

(Email sent January 10, 2022 by Daniel Kahneman)

Dear Tom, Mike, and Jim (if I may),

Thank you for your review, which I saw yesterday for the first time. You had indeed sent us a copy, but something went awry. Olivier just found it in the spam folder of his account. It probably went to my spam folder as well, but I deleted it a while ago.

I take entire responsibility for the omission of the lens model from our treatment. For many months, until the final editing shuffle, the prediction section was introduced by a lengthy discussion of the lens model in terms of multiple regression in the same vein as Tom Stewart's work, with which I was familiar. We discussed both Brunswik and Hammond, because we hoped to adopt a description of an individual's judgments by a set of weights. That section came before our treatment of Meehl and Goldberg, whose work was described as applications of the lens model. I put months of work in an effort to write a treatment of the lens model that was both precise and understandable by the general public. In the end I had to admit failure – there was just too much to explain -- and we removed all mention of the lens model, much to my regret.

Although we mentioned policy capture as a use of the lens model in the deleted chapter, we did not develop that topic, and did not address conflict resolution. You explain our reasoning quite well: we define noise as “unwanted variability” in a system where individuals speak for the organization, and are expected to speak in a single voice. As you point out, the work you summarized uses the variability of weights to describe disagreement, and what we call pattern noise is part of what you call policy. These distinctions should surely be made in the professional conversation, but we were not able to cover them in a general-interest book.

We plan to present what we have learned from the feedback on ‘Noise’ at JDM next month, and your ideas will certainly be a significant part of that story.

On a personal note, I should add that I was strongly motivated to give pride of place to Hammond's work, for which I have always had great respect. And of course Brunswik was an essential inspiration for our early work on judgment heuristics – which Amos and I explicitly described as

cues in our 1974 Science paper. I am sorry I could not find a way to show their work in our book, but it was not for want of trying.

Please feel free to share this response with the Brunswik community if you think it appropriate.

All best,  
Danny