The Self-Serving Bias

Ask the winner of a contest why they won and you will hear about skill, effort, and preparation. Ask the loser and you will hear about bad luck, unfair conditions, or a flawed test. This asymmetry is the self-serving bias: the tendency to attribute one's successes to internal causes such as ability and effort, while attributing one's failures to external causes such as circumstance, other people, or chance. The bias protects and enhances self-esteem, and it operates quietly and sincerely; the person displaying it is not lying but genuinely sees events in a self-flattering light. For the law, that last point is what makes the bias important. It describes a normal, motivated slant in how people who were involved in an event come to understand and report their own role in it, a slant that shapes the testimony of parties and participants without any conscious intent to deceive.

This paper explains what the self-serving bias is, the research that documents it, the competing accounts of why it occurs, and the conditions under which it weakens or disappears. It closes by locating the bias precisely: it bears most on how an involved person attributes responsibility and causation, and far less on the perception of neutral facts, and it applies with equal force to every party in a dispute.

What the Self-Serving Bias Is

The bias was brought into focus by Miller and Ross (1975), who reviewed the evidence that people take credit for success and deflect blame for failure and asked a question that still organizes the field: is this pattern motivational, a defense of the ego, or merely cognitive, a byproduct of ordinary reasoning? Whatever its source, the pattern itself is among the best-documented findings in social psychology. The most comprehensive assessment, a meta-analysis of 266 studies by Mezulis, Abramson, Hyde, and Hankin (2004), found a large overall effect: people reliably make more internal, stable, and global attributions for good outcomes than for bad ones. The bias appears across the settings in which people evaluate their own conduct, including work, school, relationships, sport, and driving, and it is robust enough that its presence in self-report about a contested event should be treated as the norm rather than the exception.

Why It Happens: Motivation and Cognition

Two broad families of explanation are in play, and current understanding holds that both contribute (Shepperd, Malone, & Sweeny, 2008). Motivational accounts locate the bias in the need to maintain self-esteem and to present oneself well to others; on this view, the bias is a form of ego protection, and it should grow stronger when the self is more threatened. That prediction is borne out: a meta-analysis by Campbell and Sedikides (1999) found that the self-serving bias is magnified precisely when a person's self-image is under threat. Cognitive accounts, by contrast, hold that the asymmetry can arise from ordinary information processing, for example, because people expect to succeed and so treat success as confirming and failure as anomalous. The two kinds of explanation are not mutually exclusive, and for legal purposes the practical lesson is the same under either: a person evaluating an outcome that reflects on them is systematically inclined to read it in their own favor, and that inclination intensifies as the stakes to their self-image rise, exactly the conditions present when one is accused of wrongdoing or blamed for harm.

Boundaries: Where the Bias Weakens

An accurate account must stress that the self-serving bias is a tendency, not a universal law, and that it has well-mapped boundaries. It is markedly attenuated, and sometimes reversed, in depression: the same meta-analysis found the bias far smaller in people with psychopathology than in those without, consistent with the long-observed pattern that depressed individuals are less likely to flatter themselves in their attributions (Mezulis et al., 2004). It varies across cultures,

tending to be weaker in collectivistic settings that discourage self-promotion than in individualistic ones. And it is softened in close relationships, where people extend to intimate others some of the charity they show themselves (Sedikides, Campbell, Reeder, & Elliot, 1998). These boundaries matter in court for two reasons. They caution against assuming that any particular witness is in the grip of the bias, since individuals and situations differ widely, and they remind the fact-finder that the bias is a feature of normal psychology rather than a marker of bad character.

The Self-Serving Bias and Testimony

The bias is relevant to legal fact-finding in a specific and limited way. It operates chiefly on attributions of responsibility and causation by people who were themselves involved in the event, and much less on the perception or recall of neutral details that carry no implication for the self. A participant in a collision, an altercation, a transaction, or a workplace accident is, on average, inclined to recount their own conduct as reasonable and to locate the cause of any harm in others or in circumstance, while an uninvolved observer of the same event distributes responsibility more evenly. This actor-and-observer divergence is a recognized expression of the bias, and it sharpens as the consequences, and thus the threat to self-image, grow more serious. Two cautions keep the point neutral and honest. First, the self-serving bias describes sincere, motivated framing, not deliberate deception; an account colored by it is not a lie, and the witness typically believes it fully. Second, the bias applies to all involved parties alike, complainants, defendants, and civil litigants, so it is not evidence for or against any side, but a general reason to weigh self-implicating attributions of blame against independent evidence rather than accepting any involved party's allocation of responsibility at face value.

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, the self-serving bias is most relevant to the accounts of involved parties who have an interest in how responsibility is allocated, including defendants who attribute their conduct to provocation, necessity, or circumstance rather than to their own choices. The prosecution is well positioned to help the trier of fact see that such externalizing attributions are a predictable feature of how people protect self-image under threat, and that they intensify precisely when the stakes are highest, so that a self-exculpating account need not be a calculated fabrication to be unreliable as a measure of actual responsibility. The error to guard against is treating the bias as a one-way tool. It operates on the State's witnesses as well, including complainants and involved officers, whose attributions of blame may also tilt self-favorably and sincerely; and because the bias is attenuated in depression and varies by person and culture, it cannot be assumed to grip any particular witness. The sound course is to corroborate contested attributions of cause and fault against physical evidence and disinterested testimony rather than to rely on, or to attack, any involved party's framing alone.

Special Issues for Defense

For the defense, the self-serving bias bears on the weight of testimony from any party with a stake in how fault is assigned, including complainants and witnesses whose accounts cast their own conduct favorably and attribute harm to the accused. The defense is well positioned to remind the trier of fact that people involved in a disputed event tend, sincerely and without conscious deceit, to recount their own role as reasonable and to externalize blame, and that this tendency grows with the seriousness of the consequences. The corresponding error to guard against is overclaiming. The bias is a population-level tendency with real exceptions, weaker or absent in some individuals, in depression, and in some cultural contexts, so its existence does not establish that any particular witness has shaded their account, and it applies to the defendant's own self-favoring attributions as much as to anyone's. Responsible cross-examination and expert testimony should use the bias to explain why self-implicating allocations of responsibility deserve testing against independent evidence, not to assert that a given witness must be mistaken or insincere.

References

Campbell, W. K., & Sedikides, C. (1999). Self-threat magnifies the self-serving bias: A meta-analytic integration. Review of General Psychology, 3(1), 23–43. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.3.1.23

Mezulis, A. H., Abramson, L. Y., Hyde, J. S., & Hankin, B. L. (2004). Is there a universal positivity bias in attributions? A meta-analytic review of individual, developmental, and cultural differences in the self-serving attributional bias. Psychological Bulletin, 130(5), 711–747. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.130.5.711

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

Sedikides, C., Campbell, W. K., Reeder, G. D., & Elliot, A. J. (1998). The self-serving bias in relational context. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(2), 378–386. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.2.378

Shepperd, J., Malone, W., & Sweeny, K. (2008). Exploring causes of the self-serving bias. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2(2), 895–908. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00078.x

Legal Authorities

Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993).

Frye v. United States, 293 F. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923).

Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael, 526 U.S. 137 (1999).

Related topic papers: Egocentric Bias · The Self-Reference Effect · Hindsight Bias · Consistency Bias · Confirmation Bias