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The present research examines attitudes towards paternalistic policies that aim to improve individuals’ decision making without coercion. These efforts are often called as “nudges,” as described in a seminal book written by Cass Sunstein and Richard Thaler. Sunstein defines nudges as any aspects in people’s decisions-making environment that were pre-designed to influence people’s behavior in predictable ways. In the last few decades, a growing body of literature has argued that nudges can address social problems such as retirement savings (Bernartzi & Thaler, 1999; Bernartzi & Thaler, 2007; Choi et al., 2002; Choi et al., 2004; Madrian & Shea, 2001), organ donations, charity donations (Abadie & Gay, 2006; Johnson & Goldstein, 2003; McKenzie, Liersch, & Finkelstein, 2006), medicare programs, public schools (Sunstein, 2004; Hoxby, 2003; Howell, 2006; Hastings & Weinstein, 2007), and consumer health (Roberto et al., 2010; Wisdom et al., 2010; Schwartz et al., 2012). In the United States and United Kingdom, these policies have inspired numerous government interventions (Sunstein, 2012).

Decades of research on nudges assumes that people would not react against these well-intentioned policies. However, this is an empirical question. Consider the public outrage towards the recent regulation in NYC that puts 16-ounce size limit on containers of sugary beverages. Furthermore, reactance theory provides evidence that people easily rebel against limitations and constraints. Reactance is defined as the motivational state that drives people to behave in a way that is opposite to the goals of others (Brehm, 1966; Chartrand, Dalton, & Fitzsimons, 2007). According to Clee & Wicklund (1980), what creates the motivational state of reactance is the mere knowledge that “someone else wants to exert control or influence one’s behavior.” Chartrand et al. (2007) also found that those who score high on reactance tend to behave in a way that is opposite to the goals of their significant others. Given the evidence that reactance literature provides, we reason that people who score high on reactance would be more likely to perceive nudges as constraints on freedom or autonomy.

Research is needed to clarify the commonalities and differences in public attitudes towards regulatory policies. Integrating these two distinct lines of research, we offer two ways to predict public responses to policies. Those factors include the distinctions that lie in policies themselves, and the characteristics within individuals that we measure through existing personality/attitude scales. The first study proposes a conceptual framework for understanding nudges. We distinguish nudges into two types – informational nudges and behavioral nudges. Informational nudges influence decisions at an early stage, as shown in Figure 1. Informational nudges, such as calorie labels and nutritional labels, educate individuals rather than controlling their behaviors. These nudges may be contrasted with behavioral nudges, which influence choices by making certain options easier than others. Policies that manipulate defaults – i.e. automatic enrollment in 401(K) plans – are behavioral nudges. These nudges tend to bypass the cognitive stage to affect behavior [Figure 1].

In Study 1, the three informational nudges consisted of calorie labels, plate size labels, and calorie counters. The three behavioral nudges were food ordering in a cafeteria line, smaller plate sizes at a cafeteria line, and menus with healthier options featured at the top. For these nudges, we also explored how people’s attitudes change when nudges are brought to awareness. We asked subjects to imagine that there is a sign that explains the reason behind the nudges – i.e. “Calorie labels were used to encourage healthy eating.”
Reactance scores captured individual differences in attitudes towards nudges. Scoring high on reactance correlated with decisions to vote against nudges ($r= -0.15$, $t = -2.26$, $df = 233$, $p$-value = 0.025**). The data also supported our hypothesis that behavioral nudges, compared to informational nudges, were more likely to be met by reactance. Subjects who scored high on reactance were more likely to vote against behavioral nudges ($B = -1.63$, $SE = 0.66$, $t(117) = -2.47$, $p = 0.015**$), but not necessarily against informational nudges.

We also found evidence that adding a sign to the decision making environment helped individuals choose healthier foods. Subjects consumed fewer calories when the sign was displayed ($t(87) = 5.67$, $p$-value <0.0001****). But subjects who scored high on reactance were more likely to be annoyed by accompanied signs for behavioral nudges ($r = 0.26$, $t(93) = 2.6456$, $p$-value < 0.01), and not informational nudges ($t(90) = 1.54$, $p$-value = 0.13).

The support of the Ackoff Fellowship will enable me to build on this research. In addition to providing support for the current hypothesis, and conducting follow up studies necessary for publication, I also hope to investigate a third category, persuasive nudges. Persuasive nudges are informational nudges that are opinionated – i.e. informational labels that provide warning. I would also like to explore the effects of religious beliefs on negative attitudes towards nudges. The financial support of $4,050 that I am seeking will be used for two purposes within this research project: to fund data collection and to share the results of my research at two conferences. Data will continue to be collected in a series of experiments primarily in the Wharton Behavioral Lab. Typically these studies provide participants with $5 per participant.

In addition, I anticipate that this research will be of interest to marketers, psychologists, and economists, as well as to the general public. I hope to present my results at two relevant conferences: the Association for Consumer Research (ACR) North American conference in Chicago, and the Society for Judgment and Decision Making conference in Toronto, Canada. The budget outlined below reflects estimated costs of hotel stay (at conference room rates) and travel. While the Marketing Department allocates some funding for research and travel, it is sufficient to cover only a small portion of the research I intend to conduct over the course of my studies. Any incurred expenses that the Russell Ackoff Doctoral Student Fellowship does not cover will thus be paid out-of-pocket or by any funds remaining in my departmental research budget.

If you have any questions, or if there is any further information I can provide, please do not hesitate to call or email me. I greatly appreciate any support the Ackoff Fellowship can provide. Thank you for your consideration.
## Budget of Anticipated Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost per Unit</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study 2: Payment for Subjects (data collection)</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 3: Payment for Subjects (data collection)</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Consumer Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Registration</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Travel</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Hotels</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Judgment and Decision Making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Registration</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Travel</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Hotels</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,050.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Spectrum of Nudges

Stages of informational processing and possible points of influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure/Identification</th>
<th>Evaluation and Reasoning</th>
<th>Attitude/Intention</th>
<th>Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informational nudge</td>
<td>persuasive nudge</td>
<td>behavioral nudge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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