The Illusion Of Insight: When Data Tells Stories Instead Of The Truth

forbes.com/councils/forbesbusinesscouncil/2025/08/01/the-illusion-of-insight-when-data-tells-stories-instead-of-the-truth

Vikram Joshi August 1, 2025

pulsd—a company in the business of democratizing fun in New York City.

getty

In an era where data reigns supreme, the phrase "data-driven decision making" has become a badge of honor in boardrooms, classrooms and codebases alike. We are encouraged—rightly so—to rely on metrics, KPIs, dashboards and models to guide our actions. But amid this data revolution, a subtler, more dangerous phenomenon often slips under the radar: the illusion of insight.

This illusion doesn't arise from a lack of data but rather from selective use of it. When data is cherry-picked to support a predetermined conclusion, it can create the appearance of truth while potentially leading us away from it. For business leaders, the cost of this illusion can be steep: flawed strategies, poor investments, broken trust and wasted resources.

Data As Narrative: A Double-Edged Sword

Humans are natural storytellers. We seek patterns and causality, even when none exist. Data, by its very structure, can be shaped into almost any narrative with enough creativity—or agenda. Want to prove a marketing campaign was successful? Highlight the spike in traffic, but ignore the bounce rate. Need to justify a policy change? Focus on short-term gains and disregard long-term costs. With enough selective filtering, the same dataset can support conflicting conclusions.

This isn't just misleading; it can also be dangerous. Decisions based on incomplete or manipulated data can lead to strategic misfires, erosion of public trust and, in some cases, irreversible damage.

At my company, we're always looking for opportunities to drive user growth. At one point, we identified a particular source that was generating a noticeable increase in sign-ups. Our typical playbook would have been to double down and allocate more resources to that channel. However, a deeper look revealed that users from this source were converting to paying customers at significantly lower rates. By looking beyond the top-line metric and examining the full customer journey, we avoided investing in a channel that ultimately lacked long-term value. It was a clear reminder that surface-level data can be misleading without context.

Cherry-Picking: The Subtle Art Of Misleading

Cherry-picking is often unintentional. It stems from unconscious cognitive biases—most notably, confirmation bias. We tend to favor data that supports our existing beliefs and goals, while discounting or ignoring contradictory signals. In high-stakes environments where teams are under pressure to perform, impress stakeholders or justify sunk costs, this bias can become especially potent. Let's consider some examples:

• Product Feedback Gone Wrong

Imagine a product leader advocating for a new feature rollout. Their case is supported by survey data showing overwhelmingly positive user feedback. On the surface, the data validates the initiative. But under scrutiny, we find that the survey targeted only power users—those who specifically requested the feature—and that feedback from newer or less tech-savvy customers, many of whom found the feature unnecessary or confusing, was excluded.

By presenting only the favorable data, the team manufactures a false sense of confidence. The result? A launch that alienates the broader user base and increases churn among core segments.

• AI Benchmark Games

This dynamic can also be seen in how a number of tech companies compare their models. For instance, a company might announce that its chatbot outperforms competitors on certain tasks. However, the fine print may reveal that their model was specifically trained or tuned on that niche benchmark (e.g., legal reasoning, code generation, etc.), while competitors were not. The performance comparison selects metrics and domains that flatter the in-house model and avoids general-purpose or out-of-domain benchmarks where the model may underperform.

To the casual reader—or executive buyer—the takeaway seems clear: "This model is better." But in reality, it's a case of strategic omission: presenting performance out of context to shape perception. Without the full distribution of results or transparency in methodology, the comparison becomes marketing, not science.

The Cost Of Illusion

When business leaders make decisions based on cherry-picked data, the cost isn't theoretical—it's often immediate and tangible:

• **Misallocated Resources:** Teams can end up chasing growth in the wrong markets or building features no one wants.

• **Misdirected Strategy:** Product roadmaps can be shaped by anomalies instead of representative trends.

• **Erosion Of Trust:** Teams may begin to doubt dashboards, analysts and leadership when reality doesn't match projections. And over time, the organization can become data-resistant—not because people distrust data itself but because they've seen it used as a tool for persuasion, not understanding.

Moving Toward Data Integrity: Five Practices For Leaders

Avoiding the illusion of insight doesn't require more data; in my experience, it requires better data stewardship. Here are five leadership practices that can help you safeguard against cherry-picking:

1. Show the full picture. Encourage the sharing of complete datasets, not just highlights. Include outliers, negative feedback and anomalies.

2. Contextualize everything. Frame data with its collection methods, limitations and assumptions. A chart without context is just decoration.

3. Incentivize truth over narrative. Build a culture where admitting uncertainty or highlighting flaws is rewarded, not penalized.

4. Ask the second question. When presented with data, ask, "What are we not seeing here?" or, "Who isn't represented?"

5. Use exploratory analysis, not just confirmatory. Start with questions, not conclusions. Let the data speak—even if what it says is uncomfortable.

Finding The Truth In The Totality

When we launched our mobile app, we initially saw a higher conversion rate among app users compared to those on our website—even without additional marketing. At first glance, it was tempting to conclude that the app itself was driving better performance. But a closer analysis revealed a different story: The users who chose to download the app were already more engaged and predisposed to convert.

The platform wasn't causing the behavior—it was attracting a certain type of user. If we had shifted all our efforts toward the app based solely on that surface-level insight, we might have overlooked the broader user base and misallocated resources. It was a classic case of mistaking correlation for causation—and a valuable lesson in digging deeper before drawing conclusions.

For business leaders, I believe our responsibility is clear: Look beyond the narrative and dig into the data. Insight doesn’t come from picking the best-looking numbers; it comes from understanding the whole story—even the parts we don’t want to hear.

In a world flooded with dashboards and KPIs, the real competitive advantage isn't access to data: It’s discipline in how we use it.

Editorial StandardsReprints & Permissions