Journal of Psychological Research
https://journals.bilpubgroup.com/index.php/jpr

REVIEW

Images That Think: Theoretical Conflicts in Cognitive Psychology

Luísa Soares [1*], *Frank Shifferdecker-Hoch* [2], *Inês Santos Silva* [2*]

[1] *Department of Psychology, Universidade da Madeira, 9000-082 Funchal, Portugal*

[2] *2256C.Health Unipessoal Lda, 1269-039 Lisboa, Portugal*

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the theoretical and empirical foundations of mental imagery and inductive reasoning within cognitive psychology, with a particular focus on their epistemological tensions and functional complementarities. The first part examines the longstanding debate between pictorial and propositional theories of mental representation, highlighting pivotal contributions by Kosslyn, Pylyshyn, Paivio, Shepard, and Cooper. Drawing on neuroimaging, behavioral experimentation, and computational modeling, the paper argues that mental images preserve spatial and perceptual properties and are manipulated in ways that mirror actual perception, thereby supporting the analogical view. These findings are contrasted with symbolic or propositional accounts, which emphasize the abstract, language-like structure of thought. The Kosslyn–Pylyshyn debate is analyzed as a paradigmatic conflict that shaped subsequent empirical methodologies and conceptual assumptions in the field. The second part focuses on inductive reasoning as a probabilistic, experience-driven process that underpins concept formation, categorization, and adaptive learning. The paper investigates the interplay between attention, perception, and memory in constructing conjunctive, disjunctive, and relational concepts. Inductive reasoning is shown to support decision-making in dynamic, uncertain environments through flexible cognitive strategies. Both imagery and induction are examined in their applied dimensions, ranging from clinical psychology and education to AI and neuroscience, where they inform therapeutic tools, instructional design, and cognitive modeling. Methodological insights from neuropsychology and qualitative introspection are integrated to underline the dynamic, multimodal nature of these processes. The paper concludes by proposing that imagery and inductive reasoning are not only theoretically

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:
Luísa Soares, Department of Psychology, Universidade da Madeira, 9000-082 Funchal, Portugal; Email: lsoares@staff.uma.pt; Inês Santos Silva, 2256C.Health, 1269-039 Lisboa, Portugal; Email: ines.santossilva@2256c.health

ARTICLE INFO
Received: 9 September 2025 | Revised: 28 September 2025 | Accepted: 15 October 2025 | Published Online: 6 January 2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30564/jpr.v7i4.11529

CITATION
Soares, L., Shifferdecker-Hoch, F., Silva, S., 2026. Images That Think: Theoretical Conflicts in Cognitive Psychology. Journal of Psychological Research. 7(4): 12–23. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30564/jpr.v7i4.11529

interdependent but also crucial for advancing cognitive science and its practical applications.
Keywords: Mental Imagery; Inductive Reasoning; Cognitive Processes

1. Introduction

Mental imagery has long been a subject of theoretical contention in cognitive psychology, tracing back to classical philosophical inquiries into the nature of thought and representation. From Aristotle's idea that "the soul never thinks without an image" (*De Anima*, Book III) to Descartes' dualist speculations about mental picturing, the issue of how humans mentally simulate reality has remained pivotal in debates over the architecture of cognition. Contemporary psychological research inherits this tension, crystallizing it into two dominant perspectives: the pictorial and propositional approaches to mental representation.

The pictorial approach posits that mental images function analogously to visual perception, they retain spatial structure, metric properties, and a sense of visual continuity. This model is closely linked to the work of Stephen Kosslyn, who proposes that visual imagery operates through quasi-perceptual processes and relies on mechanisms similar to those involved in actual vision [1,2]. In contrast, the propositional view, advanced notably by Zenon Pylyshyn, argues that cognition is mediated by abstract, language-like codes that do not necessarily preserve sensory or spatial features [3,4]. These propositions, akin to syntactic representations in logic or computer programs, are assumed to be amodal, operating independently of perceptual systems.

This theoretical divide has significant implications for understanding cognitive processes, including memory, reasoning, language, and problem-solving. Kosslyn's experiments, which utilized mental scanning and rotation tasks, demonstrated that response times were proportional to the physical characteristics of the imagined stimuli, such as distance or angle [5]. These findings support the analogical nature of mental images. Conversely, Pylyshyn's critique emphasized the possibility that "tacit knowledge" influences participants' expectations, thereby mimicking perceptual effects without necessitating pictorial representation [4].

Mental imagery refers to the generation of sensory-like experiences in the absence of direct external stimuli. These experiences may span across multiple modalities, visual, auditory, olfactory, gustatory, and tactile, but the visual modality has received the most empirical attention [6,7]. Visual imagery allows individuals to mentally simulate objects, scenarios, or spatial transformations, playing a central role in knowledge acquisition, memory encoding, and creative reasoning [8,9].

Cornoldi, De Beni, and Giusberti [6] argue that mental images preserve key sensory characteristics of absent stimuli, allowing individuals to "reconstruct" perceptual experiences internally. Kosslyn, Thompson, and Ganis [7] further define mental imagery as a perceptual representation in the mind that can evoke subjective experiences similar to direct perception. These insights are supported by neuroimaging studies, which demonstrate that visual imagery activates overlapping regions in the visual cortex, particularly areas V1 and V2, suggesting a shared neural substrate for perception and imagery [10,11].

Allan Paivio's Dual Coding Theory [12,13] offers a complementary perspective by positing that cognition involves two semi-independent subsystems: one for verbal information and another for imagery. The interaction between these channels enhances learning and memory by providing multiple encoding routes. Empirical evidence from education and multimedia learning supports this claim, showing that information presented with congruent verbal and visual elements is retained more effectively than when either format is used alone [14,15]. This evidence has led to practical applications in instructional design, particularly in online learning and textbook development.

Complementary evidence comes from Shepard and Cooper's mental rotation studies [16], which found that individuals mentally manipulate three-dimensional objects in a manner that reflects physical transformations. Response times increased linearly with the angular disparity between objects, suggesting that mental images preserve geometric properties and are processed via mechanisms akin to motor planning.

Kosslyn's computational model of imagery conceptualizes the brain as a visual information processor, comprising a visual buffer, an image processor, and long-term memory for symbolic encoding [5]. The visual buffer, located in the primary visual cortex, acts as a mental screen where images are projected. The image processor manipulates these inputs, while long-term memory provides the syntactic rules for generating and interpreting visual scenes. This tripartite architecture has become a foundational model for understanding how visual representations are formed, transformed, and integrated into broader cognitive functions.

Recent perspectives have sought to bridge the pictorial–propositional divide through hybrid models. For example, the embodied cognition framework suggests that cognitive processes, including imagery, are grounded in bodily experience and sensorimotor contingencies [17]. These models propose that mental images are not mere static snapshots but dynamic simulations that recruit perceptual, motor, and affective systems. Neuroscientific studies support this view, showing that motor areas are activated during mental rotation tasks or when imagining grasping actions [18].

Mental imagery has also been examined in clinical and developmental contexts. For instance, individuals with aphantasia, an inability to voluntarily generate visual imagery, provide unique insight into the variability of imagery abilities across populations [19]. Conversely, individuals with highly vivid imagery may excel in tasks that require visualization, such as architectural design or advanced mathematics. Understanding these individual differences has implications for diagnosis and intervention in cognitive training, educational scaffolding, and therapy.

From a methodological standpoint, the study of mental imagery has employed a range of tools, including functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), electroencephalography (EEG), transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS), and eye-tracking. These techniques allow researchers to map the neural correlates of imagery and assess its temporal dynamics and spatial fidelity. For example, TMS applied to the occipital cortex can disrupt visual imagery, suggesting that early visual areas are functionally necessary for image maintenance [20].

The present paper adopts a dual-structured approach, first analyzing the theoretical foundations and empirical validations of the mental imagery debate, with a focus on analogical versus symbolic representations. Second, it investigates inductive reasoning as a complementary cognitive mechanism that operates probabilistically and empirically to form generalizations from specific instances. This second axis enables the exploration of how cognitive systems structure experience, construct meaning, and navigate uncertainty, thereby enriching the study of mental imagery with a broader lens on human cognition.

2. The Kosslyn–Pylyshyn Debate: Mental Imagery and Cognitive Architecture

A central controversy in cognitive psychology is the imagery debate between Stephen Kosslyn and Zenon Pylyshyn, which reflects broader tensions about the nature of mental representation and the architecture of thought. This debate is not merely academic but forms the epistemological axis upon which much of the empirical research on mental imagery is designed and interpreted. It centers on a deceptively simple yet deeply consequential question: When we imagine a visual scene, does the mind generate picture-like representations, or are these experiences epiphenomenal outputs of underlying symbolic processes?

Kosslyn, a prominent advocate of the pictorial (analogical) model, argues that mental imagery preserves spatial and visual characteristics akin to those found in actual perception. His neuroimaging studies using Positron Emission Tomography (PET) and fMRI techniques show that visual mental imagery activates early visual cortices (for example, area V1), reinforcing the idea that such imagery is functionally grounded in the perceptual system itself [1,7,10,11]. According to Kosslyn's theory, the brain constructs images on a "visual buffer", a mental screen within the visual cortex, on which transformations such as rotation, scanning, and resizing can occur [5].

In stark contrast, Pylyshyn contends that imagery is epiphenomenal, meaning that what feels like a picture in the mind is the byproduct of propositional cognitive processes. These propositions are abstract, amodal, and syntactically structured, comparable to language or computer code, without intrinsic spatial properties [3,4]. For Pylyshyn, the appearance of analogical behavior (for example, longer response times with increased mental distance) can be attributed to tacit knowledge or learned expectations about the physical world, rather than to genuinely pictorial representations.

2.1. Empirical Grounding: Classic Experiments

One of the most cited bodies of evidence in favor of the analogical view comes from Kosslyn's mental scanning tasks, in which participants are asked to form a mental image of a previously memorized map. The time it takes to scan from one point to another correlates linearly with the imagined distance, mimicking real-world spatial navigation [5]. Similarly, mental rotation tasks, originally conducted by Shepard and Cooper [16] and extended by Kosslyn, demonstrated that response times increase with angular disparity between imagined objects, again suggesting that mental images behave analogously to perceptual input.

Another widely discussed experiment involved imagining a rabbit next to either a fly or an elephant. Participants were quicker to identify features of the rabbit when imagined next to the fly than next to the elephant, implying that relative size and spatial granularity were preserved in the mental image [2,5,21]. These findings are difficult to reconcile with propositional theories, which do not predict such perceptual-like scaling effects.

In support of Pylyshyn's critique, however, some researchers have shown that strategic or task-related factors, such as the wording of instructions or contextual framing, can significantly alter results in imagery experiments. These effects suggest that cognitive strategies, rather than perceptual mechanisms, may drive some aspects of performance [22].

2.2. Cognitive and Neural Dissociations

Additional insights into the debate can be acquired from clinical neuropsychology. Studies of patients with brain lesions affecting occipital or parietal lobes show selective impairments in spatial imagery tasks, even when verbal reasoning remains intact [23]. For example, patients with damage to the right posterior parietal cortex often exhibit difficulties with mental rotation or spatial reconstruction, but can perform logical reasoning and semantic tasks normally. This fact supports the idea that imagery and symbolic processing are partially dissociable, both anatomically and functionally.

Kosslyn and colleagues used TMS (transcranial magnetic stimulation) to temporarily disrupt the occipital cortex during imagery tasks. They found that performance on visual imagery tasks decreased significantly during stimulation, suggesting a causal role for perceptual regions in the construction of imagery [20]. Such findings undermine the proposition that imagery is merely a symbolic epiphenomenon.

2.3. Multimodal Imagery and Embodied Extensions

Although much of the debate has focused on visual imagery, recent work emphasizes that mental imagery is a multimodal phenomenon, extending across auditory, tactile, olfactory, and motor domains. For example, individuals who are blind from birth can generate tactile or auditory mental representations that serve similar cognitive functions, such as spatial navigation, memory retrieval, or simulation of experiences, demonstrating that visual experience is not a prerequisite for mental imagery [24].

Embodied theories of cognition further challenge the dichotomy by proposing that imagery arises from sensorimotor simulations rooted in bodily experience [17]. For instance, imagining an action (for example, lifting a cup) activates overlapping neural circuits with those involved in the actual action itself [18]. This convergence suggests that mental imagery is not solely a symbolic construct, nor is it reducible to pictorial codes. It may instead emerge from integrated perceptual-motor systems, giving rise to what Barsalou calls "grounded simulations" [17].

2.4. Symbolic Representation Revisited

It is important to note that even Kosslyn acknowledged the limitations of a purely analogical model. In tasks involving abstract reasoning, ambiguous stimuli, or complex conceptual manipulation, propositional strategies may dominate. For instance, interpreting reversible figures (like the duck–rabbit illusion) or constructing mental representations of logic-based problems often involves symbolic encoding, hypothesis testing, and rule-based processing [4,25].

Thus, a hybrid account may offer a more plausible resolution to the imagery debate. Contemporary frameworks suggest that mental imagery engages multiple representational formats depending on task demands, individual differences, and domain-specific expertise. Some researchers propose that the brain dynamically toggles between analogical and symbolic systems, leveraging each according to efficiency and context [26].

2.5. Implications for Cognitive Architecture

The implications of this debate go beyond theoretical speculation. They influence how we understand memory consolidation, problem-solving, creativity, and even artificial intelligence (AI). In AI, for example, visual reasoning models attempt to simulate human-like perception-based inference, while symbolic systems focus on formal rule encoding. A comprehensive theory of cognition must therefore account for how both modalities contribute to flexible, adaptive intelligence [27,28].

In summary, the Kosslyn–Pylyshyn debate remains one of the most generative theoretical divides in cognitive science. Rather than resolving the controversy in favor of one model, recent research suggests that mental imagery is a composite process, sometimes perceptual and at other times symbolic, and often interactive. Ongoing studies in neuroscience, Human Computer Interaction (HCI), and computational modeling continue to refine our understanding of this core dimension of human cognition.

3. Applications of Imagery and Inductive Reasoning in Cognitive Psychology

Mental imagery is a powerful cognitive function with extensive applications across various domains, including clinical, educational, technological, and scientific fields. Far from being a theoretical curiosity, imagery processes are actively harnessed to enhance motor coordination, emotional regulation, memory consolidation, decision-making, and learning outcomes [9]. The increasing integration of neurocognitive tools and applied frameworks has provided empirical support for the practical benefits of imagery in diverse settings.

3.1. Clinical Psychology

In clinical psychology, mental imagery has emerged as a versatile tool used across both neurorehabilitative and psychotherapeutic frameworks. One of the most well-documented applications is Motor Imagery Practice (MIP), in which individuals imagine executing motor actions without actually moving their bodies. This method is particularly valuable for patients recovering from stroke, traumatic brain injury, or neurodegenerative conditions like Parkinson's disease. Empirical studies demonstrate that MIP activates the motor cortex, supplementary motor area, and cerebellum, areas also involved during actual movement, indicating its potential to preserve and enhance motor pathways during periods of physical inactivity [29].

In parallel, mental imagery plays a transformative role in trauma-focused therapies, especially within Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR). In this context, guided imagery is employed to evoke traumatic memories in a structured setting, allowing clients to reconsolidate these experiences with reduced emotional intensity. The visualization of safe spaces, protective figures, or empowering narratives is used to reframe cognitive appraisals and attenuate distress responses [30].

Beyond trauma, imagery-based cognitive restructuring is also highly effective in the treatment of anxiety disorders, depression, and obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD). For instance, patients may be guided to visualize feared situations and mentally rehearse adaptive responses, or to imagine more realistic, compassionate interpretations of self-defeating thoughts. This process enhances emotional processing, supports exposure techniques, and strengthens self-efficacy, particularly in clients with high verbal reasoning skills but low emotional insight [31,32]. Overall, mental imagery serves as both a diagnostic probe and a change agent in psychotherapy, offering access to preverbal representations, implicit memory, and nonverbal affective schemas that are often difficult to reach through verbal dialogue alone.

3.2. Sports Psychology

Mental imagery is a cornerstone of performance enhancement and psychological training in sports psychology. Athletes routinely engage in visual, kinesthetic, and auditory imagery to mentally rehearse athletic movements, game strategies, and even emotional states under pressure. This type of mental simulation is widely recognized for improving motor coordination, reaction time, focus, and self-regulation. It is particularly effective when combined with physical practice, as it enables athletes to rehearse precision tasks repeatedly without the fatigue or injury risk associated with physical overtraining [33].

Neuroimaging studies [34,35] have confirmed that motor imagery activates neural structures, such as the premotor cortex, basal ganglia, and cerebellum, which overlap with those engaged during physical execution. This shared circuitry supports the idea that mental rehearsal strengthens sensorimotor representations, accelerates motor learning, and enhances automatization of complex skills.

Elite athletes often use scripted imagery protocols developed in collaboration with sports psychologists. These scripts may incorporate motivational components (for example, imagining successful outcomes), strategic simulations (for example, adapting to a competitor's unexpected move), and recovery scenarios (for example, bouncing back from errors). Imagery is also used pre-competition to regulate arousal levels, reduce performance anxiety, and maintain optimal attentional focus. For example, visualizing the execution of a penalty kick in front of a hostile crowd prepares athletes to maintain composure under stress.

Beyond individual sports, team-based disciplines utilize collective imagery sessions to improve coordination, communication, and tactical execution. As a cognitive training tool, mental imagery has become an integral part of performance psychology programs for Olympic teams, military athletes, and professional leagues worldwide.

3.3. Education

Educational psychology has long benefited from the application of mental imagery, particularly through frameworks like Dual Coding Theory, which posits that information is encoded more robustly when presented in both verbal and visual formats [12–14]. In classrooms and digital learning environments, this principle supports the use of diagrams, illustrations, mind maps, and interactive visuals to reinforce complex or abstract content.

Imagery facilitates not only memory retention but also conceptual clarity, especially in domains such as mathematics, science, engineering, and foreign language acquisition. For example, visualizing geometric transformations, atomic structures, or grammatical sentence trees can reduce cognitive load and scaffold schema construction [15,36]. The use of graphic organizers and imagery cues is particularly effective for students with learning difficulties, such as dyslexia or Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), as it provides multisensory input and supports working memory.

Emerging technologies have further amplified the instructional potential of imagery. Augmented reality (AR) and simulation-based learning environments enable learners to interact with 3D models of anatomical systems, historical reenactments, or molecular structures [37]. These immersive experiences utilise spatial cognition and embodied learning, fostering a deeper understanding through visual manipulation and exploratory engagement [38].

Additionally, mental imagery plays a crucial role in developing reading comprehension, mathematical reasoning, and creative writing. When students are encouraged to "form a picture in their mind" while reading or solving problems, they engage with the material more actively and meaningfully. Overall, imagery-based strategies are essential tools for enhancing meaning-making, retention, and transfer of learning in both traditional and technology-enhanced educational settings.

3.4. High-Risk Professions and Training

In high-stakes environments, such as aviation, surgery, firefighting, and military operations, the stakes for human error are significant. In these fields, mental imagery is deployed as a core element of simulation-based training, allowing professionals to rehearse tasks, contingencies, and decision trees in controlled, low-risk settings. By mentally simulating the procedural and emotional demands of critical scenarios, individuals can pre-activate the neural and cognitive systems essential for successful real-world performance [39].

Virtual Reality (VR), Augmented Reality (AR), and 3D simulation platforms replicate realistic task environments and stress conditions. For instance, in aviation, pilots undergo flight simulator training that incorporates not only technical maneuvers but also emergency response protocols, often guided by scripted imagery. Similarly, military units train with VR-based mission walkthroughs that prepare personnel for combat unpredictability, helping to desensitize threat responses and enhance cognitive flexibility.

In medical education, imagery-based simulation is integral to surgical training. Residents practice complex procedures using haptic feedback systems and VR interfaces that mimic anatomical variability, time pressure, and instrument handling. Studies show that mental walkthroughs improve procedural recall, precision, and team coordination, even when physical resources are limited [40].

Importantly, these applications extend beyond technical training to emotional regulation and situational awareness.

Visualising a successful response in a high-stress emergency or anticipating complications during surgery not only improves competence but also enhances confidence, resilience, and decision-making speed. Mental imagery thus functions as a bridge between cognitive rehearsal and real-time adaptability, enhancing both performance and safety in critical settings.

3.5. Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience

In the fields of artificial intelligence (AI) and neuroscience, mental imagery has inspired the development of computational models that attempt to simulate human reasoning, perception, and internal representation. Contemporary AI systems—particularly those focused on visual question answering (VQA), image captioning, and scene understanding—increasingly incorporate architectures that emulate perceptual-symbol systems [27,28]. These systems are designed not merely to process visual data but to interpret and generate inferences from imagined or hypothetical scenarios, mimicking the simulation-based reasoning seen in human cognition.

For instance, models like CLEVR or neural-symbolic reasoning frameworks integrate symbolic logic with deep learning to answer questions about visual scenes. Such models reflect how the human mind links perceptual input with conceptual structure, aligning with theories of grounded cognition and dual-process reasoning [41].

Simultaneously, in neuroscience and neuroengineering, mental imagery underlies critical innovations in brain-computer interface (BCI) technology. These systems translate imagined motor commands into digital signals that control prosthetic limbs, communication devices, or robotic systems. Successful implementation depends on the brain's ability to generate distinct neural activation patterns during motor imagery, which can be detected using EEG, MEG, or fMRI and then interpreted by machine learning algorithms [42].

Beyond motor control, BCIs are now exploring affective imagery for emotion regulation and visual imagery for neurofeedback-based treatments in anxiety or ADHD. This bidirectional relationship, where mental imagery both informs and is decoded by AI, demonstrates its centrality in bridging human and machine cognition, offering promising avenues for assistive technologies and the future of human–AI symbiosis.

3.6. Methodologies in Imagery Research

The scientific investigation of mental imagery relies on a diverse array of quantitative and qualitative methodologies, each providing distinct insights into the nature, function, and variability of internal representations.

On the quantitative side, neuroimaging tools such as functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), electroencephalography (EEG), and transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) allow researchers to explore the neural correlates and causal mechanisms underlying imagery processes. For instance, fMRI has shown that imagining a visual scene activates regions in the occipital cortex, particularly area V1, similar to those recruited during actual perception [10,20]. EEG provides high temporal resolution for analyzing the time course of imagery generation, while TMS can disrupt specific cortical areas to assess their functional necessity during imagery tasks.

Behavioral experiments complement these neural methods by assessing response time, accuracy, and task interference during classic tasks such as mental rotation, image scanning, and size comparison [5,16]. These experiments provide evidence for the analogical nature of mental images and reveal how imagery is manipulated in real time, often in a spatially structured manner.

Qualitative methods contribute essential insights into the subjective experience of imagery. Approaches like introspective verbal reports, think-aloud protocols, and imagery-based drawing tasks help uncover individual differences in vividness, modality dominance (e.g., visual, auditory, kinesthetic), and phenomenological richness [19]. Such methods are especially valuable in clinical and educational contexts, where imagery ability varies widely across populations.

More recently, mixed-methods research has begun to integrate these approaches, linking neurophysiological data with self-report measures and performance outcomes, thereby creating a more holistic understanding of imagery as both a neural process and an experiential phenomenon.

3.7. Inductive Reasoning: From Specifics to Generalizations

Inductive reasoning represents a fundamental form of human cognition through which individuals derive general principles from specific instances. Unlike deductive reasoning, which produces logically necessary conclusions from given premises, induction is probabilistic, experience-based, and often domain-sensitive. This makes it particularly well-suited to environments characterized by uncertainty, variability, and incomplete information [43,44].

Historically, the philosophical foundation of inductive reasoning was laid by Francis Bacon, who advocated for the systematic accumulation of empirical observations followed by the gradual formulation of hypotheses. This legacy underpins not only the scientific method but also modern approaches to machine learning, clinical inference, and concept development in psychology.

In contemporary cognitive science, induction is seen as the mechanism behind categorization, analogy formation, pattern recognition, and decision-making. It allows humans to learn from experience, generalize beyond data, and adapt flexibly to new or complex situations. Importantly, inductive reasoning is not purely logical, it is deeply integrated with perception, attention, and memory, making it an embodied, context-sensitive process [45,46].

Moreover, computational models of induction, including Bayesian reasoning, connectionist networks, and case-based reasoning systems, have further elucidated how humans approximate optimal inference using limited cognitive resources, highlighting both the power and limitations of inductive thought.

3.8. Cognitive Components of Induction

The success of inductive reasoning hinges on the coordinated activity of several core cognitive faculties, each contributing a specific function to the process of generalization:

- **Attention** acts as a filter and amplifier, selecting relevant features from sensory input while suppressing irrelevant or distracting stimuli.
- **Perception** structures incoming data, detecting patterns and organizing stimuli into meaningful categories that support early generalizations.
- **Memory** serves as a repository for exemplars and experiences, enabling comparisons across instances and aiding the abstraction of common features [47].

These faculties are dynamically engaged in the processing of different concept types:

- **Conjunctive concepts** (for example, "red and circular") are relatively straightforward, requiring identification based on simultaneous features.
- **Disjunctive concepts** (for example, "red or circular") demand attentional flexibility and greater working memory to handle multiple rule sets.
- **Relational concepts** (for example, "larger than", "left of") necessitate spatial reasoning and the ability to manipulate mental representations of relationships [47,48].

To navigate these challenges, individuals rely on strategic reasoning approaches such as:

- **Successive scanning**—testing one feature or hypothesis at a time,
- **Conservative focus**—limiting comparisons to one dimension,
- **Comparative analysis**—weighing similarities and contrasts to find general patterns.

These strategies reflect an adaptive toolkit that adjusts to task demands, prior experience, and cognitive load. Crucially, they highlight how inductive reasoning is not simply a logical function but an adaptive, contextually driven process influenced by individual differences and environmental affordances.

3.9. Integration of Imagery and Induction

While often studied independently, mental imagery and inductive reasoning are deeply interconnected in real-world cognition. Their interaction is particularly evident in domains such as scientific hypothesis generation, clinical diagnosis, design thinking, and problem-solving. In these contexts, imagery supports the simulation of scenarios, while induction helps extract patterns and derive rules or explanations from those simulations.

For example, a scientist may visualize a molecular interaction before forming a generalized hypothesis; a physician may mentally simulate a disease progression based on symptom patterns and then infer a diagnosis; a designer may prototype mental models of functionality and iteratively refine them through inductive reasoning based on feedback. In each case, visual simulation scaffolds abstraction, and inductive inference informs model updating.

This integration also plays a central role in learning environments, where visual analogies or conceptual metaphors enhance inductive category learning. In therapy, clients may visualize emotionally salient situations and derive new interpretations or relational patterns, reinforcing cognitive change.

Theoretical models increasingly recognize this dynamic interaction, advocating for hybrid frameworks that combine simulation-based and probabilistic reasoning systems. Empirically, studies using dual-task paradigms, neuroimaging, and computational modelling provide converging evidence that imagery and induction co-activate in problem-solving contexts, contributing to creative and flexible cognition.

Understanding this synergy is crucial for developing educational tools, clinical interventions, and intelligent systems that capture the full complexity of human thought. The scientific investigation of mental imagery relies on a diverse array of quantitative and qualitative methodologies, each providing distinct insights into the nature, function, and variability of internal representations.

On the quantitative side, neuroimaging tools such as functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), electroencephalography (EEG), and transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) allow researchers to explore the neural correlates and causal mechanisms underlying imagery processes. For instance, fMRI has shown that imagining a visual scene activates regions in the occipital cortex—particularly area V1—similar to those recruited during actual perception [10,20]. EEG provides high temporal resolution for analyzing the time course of imagery generation, while TMS can disrupt specific cortical areas to assess their functional necessity during imagery tasks.

Behavioral experiments complement these neural methods by assessing response time, accuracy, and task interference during classic tasks such as mental rotation, image scanning, and size comparison [5,16]. These experiments provide evidence for the analogical nature of mental images and reveal how imagery is manipulated in real time, often in a spatially structured manner.

Qualitative methods contribute essential insights into the subjective experience of imagery. Approaches like introspective verbal reports, think-aloud protocols, and imagery-based drawing tasks help uncover individual differences in vividness, modality dominance (e.g., visual, auditory, kinesthetic), and phenomenological richness [28]. Such methods are especially valuable in clinical and educational contexts, where imagery ability varies widely across populations.

More recently, mixed-methods research has begun to integrate these approaches, linking neurophysiological data with self-report measures and performance outcomes, thereby creating a more holistic understanding of imagery as both a neural process and an experiential phenomenon.

4. Conclusions

Mental imagery and inductive reasoning are foundational constructs in cognitive psychology, shaping our understanding of internal representation, simulation, learning, and adaptive behavior. Theoretical debates surrounding these processes, most prominently the one between Kosslyn and Pylyshyn, have not only crystallized divergent philosophical positions but also driven a robust empirical legacy. These debates have inspired the development of neuroimaging protocols, behavioral paradigms, and computational models that collectively reveal how the mind generates, manipulates, and evaluates mental content [49–52].

Mental imagery is no longer regarded as an epiphenomenal by product of thought. Instead, it is recognized as a neurologically grounded and functionally significant process, implicated in visual perception, memory retrieval, motor planning, and decision-making. Inductive reasoning, through its probabilistic, experience-based nature, complements imagery by elucidating how abstract categories and generalizations emerge from concrete perceptual input. Together, these two systems provide a rich and interactive account of cognition, one that is both symbolically expressive and perceptually embodied.

The convergence of empirical methodologies, from fMRI and TMS to behavioral experimentation and introspective techniques, underscores that neither imagery nor induction is a static construct. Rather, they are dynamic processes, modulated by developmental stage, task context, cultural background, and technological mediation [53]. This flexibility renders them especially relevant for real-world applications in therapy, education, professional training, and artificial intelligence.

Recent advances in immersive and simulation-based technologies, particularly in educational and clinical contexts, underscore the applied value of these cognitive mechanisms. As Soares[54] has noted, technologies such as virtual reality, serious games, and visualization tools can activate core imagery and reasoning processes, fostering experiential learning, metacognition, and adaptive expertise. These tools enable learners and practitioners to rehearse, reflect, and generalize in controlled yet realistic environments, thereby enhancing both conceptual understanding and the transfer of learning[55].

Future Directions

Despite the significant progress outlined above, several questions remain unanswered, indicating fertile ground for future research. One key direction involves investigating the developmental trajectory of imagery and induction, how these capacities emerge, interact, and differentiate across childhood, adolescence, and aging. Longitudinal and cross-sectional studies that integrate neurocognitive and educational assessments could provide valuable insights into sensitive periods and cognitive plasticity.

Another avenue concerns the individual differences in imagery ability and inductive reasoning. Emerging evidence suggests that factors such as vividness, modality dominance, working memory capacity, and even affective traits (for example, anxiety, optimism) may influence how individuals engage in and benefit from imagery-based or inductive tasks. Future studies should explore how to tailor interventions and learning strategies to these differences, particularly in clinical populations, neurodiverse groups, and aging adults.

Additionally, the integration of imagery and induction in computational models remains a largely unexplored frontier. Bridging symbolic AI systems with perceptual-simulation architectures could enhance machine reasoning, particularly in areas such as decision-making, causal inference, and human–AI collaboration. Research that translates insights from cognitive neuroscience into machine learning architectures, such as integrating image-based simulation with rule learning, could advance both theoretical and applied AI.

Ultimately, the study of contextual and cross-cultural influences on imagery and reasoning remains in its infancy. Cross-linguistic and cross-cultural research could reveal how social environments, educational systems, and cultural norms shape the development and deployment of these cognitive tools.

In sum, imagery and induction remain at the heart of some of psychology's most pressing questions and most promising solutions. Their continued study offers not only theoretical enrichment but also transformative potential across various fields, including science, health, education, and technology.

Author Contributions

All authors contribute equally. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Pearson, J., 2019. The human imagination: the cognitive neuroscience of visual mental imagery. Nature reviews neuroscience. 20(10), 624–634.
[2] Kosslyn, S.M., 1994. Image and Brain: The Resolution of the Imagery Debate. MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA.
[3] Pylyshyn, Z.W., 1981. The imagery debate: Analog media versus tacit knowledge. Psychological Review. 88(1), 16–45. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.88.1.16
[4] Pylyshyn, Z.W., 2002. Mental imagery: In search of a theory. Behavioral and Brain Sciences. 25(2), 157–182. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X02000043
[5] Kosslyn, S.M., Ball, T.M., Reiser, B.J., 1978. Visual images preserve metric spatial information: Evidence

from studies of image scanning. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance. 4(1), 47–60. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.4.1.47

[6] Cornoldi, C., De Beni, R., Giusberti, F., 1998. Imagination and Visual Memory. Il Mulino: Bologna, Italy. (in Italian)

[7] Kosslyn, S.M., Thompson, W.L., Ganis, G., 2006. The Case for Mental Imagery. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.

[8] Gonçalves, E.F., Oliveira, R.A., Neves, D.A.B., 2016. Image information analysis: a cognitive perspective approach. Em Questão. 22(3), 110–135. (in Portuguese)

[9] Pearson, J., Naselaris, T., Holmes, E.A., et al., 2015. Mental imagery: Functional mechanisms and clinical applications. Trends in Cognitive Sciences. 19(10), 590–602. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2015.08.003

[10] Ishai, A., Ungerleider, L.G., Haxby, J.V., 2000. Distributed neural systems for the generation of visual images. Neuron. 28(3), 979–990. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273(00)00168-9

[11] Ganis, G., Thompson, W.L., Kosslyn, S.M., 2004. Brain areas underlying visual mental imagery and visual perception: An fMRI study. Cognitive Brain Research. 20(2), 226–241. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2004.02.012

[12] Paivio, A., 1971. Imagery and Verbal Processes. Holt, Rinehart and Winston: New York, NY, USA.

[13] Paivio, A., 1986. Mental Representations: A Dual Coding Approach. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.

[14] Clark, J.M., Paivio, A., 1991. Dual coding theory and education. Educational Psychology Review. 3(3), 149–210. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01320076

[15] Mayer, R.E., 2009. Multimedia Learning, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.

[16] Shepard, R.N., Cooper, L.A., 1982. Mental Images and Their Transformations. MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA.

[17] Barsalou, L.W., 2008. Grounded cognition. Annual Review of Psychology. 59, 617–645. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093639

[18] Jeannerod, M., 2001. Neural simulation of action: A unifying mechanism for motor cognition. NeuroImage. 14(1), S103–S109. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2001.0832

[19] Zeman, A., Dewar, M., Della Sala, S., 2015. Lives without imagery—congenital aphantasia. Cortex. 73, 378–380. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2015.05.019

[20] Kosslyn, S.M., Pascual-Leone, A., Felician, O., et al., 1999. The role of area 17 in visual imagery: Convergent evidence from PET and rTMS. Science. 284(5411), 167–170. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.284.5411.167

[21] Finke, R.A., Pinker, S., 1982. Spontaneous imagery scanning in mental extrapolation. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition. 8(2), 142.

[22] Intons-Peterson, M.J., 1983. Imagery paradigms: How vulnerable are they to experimenter expectancy effects? Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance. 9(3), 394–412. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.9.3.394

[23] Farah, M.J., Hammond, K.M., Levine, D.N., et al., 1988. Visual and spatial mental imagery: Dissociable systems of representation. Cognitive Psychology. 20(4), 439–462. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(88)90012-6

[24] El Haj, M., Badcock, J.C., Jardri, R., et al., 2019. A look into hallucinations: the relationship between visual imagery and hallucinations in Alzheimer's disease. Cognitive Neuropsychiatry. 24(4), 275–283.

[25] Ferreira, A.I., Caldeira, P.Z., 2007. Cognitive Psychology: A Simple Laboratory, 1st ed. Climepsi Editores: Lisboa, Portugal. pp. 1–194. (in Portuguese)

[26] Reisberg, D., Pearson, D.G., Kosslyn, S.M., 2003. Intuitions and introspections about imagery: The role of imagery experience in shaping an investigator's theoretical views. Applied Cognitive Psychology. 17(2), 147–160. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.858

[27] Lake, B.M., Ullman, T.D., Tenenbaum, J.B., et al., 2017. Building machines that learn and think like people. Behavioral and Brain Sciences. 40, e253. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X16001837

[28] Johnson, J., Hariharan, B., van der Maaten, L., et al., 2017. CLEVR: A diagnostic dataset for compositional language and elementary visual reasoning. In Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), Honolulu, HI, USA, 21–26 July 2017; pp. 2901–2910.

[29] Mulder, T., 2007. Motor imagery and action observation: Cognitive tools for rehabilitation. Journal of Neural Transmission. 114(10), 1265–1278. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-007-0763-z

[30] Holmes, E.A., Mathews, A., 2010. Mental imagery in emotion and emotional disorders. Clinical Psychology Review. 30(3), 349–362. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2010.01.001

[31] Kanczok, J., Jauch-Chara, K., Müller, F.J., 2024. Imagery rescripting and cognitive restructuring for inpatients with moderate and severe depression—a controlled pilot study. BMC psychiatry. 24(1), 194.

[32] Maloney, G., Arntz, A., Pittenger, C., 2025. The imagery rescripting protocol for obsessive-compulsive disorder (ImRs-OCD): A decade of iterative refinement in treatment sequencing following ERP. Behaviour Research and Therapy. 195, 104878.

[33] Guillot, A., Collet, C., 2008. Construction of the motor imagery integrative model in sport: A review and the-

oretical investigation. International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology. 1(1), 31–44. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/17509840701823139

[34] Henschke, J.U., Pakan, J.M., 2023. Engaging distributed cortical and cerebellar networks through motor execution, observation, and imagery. Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience. 17, 1165307.

[35] Torbati, A.H.M., Jami, S., Kobravi, H., et al., 2024. Underlying interactive neural mechanism of motor learning governed by the cerebellum, the basal ganglia, and motor/sensory cortex: a review from theoretical perspective. Neuroscience and Behavioral Physiology. 54(3), 347–356.

[36] Mayer, R.E., Fiorella, L., 2014. Principles for Managing Essential Processing in Multimedia Learning. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.

[37] Dede, C., 2009. Immersive interfaces for engagement and learning. Science. 323(5910), 66–69. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1167311

[38] Makransky, G., Lilleholt, L., 2018. A structural equation modeling investigation of the emotional value of immersive virtual reality in education. Educational Technology Research and Development. 66(5), 1141–1164. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-018-9581-2

[39] He, Z., Zhu, F., Perlin, K., et al., 2018. Manifest the invisible: Design for situational awareness of physical environments in virtual reality. arXiv preprint. arXiv:1809.05837. DOI: https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1809.05837

[40] Khan, R., Plahouras, J., Johnston, B.C., et al., 2019. Virtual reality simulation training in endoscopy: A Cochrane review and meta-analysis. Endoscopy. 51(7), 653–664. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1055/a-0894-4400

[41] Liang, B., Wang, Y., Tong, C., 2025. AI Reasoning in Deep Learning Era: From Symbolic AI to Neural–Symbolic AI. Mathematics. 13(11), 1707.

[42] Abiri, R., Borhani, S., Sellers, E.W., et al., 2019. A comprehensive review of EEG-based brain–computer interface paradigms. Journal of Neural Engineering. 16(1), 011001.

[43] Indeed Editorial Team, 2025. Inductive reasoning: what is inductive thinking (with examples). Available from: https://br.indeed.com/conselho-de-carreira/desenvolvimento-de-carreira/raciocinio-indutivo (cited 30 July 2025). (in Portuguese)

[44] Han, S.J., Ransom, K.J., Perfors, A., et al., 2024. Inductive reasoning in humans and large language models. Cognitive Systems Research. 83, 101155.

[45] Heit, E., 2008. Models of inductive reasoning. In: Sun, R. (Ed.). The Cambridge Handbook of Computational Psychology. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA. pp. 322–338.

[46] Barrett, L., Stout, D., 2024. Minds in movement: embodied cognition in the age of artificial intelligence. Philosophical Transactions B. 379(1911), 20230144.

[47] Braun Endo, A.C., Brás Roque, M.A., 2020. Attention, memory and perception: a conceptual analysis of Neuropsychology applied to advertising and its influence on consumer behavior. Revista Brasileira de Ciências da Comunicação. 40(1), 21–45. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/rbcc.v40i1.2638 (in Portuguese)

[48] Medin, D.L., Smith, E.E., 1984. Concepts and concept formation. Annual Review of Psychology. 35(1), 113–138. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.35.020184.000553

[49] Soares, L., Barbosa, P., Aguiar, A., et al., 2023. Clinical psychology and the new technological challenges after Covid-19. Diversitas Journal. 9(4), 2069–2084.

[50] Santos, I., Gama, S., Gonçalves, D., 2017. CogniHue: Studying the Cognitive Effect of Color in HCI [Master's Thesis]. Instituto Superior Técnico: Lisbon, Portugal.

[51] Santos Silva, I., Paulo, S.F., Soares, L., et al., 2024. Investigating social sensemaking technologies for emotional wellbeing of stroke survivors and caregivers. In CHI'24: ACM CHI conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, May 11–16, 2024, Honolulu, Hawai'i. Association for Computing Machinery (ACM): New York, NY, USA. Available from: https://www.academia.edu/143980690/Investigating_Social_Sensemaking_Technologies_for_Emotional_Wellbeing_of_Stroke_Survivors_and_Caregivers

[52] Santos Silva, I., Soares, L., Schifferdecker-Hoch, F., 2024. 7 dimensions of holistic wellbeing (7DHW): A theoretical model. Archives of Internal Medicine Research. 7 (2024), 321–330. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26502/aimr.0187

[53] Soares, L., 2023. Psychology: The science of human behavior - A historical perspective. Digital Journal. 8(3), 2526–2537. DOI: https://doi.org/10.48017/dj.v8i3.2567

[54] Soares, L., 2024. Technology as an imperative tool in education of clinical and health psychology. Journal of Education and Language Studies. 2(3), 555–589. DOI: https://doi.org/10.19080/OAJELS.2024.02.555589

[55] Hmoud, M., Daher, W., Ayyoub, A., 2025. From experience to engagement: a mixed methods exploration of learning environments using artificial intelligence and extended reality. Frontiers in Education. 10, 1617132.