

Planning fallacy and its relationship to the false consensus effect

¹Nagham Hadi Hussein Al-Khafaji, ²Dr. Saad Abdul-Zahra Al-Hasnawi

¹*Al-Qadisiyah University, College of Arts, nagham.hadi@qu.edu.iq*

²*Al-Mustansiriya University, College of Arts*

Abstract

Exceeding deadlines and budgets occurs frequently in our daily lives, and this may be due to a failure to accurately predict the time, costs, and efforts we will need to complete a task or project, despite the knowledge that previous similar tasks took longer, costs, and efforts in general. Cognitive psychologists and social psychologists called this the planning fallacy, as many of us fall prey to the planning fallacy, (Buehler & etal, 1994: 366), whether it is in social plans, work projects, or anything on the personal to-do list, (Gilovich & etal, 2002:4). The literature has indicated the spread of the planning fallacy in multiple areas, as the underestimation of the importance of time and costs to complete personal, academic, and work-related tasks has been documented in a wide range of studies. The academy among students (Buehler&etal, 1994:370). Roy and colleagues argue that the planning fallacy is due to memory bias. (Roy&etal, 2005:738) Bezo et al. argue that the reason people make optimistic estimates is their desire to make a good impression on others.

Keywords: psychologists, false consensus, fallacy.

INTRODUCTION

Research problem:

Exceeding deadlines and budgets occurs frequently in our daily lives, and this may be due to a failure to accurately predict the time, costs, and efforts we will need to complete a task or project, despite the knowledge that previous similar tasks took longer, costs, and efforts in general. Cognitive psychologists and social psychologists called this the planning fallacy, as many of us fall prey to the planning fallacy, (Buehler & etal, 1994: 366), whether it is in social plans, work projects, or anything on the personal to-do list, (Gilovich & etal, 2002:4). The literature has indicated the spread of the planning fallacy in multiple areas, as the underestimation of the importance of time and costs to complete personal, academic, and work-related tasks has been documented in a wide range of studies. The academy among students (Buehler&etal, 1994:370). Roy and

colleagues argue that the planning fallacy is due to memory bias. (Roy&etal, 2005:738) Bezo et al. argue that the reason people make optimistic estimates is their desire to make a good impression on others. (Pezzo&etal, 2006:1360) Individuals may also seek to enhance themselves, or improve their self-esteem, by interpreting, distorting, or ignoring information gained through social comparison (whether with their past experiences or with the experiences and experiences of others) to see themselves more positively and to serve their goals in Self-enhancement and self-esteem. (Festinger, 1954:21) This may be related to the false consensus effect that drives people to seek self-enhancement, as it leads people to assume that others think and act the same way they do, even when this is not the case. It leads people to believe that their values, thoughts and behaviors are normal and that the majority of people share the same opinions, thoughts and judgments, which becomes a reinforcement for

them and their decisions, judgments and plans. (Edward, 1995:32) and that the effect of this false consensus has an effect on future behavior, as individuals' perceptions of behavior standards affect their behavior, and this was confirmed by Botfen's study (1992), which clearly showed that the effect of false consensus can affect Behaviour, where it was found that students with the highest false-consensus effect, smoking prevalence estimates were more likely to smoke or start smoking. (Botvin, 1992: 296) and the study of Sherman et al. (1983) which indicated that there is a relationship between the effect of false consensus and cigarette smoking. ((Sherman&etal, 1983:198 .)

The fallacy of planning and not planning accurately to complete tasks and duties is a serious problem that disrupts students' energies towards doing their homework. As individuals who do not devote enough time to complete their tasks, the pressures, duties and tasks that are not completed on time are exacerbated by them. (Buehler & etal, 1994:367), which leads to future harms and is reflected in the dimensions of personal and social life as a whole, as the study of Abu Sheikha (1991) indicates that the mismanagement of time negatively affects work and social relations, as well as helps the spread of some bad habits, the most important of which is Laziness, apathy, lack of commitment, lack of responsibility. (Al-Tah, 2016: 206) The study of Ferrari et al. found that the poor ability of the university student to manage and organize his time leads to academic procrastination. (Díaz-Morales, 2008, 554) Therefore, students who are characterized by poor time management and organization suffer from many academic problems, as they feel effort and great psychological pressure, distress, and annoyance quickly, and the accumulation of academic duties, and may face poor mental health and academic failure. (Al-Zahrani, 2010, 5) Thus, the researcher concludes that the study variables have a serious impact on the lives of university students in general and graduate students in particular, because at this stage they are going through a complex mixture of performances with different priorities and

different dates for completion, which requires good planning of time and effort. The costs required to complete the tasks and duties assigned to them. Based on the foregoing, the problem of the current research is manifested by highlighting the possible relationship between the planning fallacy and the effect of false consensus.

research importance:

Planning is a process of thinking about what needs to be done, and it includes setting goals in the future, how and when to do this, and drawing the necessary ways and steps to achieve them, (Al-Najjar, 2008: 85). And that planning is very important in personal life, because it helps individuals to organize their own time and make good use of it. It is necessary to organize time, and it is important in making a clear plan in front of the person in order to make an appropriate balance among those aspects of his different life (Zuaibi, 2014: 28-29). Planning is a human activity and a rational choice directed at future action only. (Saddar and Zadariah, 2016: 6) The focus on the future - and the consequent neglect of the past - is a feature of the planning process. (Buehler & etal, 2010:24) Planning requires accuracy in predicting the direction of events and a great deal of clarity of vision, or what things will be like in the future. (Zuaibi, 2014: 28) As accurate forecasts allow individuals to plan effectively. (Buehler & etal, 1994: 368) and that inaccurate predictions affect planning, which leads to the planning fallacy. Kahneman & Tversky, 1982:127)) The planning fallacy refers to a specific form of optimistic bias in which people underestimate the time, costs, and effort it will take to complete an upcoming task even though they are fully aware that similar tasks have taken more time, more money, and more effort in the past. (Buehler & etal, 1994:366) and that poor judgment or a tendency to underestimate task completion times has important practical implications. Governments, companies, and individuals spend a great deal of time, money, and effort trying to predict how long projects will take to complete. (Buehler&etal,1994:367) In daily life, the inaccurate predictions of individuals affect planning in one way or another, which

leads to the occurrence of the planning fallacy, and that the main result of the planning fallacy is insufficient time management (Kahneman & Tversky, 1982:127)) and bad time management leads This leads to wasting and wasting time, and preventing individuals from performing their work tasks optimally, so they fail to commit to implementation, and they constantly resort to postponement, which generates more psychological pressures and tensions for them, and this negatively affects their working and personal lives. (Adarba, 2006: 3) and that time management and organization is one of the foundations of student success and excellence in terms of study and life in general, as it helps the student to take advantage of the available time to achieve his goals and ambitions, and creates a balance between academic and social life, which brings him success and happiness in his life. Time management also contributes to raising the level of the student's academic achievement, by allocating sufficient time for each subject and its requirements, and working to achieve them successfully. (Al-Momani, 2017: 434) According to Haqi (1995) study, good planning for time management will enable students to carry out all their work and multiple responsibilities in the shortest time and with the least effort. (Fakhro, 2005, 36).

The planning fallacy requires that predictions of completion times for current tasks be more optimistic than beliefs about previous completion times of similar projects and that predictions of completion times of current tasks are more optimistic than the actual time required to complete tasks. This explains the ability of people to hold to two seemingly contradictory beliefs, even though they realize that most of their previous expectations were over-idealistic, they (apparently) believe that their current expectations are realistic. (Buehler & etal, 1994:367) Individuals may be inclined to believe that the general public agrees with them with opinions, judgments, and expectations, whether this belief is true or not. (Ross&etal, 1977:292) They believe that there is a high consensus on their own traits, meaning that individuals tend to see any behavior or trait they possess as relatively common. (Tabachnik&etal, 1983:688) because this

tendency gives them a feeling of confidence and security in their behaviour, decisions and expectations. (Ross&etal, 1977:292) People tend to have a tendency to view their attitudes as normative, and therefore, they sometimes tend to think that others are more like them than they actually are. This is called the false consensus effect, (Edward, 1995:33), whereby people tend to perceive more consensus on their traits, decisions, and expectations in the groups to which they belong than in the groups to which they do not belong. (Krueger&Zeiger, 1993:672) For example, university students, where several studies indicate that college students, have a high level of false consensus effect because they are surrounded by peers (and may experience inference for availability) and because they often assume that they are similar to their peers. (Bauman, 2002:394) This was confirmed by the study of Bunker & Varnum (2021) which was conducted on university students in America who use social media, which indicated that there is a high level of the influence of false consensus on political attitudes and traits. Personal, basic social motives. (Bunker&Varnum,2021:1-7). The current study deals with a sensitive educational stage, which is the master's and doctoral stages (postgraduate studies), in which researchers are trained in scientific research methods, which are the academic cadres that lead the renaissance of society and represent the top of the influential societal pyramid. The fact that postgraduate students will be researchers or faculty members, and they will contribute to achieving the goals of higher education institutions, and preparing the next generation of researchers and future professors. (Al-Shurman, 2010: 532) In light of the previous data, the idea of this study was launched, which deals with the fallacy of planning and its relationship to the effect of false consensus among graduate students, which may have a significant impact in directing attention to this group of society, to improve their efficiency and research and academic capabilities.

Research Objectives:

The current research aims to identify:

- The planning fallacy among graduate students.
- The effect of false consensus among graduate students.
- The correlation between the planning fallacy and the effect of false consensus among graduate students.

Research limits:

The current research is limited to graduate students (Master's, PhD) in both the University of Al-Qadisiyah and the University of Karbala for the academic year 2021-2022, who are in the first year and the second course, and for both sexes.

Define terms:

First: The Planning fallacy: defined : Buehler et al. (1994): It is the tendency to underestimate the time, costs, and effort needed to complete a particular task or project, even when they have significant experience with previous failures of planned schedules for similar tasks and projects. (Buehler&etal,1994:369)

Theoretical definition of the planning fallacy: The definition of (Buehler & etal, 1994) was adopted for several reasons, including that the definition provided a comprehensive picture that includes important details about the planning fallacy, and presented a clear and detailed picture of the variable and its components, which facilitates the measurement process, and is linked to a clear and in-depth theorization of the fallacy. planning, and their theoretical orientation was adopted. As for the procedural definition of the planning fallacy: it is the degree to which the respondent obtains on the planning fallacy scale prepared in the current study.

Second: The effect of false consensus.

Ross et al. (1977): A pervasive cognitive bias in social inferences, which refers to people's tendency to view their choices, behavioral judgments, opinions, and beliefs as relatively common to others and appropriate to existing circumstances. (Ross&etal, 1977:280)

Theoretical definition of the effect of false consensus: The researcher adopted the definition of (Ross & etal1977) for several reasons, including the comprehensiveness of the definition, which includes important details about the effect of false consensus and to provide a clear picture of it, as well as the clarity of the theorizing it adopted. And for the researcher to adopt the theory of the owner of the definition itself. As for the procedural definition of the effect of false consensus: it is the degree that the respondent obtains on the scale of the effect of false consensus prepared in the current study.

Expanded Cognitive Model of the Planning Fallacy (Extended Inner-External Model):

The planning fallacy has been discovered by social psychologists since the term was coined by Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky in 1979. (Buehler&etal, 2005:47) Kahneman and Tversky hypothesize that there is a fallacy in planning. When they noticed that the problem was very common and discovered that behind it all was a cognitive bias of self-deception associated with limitations in the perception of reality. (Buehler&etal, 2010:4) Buehler and colleagues argue that the planning fallacy occurs as a result of wishful thinking. In other words, people believe that tasks will be completed quickly and easily because that is what they wish for. (Buehler&etal, 2005:48) Buehler and colleagues have proposed an explanation for self-bias related to how individuals account for their past performance. By attributing the reason for the success of the tasks that went well to oneself, and blaming the delays on external influences, (Pezzo & etal, 2006:1360). Buehler and colleagues' studies have supported an intrinsic and extrinsic explanation of the planning fallacy. The processes behind the classic model of the planning fallacy were also documented, and then these processes were used to explain the effects of a wider range of variables, leading to an extended model. (Buehler & etal, 2010:21) The mechanisms that may be based on the planning fallacy have also been revealed, as Buehler and his colleagues see that the planning fallacy is attributed to several possible mechanisms. These mechanisms are as follows:

□ Focal biases: People who are overly focused on an event or activity ignore key sources of information, and because other sources of information are ignored, estimates of how long it will take to complete some tasks is specifically inaccurate. (Buehler & Griffin, 2003: 86).

□ Fixation and modification: The planning fallacy may stem from fixation and modification. (Byram, 1997:216) Fixation and modification is a detection prompt that leads us to use a number or value as a starting point that we make adjustments to, and these adjustments may not be enough to reflect the social reality, perhaps because once we get a reasonable value, we stop the process. (Barron and Branccombe, 2015: 114)

□ Focus on plans and the effects of motivation or motives: The role of motivation in reinforcement or exaggeration is a narrow focus on planning for success, whereby motivation in service of the desire to finish tasks quickly leads to a greater focus on future plans and less focus on potential obstacles (for example, problems or other deviations or threats to completion), a form of motivational reasoning or approval bias (Buehler&etal, 2010:28).

The classic model of the false-consensus effect of Ross et al. (1977): Empirical research shows that our understanding of others' attitudes is consistently biased against those we adopt for ourselves. This type of bias leads people to believe that their values and ideas are normal and that the majority of people share the same views. (Locke&etal, 2016:3) Social psychologists Ross, Greene & House, 1977 have described this bias as the tendency for people to view their behavioral choices or judgments as relatively common and appropriate for current circumstances while looking at Alternative responses as uncommon, skewed, and inappropriate. (Ross & etal, 1977: 280) and called it the false consensus effect, and that the classic model of the false consensus effect developed by Ross, Greene & House in (1977) (Ross, Greene & House, 1977), came as a culmination of the related theories that preceded it. The model for the

ideas put forward by two parallel theories of social cognition (Campbell, 1986:281) are the social comparison theory and the projection theory. The literature is imbued with potential explanations for relevant biases in social cognition (eg, putative self-similarity and overestimation of consensus (the 'pseudo-consensus effect'). A systematic review of the pseudo-consensus literature by Marks&Miller, 1987) revealed four underlying mechanisms. Behind the effect of false consensus are as follows:

1) Selective exposure and cognitive availability: Selective exposure and cognitive availability indicate that perceptions of similarity are easily affected with any evidence of similarity accessed from memory. Thus increasing the consensus estimates on the preferred position of the individual. And that cases of similarity or agreement are readily available because people usually relate to others who are similar to themselves more than they are different. Friendship groups usually show a high degree of internal similarity in terms of members' beliefs. (Marks&Miller, 1987:74)

2) Emergence and focus: The mechanism of salience and focus indicates that an individual focuses only on his preferred position, which leads to overestimate his popularity, and thus fall victim to the influence of false consensus. That is because this position is the only one in his direct consciousness, and doing an action that promotes the position will make it more prominent and may increase the effect of the false consensus. 283). According to this mechanism, the individual focuses on what is more prominent, which is his position, and if the individual focuses on one situation (his, hers) and not on the alternatives, this focus may increase the consensus on his position because this is the only information in his consciousness. (Marks&Miller, 1987:80)

3) Logical information processing (causal attribution process). Logical information processing machinery refers to reasoning and rational processes as an individual's basic assessments about the similarity between self and others. The process of causal attribution is

an example of such a mechanism, for example, if an individual makes an extrinsic attribution of his belief, he is likely to see his experience with the thing in question as merely a matter of objective experience. For example, a few movie-goers may mistakenly assume that the quality of the film is not good, to explain their dissatisfaction with it, and viewers may say that it was just a bad movie (external attribution). It is logical to assume that everyone else will have the same experience with the film, and here the consensus is high. On the other hand, someone in the same position making an internal attribution (perhaps a movie buff who is well-versed in his particularly high standards) will recognize the subjectivity of experience and will be drawn to the opposite conclusion, and their unanimous appreciation of their experience will be much lower. Although these two situations lead to opposite results, both paths of attribution depend on an initial assumption that then leads to a logical conclusion. Through this reasoning, then, it can be said that the effect of false consensus is in fact a reflection of the logical conclusion. By this logic, then, it can be argued that the pseudo-consensus effect is in fact a reflection of a fundamental error in attribution (specifically actor-observer bias), whereby people prefer external (situational) qualities over internal ones (disposition) to justify their behaviours. (Marks&Miller, 1987:74)

4) catalytic processes. Researchers who discussed the phenomena of false consensus emphasized its motivational function of the individual, and claimed that such biases reinforce and justify the individual's feelings that his behavioral choices are appropriate and rational responses to the requirements of the environment, as well as include responses to self-defense. (Cherry, 2020:1) Motivational processes emphasize the functional value of the cognition and the relative positioning of self and others. Awareness of similarity between self and one's own goals may enhance perceived social support, validation or appropriateness of a situation, and more specifically one may assume greater similarity between self and others when one is less certain of the adequacy or validity of one's position.

Any increase in certainty in attitudes provided by an external consensus would be less important, because situational factors that temporarily reduce self-esteem or self-confidence may also increase perceptions of similarity, and similarly one can project one's beliefs and attitudes to appropriate goals, as opposed to inappropriate ones. Furthermore, when anticipating future interactions between self and others, it may be practical to exaggerate similarity to increase the degree to which one is liked and accepted, which in turn may improve the individual's other outcomes, although these specific motivational processes They undoubtedly overlap with each other to some extent. (Marks&Miller, 1987:73)

Research Methodology and Procedures

First: The research community: The current research community consists of graduate students (Masters and PhD) in both the University of Qadisiyah and the University of Karbala for the academic year (2021-2022) who are in the preparatory year (the second course), and their number is (3531) students distributed on The aforementioned two universities, where the number of students of the University of Al-Qadisiyah reached (1652) male and female students, while the number of students of the University of Karbala reached (1879) male and female students.

Second: The research sample: The current research sample, which amounted to (500) male and female students, was selected from the research community using a stratified random sampling method with a proportional distribution. Of them, (114) male and (120) female students, and (266) male and female students from the University of Karbala, including (140) male and (126) female students, and the percentage of the students of Al-Qadisiyah University was (47%), of whom (49%) were male and (51 %) are females, and the percentage of Karbala University students is (53%), of whom (53%) are males and (47%) are females.

Third: Research tools:

First: The planning fallacy scale:

1) Planning the scale (determining the concept according to the theory adopted in the study): The researcher relied on the theoretical model of Buehler and others (Buehler & etal, 1994) as a theoretical framework in constructing the scale.

2) Develop and formulate scale positions: The researcher has formulated (15) positions for the planning fallacy scale in its initial form, and each situation contains two alternatives. The first alternative (A) represents the planning fallacy, while the second alternative (B) does not represent the planning fallacy, and the researcher has set clear instructions for the scale And I asked the respondent to answer the scale positions frankly and accurately, and that the respondent is not required to mention his name, and that the answer will not be seen by anyone except the researcher, and it is for scientific research purposes only, so that the respondent is assured of the confidentiality of his answer, and that there is no right or wrong answer as far as it is It expresses only his opinion (Abu El-Nil, 1987: 34).

3) Logical analysis of the situations (the validity of the scale positions): for the purpose of achieving this, the scale positions were presented to a number of arbitrators specialized in the field of psychology, numbering (16) arbitrators, to issue their judgments on the extent of their validity, the soundness of their formulation and their suitability for the purpose for which they were established. And judging the validity of the scale's alternatives and what they deem appropriate of modifications. The scale positions in its initial form reached (15) positions, and in light of the arbitrators' opinions and suggestions, the researcher modified the formulation of some positions and some of their alternatives, and one position was excluded, which is sequenced (14), Thus, the scale settled on (14) position. The percentage of agreement between the arbitrators (80%) or more was determined to maintain the scale positions. According to the above, the planning fallacy scale has become composed of (14)

positions, and each position consists of two alternatives (A, B), which are formulated in the form of statements, and one of these statements represents the planning fallacy, which takes alternative (A) and gives a weight of (1), while the other statement It does not represent the planning fallacy, which takes alternative (b) and gives weight (0).

4) Statistical analysis of situations: The statistical analysis of the items aims to verify the accuracy of the standard (psychometric) characteristics of the scale itself, because it depends to a large extent on the characteristics of its items (Esawy, 1999: 335). And the aim of performing the paragraph analysis is to extract the discriminatory power of the paragraphs and to keep the distinct paragraphs in the scale and to exclude the undistinguished paragraphs (Daoud and Abdel Rahman, 1990: 85). The method of the two end groups (external consistency), and the method of the relationship of the paragraph degree to the total score of the scale (internal consistency) are among the appropriate methods in the process of analyzing paragraphs, and the researcher has used them for this purpose as follows:

A. The method of the two end groups (external consistency): To calculate the discriminatory power for each of the positions of the planning fallacy scale, the researcher applied the scale to the research sample of (500) male and female students. After correcting the respondents' responses and calculating the total score for each form of the planning fallacy scale, which amounted to (500) forms, the researcher followed the following steps to calculate the discriminatory power of the planning fallacy scale positions, as follows:

□ Determining the total score for each of the 500 planning fallacy forms.

□ Arranging the forms according to the scores in descending order, starting from the highest score and ending with the lowest score.

□ A percentage of (27%) of the forms with the highest scores were named as the upper group, which amounted to (135) forms, as well as a percentage of (27%) of the forms

with the lowest scores and were called the lower group, which amounted to (135) forms as well. The number of forms subject to analysis is (270) out of (500) forms.

□ Application of the discrimination coefficient equation to extract the

discriminatory power of situations. The calculated value was considered an indicator to distinguish each paragraph by comparing it with the Ebel criterion. And Table (1) shows the degrees of discriminatory power of the positions of the planning fallacy scale in the two-peripheral group method.

Table (1) The discriminatory power of the attitudes of the planning fallacy scale using the two-end group method

indication	discriminating power	Lower group answer (one) 27%	Upper group answer (one) 27%	paragr aph numb er
Function	0.70	41	135	1
Function	0.62	51	135	2
Function	0.57	58	135	3
Function	0.64	48	135	4
Function	0.57	58	135	5
Function	0.53	64	135	6
Function	0.62	51	135	7
Function	0.53	63	135	8
Function	0.48	70	135	9
Function	0.49	69	135	10
Function	0.55	61	135	11
Function	0.40	81	135	12
Function	0.41	79	135	13
Function	0.49	69	135	14

It appears from the above table that all the positions of the scale are statistically significant, as the paragraph that gets the degree (0.30) and above is a (distinctive) function, according to the Ebel criterion (Al-Zobai et al., 1981: 74).

B. The method of the relationship degree of the situation with the total degree of the scale (internal consistency): To verify the validity of the paragraphs of the planning fallacy scale, according to the method of the relationship

degree of the paragraph with the total degree, a correlation coefficient (Point-Bacerial) was calculated between the degree of each paragraph and the total degree of the scale because the answer to the situation is intermittent with a two-fold cut (Ferguson, 1991: 515). The position is considered valid by comparing it with the critical value of the significance of the correlation coefficient, which is (0.088) at the level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (498), and Table (2) illustrates this.

Table (2) The coefficients of sincerity of the positions of the planning fallacy scale through the correlation of the paragraph with the total score of the scale

Indication	correlation coefficient	T	Indication	correlation coefficient	T
Function	0.60	8	Function	0.67	1
Function	0.58	9	Function	0.62	2
Function	0.60	10	Function	0.67	3
Function	0.62	11	Function	0.68	4
Function	0.52	12	Function	0.65	5
Function	0.48	13	Function	0.54	6
Function	0.61	14	Function	0.65	7

It is clear from the above table that all the positions have a relationship to the total score that is statistically significant as it is higher than the critical value of the significance of the correlation coefficient of (0.088) at the level (0.05) (Al-Heldah, 2019: 212).

5. Exploratory factor analysis: Exploratory factor analysis is a statistical method that aims to reduce a number of variables that make up the main variable in question, to a smaller number called factors (Al-Sayed, 1979: 688), and it is used as a strategy to reduce the number of variables or indicators that are used to collect data, such as a questionnaire. , and revealing the common space of significance or meaning (relationship) that you share (the common denominator) (Faraj 2007: 270). As for the planning fallacy variable, the studies and literature reviewed by the researcher did not indicate the presence of factors in the planning fallacy variable. The question that arises is: Are there areas (factors) that can be derived from the planning fallacy scale in proportion to the characteristics of the research community? This is what we will find out using factor analysis of the same data on which attitude discrimination was performed. Therefore, the researcher used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), and relied on the basic components method, which is one of the most widely used and accurate methods, because it leads to the extraction of accurate and clear saturations, and that each factor extracts the maximum amount of variance (Abu Hatab and Sadiq, 1991: 622) . The researcher

also relied on the Kaiser Criterion to determine the factors, which depends on the size of the variance expressed by the factor. It is better to obtain a factor whose latent root is not less than one (1), and the source of its variance is more than one paragraph, and then it is an expressive factor of Common Variation (Guttman, 1954:190). And that the indicative factors in this method are the factors whose potential root is equal to or greater than one (1), and that the size of saturations in that factor is not less than (0.30), and if it is less, it is excluded, that is, the factor whose latent root is less About one, which indicates a small amount of variance in the original variables themselves, it is better to exclude it because it is not significant in the factor analysis (Abu El-Nile, 1987: 420), and this procedure will be taken as a standard in the factor analysis for this scale and subsequent measures. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the scale positions, and the researcher used the basic components method on the research sample of (500) male and female students. 1987: 400), which indicates that the size of the research sample is suitable for factor analysis. The positions of the planning fallacy scale (14) represented a variable used in the process of factor analysis, and the factor analysis process resulted in (3) factors arranged in descending order in terms of their contribution to the calculated socialism, and the latent root of the first factor whose contribution to the total of the socialism is equal to (5.20), which It explains the amount of (37.16) of the explained variance, while the latent root of the remaining factors is less than

one (1). Then the researcher used Varimax rotation method to identify the saturation of the paragraphs in this factor, and based on the Thurston criterion, which emphasized the importance of the paragraph being saturated in a way that has practical significance in a particular factor and weak in other factors (Abu El-Nile, 1987: 433), and to judge the value of saturation The factoriality of the variables (attitudes) of practical significance, saturation is considered close to zero if it is less than (0.30), and the researcher used this as a criterion on the basis of which the variables (attitudes) are accepted in the factor. The planning fallacy scale has maintained its global structure consisting of one factor, as it was found that all situations have psychological meanings and are saturated with this factor according to the previous criterion that was referred to, and as shown in the matrix of factors for the planning fallacy scale after rotation in Table (3).

Table (3) Factor matrix for post-cycling planning fallacy scale

First factor	Paragraph sequence in scale
0.68	1
0.61	2
0.68	3
0.69	4
0.66	5
0.51	6
0.66	7
0.60	8
0.57	9
0.60	10
0.64	11
0.52	12
0.46	13
0.61	14
5.20	latent root
37.16	Explained variance

From the foregoing, it appears that the result of the exploratory factor analysis of the planning fallacy scale resulted in one general factor and that this factor explains the amount of (37.16%)

of the total variance, and this factor has been saturated with (14) positions, and by reading these positions we see that they deal with a specific characteristic It is the planning fallacy, and thus the scale of the planning fallacy in its final form has one factor and consists of (14) positions.

A - Indicators of honesty:

The researcher used several indicators of honesty, which are as follows:

1) Apparent honesty: This type of honesty was achieved in the scale of planning fallacy when the positions were presented to a group of arbitrators specialized in the field of psychology, as mentioned previously.

2) Construction honesty: This type of honesty is provided through the following indicators:

a) Extraction of discrimination by the method of the two end groups, as mentioned previously.

b) Extracting the correlation of the degree of the situation with the total degree of the scale, as mentioned previously.

B. Stability indicators: The researcher extracted the stability of the planning fallacy scale in two ways, as follows:

- First: Internal consistency (Keowder-Richardson method (20): The stability of the planning fallacy scale was extracted using the Keuder-Richardson method (20) due to the fact that the scale is two-way, and the reliability coefficient reached (0.87), which is good stability, as the stability coefficient that It is reliable, according to Likert, from (0.62 - 0.93) (Al-Sayed, 1971: 413).

- Second: The external consistency method (Test-Retest): The researcher applied the planning fallacy scale to extract stability in this way on a sample of (100) male and female students.

Description of the scale, its correction and the calculation of the total score: The planning fallacy scale in its final form consisted of (14) situations, in the light of which the students

respond to two alternatives to answer (A, B), and alternative (A) is given one score, while alternative (B) is given zero, and thus The theoretical range for the highest score that a student can obtain is (14), and the lowest score is (0), with a hypothetical average of (7).

Third, the measure of the impact of false consensus: The researcher built a measure of the impact of false consensus, and the researcher followed the following steps in building the scale:

1) Planning the scale: The theoretical model of Ross et al. (1977) was adopted as a theoretical framework in constructing the scale.

2) Develop and formulate paragraphs of the false consensus impact scale: The researcher has formulated (18) items for the false consensus impact scale in its initial form, and each paragraph contains two parts of the alternatives: the first part: for the questioned person, they are two alternatives (yes, no). Part Two: Regarding the people surrounding the respondent, and from the respondent's point of view, they are also alternatives (the point of view of my colleagues agrees with this point of view, the point of view of my colleagues differs with this point of view). Whatever the respondent's answer is (yes) or (no), it is possible for him to choose any of the other two alternatives to the extent to which his colleagues' point of view agrees or differs with his choice according to his point of view. Note that the alternatives (yes, no) are not used in the measurement, only to determine the presence of the trait or behavioral option or not in the respondent, and that the alternatives that determine the effect of false consensus or not are the two alternatives (the point of view of my colleagues agrees with this point of view, the point of view of my colleagues differs With this point of view), that is, when the point of view of colleagues agrees with the point of view of the respondent, there will be a false consensus effect here. The researcher has set clear instructions for the scale, and asked the respondent to answer the paragraphs of the scale frankly, honestly and accurately, and that the respondent is not required to mention his name, and that the answer will not be seen by

anyone but the researcher, and it is for the purposes of scientific research only, so that the respondent is assured of the confidentiality of his answer, and that he does not There is a right answer and another wrong as far as expressing his opinion only.

3) Logical analysis of the paragraphs (the validity of the paragraphs of the scale): To achieve this, the paragraphs of the scale were presented to a number of arbitrators specialized in the field of psychology, numbering (16) arbitrators. The researcher modified the wording of some paragraphs, and one paragraph was excluded from the paragraphs that take the sequence (1), and thus the scale settled on (17) paragraphs, and the percentage of agreement between the arbitrators was determined (80%) or more to keep the paragraphs of the scale.

C. Factorial validity: The researcher calculated the factorial validity of the scale by conducting an exploratory factor analysis on the scale's positions, as mentioned previously.

4. Statistical analysis of paragraphs:

A - The two peripheral groups method (external consistency): The researcher applied the scale to the research sample of (500) male and female students. After correcting the respondents' responses and calculating the total score for each form of the false consensus impact scale, which amounted to (500) forms, the researcher followed the following steps to calculate the discriminatory power as follows:

1) Determining the total score for each of the (500) false consensus impact forms.

2) Arranging the forms according to the scores in descending order, starting from the highest score and ending with the lowest score.

3) A percentage of (27%) of the forms with the highest scores were named as the upper group, which amounted to (135) forms, as well as a percentage of (27%) of the forms with the lowest scores and were called the lower group, which amounted to (135) forms as well. The number of forms subject to analysis is (270) out of (500) forms.

4) Application of the discrimination coefficient equation to extract the discriminatory power of the paragraphs, and the calculated value was considered an indicator to

distinguish each paragraph by comparing it with the Ebel criterion. Table (4) shows the degrees of discriminatory power.

Table (4) The discriminatory power of the items of the false consensus effect scale by the two-end group method

Indication	discriminating power	Lower group answer (one) 27%	Upper group answer (one) 27%	paragraph number
Function	0.47	72	135	1
Function	0.34	89	135	2
Function	0.33	90	135	3
Function	0.31	93	135	4
Function	0.36	87	135	5
Function	0.33	91	135	6
Function	0.32	92	135	7
Function	0.36	87	135	8
Function	0.34	89	135	9
Function	0.46	73	135	10
Function	0.43	77	135	11
Function	0.38	84	135	12
Function	0.43	77	135	13
Function	0.37	85	135	14
Function	0.34	89	135	15
Function	0.39	82	135	16
Function	0.36	86	135	17

It appears from the above table that all the items of the scale are statistically significant, as the item that gets a degree (0.30) and above is a (distinguished) function, according to the Ebel criterion (Al-Zobai et al., 1981: 74).

scale (internal consistency): a correlation coefficient (Point-Bacerial) was calculated between the degree of each paragraph and the total degree of the scale. Freedom (498) and Table (5) illustrate this.

B. The method of the relationship of the paragraph degree with the total degree of the

Table (5) The validity coefficients of the items of the false consensus impact scale with the item's correlation with the total score of the scale

Indication	correlation coefficient		Indication	correlation coefficient	T
Function	0.68	10	Function	0.56	1
Function	0.66	11	Function	0.55	2
Function	0.55	12	Function	0.50	3
Function	0.18	13	Function	0.40	4
Function	0.17	14	Function	0.36	5
Function	0.16	15	Function	0.47	6
Function	0.150	16	Function	0.46	7
Function	0.22	17	Function	0.55	8
			Function	0.62	9

It is clear from the previous table that all the items are related to the total score, which is statistically significant, as it is higher than the critical value of the significance of the correlation coefficient of (0.088) at the level (0.05) (Al-Hidla, 2019: 212).

7. Exploratory factor analysis: The exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the scale items, and the researcher used the basic components method on the research sample of (500) male and female students, and the value of the (Kaiser-Meyer-Olen) test reached (0.58), which is higher than the cut-off score (0.50).), which indicates that the size of the research sample is suitable for factor analysis. The paragraphs of the false consensus impact scale represented (17) a variable used in the factor analysis process, and the factor analysis process resulted in (6) factors arranged in descending order in terms of their contribution to the calculated socialism, and the latent root of the first factor that represents his contribution to the total of the socialism is equal to (3.69) Which explains the amount of (21.72) of the explained variance, while the latent root of the remaining factors is less than one (1). Then the researcher used Varimax rotation method to identify the saturation of the paragraphs in this

factor, and to judge the value of the global saturations of the variables (paragraphs) of practical significance. Variables (paragraphs) in the factor. It was found that all paragraphs have psychological meanings and are saturated with one factor according to the previous criterion that was referred to, and as shown in the matrix of factors for the measure of the effect of false consensus after rotation in Table (6).

Table (6) Factor matrix for the measure of the effect of false consensus after rotation

first factor	Paragraph sequence in scale
0.49	1
0.48	2
0.50	3
0.68	4
0.58	5
0.41	6
0.48	7
0.54	8
0.71	9
0.77	10
0.75	11
0.61	12
0.44	13
0.59	14
0.80	15
0.66	16

0.57	17
3.69	latent root
21.72	Explained variance

From the foregoing, it is clear that the result of the exploratory factor analysis of the measure of the impact of false consensus resulted in one general factor and that this factor explains the amount of (21.72%) of the total variance, and this factor has been saturated with (17) paragraphs, and by reading these paragraphs we see that they deal with the property of Specific, which is the effect of false consensus, and thus the measure of the effect of false consensus in its final form has one factor and consists of (17) items.

8. Standard characteristics (psychometric) of the false-consensus effect scale:

A - Indicators of honesty: The researcher used the following to extract the validity of the false consensus effect scale:

1) Apparent honesty: This type of honesty was achieved when the paragraphs of the measure of the impact of false consensus were presented to a group of arbitrators specialized in the field of psychology, and an agreement percentage (80%) or more was approved.

2) Construction honesty: This type of honesty is available in the measure of the effect of false consensus through the following indicators:

a) Extraction of discrimination by the method of the two end groups, as mentioned previously.

b) Extracting the correlation of the paragraph's score with the total score of the scale, as mentioned previously.

c) Factorial validity: The researcher calculated the factorial validity by conducting an exploratory factor analysis.

B - Stability indicators: The researcher extracted the reliability of the false consensus effect scale in two ways:

□ First: The method of re-testing: The researcher applied the measure of the effect of false consensus to extract stability in this way on a sample of (100) male and female students, and it appeared that the value of the reliability coefficient of the scale was (0.72), which is good stability.

□ Second: Kewder-Richardson method (20): The stability of the planning fallacy scale was extracted using Kewder-Richardson method (20) because the scale is two-way, and the reliability coefficient reached (0.76), which is good stability.

Description of the False Consensus Effect Scale its correction and the calculation of the total score: The False Consensus Effect Scale in its final form consisted of (17) items, in the light of which the students respond to two alternatives to answer: . And that the first alternative is given a weight of (1), which indicates the existence of the effect of false consensus, and the second alternative is given a weight of (0), which indicates the absence of the effect of false consensus, and thus the theoretical range for the highest degree that the student can obtain is (17) The lowest score is (0) with a hypothetical mean (8.5).

View and discuss results

The first objective: measuring the planning fallacy among graduate students: the results showed that the average score of the sample on the scale amounted to (11.14) degrees, with a standard deviation of (3.43) degrees, and when balancing this average with the hypothetical average of the scale of (7) degrees, and using the T-test for the sample One shows that the difference is statistically significant and in favor of the arithmetic mean, as the calculated t-value was (26.99) higher than the tabular t-value of (1.96) with a degree of freedom (499) and a level of significance (0.05), and Table (7) illustrates this.

Table (7) the t-test for the difference between the sample mean and the hypothetical mean of the planning fallacy scale

Indication Level	Freedom Degree	Tabular t-value	Calculated t-value	hypothetical mean	Standard deviation	ASM	Sample
Function	499	1.96	26.99	7	3.43	11.14	500

This result indicates that the research sample has a high degree of planning fallacy, and this result can be explained according to the theory of Buehler and et al (Buehler & etal, 1994), who believe that the planning fallacy occurs as a result of wishful thinking (Buehler & etal, 2005: 48), that is, individuals believe that the tasks will be finished. Quickly and easily because that is what they wish for. In addition, people attribute success to tasks on their own, and blame delays on external influences (Pezzo & etal, 2006:1360). In addition, Buehler et al. argue that strong desires to finish tasks early lead to an increased focus on people's work. future plans and reduce their focus on past experiences, which leads to overly optimistic expectations and the occurrence of the planning fallacy (Buehler & etal, 2010:25). This result is consistent with the results of many studies such

as Buehler & etal, 1994, Griffin & Buehler, 1999, and Gilvich & etal, 2002.

The second objective: To measure the effect of false consensus among graduate students:

The results showed that the average sample scores on the scale amounted to (15.79) degrees and a standard deviation of (1.97) degrees, and when balancing this average with the hypothetical average of the scale of (8.5) degrees, and using the t-test for one sample, it was found that the difference is statistically significant and in favor of the arithmetic average, as the calculated T value was (82.65), which is higher than the tabular t-value of (1.96) with a degree of freedom (499) and a level of significance (0.05), and table (8) shows that

Table (8) T-test for the difference between the sample mean and the hypothetical average of the measure of the effect of false consensus

Indication Level	Freedom degree	Tabular t-value	Calculated t-value	hypothetical mean	Standard deviation	ASM	Sample
Function	499	1.96	82.65	8.5	1.97	15.79	500

The above result indicates that the research sample has a high degree of false consensus effect, and this result can be explained by what Ross and others have explained in their theory that people tend to overestimate the popularity of their beliefs, preferences, decisions and opinions (Ross&etal, 1977:279), and that selective exposure and availability Cognitive is a non-motivating factor that creates the impression that an individual's judgments and responses have a high degree of consensus, and through selective exposure, people tend to be exposed to others who have similar opinions and values, meaning that people usually relate to others who are similar to them more than those who differ from them (Marks & Miller, 1987:74), so the people that an individual encounters in daily life tend to be a sample of individuals who are similar to them. Ross et al. (1977) argue that selective exposure and cognitive availability is a major contributor to

false-consensus effect (Ross&etal, 1977:282), and studies indicate that college students have a high level of pseudo-consensus effect because they are surrounded by peers (and may test the inference of availability). Because they often assume that they are similar to their peers (Bauman, 2002:394). The researcher believes that this is evident through the fact that graduate students live in one environment and live close life conditions. They are exposed to life and study situations that may be similar, and they deal with each other on a daily basis, which increases the chances of cognitive availability and selective exposure, and thus increases the effect of false consensus among students. . This result is consistent with the results of previous studies such as Ross & etal, 1977, Zuckerman and Mann, Judd & Johnson, 1981, and Gilovich & etal, 1983.

The third objective: to identify the correlation between the planning fallacy and the effect of false consensus among graduate students:

To achieve this goal, the Pearson correlation coefficient was used to calculate the correlation coefficient between the total scores obtained by the sample members on the scale of the planning fallacy and false consensus, and it was

found from the results that there is a relationship. Statistically significant direct correlation between the planning fallacy and the effect of false consensus, as the calculated correlation value reached (0.21) which is higher compared with the statistical significance value of the correlation coefficient of (0.088) at the level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (498), and Table (9) shows that.

Table (9) Pearson correlation coefficient of the correlation between the planning fallacy and the effect of false consensus

Indication	The value of the tabular correlation coefficient	correlation coefficient	Number of students	Relation type
Function	0.088	0.21	500	The Planning Fallacy/False Consensus Effect

From the above table, it is clear that there is a direct correlation between the planning fallacy and the effect of false consensus, that is, the higher the effect of false consensus, the higher the planning fallacy. This result can be explained according to the point of view of both Ross & etal, 1977 and Buehler & etal, 1994 that the effect of false consensus, the higher it is, the more it affects the behavior and thinking of the individual. Individuals who believe that a certain behavior performed by their peers may have an effect on their behavior (Suls&etal, 1988:67), where an overestimation of the consensus on some behaviors makes these behaviors seem more common and therefore more acceptable and thus support these behaviors (Pedersen, 1995:26), which makes them feel that their thoughts and behaviors are normal and that the majority of people share them. In the same ideas, which becomes a reinforcement for them and their decisions, judgments and plans (Edward, 1995:32), and that the fallacy of planning is a manifestation of human behavior, and all of the above, in turn, is associated with the fallacy of planning. Individuals may seek to enhance themselves, ignoring the information gained through comparison. Social (whether with their past experiences or with the experiences and experiences of others) and relying on their inner view only and this is the basis of the planning fallacy, Buehler and others have pointed out that individuals overlook the previous evidence of the time that the task should take and do not. They compare the

current task with previous tasks (i.e. with their own or others' past experiences). The researcher believes that graduate students fall into the planning fallacy when planning their tasks and duties when they think that other students are planning in the same way, which enhances their planning and supports their position, and this in turn leads to inattention or ignoring previous similar tasks, which leads to the occurrence of the planning fallacy. This result is consistent with the results of previous studies, which indicated that the effect of false consensus affects the behavior of the individual by supporting those behaviors and enhancing the individual's position, such as the study of Sherman & etal, 1983, and the study of Suls & etal, 1988), and the study of Qazoura (2013). Which indicated the existence of a correlative relationship between social factors and the individual's planning for his life, including future perceptions (Qasim, 2020: 65).

Recommendations:

In light of the research findings, the researcher recommends the following:

- The Ministry of Higher Education and its university institutions should open workshops and prepare educational programs to familiarize students with the consequences of the planning fallacy, as it harms the student, and it should highlight the advantages of careful planning of tasks and their impact on

the completion of academic duties, tasks and private work.

□ Directing the audio, visual and print media to a lot of programs that explain the fallacy of planning, and how it is affected by false consensus and the search for incentives and reward.

Suggestions:

In light of the findings of the research, and to complement the study of the topic in a broader way, the researcher suggests the following:

□ Conducting a study dealing with study variables (the planning fallacy and the effect of false consensus) and their relationship to other demographic variables.

□ Conducting a study dealing with the planning fallacy and its relationship to other variables such as the perceived power and the effect of false singularity.

References

- [1] Abu El-Nil, Mahmoud El-Sayed (1987): Psychological, Social and Educational Statistics, Psychology Series, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Beirut.
- [2] Abu Hatab, Fouad, Sadeq, Amal (1991): Research Methods and Statistical Analysis Methods in Psychological, Educational and Social Sciences, Anglo-Egyptian Library, Cairo.
- [3] Barron, Robert A. and Branccombe, Nella R. (2015): Social Psychology. Translated by Al-Tuwaijri, Muhammad bin Abdul-Mohsen and Abu Hashem, Ahmed Ismail and Al-Ali, Talal. The first edition, Amman, Dar Al-Fikr Publishers and Distributors.
- [4] Al-Tah, Rashid Khamis (2016): Academic procrastination and its relationship to metacognitive strategies among university students, Journal of the College of Education, Al-Azhar University, Issue: 168, Part One.
- [5] Daoud, Aziz Hanna and Abdel Rahman, Anwar Hussein (1990): Educational Research Methods, Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, University of Baghdad, Iraq.
- [6] Al-Sharman, Munira (2010): Postgraduate Students' Perceptions of the Faculties of Education at the Universities of Mutah and Yarmouk about the problems they face, Damascus University Journal, Vol. 26, No. 4.
- [7] Sadar, Ahlam and Zadaria, Reem (2016): The role of strategic planning in achieving sustainable tourism development, a case study of Algeria, Larbi Tebessa University - Tebessa - Faculty of Economics, Commercial Sciences and Management Sciences. Master's Thesis in Enterprise Business Administration.
- [8] Abdel-Khaleq, Ahmed Mohamed (1980): Personality Intelligence: An Introduction to Theory and Egyptian Standards, Dar Al-Maaref, Alexandria, 2nd Edition.
- [9] Adarba, Mahmoud Muhammad Yahya (2006): Time management for principals of UNRWA primary schools in the West Bank, a master's thesis in educational administration from the College of Graduate Studies at Birzeit University - Palestine.
- [10] Fakhro, Hessa Abdel Rahman (2005): Levels of time management among Qatar University students and their university specialization and their relationship to academic achievement and life satisfaction, Journal of Qatar University Educational Research Center, No. 27.
- [11] 11-Qassem, Abdul-Marid Abdul-Jaber Muhammad (2020): Self-orientation as a modifier of the relationship between neuroticism and planning skill among university students, Arabic Studies, Volume 1, Volume 19.
- [12] Qassem, Abdel Mureed Abdel Jaber Mohamed (2020): The causal model of the interrelationships between kindness, gratitude, and cooperation in personality among adolescents and adults, The Egyptian Journal of Psychological Studies, p. 108, Volume 30.
- [13] Aoun, Attia and Ayesh, Sabah (2016): Using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis in codifying psychological and educational measures. Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences, No. 2, Volume 3, Oran University - Algeria, pp. 92-105.

- [14] Al-Hadla, Abdul-Sattar Salem (2019): Principles of Statistical Methods in Physical Education, University of Hama, Syria.
- [15] Botvin G. J., Botvin E. M., Baker E., Dusenbury L., & Goldberg C. J. (1992): The false consensus effect: predicting adolescents' tobacco use from normative expectations. *Psychol Rep.* V70, pp171-178.
- [16] Buehler, R., Griffin, D. & Michael, R. (2011): It's about time: Optimistic predictions in work and love. *European Review of Social Psychology American Psychological.* Pp1-33.
- [17] Buehler, R., Griffin, D. & Peetz, J., (2010): The Planning Fallacy: Cognitive, Motivational, and Social Origins. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, V43, pp1-62.
- [18] Buehler, R., Griffin, D., & MacDonald, H. (1997): The role of motivated reasoning in optimistic time predictions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, V23, No3, pp238-247.
- [19] Buehler, R., Griffin, D., & Ross, M. (1994): Exploring the planning fallacy: Why people underestimate their task completion times. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. V67, No3, pp366–381.
- [20] Buehler, R., Messervey, D., & Griffin, D. (2005): Collaborative planning and prediction: Does group discussion affect optimistic biases in time estimation? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97, pp47-63.
- [21] Griffin, D., & Buehler, R. (1999): Frequency, probability, and prediction: Easy solutions to cognitive illusions? *Cognitive Psychology*, 38, 48–78.
- [22] Judd, C. M., & Johnson, J. T. (1981): Attitudes, Polarization, and Diagnosticity: Exploring the Effect of Affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, V 41, NO1, pp26-36.
- [23] Krueger, J., Zeiger, J., S. (1993): Social Categorization and the Truly False Consensus Effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. V65, No4, pp670-680.
- [24] Marks, G. & Miller, N. (1987): Ten years of research on the false-consensus effect: An empirical and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, V102, No1, pp72-90.
- [25] Miller, D. T., & Ross, M. (1975): Self-serving biases in the attribution of causality: Fact or fiction? *Psychological Bulletin*, 82, pp213–225.
- [26] Misra. R; McKean. M (2000): College Students' Academic Stress And Its Relation to Their Anxiety, Time Management, And Leisure Satisfaction. *American Journal of Health Studies*.16.1.41-51.
- [27] Pedersen, J. Peggy.(1995): The False Consensus Effect in Estimates of Safe and Unsafe Sexual Practices. A THESIS submitted to Oregon State University. in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. pp1-148.
- [28] Pezzo, S. P., Pezzo, M. V., & Stone, E. R. (2006): The social implications of planning: How public predictions bias future plans, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42, pp221-227.
- [29] Ross, L., Greene, D., & House, P. (1977): "The 'false consensus effect': An egocentric bias in social perception and attribution processes". *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. V13, No3, pp279-301.
- [30] Roy, Michael M.; Christenfeld, Nicholas J. S.; McKenzie, & Craig R. M. (2005): Underestimating the Duration of Future Events: Memory Incorrectly Used or Memory Bias?. *Psychological Bulletin*. 131 (5): 738–756.
- [31] Sherman, S. J., Presson, C. C., Chassin, L., Corty, E., & Olshaysky, R. (1983): The false consensus effect in estimates of smoking prevalence: Underlying mechanisms. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, V 9, No 2, pp197-207.
- [32] Welsh, M. B. & Begg, S. H. (2016): The planning fallacy in oil and gas decision-making, Article in *The APPEA Journal*.