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The paper " A Tyranny of Choices by Schwartz Barry" is a delightful example of an article on sociology. The article on “ tyranny of choice” ed by Schwartz Barry is an intriguing piece that presents new ideas to the readers. Evidently, the article reveals that the modern society, especially in the developed world has a range of choices to choose from compared to other societies. However, the level of happiness exhibited by people with more choices has been declining over time. This is the issue that the article focuses on, describing the different reasons why more choices do not present an opportunity for people to be happier. The article compares the level of happiness exhibited by people with more choices and those with lesser choices in less developed societies. This paper will offer a critique of the article. In order to elaborate on the effects brought about by the tyranny of choices, especially in the American society, the author describes two categories of people. One category comprises of maximizers and satisficers. According to the author’s description, maximizers denote a group of people who are more likely to compare the diverse range of choices before settling on one. Usually, the comparison process is rigorous because they intend to settle for the best. Maximizers take a lot of time in order to achieve this because they have to identify all the available choices and compare them effectively before identifying the best. On the other hand, satisficers only seek to fulfill their needs, hence they settle for choices that can satisfy their specific needs. They do not need to carry out a rigorous comparison of the available choices, but rather settle for what is “ good enough” (Scwartz, 2004).
According to the description offered in this article, it is possible to determine whether an individual is a maximizer or a satisficer. A maximization scale has been designed that helps different people gauge themselves and highlight what side of the two extremes they are. After a close analysis, it becomes evident that I am a maximizer because I have learned the habit of comparing the numerous choices that I have before deciding on my final option. Without doubt, I face confusion prior to making the final decision concerning the choice to be made. Although I am not at the extreme end of maximization, I tend to rigorously compare alternatives proving decision making harder. I have formed a goal of ensuring that I get the best of what is available. From the maximization scale described in the article, my average score is 6, which highlights that I am less likely to face the effects of having multiple choices. As the author describes, different people opt for various strategies such as adaptation and learning to accept choices in a bid to improve their level of satisfaction (p. 45).
After reading this compelling article, I encountered many new ideas that serve to explain why many people in developed societies are likely to be less happy than people with fewer choices. I found the article highly educative and interesting to read. The findings described by the author have a good basis of experiments that were performed and hence prove reliable (p. 47).
Conclusion
Evidently, this paper successfully discusses the conflicts and confusion faced by maximizers as they struggle to make choices amongst the numerous available alternatives. The author develops a linkage between many choices and declining levels of happiness and uses experimental data to prove this claim right. The article is an impressive read for readers interested in understanding how choices affect our lives. The article also presents strategies for overcoming the negative feelings that maximizers often have to handle after making some choices.