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**Length of Review** (see p. 1): *Range of 750 to 1,500 words for a review of a single book, NOT to exceed 2,000 words (excluding references). Reviews longer than 2,000 words will be returned immediately for shortening.* For a review of multiple books, the range is 2,500 to 3,000 words.

**Writing Tips** (see p. 1): *Do not write chapter-by-chapter summaries! Reviews will be returned for revision if this approach is used.* Place the book in the context of the field; cite at least one or two seminal articles relevant to the book; select chapters to discuss to highlight strengths/weaknesses; mention who would find the book of interest.

**Title Page for the Review** (see pp. 1, 6): See the Sample Review on page 6. Provide title page with review title, book citation information, reviewer name(s), and reviewer contact information for production staff.

**Addition of a Coreviewer** (see pp. 1–2): *You must get approval from the Editorial Office to add a coreviewer, and the person invited to write the review must be the first author.* See the Guidelines for the allowed number of coreviewers and information about doctoral student coreviewers (who must serve as second authors). *Only one book can be provided.*

**Deadline** (see p. 2): Our primary mission is to publish timely reviews, so take deadlines seriously. The standard due date is 30 days after you receive the book, unless otherwise arranged. If you do not receive the book within 2 weeks of selecting it (or within 4 weeks if delivery is international), please alert the Editorial Office.

**Conflict of Interest** (see p. 2): If you have a potential conflict of interest, please contact the Editorial Office to discuss it before you write the review.

**Abstract of Review for *PsycINFO*** (see pp. 2, 8): Providing an abstract of your review for use in *PsycINFO* is optional, but encouraged. An abstract should be one paragraph up to 250 words long.

**Tables or Figures** (see p. 3): We don’t accept them.

**References** (see p. 3): *References must be in APA style. Please try to cite one to two articles especially relevant to the book,* and we suggest up to seven references for reviews of 1,500 words. APA will insert hyperlinks from your references to APA publications or other journals that provide online access.

**Biography of Reviewers** (see p. 4): Reviewers should provide a short biography (around 100 words or less) that will be linked to all of their published reviews. A photo (JPG or TIFF format) is optional but encouraged.

**Submitting Your Review** (see p. 5): *Be sure to format your review (see sample on p. 6)!* Submit the review through our Reviewer Portal at [http://jbo.apa.org/cprs_reviewer/](http://jbo.apa.org/cprs_reviewer/) (requires log in), or send it as an e-mail attachment to the Editorial staff at PSQJournals@apa.org.

**Forms** (attached at end): *You must sign the Publication Rights form (sign in both Sections 1A and 2) and the Full Disclosure of Interests form.* Complete the other forms only if applicable. *We prefer*
forms scanned to PDF and e-mailed, or they may be faxed to (202) 336-5549 (Attn. PsycCRITIQUES staff).
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*PsycCRITIQUES™*, the online continuation of *Contemporary Psychology: APA Review of Books*, publishes evaluative reviews of books and other materials of interest to psychologists. **The quality of *PsycCRITIQUES* depends on the quality of its reviews, so please read these guidelines completely.**

**Length of the Review**

Reviews should be between 750 and 1,500 words long for a review of a single book, NOT to exceed 2,000 words, excluding references, regardless of the length of the book. **Reviews will be returned immediately to be shortened if text is longer than 2,000 words.** The nature or complexity of a book may warrant a longer review, but this should be negotiated with the Editorial Office prior to submission.

For a review of multiple books (whether a multivolume work or different titles), we suggest a length of 2,500 to 3,000 words (excluding references), with the same proviso as for reviews of a single book.

**Writing Tips (see also Content of the Review, p. 2)**

- **Do not** write chapter-by-chapter summaries, which are tedious to read and of limited value. **Reviews will be returned for revision if this approach is used.** Select chapters to discuss in depth to highlight strengths and weaknesses of the book. Reviews must go beyond the confines of the book, placing the book into the broader context of the field (see “Content of the Review,” p. 2). Cite one or two seminal articles relevant to the book being reviewed.

- Mention who would find the book of interest.

- With the online format of the journal, short paragraphs and sentences are more reader friendly.

- If after becoming familiar with a book you feel it does not warrant review in *PsycCRITIQUES* (e.g., the book seems of limited interest/value to psychologists), please send a brief explanation to the Editorial Office as to why, so the editors can decide if the review should be cancelled.

**Title Page for the Review (see also Sample Review, p. 6)**

You must provide a title page for your review for it to be evaluated and edited. See also the section “Formatting and Style Matters,” page 3. The title page should be in the following form:

- Improving Decisions Through Formal Analysis
  
  [Try to be creative in selecting a title for your review]

**Rational Choice and Judgment: Decision Analysis for the Decider**

By Rex Brown


Reviewed by Gordon Pitz

Gordon Pitz, <<fill in correspondence address>>. E-mail: XXXXX

**Addition of a Coreviewer and Number of Coreviewers**
The authors of the books reviewed in *PsycCRITIQUES* expect the reviews to be written by their peers who are individuals with established credentials, and we appreciate your cooperation to ensure that this occurs. Reviewers may solicit the assistance of a colleague or an advanced doctoral candidate in preparing the review. However, the person recruited to do the review is expected to be the senior author, and the addition of a coauthor must be approved by the Editorial Office before the review is written. Provide an e-mail address, mailing address, and brief description of the coauthor’s qualifications to assist with the review. We reserve the right to refuse a review with coauthors who were not previously approved.

The number of coreviewers is limited to one for a book of 600 pages or less, and two for a book longer than that. For multiple volumes, there may be as many reviewers as there are volumes. The need for more reviewers than described here must be explained to and approved by the editor.

**Doctoral Students as Coreviewers**

Doctoral students are welcome to serve as second authors on reviews. We realize that student authors may sometimes do most of the work on a review; however, *PsycCRITIQUES* offers genuine peer review. No matter how smart and well qualified, a doctoral student is not a peer for someone who writes a book (someone who is often a senior academician with decades of experience and expertise in the area he or she is writing about). We have a formal vetting process for our reviewers at the behest of the APA Publications & Communications Board. It dilutes the review and approval process if we abdicate responsibility for selecting the best possible reviewers and let students who have not been vetted take responsibility for the quality of the review.

**Deadline for the Review**

Please take the deadline seriously. Our goal is to publish primarily reviews of current-year copyright books and to receive reviews of previous-year copyright books only through the first few months of the current year. **The standard deadline for book reviews is 30 days after receipt of the book. If you do not receive the book within 2 weeks if you are within the continental United States (or within 4 weeks if delivery is international), please alert the Editorial Office.** If the book you are reviewing is longer than 400 pages, or if you are reviewing more than one book, please contact the Editorial Office to arrange an appropriate deadline. Also, if your review will be significantly delayed, notify the Editorial Office to determine whether the book should be assigned to another reviewer.

**Conflict of Interest (See Full Disclosure of Interests Form)**

You must fill out and sign a Full Disclosure of Interests form. Occasionally, *PsycCRITIQUES* will inadvertently invite a reviewer who may be perceived by the author(s) of the work and/or by the readers to have a conflict of interest that prevents an objective evaluation of the work. For example, the invited reviewer may be the author of a competing book, a former student of the book author/editor, a colleague in the same department, have a history of collaboration with the author/editor, or have read the book prior to publication for the publisher or written a blurb for the book jacket. **If for any reason you suspect that the perception of a conflict of interest may cast a shadow over your review, please contact the editorial staff to discuss before you begin the review.** They will decide if it is appropriate for you to proceed with your review. We appreciate your sensitivity to this issue because it is impossible for our editors to know of all the conditions and circumstances that might lead readers to dismiss a review because of a perceived conflict of interest.

**Write Abstract of Your Review for PsycINFO (Optional)**

If you wish to write an abstract that would be used for the *PsycINFO* entry for your review, provide a single paragraph up to 250 words long (see sample, p. 7). It should be written in the third person, and active voice is preferred. Use words that you think readers would use in electronic searches. General information on writing an abstract is available in the APA *Publication Manual* (6th edition), section 2.04.
Submitted abstracts may be edited by APA’s abstracting service; you will not be contacted, nor will you see the abstract before it is published. If you do not provide an abstract, APA will have one prepared by the abstracting service.

**Content of the Review**

Reviews should go beyond the confines of the book, placing the book into a broader perspective as needed *(we strongly encourage citation of one or two articles relevant to the book, for the benefit of our broad readership)*. Reviews should be

- **incisive**, going into depth beyond summarizing the book and ending with a brief commentary;
- **integrative**, relating the book to the field and both classical and recent developments in it;
- **balanced**, pointing out both the strengths and the weaknesses of the book;
- **provocative**, taking a stand and then explicating and defending this stand.

From its inception, *Contemporary Psychology* (now *PsycCRITIQUES*) has aspired to literary as well as scholarly excellence, and the journal continues to adhere to the guidelines for reviewers set out by its first editor, E. G. Boring, in 1956. His “Comments to Reviewers” are reproduced below.

*Contemporary Psychology* [CP] is a journal of critical reviews. It aspires to literary excellence. . . . Primarily, the quality of this [journal] depends upon the reviewers’ skills.

*Contemporary Psychology* expects to publish value judgments and criticism . . . even the short review may and should contain evaluations.

Good criticism requires tact, objectivity, and a sense of good taste. Personal aspersions are taboo. Criticize the text, the ideas, the logic, the accuracy, not the author. Let all criticism be ad verbum, never ad hominem. *CP* does not provide space for the discussion of the intelligence or integrity of the author. Always try to see how nearly the author has realized his [or her] own aspiration, whether you approve of the aspiration or not.

Do not abstract the book. Talk about it and in doing so indicate the range and nature of its content. Readers will not go to *CP* for the tables of the contents of books. Indicate the book’s purpose, the way in which the author seeks to achieve the purpose and your estimate of his [or her] success. Compare the book with other books of similar kind or intent. Place it in perspective in the contemporary psychology scene. Give it an historical perspective, too, if that seems appropriate. A good review is critical, and a good critic needs all the scholarship he [or she] can command.

Address your review to the whole range of the readers of *CP*, not to your own special group. Let the expert in personality write to psychophysicists and to experts in animal learning. Let the physiological psychologist write to religious psychologists, historians, and statisticians. Avoid technicalities, or, if scholarship demands their inclusion, write a two-phase review with the technicalities marked for fine print, and the rest of the review a literary unit even when the fine print is skipped by the reader. In general, let the review teach. Let it teach your intellectual peers about books that are not in their special fields. One of *CP*’s most important functions is to tell psychologists about one another. In short, write a review that addresses the whole range of *CP* readers, not just the specialist, and that makes a contribution to the scholarly advancement of psychology. *CP* reviews are frequently cited as sources of ideas.

**Edited Works**

Edited works can pose special problems to the reviewer. When reviewing such a book, the rule against chapter-by-chapter summaries holds with even more force. Give a brief characterization of the volume as a whole, perhaps commenting on omissions or peculiar inclusions or bias, or make a comment on the quality and thoroughness of the contributions. Do not feel that you have to say something about every contribution to the volume. If you cannot say anything useful, please notify the editor.

**Formatting and Style Matters**
Text: Prepare the review as a Word document and double space it. **Include a title page,** as described on page 1 and illustrated in the Sample Review (p. 6).

**Subheadings:** If the review exceeds 1,000 words, the addition of subheadings is recommended to clarify its organization. A good rule of thumb is that a subheading should occur at 500-word intervals. If subheadings are added, please use at least two.

**No Figures or Tables:** *PsycCRITIQUES* does not accept any figures or tables.

**References and Footnotes:** Footnotes within the main text should not be used. Regarding references, although reviews don’t require exhaustive documentation, we strongly encourage citation of at least one to two articles that relate to the book you are reviewing, to benefit our broad readership. In most cases, we suggest up to seven references for reviews of 2,000 words or less and up to 10 references for reviews (of multiple books) of up to 3,000 words. In formatting references, you must use standard APA style for references as described in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.).

As an online journal, we will add hypertext links for references when possible, in particular when the articles are APA publications available through *PsycNET*. The ability to use hyperlinks to quickly download relevant research will significantly enhance the value of your review.

**Biography of Reviewers:** Reviewers should provide a short biography (up to 100 words per biography), which will be linked to the published review. This biography can be submitted through the online Reviewer Portal (see p. 5) or placed on the last page of the review. A digital photo (JPG or TIFF format) is optional but desirable. If you send a digital photo, please sign a Photo Permission form to submit with your other forms.

**Quotations:** Short quotations (40 words or less) are set off by double quotation marks; longer quotations are set off from the text as a freestanding block with no quotation marks. APA requires permission for a quotation that contains 400 or more consecutive words or 800 or more words of nonconsecutive text excerpts. Most scholarly publishers have adopted similar fair use guidelines; however, it is your responsibility to confirm the fair use guidelines for the relevant copyright holder to determine whether you need to secure permission (see Permissions Alert form). It is particularly important that all quotations conform exactly to the material in the book. The validity of an entire review may be called into question if it contains inaccurate quotations. **Please double-check the accuracy of each quotation. Cite a page number at the end of every quotation.**

Text inserted into a quotation (as a comment or to create complete, understandable sentences) should be contained in brackets [ ], rather than in parentheses, to avoid confusion with parenthetical material that is part of the original text. Specify when italics have been added by inserting “[italics added]” directly following the material emphasized.

**Linguistic Conventions:** *PsycCRITIQUES* avoids sexist language. Please review the section on bias in language in APA’s *Publication Manual* (6th edition; pp. 70–77) before submitting reviews.

Avoid the use of titles (Dr., Prof., Mrs., Ms., etc.) with authors’ or editors’ names. A last name will usually suffice; however, first names should be given the first time a reference is made to a particular individual (e.g., Alfred Adler, Albert Bandura, Raymond Corsini).

**Combined and Companion Reviews**

Combined reviews are invited when the editors believe that *PsycCRITIQUES* readers will benefit from having two or more books evaluated together, with comparisons and contrasts drawn where appropriate. These books are compared in a single review (rather than separate reviews for each book), and the length of the review will be negotiated with the *PsycCRITIQUES* editor.
Companion reviews are invited when the editors believe that readers will benefit by having a book reviewed by people from two different professional perspectives and/or areas of expertise. In these cases, two separate reviews are solicited, with their own titles, and are published in the same issue.

**Editorial Actions and the Production Process**

The policy of this journal is to request reviewers to evaluate substantive changes and respond to queries from the editors or copyeditor. Editors may make minor changes (e.g., to improve clarity or conform to APA style) in manuscripts without informing the reviewer when deemed appropriate. Once accepted by an editor for publication, we will send your review to APA for copyediting. **You will be contacted by APA only if copyediting changes are made that might risk altering the meaning of your text.** You will have 48 hours to respond. Please keep your final copy of the review handy to refer to in this instance. If the copyeditor makes only standard changes for APA style, grammar, or punctuation, you will not see the review until it is published. **No page proofs will be sent before publication.**

It is *PsycCRITIQUES*’s policy that, prior to publication, no portion or description of the contents of a review are to be disclosed to either (a) the author(s)/editor(s) of the book or books under review or (b) any other third party (e.g., but not limited to, the book’s publisher or the book author’s agent).

**PsycCRITIQUES Spotlight**

The APA-sponsored *PsycCRITIQUES* Spotlight is located at [www.apa.org/pubs/highlights/psyccritiques-spotlight/](http://www.apa.org/pubs/highlights/psyccritiques-spotlight/). The forum is publicly accessible. Once or twice a month the editors release a Spotlight based on a recent book, film, or video review. Reviewers are notified at the time of posting when their reviews are highlighted for discussion on the Spotlight.

**Submitting Your Review**

To ensure that your manuscript is sent to *PsycCRITIQUES* in proper form, please check the following:

1. Prepare the review as a Word document, and **format your review, including a title page,** as described on pages 1 and 3 and illustrated in the Sample Review (p. 6). **Double-space the review.**

2. Quotations must be accurate and must be followed by the page number(s) on which the quotes appear. Please check quotations against the book to be certain that they are typed exactly as they appear in the book.

3. **Submit review as follows:** Go to [http://jbo.apa.org/cprs_reviewer/](http://jbo.apa.org/cprs_reviewer/) to log in and submit your review. If you need log-in information, there is help available at this site, or contact the Editorial staff for assistance. Once logged in, choose from the Menu Options “Upload Reviews,” and then fill in the requested information and upload your review. The system will let you know if you successfully submit your review.

   Alternatively, you may send your review (and digital photo, if you choose to send one) as an e-mail attachment to the Editorial staff at [PSQJournals@apa.org](mailto:PSQJournals@apa.org).

4. **Submit forms as follows:** The following forms must be signed by all authors and submitted before the review can be sent on to APA. Forms can be scanned as a PDF and submitted as an e-mail attachment, or faxed to (202) 336-5549 (or mailed to the address listed at the top of the Guidelines, if either of these options is not convenient):

   - APA Publication Rights form, **signed in sections 1A and 2;**
   - Full Disclosure of Interests form, signed;
- If applicable: (a) the Photo Permission form, if you send a digital photo to include with your biography, and (b) the Permissions Alert form plus letters granting permission to use copyrighted material. Your manuscript cannot be published without these letters.

---

Review Submission Checklist

☐ Formatted review, with title page
☐ Electronic file of review as a Word document
☐ Reviewer biography (with optional photo)
☐ APA Publication Rights form (first author signs Section 1A and all authors in Section 2)
☐ Full Disclosure of Interests form (signed by all reviewers)
☐ Additional forms, if applicable
☐ Abstract of review (optional)


Editorial staff: [PSQJournals@apa.org](mailto:PSQJournals@apa.org)

Fax: (202) 336-5549 (Attn: PsycCRITIQUES staff)
Sample Book Review With Title Page

Improving Decisions Through Formal Analysis  [Try to be creative in selecting a title for your review]

Rational Choice and Judgment: Decision Analysis for the Decider
By Rex Brown

Reviewed by Gordon Pitz

Gordon Pitz, <<fill in correspondence address>>. E-mail: XXX@XXX

[Start your review on a new page.]
[Single spacing of the sample review is to save space. Your review should be double spaced.]

Do you have trouble making choices? Would you like help dealing with the uncertainties and conflicts that pervade important decisions? Decision analysis might have something of value to offer, especially if you happen to be a company president considering a relocation of your manufacturing plant or the head of a government agency thinking of contracting out operations to a private firm. But even if you are merely worried about the purchase of a new couch for your living room, you might find useful ideas in Rex Brown’s treatment of the decision analysis approach to problem solving.

The practice of decision analysis is based on formal theories of decision making, such as game theory, subjectively expected utility, multiattribute utility, and Bayesian updating of probabilities. Nevertheless, although the underlying mathematics can be intimidating, Brown’s book Rational Choice and Judgment: Decision Analysis for the Decider presents the methods of decision analysis in a way that makes few demands on the reader’s mathematical background.

The intended audience includes students and professionals in public policy, business management, and systems engineering. Now, this is a group that probably includes few psychologists. So why might readers of PsycCRITIQUES have any interest in the book? Well, Brown’s stated goal in writing the book is to enhance a person’s thinking about problems and thereby to improve the overall rationality of decisions. Surely psychologists too have an interest in enhancing thinking and in improving rationality. The book’s prolog is a transcript of a discussion between father and daughter concerning a decision about caesarian delivery. The father, of course, is Brown himself. But here surely is a topic from the mainstream of applied psychology.

The methodology of decision analysis is summarized by Brown as a “quantified GOO” approach to decision making. GOO stands for the goals, options, and outcomes that characterize a decision problem. In other words, decision analysis begins with a decomposition of a problem into its component parts, which are given a quantitative assessment, then recombined to provide a recommended choice. The analysis uses the decision maker’s own judgments of what is important and what is likely to happen. It emphasizes a “multi-path approach,” in which one explores the limitations of the analysis and assesses the implications of making changes in the input before accepting any recommendation.

The problem of quantifying a person’s preferences and opinions is one with which psychologists are familiar, for it lies at the heart of much psychological measurement. What is less familiar to most psychologists is using the quantifications to suggest optimal decisions. Decision analysis is a technology that has been widely used in the business community and in government agencies. Rex Brown himself has
many years’ experience using decision analysis in areas ranging from the auto industry to environmental protection to national defense. In recent years the technology has been used increasingly for medical decisions, although other applications to purely personal problems are rare.

A complete quantitative analysis of a problem is a time-consuming affair. The methods are not easy to use, and they usually require guidance from someone who has had extensive practice in their use. Indeed, it is the purpose of the book to provide students with a thorough training in the methods, which they can then use as a foundation for developing their own expertise. Brown makes it clear that the procedure is to be recommended only for decisions where the expenditure of time and effort is worth the potential returns.

Brown does describe a more qualitative approach that is restricted to the more obvious aspects of the GOO analysis. For example, simply thinking clearly about the distinction between goals and outcomes might be a valuable exercise. Reviewing systematically one’s values, and listing the uncertainties that are inherent in a problem, might clarify a decision maker’s thought processes. It remains an open question whether experience in thinking like a decision analyst can lead to long-run improvements in one’s own decision processes. Brown claims that it has done so in his case, but one would like to see a well-designed study to investigate this question.

For a psychologist, then, the book may be of less interest as a practical manual for decision making and more important as a source of ideas that address theoretical and applied psychological questions. It is likely that psychologists have contributions to make toward the practice of decision analysis as well, since the validity of the analysis will depend entirely on the accuracy of the process in representing the decision maker’s values and beliefs.

**Connections Between Decision Analysis and Psychology**

For many years a few psychologists have been interested in the applications of psychological theory to decision analysis and in applications of decision analysis to the psychology of decision making (e.g., Von Winterfeldt & Edwards, 1988). Many others might derive profitable lessons from the practice of decision analysis. For example, there is some evidence that using a GOO decomposition, and evaluating goals and objectives separately, can reduce apparent conflicts between decision makers. The methods would be worth investigation as a contribution to conflict resolution.

Other lessons can be found in the format of the analysis. For example, the theory behind decision analysis makes clear how important it is to consider uncertainties when making choices, something that many decision makers are reluctant to do.

A less obvious point is the important relationship between the “importance” of a preference and the range of possible outcomes. For example, a person confronted with choice among several jobs might assert that the benefits package is an important consideration. Yet, if the benefits offered in connection with all available jobs differ very little, then that factor should have little relevance to the final decision.

Psychologists might also make contributions to the practice of decision analysis. For example, a common concern among decision analysts is reconciling the output of analysis with the gut feelings of the decision maker. This is an issue that deserves some investigation by psychologists.

**Pitfalls and Limitations**

Before decision analysis can be promoted as a way to enhance the rationality of human decision making, some of the limitations to the approach need to be addressed. In all fairness, these limitations are clearly
recognized by Brown. First and foremost, there is a need for empirical demonstration of the superiority of decisions made using the quantitative GOO approach over decisions made without such assistance. There is some documentation of the value of decision analysis in medical settings. Unfortunately, it is almost impossible to obtain such evidence when the analysis concerns one-of-a-kind, major decisions. It is impossible to know in these cases what would have happened in the absence of the analysis. Compounding the problem is the recognition that using a good decision process does not guarantee a satisfactory outcome.

Brown points out that there are pitfalls to the procedure itself. Using a quantified approach may encourage the decision maker to ignore elements that are less easily quantified, and it may lull the decision maker into an inappropriate trust in the outcome of the analysis.

The justification usually offered for decision analysis is a rational rather than an empirical one. Proponents of the methods assume, first, that unaided human decision making is subject to systematic biases and errors. This assumption has been extensively debated (see Stanovich & West, 2000, for a summary of the debate), but let’s take the assumption as true for the sake of argument. The second assumption is that formal methods of analysis can eliminate, or at least reduce, the frequency of such errors. This assumption too is far from self-evident. Gigerenzer et al. (1999) provided examples of tasks for which a simplified heuristic solution appears to outperform a more comprehensive analysis.

The arguments raised here have been central to discussions among psychologists and others of the rationality of human judgment. A study of the practice of decision analysis, then, has a great deal to contribute to this debate. Finally, though, it must be noted that Brown’s book provides the most thorough and accessible treatment of decision analysis that I am familiar with. It provides many examples derived from real cases. It includes assignments and project descriptions that, if followed carefully, should provide a student with all of the background necessary to begin working with the methodology. It is probably best used as a textbook rather than a source of independent instruction, for guidance will be needed in completing some of the exercises. The student will not be an expert upon completing the book, but the book does provide a comprehensive tool kit that will be useful to anyone who seeks further practice in using the technology.
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Example Abstract for PsycINFO

(Adapted from published PsycINFO abstract to reflect current guidelines.)

Reviews the book Rational Choice and Judgment: Decision Analysis for the Decider by Rex Brown, with the assistance of Pascal Paschoud. This book provides a thorough and accessible treatment of the decision analysis approach to problem solving. In the methodology summarized by Brown, decision analysis begins with the decomposition of a problem into its component parts, which are given a quantitative assessment and then recombined to provide a recommended choice. The analysis uses the decision
maker’s own judgments of what is important and what is likely to happen. In the multipath approach described, one explores the limitations of the analysis and assesses the implications of making changes in the input before accepting any recommendation. The intended audience includes students and professionals in public policy, business management, and systems engineering; few demands are placed on the reader’s mathematical background. For a psychologist, the book may be of less interest as a practical manual for decision making and more important as a source of ideas that address theoretical and applied psychological questions. It is probably best used as a textbook rather than as a source of independent instruction.