R⁴ Bench Card

Intellectual Humility *by Design*

Recognize · Reflect · Respond · Reassess — A practical routine for trial and appellate judges

1 **Recognize fallibility**	→ What would change my mind? → Consider the opposite: write two plausible counterpoints. → Premortem: If this decision is later criticized or reversed, why? → Outside view: How would a neutral colleague frame this? → Reminder: Revision is progress; better reasons are the goal. **Trial:** Name one uncertainty or assumption you should test before ruling. **Appellate:** Note a plausible alternative reading and the limits of the holding.
2 **Reflect before ruling**	→ Voice first: “Here is what I hear—did I get that right?” → Ask each side (one sentence): “What is your strongest point, and the best legal authority for it?” → Quick procedural-justice check: voice, neutrality, respectful treatment, and trustworthiness. **Trial:** Paraphrase each party’s key point; invite a one-sentence correction; pause or take the matter under advisement if tempers rise. **Appellate:** In a bench memo, write one sentence stating each side’s best case; in conference, start with that before voting; ask what you might be missing.
3 **Respond with reasons**	→ Roadmap early (point-first when practical): issue/outcome → rule/standard → key facts → analysis → remedy. → Address the strongest opposing point (as the party would state it). → Name constraints (standard of review; statutory bounds; record limits). → Add one sentence recognizing the human stakes (tone signals care, not bias). **Trial:** Give step-by-step oral reasons; make next steps clear. **Appellate:** Engage the best contrary authority respectfully; explain why your reading prevails; keep the holding bounded.
4 **Reassess after decision**	→ Second look: read as the losing party—did I fairly state and answer the best point? → Invite perspective; treat disagreement as data. → Optional: 15-minute quarterly “R⁴ retro” — review reversals and unclear passages; make one template tweak; log it for next time. **Trial:** Do a brief tone and clarity pass; update templates; log one improvement. **Appellate:** Ask a colleague to present the strongest contrary argument; revise where others expose gaps.

30-SECOND VERSION — WHEN THE BENCH PACE IS FAST

R1	R2	R3	R4
Name one possible error source.	Confirm you captured each side’s strongest case.	Give clear, step-by-step reasons addressing the key opposing point.	Invite perspective; log one improvement for next time.

HOW TO USE

Pick one prompt from each R when the case is routine; use more prompts when the stakes, uncertainty, or time pressure increase. Use “in chambers” prompts before issuing a decision; use “on the record” prompts to make voice, neutrality, and constraint visible.

IN CHAMBERS

trial & appellate

- → Write the best argument for the outcome you are not inclined to reach—using the other side’s own framing.
- → Identify one assumption you are making (about facts, credibility, or law) and what evidence would test it.
- → Ask: “If I am wrong, where am I most likely wrong—facts, law, or procedure?”
- → Use a short premortem: “A reviewing court (or the public) criticizes this—why?”
- → When you disagree with a colleague’s view, treat it as information: “What are you seeing that I am not?”

ON THE RECORD

trial

- → Summarize what you heard before ruling; invite a one-sentence correction.
- → Explain the next step (what happens now; what the party must do; when the court will act).
- → If emotion is high, name the process move: “I’m going to pause so I can decide carefully.”

CONFERENCE & DRAFTING

appellate

- → Start conference by stating each side’s best point (even if you will reject it).
- → Assign a rotating “counterargument” role: one judge presents the strongest contrary authority and the best response.
- → During drafting, mark the holding and its limits; avoid unnecessary breadth.
- → Do a “losing party” read for tone and clarity; revise to address the best point directly.

WHY R⁴ WORKS — RESEARCH IN BRIEF

Each step is grounded in procedural-justice, decision-science, judicial-writing, and intellectual-humility literatures. Compact citations follow; full authorities appear in the article and footnotes.

R1 — Recognize fallibility

Intellectual humility predicts openness to opposing views and less myside bias. Porter et al., Predictors and Consequences of Intellectual Humility, 1 Nat. Rev. Psychol. 524 (2022); Porter & Schumann, Intellectual Humility Enhances Openness to Learning About the Opposing View, 12 Self & Identity 1 (2017); Bowes et al., Stepping Outside the Echo Chamber, 48 Pers. & Soc. Psychol. Bull. 150 (2022).

Decision-quality checks — “consider the opposite,” outside-view prompts, premortems — counter overconfidence and reduce avoidable error. Kahneman, Sibony & Sunstein, Noise: A Flaw in Human Judgment (Little, Brown 2021); Burns & Winthrop, The Art and Science of Pre-Mortems (Brookings 2025); Casey, Burke & Leben, Minding the Court, 49 Court Rev. 76 (2013).

R2 — Reflect before ruling

Voice, neutrality, respectful treatment, and trustworthiness predict perceived fairness and acceptance — especially for losing parties. Tyler, Procedural Justice and the Courts, 44 Ct. Rev. 26 (2007–2008); Leben, Getting It Right Isn’t Enough, 69 U. Kan. L. Rev. 13 (2020); Hennepin County court fairness studies (2004–05).

Listening is trainable; feeling heard supports openness and intellectual humility. Itzchakov et al., Listening to Understand, 126 J. Pers. & Soc. Psychol.: Attitudes & Soc. Cognition 213 (2024); Reis et al., Perceived Partner Responsiveness Promotes Intellectual Humility, 79 J. Experimental Soc. Psychol. 21 (2018); Farley, Jensen & Rempel, Improving Courtroom Communication (Ctr. for Ct. Innovation & Nat’l Judicial Coll. 2014).

R3 — Respond with reasons

Explanations and transparency make voice and neutrality visible and can strengthen legitimacy. Tyler, supra; Leben, supra.

Reader-first structure, plain language, and disciplined tone improve comprehension and reduce perceived arbitrariness. Garner, The Redbook (5th ed. 2023); Kimble, Writing for Dollars, Writing to Please (2d ed. 2023); McCormack, Access to Justice Requires Plain Language, Mich. B.J. 44 (Feb. 2021).

R4 — Reassess after decision

Constructive disagreement and dissent broaden thinking and improve independent reasoning in groups. Nemeth, In Defense of Troublemakers (2018); Krumrei-Mancuso et al., Toward an Understanding of Collective Intellectual Humility, Trends Cogn. Sci. (2025).

Feedback loops, brief retros, and template updates support learning over time. Casey, Burke & Leben, supra.

PREPARED BY

Prof. Steve Leben

Douglas R. Stripp Distinguished Professor of Law, UMKC School of Law

SOURCE

Reprinted from Steve Leben, Intellectual Humility by Design: How Courts Earn Legitimacy and Improve Decisions, 79 Ark. L. Rev. 145 (2026).