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Objectives: Therapist decisions and judgments are present in all stages of clinical work. This research seeks to understand the relation between clinical judgments and the underlying cognitive processing types, notably the use of intuition and analytical reasoning. Contexts, such as a clinical session, in which the clinical judgments are non-decomposable tasks, favor the use of intuition (Dane, Rockmann & Pratt, 2012; Hammond et al., 1987). Literature suggests that intuitive judgments are accompanied by a sense of confidence, which suggests to the individual that his or her judgment is valid and correct (e.g., Koriat, 2012, Simmons & Nelson, 2006). The main question focuses on understanding the role of intuitive processes as a driver of clinical judgments and the extent to which the confidence that accompanies the intuitive outcome limits the therapist’s information seeking behavior (Radecki & Jaccard, 1995). Two objectives of the proposed research are: 1) to explore the processing types, analytical vs. intuition, in a clinical session as context that favors, such as a clinical session; 2) to understand the impact of the therapist’s confidence in intuition on the information seeking process.

Expected & Methods: It is hypothesized that therapist who reporting use an intuitive process should have more confidence in their judgments than those who report to use an analytical reasoning. Also, it is hypothesized that high confidence in one’s intuition is associated with low information seeking to aid in subsequent judgments and planning within the therapeutic context. This paper puts forth a testable conceptual model, guided by an interdisciplinary integration of the literature, in which a synthesis of studies examines professional best practices in clinical decision-making. This model will be tested under an experimental paradigm, using both behavioral and neural methods, in which a sample of students of psychology and therapists are asked to make judgments about a hypothetical case and then are invited to search for more information about the same case.

Brief statement of the conclusion/discussion: The proposed model results argue that the process of testing clinical judgments is essential for optimizing therapy effectiveness primarily because it allows for therapists to validate their case conceptualizations. The proposed model is discussed with respect to its implications for clinical practice and future research.