Judgement: 10 judgemental biases to avoid. 10 improvements to your decision making.

by

Dr. Daniel Frings

Contents.

Introduction.

This PocketBook was inspired by a desire to make the insights the study of psychology generates available to everyone. In this volume, I outline, across 10 sections, a number of key biases which negatively affect our everyday decision making. Each concept is presented concisely in less than 600 words, with a minimum of jargon and technicality. For each of the biases discussed, I also try and list a number of strategies you can immediately employ to minimise their effects.

The heavy lifting for this volume was done by fellow psychologists who developed the ideas which I condense and discuss. A desire for brevity and simplicity does, of course, sometimes come at the cost of detail. If you enjoy this introduction and want to find out more, I would strongly recommend 'Thinking Fast and Slow' by Daniel Kahneman. This provides a much more in-depth commentary on many (but not all) of the biases described here.

This book was also inspired by my experience of writing about the ways the study of psychology can help improve our lives. If you want to find out more, do visit my blog. At **www.PsychologyItBetter.com** you can:

- Learn about other books in the PocketBook series as they come out
- Read about how psychology impacts our everyday lives in many different ways
- Sign up for new content and updates.

In the meantime - I wish you happy reading and better judgements!

Dr. Dan Frings,
Daniel.Frings@PsychologyItBetter.com

1.
Cognitive misers and motivated tacticians.

The idea of being a 'cognitive miser' is a key concept for psychologists studying judgements and decision making. Coined in the early 1980s by psychologists Fiske and Taylor, it describes the tendency to minimise one's cognitive effort, often inappropriately. Prior to formulation of this concept, psychologists worked with the assumption we were 'naive scientists' who aimed to be correct and act with rationality. Observations that our attempt to understand the causes of others' behaviours (see *fundamental attribution bias*) were often biased, or simply plain wrong, forced a re-evaluation of this idea. In contrast to a motivation towards accuracy, cognitive miser theory argues that we aim to save cognitive energy where possible. We do this by relying on 'rules of thumb' or cognitive short-cuts called heuristics. These usually involve focusing on some information which is salient - for instance judging an entire argument or situation on the basis of one point or aspect, overly relying on the opinions of particular others, or being influenced by framing effects. Many of the biases outlined in this book are driven by the use of heuristics.

A good example of being a cognitive miser is the 'bat and ball problem'. Consider the following question: "A bat and ball together costs £1.10. A bat costs £1.00 more than the ball. How much does the ball cost?". Most people jump to the (apparently obvious) answer "10 pence". However, closer inspection reveals this is wrong. If a ball cost 10 pence, and a bat £1.10, the total would be £1.20. The actual answer is 5 pence. However, most people do not apply sufficient effort to reach this conclusion, relying on the apparent answer which 'pops' out.

Why are we cognitive misers? It is thought that we do this to cope with large amounts of information we have to deal with, or simply because we are not motivated to do expend more energy than we need to. Indeed, although this means we ignore potentially relevant information, Fiske and Taylor argue that such a response is often rational - even with the best of intentions it would be impossible to process all available information in a timely or a meaningful way. Indeed, if we are experts and use appropriate decision making heuristics, we can make accurate decisions quicker by being cognitive misers. However, non-experts tend to make quicker but more erroneous judgements. Later accounts of the cognitive miser approach argue that we can also be seen as 'motivated tacticians' - our default state is as a cognitive

miser but, in situations when correct judgements are important to us, we attempt to rely less on heuristics, and more on careful information processing and reflection. However, this more careful strategy requires significant self-regulation (see *ego-depletion*) so is not always available.

IMPROVEMENT

One cannot constantly avoid being a cognitive miser - it is an automatic process. However, you can attempt to influence which heuristics you rely upon by keeping those you wish to avoid in mind. Likewise, try and judge for yourself in advance which situations you need to be less miserly. The key improvement here is to know when to step away from a task or a decision because you are likely to be relying on heuristics inappropriately, and when such short-cuts are a reasonable compromise between speed, accuracy and effort.

2.

How we think.

One of the most important principles in this book is the idea of automatic and reflective thinking - thinking 'fast' and 'slow'. This concept builds upon the idea of being a cognitive miser outlined previously (see *cognitive misers and motivated tacticians*). Theorists such as Daniel Kahneman argue we have two thinking systems - System 1 and System 2. The former system is characterised by 'fast' thinking - quick, automatic and drawing on emotions and heuristics. System 2 is the slower, more reason-based and reflective judgemental route.

System 1 is prone to biases which can radically effect our judgement. For instance, the anchoring effect reflects a bias in which we anchor judgements on irrelevant information (see *anchoring bias*). A similar heuristic is the availability heuristic. This bias leads us to overestimate the likelihood and magnitude of outcomes when they come easily to mind - so if we hear lots of reports of, for instance, plane crashes, we tend to estimate the likelihood of such events as being high, even if we also objectively know this is not the case. The substitution bias is another example: If people are asked if fictional Linda, a young,

single, outspoken and bright individual is more likely to be a bank teller or a bank teller and a feminist, they often point to the latter option. Our 'fast' thinking system tries to answer this question quickly, by substituting a new question (Is Linda a feminist?) to make the judgement. As Linda fits the profile of 'being a feminist', we assume it the answer is yes, despite the fact that are many more bank tellers that fit Linda's description than there are feminist bank tellers. We examine other biases Kahnmen discusses more thoroughly in later sections of this book.

IMPROVEMENT

The key lesson to learn from this is that these biases affect us most when System 1 is dominating our thinking. They particularly affect decisions which are 'instinct' calls. Unfortunately, these biases are also largely automatic and thus difficult to notice. One possible approach to limit their effects is to systematically identify which biases are most likely to affect our judgement, and then critically examining our initial 'gut' response - evaluating if the assumptions we are making are valid and fit with realistic probabilities. Doing so increases the chance that System 2 (the reflective system which is less affected by biases) can kick in, which should improve our judgements. Creating and using a mental 'check list' when making decisions can

itself be turned into a habit, but you must also be aware
this requires self-regulation and will-power, which can
themselves be a limited resource (see *ego-depletion*).

3.
Ego-depletion.

Why do we sometimes seem to have iron-discipline and self-control, and at other times seem unable to restrain ourselves? Psychologist Roy Baumeister and colleagues propose, in their 'ego-depletion' theory, that our self-control is like a muscle - if we use self-control for one task, we will subsequently have less available to us in another task. Like a muscle, rest will cause the strength to return, and training can increase its capacity. So, for instance, resisting temptation for an unhealthy food depletes self-control, which may make us less able to sustain effort on a difficult task shortly afterwards (even though the two tasks are unrelated). Some research suggests that this effect is linked to levels of glucose available to the brain when self-control is being exerted, with a lack of glucose leading to a lack of self-control. Ego-depletion has been empirically linked to a variety of negative outcomes such as inability to refrain from shopping, failing to adhere to diet regimes, reduced determination amongst athletes, lower levels of pro-social behaviour and decreased ability to self-reflect on one's actions. Ego-depletion is particularly problematic to the extent which it also hinders attempts to overcome the rest of the biases described in this book.

IMPROVEMENT

The key to understanding and using the concept of ego-depletion is recognising that you willpower will ebb and flow over the day. Once you grasp that, you can try and ensure that you only make big decisions when you have adequate regulatory reserve. Ego-depletion theory also suggests that, like a muscle, will-power can be strengthened by training. Building up your self-control through self-discipline is therefore both possible and desirable. More immediately, convincing yourself you have self-control can (briefly) make you less susceptible to ego-depletions effects, but this can only be sustained for a short period.

To make quick gains in this area, there are three specific strategies you can use. First, ensure you conserve your will-power stores by not spending too much regulatory energy on small decisions - using up will-power on trivial issues (for instance, what tie or shirt to wear) means you may be lacking in will-power later when it really matters (for instance, staying focused in the big meeting, or keeping calm in a difficult situation). Basically, try not to sweat the small stuff. Secondly, try and use implementation intentions. These are fairly specific 'if-then' rules you try and program yourself with, which allows you

to make the right decisions when processing on the 'fast' route. For instance, you could form an 'implementation intention' around eating behaviours in the form "if I want a biscuit then I will fetch myself an apple". When we hit this situation, the implementation intention will hopefully be the default response which needs no willpower to adhere to. A third key way to avoid failures in self-regulation is simply to avoid putting yourself in situations when it is needed. If you are dieting, for example, you may well be able to resist dipping into the biscuit jar most of the time. However, under conditions of ego-depletion, you are more likely to break and have one (unless of course, you have your implementation intention ready!). So, the answer is simply to give the biscuits to a neighbour, and avoid shopping for food when you are ego-depleted!

4.
Framing bias.

'Framing bias' is the tendency to be swayed by the way options are presented as potential gains or losses. It is often considered one of the strongest biases affecting our judgement. Typically, we tend to try to avoid losses when options are 'framed' as positive, but tend to choose risk when options are framed negatively. This concept was developed by Tversky and Kahneman in the early 80s, and is famously illustrated with a scenario in which individuals have to choose between two treatment options ('A' and 'B') when treating 600 people suffering from a severe illness. In a positive frame, these outcomes of these options are presented as "A – 'Saving 200 lives'" and "B –'A 33% chance of saving all 600 people and a 66% chance of saving no-one". Around 70% of people in Tverksy and Kahneman's study picked treatment A in this context - avoiding the option which highlighted the risk. The same outcomes were also phrased negatively - with treatment A leading to "400 people will die" and treatment B as "a 33% chance that no-one will die and a 66% probability that all 600 will die". In this negative frame, far fewer (~20%) choose option A. In both cases, option A and B are mathematically equivalent between frames (and, probabilistically, identical with frames too, for

example, 100% of 200 is the same as 33% of 600).

This framing bias can affect our behaviour in a variety of domains and be translated into various strategies. For instance, political parties may frame outcomes in terms of possible gains or possible losses to elicit behaviours and attitudes amongst voters - political poll questions in particular can be biased in this way. In financial settings, discussing investment decisions in the context of either pricing (negative frame) or returns (positive frame) can induce framing effects. In sales, framing is used to highlight positives (9 out of 10 people like our product) or losses (only 1 in 10) in different ways to induce different frames. Interestingly, framing bias effects increases as we age. Adolescents are particularly less averse to risk than other age groups and people over 40 are increasingly prone to negative biases.

IMPROVEMENT

Framing biases can be overcome if we are sufficiently motivated and not in a state of ego-depletion (see *ego-depletion*). Actively using one's working memory and avoiding answers which 'pop out' are strategies which can be trained to become habitual. One method of doing this is to logically test your answers by calculating outcomes

instead of relying on ones gut feeling. Identifying which questions need analytical, accurate answers and which can be erroneous is also a possible strategy. If you need to make decisions under conditions of high demand on a regular basis, training a new set of cognitive heuristics (rules of thumb) which are accurate in the context you work in may help also. In your communications with others, framing effects can be reduced by the use of visual aids - particularly when people are unwilling (or unable) to process complex information. For instance, pie charts, bar graphs and other mathematical graphing aids can illustrate outcomes in ways which reduce framing effects. Equally, you may want to harness this bias in your own favour by matching the frame to the audience - presenting the option you wish to be most persuasive in a frame which encourages decisions in the direction you want.

5.
Confirmation bias.

In an ideal world, we would evaluate each situation on its own merits. When we make a judgement, we would seek information to inform it in an unbiased and thorough manner. Unfortunately, as we are cognitive misers and motivated tacticians, we don't. The 'confirmation bias' is a tendency to interpret the world in a way which fits with our existing beliefs. It is strongest when emotions are running high, and affects people of all levels of intelligence. It is an automatic ('fast') process which is unintentional. It can also be affected by a desire to remain consistent in the eyes of ourselves and others (see *the planning fallacy and sunk cost effects*).

One way confirmation bias manifests is apparent in the way we seek out and process information. For instance, we tend to seek information which confirms our existing view. Given we make decisions in complex situations in which evidence for multiple outcomes is usually present, this makes it more likely we find information which supports our existing position. Moreover, we notice (and think less about) information which is inconsistent with our beliefs less readily than consistent information.

Confirmation bias can distort our interpretation of the evidence which is in front of us. When viewing ambiguous information, we understand it in such a way that it supports our own position. We also tend have a bias towards considering arguments which fit our existing beliefs to be more important than we do those which challenge them. Finally, our memory can also be affected by the confirmation bias. We recall information which fits our beliefs (or our expectations) more consistently and more easily than belief inconsistent information.

This bias is particularly problematic as it can lead us to be overconfident, unable to process new information effectively and generally be irrational and inflexible in our decision making.

IMPROVEMENT

First, and most importantly, try and cultivate an attitude of 'active open-mindedness'. Do not just try and avoid ignoring information which does not confirm your judgement- actively seek it out and test you ideas. When people challenge your opinions, try and welcome it as a chance to 'quality assure' your ideas, rather than someone threatening your opinion (and, by extension, yourself). When you are trying to understand a new situation, avoid

jumping to conclusions - once you have an initial 'hunch', which may not be based on much evidence, you will find it difficult to switch to new judgements. To remedy this, try and generate three alternative explanations, then look for evidence of each. If you do have a hunch (which is often an automatic response, given our tendency to think fast), note what your initial evidence is, and be suspicious of it and yourself. Finally, try to overcome the desire to be self-consistent in your attitudes at the expense of good judgements. Instead, try and consistently be open-minded, and willing to shift in response to new information.

6.
Availability bias.

The availability bias is another symptom of 'thinking fast'. This bias manifests in an increasing importance being placed on information which we can recall or consciously access with ease. In essence, easily recalled information biases our judgements. This can affect us due to a number of related features of our cognitive processes. First, we tend to recall negative or socially undesirable information about things more easily then positive information - our judgements can rely more on the former. Equally, we attend to (and can recall) unexpected information more easily than expected information (although if we do not, we may be experiencing *confirmation bias*!). Finally, more recently presented information can be recalled more easily than information seen earlier. Information fitting these criteria tend to have an undue impact on our decisions.

 Availability bias can also be driven simply by how easily information comes to mind more generally. Consider the following question used in experiments by Tversky and Kahneman – "If a random word was taken from the English language, is it more likely it would begin with a 'k' or have a 'k' as the third letter?". Most people find it easier to generate words beginning with a 'k', than those with a 'k' in

the third position. People also typically overestimate the frequency of the former and underestimate the frequency of the latter. The availability heuristic can also apply to maths - in another study people were given one of the following equations '8x7x6x5x4x3x2x1' or '1x2x3x4x5x6x7x8' to solve under time pressure. People with the first equation typically estimated the answer as being higher than people given the second. This is thought to be because they relied on the initial (more easily available) information. The availability bias can also affect our risk perception - for instance, being able to recall information about low frequency negative events (e.g. a cruise ship sickness bug, or the abduction of a child) makes our estimate of the frequency of such events appear higher. This effect was nicely illustrated by research showing that people who watch more crime dramas perceive more crime in society and that seeing pictures of sharks leads one to overestimate the possibility of being involved in a shark attack!

This bias is so strong it can even influence our own perceptions about ourselves. Another researcher named Schwarz requested participants recalled either six or twelve instances where they were assertive or unassertive. Most people can generate six easily, but twelve is typically a struggle. People who generated the

six examples subsequently rated themselves as more assertive (or unassertive depending on condition). Availability biases may also be implicated in a lack of cognitive flexibility. When we think we are familiar with a problem, the solution we usually employ is easily accessible. As such we place a lot of weight on it. One result of this is that more efficient or effective solutions or approaches may be less easily accessible and, as such, may not be considered.

IMPROVEMENT

To ensure that the availability bias does not overly affect your decision making, try and increase the availability of competing information, thus reducing the difference between sources. Forcing yourself to write down information, rearranging it (so you are forced to process all of it) and dedicating a generous set time period for the decision making process can all act to help make other information more available. It also seems there are individual differences in bias perception - people who have faith in intuition, for example, have been shown to be more prone to availability bias effects. Whilst such a belief may have other benefits, if you recognise yourself here, be particularly wary of information and ideas which 'pop' out at you.

7.
Anchoring bias.

Our judgements are often unduly influenced by a single piece of information - a bias know as the 'anchoring effect'. Tversky and Kahneman developed ideas around this to explain fast and slow thinking. Pricing strategies are a good example of anchoring - a high price is provided as the 'recommended price'. This sets the anchor which we cognitively compare the offered purchase price. This price anchoring seems to have a greater impact when the anchors are specific (for instance, a price of £198,845) than general (e.g. £199,000). The anchor also reduces the impact of other sources of information (for instance, the comparison price of other products, or the actual product quality). This is also known as the 'adjustment effect'. We can also focus on some information and let it bias us unduly. For instance, research involving self-judgements show that many people believe that receiving a pay rise will make us happier. In reality, pay raises account for only a small proportion of the changes in life satisfaction we undergo - and such effects are very short-lived even then. However, as we anchor on this aspect we do not take into account others (health, relationships etc) which are actually more influential.

Anchoring can also occur when information primed in one domain of thinking erroneously influences information in another. For instance, research shows that generating a long number in one task can lead people to overestimate judgements of frequency or quantity in others. For example, getting people to engage in the act of writing down their mobile phone number can lead them to overestimate the number of people who live in Alaska. Although unrelated, thinking about a big number (an 11 digit number) increases the subsequent quantity estimation. Such effects are particularly pronounced when we have little or no initial information (Alaskans, for example, would be unlikely to experience this particular effect!). Similar effects have been observed in research which asks participants for estimations after they have spun a roulette wheel - lower numbers in roulette tend to lead to lower estimations.

IMPROVEMENT

Unfortunately, anchoring is very hard to avoid, even when you know it is happening - people given clearly nonsense anchors (10 people or 600 million people living in Alaska, for example) are still biased in their subsequent decision making. Likewise, being explicitly told that information in one domain can cause biases in others does not reduce

the amount of bias experienced! However, you can estimate to what extent you are likely to be affected by anchoring bias - it seems to be more prevalent in those in a good mood and amongst those who are not experts in a field. There are also individual differences in anchoring bias - people who are highly conscientiousness and agreeable seem to be more influenced. Interesting, people who are more extroverted seem to be less susceptible. There is no conclusive evidence that people with higher or lower cognitive ability are more or less affected by anchoring.

8.
Planning fallacy
and sunk cost effects.

The 'planning fallacy' reflects a tendency to underestimate the time and effort required to reach a goal, even when such requirements are very obvious to outsiders. Indeed, we can quite cheerfully realise that others' plans underestimate resources, whilst misjudging our own resource needs badly. A neat study conducted by Buehler and colleagues demonstrates this nicely. In this research, PhD students were asked how long they judged it would take themselves to write their final thesis, giving both best, expected and worst case estimates. On average, these students estimated 48.6 days as worse case, but it actually ended up being 55.5 days on average. Common real life examples of the planning fallacy include assuming people will work faster, error rates will be lower than they actually are, mistakes will not occur and best case scenarios will be consistently met.

Once projects are running but not going well, it can be difficult to know how to respond. A bias which often occurs here is the 'sunk cost effect'. This is a tendency to show increased commitment to a project, idea or situation when we have already invested heavily in it. This may in part be

driven by a desire to remain consistent within ourselves, be seen to be effective when things are difficult and show tenacity and determination. However, such a strategy may be sub-optimal: Maintaining a problematic relationship because you have tried hard to make it work already, putting more effort into a project because you have already spent hours on it and chasing bad investments with more money are all examples of sunk cost effects. These actions are all problematic to the extent that they take account of information (past investment) which may be irrelevant. Ideally, judgements should be made by comparing current / future cost of an action weighed up against the expected utility of the outcome. Considering a sunk cost is erroneous when it does not impact on the future at all, as the already made investment can never be recovered regardless of subsequent actions.

IMPROVEMENT

There are ways to reduce the planning fallacy - for instance, to segment tasks up when evaluating time and energy requirements. This forces you to evaluate needs in more detail. It also gives you opportunity to realise the extent to which elements are dependent upon one another. Another highly effective strategy is to have an independent person make an honest evaluation of your

estimates (and, importantly, ensuring that you listen to the answer and take it seriously!).

To avoid sunk costs, try and focus on the future without focusing too much on the past (with the exception, of course, of information which informs judgements about future outcomes). Much of the sunk cost bias is to do with our own self-perceptions. Changing course from a direction you have already embarked on may make you feel that your initial decision was erroneous. This may not be true - for example the 'best' decision given the information at the time may later lead to an unsuccessful outcome. Moving away from judging past decisions too critically can help increase your willingness to be flexible (although retain some honest self-reflection!). Secondly, be aware typically we want to see ourselves as internally consistent. As a result, moving away from a pre-determined strategy can be challenging. To overcome this, try and see being flexible as more positive than being cognitively rigid - reframing 'inconsistency' as a virtue.

9.
Normal distributions and unusual events.

The concept of normal distribution also know as a 'bell curve' or 'Gaussian curve') is highly influential in both scientific and human resource circles. Consider a coin tossed 10,000 times (or, even better, an infinite number of times). Probability suggests that it come up heads 50% of the time. It will also be almost as likely to come up heads 49% or 51% of the time. Slightly less likely, but not completely unlikely would be patterns more distant from probable outcomes- 35% heads for example. It is very unlikely, but not impossible, that we would get 10% heads. This can be applied to many domains - if we picked a sample of men from the population of the UK, we would find most would have average sized feet, and a smaller, but roughly equal number would be slightly smaller / larger. Finally, a very small (but again equal) number would have tiny or very large feet). If we graphed this we would get a curve roughly in the shape of a bell. Distributions of these types can also be seen in factors such as intelligence, sales figures and liking of ice-cream. In such distributions, an equal number of scores on the dimension being measured will fall above and below the

median ('middle') score.

It is important to note that whilst normal distributions are common, some outcomes (reaction times and levels of alcohol consumption for example) do not follow normal curves - they can be 'skewed'(i.e. have more people above the median, like someone stretched the tail of one side of the curve out) or have other odd properties (such as being 'bi-modal', where two distinct 'peaks' occur in the curve).

IMPROVEMENT

Understanding bell curves and skewed distributions can be a big help in making better judgements. For instance, you may well realise that, on any normally distributed dimension, most people will fall in the middle BUT, some will also fall at the extreme ends. Not only should this not be a surprise, it should in fact be expected. Some people will always be more (or less) of whatever it is you are measuring. You shouldn't, however, fall for the fallacy that the shape of this curve is fixed. For example, just because people thrive to varying extents in a particular social environment does not mean that people in the lower end of that dimension cannot be 'caught up' if offered the opportunity. Equally, although bell shaped distributions are common, they are not by any means the norm - plenty of

distributions start out non-normative. Try and understand what you would expect the outcome curve to be before you start to best predict (and intervene to control) results. You should also consider how curves on different dimensions interact - it is not highly unlikely that a given individual in a population sample is aged 15, nor is it highly unlikely someone in the same sample will earn £60,000. However, the odds of someone meeting both these criteria gets pretty low (although, as we know from curves more generally, not impossible!). In general, however, try to bear in mind that things will be unusual at least 10% of the time!

10.
Fundamental attribution bias.

Imagine someone you work with neglected to live up to some responsibility they have. How do you understand this behaviour? How do others understand your own? Psychologists understand these judgements through 'attribution theory'. Attribution theory argues that we can understand behaviour as either due to the person themselves (i.e. due to their personality or disposition) or due to the situation people are in. These are referred to as internal or external attributions accordingly.

In general, we suffer from something called the fundamental attribution error. This reflects a strong bias towards making internal attributions to others' behaviours. In essence, our default assumption is other people behave the way they do because of the sort of people they are. This is particularly the case when the behaviour is socially undesirable. In many ways, this makes sense - if someone behaves negatively but we mis-attribute it to the situation, we risk them behaving that way again unexpectedly. Alongside this, the fundamental attribution error also leads us to assume our own behaviour is due to the situation to a greater extent than it actually is. So, whilst your work colleague may have failed in their duty due to being lazy or

inefficient, you may perceive the same behaviour in yourself as being due to circumstance you cannot possibly control. This is particularly the case when we behave in ways we think less than ideal (we are good at making internal attributions to our successes!). Again, this approach has its benefits - we protect our self-esteem against uncomfortable information (indeed, depression is often linked to internal attributions of self-relevant negative behaviours and outcomes).

Why may this effect occur? It could be due to the self-protection and self-esteem buffering effects outlined above. More intriguingly, it could also be a perceptual effect. When we attribute others behaviour, we focus on the actor - against the backdrop of the situation. When we attribute our own behaviours, we literally cannot see the actor (ourselves), but are aware of the situational context. In line with this idea, performing an action in front of a mirror (or whilst watching oneself on TV) leads us to understand our behaviour as being driven more by the situation.

IMPROVEMENT

Although the fundamental attribution bias can be psychologically healthy, it is also a systematic bias which

can impair your judgement. As such, it prevents us from accurately comprehending and understanding the world. For example, blaming someone for something that is not their fault may unnecessarily damage relationships which could be beneficial. Similarly, not recognising our own faults prevents positive self-development. To try and overcome this, bear in mind that our initial default tendency is to attribute others behaviour internally - you need to consciously look for situational reasons. So, try and train yourself whenever you feel 'blame' towards someone to step back and imagine the person isn't to blame and look for other explanations. Then, compare these explanations to what you think you personally would have done in that circumstance. Finally, compare these two explanations against one another. For self-evaluations, ask yourself how important accurate reflection is in a given circumstance. If it is important, try and evaluate your own behaviour (without judging yourself too much) by looking at what you could have done differently, and whether the situation is truly to blame.

Footnote.

I hope you enjoyed this PsychologyItBetter.com PocketBook. If you did, please do review me on your preferred platform. I always love to hear what you think. You can find out more about how psychology can make our lives better at **PsychologyItBetter.com**- a blog I run packed with insights into how psychology impacts us on a day to day basis. Do visit us and subscribe to get high quality content freely delivered straight to your inbox.

Also keep an eye out for forthcoming titles in the PsychologyItBetter.com PocketBookseries:

- Better Interpersonal interactions
- Better Sports Performance
- Better Memory
- Better Influence
- Better Health and Wellbeing
- Better Parenting
- Better Motivation

Thanks again for reading!

Dr. Dan Frings,

Daniel.Frings@psychologyitbetter.com

OUT NOW! Better Influence!

We all want to be more effective at influencing others. Drawing on both classic and contemporary accounts of social influence and persuasion, this PocketBook outlines 10 key concepts which will help improve you own influence attempts and resist those made by others. Each concept is concisely presented in 600 words or less, making it perfect to dip into. Every section also outlines improvements you can implement easily into your day-to-day life.

Concepts covered include:

- How different thinking styles influence the way we process arguments,
- How to pitch the right arguments to the right people,
- Using the power of giving meaning to behaviour to maximise responses,
- Understanding and using the power of social proof effectively,
- Understanding the role and use of nudges, and many more!

Click here to find out more!