The False Dichotomy Problem

By Bea Groves-McDaniel, July 2026 Research Assistant: FAYE-9000

Think of the last time someone told you that you had to choose between two options, when you knew perfectly well that a third, fourth, or fifth path existed. Perhaps it was a colleague insisting that a policy was either "*for workers or against them.*" Perhaps it was a family member reducing a nuanced political question to "*you're with us or you're against us.*" Perhaps it was your own inner voice, telling you that if this approach did not work, then nothing would.

The either/or trap is everywhere, and almost never accurate. This is the **false dichotomy problem**, and understanding why we fall for it so readily is one of the most useful things psychology can teach us.

The habit of forcing complex issues into binary boxes has a name in formal logic: **the false dilemma**, or false dichotomy. The rhetorical move is simple. You present two options as if they were the only possibilities on the table, when in fact the range of viable positions is far wider. What is less well understood is why human beings are so susceptible to this move and why even highly intelligent people find it so difficult to resist. The answer lies at the intersection of cognitive architecture, emotional self-defence, and social identity.

The Mind That Simplifies

Daniel Kahneman, together with his long-time collaborator Amos Tversky, spent decades documenting the systematic ways in which human judgement deviates from rational norms. Their foundational 1974 paper **"Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases,"** published in *Science*, identified a set of mental shortcuts, or heuristics, that the mind uses to process complex information quickly (Tversky and Kahneman, 1974).

One of the most significant of these is the **representativeness heuristic**, through which people assess whether something belongs to a category based on how much it resembles a typical example. The problem is that real-world categories are rarely as clean as textbook stereotypes. When we encounter a messy, ambiguous situation, System One, as Kahneman came to call the fast, intuitive mode of thinking, reaches automatically for the nearest available binary template.

This tendency is not a failure of intelligence. It is a feature of the cognitive system that evolution has built. The brain consumes roughly twenty per cent of the body's metabolic resources despite accounting for only two per cent of its mass, and processing nuance is expensive. Simplification is the default setting. The issue arises when the simplified model is taken for an accurate map of the territory. In their 1982 paper "The Study of Statistical Intuitions," Kahneman and Tversky (1982) showed that even trained professionals consistently failed to apply base-rate reasoning correctly when a plausible narrative was available to override it. The either/or frame provides exactly that narrative: a story simple enough to feel true.

More recently, Matthew Fisher and Frank C. Keil demonstrated in their 2018 study "The Binary Bias: A Systematic Distortion in the Integration of Information," published in *Psychological Science*, that the preference for binary categories is not merely a lazy habit but an active distortion mechanism (Fisher and Keil, 2018). Across experiments involving health outcomes, financial data, and general

information integration, participants systematically overweight binary information and underweight genuinely continuous evidence. When presented with a spectrum of data, people spontaneously converted it into two poles and then reasoned from those poles as if they represented reality. This is not a peripheral quirk; it is a core feature of how human beings process information.

The Ego Under Siege

If cognitive architecture explains why we reach for binary categories, psychological self-defence explains why we hold onto them so tightly even when evidence challenges them. Leon Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance, introduced in his 1957 work *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*, remains the most influential account of why changing people's minds is so difficult (Festinger, 1957). The core idea is straightforward: when a person holds two conflicting cognitions, or when behaviour contradicts belief, the resulting discomfort is psychologically intolerable. People do not simply accept the correction and move on. They actively restructure their interpretation of the evidence to reduce the dissonance.

This has direct implications for the false dichotomy problem.

When someone has built an identity around a binary position, encountering complexity that destabilises that binary triggers genuine distress. It is not that the person is being wilfully stupid. The discomfort is real, and the retreat into false certainty is an ego-protective response. The either/or frame does not feel like a simplification to the person using it. It feels like standing on solid ground compared to the vertigo of acknowledging that both options might contain partial truths or that neither might be adequate.

David Trafimow, writing in 2024 in the *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*, coined the term "*dichotomomania*" to describe the compulsive tendency in psychological research to force continuous variables into dichotomous pairs (Trafimow, 2024). The phenomenon is not limited to research methodology. Trafimow argues that dichotomisation is so pervasive because it provides the psychological reward of apparent certainty. The world is genuinely uncertain, and the mind finds that unbearable. A binary choice offers a way out of that vertigo.

This connects to what Irmak Olcaysoy Ökten and colleagues identified in 2024 as "*misplaced certainty,*" published in *Personality and Individual Differences*. Their research found that people who display stronger preferences for simple thinking also show higher levels of what they call misplaced certainty: **confident conviction in answers that are, objectively, not warranted by the evidence** (Ökten et al., 2024). The problem is not that these people are unintelligent. It is that they have mistaken the feeling of certainty for a symptom of accuracy. The two are not the same, and confusing them is at the heart of the false dichotomy problem.

The Tribal Amplifier

Individual cognitive architecture and emotional self-defence would be enough to sustain the false dichotomy problem on their own. But there is a social dimension that amplifies it considerably. Jonathan Haidt's social intuitionist model of moral judgement, outlined in his 2001 paper "The Emotional Dog and its Rational Tail," published in *Psychological Review*, proposes that moral reasoning is primarily a **post-hoc** enterprise: people first have an emotional response to a situation, and then construct a rational justification for what they already feel (Haidt, 2001). **The tribal affiliation comes first. The intellectual defence comes second.**

This matters enormously for false dichotomies because tribal identity gives emotional force to binary categories. When a person belongs to a group that has staked out one pole of a supposed binary, questioning that binary is experienced not merely as an intellectual error but as an act of disloyalty or even betrayal.

Jay J. Van Bavel and Andrea Pereira developed this argument directly in their 2018 paper "The Partisan Brain: An Identity-Based Model of Political Belief," published in *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. They argue that political beliefs are not primarily shaped by dispassionate evaluation of evidence but by social identity, and that the neural systems involved in evaluating in-group versus out-group signals are the same systems recruited when processing political information (Van Bavel and Pereira, 2018). The binary is not just a cognitive simplification. It is a marker of **tribal membership**.

The false dichotomy is thus not merely wrong. It is socially useful to those who deploy it. "*You are either with us or against us*" is not a genuine argument. It is an identity-enforcement mechanism dressed in the grammar of logic. The reductio ad absurdum is obvious: if the question genuinely permitted only two answers, the question itself would have to be so contrived as to be meaningless. Real social and political questions almost never meet that standard. They are forced into binary form because that form is politically or psychologically convenient, not because the evidence supports it.

The Cost of Complexity

None of this means that binary distinctions are never useful. Categorisation is a necessary cognitive tool, and some genuine oppositions do exist. The problem is the reflexive assumption that every contested issue belongs to the same either/or structure, and the consequent failure to investigate whether that structure actually fits the phenomenon it purports to describe.

There is an irony here that should not be lost. The same cognitive system that produces the false dichotomy also contains, at its best, the capacity for exactly the kind of complex, nuanced reasoning that the false dichotomy forecloses.

System Two, in Kahneman's framework, is slow, effortful, and resources-intensive, but it is precisely the mode of thinking that can hold multiple possibilities in suspension, weigh gradations of evidence, and resist the emotional pull of tribal simplification. The false dichotomy problem is not an insoluble feature of human cognition. **It is a default setting that can be overridden, but only when the holder of the cognition is willing to invest the effort and tolerate the discomfort that complexity entails.**

The question worth asking is not whether a complex issue can be reduced to two options, but whether reducing it tells us anything true. More often than not, the answer is no.

The world is continuous in ways that binary thinking cannot accommodate, and the price of pretending otherwise is paid in bad policy, damaged relationships, and the quiet erosion of the nuanced understanding on which good judgement depends.

Bibliography

Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Fisher, M. and Keil, F.C. (2018). 'The Binary Bias: A Systematic Distortion in the Integration of Information', *Psychological Science*, 29(11), pp. 1846–1860. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797618792256 (Accessed: 28 July 2026).

Haidt, J. (2001). 'The Emotional Dog and its Rational Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment', *Psychological Review*, 108(4), pp. 814–834.

Kahneman, D. (2003). 'Maps of Bounded Rationality: A Perspective on Intuitive Judgment and Choice', *American Economic Review*, 93(5), pp. 1449–1475.

Kahneman, D. and Tversky, A. (1982). 'The Study of Statistical Intuitions', *Cognition*, 11(2), pp. 123–141.

Ökten, I.O., Kiselev, K. and Grashow, G. (2024). ‘Misplaced Certainty and Simple Thinking’, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 217, 112734.

Trafimow, D. (2024). ‘Dichotomomania and its Manifestations in Psychology Research’, *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*, 22(1), pp. 1–8.

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

Van Bavel, J.J. and Pereira, A. (2018). ‘The Partisan Brain: An Identity-Based Model of Political Belief’, *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 22(11), pp. 1028–1040.