THE BIASED BRAIN



A COMPREHENSIVE EXPLORATION OF COGNITIVE DISTORTIONS

BO BENNETT, PHD

The Biased Brain

A Comprehensive Exploration of Cognitive Distortions

by Bo Bennett, PhD

Copyright 2023 Archieboy Holdings, LLC.
All rights reserved.

Formatted, Converted, and Distributed by eBookIt.com
http://www.eBookIt.com

ISBN-13: 9781456641207 (hardcover)
ISBN-13: 9781456641184 (paperback)
ISBN-13: 9781456641177 (ebook)
ISBN-13: 9781456641214 (audiobook)

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means including information storage and retrieval systems, without permission in writing from the author. The only exception is by a reviewer, who may quote short excerpts in a review.

Dear Esteemed Reader,

Thank you immensely for choosing this book to join your collection. We imagine that you've already embarked on an exploration of ideas within these pages, and we couldn't be happier about it!

Now, if you find yourself chuckling, pondering, or even debating with the words in front of you, we'd absolutely love to hear about it. If you can spare a few moments to pen down your thoughts in a review, we would be as delighted as a dictionary on a spelling bee!

An Amazon review would be excellent - but hey, we're far from picky. Whether it's a scribble on the back of a grocery list, a tweet, or even a message in a bottle (though that might take a while to reach us), your feedback is gold.

Writing a review might not be as fun as a spontaneous dance-off, but we promise it'll bring grins to our faces, warmth to our hearts, and incredibly valuable insights to future readers.

With Gratitude,

Bo Bennett, PhD
Publisher
Archieboy Holdings, LLC.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Actor–Observer Bias

Ambiguity Aversion

Ambiguity Effect

Anchoring Bias

Anthropic Bias

Appeal to Novelty

Argument from Repetition (Argument Ad Nauseam)

Association Fallacy

Association-Transfer Bias

Attentional Bias

Attentional Blink

Authority Bias

Automation Bias

Availability Cascade

Availability Heuristic

Backfire Effect

Backward Induction

Backward Reasoning

Bandwagon Effect

Base Rate Neglect

Belief Bias

Belief Perseverance

Ben Franklin Effect

Bias Blind Spot

Boomerang Effect

Bystander Effect

Cheerleader Effect

Choice-Supportive Bias

Chameleon Effect

Clustering Illusion

Cobra Effect

Confirmation Bias

Conjunction Fallacy

Conservatism Bias

Construal Level Theory

Contrast Effect

Control Bias

Courtesy Bias

Curse of Knowledge

Decoy Effect

Default Effect

Denomination Effect

Disconfirmation Bias

Disjunction Fallacy

Disregard of Regression Toward the Mean

Divergence Bias

Door-In-The-Face Technique

Dunning-Kruger Effect

Duration Neglect

Effort Justification

Egocentric Bias

Endowment Effect

Epistemic Closure

Experimenter's Bias (Expectation Bias)

Extension Neglect

Extrinsic Incentives Bias

False Consensus Effect

False Dichotomy

False Fame Effect

False Memory

Fading Affect Bias

Fear of Missing Out (FOMO)

Focusing Effect

Foot-In-The-Door Technique

Forer Effect (Barnum Effect)

Framing Effect

Frequency Illusion

Functional Fixedness

Fundamental Attribution Error

Gambler's Fallacy

Generation Bias

Google Effect

Group Attribution Error

Groupthink

Hard-Easy Effect

Halo Effect

Hawthorne Effect

Herd Instinct

Hindsight Bias

Hoarding

Horns Effect

Hot-Hand Fallacy

Hot-Cold Empathy Gap

Hyperbolic Discounting

Illusion of Asymmetric Insight

Illusion of Attention

Illusion of Control

Illusion of External Agency

Illusion of Explanatory Depth

Illusion of Knowledge

Illusion of Skill

Illusion of Superiority

Illusion of Transparency

Illusion of Truth Effect

Illusory of Understanding

Illusory Pattern Perception

Impact Bias

Impostor Syndrome

Inattentional Blindness

Inductive Bias

Information Bias

Insensitivity to Sample Size

Introspection Illusion

In-group Bias

Irrelevant Alternatives Fallacy

Irrational Escalation

Just-Noticeable Difference (JND)

Just-World Hypothesis

Law of the Instrument

Law of Triviality

Less-is-Better Effect

Likability Bias

Licensing Effect

Loss Aversion

Mere Exposure Effect

Memory Bias

Misattribution of Arousal

Misinformation Effect

Money Illusion

Mood-Congruent Judgment

Mood-Congruent Memory Bias

Moral Credential Effect

Moral Luck

Myside Bias

Naive Realism

Narrative Fallacy

Negativity Bias

Neglect of Duration

Neglect of Probability

Normalcy Bias

Not Invented Here (NIH) Syndrome

Observer Expectancy Effect

Observational Selection Bias

Omission Bias

Optimism Bias

Outcome Bias

Outgroup Homogeneity Bias

Overconfidence Bias

Overestimation Bias

Overprecision

Overreaction Bias

Overtrust

Pareidolia

Peak-End Rule

Perceptual Bias

Picture Superiority Effect

Planning Fallacy

Positivity Effect

Post Hoc Ergo Propter Hoc Fallacy

Post-Purchase Rationalization

Pratfall Effect

Primacy Effect

Priming

Pro-Innovation Bias

Projection Bias

Proportionality Bias

Prototype Heuristic

Pseudocertainty Effect

Pseudo-opinion

Psychological Reactance

Pygmalion Effect

Reactive Devaluation

Recency Effect

Reification (Concretism, Hypostatization, or the Fallacy of Misplaced Concreteness)

Rejection of Instruction

Reminiscence Bump

Representativeness Heuristic

Restraint Bias

Rhyme as Reason Effect

Risk Compensation or Peltzman Effect

Rosy Retrospection

Satisficing

Scarcity Principle

Scope Insensitivity

Selective Exposure

Self-Consistency Bias

Self-Enhancement Bias

Self-Handicapping Bias

Self-Perception Bias

Self-Relevance Effect

Self-Reference Effect

Semmelweis Reflex

Shared Information Bias

Simulation Heuristic

Sleeper Effect

Social Attribution Bias

Social Comparison Bias

Social Desirability Bias

Social Loafing

Stereotype Boost and Stereotype Lift

Stereotype Threat

Stereotyping

Status Quo Bias

Streetlight Effect

Subadditivity Effect

Subjective Validation

Survivorship Bias

Sunk Cost Fallacy

System Justification

Telescoping Bias

Temporal Discounting

The Texas Sharpshooter Fallacy

Third Person Effect

Thought Suppression

Time-saving Bias

Trait Negativity Bias

Trivial-Pursuit Effect

Triviality Bias

Ultimate Attribution Error

Uncertainty Bias

Unit Bias

Von Restorff Effect

Wishful Thinking

WYSIATI (What You See Is All There Is)

Zeigarnik Effect

Zero Price Effect

Zero-Sum Bias

Zero Risk Bias

Conclusion

About the Author

Introduction

Welcome! I'm Bo Bennett, PhD, social psychologist and tour guide, navigating the perplexing labyrinth of the human mind. You might know me from my best-selling book, "Logically Fallacious," a merry romp through the world of logical fallacies. But my friends, fallacies are only part of the puzzle, the frosting on the cognitive cake, so to speak. To get a more complete picture of human reasoning (and occasionally, un-reasoning), we need to delve into the realm of cognitive biases. So get ready to have your mind blown—or at least say to yourself, "Wow, that's interesting."

You see, logical fallacies and cognitive biases are like mischievous twins. They look similar and often conspire together, but they're distinct in their own right. Logical fallacies are errors in reasoning, the result of faulty logic. They're akin to reaching an incorrect solution in a math problem because you added when you should have subtracted. Cognitive biases, on the other hand, are systematic errors in our thinking that influence our choices and judgments. They're like a calculator that's always a few digits off, no matter how carefully you punch in the numbers.

"But Bo, how come many of these biases have 'Fallacy' in the name?" Wise observation, my friend. This is because a fallacy, in a general sense of the term, is more synonymous with "error" in the context of language or thought. In that regard, a "logical fallacy" would be a subset of "fallacy". Confused? Don't lose sleep over it. I don't.

Despite their differences, both logical fallacies and cognitive biases are disruptions in our thought process. They prevent us from seeing the world as it is, instead presenting us with a

distorted, often self-serving version of reality. It's a bit like wearing rose-tinted glasses that also happen to have smudges, scratches, and the occasional bug splatter.

Take politics, for instance. The Confirmation Bias - a cognitive bias - nudges us to favor information that supports our beliefs, while the Strawman Fallacy - a logical fallacy - misrepresents an opponent's argument to make it easier to attack. Together, they're like a tag team, working to undermine objective reasoning.

In religion, the Belief Bias clouds our judgment of logic and evidence, while the Appeal to Faith Fallacy argues that belief comes from faith, not evidence. These two can tango together, leading to steadfast belief without logical foundation.

And on social issues, such as climate change, the Dunning-Kruger Effect (a cognitive bias) leads people to overestimate their understanding, while the Appeal to Nature Fallacy (a logical fallacy) argues that anything natural is inherently good or right.

In "Cognitively Biased," we'll dive into these cognitive quirks, exploring their impacts, offering countermeasures, and shedding light on the scientific underpinnings. Because to truly understand our minds and to reason effectively, we need to see the whole circus, clowns and all.

So, as we embark on this expedition, remember: understanding is the first step to improvement. With a sprinkle of humor, a dash of insight, and a healthy dose of reality-check, let's make our way through the enthralling world of cognitive biases. Here's to becoming a little less cognitively biased and a whole lot more cognitively savvy!

Actor–Observer Bias

Definition: Actor-Observer Bias is the dandy little tendency we have to blame our own actions on external factors while attributing others' actions to their intrinsic characteristics. It's like the psychological version of wanting to have our cake and eat it too, only in this case, the cake is blame and nobody really wants a slice.

Description: This bias stems from our struggle to see events from a balanced perspective. Think of it as a sort of 'perception see-saw'. On one side, we have the 'actor', where we attribute our own actions to our circumstances rather than our personalities. The 'observer' side, however, sees others' actions as reflective of their character, rather than their situation. These inconsistencies in attribution can lead to some rather unbalanced judgment swings. After all, we all like to think we're the ones dancing with grace while everyone else is just tripping over their own feet.

Examples: To illustrate, consider the realm of politics. Politician A may argue passionately about income inequality, attributing their own wealth to a fortunate upbringing (the actor). Meanwhile, the observer (read: rivals and critics) might attribute Politician A's wealth to inherent greed or corruption.

In religious contexts, imagine a religious leader who falls from grace due to scandal. The leader might attribute their fall to external pressures or temptation (actor), while their followers might see it as a revelation of their true, morally flawed character (observer).

And on social issues, let's consider online trolling. An individual might troll others due to perceived anonymity and lack of consequence (actor), while those on the receiving end might attribute the trolling to the individual's inherent nastiness (observer).

Impact: The Actor-Observer Bias can significantly skew our understanding of others' behaviors and our own. It leads to misunderstanding, feeds conflict, and generally muddies the waters of objective judgment. For society, this bias can perpetuate stereotypes, widen political divisions, and even undermine efforts to promote social justice.

Related Biases: This bias is a cousin to the Fundamental Attribution Error, which is the general tendency to over-emphasize personal characteristics and ignore situational factors when judging others' behavior. It's also a close relative to the Self-Serving Bias, where we credit our successes to our own merit and blame failures on external factors.

Countermeasures: To avoid this bias, we need to play the world's least exciting game of 'switcheroo'. This involves swapping perspectives; trying to see situations from the other person's point of view, and critically examining our own actions as if we were outside observers. Sounds fun, right?

Key Takeaways: The Actor-Observer Bias is like psychological double standards, where we attribute our actions to circumstances and others' actions to their character. It has substantial social impacts, but can be countered by perspective-switching. So the next time you feel the urge to judge, remember to get off the 'perception see-saw' and try a little balance instead.

References:

Malle, B. F. (2006). The actor-observer asymmetry in attribution: A (surprising) meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 132(6), 895–919. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.6.895

Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings: Distortions in the attribution process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 10, pp. 173-220). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60357-3

Miller, D. T., & Ross, M. (1975). Self-serving biases in the attribution of causality: Fact or fiction? Psychological Bulletin, 82(2), 213–225. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0076486

Ambiguity Aversion

Definition: Ambiguity Aversion, also known as the Ellsberg Paradox, is our cognitive desire to run screaming from anything uncertain or ambiguous. It's not just a fear of the dark; it's a fear of a slightly shadowy corner in broad daylight.

Description: In essence, ambiguity aversion refers to our preference for known risks over unknown risks. This bias arises from our brain's penchant for certainty and predictability. Uncertainty sends our grey matter into a tizzy, and like a distressed parent losing sight of their child at the supermarket, it starts frantically opting for safer, familiar choices.

Examples: In the world of politics, ambiguity aversion might manifest in our voting behavior. People often vote for the same party or candidate simply because it's a known entity, ignoring potential new candidates who might be better but are less familiar.

Religion is another area where ambiguity aversion is at play. Many individuals stick with the religious beliefs they were raised with, a known risk, instead of exploring other faiths or the lack thereof, an unknown risk.

And let's not forget social issues. People may be averse to new policies or laws that promise improvement but entail a certain degree of uncertainty. For instance, resistance to healthcare reform or new environmental regulations often stems from ambiguity aversion.

Impact: Ambiguity aversion can limit our growth, our understanding, and our progress. It often locks us into the

status quo, preventing us from exploring potentially beneficial opportunities, be it in politics, religion, social issues, or daily life. It's like choosing to stay in a mediocre restaurant because we're afraid the one across the street, despite its fantastic reviews, might disappoint us.

Related Biases: Ambiguity aversion is a sibling to the Status Quo Bias, the human tendency to like things to stay relatively the same. It's also kin to Risk Aversion, where we prefer the sure thing over the gamble, even if the gamble might have better potential outcomes.

Countermeasures: Combating ambiguity aversion is like learning to swim in the deep end. It's about gradually increasing our tolerance for uncertainty and practicing decision-making in ambiguous situations. It can help to gather as much information as possible, weigh the pros and cons, and then take the plunge.

Key Takeaways: Ambiguity aversion is our cognitive distaste for uncertainty, which can limit our openness to new experiences and potentially beneficial opportunities. It's a tricky bias to overcome, but with patience, information, and a willingness to cannonball into the deep end of ambiguity, we can begin to navigate uncertainty with a little more finesse.

References:

Ellsberg, D. (1961). Risk, Ambiguity, and the Savage Axioms. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 75(4), 643-669. https://doi.org/10.2307/1884324

Samuelson, W., & Zeckhauser, R. (1988). Status Quo Bias in Decision Making. Journal of Risk and Uncertainty, 1, 7-59. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00055564

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263-291. https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185

Ambiguity Effect

Definition: The Ambiguity Effect is a cognitive bias where we shun options with missing information, even if they're potentially more rewarding. It's the feeling you get when you opt for an apple over an exotic fruit because, well, who knows what that thing tastes like?

Description: The Ambiguity Effect, a cousin to the Ambiguity Aversion, emerges from our desire for certainty and predictability. We tend to go for options where we have more information, even if it means potentially missing out on something better. It's like picking a predictable movie over a potentially groundbreaking one, just because you know the actor in the first one.

Examples: In politics, the Ambiguity Effect can lead to people shying away from voting for a promising candidate with less public exposure. They might opt for a well-known candidate with a less stellar record, simply because there's more information available about them.

In religion, the Ambiguity Effect might stop someone from exploring a different faith or philosophy. The uncertainty about the new belief system can make their known faith seem more appealing, even if it might not be satisfying them spiritually.

On social issues, let's say there's a new but vaguely described policy on education reform. Despite its potential to dramatically improve education standards, people might oppose it simply because the plan lacks detailed information.

Impact: The Ambiguity Effect can make us miss out on potentially beneficial opportunities, stifle innovation, and

promote a fear-based decision-making process. It encourages playing it safe, even when playing it safe means staying stuck in less-than-optimal situations.

Related Biases: The Ambiguity Effect shares a common thread with the Status Quo Bias and Risk Aversion. It's also related to the Uncertainty Effect, where our dislike for uncertainty affects our decision-making process.

Countermeasures: To fight the Ambiguity Effect, we need to learn to be comfortable with a certain degree of uncertainty. This involves stepping outside of our comfort zones, seeking out new information, and evaluating options based on potential benefits, not just available information.

Key Takeaways: The Ambiguity Effect is our tendency to shy away from uncertainty, even at the cost of potential benefits. By embracing a bit of uncertainty and making decisions based on potential outcomes, we can navigate life a bit more adventurously and potentially more fruitfully.

References:

Ellsberg, D. (1961). Risk, Ambiguity, and the Savage Axioms. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 75(4), 643-669. https://doi.org/10.2307/1884324

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263-291. https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185

Fox, C. R., & Tversky, A. (1995). Ambiguity Aversion and Comparative Ignorance. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 110(3), 585-603. https://doi.org/10.2307/2946693

Anchoring Bias

Definition: Anchoring Bias is our cognitive tendency to rely heavily on the first piece of information (the “anchor”) we receive when making decisions. Picture it as a mind-anchor stubbornly sticking to the seabed while you’re trying to navigate your boat - the boat being your decision-making process.

Description: The Anchoring Bias is a peculiar quirk of the human mind. We tend to give undue weight to the initial information we receive and then adjust our subsequent thoughts and judgments based on this anchor. It’s like trying to estimate the value of a used car based on its original price tag, ignoring factors like its current condition and mileage.

Examples: In politics, initial poll results often act as anchors, affecting how people perceive the candidates. Once we form an opinion based on these polls, we might ignore later information that contradicts our initial impressions.

In religion, the first religious beliefs or practices we’re exposed to often become anchors. They heavily influence our perception of other faiths and philosophies.

When discussing social issues, the first piece of news or opinion we come across can act as an anchor, coloring our perception and interpretation of subsequent information about the issue.

Impact: The Anchoring Bias can lead us to make less-than-optimal decisions and judgments. It can skew our perception of people, ideas, and events, potentially blinding us to more accurate or helpful information that comes later.

Related Biases: Anchoring Bias is a close cousin of the Confirmation Bias, where we seek out information that confirms our existing beliefs. It also shares a family resemblance with the Availability Heuristic, which leads us to overestimate the importance of information that's readily available or memorable.

Countermeasures: To counteract the Anchoring Bias, consciously seek diverse information before making a decision. Don't let the first piece of information dictate your perspective. And remember, your mind-anchor is not made of adamantium; it can and should be lifted when needed.

Key Takeaways: Anchoring Bias is our cognitive tendency to stick too closely to our first impressions. By recognizing this bias and actively seeking out diverse and later information, we can make more balanced and informed decisions.

References:

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. Science, 185(4157), 1124–1131. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.185.4157.1124

Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, Fast and Slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Furnham, A., & Boo, H. C. (2011). A literature review of the anchoring effect. The Journal of Socio-Economics, 40(1), 35-42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2010.10.008

Anthropic Bias

Definition: Anthropic Bias is our tendency to reason as if our particular moment in history, our particular location, or our particular species is somehow central or typical in the grand scheme of things. It's like thinking you're the center of the universe, and let's be real, who hasn't entertained that thought at some point?

Description: Anthropic Bias can distort our perception of reality by making us presume our perspective is "the norm". It arises from our difficulty to detach ourselves from our personal experiences and limited perspectives when trying to understand the universe and its laws. It's like watching a soccer game only through the GoPro strapped to your favorite player's head.

Examples: In politics, a country might assume that its form of government is the most effective one, ignoring the successes and nuances of others. This can lead to flawed foreign policies and diplomatic misunderstandings.

In religion, anthropic bias can lead to the belief that humans are the purpose or focal point of the universe or divine creation. This can influence how we perceive and interact with nature and other species.

In social issues, anthropic bias can lead to an inability to understand or respect cultures, values, or practices different from ours. For instance, a person might find it hard to comprehend why certain societies uphold certain traditions, simply because it's far removed from their own experiences.

Impact: Anthropic Bias can hamper our understanding of the universe, constrain our thinking, and fuel

misunderstanding and conflict. It can hinder our ability to grasp the diversity and complexity of the world around us.

Related Biases: The anthropic bias is closely related to the False Consensus Effect, where we assume our opinions are representative of the majority. Egocentric Bias, where we overly rely on our own perspective, is another close relative.

Countermeasures: Mitigating the Anthropic Bias requires a conscious effort to broaden our perspectives. We need to actively seek out diverse viewpoints, experiences, and cultures. Recognize that our viewpoint is one among many, and that the universe doesn't revolve around our tiny existence.

Key Takeaways: Anthropic Bias reflects our tendency to see the world from our limited and subjective vantage point. By embracing a more humble, curiosity-driven approach, we can counteract this bias and enrich our understanding of the universe and its diversity.

References:

Bostrom, N. (2002). Anthropic Bias: Observation Selection Effects in Science and Philosophy. Routledge.

Page, S. E. (2007). The Difference: How the Power of Diversity Creates Better Groups, Firms, Schools, and Societies. Princeton University Press.

Appeal to Novelty

Definition: The Appeal to Novelty is our cognitive predisposition to favor newer ideas, innovations, or things simply because they're new. It's like a child with a shiny new toy, except we're all adults and the toys are concepts and objects.

Description: The Appeal to Novelty is rooted in our attraction to novelty, excitement, and discovery. We like to think that the new must be improved. And while that's often the case, it's not always true. Like assuming your new smartphone must be better, until you realize the battery life is worse than an antique pocket watch.

Examples: In politics, we often see the Appeal to Novelty at play when voters get excited about a fresh-faced candidate promising groundbreaking reforms, despite a lack of substantive policies or experience.

In religion, the emergence of new spiritual movements or reinterpretations of ancient teachings can attract followers, drawn by the allure of the "new."

In social issues, novel solutions to long-standing problems may be touted as the best without sufficient evidence. For instance, adopting new educational technologies without proper evaluation, just because they're "the future."

Impact: The Appeal to Novelty can lead us to make choices that aren't necessarily the best. We might adopt newer, untested technologies, or discard established, effective strategies merely because they're "old."

Related Biases: This bias is an antithesis to the Appeal to Tradition, where old is seen as gold. It also shares its lineage with the Bandwagon Effect, where popularity dictates our preferences.

Countermeasures: To combat the Appeal to Novelty, we should evaluate the merits of ideas, technologies, or strategies based on evidence, not their age. Always remember, new doesn't automatically mean better.

Key Takeaways: The Appeal to Novelty reflects our fondness for the "new." By valuing evidence and substance over novelty, we can make more informed, rational decisions.

References:

Baron, J. (2008). Thinking and Deciding, 4th ed. Cambridge University Press.

Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, Fast and Slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Meyer, R. (2014). The Appeal of the New: A bias in our decision making? In B. Todd (Ed.), How to decide what to do (pp. 77–84). CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

Argument from Repetition (Argument Ad Nauseam)

Definition: The Argument from Repetition is a cognitive bias where repeated statements are perceived as more truthful than they actually are. In other words, if you say something enough times, it starts to sound like a catchy song you can't get out of your head, or worse, it begins to sound true.

Description: The power of repetition can't be underestimated. The underlying mechanism here is the 'illusory truth effect,' which describes our tendency to believe information to be correct after repeated exposure. This bias acts like an annoying dinner guest who won't stop talking about their pet theory. You might not agree at first, but after the fifth explanation, you begin to question your sanity and their point starts to make an eerie amount of sense.

Examples: In politics, repetitive campaign slogans ("Make America Great Again") can create a perceived truth among constituents, regardless of the factual basis.

Religion often uses repetition, with prayers, mantras, or doctrines repeated until they are accepted without question.

Socially, stereotypes can perpetuate through society via repetitive assertions, regardless of their truth.

Impact: This bias can distort our perception of truth, swaying public opinion, reinforcing stereotypes, and creating dogmatic beliefs. You might end up voting for a candidate

you otherwise wouldn't or believing in a stereotype that doesn't hold water.

Related Biases: The Continued Influence Effect, where discredited information continues to influence our thinking, and the Mere Exposure Effect, where we develop a preference for things merely because they're familiar, are close cousins.

Countermeasures: Healthy skepticism and fact-checking can keep this bias in check. Just because something is repeated doesn't make it true.

Key Takeaways: The Argument from Repetition demonstrates the power of repetition in shaping our beliefs. Remember, truth is not a function of repetition.

References:

Hasher, L., Goldstein, D., & Toppino, T. (1977). Frequency and the conference of referential validity. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 16(1), 107-112.

Fazio, L. K., Brashier, N. M., Payne, B. K., & Marsh, E. J. (2015). Knowledge does not protect against illusory truth. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 144(5), 993–1002.

Schwarz, N., Sanna, L. J., Skurnik, I., & Yoon, C. (2007). Metacognitive experiences and the intricacies of setting people straight: Implications for debiasing and public information campaigns. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 39, 127–161.

Association Fallacy

Definition: The Association Fallacy, or guilt by association, is a cognitive bias where the qualities of one thing are inaccurately attributed to another due to their association. It's like assuming your neighbor's cat must be evil because it hangs out with the raccoons.

Description: This bias emerges from our penchant to create mental shortcuts, or heuristics. We tend to believe that things, people, or ideas associated with something negative (or positive) must also share those qualities, kind of like the dubious assumption that wearing a lab coat automatically makes one a genius.

Examples:

In politics, politicians are often either praised or criticized based on the people they associate with, rather than their actual policies.

In religion, one may be viewed as a "sinner" simply by associating with individuals deemed to be such by a religious community.

In social issues, if a person hangs out with a group known for a negative stereotype, they may be unjustly attributed those same characteristics.

Impact: This bias can lead to unfair judgments, stereotypes, and discrimination. It can create guilt by association and can promote the spread of misinformation.

Related Biases: The Halo Effect, where one positive attribute is generalized to all attributes of an individual, and

the Horn Effect, its negative counterpart, are siblings of the Association Fallacy.

Countermeasures: Critical thinking and not jumping to conclusions can mitigate this bias. Remember, correlation does not mean causation.

Key Takeaways: The Association Fallacy reminds us that associations can be misleading, and qualities don't always transfer by association. Keep your judgments based on individual merits, not company kept.

References:

McElroy, T., & Seta, J. (2003). Framing effects: An analytic–holistic perspective. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 39(6), 610-617.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. Science, 185(4157), 1124–1131.

Association-Transfer Bias

Definition: The Association-Transfer Bias is a cognitive bias where emotions linked to one stimulus are transferred to another through association. It's a bit like getting mad at your office chair because your boss yelled at you while you were sitting on it.

Description: This bias stems from the way our brains process information. We create connections between stimuli and the emotions they evoke, sometimes resulting in the emotions linked to one stimulus being applied to another, unrelated one. It's like the blame game in our brains, where unrelated things are blamed for emotions they didn't cause.

Examples: In the realm of religion, an individual might associate negative feelings towards a particular belief system because of a negative experience with a single adherent.

In politics, a scandal involving a politician from one party might result in negative emotions being transferred to all politicians from that party.

On social issues, if a person has a negative experience with an individual from a certain demographic, they might transfer these negative emotions to the entire group, fueling stereotypes and prejudices.

Impact: The Association-Transfer Bias can contribute to misunderstandings, stereotyping, and discrimination. It can also impact relationships and decision-making processes negatively.

Related Biases: The Association Fallacy and the Halo Effect bear a family resemblance to the Association-Transfer Bias.

Countermeasures: Being aware of the bias and engaging in mindful thinking can help keep this bias in check. Always analyze the root of your emotions to ensure they're directed at the right source.

Key Takeaways: Association-Transfer Bias is a good reminder that misplaced emotions can distort our perspective. So, the next time you're upset with your boss, remember it's not your chair's fault.

References:

Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2006). Associative and propositional processes in evaluation: An integrative review of implicit and explicit attitude change. Psychological Bulletin, 132(5), 692–731.

Zajonc, R. B. (1980). Feeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences. American Psychologist, 35(2), 151–175.

Attentional Bias

Definition: Attentional Bias is the brain's tendency to pay more attention to certain stimuli, somewhat like a picky eater who only sees the broccoli on a plate full of delicacies.

Description: This cognitive bias involves our attention being disproportionately drawn to certain factors while others are ignored or marginalized. It's like our mind has a spotlight, and whatever it illuminates gets all the focus, regardless of whether it deserves it or not.

Examples: In religious contexts, an adherent may focus on passages that support their belief and ignore ones that present challenges, leading to a skewed understanding of the text.

Politically, people might pay more attention to news items that align with their views and disregard information that contradicts them. It's like reading only every other line of a story and claiming to understand it fully.

In social issues, someone might concentrate on negative news about a particular demographic, fostering an unfair bias against the entire group.

Impact: Attentional Bias can lead to a narrow view of the world, as well as polarized opinions and ignorance of broader contexts. It's a dream come true for misinformation and a nightmare for nuanced understanding.

Related Biases: Confirmation Bias and Selection Bias share a bunk bed with Attentional Bias in the dormitory of cognitive biases.

Countermeasures: Cultivate awareness of the bias and intentionally seek out diverse information sources. It might feel like forcing yourself to eat broccoli, but it's good for you.

Key Takeaways: Attentional Bias reminds us that what we focus on shapes our perception and understanding. It's worth questioning if our spotlight is casting light on the whole picture or just a fragment.

References:

MacLeod, C., Mathews, A., & Tata, P. (1986). Attentional bias in emotional disorders. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 95(1), 15–20.

Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and cognitive performance: Attentional control theory. Emotion, 7(2), 336–353.

End of the free sample

You have just read the introduction and the first ten biases of *The Biased Brain* by Bo Bennett, PhD.

The complete ebook (EPUB and PDF) is available direct from the author at

bobennett.com/bookstore