A mindset is the lens through which one perceives the world. In a dynamic process, perceptions are translated into knowledge and reflectively influence one’s mindset. Additionally, patterns of expectation are quickly developed in accordance with a mindset and tend to resist change. Due to their unreliability, researchers require active consideration of their mental biases to conduct quality work. Through critical analysis of *A Default Mode of Brain Function*, I intend to examine how researcher’s Raichle, M. E., et al. mindset might influence the observations made in the study.

Neuroscientists are not exempt from having biased mindset, in fact their expertise puts them at a disadvantage for objective analysis in the field. Before conducting the experiment, Raichle, M. E., et al. invested heavily in understanding the previous literature surrounding the default mode. Examples of this are seen in the many citations referenced within the study. Of course, this is commonplace, however reading background material considerably diminishes the objective potential of a researcher. Because inundation with relevant material create expectations, Raichle, M. E., et al. developed a mindset that anticipated similar results. This potentially confounds the analysis as well-read researchers are more likely to notice patterns they would expect rather than an anomaly.

For similar reasons, performing analysis when receiving data incrementally also nudges researchers towards a mindset bias. In the study, PET (positron emission topography) and fMRI (functional magnetic resonance imaging) were used to collect data one by one for one hundred thirty-two individuals. Receiving data incrementally establishes a standard or expectation as new information is assimilated to existing images. Again, this is problematic because researchers may overlook details that differ from initial results. Researchers require awareness of this danger to protect themselves from assuming false conclusions.

Lastly, a career or groupthink mindset might have influenced the researchers of this study. Lab technicians just starting in their field could be biased to interpret the results as consistent with a supervisor’s hypothesis. The larger the amount of people working on the project the less responsibility each member feels for exhausting potential discrepancies or confounds. A groupthink mindset considers how a team of expert scientists, such as Raichle, M. E., et al. might miss any inconsistencies or conflicting evidence.

A mindset is neither good nor bad, but a good researcher must be aware of her expectations and proceed with caution.