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ABSTRACT
This paper proposes that pursuit of a prevention goal demands more self-regulatory resources than does pursuit of a promotion goal. As a result, depleting self-regulatory resources should be more likely to adversely influence the pursuit of a prevention goal than the pursuit of a promotion goal. Two studies are conducted in the contexts of hypothesis generating and endowment effect to test this proposition. Results of the studies provided support for the proposition.

INTRODUCTION
Regulatory focus theory (Higgins 1997; Higgins 2002) has recently drawn great attention from consumer behavior researchers and has been applied in areas such as persuasion (Lee and Aaker forthcoming; Aaker and Lee 2001), information processing (Zhu and Meyers-Levy 2003), and decision making (Crowe and Higgins 1997; Liberman 1999; Liberman et al. 2001). The theory proposes that individuals can pursue two distinct types of regulatory goals. Promotion goals entail achieving positive outcomes whereas prevention goals demand avoiding negative outcomes. People may differ in chronic accessibility of either of the two regulatory goals and the goals may also be activated temporarily by situational factors.

One aspect of the theory that has received limited attention is the process distinction between pursuit of a promotion goal and pursuit of a prevention goal. That is, how pursuit of a promotion goal is different from pursuit of a prevention goal in terms of the physiological and psychological processes involved. According to a recent model of self-regulatory resources (Baumeister et al. 1998; Muraven, Tice, and Baumeister 1998), pursuit of regulatory goals entails utilization of self-regulatory resources, which are limited in supply and can be temporarily depleted or fatigued by demands that are induced by situational or chronic regulatory goals. This paper investigates how pursuit of a promotion goal and pursuit of a prevention goal differ in the amount of self-regulatory resources demanded.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND
Goals are “representational structures that guide the system in its pursuit of a reference or end state” (Markman and Brenlll 2000, p. 98). Regulatory focus theory (Higgins 1997; Higgins 2002) distinguishes between two basic types of goals: promotion goals and prevention goals. The desired end state associated with a promotion goal is the presence of positive outcomes such as gain, achievement, and advancement. The desired end state associated with a prevention goal is the absence of negative outcomes such as loss, failure, and punishment.

Individuals can differ in chronic accessibility of either of the two regulatory goals. Individuals for whom promotion goals are more accessible than prevention goals have a promotion focus whereas individuals for whom prevention goals are more accessible than promotion goals have a prevention focus. According to regulatory focus theory (Higgins and Silberman 1998), differences in chronic regulatory focus may arise from different parenting styles. A parenting style that emphasizes protection and uses punishment as discipline induces a prevention focus whereas a parenting style that emphasizes encouragement and uses love withdrawal as discipline induces a promotion focus.

Regulatory goals can also be temporarily induced by situational factors. For example, regulatory goals can be activated by advertising messages that focus on either a positive outcome achieved by consumption (thus activating a promotion goal) or a negative outcome avoided by consumption (thus activating a prevention goal) (e.g., Aaker and Lee 2001). Regulatory goals can also be activated by engaging in thoughts about hopes and aspirations (thus inducing a promotion goal) or duties and responsibilities (thus inducing a prevention goal) (e.g., Liberman et al. 2001).

Regulatory focus theory also proposes that individuals with a different regulatory focus differ in their strategic inclination in pursuing their goals. Specifically, an “eagerness” means is utilized to pursue a promotion goal whereas a “vigilance” means is deployed to pursue a prevention goal. To illustrate, consider a signal-detection situation where people are asked to decide whether a stimulus is present or not. There are four possible outcomes of each signal-detection trial: 1) a hit—accepting a correct stimulus, 2) a miss—rejecting a correct stimulus, 3) a false alarm—accepting a false stimulus, and 4) a correct rejection—rejecting a false stimulus. Individuals with a promotion focus are likely to use an “eagerness” means and thus are most concerned about obtaining a hit whereas individuals with a prevention focus are likely to use a “vigilance” means and thus are most concerned about avoiding a false alarm.

Consistent with the above theorizing, Crowe and Higgins (1997) found that promotion-focused individuals were inclined to say “yes” when asked to judge whether or not they’d previously seen the nonsense syllable currently presented whereas prevention-focused individuals were inclined to say “no” when performing the same task. In a series of study, Liberman et al. (2001) asked people to generate hypotheses with regard to a number of ambiguous objects or events (e.g., generate guesses for ambiguous pictures, generate explanations for ambiguous behaviors, etc.) and recorded the number of hypotheses generated. They found that promotion-focused individuals generated significantly more hypotheses than prevention-focused individuals. In another series of studies, Liberman et al. (1999) demonstrated that promotion-focused individuals prefer change, while prevention-focused individuals have a preference for maintaining the status quo. For instance, prevention-focused individuals are more inclined than promotion-focused individuals to resume an interrupted task rather than do a substitute task that may fulfill the same goal and to exhibit a reluctance to exchange currently possessed objects or previously possessed objects for money or objects with equal monetary values (i.e., the endowment effect; Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler 1990, 1991).

This is because, consistent with regulatory focus theory, individuals with a prevention focus are more risk-averse than individuals with a promotion focus.

While much has been done with regard to the consequences of regulatory focus, so far little is known about the process distinction between pursuit of a promotion goal and pursuit of a prevention goal. How does pursuit of a promotion goal differ from pursuit of a prevention goal in terms of the physiological and psychological processes involved? A recent model of self-regulatory resources (Baumeister et al. 1998; Muraven, Tice, and Baumeister 1998) suggests that pursuit of a promotion goal may differ from pursuit of a prevention goal in terms of the amount of self-regulatory resources required.

Self-regulation refers to the self’s capacity to alter its own states and responses. Usually, self-regulation overrides one incipient pattern of response and replaces it with another (Baumeister 2002). According to the theory of self-regulatory resources, one’s ability to regulate (i.e., alter one’s own states and responses) is
governed by a finite pool of resources. This pool of resources can be temporarily depleted or fatigued by self-regulation demands induced by chronic personal goals or goals that are activated situationally.

A number of studies have provided clear evidence for the view that the pool of self-regulatory resources is finite and thus can be depleted or fatigued after usage (see Baumeister et al. 1998; Muraven, Tice, and Baumeister 1998). In these studies, subjects first engaged in some self-regulation activities intended to deplete self-regulatory resources. These activities included stifling (or amplifying) one’s emotional response to an upsetting film, suppressing thoughts about a white bear, resisting the temptation to eat chocolates and cookies so as to force oneself to eat radishes instead (Baumeister 2002). The same subjects then engaged in a second task requiring self-regulatory resources. Their performance on this task was compared with that of a control group. A consistent finding has been that subjects who initially engaged in self-regulation and thus whose self-regulatory resources were depleted performed significantly worse on the second task requiring self-regulatory resources than those in the control group.

The theory of self-regulatory resources has been applied in studies investigating various phenomena such as consumer impulsive buying (Vohs and Faber 2003), subjective experience of time (Vohs and Schmeichel 2003), and information processing (Schmeichel, Vohs, and Baumeister 2003). For example, Vohs and Faber (2003) consider impulsive buying as a result of one’s failure to self-regulate or control one’s impulse to buy. They argue that one of the important reasons for this failure to self-regulate is the depletion of self-regulatory resources. They examined this theorizing in two studies. In both studies, subjects were asked to watch a six-minute videotape, without audio, that featured a woman being interviewed by an off-camera interviewer and were told that they would later be asked to make personality judgments about the interviewee. In addition to the woman being interviewed, the tape also showed common, one-syllable words (e.g., play, tight, greet) presented individually at the bottom of the screen. Each word appeared for 30-seconds. Subjects in the resource depletion condition were asked not to look at the words and focus their attention to the woman and those in the control group were given no explicit instructions. After watching the video, all subjects performed some tasks designed to tap into their tendency to engage in impulsive buying. It was found that depleting self-regulatory resources significantly increases one’s tendency to engage in impulsive buying.

It is important to note that the theory of self-regulatory resources posits that self-regulatory resources are mainly used to override one response with another (see Baumeister and Vohs in press). Overriding an incipient response with another needs to draw from the finite pool of self-regulatory resources but executing the incipient response needs not to draw from the pool of resources. In the case of impulsive buying, overriding the urge to buy consumes self-regulatory resources whereas unleashing the urge to buy does not consume self-regulatory resources. This theorizing has important implications for delineating the process distinction between pursuit of a promotion goal and pursuit of a prevention goal.

According to regulatory focus theory, pursuit of a promotion goal entails an “eagerness” means, which strives for achieving positive outcomes. A basic strategy for maximizing the probability of the presence of a positive outcome is to execute as many trials as possible (Liberman et al. 2001). Hence, in the process of pursuing a promotion goal, there are relatively fewer cases wherein one needs to override an incipient response with another since an incipient response often gets executed. Consequently, pursuing a promotion goal demands relatively fewer self-regulatory resources. In contrast, pursuit of a prevention goal entails a “vigilance” means, which strives for avoiding negative outcomes. A basic strategy for maximizing the probability of the avoidance of a negative outcome is to execute as few trials as possible (Liberman et al. 2001). Hence, in the process of pursuing a prevention goal, there are relatively more cases wherein one needs to override an incipient response with another since an incipient response often does not get executed. Consequently, pursuing a prevention goal demands relatively more self-regulatory resources.

To illustrate, consider a hypothesis-generating situation. With a promotion goal, one often adopts the strategy of generating as many hypotheses as possible to maximizing the probability of “hit”–accepting a correct hypothesis (Liberman et al. 2001). Thus, whatever that comes to mind that seems to be a plausible hypothesis will be accepted as true. In this case, one needs not to engage in self-regulation by replacing an incipient response (i.e., accepting an initial plausible hypothesis) with a new one (i.e., not to accept this initial plausible hypothesis). Therefore, relatively fewer self-regulatory resources are required here. In contrast, with a prevention goal, one often adopts the strategy of generating as few hypotheses as possible to maximizing the probability of avoiding a “false alarm”–accepting an incorrect hypothesis (Liberman et al. 2001). Thus, while one’s initial response is to accept a plausible hypothesis, this initial response is often curbed and the hypothesis reevaluated to ensure against false acceptance. In this case, one needs to engage in self-regulation by replacing an incipient response (i.e., accepting an initial plausible hypothesis) with a new one (i.e., not to accept this initial plausible hypothesis). Therefore, relatively more self-regulatory resources are required here.

The same reasoning can also be illustrated within an object substitution situation. In this situation, an opportunity for change is presented (i.e., an opportunity for exchanging one’s object with another one with an equal monetary value). The presence of this opportunity may induce an initial response to exchange. When the goal is preventional, this initial response is often coerced and replaced with a safer option (i.e., denying the exchange and keeping the original object). The process of replacing the initial response with a different response requires self-regulatory resources. Thus, pursuit of a prevention goal should demand self-regulatory resources. On the other hand, when the goal is promotional, the initial response of exchanging is often not curbed but executed. In this case, no self-regulatory resources are needed. Therefore, pursuit of promotion goal should demand few self-regulatory resources.

A direct implication of the above reasoning is that depleting self-regulatory resources will be more likely to adversely influence the pursuit of a prevention goal than the pursuit of a promotion goal. In a hypothesis-generating situation, the successfullness of pursuing a particular goal can be operationalized as the number of hypotheses generated. The pursuit of a promotion goal is more successful if more hypotheses are generated since a larger number of hypotheses implies a greater probability of achieving a positive outcome (i.e., accepting a correct hypothesis). The pursuit of a prevention goal is more successful if fewer hypotheses are generated since a smaller number of hypotheses implies a greater probability of avoiding a negative outcome (i.e., avoid accepting an incorrect hypothesis). Therefore, when a prevention goal is more accessible, depleting self-regulatory resources should increase the number of hypotheses generated. In contrast, when a promotion goal is more accessible, depleting self-regulatory resources should have no effect on the number of hypotheses generated. More formally:

H1: depleting self-regulatory resources will significantly increase the number of hypotheses generated with regard to an ambiguous object when a prevention goal is more accessible but will have no effect on the number of
hypotheses generated when a promotion goal is more accessible.

In an object substitution scenario, the successfufulness of pursuing a particular goal can be operationalized as the tendency of exchanging one’s object for another object with an equal monetary value. The pursuit of a promotion goal is more successful if there is a stronger tendency to exchange since exchange opens opportunities for positive outcomes. The pursuit of a prevention goal is more successful if there is a weaker tendency to exchange since exchange may lead to potential losses. As argued previously, depleting self-regulatory resources will be more likely to adversely influence the pursuit of a prevention goal than the pursuit of a promotion goal. Consequently, when a prevention goal is more accessible, depleting self-regulatory resources should increase the tendency to exchange. In contrast, when a promotion goal is more accessible, depleting self-regulatory resources should have no effect on the tendency to exchange. More formally:

H2: depleting self-regulatory resources will significantly increase the tendency to exchange one’s object for another object with an equal monetary value when a promotion goal is more accessible but will have no effect on this tendency when a promotion goal is more accessible.

**STUDY 1**

This study tests H1, which posits that depleting self-regulatory resources will significantly increase the number of hypotheses generated with regard to an ambiguous object when a prevention goal is more accessible but will have no effect on the number of hypotheses generated when a promotion goal is more accessible. Thus, a significant interaction effect of self-regulatory resources (depleted vs. normal) and regulatory focus (promotion vs. prevention) on the number of hypotheses generated is predicted.

**Method**

Participants and Procedure. 40 undergraduate students from an introductory communication class participated in this study in exchange for extra credits. Each subject was randomly assigned to one of the 4 experimental conditions by receiving a booklet previously shuffled. On the first page of the booklet, subjects were told that they were about to engage in three unrelated tasks. The first task was actually a manipulation of self-regulatory resources. The second task was a hypothesis-generating task similar to the one used in Liberman et al. (2001). The third task was to respond to a scale measuring chronic regulatory focus. The subjects performed these tasks at their own pace.

Manipulation of Self-Regulatory Resources. The manipulation of self-regulatory resources was similar to the one used in Vohs and Faber (2003). All subjects were told that the first task required them to read a short article from a recent issue of *New York Times* (an article about medical bills with about 250 words) and their memory for specific facts mentioned in the article would be tested later. The article appeared in the middle of the next page. There was a picture both above and below the article. The upper picture showed a group of young people and the lower picture featured a famous movie star (Richard Gere). The pictures were reasonably eye-catching. Half of the subjects were asked to focus on the article and not to look at the pictures. They were also told that in case they found themselves looking at the pictures while reading, they should immediately refocus their attention on the article (the “depleted” condition). The other half of the subjects were not given explicit instructions with regard to the pictures (the “normal” condition).

**The Hypothesis-Generating Task.** After completing the first task, subjects engaged in a hypothesis-generating task, similar to the one used in Liberman et al. (2001). Subjects were given the following instruction: In this task you will be presented with pictures of familiar objects. The pictures were somehow truncated and blurred, so that the objects are difficult to recognize. Your task will be to guess what the original object is. You may list as many or as few answers as you want. The next page featured a picture of an ambiguous object (a truncated and blurred picture of a baseball). Under the picture were several blank lines on which subjects could write down their hypotheses.

Measure of Regulatory Focus. Regulatory focus was measured by a scale developed by Lockwood, Jordan, and Kunda (2002). The scale was comprised of 18 items, 9 of which were related to a promotion focus and the other 9 items were related to a prevention focus. Subjects were asked to rate themselves on each of the 18 items. Ratings were made on a 9-point scale with endpoints labeled 1 (not at all true of me) and 11 (very true of me). Scores on the 9 items measuring promotion focus were averaged to form an index of promotion focus and scores on the 9 items measuring prevention focus were averaged to form an index of promotion focus. Subjects were classified as predominantly having a promotion focus or predominantly having a prevention focus on the basis of a median split of the difference between the average score for promotion focus and the average score for prevention focus.

**Results**

It is predicted that depleting self-regulatory resources will significantly increase the number of hypotheses generated with regard to an ambiguous object when a prevention goal is more accessible but will have no effect on the number of hypotheses generated when a promotion goal is more accessible. Thus, an interaction between self-regulatory resources (depleted vs. normal) and regulatory focus (promotion vs. prevention) is expected. A 2x2 ANOVA was performed to examine the interaction effect. The dependent variable was the number of hypotheses generated, which represented the degree to which a promotion or a prevention goal was successfully pursued. For a promotion goal, a larger number of hypotheses generated indicates a more successful pursuit of the goal; for a prevention goal, a larger number of hypotheses generated indicates a less successful pursuit of the goal. Results of the ANOVA revealed an interaction between self-regulatory resources and regulatory focus that approached to significance ($F(1,36)$ = 3.59, $p < .04$). Additionally, under normal condition (i.e., self-regulatory resources were not depleted), promotion-focused individuals generated somewhat more hypotheses than prevention-focused individuals ($M_{promotion}=2.18$, $M_{prevention}=1.56$, $t=-1.59$, $p=.13$), consistent with previous findings (Liberman et al. 2001).

**STUDY 2**

This study tests H2, which posits that depleting self-regulatory resources will significantly increase the tendency to exchange one’s object for another object with an equal monetary value when
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a prevention goal is more accessible but will have no effect on this tendency when a promotion goal is more accessible. Thus, a significant interaction effect of self-regulatory resources (depleted vs. normal) and regulatory focus (promotion vs. prevention) on the tendency to exchange one’s object for another object with an equal monetary value is predicted. Study 2 had a similar experimental design as Study 1.

Method

Participants and Procedure. 40 undergraduate students from an introductory communication class participated in this study in exchange for extra credits. Data from three subjects were dropped because of largely incomplete information provided on their questionnaires. Each subject was randomly assigned to one of the four experimental conditions by receiving a booklet previously shuffled. Each subject was given a pen and was initially told that the pen was given as a gift for participation. On the first page of the booklet, subjects were told that they were about to engage in two unrelated tasks. Subjects first responded to the same 18 questions measuring regulatory focus used in Study 1. The second task was a manipulation of self-regulatory resources, which was similar to the one used on Study 1. Subjects then responded to a manipulation check question (i.e., while reading the New York Times article, you tried hard to control yourself not to look at the pictures) answered on a 1-9 scale with “1” representing “strongly disagree” and “9” representing “strongly agree.” A straight line and a thank you note appeared below the manipulation check question, making the impression on the part of the subjects that they had reached the end of the study. A surprising message appeared below the straight line and the thank you note:

In fact, I have some extra pens, each of which is worth the same amount of money as the one you have now (i.e., $1.50). If you like, you can exchange your current gift pen with one of the extra pens.

Subjects were asked to indicate how much they would like to exchange their current gift pen with one of the extra pens on a 1-9 scale with “1” representing “not at all” and “9” representing “very much.”

Results

It is predicted that depleting self-regulatory resources will significantly increase the tendency to exchange one’s object for another object with an equal monetary value when a prevention goal is more accessible but will have no effect on this tendency when a promotion goal is more accessible. Thus, an interaction between self-regulatory resources (depleted vs. normal) and regulatory focus (promotion vs. prevention) is expected. A 2x2 ANOVA was performed to examine the interaction effect. The dependent vari-
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The Interaction between Self-Regulatory Resources and Regulatory Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Focus</th>
<th>Self-Regulatory Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>2.00 (.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>2.36 (.81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1

Number of Hypotheses Generated by Regulatory Focus and Self-Regulatory Resources
able was the tendency to exchange one’s gift pen, which represented the degree to which a promotion or a prevention goal was successfully pursued. For a promotion goal, a stronger tendency to exchange indicates a more successful pursuit of the goal; for a prevention goal, a stronger tendency to exchange indicates a less successful pursuit of the goal. Results of the ANOVA revealed a pattern of interaction between self-regulatory resources and regulatory focus that was consistent with H2, but was statistically insignificant. Both main effects were not statistically significant.

From Table 2 and Figure 2, we can see that for subjects involved in Study 2, those with a promotion focus in general had a stronger tendency to exchange their gift pens than those with a prevention focus, which was consistent with the previous finding that prevention-focused people show a stronger endowment effect than promotion-focused people (Liberman et al. 1999). For subjects in Study 2, depleting self-regulatory resources had a stronger effect on the tendency to exchange one’s gift pen for those with a prevention focus than those with a promotion focus. For those with a prevention focus, depleting self-regulatory resources increased the tendency to exchange one’s gift pen, indicating a less successful pursuit of one’s prevention goal, which was to keep the status quo.

**DISCUSSION**

This paper offers some general theoretical propositions and reports the procedures and results of two pilot studies testing these propositions. The central argument of this paper is that pursuit of a prevention goal demands more self-regulatory resources than does pursuit of a promotion goal. According to the theory of self-regulatory resources, overriding an incipient response and replacing it with another one consumes self-regulatory resources, which are finite and can be depleted or fatigued by usage (Baumeister and Vohs in press). Because pursuit of a prevention goal often involves overriding an initial response with another, it is expected to consume self-regulatory resources. On the other hand, since pursuit of a promotion goal often involves executing an initial response and thus does not require controlling the incipient response, it needs not to consume self-regulatory resources. A direct implication of the central argument is that depleting self-regulatory resources will be more likely to adversely influence the pursuit of a prevention goal than the pursuit of a promotion goal.

This reasoning provides a basis for more specific predictions. According to Liberman and colleagues (2001, 1999), individuals with a prevention focus will generate fewer hypotheses with regard to an ambiguous object/event than individuals with a promotion focus. In addition, prevention-focused individuals will be more inclined than promotion-focused individuals to resume an interrupted task rather than do a substitute task that may fulfill the same goal and to exhibit a reluctance to exchange currently possessed objects or previously possessed objects for money or objects with equal monetary values. Thus, the successfullness of pursuit of

**TABLE 2**

Tendency of Exchange by Regulatory Focus and Self-Regulatory Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Focus</th>
<th>Depleted</th>
<th>Normal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>2.67 (1.87)</td>
<td>2.36 (1.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>2.30 (1.70)</td>
<td>1.57 (0.78)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2**

The Interaction between Self-Regulatory Resources and Regulatory Focus
regulatory goals can be operationalized either as the number of hypotheses generated with regard to an ambiguous object or as the tendency to exchange one’s object for another object with an equal monetary value. Consequently, it is predicted that depleting self-regulatory resources will significantly increase the number of hypotheses generated with regard to an ambiguous object when a prevention goal is more accessible but will have no effect on the number of hypotheses generated when a promotion goal is more accessible (H1). In addition, it is proposed that depleting self-regulatory resources will significantly increase the tendency to exchange one’s object for another object with an equal monetary value when a prevention goal is more accessible but will have no effect on this tendency when a promotion goal is more accessible (H2).

The results of Study 1 provided support for H1. A significant interactive effect between self-regulatory resources and regulatory focus on the number of hypotheses generated with regard to an ambiguous object emerged. Specifically, for promotion-focused individuals, depleting self-regulatory resources had no effect on the number of hypotheses generated. This implies that pursuit of a promotion goal does not draw upon the finite pool of self-regulatory resources. In contrast, for prevention-focused individuals, depleting self-regulatory resources significantly increased the number of hypotheses generated. This implies that pursuit of a prevention goal does consume self-regulatory resources that are in limited supply.

More perplexing were the results from Study 2. The results showed a general pattern that was consistent with findings by other researchers and H2. Specifically, subjects with a promotion focus in general showed a stronger tendency to exchange their gift pen than those with a prevention focus, which was consistent with Liberman et al.’s (1999) study on endowment effect. In addition, depleting self-regulatory resources seemed to increase subjects’ tendency to exchange their gift pen and this effect was more prominent for those with a prevention focus. However, because the results were not statistically significant, generalizations cannot be made based on the results of this study. Small sample size might have made it difficult for significant results to emerge. Future studies may include more subjects and see whether something more substantive was responsible for the insignificant results.

Although regulatory focus theory has recently drawn great attention from consumer behavior researchers, the process distinction between pursuit of a promotion goal and pursuit of a prevention goal, has rarely been explored. This paper is among the first a few attempts to bridge the research on regulatory focus and the research on self-regulatory resources and offer a specific prediction with regard to the relative amount of self-regulatory resources required by pursuit of a promotion goal vs. pursuit of a prevention goal. This proposition received some empirical support and more studies are needed to test the validity of this proposition and to find boundary conditions that may exist.
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