



ASSOCIATION FOR CONSUMER RESEARCH

Labovitz School of Business & Economics, University of Minnesota Duluth, 11 E. Superior Street, Suite 210, Duluth, MN 55802

Environmental Disorder Leads to Self-Regulatory Failure

Boyoun (Grace) Chae, University of British Columbia, Canada

Rui (Juliet) Zhu, University of British Columbia, Canada

We examine the impact of environmental orderliness on consumers' self-regulation. We propose that a disorganized (vs. organized) environment threatens individuals' sense of personal control. Because coping with this threat depletes cognitive resources, individuals exposed to a disorganized (vs. organized) environment are more likely to exhibit self-regulatory failures.

[to cite]:

Boyoun (Grace) Chae and Rui (Juliet) Zhu (2012), "Environmental Disorder Leads to Self-Regulatory Failure", in *NA - Advances in Consumer Research Volume 40*, eds. Zeynep Gürhan-Canli, Cele Otnes, and Rui (Juliet) Zhu, Duluth, MN : Association for Consumer Research, Pages: 90-94.

[url]:

<http://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/1011953/volumes/v40/NA-40>

[copyright notice]:

This work is copyrighted by The Association for Consumer Research. For permission to copy or use this work in whole or in part, please contact the Copyright Clearance Center at <http://www.copyright.com/>.

The Control Dilemma: Pros and Cons of Perceived Control on Self-Regulation

Chair: Jaideep Sengupta, HKUST, Hong Kong

Paper #1: Environmental Disorder Leads to Self-Regulatory Failure

Boyoun (Grace) Chae, University of British Columbia, Canada
Rui (Juliet) Zhu, University of British Columbia, Canada

Paper #2: What's the Point of Temptation if You Don't Give in to It? The Positive Impact of Vice Consumption on Consumer Vitality

Fangyuan Chen, HKUST, Hong Kong
Jaideep Sengupta, HKUST, Hong Kong

Paper #3: Let Freedom Ring? Divergent Effects of Free Choice on Goal Pursuit

Jordan Etkin, University of Maryland, USA
Juliano Laran, University of Miami, USA

Paper #4: Kids in the Candy Store: The Motivational Consequences of Multiple Goals

Szu-chi Huang, University of Texas at Austin, USA
Ying Zhang, University of Texas at Austin, USA

SESSION OVERVIEW

Objectives and Overview

A greater sense of control over one's decisions and choices is usually viewed to be desirable (Kelly 1963; Ryan and Frederick 1997). Thus, consumers in general appreciate making their own decisions (Markus and Kitayama 2003), and companies strive to offer as many alternatives as possible in order to enhance perceptions of choice freedom (Levav and Zhu 2009). There is, however, relatively scant research on the possible downsides of perceived control and autonomy (for an exception, see Botti, Orfali, and Iyengar 2009). The papers in this session offer new insights into the nature and effects of perceived control, with a particular emphasis on how it may exert either a positive or negative influence on self-regulation, depending on aspects of the context and the task. In putting together this work, we hope to spark an interest in new directions of inquiry into perceived control and its effects.

Topics

The first two papers in the proposed session identify, respectively, a negative and a positive influence of perceived control on self-regulation. The next two papers then use the goal pursuit context to identify moderating factors for when either a positive or a negative effect may be obtained.

First, Chae and Zhu, while documenting the negative impact of low perceived control, identify an entirely novel antecedent of such perceptions. The authors examine the impact of environmental orderliness on consumers' self-regulation. Across four studies, they propose and find that a disorganized (vs. organized) environment threatens individuals' sense of personal control, causing them to spend substantial cognitive resources to cope with this threat. Consequently, people are resource depleted and exhibit more self-regulatory failures in a disorganized (vs. organized) environment. In the second paper, Chen and Sengupta demonstrate the beneficial effects of consuming vices, and in so doing, identify a context in which lower perceived control actually produces a positive influence on self-regulation. Across four studies, they find that giving in to temptations (e.g., eating indulgent food, or impulsively buying hedonic products) increases subjective vitality – defined as the positive energy available

to oneself. Increased vitality, in turn, produces better self-regulation. Of importance, these effects only obtain when vice consumption can be justified – such as when it can be explained away on the grounds of relatively low personal control. For example, greater vitality and improved self-regulation obtain when eating an unhealthy but tasty snack is perceived as complying with the experimenter's instructions, rather than resulting from one's own free choice. Thus, in the specific context of vice consumption, lower perceived control actually produces beneficial effects. The next two papers focus on how perceived control in the sense of choice freedom influences self-regulation, as manifested in goal pursuit. Etkin and Laran propose that freedom (vs. restricted freedom) in an initial goal-consistent choice can increase or decrease goal-directed motivation, depending on the level of goal activation prior to choice. Across three studies, they show that when a goal is highly active at the time of choice, increased (vs. restricted) freedom in making a goal-consistent choice leads to that choice being interpreted as having fulfilled the goal. Ironically, this then hinders subsequent goal pursuit. For example, having the freedom to choose between several healthy products (vs. having to pick the only available product) in pursuit of an active self-control goal induces the inference that one has at least partly satisfied the goal, lessening the motivation to engage further in it. On the other hand, when the goal is less active at the time of choice, free (vs. restricted) choice simply increases goal activation, which then increases subsequent goal pursuit. Finally, Huang and Zhang also propose both positive and negative effects on goal pursuit as a result of increased choice freedom, operationalized in their work as the number of reward options available upon task completion (e.g., having the freedom to choose between many different rewards after completing a certain number of frequent flyer miles, as opposed to having just one possible reward). The critical moderator identified in their work is stage of goal pursuit. At an early stage, the multiple available rewards are construed as substitutable for one another; these substitutes, combined, create a greater perceived likelihood that one will eventually get something desirable. Therefore, freedom of choice increases goal pursuit motivation. On the other hand, when nearing goal attainment, multiple available rewards (vs. an assigned reward) are conversely construed as competitive against one another – the consumer now has to decide which one to pick. Because it highlights the fact that some attractive rewards will have to be foregone, this produces a demotivating effect on goal pursuit.

General Orientation and Likely audience

Together, the four papers in this proposed session enhance our understanding of the nature of personal control, and also of how it may influence self-regulation. We believe that this session, if accepted, will attract scholars interested in the diverse yet related areas of motivation, goals, vitality, and self-regulation. Given the overlap as well as the distinctions between the four papers, we hope that they will, as a set, provoke illuminating discussion and debate.

Fit with Conference Theme

Finally, we believe that this session proposal fits with the theme of this year's ACR – appreciating diversity – along two aspects. First, while all the presentations will touch upon two common themes (perceived control, and self-regulation) each of them offers distinct insights on a diverse set of topics, such as vitality, environmental disorder, option availability, and reward programs. Second, the authors

involved in the different papers represent schools across Canada, Hong Kong and the US; thus, this session, if accepted, would serve to further facilitate interaction among a far-flung group of scholars.

Environmental Disorder Leads to Self-Regulatory Failure

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

A common theme in many popular home organizations TV shows is that environmental disorganization is associated with a number of negative outcomes, such as deteriorating health and self-regulatory failures. As such, better organization or de-cluttering can improve life quality. Despite these beliefs in practice, our theoretical understanding of how environmental organization or orderliness can affect cognition and behavior remains limited (Keizer, Lindenberg, and Steg 2008). We address this question in this research by focusing on the impact of environmental orderliness on self-regulation.

Research on personal control (Kelly 1963) suggest that humans have a fundamental need to control their environment (Kelly 1963; White 1959). Among various factors such as choice freedom and predictability of outcomes that are known to affect personal control, we focused on the impact of characteristic of physical environment on personal control and consequently self-regulation. Previous literature documents that characteristics of a physical environment, such as physical confinement, can threaten individuals' sense of freedom, a very important component for people to maintain their sense of personal control (Baum, Singer, and Baum 1981; Edney and Buda 1976; Levav and Zhu 2009). For instance, Levav and Zhu (2009) showed that, just like restriction on choice freedom, physical confinement also increases reactance behaviors. Extending on this line of research, we suggest that environmental orderliness can threaten individuals' sense of personal control, because people in messy homes often feel that their lives are also out of control (Belk, Seo, and Li 2007; Cwerner and Metcalfe 2003) and people tend to attribute a messy home to the person's lack of ability to manage her time and life (Bitner 1990). Furthermore, research on resource depletion theory suggests that coping with a threat demands cognitive resources, and subsequently increases self-regulatory failures (Glass, Singer, and Friedman 1969; Inzlicht and Kang 2010). Combining the above theorizing, we propose that a disorganized environment threatens individuals' sense of personal control, causing them to spend substantial cognitive resources to cope with this threat. As a result, these people are resource depleted and exhibit more self-regulatory failures in subsequent tasks.

Across four studies, we show that individuals who were exposed to a disorganized (vs. organized) environment exhibited more self-regulatory failures in subsequent tasks, such as impulsive buying, less persistence on challenging tasks, and unhealthy eating. We also validate our process explanation by showing that: (1) the negative impact of environmental disorder on self-regulation is more acute for people who are highly sensitive to control threats (study 2), (2) the control motivation mediates the relationship between environmental orderliness and self-regulation (study 3), and (3) self-affirmation, which helps recoup cognitive resources, moderates the relationship between environmental orderliness and self-regulation (study 4a and 4b).

Study 1 showed that a disorganized (vs. organized) environment leads to poorer performance on a challenging task. The study was run with one participant at a time. Upon arrival, the participant was guided to the room where environmental orderliness was manipulated. Specifically, she was exposed to either an organized or a disorganized environment. In the disorganized environment condi-

tion, office supplies (e.g., paper, file folders, and paper cups) were scattered all over the place in a cluttered manner. In contrast, in the organized environment condition, the same amount of items was placed in a very structured and ordered manner. Then, the participant was escorted to the second room where no orderliness manipulation was present and was asked to complete an unsolvable puzzle (Baumeister et al. 1998). We found that participants who were exposed to the disorganized (vs. organized) environment earlier gave up sooner on the unsolvable puzzle.

Study 2 provided a theoretical replication in an impulsive buying context, and illuminated the process by showing that this effect is more salient among individuals who are chronically motivated to react to control threats. The environmental orderliness manipulation and the procedure were similar to those in the study 1. After exposure to either an organized environment or a disorganized environment, participants were asked to indicate Willingness-To-Pay (WTP) for a number of products (Vohs and Faber 2007). Individuals' chronic reactance were assessed via the Hong Psychological Reactance Scale (Hong and Faedda 1996). The result provided the replication on impulsive buying: participants in the disorganized environment indicated higher WTP than those in the organized environment. Furthermore, the impact of environmental orderliness on WTP was only salient among participants who were chronically high in reactance.

Study 3 tested the proposed process explanation by demonstrating that the control motivation mediates the effect of environmental orderliness on unhealthy eating behavior. Adopting a lexical decision task to assess the implicit activation of control motivation, we showed that people in a disorganized (vs. organized) environment responded faster to control-related words, indicating the increased activation of control motivation (as measured by response time to control-related words) mediated the effect of environmental orderliness on chocolate consumption.

Finally, Study 4 provided further evidence for the underlying process. Based on the finding that self-affirmation counteracts resource depletion and facilitates subsequent self-control behaviors (Schmeichel and Vohs 2009), we expected that self-affirmation will counteract the resource depletion induced by a disorganized environment, and thus attenuate self-regulatory failures in subsequent tasks. Results from two studies (4A and 4B) supported our hypothesis.

What's the Point of Temptation if You Don't Give in to It? The Positive Impact of Vice Consumption on Consumer Vitality

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

Vice consumptions are characterized by immediate pleasures, which have negative later consequences (Rook 1987). Therefore, such behaviors, e.g., eating a rich but fattening piece of cake, or buying an expensive sweater that one can't quite afford – are typically viewed as being normatively “bad”. This research takes a different tack: we examine how vice consumption can actually have beneficial effects – specifically, by increasing vitality – as long as the consumption can be explained away on grounds of relatively low perceived control.

Arising from self-determination theory (SDT; Deci and Ryan 1991), subjective vitality refers to the positive experience of having energy and feeling alive (Christianson et al. 2005; Nix et al., 1999). Vitality arises from the feeling of behaving in fulfillment of intrinsic motivations rather than norm-based rewards and punishments (Deci and Ryan 1991). Thus, tasks that are inherently enjoyable (e.g., jogging for the sheer pleasure of it) typically produce more vitality than tasks that are performed as a means to an end (e.g., jogging in order

to lose weight; Ryan and Deci 2000). Viewed from this perspective, since vices are associated with immediate hedonic pleasure, yielding to the temptation to consume a vice (vs. a virtue) should produce enhanced subjective vitality.

Vice consumption should also exert a countervailing force on vitality, however. Given its negative normative connotations, consuming a vice typically produces guilt. Because vitality is characterized by the absence of conflict (Ryan and Frederick 1997), the tension produced by these feelings of guilt should dampen the vitality that would otherwise be induced by vice consumption. We argue, therefore, that vice consumption will enhance vitality only when the accompanying guilt can be reduced by justifying the behavior. For example, if eating a chocolate cake can be justified on the grounds of complying with instructions (as opposed to freely choosing to do so), it should improve vitality. Support for this argument would inform SDT, which posits that autonomous (i.e., freely-chosen) behaviors produce more vitality than behaviors that are externally mandated. While this positive effect of autonomy has received wide support in the context of regulatory behaviors (Muraven, Gagne, and Rosman, 2008; Nix et al. 1999), we argue that the vice consumption context is qualitatively different: here lower autonomy actually leads to increased vitality. Finally, our research also examines downstream consequences of the increased vitality produced by vice consumption. Drawing on the idea of vitality as an enabling resource (e.g., Muraven et al. 2008), we propose that as long as accompanying guilt can be attenuated, the increase in vitality produced by consuming a vice should lead to enhanced creativity, as well as improved self-control.

Results from four studies provide convergent support for these arguments. Experiment 1 required participants to sample either a chocolate cake (vice) or baby carrots (virtue), and vitality was measured using a standard scale (Ryan and Frederick, 1997). Higher vitality obtained for the former ($M_{chocolate} = 4.46$ vs. $M_{carrot} = 3.74$, $F(1, 82) = 11.92$, $p < .01$). A corresponding effect was obtained on creativity as measured on an alien-drawing task (8.73 vs. 6.96, respectively, $F = 38.78$, $p < .01$); vitality fully mediated this effect.

Experiment 2 provided a more complete picture by examining the interaction between type of behavior and external justification. Participants were either explicitly instructed to sample the snack they were exposed to (either chocolates or carrots) as part of the experiment, or were asked to choose between eating the snack and writing an aversively long essay – eating the snack was more under one's control and accordingly less "justified" in this condition. The vitality benefit accruing from eating a chocolate (vs. a carrot) was greater in the justified condition (M 's: 4.78 vs. 3.79, $F(1, 76) = 13.71$, $p < .01$) than in the not-justified condition (M 's: 3.95 vs. 3.78, $F(1, 76) = 0.57$, $p > .50$). Note that these results argue against a simple physiological account (eating chocolates increases vitality because of higher sugar/caloric intake); this argument would not explain the effect of justification. Results from a control condition ($M = 3.88$) showed that the vitality difference observed in the justified conditions was due to increased vitality obtaining in the chocolate condition, rather than a dampening in the carrots condition. Guilt was also measured in this study, and as expected, indulgent behavior led to higher guilt in the no-justification condition ($M_{chocolate} = 5.22$ vs. $M_{carrot} = 2.62$, $F(1, 76) = 7.23$, $p < .01$), but not in the justification condition (M 's: 2.96 vs. 2.89). This study included a new measure of creativity, as manifested in advertising slogans generated by participants, and adjudged by independent observers. The creativity of these slogans was greater given justified (vs. not-justified) vice consumption (M 's: 7.16 vs. 5.24, $F(1, 76) = 32.46$, $p < .01$); inter-

estingly, justification had the reverse effect for virtue consumption (M 's: 5.15 vs. 6.07, $F(1, 32) = 7.08$, $p = .01$).

Experiment 3 used the same design as Experiment 2 and found evidence for another downstream consequence of the vitality induced by consuming vices: i.e., self-control performance, as measured in a concentration task. Individuals who consumed a vice performed significantly better at this task when the vice was justified (vs. not); no such difference obtained for virtue consumption. Experiment 4 replicated these results using a different operationalization of vice vs. virtue behaviors (impulsively buying a hedonic product vs. deliberately buying a utilitarian product), and also of justification (mentally accounting the purchase as a gift from another person). Exactly the same significant pattern of results on vitality, guilt, and self-control was obtained as in previous studies (not detailed here for reasons of space).

Thus, in opposition to the view that one should not give in to the temptation of consuming a vice, we find evidence for its beneficial effects – vice consumption heightens a resource, vitality, which then benefits consumers' creativity and self-control performance. We also inform self-determination theory: contrary to extant findings in this literature, in the vice-consumption context, lower autonomy may actually benefit vitality.

Let Freedom Ring?

Divergent Effects of Free Choice on Goal Pursuit

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

There is a generalized belief that freedom of choice is beneficial to consumers. Companies strive to offer as many product lines as possible, shopping malls are popular for having many different stores available, and consumers appreciate making their own decisions, without the influence of others. The current research looks at freedom of choice from a goal pursuit perspective. Our focus is on understanding the conditions under which perceiving freedom in an initial goal-consistent choice (e.g., being able to choose without any restrictions, making decisions without the influence of others) helps versus hinders subsequent goal pursuit. For example, when will healthy grocery-shoppers feel more motivated to be healthy? After making healthy snack choices with freedom, or after their freedom to choose has been restricted?

We propose that the impact of freedom in an initial goal-consistent choice on subsequent goal pursuit will depend on the level of activation of the goal at the time of choice. Specifically, we predict that having freedom in goal-consistent choice when a goal is highly active at the time of choice will reduce subsequent goal pursuit, whereas having freedom in goal-consistent choice when a goal is not highly active at the time of choice will increase subsequent goal pursuit. We base our predictions on the following reasoning. When people have freedom in choosing products associated with a goal, we expect that they will perceive their behavior as pursuing their goal to a greater degree relative to when they do not have as much freedom. For instance, going to the supermarket and being free to choose several different healthy items is perceived to be a stronger exertion of self-control than when one is able to choose only one type of item (the number of options is restricted), even if in the same quantity.

The impact of this perceived stronger act of goal pursuit on subsequent motivation will depend on the level of goal activation prior to choice. When the goal is highly active, for example, if people have been exposed to environmental cues associated with the goal (Chartrand et al. 2008), a strong act of goal pursuit will satisfy the goal to a greater degree. As a result, the goal will be less active following freedom versus restricted goal-consistent choice (Bargh and Ferguson

2004), decreasing subsequent goal pursuit. In contrast, when the goal is not highly active prior to choice, a strong act of goal pursuit will not satisfy the goal, but increase the activation of the goal (Bargh 2006; Laran and Janiszewski 2009; Shah and Kruglanski 2002). As a result, having freedom versus restricted freedom in initial goal-consistent choice should increase subsequent goal pursuit in this case.

Across three studies we find support for our propositions. In each study, we invite participants to make several healthy snack choices, varying whether a health goal is highly active (vs. not active) prior to choice, as well as whether participants have freedom (vs. restricted freedom) in choosing snacks. Having participants choose among healthy snacks ensures that they all have the opportunity to pursue a health goal, with or without freedom. Study 1 provides an initial test of our reasoning regarding the effect of freedom versus restricted freedom in goal-consistent choice on goal activation. Consistent with our argument, when a health goal was not activated prior to choice, free (vs. restricted) choice increased the level of goal activation, as measured by a word-stem completion task ($M_{\text{freedom}} = 3.52$, $M_{\text{restricted}} = 2.28$; $F(1, 121) = 15.77$, $p < .001$). In contrast, when a health goal was activated prior to the snack choice task, free (vs. restricted) choice satisfied the goal, decreasing its level of activation as measured by a word-stem completion task ($M_{\text{freedom}} = 3.03$, $M_{\text{restricted}} = 3.67$; $F(1, 121) = 3.84$, $p = .05$).

Study 2 demonstrates the divergent effects of choice freedom on goal pursuit following an initial goal-consistent choice. Supporting our predictions, when a health goal was not activated prior to choice, free (vs. restricted) choice among the healthy snacks increased participants' subsequent likelihood of engaging in a healthy behavior, as measured by their propensity to participate in an unrelated study involving eating raisins (health goal-consistent) versus M&Ms (health goal-inconsistent; $M_{\text{freedom}} = 58.3\%$, $M_{\text{restricted}} = 23.1\%$; $\chi^2(1) = 9.70$, $p < .01$). In contrast, when a health goal was activated prior to choice, free (vs. restricted) choice decreased participants' subsequent likelihood of engaging in a healthy behavior ($M_{\text{freedom}} = 38.9\%$, $M_{\text{restricted}} = 71.1\%$; $\chi^2(1) = 7.74$, $p < .01$). Finally, study 3 provides another demonstration of these effects, with different goal activation and choice freedom manipulations. Again supporting our predictions, when a health goal was not activated prior to choice, free (vs. restricted) choice among the healthy snacks increased participants' subsequent likelihood of making a healthy choice, as measured by their propensity to choose an apple (health goal-consistent) versus a candy bar (health goal-inconsistent) as a thank you for participating in the study ($M_{\text{freedom}} = 63.3\%$, $M_{\text{restricted}} = 31.8\%$; $\chi^2(1) = 4.46$, $p < .05$). In contrast, when a health goal was activated prior to choice, free (vs. restricted) choice decreased participants' subsequent likelihood of making a healthy choice ($M_{\text{freedom}} = 26.9\%$, $M_{\text{restricted}} = 56.0\%$; $\chi^2(1) = 4.45$, $p < .05$).

In sum, this research demonstrates divergent effects of experiencing freedom in goal-consistent on subsequent goal pursuit; freedom (vs. restricted freedom) can increase or decrease goal-directed motivation, depending on the level of goal activation prior to choice. As such, our findings contribute to the literature on goal pursuit by showing that motivation to pursue a goal is not simply dependent on whether consumers make a goal-consistent choice or not, but on the degree of freedom associated with this choice. In addition, we contribute to the literature on the benefits of offering consumers freedom by showing that freedom of choice is not always beneficial and may in fact be detrimental to people's motivation to pursue a goal.

Kids in the Candy Store: The Motivational Consequences of Multiple Goals

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

A goal is the mental representation of a desirable end state, and could influence not only the direction of people's behavior, but also the intensity of such behavior (Locke & Latham, 1990; Pieters et al., 1995). While prior research has mainly focused on the pursuit of a goal in isolation, recent efforts have been made to extend our understanding toward "goal structure" that comprises a network of interrelated goals (Kruglanski et al., 2002). In practice, marketers often offer multiple goals for customers to choose from (e.g., offering multiple rewards for customers who have accumulated 10,000 miles in a frequent flyer program), under the assumption that such freedom of choice would lead to greater motivation and participation. In this research, we ask the question: Is the offering of multiple goals always more motivating? For companies that try to encourage repeat purchases, should they design a loyalty program that allows consumers to choose a prize from multiple options? Also, should companies use the same reward structure to motivate customers who just joined a loyalty program as those who are getting close to redemption?

We posit that people view the relations among multiple goals that can be served by a single means differently as they move from earlier stages to later stages of the pursuit, and thus the freedom of choice could either be motivating or demotivating, depending on one's current stage in the pursuit. Specifically, when people first begin the pursuit and are still far away from the end-point at which they would need to make a decision on the final reward, the freedom of choice among multiple goals (vs. an assigned goal) elicits greater motivation. This is because, at this early stage, multiple goals are construed as *substitutable* for one another; therefore, these potential substitutes, combined, create a greater perceived likelihood that one would eventually attain something one desires, which leads to greater motivation in the pursuit.

However, when people have made substantial progress and are approaching the end of the pursuit, the need to make a decision on the reward becomes imminent and people begin to compare among options; at this advanced stage of pursuit, the freedom of choice among multiple goals (vs. an assigned goal) conversely becomes demotivating. This is because, when people begin to contemplate and compare among options, multiple goals would conversely be construed as *competitive* against one another (i.e., one would have to let go some equally attractive options), which leads to lower perceived value in the pursuit and thus lower motivation.

Two studies provided supportive evidence for the proposed hypothesis and the underlying mechanisms. In Study 1, we asked participants to memorize price information of products in different categories, and to type down these prices in question sections to earn points for the reward. We provided participants either one assigned reward or four different rewards (of equal market value) to choose from, and tracked how their motivation naturally progressed throughout the pursuit. This study allowed us to obtain the trend of participants' motivation when given the freedom of choice among multiple goals. We found that when there was only one assigned reward offered for attaining the target number of points, participants' motivation constituted a linearly increasing trend as they accumulated more progress. In contrast, when given the freedom to choose from multiple rewards, participants' motivation instead fitted a cubic trend; further analyses showed that, although participants who had the freedom of choice among multiple rewards became slightly more motivated from stage 1 to stage 2, their motivation did not increase as they moved across the mid-point of the pursuit (i.e., as they ad-

vanced into the later stage and started comparing among different options).

In Study 2, we provided prospective customers of a school-based debit-card loyalty program either one assigned reward or four different rewards to choose from, and directly manipulated the loyalty points they have accumulated so far in the semester (based on their accumulated expenditure on campus and school-related businesses) as their progress level in the program when they joined. We measured these prospective customers' thoughts about the loyalty program and the reward system (e.g., the perceived goal competitiveness, goal attainability, and goal value) to capture the underlying mechanisms, and we also measured their sign-up rate for the loyalty program as a proxy for their motivation to continue the pursuit of the reward. Three moderated mediation models provided supportive

evidence for the proposed mechanisms. We found that when people were at the initial stage of the pursuit, having the freedom to choose among multiple goals led to higher perceived likelihood to attain something one desired, which elicited greater motivation to sign up for the loyalty program (conditional indirect effect: $\beta = .07$, $z = 2.74$, $p < .01$); however, when people were at the advanced stage of the pursuit, the freedom to choose among multiple goals conversely led to lower perceived value of the program, which led to lower motivation to sign up (conditional indirect effect: $\beta = -.04$, $z = -1.65$, $p < .10$); this is because the perceived goal competitiveness (i.e., the perception that some options were more attractive than others) led to lower perceived value for people at this advanced stage of pursuit (conditional indirect effect: $\beta = -.05$, $z = -2.88$, $p < .01$).