

The Seductive Allure of “Seductive Allure”

Martha J. Farah and Cayce J. Hook

Center for Neuroscience & Society, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

Perspectives on Psychological Science
8(1) 88–90

© The Author(s) 2013

Reprints and permission:

sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/1745691612469035

http://pps.sagepub.com



Abstract

The idea of fMRI’s “seductive allure” is supported by two widely cited studies. Upon closer analysis of these studies, and in light of more recent research, we find little empirical support for the claim that brain images are inordinately influential.

Keywords

fMRI, brain imaging, scientific communication, publication bias, neuroethics

As a tool for studying the human mind and brain, fMRI has been subject to various criticisms. One often-cited problem with fMRI is that the images are too dazzling—that is, that they cloud readers’ judgment and mask the technology’s limitations. Neuroimaging has been described with the word “seductive” as early as the 1990s (Ratcliff, 1998, p. 129; Sarter, Berntson, & Cacioppo, 1996, p. 13; see also Brammer, 2003, p. 373; Check, 2005, p. 254; Gerard & Peterson, 2003, p. 13; Gordon, 2001, p. 104; Illes, De Vries, Cho, & Schraedly-Desmond, 2006, p. W27; Marks, 2010, p. 4; Merckelbach, Devilly, & Rassin, 2002, p. 492). William Uttal (2011), a vocal critic of functional neuroimaging research in psychology, asserts “Their charm, their novelty, and their pictorial splendor tend to overwhelm critical consideration...” (p. 21). Whereas Roskies (2010) cautiously observes “Neuroimages are epistemically compelling: They invite us to believe” (p. 195), more pointed references to this problem come from Bloom (2006) who writes of “fMRI’s seductive but deceptive grasp on our attentions” (paragraph 6) and Crawford (2008) who refers to neuroimaging as “that fast-acting solvent of critical faculties” (p. 65). According to Poole (2012), “the [fMRI] pictures, like religious icons, inspire uncritical devotion” (paragraph 18).

What is the evidence for the seductive allure of brain imaging? The most frequently cited findings come from two articles published in 2008. McCabe and Castel (2008) assessed the effects of functional brain images on the perceived quality of cognitive neuroscience research. Using both fictional research descriptions and a real science news article, they documented higher ratings of credibility when the texts were accompanied by functional brain images rather than bar charts, topographical maps of scalp-recorded electroencephalography (EEG), or no image. For example, in a hypothetical study entitled “Watching TV is Related to Math Ability” the result of interest was that both TV watching and arithmetic evoked activation in the temporal lobe. The conclusion of the study, which

subjects were to evaluate, was that TV watching could improve math skills. Subjects did so after reading a description of the study and results accompanied by either a bar chart or a brain image.

McCabe and Castel described the illustrations used in these two conditions as “informationally equivalent,” but this was not strictly true. Figure 1 shows the sample stimuli illustrating the hypothetical research on TV and math from that article. The bar chart shows total temporal lobe activation, whereas the 3-D rendering of the brain shows specific regions of activation in the temporal lobe, including both the shape and location of the activated areas within the temporal lobe. Given that the scientific argument in the accompanying text was based on the similarity of brain activation across the two conditions, the similarly shaped and located splotches of activation in the brain images do in fact provide more support than the equivalent total temporal lobe activation in the bar chart.

The authors also compared fMRI brain images to a different kind of data representation: a topographic map of the kind used to represent scalp distributions of electric potential in EEG and event-related potentials (ERP) research. The latter was a circular map of the head, with 21 electrode sites, and color-coded gradations of interpolated activity. Although such representations include somewhat more specific information about the shape and location of brain activity than do bar charts of lobe-wide activity, the signals they depict (scalp recordings from widely spaced electrodes) offer fewer specific details than does fMRI. For purposes of evaluating the persuasiveness of conclusions that rest on evidence of common anatomical substrates, this difference is relevant. Thus, like the bar charts, the maps are not informationally equivalent

Corresponding Author:

Martha J. Farah, University of Pennsylvania, 3720 Walnut St, Philadelphia, PA 19104

E-mail: mfarah@psych.upenn.edu




Fig. 1. Sample stimuli from the article by McCabe and Castel (2008).¹

to fMRI. In other words, subjects should find them more persuasive, because of the information they convey, not their seductive allure.

The other study that is sometimes cited in connection with the seductive allure of imaging did not actually study the effect of brain images. Weisberg, Keil, Goodstein, Rawson, and Gray (2008) set out to examine the effect of neuroscience information on the perceived quality of explanations of psychological phenomena. They found that poor explanations for psychological phenomena were rated as more convincing when accompanied by irrelevant neuroscience information. Although some of the explanations in the “With Neuroscience” condition (i.e., including such irrelevant information) referred to brain imaging, no images were presented to subjects. In addition, Weisberg et al. pointed out that their results are “not necessarily limited to neuroscience or even to psychology. Rather, people may be responding to some more general property of the neuroscience information that encouraged them to find the explanations in the With Neuroscience condition more satisfying” (p. 476).

Despite their limitations, these two studies from 2008 have been cited hundreds of times in subsequent years as proof of brain images’ power to overwhelm our judgment. Surprisingly little additional evidence has been published in support of the disproportionate persuasiveness of brain images. Specifically, to our knowledge only one subsequent published study has reported effects of functional brain images on ratings of scientific credibility, and this study did not compare ratings with and without images: Keehner, Mayberry, and Fischer (2011) contrasted ratings of research credibility for five different types of functional brain images (glass brain, axial slice, 3-D brain, inflated brain, and ERP scalp topography). Effects of rated image complexity, realism, three-dimensionality and familiarity were examined, and only three-dimensionality was observed to have a significant effect (uncorrected for multiple comparisons).

Other recent studies have failed to replicate the effect of functional brain images on judgments of research. Gruber and Dickerson (2012) performed an experiment much like McCabe and Castel’s (2008), asking subjects to rate the quality of reasoning and other aspects of a science news article and

comparing the effects of an article with a brain image relative to that with no image or other types of images. They reported no significant effects of image type on subjects’ ratings. Two series of as-yet unpublished experiments have failed to find evidence for the seductive allure of brain images. Michael, Newman, Vuorre, Cumming, and Garry (2012) reported a series of replication attempts using materials similar to McCabe & Castel’s Experiment 3. Across nearly 2,000 subjects, a meta-analysis of these studies and McCabe & Castel’s original data produced a miniscule estimated effect size whose plausible range includes a value of zero. Our own work (Hook & Farah, 2012) found little or no evidence that brain images enhance readers’ evaluation of research (specifically, no effect on judgments of reasoning quality) in three experiments with a total of 988 subjects.

Given the paucity of published support for the seductive allure hypothesis, the weaknesses in that support, and the recent null results, it is remarkable that the hypothesis has persisted. Why might this be? There are many possible answers, none of which are mutually exclusive.

First, the idea of seductive allure lends support to the widely held concern that the behavioral sciences are being deprived of funding in favor of brain imaging research (Bloom, 2006; Fodor, 1999; Miller, 2010; Weisberg, 2008). Although we agree that behavioral science research is underfunded, the seductive allure of brain imaging is not likely to be the reason. In addition, given the visual appeal of images and their high-tech origins, the idea that they are inordinately persuasive is plausible. This a priori plausibility may have reduced scrutiny of the experimental designs and of results that seem to support it. In addition, publication bias may have played a role by preventing us from learning of negative results from other, possibly better controlled, studies. As the blogger Neuroskeptic wrote in 2009 concerning Weisberg et al.’s (2008) study, there is “another kind of seductive allure, probably the oldest and most dangerous of all—the allure of that which confirms what we already thought we knew.”

Acknowledgments

We thank Robert Michael and Maryanne Garry for sharing their findings and ideas with us. We also thank our colleagues at the Center for

Neuroscience & Society and the Intuitive Neuroscience Working Group for helpful discussion.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared that they had no conflicts of interest with respect to their authorship or the publication of this article.

Funding

The writing of this article was supported by NIH Grant R01-HD055689 and NSF Grant 0933919.

Note

1. Reprinted from McCabe, D. P., & Castel, A.D. (2008). Seeing is believing: The effect of brain images on judgments of scientific reasoning. *Cognition*, 107, pp. 343–352, with permission from Elsevier.

References

- Bloom, P. (2006, June 26). Seduced by the flickering lights of the brain. *Seed Magazine*. Retrieved from http://seedmagazine.com/content/article/seduced_by_the_flickering_lights_of_the_brain/
- Brammer, M. (2003). Statistical analysis of functional magnetic resonance imaging data: Current state and recent developments. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 12, 373–374. doi:10.1191/0962280203sm344ed
- Check, E. (2005). Ethicists urge caution over emotive power of brain scans. *Nature*, 435, 254–255. doi:10.1038/435254a
- Crawford, M. B. (2008). The limits of neuro-talk. *The New Atlantis*, 19, 65–78.
- Fodor, J. (1999, September 30). Diary: Why the brain? *London Review of Books*, 21, 68–69.
- Gerard, E., & Peterson, B. S. (2003). Developmental processes and brain imaging studies in Tourette's syndrome. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 55, 13–22. doi:10.1016/S0022-3999(02)00581-0
- Gordon, E. (2001). Integrative psychophysiology. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 42, 95–108. doi:10.1016/S0167-8760(01)00160-X
- Gruber, D., & Dickerson, J. A. (2012). Persuasive images in popular science: Testing judgments of scientific reasoning and credibility. *Public Understanding of Science*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/0963662512454072
- Hook, C. J., & Farah, M. J. (2012). *Look again: Effects of neuro-images and mind-brain dualism on lay evaluations of research*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Illes, J., De Vries, R., Cho, M. K., & Schraedley-Desmond, P. (2006). ELSI priorities for brain imaging. *American Journal of Bioethics*, 6, W24–W31. doi:10.1080/15265160500506274
- Keehner, M., Mayberry, L., & Fischer, M. (2011). Different clues from different views: The role of image format in public perceptions of neuroimaging results. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 18, 422–428. doi:10.3758/s13423-010-0048-7
- Marks, J. H. (2010). A neuroskeptic's guide to neuroethics and national security. *AJOB Neuroscience*, 1, 4–12. doi:10.1080/21507741003699256
- McCabe, D. P., & Castel, A. D. (2008). Seeing is believing: The effect of brain images on judgments of scientific reasoning. *Cognition*, 107, 343–352. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2007.07.017
- Merckelbach, H., Devilly, G. J., & Rassin, E. (2002). Alters in dissociative identity disorder: Metaphors or genuine entities? *Clinical Psychology Review*, 22, 481–497. doi:10.1016/S0272-7358(01)00115-5
- Michael, R. B., Newman, E. J., Vuorre, M., Cumming, G., & Garry, M. (2012). *On the (non)persuasive power of a brain image*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Miller, G. A. (2010). Mistreating psychology in the decades of the brain. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5, 716–743.
- Neuroskeptic. (2009, January 6). *Critiquing a classic: "The seductive allure of neuroscience explanations."* Retrieved from <http://neuroskeptic.blogspot.com/2009/01/critiquing-classic-seductive-allure-of.html>
- Poole, S. (2012, September 6). Your brain on pseudoscience: The rise of popular neurobollocks. *The New Statesman*. Retrieved from <http://www.newstatesman.com/culture/books/2012/09/your-brain-pseudoscience>
- Ratcliff, R. (1998). The role of mathematical psychology in experimental psychology. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 50, 129–130.
- Roskies, A. L. (2010). Neuroimaging and inferential distance: The perils of pictures. In S. J. Hanson & M. Bunzl (Eds.), *Foundational issues in human brain mapping* (pp. 195–215). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Sarter, M., Berntson, G. G., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1996). Brain imaging and cognitive neuroscience: Toward strong inference in attributing function to structure. *American Psychologist*, 51, 13–21. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.51.1.13
- Uttal, W. R. (2011). *Mind and brain: A critical appraisal of cognitive neuroscience*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Weisberg, D. S. (2008). Caveat lector: The presentation of neuroscience information in the popular media. *Scientific Review of Mental Health Practice*, 6, 51–56.
- Weisberg, D. S., Keil, F. C., Goodstein, J., Rawson, E., & Gray, J. R. (2008). The seductive allure of neuroscience explanations. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 20, 470–477. doi:10.1162/jocn.2008.20040