THE DECISION SCIENCE SERIES

joe worden marketing

The Decision Sequence

Designing Engagement Strategies Based on How Consumers Decide.

How to Engage the People Paid to Doubt You



DS 11

Proof, Evidence and the Skeptic

–A Strategic Resource by Joe Worden | More @ www.jworden.com

Proof, Evidence, and Skepticism

Petty & Cacioppo · Shelly Chaiken · Kahneman & Tversky · Ward Edwards · Kolodner · Pfeffer & Sutton

Questions this paper answers

- Why do skeptical prospects ignore the evidence we worked hardest to prepare?
- How do we choose a case study that answers this buyer's actual concern?
- Should our case studies explain what went wrong as well as the outcome?
- How can we make a proof claim easy for a skeptical buyer to check?

Definition. Proof is what lets a buyer cross a quiet line, from "maybe they get what I'm dealing with" to "I believe they can really help." Skepticism sits on the other side of that line, a built-in resistance proof has to push through. The recurring twist, shown again and again, is that people don't handle evidence like tidy calculators. They pay attention when they already care, when they already put some weight on the messenger, and even then a vivid account tends to beat a clean table of numbers. Proof works, just not in the way a logic class would predict.

The Appendix Nobody Opened

The people you're trying to convince are paid to doubt you. That's not a metaphor. The due diligence analyst across the table has a job description that says, in politer language, "assume this pitch is wrong and find out why." Career risk runs one direction for them: nobody gets fired for the manager they rejected.

Early in my career, I responded to skeptics the way most marketers do. More proof. I once shipped a pitch book with an appendix so thick the thing needed its own binding budget: attribution analysis, peer comparisons, risk decompositions, footnotes on the footnotes. I was proud of it.

Then I started paying attention to what the skeptics did in the room. They'd flip past the appendix, sometimes with a little smile I eventually learned to dread, and ask something like, "Walk me through your worst quarter. What happened, and what did you do?"

And here's the part that rearranged my thinking: the deals that closed were decided by that answer. Two minutes, one specific story, told honestly, losses included. The sixty-page appendix wasn't proof to these people. The two-minute story with a scar in it was. The professionals paid to doubt had seen a thousand perfect track records, and they'd learned the same lesson I was learning: perfection is a formatting choice. A scar is evidence.

The research explains exactly why they read it that way.

Proof Only Counts When the Buyer Is Listening

When does evidence get taken seriously? Two persuasion models keep landing on the same answer. The Elaboration Likelihood Model, from Petty and Cacioppo, and Chaiken's Heuristic-Systematic Model both argue that strong evidence shifts people mainly when they're thinking carefully. An engaged buyer looks at substance. A disengaged one skims, then reaches for cues. So the ironic outcome is simple: your best proof convinces the person who has already arrived at the stage of truly considering it.

Chaiken's sufficiency threshold makes the picture sharper. People keep evaluating only until they feel "sure enough" to choose, then they quit. If a shortcut, say a trusted referral, a familiar brand, an expert badge, has already pushed them past that threshold, your proof might never even get a hearing. Evidence doesn't get processed because it's present. It gets processed when the buyer still needs it, and is willing to spend the effort.

People Weigh Evidence Unevenly

Even with attention, the weighting is lopsided. Kahneman and Tversky laid this out in their work on base-rate neglect ("On the Psychology of Prediction," Psychological Review, 1973). People commonly disregard base rates, the background odds, then overvalue specific details that make a story click. Tell them a sample holds seventy engineers and thirty lawyers, hand them one bland personality sketch, and watch the seventy-thirty stop mattering. A concrete cue washes out the larger numbers.

There is, of course, a normative way to combine what you already believe with what you just learned: Bayesian reasoning. Bayes' rule says to blend prior odds with the strength of the new evidence. Yet decades of studies, with early work often linked to Ward Edwards, show how people miss the mark. Sometimes they barely update at all. Sometimes they toss out the prior and sprint after the latest striking input. The practical takeaway isn't gentle. More proof does not lift confidence as reliably as logic would imply, which is why proof has to be designed and placed, not dropped in a heap at the buyer's feet.

People Reason from Cases

Still, there's an encouraging piece. The abstract rule rarely persuades anyone. The concrete case does. Case-based reasoning research, associated with thinkers like Roger Schank and Janet Kolodner, describes a basic habit of mind: we solve fresh problems by recalling similar ones and adapting what worked. We think in examples.

That is why a well-matched case study can be a firm's strongest form of proof. A buyer spots resemblance, then reasons forward from it: this looks like my situation, so the outcome could look like mine. One specific, aligned case can do what a page of averages can't, because it speaks in the format the mind already uses. Fit is everything, though. A case about a different buyer with a different problem doesn't function as proof, it's simply a story about someone else.

Even Professionals Skip the Evidence

One more result keeps the whole "proof" idea grounded. Even seasoned professionals often don't use the best evidence available. The evidence-based management work associated with Jeffrey Pfeffer, Robert Sutton, and Denise Rousseau documents how managers frequently default to fads, habit, mimicry, and whatever sounds convincing, instead of what the evidence supports (Hard Facts, Dangerous Half-Truths, and Total Nonsense, 2006).

For this library, that cuts in two directions. Proof is competing less with strict analysis than with the buyer's own loose evidence habits, which can make vivid, well-timed proof unusually potent. At the same time, a firm that visibly reasons from real evidence can stand apart, because disciplined attention to proof is less common than it should be. In that sense, living by the standards you present becomes part of the credibility you bring into the next decision.

Why This Belongs in Decision Architecture

This is the research beneath the Proof gate, and it supports a central claim of Decision Architecture: sequence matters alongside substance. Proof can settle skepticism, but the processing models show it tends to be weighed only after the buyer has entered the route where evidence counts. In this framework, relevance gives the buyer a reason to care, and credibility gives the source a reason to be heard. The processing models inform that design; they don't independently establish a fixed gate sequence.

Put the same proof in the wrong slot, before the buyer cares or before trust exists, and it meets a mind that isn't evaluating. Same evidence, wrong moment, no impact.

The rest fits as well. A relevant case study is exactly the sort of affirmation the framework points to, and case-based reasoning explains why it lands. Base-rate neglect and the Bayesian shortfall also explain why stacking more proof doesn't steadily build confidence, which matches the Decision Architecture warning that more information is not the same as more conviction. Proof isn't a volume game. It's the right evidence, placed correctly, shaped to the way people reason in the wild.

Artificial intelligence changes the economics of presenting proof. Case-study drafts, charts and confident claims are easy to generate. The completed work and verified outcomes behind them are not. The appearance of evidence is not the evidence itself. Skepticism grows, not shrinks, for buyers and for the machines assisting them. What still works is proof that survives checking, specific, verifiable, and clearly matched to the buyer's real situation. Because people reason from cases, one concrete, checkable example can beat a wall of generated statistics. Make that evidence accessible and traceable so a reader, or a service retrieving it, can inspect where it came from.

The Marketing Read

The skeptic across the table has seen a thousand perfect track records, and they've never once believed one. Start there, and most of the standard proof playbook falls apart on contact.

First, place your proof where the research says it can land: where it answers a question the buyer is actually considering. Proof shipped to a buyer who doesn't yet care gets skimmed by a mind grading your fonts. Proof shipped to a buyer already past their sufficiency threshold, the one who arrived on a strong referral, is answering a question they've stopped asking, and reopening it does you no favors. The question before every proof point is the same: is this buyer, right now, in the market for evidence? If not, your appendix is dead weight with page numbers.

Second, rebuild your case studies around fit instead of pride. Firms index their cases by what they're proudest of. Buyers reason from resemblance: this looks like my situation, so the outcome could look like mine. A dazzling case about somebody unlike them is a story about someone else, and lands with the force of one. Index the library by buyer situation, size, problem, constraint, and lead with whichever case makes this buyer say "that's us." One matched case can do more work than five impressive ones that leave this buyer's question unanswered.

Third, put a scar in it. The skeptic's entire profession is finding what you left out, so leaving it in is the single cheapest credibility move available. The quarter that went wrong and what you did about it, the client situation you'd handle differently now, the limitation stated before it's discovered. Base-rate neglect means your vivid specifics will outweigh the industry's averages anyway; make sure the specifics include the one that proves you tell the truth when it costs you.

Fourth, make it checkable, because generated proof has flooded the market and both audiences have adjusted. A statistic with no source reads as manufactured. A named client who'll take a call, a date, a number that survives a Google search, these are the proof points that still clear a skeptic, and they make the source easier to inspect when it is encountered through search or an AI-assisted answer.

What backfires: the arms race. When a skeptic hesitates, the reflex is another exhibit, and every addition dilutes the one piece of proof that was working. Volume reads as insecurity. Ask any professional doubter what a sixty-page appendix tells them, and they'll say someone's nervous.

The hard call: take your next proposal and mark the question each proof point answers. Cut repetition, keep the evidence the decision requires, and add one honest account of difficulty and how it was handled. If that trade scares you, you've been counting on volume to do a job volume has never done.

Primary Sources

- Richard E. Petty & John T. Cacioppo, Communication and Persuasion: Central and Peripheral Routes to Attitude Change. Springer-Verlag, 1986.
- Shelly Chaiken, "Heuristic Versus Systematic Information Processing and the Use of Source Versus Message Cues in Persuasion." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, vol. 39, 1980, pp. 752–766.
- Daniel Kahneman & Amos Tversky, "On the Psychology of Prediction." Psychological Review, vol. 80, 1973, pp. 237–251. (Base-rate neglect and evidence evaluation.)
- Ward Edwards, "Conservatism in Human Information Processing," in B. Kleinmuntz (ed.), Formal Representation of Human Judgment. Wiley, 1968. (Representative of Bayesian reasoning research.)
- Janet L. Kolodner, Case-Based Reasoning. Morgan Kaufmann, 1993. (See also Roger Schank, Dynamic Memory, 1982.)
- Jeffrey Pfeffer & Robert I. Sutton, Hard Facts, Dangerous Half-Truths, and Total Nonsense: Profiting from Evidence-Based Management. Harvard Business School Press, 2006.