



Ego Fragility Test Game

In this game, we use UXCG to test a person (position candidate, colleague, anyone) for a few points:

- Mind flexibility;
- Ego issues;
- Stress resistance;
- Learning mind (open-mindedness);
- Person's arrogance.

To explain this game, let's imagine two persons: Person A - let's call him an Interviewer, and person B - say, the Candidate.

This game consists of two processes running simultaneously. The first process is when an Interviewer asks questions, and the second process is when an Interviewer analyses the Candidate's reaction.

In short, we're interested in spotting anger, discomfort, and any kind of negativity while asking the questions to the Candidate.

The game starts with one of the below-mentioned questions. The goal is to try to check a person for being prone to some specific biases.

The questions are written in a bit generic way, and you might adjust them to your business specifics per need.

Overconfidence effect (UX Core Bias #69)

Question: How often do you make mistakes in your work-related judgments in a year?

Expectation: There is no right answer to this question, but there should always be a balance. If a person says that they don't make mistakes, this indicates that the person might be confident in their actions too much than needed. With this question, we would want the person to clarify what kind of mistakes we're talking about. If a person answers our question without clarification, this is another sign of overconfidence since our question is too broad to be answered without clarification.

Illusory superiority (UX Core Bias #77)

Question: What is the most efficient thing that you did at your job?

Expectation: We want the Candidate to tell us the story of their input as something major. We want them to tell us about something they consider a major accomplishment, achievement.

Question: Why do you think that XYZ thing was that major?

Expectation: We want to show our doubt of the Candidate's achievement seriousness. If we see that this is something that insults the Candidate, this is a negative sign for them and us.

Question: And nobody from your colleagues could do the same thing?

Expectation: Here, we want to doubt the uniqueness of the Candidate's input. A person who doesn't have problems with ego and has enough stress resistance will talk simply, in an easy-going manner, without thinking that we downplay his achievements.

Question: So we might say that there was just an opportunity and you just was at the right time in the right place to see and use it?

Expectation: If a person says "yes" to this question, it shows that the person is confident enough, stress-resistant enough, and understands their value.

If we assume that the Candidate is too confident in himself, the question we might ask is as follows.

Question: You seem to be confident enough in what you do. Do you think that might become a problem while working with the team?

Expectation: We don't want to see an immediate answer to this question. We want the Candidate to think of what we asked and make sure that he understands the risks. If the Candidate replies quickly and says something like "No, I'm a very friendly/funny/teamplay/etc. person," this might be the sign that he won't be good at maintaining good, honest relations with the colleagues.

Dunning-Kruger effect (UX Core Bias #74)

To test a Candidate for the Dunning-Kruger effect, we must understand their current responsibility and competence level. Then we should ask them questions that require more experience and competence. For example, while interviewing a junior or mid-level manager, we might ask them questions requiring senior-level experience and competence. If we talk to a principal specialist, we might ask them questions within the scope of C-level executives of the organization.

Expectation: We are not interested in the content of the Candidate's answer, but more in the form of their answer. If they're totally okay answering the questions that are obviously out of the scope of their responsibilities and competence, it is a red flag for us. This might bring to the situation when we won't be able to trust the judgments of this person in the future. Ideally, we want to see the discomfort, maybe even a disclaimer, that the answer they're about to tell is a theory. We want to see that they understand that.

Another simple technique is to tell the Candidate about the biases, and pin-point the ones described above. If the Candidate completely excludes the possibility of being biased, without even trying to understand what we just said, then he is prone to Bias blind spot (UX Core Bias #33).