only (top) or the entire population at risk (bottom).	156
Figure 7.2.	Percentage of participants with low and high graph literacy and numeracy who correctly inferred treatment risk reduction, by visual aids condition.	157
Figure 7.3.	Icon arrays representing a treatment risk reduction of 50% with unequal samples of treated and non-treated patients (i.e., 100 and 800, respectively).	158
Figure 7.4.	Percentage of participants with low (a) and high (b) numeracy whose estimates of risk reduction were either accurate or lower or higher than the exact value as a function of the sizes of the denominators and icon arrays.	160
Figure 7.5.	(a) Icon array presented in Condition 1; (b) horizontal bar graph presented in Condition 2; (c) vertical bar graph presented in Condition 3; and (d) pie chart presented in Condition 4.	162
Figure 7.6.	Percentage of participants who reported performing the promoted behavior (condom use or STD screening) when the health information brochure was framed as gains or losses as a function of message format (text only, text and numerical information, and text and graphical information).	164
Figure 8.1.	Providing a framework increased understanding of related information that follows, but decreased	

List of figures	xi
understanding of unrelated information among the less numerate.	182
Figure 8.2. Hospital quality information is provided in an evaluative categories format (top) or with numbers only (bottom) in Study 1 of Peters et al. (2009).	185

Tables

Table I.1. Definitions for numeracy and related terms.	<i>page 2</i>
Table 1.1. Descriptions and references for tests used to establish psychometric validity.	24
Table 1.2. Psychometric properties of the scale: basic attributes, reliability, and discriminability.	26
Table 1.3. Psychometric properties of tests: Convergent and discriminant validity.	27
Table 1.4. Psychometric properties of the tests: Predictive validity.	29
Table 1.5. Proportion of participants in each quartile from 14 countries.	30
Table 1.6. Percentage of people in each quartile from three different samples estimated by the computer adaptive Berlin Numeracy Test algorithm.	31
Table 1.7. Properties of validated numeracy research instruments.	33
Table 2.1. Basic numeracy in the USA and Germany based on nationally representative samples.	43
Table 2.2. Examples of non-transparent information from a variety of sources, and simple transparent solutions.	44
Table 3.1. Instructions for the three conditions in a study assessing physicians' Bayesian estimates.	66
Table 4.1 Key functions of patient numeracy and examples of how these functions enable patients to act on health data.	81
Table 4.2. Examples of patient health outcomes related to patient numeracy.	92
Table 5.1. Diabetes tasks and related numeracy domains.	106
Table 5.2. Summary of numeracy assessments in patients with diabetes.	114
Table 5.3. Clear communication strategies.	119
Table 5.4 List of web resources.	122

List of tables	xiii
Table 7.1. Number of treated and non-treated patients who died in the scenarios with different denominator sizes.	159
Table 8.1. Decision aids inform decisions about colorectal cancer screening.	176
Table 8.2. Types of barriers to effective communication of health information.	178
Table 8.3. Memory for precise numbers (Study 3) and accessibility of feelings versus thoughts (Study 4) in Peters et al. (2009).	186

Contributors

BRITTA L. ANDERSON, Department of Research, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

JILLIAN BERKMAN, Department of Medicine, Division of Nephrology, Vanderbilt University Medical Center.

PRISCILA G. BRUST-RENCK, Department of Human Development, Cornell University.

KERRI L. CAVANAUGH, Department of Medicine, Division of Nephrology, Vanderbilt University Medical Center.

EDWARD T. COKELY, Department of Cognitive and Learning Sciences, Michigan Technological University; Center for Adaptive Behavior and Cognition, Max Planck Institute for Human Development.

STEPHANIE DUKHOVNY, Maternal Fetal Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital.

ANGELA FAGERLIN, Center for Bioethics and Social Sciences in Medicine; Internal Medicine, University of Michigan; VA Ann Arbor Center for Clinical Management Research.

WOLFGANG GAISSMAIER, Department of Psychology, University of Konstanz.

ROCIO GARCIA-RETAMERO, Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Granada; Center for Adaptive Behavior and Cognition, Max Planck Institute for Human Development.

SAIMA GHAZAL, Department of Cognitive and Learning Sciences, Michigan Technological University, MI, USA.

GILLIAN MAYMAN, Center for Managing Chronic Disease, School of Public Health, University of Michigan.

List of contributors

xv

JAN MULTMEIER, Harding Center for Risk Literacy and Center for Adaptive Behavior and Cognition, Max Planck Institute for Human Development.

RONALD PAULUS, Mission Health System.

ELLEN PETERS, Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University.

VALERIE F. REYNA, Department of Human Development and Psychology, Cornell University; Cornell University Magnetic Resonance Imaging Facility; Center for Behavioral Economics and Decision Research, Cornell University.

JAY SCHULKIN, Department of Research, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; Department of Neuroscience, Georgetown University; Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Washington School of Medicine.

PETER H. SCHWARTZ, Indiana University Center for Bioethics; Division of General Internal Medicine and Geriatrics, Indiana University School of Medicine; Philosophy Department, Indiana University – Purdue University, Indianapolis.

WALTER F. STEWART, Sutter Health.

ODETTE WEGWARTH, Harding Center for Risk Literacy and Center for Adaptive Behavior and Cognition, Max Planck Institute for Human Development.

LOUISE WILKINS-HAUG, Maternal Fetal Medicine and Reproductive Genetics, Brigham and Women's Hospital; Harvard Medical School.

BRIAN J. ZIKMUND-FISHER, Health Behavior and Health Education, School of Public Health, University of Michigan; Internal Medicine, University of Michigan.

Acknowledgments

The life of the mind is a social event and we could not have done this without the help and support of our colleagues and friends.

Many of the issues that appear in this book were discussed in a small conference held at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford. We thank Stephen Kosslyn, Director of the Center, for his generous hospitality and to Hal Pashler, Ron Paulus, Ellen Peters, and Louise Wilkins-Haug who gave presentations.

Finally, we thank our granting agency, the US Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Maternal and Child Health Research Program for their support for our research (UA6MC19010).