

17 Liking Vs Wanting Supernormal Stimuli

1. Liking vs Wanting: Concepts and Their Divergence

Basic Distinction

- Liking
 - Subjective pleasure, enjoyment, hedonic feeling.
 - “How good it feels” when you do/consume something.
 - Often conscious and reportable: “I enjoy this,” “this tastes good.”
- Wanting
 - Motivation, urge, inclination to pursue or consume something.
 - Can operate without conscious reflection: craving, compulsion.
 - May persist even when you know you no longer enjoy the thing or judge it bad for you.

Key Point:

They are conceptually distinct. It is logically possible, and empirically common, for wanting and liking to come apart.

Ways They Diverge

1. False Beliefs About Enjoyment
 - You believe you like something (e.g., a prestigious job, social media use) because of habit, social expectations, or status.
 - On honest reflection, you realize you don't actually enjoy it very much.
 - Your beliefs about liking can misalign with your actual experience of liking.
 2. Wanting Without Liking
 - You have a strong urge to do X but:
 - X is not particularly pleasurable anymore, or
 - You might even find X aversive or empty.
 - Typical in addiction and compulsive behaviors.
 3. Liking Without Wanting
 - You enjoy something when you do it, but don't feel strong urges beforehand.
 - Example: You truly enjoy a quiet walk, reading, or visiting friends, but you rarely feel a powerful “pull” to initiate it compared with checking your phone.
-

2. Neuroscience of Wanting vs Liking

Distinct Brain Systems

Current best-supported theories in neuroscience (especially “incentive salience” theory) hold:

- Wanting system
 - Centers: mesolimbic dopamine system, particularly:
 - * Ventral tegmental area (VTA)
 - * Nucleus accumbens (core)
 - * Projections to prefrontal cortex and other limbic areas.
 - Key neurotransmitter: dopamine.
 - Function: tags stimuli and cues as “important” or “motivationally salient,” generating cravings and pursuit, not pleasure itself.
- Liking system
 - Centers: small “hedonic hotspots”:
 - * Parts of the nucleus accumbens shell
 - * Ventral pallidum
 - * Other regions in brainstem and limbic system.
 - Neurochemicals: opioids, endocannabinoids, and certain GABA processes.
 - Function: generate pleasurable feelings and hedonic “liking” reactions.

Evidence of Dissociation

- Animals can be manipulated so dopamine (wanting) is boosted while hedonic hotspots are unchanged:
 - They work harder for a reward (more wanting), but facial expressions of pleasure (liking) do not increase.
- Conversely, stimulating hedonic hotspots can increase liking reactions without creating strong motivated pursuit.

Conclusion:

Motivation (wanting) and pleasure (liking) are realized in partially separate brain systems, using different circuits and neurotransmitters.

3. Drug Addiction as Misalignment of Wanting and Liking

What Happens in Addiction?

1. Sensitization of the Wanting System
 - Repeated drug use causes sensitization of mesolimbic dopamine pathways.
 - Environmental cues associated with the drug (places, people, paraphernalia) come to trigger intense dopamine “spikes”.
 - Result: extremely strong cravings and urges when exposed to cues, even after long abstinence.
2. Tolerance and Reduced Liking
 - Over time, subjective pleasure (“high”) often decreases: the user no longer gets the same hedonic payoff.

- They may say: “I don’t even enjoy it anymore, but I can’t stop.”
 - So:
 - Wanting (craving) can remain very high or increase.
 - Liking (pleasure) can stay constant or decline.
3. Neural Mechanism of Misalignment
- Wanting: hyper-reactive dopamine system responds strongly to drug-related cues.
 - Liking: hedonic system adapts and may become less responsive; chronic use can disrupt normal hedonic function.
 - Thus the same behavior (taking the drug) is driven by a powerful motivation system that is no longer tracking actual pleasure.

Addiction Beyond Drugs

- Similar patterns can occur with:
 - Gambling (especially slot machines, online betting)
 - Junk food
 - Internet pornography
 - Certain video games
 - Common features:
 - Strong cue-triggered urges.
 - Declining or plateaued enjoyment.
 - Persistence of use despite recognition of harm.
-

4. Wanting vs Long-Term Well-Being and Values

Two levels of divergence:

1. Wanting vs Liking (momentary pleasure)
 - As above: we can crave things we no longer enjoy.
2. Wanting vs What We Value / Long-Term Well-Being
 - Even if we “like” something in the moment, we may judge that, over time, it makes our life worse (e.g., heavy social media use, binge-watching, junk food).
 - Philosophers like Harry Frankfurt emphasize:
 - We care not only about what we want, but also about “what we want to want” (our higher-order values).
 - The attention economy, as described by Jenny Odell and James Williams:
 - Uses persuasive design to keep us clicking, scrolling, and reacting.
 - Can undermine our capacity for reflection and self-regulation, making it harder “to want what we want to want.”
 - Leads to short-term engagement winning against long-term aims (meaningful work, relationships, political engagement, creativity).

Exam-Relevant Idea:

Misalignment can thus be: - Neural: wanting vs liking. - Normative: wanting vs what we judge good for us or truly value over the long term.

5. Supernormal Stimuli: Definition and Core Idea

Definition

A supernormal stimulus is:

An artificially exaggerated version of a natural stimulus that a species evolved to respond to, which triggers a stronger behavioral response than the natural, “normal” stimulus.

Key features:

- Exploits evolved preference mechanisms (for certain shapes, colors, tastes, etc.).
- Is more intense (bigger, brighter, sweeter, more frequent) than anything typically found in the original environment of the species.
- Can cause the animal to prefer the artificial stimulus over the natural one, even when that is maladaptive.

Why They Work

- Evolution shapes organisms to treat certain cues as reliable signs of fitness-relevant goods (food, mates, offspring).
 - Supernormal stimuli mimic and amplify those cues.
 - The evolved system “over-fires” in response: the animal wants it more than the thing that is actually good for survival or reproduction.
-

6. Examples of Supernormal Stimuli in Non-Human Animals

Know at least three clear examples:

1. Birds Preferring Artificial “Eggs”
 - Some birds will prefer to sit on extra-large, more speckled, more colorful artificial eggs over their own natural eggs.
 - The exaggerated size/color pattern overstimulates their built-in preference for “healthy” eggs.
2. Herring Gull Chick Pecking Behavior
 - Naturally, chicks peck at the red spot on their parent’s bill to get food.
 - In experiments, chicks peck even more at a simple stick with three bright red stripes than at the real bill.
 - The artificial cue is a supernormal version of the key visual feature (red contrast).
3. Male Butterflies with Artificial Females
 - Male butterflies can be attracted more strongly to larger, brighter cardboard models than to actual females.
 - Exaggeration of wing size and color intensity creates a supernormal sexual stimulus.
4. Geese and Oversized Egg-Shaped Objects (another common example)
 - Geese instinctively roll eggs back into their nest.
 - They will preferentially roll larger egg-shaped objects (e.g., a volleyball or fake oversized egg) over real eggs.
 - Again, bigger and more salient object triggers a stronger response.

Common Pattern:

In each case, the animal's instinctive response system treats an exaggerated cue as even more appealing than the real, fitness-supporting target.

7. Human Supernormal Stimuli: Candidates and Analysis

General Idea

Modern technologies and industries create stimuli that:

- Are more intense, more concentrated, or more frequent than ancestral environments contained.
- Tap into evolved systems for:
 - Sugar, fat, and salt (food)
 - Sexual interest
 - Social approval and information
 - Novelty and uncertainty
- These can plausibly be seen as supernormal stimuli for humans.

For the exam, know at least two clear human examples and be able to:

- Argue why they count as supernormal.
- Discuss whether they involve:
 - Wanting vs liking divergence.
 - Urges that damage long-term well-being or values.

Example 1: Highly Processed “Junk” Food

Why it's a supernormal stimulus

- Our ancestors evolved in environments with scarce sugar and fat.
- Natural foods: moderate sweetness, fat, and salt.
- Modern processed foods are:
 - Extremely high in sugar, refined carbohydrates, fat, and salt.
 - Engineered for hyper-palatability (taste, texture, mouthfeel).
- Result: They present a supernormal version of the cues that once reliably signaled high-value calories.

Wanting vs Liking

- Wanting:
 - Strong cravings, especially in response to cues (smells, packaging, ads).
 - Dopamine response to sugar/fat and cues can sensitize with repeated consumption.
- Liking:
 - Initial consumption is pleasurable.
 - Over time, people often report diminishing enjoyment and even feeling sluggish or guilty, yet they continue to eat.
- So we can see:

- Wanting may remain high or increase (craving).
- Liking can plateau or decrease.

Effect on Long-Term Well-Being

- Frequent consumption is linked to:
 - Obesity, diabetes, heart disease.
 - Lower energy and health, possibly reduced mood.
 - Thus, indulging the urge can reduce overall well-being, despite short-term pleasure and strong motivation.
-

Example 2: Social Media and the Attention Economy

Why it's a supernormal stimulus

- Humans evolved to care deeply about:
 - Social approval, reputation, group inclusion.
 - New information about threats and opportunities.
- Social media platforms (as described by Jenny Odell and others):
 - Provide continuous, rapid, quantified feedback (likes, comments, follower counts).
 - Use persuasive design: notification badges, red icons, intermittent variable rewards, infinite scroll.
 - Expose us to constant novelty, outrage-provoking news, and emotional content.
- This is a supernormal environment compared with the slow, small-scale social interactions of ancestral life:
 - Many more “social signals” per minute than we evolved for.
 - Amplified emotional triggers (fear, anger, envy, desire).

Wanting vs Liking

- Wanting:
 - Compulsive checking behaviors, especially upon seeing notifications or feeling bored or anxious.
 - Strong urge to refresh feeds, respond to notifications, and chase “engagement.”
- Liking:
 - People often report:
 - * Brief hits of satisfaction when receiving likes or messages.
 - * Overall feelings of stress, anxiety, distraction, envy, or emptiness after extended use.
- A user can feel:
 - “I keep reaching for my phone, but I don’t even like what I’m seeing.”
 - This is a classic wanting > liking pattern.

Effect on Long-Term Well-Being and Values

- As James Williams notes, persistent distraction can:
 - Prevent us from “living the lives we want to live.”
 - Undermine capacities for reflection and self-regulation, making it harder to “want what we want to want.”
- As Odell emphasizes:

- The attention economy can trap people in waves of hysteria, fear, and outrage, generating anxiety while making it hard to think clearly or act effectively.
 - Long-term costs can include:
 - Reduced ability to concentrate.
 - Neglect of meaningful relationships and projects.
 - Distorted sense of reality and values.
 - So social media can be:
 - A supernormal social stimulus (exaggerated friendship/attention/novelty).
 - A case where we frequently want to engage, often don't deeply like the experience, and harm long-term well-being and autonomy.
-

Example 3: Internet Pornography

Why it's a supernormal stimulus

- Humans evolved sexual interest for:
 - Real partners, with limited variety and frequency.
- Internet pornography:
 - Offers endless variety of bodies and scenarios (novelty).
 - Extremely convenient, available on demand.
 - Intensifies visual and sexual cues beyond what is typical in ordinary life.
- This creates a supernormal sexual environment, far beyond ancestral conditions.

Wanting vs Liking

- Wanting:
 - Strong urges or compulsive use, especially with certain cues (boredom, stress, loneliness).
- Liking:
 - Pleasure during use, but some report:
 - * Diminished satisfaction over time.
 - * Desensitization to normal sexual interaction.
 - * Feelings of emptiness or shame afterward.
- Thus, as with drugs, we can see rising or stable wanting with declining liking.

Effect on Long-Term Well-Being

- Potential consequences:
 - Interference with real-life intimacy.
 - Unrealistic expectations about sex and bodies.
 - In some cases, decreased motivation for relationships and other life projects.
 - Again, urges can lead to behavior that undermines valued aspects of life and relationships.
-

Example 4: Gambling and Slot Machines (Optional Additional Example)

- Slot machines and online gambling use:
 - Intermittent variable rewards (like the notification schedule on social media).

- Bright colors, sounds, near-misses: all designed to exaggerate reward cues.
 - This creates a supernormal reward environment for systems evolved for occasional, natural wins.
 - Clear case of:
 - Strong dopamine-driven wanting.
 - Liking that often declines.
 - Severe long-term harm (financial ruin, stress, social damage).
-

8. Supernormal Stimuli and Wanting–Liking Divergence in Humans

Do Supernormal Stimuli Create Wanting–Liking Divergences?

Often, yes:

- By over-activating our motivational systems (dopamine and related circuitry), they:
 - Increase wanting and cue-triggered urges.
- But because of:
 - Tolerance.
 - Desensitization.
 - Conflicts with our values and self-image.
- They often do not increase liking indefinitely and may even decrease the real enjoyment or meaning of the activity.

Do They Reduce Long-Term Well-Being or Other Values?

Common patterns across human cases:

- Short-term:
 - Intense motivation and quick gratifications.
- Long-term:
 - Health problems (junk food).
 - Attention fragmentation and anxiety (social media).
 - Relationship and sexual difficulties (porn).
 - Financial and psychological damage (gambling).

These are paradigmatic cases of:

1. Wanting > Liking
We pursue something more than we actually enjoy it.
 2. Wanting vs What We Value
Our immediate urges conflict with:
 - Our long-term interests.
 - Our reflective judgments about the kind of life we want to live.
-

9. How to Use These Ideas in an Exam Answer

When asked about these topics, be sure you can:

1. Define and distinguish liking vs wanting
 - Liking = pleasure; wanting = motivation/urge.
 - Explain that they are conceptually distinct and can diverge.
2. Describe the neuroscientific basis
 - Wanting: mesolimbic dopamine system.
 - Liking: hedonic hotspots with opioids/endocannabinoids.
 - Emphasize different circuits and neurochemicals.
3. Explain addiction through this lens
 - Sensitized wanting system; tolerance in liking.
 - Addict may strongly want a drug they no longer enjoy and judge as bad.
4. Define supernormal stimulus
 - Artificially exaggerated natural cue causing stronger response than the natural stimulus.
 - Explain why evolution makes us vulnerable to these.
5. Give at least three animal examples
 - Birds preferring large/artificial eggs.
 - Herring gull chicks preferring a red-striped stick.
 - Male butterflies preferring larger/brighter models.
 - (Optionally: geese and oversized egg-shaped objects.)
6. Give at least two human examples and analyze
 - Junk food, social media, porn, gambling.
 - For each: say why it is supernormal; discuss wanting vs liking; discuss impact on long-term well-being and values.
7. Connect to the attention economy readings
 - Persuasive design as engineering supernormal stimuli for attention.
 - Connection to James Williams' point about undermining our ability to "want what we want to want."
 - Odell's emphasis on the need to withdraw or resist in order to regain meaningful, self-directed attention.

These elements together will let you answer questions about:

- The difference between wanting and liking in neuroscience.
- How this explains addiction.
- What supernormal stimuli are in animals and humans.
- How they can produce both neural misalignments (wanting vs liking) and normative misalignments (urge vs long-term well-being and values).