Egocentric Bias

People remember the past with themselves at the center of it. Egocentric bias is the tendency to recall one's own role in a shared experience more readily and more favorably than the roles of others — to overweight one's own contributions, to remember the past in a self-enhancing way, and to see one's own perspective as the natural measure of what was fair, normal, or right. The classic illustration is the fisherman who sincerely "remembers" landing a bigger fish than he actually caught. The bias matters in law because so much litigation turns on accounts of shared events — who said what in a negotiation, who did what in an altercation, who was responsible for an accident — and because each participant's memory of such an event is shaped, without their awareness, to favor their own part in it. This is not lying; it is a normal feature of how the self organizes memory. This paper explains what egocentric bias is, the research that documents it, why it occurs, and how it bears on the evaluation of testimony. It assumes no background in psychology, and the science here favors no party.

What Egocentric Bias Is

Egocentric bias reflects the prominent role the self plays in encoding and retrieving episodic memories. Because our own thoughts, intentions, and actions are experienced directly and vividly, they are laid down more richly and retrieved more easily than the thoughts and actions of others, and the past is reconstructed with the self in the foreground. The memory researcher Daniel Schacter classifies this among the "seven sins" of memory — specifically the sin of "bias," in which current knowledge, beliefs, and the needs of the self distort recollection (Schacter, Chiao, & Mitchell, 2003). The distortion is typically self-enhancing: people tend to remember the past as they would like it to have been, casting their own conduct in a flattering light.

Egocentric bias overlaps with, but is broader than, simple self-serving bias. Self-serving bias is the tendency to take credit for good outcomes and deflect blame for bad ones. Egocentric bias includes that tendency but is rooted in something more basic — the greater availability of one's own contributions — so that people sometimes over-attribute their own responsibility even for negative group outcomes, because their own actions, good or bad, are simply more accessible to memory than anyone else's.

The Foundational Evidence: Availability and Attribution

Michael Ross and Fiore Sicoly first established the phenomenon in a landmark series of studies (Ross & Sicoly, 1979). Across five experiments — with married couples, intercollegiate basketball players, and discussion groups — they found a consistent pattern: people recalled their own contributions to a joint product more frequently and more easily than they recalled others' contributions, and they claimed more responsibility for the group's output than their fellow participants were willing to attribute to them. When the partners' responsibility estimates were added together, the total routinely exceeded one hundred percent, because each person was counting their own role twice over relative to how others saw it.

Ross and Sicoly traced the effect to the availability heuristic — the mind's tendency to judge by what comes most readily to mind. One's own efforts are more available than another's, so they loom larger in the reconstruction of who did what. The studies also probed the mechanism directly. The bias was attenuated, though not eliminated, when the group's product was negatively evaluated, consistent with a motivational component. And when the experimenters deliberately made a partner's contributions more available to a participant, that participant shifted responsibility toward the partner — demonstrating that what drives the bias is, in large part, whose contributions are easiest to recall.

Fairness, Consensus, and Ethics

The self-centeredness of memory and judgment extends well beyond the tally of contributions. In perceptions of fairness, people apply a standard tilted toward themselves: in one study, participants judged overpayment to themselves as more fair than the identical overpayment to someone else, and underpayment to themselves as more unfair than the same underpayment to another (Greenberg, 1983). Notably, this egocentric standard disappeared when participants were made self-aware by being seated before a mirror — under that condition they judged all inequities as equally unfair, suggesting that the bias yields to deliberate self-scrutiny.

Egocentric bias also shapes estimates of consensus, the sense that others share one's own views and choices — a tendency that persists even when accurate estimation is financially rewarded, indicating it is driven substantially by perceptual distortion rather than mere wishful thinking (Mullen, 1983). It reaches moral judgment as well: people tend to conclude that self-interested outcomes are not only desirable but morally justified, a pattern Epley and Caruso (2004) term "egocentric ethics" and attribute partly to automatic, unconscious processes rather than deliberate rationalization. The bias is not peculiar to any one culture; egocentric distortions of fairness have been documented across the United States, Europe, and Japan (Tanaka, 1993). What unites these findings is that the self serves as the default reference point, quietly bending memory and judgment in its own favor.

Reducing the Bias

Egocentric bias is a normal feature of cognition, not a defect of particular people, and it cannot simply be willed away. But the research identifies conditions that lessen it. Making others' contributions genuinely available — for instance, reviewing a record of what each person actually did or said — reduces the over-attribution to the self (Ross & Sicoly, 1979). Deliberate self-awareness has a similar corrective effect (Greenberg, 1983). The practical lesson for any setting that depends on accurate accounts of shared events is that the antidote to egocentric memory is external: contemporaneous records and the perspectives of other participants, rather than reliance on a single party's recollection of their own role.

Egocentric Bias and the Law

Egocentric bias is most consequential in law wherever a case rests on competing accounts of a shared event. In a contract dispute, each negotiator tends to recall their own statements and concessions more fully than the other side's. In an altercation, each participant remembers their own conduct as more measured and the other's as more aggressive. In an accident, each driver recalls their own care and the other's carelessness. In a joint enterprise, each member credits themselves with more of the work — or, when things go wrong, may over-attribute responsibility in either direction because their own actions are the most vivid. These divergences are predictable and, crucially, sincere: two honest witnesses to the same event can give genuinely different accounts not because either is lying but because each reconstructed the event from the privileged vantage point of the self.

The implication is not that party testimony is worthless but that it should be weighed with this systematic tilt in mind, and corroborated where possible by contemporaneous records and disinterested accounts rather than accepted at face value. This bears on the apportionment of fault, on the credibility of conflicting party witnesses, and on perceptions of fairness in negotiation and settlement. Where the issue is contested, expert explanation of egocentric bias may assist the trier of fact, subject to the general standards for expert evidence — Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals (1993), as extended by Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael (1999), or the Frye general-acceptance test still followed in some jurisdictions (Frye v. United States, 1923) — and to the requirement that a witness testify only from personal knowledge (Fed. R. Evid. 602). Like the other memory biases, it describes a general tendency that informs the evaluation of testimony rather than proving any particular account false.

Special Issues in Legal Practice

The principles described above apply with equal force to every party in a legal proceeding. Memory operates the same way regardless of who is asking the questions, and the science summarized here favors no side. What differs between the parties is not the science but the vantage point — the particular places where memory issues tend to surface, and the particular errors each party is best positioned to guard against. The two summaries below identify those recurring issues. They are offered for orientation, not as litigation strategy; in every case the controlling question is what the evidence in that case will, and will not, support, and the expert's role is to inform the trier of fact rather than to advocate for either side.

Special Issues for Prosecutors

For the State, egocentric bias is most likely to surface in accounts of shared events — an altercation, a group encounter, a transaction — where a complainant or witness reconstructs their own role more vividly and more favorably than the roles of others. The error best guarded against is treating a participant's self-favoring recollection of who did what as an objective record, when honest egocentric tilt can lead a witness to recall their own conduct as more measured and another's as more provocative, and to over- or under-state their own part. Seeking corroboration independent of any single participant — contemporaneous records, neutral witnesses, physical evidence — and interviewing participants separately so their accounts are not blended, help the State build a picture of a shared event that does not rest on one person's egocentric vantage point.

Understood this way, attention to the bias strengthens the State's case. An account of a joint event that is corroborated by disinterested evidence is far more durable than one resting on a participant's recollection of their own role, and recognizing that all participants, including the State's witnesses, view the event egocentrically keeps the evidence in proper proportion.

Special Issues for Defense

For the defense, the recurring task is to recognize that every participant in a shared event — complainant, co-defendant, and accused alike — remembers it from a self-centered vantage point. The issue most likely to surface is reliance on a complainant's or co-participant's account that casts their own conduct favorably and the accused's unfavorably, where egocentric bias predicts exactly that asymmetry without any need for deliberate falsehood. The error best guarded against is overclaiming — treating egocentric bias as proof that a particular account is fabricated, when it describes a normal tendency rather than a finding about an individual, and the accused's own recollection is subject to the same bias. Comparing each participant's account against contemporaneous records and neutral evidence, and probing where each person's own role is most vivid, is the sounder course.

The corresponding safeguard is to ensure the trier of fact understands the science: that people recall their own contributions more readily and favorably than others'; that responsibility for shared events is routinely over-attributed to the self in memory; and that sincere, confident, conflicting accounts of the same event are the expected result, not a sign that someone must be lying. Where admissible, expert explanation of egocentric bias can help the factfinder weigh competing party accounts in light of the self-centered way memory reconstructs shared events.

References

Epley, N., & Caruso, E. M. (2004). Egocentric ethics. Social Justice Research, 17(2), 171–187. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SORE.0000027408.72713.45

Greenberg, J. (1983). Overcoming egocentric bias in perceived fairness through self-awareness. Social Psychology Quarterly, 46(2), 152–156. https://doi.org/10.2307/3033851

Mullen, B. (1983). Egocentric bias in estimates of consensus. Journal of Social Psychology, 121(1), 31–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1983.9924463

Ross, M., & Sicoly, F. (1979). Egocentric biases in availability and attribution. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37(3), 322–336. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.37.3.322
Schacter, D. L., Chiao, J. Y., & Mitchell, J. P. (2003). The seven sins of memory: Implications for self. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1001, 226–239. https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1279.012
Tanaka, K. (1993). Egocentric bias in perceived fairness: Is it observed in Japan? Social Justice Research, 6(3), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01054462

Legal Authorities

Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993).
Federal Rule of Evidence 602.
Frye v. United States, 293 F. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923).
Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael, 526 U.S. 137 (1999).

Related topic papers: Reconstruction and Recall · Consistency Bias · Confirmation Bias · Memory for Oral Communications · Autobiographical Memory · Why Accounts Change Over Time