

## **Supplementary information for Structured Analogies for Forecasting: A Test Using Conflict Situations**

Kesten C. Green, Victoria Management School, Victoria University of Wellington  
Wellington, New Zealand  
email: kesten@paradise.net.nz

J. Scott Armstrong, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19104  
email: Armstrong@wharton.upenn.edu

### **Appeals for participants: Lists and response**

*December 19, 2003.*

#### **Organisation contact lists and email lists that were sent appeals**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Owner</b>
International Association of Conflict Management contact list	IACM	International Association of Conflict Management
Judgment and Decision Making Listserver	JDM	Society for Judgment and Decision-Making
Behavioural decision making	DECISION	Risk Decision & Policy, and London Judgement and Decision Making Group
Conflict Management Division Listserver	CMDNET-L	Academy of Management Conflict Management Division
Human Resource Management Listserver	HRNET	Subscribers to former Cornell HRNET ListServ organised this
Pacific Region Industrial Relations Listserver	PRIR-L	Assoc. of Industrial Relations Academics of Australia & NZ
International Employment Relations Network Listserver	IERN-L	IIRA International Industrial Relations Study Group
An electronic mail network for marketing academics	ELMAR	Sponsored by American Marketing Association
International Institute of Forecasters' Research Associates contact list <sup>a</sup>	IIF R.A	International Institute of Forecasters
International Studies Association Foreign Policy Section	ISAFP	International Studies Association
Political Science Research and Teaching List	PSRT-L	Sponsored by the Computers and Multimedia section of the APSA
Scientific Study of International Processes	SSIP	List managed by Richard Tucker of Vanderbilt

<sup>a</sup> From 1283 mostly current and former members of the IIF who responded to an appeal to become Research Associates. The 147 Research Associates I approached (8, who were familiar with my research or had not provided email addresses, were not approached) were 11 percent of the total IIF list.

### Sources of expert (non-game theorist) participants

Source	Appeal	Conflicts	Participants	Response rate(%) <sup>a</sup>
IACM	Personalised	All	17 <sup>b</sup>	4.1 <sup>c</sup>
JDM	Impersonal	All	2	0.3
DECISION	Impersonal	All	4	2.0
CMDNET-L	Impersonal	All	1	0.2
HRNET 1	Impersonal	Artists/55%/Grievance/Nurses	3	0.2
PRIR-L	Impersonal	Artists/55%/Grievance/Nurses	-	0.0
IERN-L	Impersonal	Artists/55%/Grievance/Nurses	1	0.3
ELMAR	Impersonal	Distribution / Telco Takeover	5	0.2
IIF R.A	Personalised	All	8	5.8 <sup>d</sup>
Conv. samp. <sup>e</sup>	Personalised	All, or Grievance/Telco/Water	7	50
<b>Subtotal to 14 February 2003</b> (up to 3 reminders; unweighted)			<b>48</b>	<b>1.5<sup>f</sup></b>
HRNET 2	Impersonal	Artists/55%/Grievance/Nurses	7	0.5
ISAFP	Impersonal	Water	2	NA
PSRT-L	Impersonal	(Artists) / Water	1	0.1
SSIP	Impersonal	(Artists) / Water	6	2.0
VUW PolSci <sup>g</sup>	Personalised	Water	1	7.0
Conv. samp. <sup>e</sup>	Personalised	Grievance	1	100
<b>Subtotal to 23 June 2003</b> (no reminders; unweighted)			<b>18</b>	<b>0.9<sup>h</sup></b>
<b>Total</b> (unweighted)			<b>66</b>	<b>1.3<sup>i</sup></b>

- a Number of respondents divided by number of email addresses in original sample  
b Includes four graduate students who participated in the place of their IACM-member professor  
c Numerator counts the four graduate students as a single participant  
d Roughly 0.6 percent of all those on the full IIF list participated  
e Convenience sample  
f Excludes convenience sample  
g Victoria University of Wellington Political Science Department  
h Excludes ISAFP, VUW Political Science Department, and convenience sample  
i Excludes ISAFP, convenience samples, and VUW Political Science Department.

We used a balanced design in our appeal to members of the IACM list. This approach encountered difficulties. First, of the 66 forecasts provided by the 17 experts who responded, only 12 were by experts who had been allocated to use structured analogies. Second, in the case of three of the 12 forecasts, the experts had not been able to think of analogies. Finally, none of the experts had collaborated.

In response to these difficulties, for appeals subsequent to the IACM appeal (other than the HRNET 2 appeal for Personal Grievance forecasts) we appealed only for structured-analogies forecasts and asked all experts to collaborate. Since we expected only some of the experts to collaborate and because we wanted to make comparisons between collaborators' and non-collaborators' forecasts, we asked the experts how many people they had collaborated with.