Paying Not to Go to the Gym

By STEFANO DELLAVIGNA AND ULRIKE MALMENDIER*

How do consumers choose from a menu of contracts? We analyze a novel dataset from three U.S. health clubs with information on both the contractual choice and the day-to-day attendance decisions of 7,752 members over three years. The observed consumer behavior is difficult to reconcile with standard preferences and beliefs. First, members who choose a contract with a flat monthly fee of over $70 attend on average 4.3 times per month. They pay a price per expected visit of more than $17, even though they could pay $10 per visit using a 10-visit pass. On average, these users forgo savings of $600 during their membership. Second, consumers who choose a monthly contract are 17 percent more likely to stay enrolled beyond one year than users committing for a year. This is surprising because monthly members pay higher fees for the option to cancel each month. We also document cancellation delays and attendance expectations, among other findings. Leading explanations for our findings are overconfidence about future self-control or about future efficiency. Overconfident agents overestimate attendance as well as the cancellation probability of automatically renewed contracts. Our results suggest that making inferences from observed contract choice under the rational expectation hypothesis can lead to biases in the estimation of consumer preferences. (JEL D00, D12, D91)*

"Saturday 31 December. New Year's Resolutions. I WILL [...] go to the gym three times a week not merely to buy sandwich."
Bridget Jones's Diary: A Novel

"Monday 28 April. [...] Gym visits 0, no. of gym visits so far this year 1, cost of gym membership per year £370; cost of single gym visit £123 (v. bad economy)."
Bridget Jones: The Edge of Reason

Many firms offer consumers a menu of contracts. Cellular phone users choose combinations of monthly airtime minutes and prices. Credit card users choose between teaser rate offers and contracts with a constant interest rate. A large literature in industrial organization analyzes the profit-maximizing contract design (Jean Tirole, 1988). A standard assumption in this literature is that consumers have rational expectations about their future consumption frequency and choose the utility-maximizing contract.

In this paper, we provide evidence that this may not always be the case. We present a novel dataset from three U.S. health clubs that allows us to analyze the contractual choices of consumers in light of their actual consumption behav-

TABLE 1—EMPIRICAL FEATURES AND POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS

	Standard model	Trans. costs of payment per usage	Membership benefits per usage	Limited memory	Time inconsist. with sophistication	Time inconsist. with naiveté	Overestimation of future efficiency	Persuasion
Finding 1								
Price per average attendance = $17.27		Distaste of pay per usage	Membership benefits		Commitment	Commitment, overestimation of attendance	Overestimation of attendance	Pressure of salesman
Finding 2								
Average attendance in months 2–4 higher in annual than monthly contract	Sorting at enrollment	Sorting at enrollment	Sorting at enrollment	Sorting at enrollment	Sorting at enrollment	Sorting at enrollment	Sorting at enrollment	Sorting at enrollment
Finding 3								
Users predict 9.50 monthly visits; actual monthly visits are 4.17						Overestimation of attendance	Overestimation of attendance	
Finding 4								
Interval between last attendance and termination 2.31 full months		Distaste of pay per usage	Membership benefits	Forget to cancel		Overestimation of cancellation	Overestimation of cancellation	Pressure of salesman
Finding 5								
Survival probability after 14 months 17 percent higher for monthly than for annual contract				Forget to cancel		Overestimation of cancellation	Overestimation of cancellation	Pressure of salesman
Finding 6								
Average attendance 27 percent higher in second year for annual contract	Learning, sorting out	Learning, sorting out	Learning, sorting out	Learning, sorting out	Learning, sorting out	Learning, sorting out	Learning, sorting out	Learning, sorting out
Finding 7								
Decreasing average attendance over time in monthly contract				Forget to cancel		Overestimation of cancellation	Overestimation of cancellation	Pressure of salesman
Finding 8								
Positive correlation of price per average attendance and interval between last attendance and termination						Heterogeneity in naiveté	Heterogeneity in overconf.	

ior. The dataset contains information both on the type of membership and the day-to-day attendance decisions of 7,752 health club members over three years. We find that consumers choose a contract that appears suboptimal given their attendance frequency. In addition, low-attendance consumers delay cancelling this contract despite small transaction costs.

Our empirical analysis exploits the presence of a contractual menu. Consumers can choose between two flat-rate contracts—a monthly contract and an annual contract—and a pay-per-visit option. The monthly contract is automatically renewed from month to month until the consumer cancels. The annual contract, instead, expires after 12 months unless the consumer explicitly renews it. The variation in the per-usage pricing and in the renewal procedures allows us to identify several puzzling features of consumer behavior.

First, consumers who choose a monthly membership of over $70 per month pay on average 70 percent more than they would under the pay-as-you-go contract for the same number of visits. Eighty percent of the monthly members would have been better off had they paid per visit for the same number of visits.

Second, consumers who choose the monthly contract are 17 percent more likely to stay enrolled beyond one year than users choosing the annual contract. This is surprising because monthly members pay higher fees for the option to cancel each month. This result occurs even though high-attendance users sort into the annual contract at enrollment.

These and additional empirical findings (summarized in Table 1) are hard to reconcile with standard preferences and beliefs. We explore potential explanations, including high transaction costs of payment per usage, risk aversion, underestimation of costs of attendance and of cancellation, time inconsistency, naiveté about the time inconsistency, and persuasion by health club employees.

In our view, the most parsimonious explanations are those allowing for overconfidence (naiveté). Consumers overestimate, for example, their future self-control or their future efficiency

in pursuing costly activities. This leads to over-estimation of attendance and of cancellation in automatically renewed contracts. As an alternative explanation, persuasion by health club employees can explain most findings.

In a simple yet economically significant decision—enrollment and attendance in a health club—consumers deviate systematically from the optimal contractual choice. In the health clubs of our sample, the average nonsubsidized user chooses the monthly contract and, by doing so, forgoes savings of about $600 per membership, out of a total amount of about $1,400 paid to the health club. The results of this study are likely to generalize to the 32.8 million Americans who exercise in one of the 16,983 U.S. health clubs. Therefore, both in terms of monetary magnitude and in terms of population involved, the nonstandard behavior has a significant economic impact. Our findings are also consistent with findings on consumer behavior in the credit card industry (Haiyan Shui and Lawrence M. Ausubel, 2004) and employee choice of 401(k) plans (Brigitte C. Madrian and Dennis F. Shea, 2001).

The analysis of consumer behavior is just the first step toward a better understanding of industries where consumers display nonstandard preferences or beliefs. Profit-maximizing firms should respond to the nonstandard features of consumer behavior in their contract design. This is the central theme of the growing literature on behavioral industrial organization (DellaVigna and Malmendier, 2004; Kfir Eliaz and Ran Spiegler, forthcoming; Xavier Gabaix and David Laibson, forthcoming; Paul Heidhues and Botond Koszegi, 2005), surveyed in Glenn Ellison (forthcoming). The large effect of small cancellation costs on renewal rates may explain the high frequency of contracts with automatic renewal in the newspaper, credit card, and mail-order industry. The findings have implications also for the design of flat-rate pricing (Eugenio J. Miravete, 2003). In DellaVigna and Malmendier (2004), we explore the implications for firm pricing of a leading explanation of our results: overconfidence about self-control.

Our findings suggest caution in making inferences about consumer preferences from observed choices of products (Igal Hendel and Aviv Nevo, 2004) or contracts (Miravete and Lars-Hendrik Röller, 2003), when actual consumption is unobserved. Inferences made under the assumption of rational expectations can lead to significant bias. For example, we would have concluded that monthly members attend on average at least twice a week. This erroneous conclusion would have overstated the impact of health club enrollment on health outcomes.

Finally, our findings have implications for the policy debate on obesity (David M. Cutler et al., 2003). Subsidizing enrollment in health clubs is likely to have only small effects on obesity rates, given the low average attendance of members.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section I, we introduce the main features of the health club dataset. In Section II, we develop predictions about the contractual choice at enrollment and test the predictions empirically. In Section III, we present a similar analysis of the contractual choice and consumption behavior over time. Section IV discusses possible explanations for the empirical findings. Section V concludes.

I. Health Club Dataset

A. *Health Club Industry*

As of January 2001, 16,983 clubs were operating in the United States. The industry revenues for the year 2000 totalled $11.6 billion. The memberships in the same period was 32.8 million, up from 17.4 million in 1987. Fifty-one percent of the users were members in commercial health clubs, while 34 percent were members in nonprofit facilities. Only the market leader Bally Total Fitness, with $1,007 million in revenues and 4 million members, is publicly traded. Few companies operate in more than ten states. Ownership concentration is in the tenth percentile of U.S. industries.

B. *Dataset*

We collected a new panel dataset from three health clubs located in New England, which we label clubs 1, 2, and 3. The dataset contains information on the contractual choices and the day-to-day attendance of users who enrolled after April 1, 1997. The sample period is April 1997 through July 2000 for club 1 and April 1997 through February 2001 for clubs 2 and 3. The day-to-day record of usage is made available by the technology regulating the access to

these health clubs, described below. The panel of contractual choices comes from the billing records. Each entry in the accounting data specifies the price paid for the transaction and a four-letter code. This code allows us to track the membership type—standard, student, family, corporate—as well as details like the subsidizing company (if any).

Several companies located near the clubs subsidize their employees' attendance. For these corporate members, the health club receives part of the membership payments directly from the firms, with the remainder being paid by the members. The health club informs the companies periodically about the number of employees enrolled and their attendance. This creates incentives for the health club to record attendances accurately or, possibly, to over-record them.

C. Contractual Menu

We conducted a survey of the 97 health clubs in the Boston metropolitan area to document the contract design in the industry.[1] Health clubs offer up to three options: 87 clubs offer a monthly contract and a monthly fee is automatically debited each month to a credit card or bank account until the user cancels; 90 clubs offer an annual contract. Both monthly and annual contracts have an initiation fee but no fee per visit. Finally, 82 clubs offer a pay-per-visit option, often in the form of a ten-visit pass. Health clubs 1 and 2 in our sample offer the three types of contract with the following additional features:[2]

- The monthly contract has a monthly fee ranging between $70 (discounted level) and $85 (standard level). Noncorporate users also pay an initiation fee ranging from $0 (in promotional periods) to $150. Corporate users generally pay an out-of-pocket monthly fee between $19 and $65, depending on the subsidy paid by their company, and no initiation fee. Cancellation can be done in person at the club or by sending a written note.[3] If cancellation takes place before the 10th of the month, no further fees are due, and the users can attend until the end of the month. Members who cancel after the 10th have to pay the fee for the next month and can attend until the end of the following month.

- The annual contract charges up front ten times the applicable monthly fee, e.g., $850 for a standard membership.[4] Users thus get a discount of 2 months out of 12 in exchange for a yearly commitment. The initiation fee is the same as under the corresponding monthly contract. At the end of the year, the contract expires and members who wish to stay enrolled have to sign up again, either for an annual or for a monthly contract. In order to encourage renewal, the club sends out a reminder card one month before the contract expires.

- The pay-per-visit system offers two options, either to pay $12 per visit or to purchase a ten-visit pass for $100. Transaction costs for the ten-visit pass are small. Users provide basic demographic information and receive a card for ten visits. Unfortunately, attendance is not tracked for the pay-per-visit users.

Users of club 3 face the same menu of contracts with lower prices and slightly different services. The monthly fee ranges from $13 to $52, and the initiation fee is at most $50. The annual fee in the annual contract equals ten times the corresponding monthly fee. The pay-per-visit options are a $10 fee per visit, and a $80 pass for ten visits.

Under all types of membership, users receive cards they have to deposit in a basket at the front desk when they enter. While they are exercising, a health club employee swipes them (marks the visit for the ten-visit passes), and users pick them up when they exit. This method guarantees a high recording precision even during peak hours. The three contracts give right to the same services, i.e., a temporary locker, tow-

---

[1] For details on the survey, see DellaVigna and Malmendier (2004).

[2] Contracts for one to six months with automatic expiration are also available. We do not include them in our analysis, since they are typically targeted toward occasional summer users. We also remove from the sample free, limited-time memberships that are occasionally given to employees of the subsidizing companies.

[3] Some users cancel by discontinuing the payments to the health club.

[4] The annual fee can be paid in three installments due in the first six months.

els,[5] and access to the equipment. Also, both the monthly and the annual contract allow members to "freeze" (suspend) their membership for three months per year.[6] Users with a monthly contract do not have to pay their monthly fee during the freezing period. Annual members get additional usage time after the original 12 months.

D. *Sample Construction*

We match the information on attendance and on contract choice in the three clubs to form a longitudinal dataset with monthly observations, covering the period from April 1997 to July 2000 (club 1) and to February 2001 (clubs 2 and 3). Our analysis focuses on *enrollment spells.* A spell starts whenever an individual enrolls (or reenrolls) in a club and ends whenever the individual quits. We define spells to be censored if either the enrollment is ongoing at the end of the sample period, or the individual switches to a short-term contract or receives a promotional membership. Accordingly, spells are completed if the individual cancels the membership (under a monthly contract) or if the membership expires (under an annual contract) within the sample period. Individuals have multiple spells if they quit the club and reenroll at some later date.

The initial sample includes 10,175 individuals. We drop individuals who were never enrolled in either a monthly or an annual contract (1,867 individuals). We eliminate individuals with data inconsistencies (49 individuals). We also exclude users with a family membership to avoid issues regarding the joint consumption of the services (247 individuals). Finally, in order to limit the sample to first-time users of these clubs, we drop users who had a free or a seasonal membership before they chose a monthly or an annual contract (260 individuals). (Additional information on the dataset construction is available in the Data Appendix.)

This leaves us with a sample of 7,752 individuals and 8,273 enrollment spells. In the paper, we consider only the first enrollment spell for each individual. As row 1 of Table 2 shows,

club 1 has 22 percent more members than club 2, and more than twice as many members as club 3. The percentage of completed spells is similar across the clubs, above 60 percent. Of the 7,752 individuals enrolled in any club, 89 percent choose a monthly membership as their first contract. Health club members rarely change the type of contract they initially enroll in. In addition to the whole sample, we also use the sample "no subsidy," which includes only unsubsidized memberships. We consider a membership to be unsubsidized if, over the whole spell, the average out-of-pocket fee exceeds $70 per month for enrollment in a monthly membership and $700 per year ($58 per month) for enrollment in an annual membership. This smaller sample includes 1,070 individuals (14 percent of the full sample).

E. *Descriptive Statistics*

In clubs 1 and 2 (columns 1 and 2), the average amount spent per spell is about $550, and the average fee per month ranges between $44 and $52. For corporate users, these are out-of-pocket payments and do not include subsidies paid by the sponsoring firms. The amounts are substantially lower in club 3 (column 3), since the contracts are cheaper, and substantially higher in the sample "no subsidy" (columns 7 and 8). Across all clubs (column 4), the initiation fee averages $4 and is paid by only 14 percent of users. Individuals with a monthly contract attend on average four times per month, and individuals with an annual contract attend on average 4.4 times per month. Attendance in club 1 (column 1) is somewhat higher than in the other clubs. Freezing of a contract is rare in all the clubs. The bottom part of Table 2 displays the available demographic controls. Users are somewhat more likely to be male than female and are on average in their early thirties. Corporate memberships account for 50 percent of the sample, while student memberships account for only 2 percent.

II. Contract Choice at Enrollment

A. *Predictions of the Standard Model*

We set up a model of contract choice and health club attendance. We assume that health

---

[5] Towels are not included in memberships in club 3.

[6] Monthly users can also quit for up to three additional months without repaying the initiation fee.

TABLE 2—DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

	Sample: All				Sample: All		Sample: No subsidy	
					All clubs		All clubs	
	Club 1	Club 2	Club 3	All clubs	First contract monthly	First contract annual	First contract monthly	First contract annual
	All contr. (1)	All contr. (2)	All contr. (3)	All contr. (4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Number of spells								
Total	3,495	2,866	1,391	7,752	6,875	877	866	204
Completed spells	2431	1825	990	5246	5246	509	581	112
Total amount in $	558.30	551.50	314.08	511.96	498.40	618.25	918.02	1,022.56
	(500.52)	(551.50)	(304.18)	(500.52)	(504.94)	(450.71)	(699.58)	(536.89)
	$N = 3,495$	$N = 2,866$	$N = 1,391$	$N = 7,752$	$N = 6,875$	$N = 877$	$N = 866$	$N = 204$
Initiation fee	6.35	1.91	2.89	4.09	3.88	5.74	14.68	17.65
	(26.64)	(11.91)	(13.03)	(20.23)	(19.51)	(25.10)	(41.88)	(45.57)
	$N = 3,495$	$N = 2,866$	$N = 1,391$	$N = 7,752$	$N = 6,875$	$N = 877$	$N = 866$	$N = 204$
Average fee per month								
Monthly contract	52.14	49.04	31.27	42.22	47.12	55.98	78.56	73.60
	(18.57)	(19.09)	(10.97)	(19.22)	(19.19)	(20.58)	(5.03)	(15.78)
	$N = 3,185$	$N = 2,551$	$N = 1,262$	$N = 6,951$	$N = 6,875$	$N = 76$	$N = 866$	$N = 20$
Annual contract	48.19	44.33	24.13	43.01	46.99	42.57	70.12	66.27
	(15.64)	(17.08)	(8.75)	(17.45)	(15.10)	(17.64)	(4.54)	(4.03)
	$N = 436$	$N = 391$	$N = 147$	$N = 974$	$N = 97$	$N = 877$	$N = 6$	$N = 204$
Average attendance per month								
Monthly contract	4.13	3.98	3.76	4.01	4.00	4.49	3.93	5.20
	(3.92)	(3.76)	(3.69)	(3.82)	(3.82)	(3.77)	(3.76)	(4.29)
	$N = 3,138$	$N = 2,551$	$N = 1,262$	$N = 6,951$	$N = 6,875$	$N = 76$	$N = 866$	$N = 20$
Annual contract	4.57	4.22	4.20	4.37	5.71	4.22	7.26	4.35
	(3.98)	(4.08)	(3.95)	(4.01)	(4.27)	(3.96)	(3.50)	(3.95)
	$N = 436$	$N = 391$	$N = 147$	$N = 974$	$N = 97$	$N = 877$	$N = 6$	$N = 204$
Contract choice per spell								
Months with monthly contract	9.03	6.95	8.94	8.98	10.08	0.42	11.67	0.50
	(8.27)	(9.03)	(8.84)	(8.66)	(8.57)	(2.08)	(8.87)	(2.26)
	$N = 3,495$	$N = 2,866$	$N = 1,391$	$N = 7,752$	$N = 6,875$	$N = 877$	$N = 866$	$N = 204$
Months with annual contract	1.55	1.97	1.42	1.68	0.15	13.68	0.07	14.92
	(4.67)	(5.78)	(4.83)	(5.14)	(1.50)	(7.32)	(1.05)	(7.86)
	$N = 3,495$	$N = 2,866$	$N = 1,391$	$N = 7,752$	$N = 6,875$	$N = 877$	$N = 866$	$N = 204$
Freezing	0.26	0.31	0.18	0.26	0.29	0.05	0.35	0.04
	(0.94)	(1.14)	(0.72)	(0.99)	(1.04)	(0.38)	(1.20)	(0.32)
	$N = 3,495$	$N = 2,866$	$N = 1,391$	$N = 7,752$	$N = 6,875$	$N = 877$	$N = 866$	$N = 204$
Female	0.44	0.48	0.47	0.46	0.48	0.34	0.38	0.35
	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.47)	(0.49)	(0.48)
	$N = 3,487$	$N = 2,866$	$N = 1,391$	$N = 7,744$	$N = 6,875$	$N = 876$	$N = 866$	$N = 204$
Age at sign-up	30.71	31.51	35.08	31.79	31.50	34.06	33.12	34.42
	(8.44)	(8.91)	(9.30)	(8.91)	(8.78)	(9.63)	(9.75)	(10.86)
	$N = 3,293$	$N = 2,745$	$N = 1,316$	$N = 7,354$	$N = 6,523$	$N = 831$	$N = 812$	$N = 193$
Corporate member	0.43	0.61	0.43	0.50	0.50	0.52	0.17	0.16
	(0.50)	(0.49)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.37)	(0.37)
	$N = 3,495$	$N = 2,866$	$N = 1,391$	$N = 7,752$	$N = 7,079$	$N = 877$	$N = 866$	$N = 204$
Student	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00
	(0.21)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.12)	(0.05)	(0.07)
	$N = 3,495$	$N = 2,866$	$N = 1,391$	$N = 7,752$	$N = 6,875$	$N = 877$	$N = 866$	$N = 204$

Notes: Standard deviation in parentheses. An enrollment spell starts whenever an individual enrolls in the club and ends whenever the individual quits or is censored. The sample "no subsidy" consists of the spells in which the average adjusted monthly fee is at least $70 if the spell starts with a monthly contract and at least $58 if the spell starts with an annual contract. The spells in column "first contract monthly" start with a monthly contract. The spells in column "first contract annual" start with an annual contract. "Average price per month" refers to the out-of-pocket fee in the case of corporate users.

club attendance involves immediate effort costs and delayed health benefits, and that the effort costs are uncertain ex ante. In particular, costs can be high ($c = \bar{c}$) or low ($c = \underline{c}$), and individuals differ in the ex ante probability that costs will be high. A contract (L', p', T') gives

customers the right to exercise for a fee p' and for T' periods (days), once the flat fee L' is paid. We assume that consumers can choose between flat-fee contracts (like the monthly and annual contract) with $p' = 0$ and pay-per-visit contracts with $L' = 0$. We summarize here the results on contract choice for the case of standard preferences and rational beliefs. The derivation is in the working-paper version (DellaVigna and Malmendier, 2002).

Flat Rate versus Pay per Usage.—We consider first the choice at enrollment between a flat-rate contract $(L, 0, T)$ and a pay-per-visit contract $(0, p, T)$. Denote by δ the daily discount factor and by $E_F[v]$ the expected number of visits (over T days) under the flat-rate contract.

Prediction 1 (price per expected attendance at enrollment): *For agents who choose a flat-rate contract,*

$$(1) \qquad \frac{L}{E_F[v]} \, a(T) \leq p.$$

The factor $a(T) \equiv (1 - \delta)T/(1 - \delta^T)$ is a time-adjustment coefficient due to the fact that the flat fee L is paid up front and the per-visit fee p is paid every period between 1 and T. For small T, such as $T = 30$ under the monthly contract, $a(T)$ is approximately 1. Equation (1) says that payment per expected visit under the flat-rate contract should be smaller than the per-visit-fee p. Intuitively, only consumers who attend frequently should choose the flat-rate contract. Suppose, instead, that a consumer under the flat-rate contract attends infrequently enough that the price per expected visit $L/E_F[v]$ is greater than the per-visit-fee p. If this consumer switched to the pay-per-visit contract without changing state-contingent attendance, she would have higher utility. Reoptimizing the attendance choices, she must be even better off.

Annual versus Monthly Contract.—The annual contract A requires a yearly commitment. The monthly contract M offers the option to cancel in any period but charges a higher fee per month. Consumers who anticipate a high enough probability of being high-cost types $(c = \bar{c})$ prefer the monthly contract for its flexibility. Users who believe that they will be low-cost types prefer the annual contract. The

users who select the annual contract, therefore, are more likely to be frequent users. In Prediction 2, we use attendance in the initial months $E[v]$ (before the selective exit) as a measure of the likelihood to be a frequent user.

Prediction 2 (attendance of monthly and annual members): *The average initial attendance of annual members is higher than the average initial attendance of monthly members:*

$$E_A[v] > E_M[v].$$

A third test for the standard model is whether consumers have rational expectations about their attendance.

Prediction 3 (forecast of attendance): *The average forecast of attendance equals the average actual attendance.*

B. *Empirical Analysis*

We test Prediction 1 using the sample of users enrolled in an unsubsidized flat-rate membership in clubs 1 and 2. We analyze separately users in club 3, given the lower fee per visit. As the benchmark measure of price per visit, we use the price per visit under the ten-visit pass, $10, rather than the $12 visit-by-visit fee: the ten-visit pass is cheaper for users with a monthly or annual contract, given their attendance frequency.[7]

Monthly Contract.—For users initially enrolled in a monthly contract, we compute the price per expected attendance for each month. We limit the analysis to the first six months of tenure to target inexperienced users. We use the sample "no subsidy" (866 individuals) to ensure comparability to standard health clubs with no corporate subsidy.

The first column in Table 3 reports the average monthly fees in months one through six,

---

[7] The (hypothetical) average price per average attendance from using the ten-visit pass, given the distribution of attendance for users enrolled with the monthly and the annual contract, is $10.91. The benefits of a lower price relative to the $12-per-visit fee outweigh the losses from unused coupons for these users. The single-visit fee of $12 is targeted toward one-time users such as travelling businessmen.

TABLE 3—PRICE PER AVERAGE ATTENDANCE AT ENROLLMENT

	Sample: No subsidy, all clubs		
	Average price per month (1)	Average attendance per month (2)	Average price per average attendance (3)
	Users initially enrolled with a monthly contract		
Month 1	55.23 (0.80) N = 829	3.45 (0.13) N = 829	16.01 (0.66) N = 829
Month 2	80.65 (0.45) N = 758	5.46 (0.19) N = 758	14.76 (0.52) N = 758
Month 3	70.18 (1.05) N = 753	4.89 (0.18) N = 753	14.34 (0.58) N = 753
Month 4	81.79 (0.26) N = 728	4.57 (0.19) N = 728	17.89 (0.75) N = 728
Month 5	81.93 (0.25) N = 701	4.42 (0.19) N = 701	18.53 (0.80) N = 701
Month 6	81.94 (0.29) N = 607	4.32 (0.19) N = 607	18.95 (0.84) N = 607
Months 1 to 6	75.26 (0.27) N = 866	4.36 (0.14) N = 866	17.27 (0.54) N = 866
	Users initially enrolled with an annual contract, who joined at least 14 months before the end of sample period		
Year 1	66.32 (0.37) N = 145	4.36 (0.36) N = 145	15.22 (1.25) N = 145

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors for "average price per average attendance" measure computed using the bivariate Delta method. The number of observations is denoted by N. An enrollment spell starts whenever an individual enrolls in the club and ends whenever the individual quits or is censored. The sample "no subsidy" consists of the spells in which the average adjusted monthly fee is at least $70 if the spell starts with a monthly contract and at least $58 if the spell starts with an annual contract. The sample for the t-th month includes spells that are ongoing, not frozen, and not miscoded at month t. For the six-month period, the sample includes spells that are ongoing, not frozen, and not miscoded in at least one month in the period. For the one-year period in the annual contract, the sample includes only spells that started at least 14 months before the end of the sample period, and that were not prematurely terminated because of medical reasons or relocation. The "average price" in period t is the average fee across people enrolled in period t. The "average attendance" in period t is the average number of visits across people enrolled in period t. The measure in column 3 is the ratio of the measure in column 1 and the measure in column 2.

with standards errors in parentheses. The sample for month t consists of users who initially enrolled in a monthly contract and have had a continuous history of membership up to month t under either a monthly or an annual contract. Consumers drop out of the sample when they cancel or are censored. For users who switch to an annual contract, the monthly fee is the monthly share of the annual fee. The average monthly fee exceeds $80 in all months, except in the joining month which is typically prorated, and in month 3, a promotional free month for 18.6 percent of the sample. The average number of visits for users in the tth month of tenure (column 2) declines from 5.46 in month 2 to 4.32 in month 6. (Month 1 covers only part of a month.)

The third column in Table 3 presents the ratio of the average fee in month t (column 1) and the

TABLE 4—DISTRIBUTION OF ATTENDANCE AND PRICE PER ATTENDANCE AT ENROLLMENT

	Sample: No subsidy, all clubs			
	First contract monthly, months 1–6 (monthly fee ≥ $70)		First contract annual, year 1 (annual fee ≥ $700)	
	Average attendance per month (1)	Price per attendance (2)	Average attendance per month (3)	Price per attendance (4)
Distribution of measures				
10th percentile	0.24	7.73	0.20	5.98
20th percentile	0.80	10.18	0.80	8.81
25th percentile	1.19	11.48	1.08	11.27
Median	3.50	21.89	3.46	19.63
75th percentile	6.50	63.75	6.08	63.06
90th percentile	9.72	121.73	10.86	113.85
95th percentile	11.78	201.10	13.16	294.51
	N = 866	N = 866	N = 145	N = 145

Notes: The number of observations is denoted by N. An enrollment spell starts whenever an individual enrolls in the club and ends whenever the individual quits or is censored. The sample "no subsidy" consists of the spells in which the average adjusted monthly fee is at least $70 if the spell starts with a monthly contract and at least $58 if the spell starts with an annual contract. The spells in column "first contract monthly, months 1–6" start with a monthly contract. The spells in column "first contract annual, year 1" start with an annual contract. The variable "price per attendance" is defined as the ratio of the average price over the average attendance over the first period (six months for the monthly contract, one year for the annual contract).

average attendance in month t (column 2). This ratio is the estimated price per expected attendance for month t, $(L/E_F[v])a(T)$ in Prediction 1. In each of the six months, we reject the hypothesis that the price per expected attendance is smaller than $10 (or than $12). The estimate ranges between $14 and $16 in the first three months and is higher than $17 in the subsequent three months. As a summary measure, we compute the ratio of average monthly payment (column 1) and average monthly attendance (column 2) in the first six months across all individuals.[8] The resulting price per average attendance in the first six months of enrollment equals $17.27, well above $10 (or $12).

In addition to averages, we consider also the distribution of these measures in the first six months (Table 4). We measure the price per attendance as the ratio of total attendance over

total payment in the first six months of membership in a monthly contract (column 2). Only 20 percent of the individuals pays less than $10 per visit. The remaining 80 percent would have saved money choosing the pay-per-visit contract, holding constant the number of visits.

Annual Contract.—We also test Prediction 1 on the users who chose an annual contract at enrollment. We use the sample "no subsidy" further restricted to users who joined the club at least 14 months before the end of the sample period (145 individuals). This ensures that we observe the annual contract in its entirety.[9]

The bottom row of Table 3 presents the estimation results. The average monthly share of the annual fee for the first year (column 1), adjusted for discounting, is $66.32.[10] The average number of monthly visits in the first year

---

[8] For each individual, we compute the average over all available months until the sixth, with the exception of miscoded months and months with freezing. When averaging across individuals, we weigh all individuals equally, independent of tenure.

[9] We exclude three annual contracts that are terminated before the twelfth month. Health clubs are required to accept cancellations for medical reasons or for relocation more than 25 miles from the clubs.

[10] We use a daily discount factor of 0.9998, implying an adjustment factor $T(1 - \delta)/(1 - \delta^T)$ equal to 1.037.

(column 2) is 4.36. The resulting price per average attendance (column 3) of $15.22 is substantially higher than $10 (or than $12). The estimate is somewhat lower than for the monthly contract, consistent with selection of users with higher expected attendance into the annual contract (Prediction 2). Table 4 shows the distribution across users of attendance (column 3) and of the price per attendance (column 4) in the first year of an annual membership. Only 24 percent pay less than $10 per visit.

Finding 1 (price per expected attendance at enrollment): *Users who choose an unsubsidized flat-rate contract pay a price per average attendance of over $17 in the monthly contract and over $15 in the annual contract. The share of users who pay ex post less than $10 per visit is 20 percent in the monthly contract and 24 percent in the annual contract.*

Size of the Effect.—As a monetary measure of the deviation from the standard model, for monthly and annual memberships we compute the difference between actual expenses over the whole enrollment spell and imputed expenses for the same number of attendances with ten-visit passes.[11] This measure understates the savings from paying per visit since the agents could reoptimize their attendance. The "average loss" measure is positive if the user would have saved money purchasing ten-visit passes, and negative otherwise. We use the sample "no subsidy" for spells that start before October 1997.

The average loss per spell is $614 for agents initially enrolled in a monthly contract. This amount is 43 percent of the overall $1,423 spent on the health club membership. For agents initially enrolled in an annual contract, there is a small, insignificant gain of $1.

The observed deviation from the standard model has large monetary consequences for users in the monthly contract. For users in the annual contract, the automatic expiration moderates the possible losses.

Robustness.—We now check the robustness of Finding 1.

1. *Sample.* Thus far, we have restricted attention to the unsubsidized sample and pooled the results across clubs. We now include all users who initially chose a monthly contract and disaggregate the results by club. Separately for each club, we regress health club attendance on the monthly fee using an Epanechnikov kernel. The measure of attendance is the average attendance per month in the first six months. We cross-validate club by club with a grid search to compute the optimal bandwidth for the price.[12] In club 1 (Figure 1A), the average monthly attendance from the kernel regression lies between three and five and is increasing in price, although the estimates are not very smooth given the small bandwidth suggested by the cross-validation. We use the average attendance from the kernel regression to compute the ratio of price and average attendance for each level of price (Figure 1B). The price per average attendance is significantly higher than $10 for users paying a monthly fee in excess of $53. The estimates for club 2 are comparable (Figures 1C and 1D) and somewhat smoother given the larger optimal bandwidth. In club 3 the price per average attendance is higher than the per-visit fee of $8 for users paying a fee in excess of $46 (Figure 1F).

2. *Underrecording of attendance.* The high price per attendance could result from underrecording of attendance due to a faulty computer system or moral hazard problems with the staff. Health club employees may also seek to avoid queues of users waiting to swipe. The three health clubs in our sample had incentives to address these problems, since they provide reports of attendance to the corporations subsidizing employee memberships. They therefore put in place one of the most advanced and reliable systems to track attendance in the industry. Unlike in most clubs, a front-desk employee collects the cards from the members and swipes them while the member is exercising. Therefore, card swiping does not generate queues. We also witnessed the procedure if a member has forgotten the card: the employee looks the name up in the computer and records the attendance. Thus, while errors may occur in both directions—failure to swipe and double swiping—the health club data used in our analysis are unusually accurate.

---

[11] This measure takes into account the potential loss associated with not using fully a ten-visit pass.

[12] Adrian Pagan and Aman Ullah (1999), pp. 110–20.

FIGURE 1. AVERAGE ATTENDANCE AND PRICE PER AVERAGE ATTENDANCE (KERNEL REGRESSIONS)

Notes: Point estimates and 95-percent confidence intervals plotted. The sample is all individuals initially enrolled with a monthly contract. The individual price variable is the average price over the first six months. The individual attendance variable is the average attendance over the first six months. Figures 1A, 1C, and 1E show a kernel regression of attendance on price using an Epanechnikov kernel. The bandwidth is determined by cross-validation with a grid search separately for each club. Figures 1B, 1D, and 1F show the ratio of the price and the expected attendance predicted for that price using the kernel regression. Confidence intervals are derived using the Delta method.

As supporting evidence, we can test whether random events such as computer crashes or idiosyncratic laziness of employees affect substantially the accuracy of the attendance record. We calculate the fraction of members attending on each day in the sample and regress it on a set of controls: 6 day-of-the-week dummies, 11 month dummies, 3 year dummies, and 15 holiday dummies. If recording precision is highly variable, the R^2 of this regression should be low. The R^2 of the regression for club 1, instead, is as high as 0.8785, with the day-of-the-week dummies explaining most of the variance. The regression for clubs 2 and 3 yield an even higher R^2 of 0.8915.[13] The high explanatory power of these regressions suggests that daily variation in recording precision is limited.

3. *Ex post subsidies.* Some HMOs reimburse members partially for health club expenses. To the extent that these reimbursements make the annual and the monthly contract cheaper relative to the pay-per-visit contract, they induce users to choose flat-rate contracts. However, the HMOs in the state where the three clubs operate offer discounts either on the initiation fee only, or to both flat-rate and pay-per-usage contracts.[14]

4. *Membership benefits.* Consumers' choice of the monthly or annual contract could be due to contract-specific membership benefits. The only benefit not available under the per-visit payment, though, is the option to rent an overnight locker at an extra fee, and only 9.4 percent of the users ever rent a locker. If we exclude these users, the results on price per average attendance for the monthly contract do not vary.

Overall, we observe a robust deviation from Prediction 1. Nonsubsidized users enrolled in contracts with flat fees pay a price per average attendance that is significantly higher than the per-visit price available as an alternative contract. The result is robust to the type of contract (monthly or annual), the sample (the amount of subsidy), and the club considered. The results do not appear to depend on measurement error, ex post subsidies, or unobserved benefits. The deviation from Prediction 1 is large: unsubsi-

TABLE 5—AVERAGE ATTENDANCE IN MONTHLY AND
ANNUAL CONTRACTS
(Sorting)

	Average attendance during the n-th month since enrollment		
	Sample: All clubs		
	Month 2	Month 3	Month 4
Monthly contract	5.507	5.005	4.614
	(0.0668)	(0.0696)	(0.0709)
	$N = 6219$	$N = 5693$	$N = 5225$
Annual contract	5.805	5.629	5.193
	(0.1885)	(0.1934)	(0.1913)
	$N = 862$	$N = 841$	$N = 817$

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. The number of observations is denoted by N. An enrollment spell starts whenever an individual enrolls (or reenrolls) in the club and ends whenever the individual quits or is censored. The spells in row "monthly contract" start with a monthly contract. The spells in row "annual contract" start with an annual contract. The sample in month n includes spells that are ongoing, not frozen, and not miscoded.

dized members of a monthly contract pay 70 percent in excess of the $10 fee.

To test Prediction 2 on the initial sorting between the monthly and the annual contracts, we compare the average number of visits in months 2, 3, and 4 of tenure for individuals initially enrolled in the monthly and in the annual contract.[15] Given that the price per visit p is zero for both contracts, differences in attendance should reflect differences in the expected future attendance cost. Column 1 of Table 5 reports the results for the whole sample. In each month, expected attendance is higher under the annual than under the monthly contract, and significantly so in months 3 and 4. Overall, average attendance in months 2 to 4 is 10 percent higher under the annual contract. The magnitude of this difference is comparable to variation in average attendance by age groups and by gender. When we break down the sample into 24 age-gender-month cells, average attendance is higher under the annual contract in

---

[13] Detailed results are available in DellaVigna and Malmendier (2002, Appendix Table 1).

[14] We report the results in Appendix Table 3 in DellaVigna and Malmendier (2002). We thank Nancy Beaulieu for providing the list of HMOs.

[15] We exclude the first month because attendance is prorated over the number of effective days of membership, and the prorating procedure is slightly different for the annual and the monthly contract. We do not extend the comparison to months after the fourth, since users who experience a high cost can quit under the monthly contract but not under the annual contract.

20 cells out of 24. Even after controlling for some heterogeneity, individuals with higher attendance are more likely to choose the annual contract at enrollment.

Finding 2 (attendance of monthly and annual members): *Average attendance in months 2–4 is 10 percent higher under the annual contract than under the monthly contract.*

While consumers' choice between flat-rate contracts and a per-visit fee is hard to explain in the standard framework (Finding 1), their choice between the monthly and annual contract (Finding 2) is consistent with standard preferences and beliefs. Consumers sort according to the expected attendance.

Finally, we elicit the expectations of health club members about their future attendance using a survey of 48 randomly chosen respondents interviewed in a mall.[16] The mall is not near a health club, so the respondents are not selected on health club attendance. We ask the ones that report to be members or to attend a health club how often they expect to visit their health club in the next month, September.[17] This question attempts to measure directly whether health club users have rational expectations. Although we do not observe actual attendance among these 48 survey respondents, it is unlikely to differ substantially from attendance in our dataset, which is very robust across demographic subgroups. Across 24 (gender)*(club)*(age) subgroups, the average monthly attendance over the membership is lower than 4.75 visits for 23 out of 24 groups, with an overall average of 4.17 monthly visits.

Finding 3 (forecasts of attendance): *The average forecasted number of monthly visits, 9.50 (s.e. 0.66), is more than twice as large as average attendance, 4.17.*

The overestimation displayed by the subjects matches Finding 1. If health club consumers expect to attend 9.5 times per month, they should indeed choose a flat-rate contract, rather than paying per visit.

We also present the subjects with the following scenario: Suppose that, based on your pre-

vious experience, you expect to attend on average five times per month (about once a week), if you enroll in a monthly membership. You plan to attend the health club throughout the next year. Would you choose a monthly contract with a monthly fee of $70 per month or ten-visit passes for $100 (each visit costs $10)? This question attempts to measure whether users endowed with realistic expectations about attendance would still overwhelmingly choose flat-rate contracts. In the hypothetical scenario, 18 consumers out of 48 prefer the monthly contract, and 30 prefer the ten-visit pass. With realistic expectations about attendance, therefore, the majority prefers to pay per visit.

These findings suggest that health club members have unrealistic expectations about their future attendance. One should take responses to hypothetical questions with caution, however, particularly because the survey sample differs from the health club sample.

III. Contract Choice over Time

A. *Predictions of the Standard Model*

In the previous section, we analyzed consumers' initial choice of membership contract. In this section, we compare the renewal decisions of monthly and annual members. We take advantage of two differences in the renewal procedure between the two flat-rate contracts. First, the renewal default differs. The monthly contract is automatically renewed and requires a (small) effort—sending a letter or cancelling in person—in order to discontinue the membership. The annual contract automatically expires after 12 months, and cancellation requires no effort. Second, members with a monthly contract can cancel at any month, while members with an annual contract are committed for a year. We evaluate the impact of these differences on cancellation lag, survival probabilities, and average attendance over time in a simple setup with standard preferences and beliefs (details are in DellaVigna and Malmendier, 2002).

Calibration.—We illustrate the effect of the renewal default on cancellation with the following calibration. Consider two agents with identical preferences and identical effort costs of attendance. One is enrolled in the monthly contract, the other in the annual contract. At the end

---

[16] The interviews were done in August 2002 in Walnut Creek, California.

[17] In our sample, average attendance in September is 5 percent lower than over the rest of the year.

of the contractual period, each consumer can either renew with a monthly or an annual contract, or switch to the pay-per-visit contract (which is equivalent to dropping out). Denote with s the (possibly negative) daily savings from switching to the pay-per-visit contract, which we assume to be deterministic.[18] The savings s are decreasing in the future health club attendance. For example, a member with a monthly fee of $70 who expects not to attend any more has $s = \$70/30 = \$2.33$. Denote by δ the daily discount factor and by k the one-time effort cost of cancellation.

Under the annual contract, this cost is zero, and the agent drops out if $\delta s/(1 - \delta) > 0$, that is, for $s > 0$. Under the monthly contract, the cost k is stochastic, with i.i.d. draws each period (day) from the c.d.f. F. In each period, the agent can switch to payment per visit at the realized cost k or postpone switching. The benefit of postponement is the option value of a lower future realization of k, while the cost is the foregone savings s. The value function V solves $V = E[\max(-k, -\delta s + \delta V)]$. The solution of the agent's dynamic programming problem is a threshold level k^*. The agent switches to payment per visit if the realized transaction cost is smaller than k^*. Without solving for k^*, we derive an upper bound on the expected number of periods (days) until cancellation, $E[T] = (1 - F(k^*))/F(k^*)$, under the assumption $\delta = 1$. In Section IIIB we then compare the predicted $E[T]$ with an empirical proxy. Denote by $k_{.2}$ the bottom quintile of the cost distribution, that is, $k_{.2} \equiv F^{-1}(.2)$, and denote by $\underline{k}$ the lower bound of the cost distribution. Then $E[T]$ must be smaller than $\max(4, [k_{.2} - \underline{k}]/s)$. The derivation is as follows. For a cost realization of $k_{.2}$, the agents either switch to payment per visit, or not. If they do switch for $k = k_{.2}$, the expected delay is at most $(1 - F(k_{.2}))/F(k_{.2}) = 4$ days. If they do not switch for $k = k_{.2}$, revealed preferences imply that the benefit of delay—bounded above by $k_{.2} - \underline{k}$—must be higher than the cost of delay, $E[T]s$. This yields the bound.

In order to calibrate the upper bound for the expected delay $E[T]$, we make the conservative assumptions $k_{.2} = \$10$ (corresponding to the value of one hour of time on a calm day) and $\underline{k} = 0$. For these values, an individual who expects not to attend the health club any more ($s = \$70/30 = \$2.33$) delays on average no more than $\max(4, 10/2.33)$, that is, 4.3 days. An individual who expects to attend four times a month ($s \approx (70 - 40)/30 = \$1$) delays on average no more than ten days. Under the standard model, therefore, monthly members with low expected attendance switch almost immediately to payment per visit. The switching behavior of monthly members is thus similar to the one of annual members. We summarize a first prediction on contract choice over time.

Prediction 4 (cancellation lags under the monthly contract): *Low attenders under the monthly contract delay cancellation for at most a few days.*

Survival Probability.—We now compare the renewal behavior for monthly and annual contracts when both contracts are up for renewal, i.e., after 12 or 24 months. The survival probability $S_{j,t}$ is the probability that a consumer initially enrolled in contract j (equal to *Monthly* or *Annual*) is still enrolled in one of the flat-rate contracts—either monthly or annual—after t months, with $t = 12, 24$. For example, $S_{M,12}$ is the probability that a monthly member has not switched to payment per visit by month 12. Similarly, $S_{A,12}$ is the probability that an annual member renews with an annual or a monthly contract after 12 months.

Sorting at enrollment (Prediction 2) implies that users who selected into the annual contract are ex post more likely to be frequent users. These users are more likely to renew—either with a monthly or with an annual membership. This increases $S_{A,t}$ relative to $S_{M,t}$. Cancellation costs for the monthly contract, instead, act to increase $S_{M,t}$ relative to $S_{A,t}$. The calibrations above, however, suggest that in a standard model the effect of cancellation costs is very small. We therefore expect the sorting effect to dominate.

Prediction 5 (survival probability): *The survival probability after one and after two years is higher for agents who initially chose the annual membership than for agents who initially chose*

***

[18] For simplicity, we are neglecting the learning over time about the savings s. In a model with learning, agents may wait to cancel for two reasons. First, as we capture in the calibrations, they may wait for a lower realization of k. Second, they may wait for a lower realization of s. Our calibrations show that the predictions are robust to the first option value argument. Adding a second option value regarding s is unlikely to change the predictions substantially.

the monthly membership: $S_{A,t} > S_{M,t}$, for $t = 12$, 24.

Attendance over Time.—Over time, monthly and annual members learn about their attendance patterns, and therefore about s. Learning induces selective exit of individuals with ex post low attendance. Define as stayers individuals initially enrolled in a flat-rate contract who do not switch to a pay-per-visit contract after the first year. Attendance of stayers in later periods should be higher than attendance of the initial group, since the low-attenders have switched to paying per visit. In the standard model, this prediction holds in similar form for both the annual and the monthly contract.[19]

Prediction 6 (expected attendance over time for annual contract): *Among users initially enrolled in an annual contract, the expected attendance in the second year among stayers is higher than the expected attendance in the first year for the initial group.*

Prediction 7 (expected attendance over time for monthly contract): *Among users initially enrolled in a monthly contract, the expected attendance among stayers should increase from month to month.*

B. *Empirical Analysis*

Cancellation Lags.—To test Prediction 4, we adopt a conservative measure of cancellation delay $E[T]$ for low attenders. We measure this lag as the number of full months between the last attendance and contract termination for users with a monthly contract at the time of termination. For example, if an agent attends the last time on March 10 and cancels on April 5, we count the 51 days between last attendance (March 10) and membership termination (April 30) as *one* full month. This is likely to understate the true cancellation lag for low-attenders on two grounds: (a) the measure does not include months with low, but positive, monthly attendance; and (b) members may attend the club one last time in order to cancel after a long

period of nonattendance. We restrict the sample to users who paid no initiation fee, to ensure minimal costs of rejoining.[20]

Finding 4 (cancellation lags under the monthly contract): *On average, 2.31 full months elapse between the last attendance and contract termination for monthly members, with associated membership payments of $187. This lag is at least four months for 20 percent of the users.*

Even though the transaction costs of cancellation are likely to be lower than $15 (time cost of sending a cancellation letter or visiting the club), users spend on average $187 in membership fees after their last attendance. This lengthy delay is at odds with the calibrations in Section IIIA, which imply an average delay of at most five to ten days.

Survival Probability.—To test Prediction 5, ideally we would compute the percentage of monthly members and of annual members still enrolled one year after the initial enrollment. We need to take into account, however, that (a) the first month in a contract is prorated, so every annual member is still enrolled in the thirteenth (calendar) month; and (b) 11.5 percent of annual contracts last one additional month due to promotions. We therefore define the survival probability as the share of members still enrolled in a flat-rate contract at the fifteenth calendar month. In order to estimate the survival probability, we set survival s_i to 1 if individual i is enrolled in the fifteenth month since enrollment, and 0 otherwise.[21] We use the following empirical specification:

$$(2) \quad s_i = 1 \text{ if } s_i^* = \alpha + \gamma M_i + BX_i + \varepsilon_i \geq 0,$$

where ε_i is normally distributed and M_i is a dummy variably that equals 1 if the first contract for individual i is a monthly contract, and 0 otherwise. The vector of controls X includes gender, a quadratic function of age, a dummy

---

[19] The main difference is that for the annual contract the comparison can be made only across years, since the selective exit is possible only every 12 months.

[20] We include users with an unsubsidized membership (monthly fee higher than $70 or annual fee higher than $700) who joined the club within a year since the start of the sample (April 1997).

[21] The survival measure, $s_i = 1$, applies also to members who have temporarily quit the club but have reenrolled by the fifteenth month since their initial enrollment.

TABLE 6—PROBIT OF RENEWAL DECISION

Sample	Non-missing controls, all clubs						No subsidy, all		No subsidy II, all	
Dependent variable	Enrollment at 15th month		Enrollment at 16th month		Enrollment at 27th month		Enrollment at 15th month		Enrollment at 15th month	
Controls	No controls (1)	Controls + time dummies (2)	No controls (3)	Controls + time dummies (4)	No controls (5)	Controls + time dummies (6)	No controls (7)	Controls + time dummies (8)	No controls (9)	Controls + time dummies (10)
Dummy for enrollment with monthly contract	0.0483 (0.0218)**	0.066 (0.0221)***	0.0337 (0.0221)	0.0546 (0.0224)**	0.0011 (0.0260)	0.0271 (0.0254)	0.0634 (0.0479)	0.0694 (0.0501)	0.091 (0.0368)**	0.1019 (0.0372)***
Female		−0.0438 (0.0143)***		−0.0425 (0.0144)***		−0.0762 (0.0165)***		−0.0187 (0.0394)		−0.0186 (0.0277)
Age		0.0133 (0.0046)***		0.0155 (0.0046)***		0.0228 (0.0052)***		0.0304 (0.0111)***		0.0229 (0.0077)***
Age squared		−0.0001 (0.0001)**		−0.0002 (0.0001)**		−0.0002 (0.0001)***		−0.0003 (0.0001)**		−0.0003 (0.0001)***
Corporate member		0.0728 (0.0144)***		0.0676 (0.0145)***		0.0676 (0.0167)***		0.234 (0.0471)***		0.0024 (0.0319)
Student member		−0.1123 (0.0503)**		−0.0924 (0.0519)*		−0.0894 (0.0567)		0.1966 (0.2669)		−0.1173 (0.0666)*
Month and year of enrollment		X		X		X		X		X
Baseline renewal probability for annual contract	0.3983	0.4017	0.3906	0.3932	0.2609	0.2589	0.4701	0.5537	0.4252	0.4347
Number of observations	N = 4,962	N = 4,962	N = 4,833	N = 4,833	N = 2,860	N = 2,860	N = 715	N = 715	N = 1,384	N = 1,384

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. The number of observations is denoted by *N*. Entries in the table represent the marginal coefficients of the probit in response to an infinitesimal change in the continuous variables, and a discrete change for the dummy variables. An enrollment spell starts whenever an individual enrolls in the club and ends whenever the individual quits or is censored. The sample "non-missing controls" consists of the individuals for whom the demographic controls "age" and "female" are available. The sample is further restricted to individuals who join at least 15 months before the end of the sample period. The sample "no subsidy" is a restriction of the sample "non-missing controls" to individuals paying on average a per-month fee of at least $70. The sample "no subsidy II" is a restriction of the sample "non-missing controls" to individuals paying on average a per-month fee of at least $60. The controls "month and year of enrollment" indicate that the probit contains 11 dummies for the month of enrollment and 4 dummies for year of enrollment. The baseline renewal probability for the annual contract is the predicted renewal probability for individuals starting with an annual contract.

   * Significant at the 10-percent level.
   ** Significant at the 5-percent level.
   *** Significant at the 1-percent level.

for corporate membership, a dummy for student membership, 11 dummies for the month, and 4 dummies for the year of enrollment. We restrict the sample to users who joined the club at least 15 months before the end of the sample period. We also drop users with missing values of a control variable, as well as spells that are censored before the fifteenth month.

The coefficient γ captures the difference in survival probability between users initially enrolled in a monthly contract and users initially enrolled in an annual contract. The coefficients in Table 6 are the marginal change in response to an infinitesimal change in the continuous independent variables, and a discrete change for the independent dummy variables. In the specification without controls (column 1), $\hat{\gamma}$ is positive and significant. Enrollment in a monthly contract increases survival by 4.83 percentage points relative to the baseline rate of 39.82 percent survival with the annual contract. The introduction of the controls increases the coefficient $\hat{\gamma}$ from 0.0483 to 0.0660 (column 2). Controlling for some of the unobserved hetero-

geneity reduces the downward bias on the coefficient due to the initial sorting (Prediction 2). For example, individuals enrolled with a monthly contract are significantly younger than users with an annual contract (Table 2), and young people are less likely to renew (column 2 of Table 6). Failing to control for age biases the coefficient $\hat{\gamma}$ downward.

Finding 5 (survival probability): *The survival probability after 14 months for the monthly contract is 17 percent higher than for the annual contract.*

It is worth reiterating that "survival" includes renewal with either of the two flat-rate contracts. We can thus rule out that liquidity concerns (i.e., the difficulty of making an annual payment all at once), and concerns about a second long-term commitment for one year induce annual members to quit.

Robustness.—In columns 3 through 10 of Table 6, we check the robustness of the findings. We measure enrollment at the sixteenth month

after the joining date as an alternative measure of survival. With demographic controls, users initially enrolled in the monthly contract are 5.46 percentage points more likely to be enrolled in the sixteenth month (column 4) than users initially enrolled in the annual contract. Alternatively, we measure enrollment at the twenty-seventh month after the joining date (columns 5 and 6). The estimate of γ is positive, although not significantly different from zero.

We also replicate the results of columns 1 and 2 of Table 6 for the sample "no subsidy" (columns 7 and 8) and for the larger sample "no subsidy II" of users who pay at least $60 per month in the monthly contract, or $600 per year in the annual contract (columns 9 and 10). In the first, smaller sample the estimated $\hat{\gamma}$ has a similar magnitude as in the benchmark specification, but the estimates are imprecise. In the second, wider sample, the coefficient $\hat{\gamma}$ is positive and large (0.1019 with controls), as well as precisely estimated. Overall, the results on survival probability are robust to the measure of past attendance, the measure of survival, and the sample.

Attendance over Time.—Finally, we test Predictions 6 and 7 on the dynamics of average attendance. We first consider spells starting with an annual contract in the sample "no subsidy" and lasting at least two years.[22] We display the results in columns 1 to 3 of the bottom part of Table 7.

Finding 6 (average attendance over time in annual contract): *In the annual contract, average monthly attendance for the initial group in the first year, 4.36, is significantly lower than for stayers in the second year, 5.98.*

The difference in attendance between the two groups is large: the baseline group in the first year attends on average 27 percent less than stayers in the second year. Consequently, the price per average attendance in the first year, $15.22, is significantly higher than in the second year, $11.32. The results for the whole sample are comparable (columns 4 to 6 of Table 7).

Figure 2A shows the within-year dynamics of the price per average attendance. The sample at month t is given by users in the "no subsidy" sample who have joined with an annual membership and are still enrolled with a flat-rate contract in the t-th month of tenure. Over the first 12 months, the price per average attendance increases from 12.3 to 19, as negative shocks accumulate. At renewal (months 13 and 14), the price per attendance is halved.

For spells starting with a monthly contract, the sample for average attendance at month t is given by the users in the "no subsidy" sample who have joined with a monthly membership and are still enrolled with a flat-rate contract in the t-th month of tenure. Columns 1 to 3 of the top part of Table 7 show the results by six-month groups.

Finding 7 (average attendance over time in monthly contract): *Average monthly attendance in the first six months of a monthly contract, 4.36, is 20 percent higher than in the next six months and is significantly higher than in any of the later six-month periods among stayers.*

The price per average attendance in the first six months, $17.27, is significantly lower than in any of the later six-month periods.[23] As Figure 2B shows, the price per average attendance increases over the first ten months from about $15 to about $20, and remains constant thereafter. The results are similar in the whole sample (columns 4 to 6).

Summary.—Unsubsidized monthly members spend on average $187 for periods with no attendance before cancellation (Finding 4), despite small transaction costs of cancellation. In addition, after one year, more monthly members are still enrolled in a flat-rate contract than annual members (Finding 5). Surprisingly, members who pay higher fees for the option to cancel each month are more likely to renew past a year. This result does not arise because of sorting but despite sorting (Finding 2). The result is economically and statistically significant and robust across specifications. Finally, average attendance decreases by 20 percent between the first six months and the next six months in

---

[22] The results remain unchanged if we restrict the sample further to users who renew with an annual contract after 12 months.

[23] The results remain unchanged if we restrict the sample further to users who have had a monthly contract at all times until month t.

TABLE 7—ATTENDANCE AND PRICE PER AVERAGE ATTENDANCE OVER TIME

	Sample: No subsidy, all clubs			Sample: All clubs		
	Average price per month (1)	Average attendance per month (2)	Average price per average attendance (3)	Average price per month (4)	Average attendance per month (5)	Average price per average attendance (6)
	Users initially enrolled with a monthly contract					
Months 1–6	75.26 (0.27) N = 866	4.36 (0.14) N = 866	17.27 (0.54) N = 866	44.77 (0.23) N = 6,875	4.33 (0.05) N = 6,875	10.35 (0.13) N = 6,875
Months 7–12	81.89 (0.26) N = 577	3.63 (0.17) N = 577	22.56 (1.07) N = 577	52.81 (0.31) N = 3,867	3.91 (0.07) N = 3,867	13.50 (0.26) N = 3,867
Months 13–18	81.27 (0.34) N = 331	3.89 (0.23) N = 331	20.88 (1.26) N = 331	52.99 (0.41) N = 2,131	4.41 (0.10) N = 2,131	12.03 (0.29) N = 2,131
Months 19–24	81.82 (0.37) N = 189	3.97 (0.31) N = 189	20.59 (1.62) N = 189	53.95 (0.59) N = 1,130	4.45 (0.14) N = 1,130	12.12 (0.39) N = 1,130
	Users initially enrolled with an annual contract					
Year 1	66.32 (0.37) N = 145	4.36 (0.36) N = 145	15.22 (1.25) N = 145	44.16 (0.69) N = 598	4.19 (0.16) N = 598	10.55 (0.45) N = 598
Year 2	67.70 (1.07) N = 35	5.98 (0.87) N = 35	11.32 (1.67) N = 35	46.72 (1.68) N = 108	5.82 (0.45) N = 108	8.02 (0.68) N = 108

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors for "average price per average attendance" measure computed using the bivariate Delta method. The number of observations is denoted by N. An enrollment spell starts whenever an individual enrolls in the club and ends whenever the individual quits or is censored. The sample "no subsidy" consists of the spells in which the average adjusted monthly fee is at least $70 if the spell starts with a monthly contract, and at least $58 if the spell starts with an annual contract. For the six-month periods, the sample includes spells that are ongoing, not frozen, and not miscoded in at least one month in the period. For year 1 in the annual contract, the sample includes only spells that started at least 14 months before the end of the sample period, and that were not prematurely terminated because of medical reasons or relocation. For year 2, the sample includes only spells that started with an annual contract at least 26 months before the end of the sample period, and that lasted at least 25 months. The spells in row "first contract monthly" start with a monthly contract. The spells in row "first contract annual" start with an annual contract. The "average price" in period t is the average fee across people enrolled in period t. The "average attendance" in period t is the average number of visits across people enrolled in period t. The measure in column 3 is the ratio of the measure in column 1 and the measure in column 2.

the monthly contract (Finding 7), a pattern opposite to the one found for annual contracts (Finding 6).

IV. Interpretations

We now consider which assumptions about consumer preferences and beliefs can explain the seven empirical findings, summarized in Table 1. Two findings are consistent with standard economic models. Health clubs members use information on expected future attendance to sort into the monthly and annual contract (Finding 2) and to sort out of the annual contract (Finding 6). The other findings, instead, are

hard to reconcile with the standard framework. Consumers pay $17 per expected attendance under the monthly contract (Finding 1) and appear to overestimate future attendance (Finding 3). In addition, monthly members with low attendance accumulate delays in cancellation (Finding 4), leading to a higher renewal probability after one year relative to the annual contract (Finding 5). Finally, average attendance among survivors decreases over time for the monthly contract (Finding 7). This finding is puzzling since we observe the opposite pattern for the annual contract (Finding 6).

We first consider if enriched versions of the standard model (Interpretations 1 and 2) can

FIGURE 2. PRICE PER AVERAGE ATTENDANCE OVER TIME

Notes: Point estimates and 95-percent confidence intervals plotted. Figure 2A plots the ratio of average price and average attendance at month *n* of tenure. The sample is "no subsidy, all clubs" for individuals initially enrolled in the annual contract and still enrolled at month *n* of tenure. Figure 2B plots the ratio of average price and average attendance at month *n* of tenure. The sample is "no subsidy, all clubs" for individuals initially enrolled in the monthly contract and still enrolled at month *n* of tenure. Standard errors for the ratio of average price and average attendance computed using the bivariate Delta method.

explain the additional findings. We then discuss nonstandard preferences and beliefs (Interpretations 3 to 9) as possible explanations. In the end, we summarize which explanations rationalize all the empirical findings.

1. *Risk aversion.* Users who are risk averse in income may prefer a flat-rate contract to the pay-per-visit contract (Finding 1) because the former contract minimizes the variance of the payments.[24] Over the small amounts of money required for a monthly contract, however,

[24] This result requires a utility function that is additively separable in income and health club net benefits. Under the assumption that the utility function is a concave function of the sum of income and health club net benefits, the predictions are reversed: more risk-averse agents are more likely to choose the pay-per-visit contract.

health club members should be locally risk neutral (Matthew Rabin, 2000).

2. *Transaction costs.* Users may choose a flat-rate contract even though they attend little (Finding 1) if paying per visit entails large transaction costs. For the same reason, they may also postpone the cancellation of a monthly contract (Finding 4). However, the actual transaction costs are small. Users can purchase a ten-visit pass by filling out a simple form, and can then enter the club for ten visits with the same procedure as users with a monthly or annual contract. A transaction-cost-based explanation requires a time cost of over $70 for the few minutes necessary to fill out the form. A related explanation involves psychological transaction costs, such as distaste for payment per visit (Drazen Prelec and George Loewenstein, 1998). These costs would also need to be high. Moreover, these explanations do not rationalize the overestimation of future attendance (Finding 3) or the differential renewal behavior for annual and monthly contract (Findings 5, 6, and 7).

3. *Membership benefits.* Findings 1 and 4 could arise from psychological benefits of the monthly and annual memberships. These contracts may make the member feel "virtuous" or provide the opportunity to impress others. Arguably, these psychological benefit should apply also to ten-visit passes, since in both cases consumers complete an initial registration procedure and receive a card, which can be shown to friends. Even if consumers treat monthly and annual memberships as special, however, it is hard to explain the differential renewal patterns for monthly and annual contracts (Findings 5 to 7). If anything, the annual contract provides more membership utility, given that it signals a stronger commitment. This would imply a higher survival probability for the annual contract, against Finding 5.[25]

4. *Time-variation in preferences for exercise.* If people enroll whenever they are most enthusiastic about exercise, a rational (but slow) updating process with mean reversion can explain the delay in cancellation (Finding 4) and the decrease in attendance among surviving monthly members (Finding 7). Mean reversion, however, explains neither the initial overpayment (Finding 1), nor the difference between renewal patterns of monthly and annual members (Findings 5 and 6).

5. *Limited memory.* Rational agents with limited memory may fail to cancel their monthly membership promptly after they stop attending (Finding 4) because they forget. Distraction can also explain Findings 6 and 7: nonattenders fail to cancel in time, but they get automatically disenrolled under the annual contract. Rational consumers, however, should anticipate their future limited memory and be wary of the monthly contract. Instead, over 90 percent of customers with flat-rate contracts choose the monthly contract (Table 2). In addition, even if we allow for overestimation of future memory, this interpretation does not explain Findings 1 and 3.

6. *Time inconsistency with sophistication.* Flat-rate contracts are attractive to sophisticated agents with (β, δ) preferences (Robert H. Strotz, 1956; Edmund S. Phelps and Robert A. Pollak, 1968; Laibson, 1997; Ted O'Donoghue and Rabin, 1999). These agents have, in addition to the usual discount factor δ, a discount factor $\beta < 1$ between present and future payoffs. Their discount function is $1, \beta\delta, \beta\delta^2, \ldots$. Given that health club attendance involves immediate costs and delayed benefits, such present-biased agents attend the health club less often than they wish at the time of enrollment. They may purchase a flat-fee membership as a commitment device that increases future attendance (Finding 1).

These agents also delay one-time activities with immediate costs, such as contract cancellation. The cancellation delays of these agents are too short, however, to account for Findings 4 through 7, as we show with an extension of the calibrations in Section IIIA. Using the same revealed-preference argument, we obtain a bound on cancellation delay for sophisticates given by $E[T] \le \max(4, [k_2/\beta - \underline{k}]/s)$.[26] Under the calibrated magnitudes[27] $k_2 = \$10$, $\underline{k} = 0$, and

---

$\beta = 0.8$, nonattenders[28] ($s = \$2.33$) delay at most 5.33 days, on average. Under the same assumptions, low attenders ($s = \$1$) delay at most 12.5 days. These bounds do not depend on the assumption $\delta = 1$. To show this, we solve the dynamic programming problem as a function of β, assuming a discount factor $\delta = 0.9995$ (corresponding to a yearly discount factor of 0.83). We consider the low-attendance case ($s = \$1$) and assume $k \sim N(15, 4)$.[29] The resulting expected cancellation delay $E[T]$ (Figure 3A) is 5 days for $\beta = 0.8$ and is less than 15 days even for a β as low as 0.5. This calibrated delay is substantially smaller than the observed delay of over 60 days. Figure 3B shows the corresponding probability of a delay T of over 120 days (4 months). This probability is essentially zero for all β above 0.4, contrary to the empirical finding that 20 percent of users delay for over 4 months. Time inconsistency with sophistication, therefore, cannot generate the delays observed in the data.

7. *Time inconsistency with partial naiveté.* Agents with (β, δ)-preferences may be overconfident about their future self-control and expect to have a discount parameter $\hat{\beta}$, with $\beta < \hat{\beta} \le 1$ (George A. Akerlof, 1991; O'Donoghue and Rabin, 2001). These (partially) naive agents may pay more than \$10 per expected visit (Finding 1) because they overestimate their future attendance (Finding 3). (This is in addition to the commitment device reason.) We now extend the calibrations in Section IIIA to show that naive (β, δ) agents may also accumulate substantial delays in the cancellation of an automatically renewed contract, the other major finding in the paper. Figure 3A plots the expected cancellation delay for a naive agent with low attendance ($s = \$1$), $\delta = 0.9995$, and costs $k \sim N(15, 4)$. For $\beta = 0.7$, the cancellation delay of the naive agent matches the delay of over 60 days observed in the data. Moreover, the same level of β also matches the probability of delays lasting over 120 days (Figure 3B), 0.2. Differently from time-consistent and time-inconsistent sophisticated agents, the predicted delay for naive agents matches the empirical estimates. A model of naive (β, δ) agents, therefore, can explain all the findings in the paper.[30]

8. *Overestimation of net benefits.* Users may choose flat-rate contracts (Finding 1) because they overestimate the future benefits of attendance or underestimate the expected future costs. Projection bias (Loewenstein et al., 2003) may reinforce the effect if health club consumers have high attendance expectations at sign-up. This interpretation is consistent with Findings 3 and 4, but it does not explain Findings 5, 6, and 8 on higher survival for the monthly than for the annual contract. In order for overestimation to explain all of the empirical findings, consumers need to have unrealistic expectations about both the costs of attendance and the costs of cancellation. This is the case if consumers overestimate their future efficiency, that is, their ability to perform desirable tasks such as health club attendance and contract switching.

9. *Persuasion.* Given that users attend on average fewer than eight times per month, flat-rate contracts are on average more profitable for the health clubs than pay-per-visit contracts. Health club employees, therefore, have incentives to persuade consumers to sign flat-rate contracts. They can do this either by not providing (sufficient) information about the pay-per-visit alternative or by urging people to take up the monthly or annual contract. We address the first concern, underprovision of information, by considering the contractual choices of a subgroup that is surely well-informed. In our data, members of a specific HMO can choose between a 20-percent discount on the flat-rate contracts and a \$6 payment per visit. Members claiming the discount must have obtained the information from the HMO itself, which explicitly lists both options. Nevertheless, the price per expected attendance over months 1 to 6 for the 1,566 HMO members enrolling with a monthly contract equals \$10.31 (s.e. 0.23), significantly higher than the \$6 price per visit. Thus, even informed members display the tendency to choose the more costly flat-rate contract.

----

[28] The savings s for sophisticated agents include the benefits of commitment to a higher future attendance under the flat-rate contract (see DellaVigna and Malmendier, 2002).

[29] The results are essentially insensitive to any choice of $\mu \in [10, 30]$ and $\sigma^2 \in [1, 49]$.

[30] The amount of delay predicted by the naive model is decreasing in the variance of the cost distribution. For σ substantially larger than 4, the calibrations of the naive model do not match the data.

A. Simulated expected number of days before a monthly member switches to payment per visit Assumptions: cost $k \sim N(15,4)$, daily savings $s=1$, and daily discount factor delta = 0.9995. The observed average delay is 2.31 months (70 days) (Finding 4)

B. Simulated probability that cancellation delays last more than 120 days. Assumptions as in Figure 3A. The probability for sophisticated agents is essentially zero. The observed share of agents with delay over 120 days is 20 percent (Finding 4).

FIGURE 3. CALIBRATION OF EXPECTED DELAY IN CANCELLATION

Alternatively, health club employees may exert pressure on members to choose a flat-rate contract (Finding 1) (B. Douglas Bernheim, 1994). Employee persuasion may also explain the cancellation lag for the monthly contract (Finding 4), even though members can also cancel in writing. Persuasion is un-likely to explain the difference in renewal between the monthly and annual contract, although health club employees can exert pressure to renew on both monthly members and annual members. Persuasion does not explain the survey evidence of overestimation of attendance (Finding 3).

Out of the nine explanations above, the most successful ones, in our view, involve both overestimation of attendance and overestimation of cancellation. Overestimation of future attendance (Finding 3) leads consumers to choose flat-rate contracts (Finding 1). Overestimation of future cancellation leads consumers to delay cancellation in the monthly contract (Finding 4), but not in the annual contract which requires no cost to cancel (Findings 5 to 7). A model with these features is the partially naive (β, δ) model of O'Donoghue and Rabin (2001), which we calibrate to the data. A model of overestimation of future efficiency (which is not formalized in the literature) would make the same predictions, without reference to self-control. In addition, persuasion by health club employees is a plausible explanation for some of the findings.

A. *Heterogeneity*

The leading explanation suggests that one mechanism—overestimation of future self control or of future efficiency—is at the root of all findings. If this is the case, and there is heterogeneity in overestimation, we expect a correlation between the findings. In particular, monthly members who pay a high price per attendance should also be more likely to accumulate a long cancellation lag. This is not necessarily the case if the different findings are driven by different phenomena (such as, for example, risk aversion for Finding 1 and limited memory for Findings 4 to 7).

We test this prediction for users enrolled in the monthly contract. As a measure of cancellation lags, we use the number of consecutive full months between the last attendance and the expiration (as in Section IIIB). As a measure of price per attendance, we take the ratio of the payments to the health club over the attendance for the period between sign-up and n months before the last attendance, with n equal to 1, 2, 3, and 4. We limit the time frame in order to avoid a spurious correlation between the price per attendance and months of delay due to low attendance in the final months. Finally, we take the log of 1 plus the measures in order to reduce the skewness of both variables. The correlation between the cancellation lag and the price per attendance is positive and significant, with values between 0.192 ($n = 1$) and 0.182 ($n = 4$).

Longer lags n between the two measures do not affect the estimate, suggesting that the correlation is not likely to be spurious.

Finding 8 (correlations): *Users who pay a high price per attendance in the monthly contract subsequently display a longer gap between last attendance and contract termination.*

These results are consistent with the idea that a unique explanation—such as overestimation of efficiency or self-control—drives both the results on the high price per attendance for flat-rate memberships (Section IIB) and the results on renewal behavior (Section IIIB).

V. Conclusion

How do consumers choose from a menu of contracts? In this paper we consider contract choice in health clubs. Using a new panel dataset from three U.S. health clubs, we find that members who choose a contract with a flat monthly fee of over $70 attend on average fewer than 4.5 times per month. They pay a price per expected visit of more than $17, even though they could pay $10 per visit using a ten-visit pass. On average, these users forego savings of over $600 during their membership. We also find that consumers who choose the monthly, automatically renewed contract are 17 percent more likely to stay enrolled beyond one year than users committing for a year. This is surprising because monthly members pay higher fees for the option to cancel each month. We present additional evidence, including results on cancellation delays and estimates of attendance expectations from a survey. These results are difficult to reconcile with a standard model. We present a number of explanations for the findings. The leading explanations involve overestimation of future self-control or of future efficiency.

The analysis of consumer behavior is a first step. Rational, profit-maximizing health clubs can observe the features of consumer behavior using datasets like the one analyzed in this paper. In DellaVigna and Malmendier (2004), we characterize the profit-maximizing contract for goods with immediate costs and delayed benefits, such as health club attendance. For consumers who are overconfident about future self-control—one of the leading explanations in

this paper—the profit-maximizing contract involves below-marginal cost pricing of attendance and automatic renewal with a transaction cost of cancellation. The typical contract of health clubs in the Boston area indeed has these features. The evidence on contractual design is consistent with the findings on consumer behavior.

Data Appendix

The data on consumer behavior come from the attendance panel and the billing records. A seven-digit identification number allows us to link multiple spells of the same individual.

Attendance Panel.—Each time a user with a flat-rate contract exercises, a staff member swipes the electronic card of the user, and therefore creates an attendance record. An observation of the attendance panel consists of the individual identification number, the date of the visit, basic demographic information (birthday, gender), a code for short-term memberships, and the enrollment and the expiration date (for members who terminated the membership). All information other than the date of visit is constant across the observations for a given individual.

Billing Records.—The health clubs keep an official record of the customer payments. The billing data provide detailed and accurate information about the category of users—retail (the default), student, family, corporate—as well as the type of transaction. Each line of the billing panel consists of the individual ID, the date of the contractual transaction, the four-digit code that identifies the transaction, and the price paid (if any). For example, line "1234567 1/1/98 R564 55" indicates that user 1234567 paid an out-of-pocket monthly fee of $55 on January 1, 1998. This monthly fee applies to employees of the company linked to code R564. For the monthly contract, typical transactions are the payment of the initiation fee, the monthly fee, and such items as an overnight locker or a personal trainer. Other codes involve monthly freezes of memberships, bounced payments, and termination of a membership for delinquency in the payments. For the annual contract, typical transactions are the payment of the initiation fee and of the annual fee.

We use the price stated in the records as a measure of the monetary payments to the clubs. We could alternatively use the four-digit code and a conversion table (based on the prices as of August 2000) to recover an imputed price. The correlation between the two measures of price is 0.9668. None of the results changes if we use the imputed price instead of the actual price.

Monthly Panel.—We merge the attendance and the billing panel into a unique dataset, and we then transform the data into a balanced panel with monthly observations. Each observation consists of a variable defining the membership (not enrolled/enrolled in a monthly contract/enrolled in an annual contract/in a freeze), the number of attendances in the month, and the price paid for the month. For an annual contract, the monthly price is $1/12$ the original price. We prorate the fees in the first month of monthly and annual contracts that start in the middle of a month. We also prorate the fees in the final month of an annual contract. Monthly contracts always terminate on the last day of the month, so no prorating is needed for the last month.

Enrollment Spells.—We define an enrollment spell as the time period of continuous monthly and/or annual membership, including possible freezes of the membership. If no more than one full calendar month of nonenrollment separates two contracts of an individual, we still include them in one spell. For example, this is the case if an annual contract expiring on 1/15/98 is renewed on 3/17/98. The missing monthly payment may be due to an (unrecorded) one-month promotional offer, a delay in payment, or missing data for a monthly payment.

We consider an enrollment spell *censored* if it is either ongoing at the end of the panel or if it is followed by a short-term contract or a promotional membership. Otherwise, the spell is completed. Short-term contracts are one-month, two-month, three-month, and four-month memberships with automatic expiration. These are uncommon contracts designed for summer users. We identify promotional contracts as a sequence of months with no contract and attendance in at least half of the months. We assume that in these periods health club members are using a free temporary membership, which the clubs grant in various promotional or charitable initiatives.

REFERENCES

Akerlof, George A. "Procrastination and Obedience." *American Economic Review*, 1991, *81*(2), pp. 1–19.

Bernheim, B. Douglas. "A Theory of Conformity." *Journal of Political Economy*, 1994, *102*(5), pp. 841–77.

Choi, James J.; Laibson, David; Madrian, Brigitte and Metrick, Andrew. "Optimal Defaults and Active Decisions." National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., NBER Working Papers: No. 11074, 2005.

Cutler, David M.; Glaeser, Edward L. and Shapiro, Jesse M. "Why Have Americans Become More Obese?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 2003, *17*(3), pp. 93–118.

DellaVigna, Stefano and Malmendier, Ulrike. "Contract Design and Self-Control: Theory and Evidence." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2004, *119*(2), pp. 353–402.

DellaVigna, Stefano and Malmendier, Ulrike. "Overestimating Self-Control: Evidence from the Health Club Industry." Stanford University, Graduate School of Business Research Paper: No. 1880, 2002.

Eliaz, Kfir and Spiegler, Ran. "Contracting with Diversely Naive Agents." *Review of Economic Studies* (forthcoming).

Ellison, Glenn. "Bounded Rationality in Industrial Organization," in Richard Blundell, Whitney Newey, and Tonsten Persson, eds., *Advances in economics and econometrics: Theory and applications, Ninth World Congress.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (forthcoming).

Fielding, Helen. *Bridget Jones's diary: A novel.* New York: Penguin, 1999.

Fielding, Helen. *Bridget Jones: The edge of reason.* New York: Penguin, 2001.

Gabaix, Xavier and Laibson, David. "Shrouded Attributes, Consumer Myopia, and Information Suppression in Competitive Markets." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* (forthcoming).

Gourville, John T. and Soman, Dilip. "Payment Depreciation: The Behavioral Effects of Temporally Separating Payments from Consumption." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1998, *25*(2), pp. 160–74.

Heidhues, Paul and Koszegi, Botond. "The Impact of Consumer Loss Aversion on Pricing." Center for Economic Policy Research, CEPR Discussion Papers: No. 4849, 2005.

Hendel, Igal and Nevo, Aviv. "Intertemporal Substitution and Storable Products." *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 2004, *2*(2–3), pp. 536–47.

Laibson, David. "Golden Eggs and Hyperbolic Discounting." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1997, *112*(2), pp. 443–77.

Laibson, David I.; Repetto, Andrea and Tobacman, Jeremy. "Estimating Discounted Functions from Lifecycle Consumption Choices." Unpublished Paper, 2004.

Loewenstein, George; O'Donoghue, Ted and Rabin, Matthew. "Projection Bias in Predicting Future Utility." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2003, *118*(4), pp. 1209–48.

Madrian, Brigitte C. and Shea, Dennis F. "The Power of Suggestion: Inertia in 401(k) Participation and Savings Behavior." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2001, *116*(4), pp. 1149–87.

Miravete, Eugenio J. "Choosing the Wrong Calling Plan? Ignorance and Learning." *American Economic Review*, 2003, *93*(1), pp. 297–310.

Miravete, Eugenio J. and Röller, Lars-Hendrik. "Competitive Non-Linear Pricing in Duopoly Equilibrium: The Early US Cellular Telephone Industry." Center for Economic Policy Research, CEPR Discussion Papers: No. 4069, 2003.

O'Donoghue, Ted and Rabin, Matthew. "Doing It Now or Later." *American Economic Review*, 1999, *89*(1), pp. 103–24.

O'Donoghue, Ted and Rabin, Matthew. "Choice and Procrastination." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2001, *116*(1), pp. 121–60.

Pagan, Adrian and Ullah, Aman. *Nonparametric econometrics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Paserman, M. Daniele. "Job Search and Hyperbolic Discounting: Structural Estimation and Policy Evaluation." Center for Economic Policy Research, CEPR Discussion Papers: No. 4396, 2004.

Phelps, Edmund S. and Pollak, Robert A. "On Second-Best National Saving and Game-Equilibrium Growth." *Review of Economic Studies*, 1968, *35*(2), pp. 185–99.

Prelec, Drazen and Loewenstein, George. "The Red and the Black: Mental Accounting of Savings and Debt." *Marketing Science*, 1998, *17*(1), pp. 4–28.

Rabin, Matthew. "Risk Aversion and Expected-

Utility Theory: A Calibration Theorem." *Econometrica*, 2000, *68*(5), pp. 1281–92.

Shui, Haiyan and Ausubel, Lawrence M. "Time Inconsistency in the Credit Card Market." Unpublished Paper, 2004.

Strotz, Robert H. "Myopia and Inconsistency in Dynamic Utility Maximization." *Review of Economic Studies*, 1956, *23*(3), pp. 165–80.

Tirole, Jean. *The theory of industrial organization.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988.

This article has been cited by:

1. Haofeng Jin. 2022. The effect of overspending on tariff choices and customer churn: Evidence from mobile plan choices. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* **66**, 102914. [Crossref]

2. Sejeong Yun, Kwanho Suk. 2022. Consumer preference for pay-per-use service tariffs: the roles of mental accounting. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* **36**. . [Crossref]

3. Joon Yong Seo, Sukki Yoon. 2022. Food waste perceptions: vice versus virtue foods. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* **9**. . [Crossref]

4. Willa Friedman, Nicholas Wilson. 2022. Can nudging overcome procrastinating on preventive health investments?. *Economics & Human Biology* **45**, 101040. [Crossref]

5. Diego Aycinena, Szabolcs Blazsek, Lucas Rentschler, Charles Sprenger. 2022. Intertemporal choice experiments and large-stakes behavior. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **196**, 484-500. [Crossref]

6. ShiNa Li, Yixin Liu, Shanshan Dai, Mengxin Chen. 2022. A review of tourism and hospitality studies on behavioural economics. *Tourism Economics* **81**, 135481662110608. [Crossref]

7. Stephen L. Cheung, Agnieszka Tymula, Xueting Wang. 2022. Present bias for monetary and dietary rewards. *Experimental Economics* **164**. . [Crossref]

8. Eileen Tipoe, Abi Adams, Ian Crawford. 2022. Revealed preference analysis and bounded rationality. *Oxford Economic Papers* **74**:2, 313-332. [Crossref]

9. Bjørn-Atle Reme, Helene Lie Røhr, Morten Sæthre. 2022. Inattention in Contract Markets: Evidence from a Consolidation of Options in Telecom. *Management Science* **68**:2, 1019-1038. [Crossref]

10. Kevin P. Grubiak, Andrea Isoni, Robert Sugden, Mengjie Wang, Jiwei Zheng. 2022. Taking the New Year's Resolution Test seriously: eliciting individuals' judgements about self-control and spontaneity. *Behavioural Public Policy* 1-23. [Crossref]

11. Thomas Rouyard, Bart Engelen, Andrew Papanikitas, Ryota Nakamura. 2022. Boosting healthier choices. *BMJ* **1**, e064225. [Crossref]

12. Luigi Butera, Robert Metcalfe, William Morrison, Dmitry Taubinsky. 2022. Measuring the Welfare Effects of Shame and Pride. *American Economic Review* **112**:1, 122-168. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

13. Ganesh Iyer, Zemin (Zachary) Zhong. 2022. Pushing Notifications as Dynamic Information Design. *Marketing Science* **41**:1, 51-72. [Crossref]

14. Barbara E. Kahn, Hoori Rafieian. 2022. More than just the spice of life: Using variety as a signal for change and diversification. *Consumer Psychology Review* **5**:1, 87-106. [Crossref]

15. Maurizio Bovi. Epilogue 151-191. [Crossref]

16. Wladimir Andreff. 2021. Oldies but Goldies ! Twenty Years After, the Journal of Sports Economics at a Crossroads?. *Journal of Sports Economics* **9**, 152700252110510. [Crossref]

17. Thomas S. Ulen. 2021. Behavioral Contract Law. *Review of Law & Economics* **17**:2, 281-322. [Crossref]

18. Steffen Altmann, Andreas Grunewald, Jonas Radbruch. 2021. Interventions and Cognitive Spillovers. *The Review of Economic Studies* **11**. . [Crossref]

19. Xiaofei Pan, Sukki Yoon. 2021. Gym Membership Programs: Image Motivation and Conditional Discount Framing. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising* **61**, 1-15. [Crossref]

20. Liang Bai, Benjamin Handel, Edward Miguel, Gautam Rao. 2021. Self-Control and Demand for Preventive Health: Evidence from Hypertension in India. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **103**:5, 835-856. [Crossref]

21. David P. Byrne, Leslie A. Martin. 2021. Consumer search and income inequality. *International Journal of Industrial Organization* **79**, 102716. [Crossref]

22. Luca Piccoli, Silvia Tiezzi. 2021. Rational addiction and time-consistency: An empirical test. *Journal of Health Economics* **80**, 102546. [Crossref]

23. Laura Blow, Martin Browning, Ian Crawford. 2021. Non-parametric Analysis of Time-Inconsistent Preferences. *The Review of Economic Studies* **88**:6, 2687-2734. [Crossref]

24. Yonas Alem, Hannah Behrendt, Michèle Belot, Anikó Bíró. 2021. Mind training, stress and behaviour —A randomised experiment. *PLOS ONE* **16**:11, e0258172. [Crossref]

25. Shuo Zhang, Tat Y. Chan, Xueming Luo, Xiaoyi Wang. 2021. Time-Inconsistent Preferences and Strategic Self-Control in Digital Content Consumption. *Marketing Science* **84**. . [Crossref]

26. Nathalie Spielmann. 2021. Green is the New White: How Virtue Motivates Green Product Purchase. *Journal of Business Ethics* **173**:4, 759-776. [Crossref]

27. Katharina Dowling, Lucas Stich, Martin Spann. 2021. An experimental analysis of overconfidence in tariff choice. *Review of Managerial Science* **15**:8, 2275-2297. [Crossref]

28. Mark Harcourt, Gregor Gall, Rinu Vimal Kumar, Richard Croucher. 2021. The role of unions in addressing behavioural market failures. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* **42**:4, 1165-1188. [Crossref]

29. Tony Beatton, Carly J. Moores, Dipanwita Sarkar, Jayanta Sarkar, Juliana Silva Goncalves, Helen A. Vidgen. 2021. Do parental preferences predict engagement in child health programs?. *Health Economics* **30**:11, 2686-2700. [Crossref]

30. Chen-Nan Liao, Ying-Ju Chen. 2021. Design of Long-Term Conditional Cash Transfer Program to Encourage Healthy Habits. *Production and Operations Management* **30**:11, 3987-4003. [Crossref]

31. Danielle Z. Boles, Maysa DeSousa, Bradley P. Turnwald, Rina I. Horii, Taylor Duarte, Octavia H. Zahrt, Hazel R. Markus, Alia J. Crum. 2021. Can Exercising and Eating Healthy Be Fun and Indulgent Instead of Boring and Depriving? Targeting Mindsets About the Process of Engaging in Healthy Behaviors. *Frontiers in Psychology* **12**. . [Crossref]

32. Markus Dertwinkel-Kalt, Holger Gerhardt, Gerhard Riener, Frederik Schwerter, Louis Strang. 2021. Concentration Bias in Intertemporal Choice. *The Review of Economic Studies* **76**. . [Crossref]

33. Hunt Allcott, Joshua Kim, Dmitry Taubinsky, Jonathan Zinman. 2021. Are High-Interest Loans Predatory? Theory and Evidence from Payday Lending. *The Review of Economic Studies* . [Crossref]

34. Ryan Oprea, Sevgi Yuksel. 2021. Social Exchange of Motivated Beliefs. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **123**. . [Crossref]

35. Lu Li, Richard Peter. 2021. Should we do more when we know less? The effect of technology risk on optimal effort. *Journal of Risk and Insurance* **88**:3, 695-725. [Crossref]

36. Leonhard K. Lades, J. Peter Clinch, J. Andrew Kelly. 2021. Maybe tomorrow: How burdens and biases impede energy-efficiency investments. *Energy Research & Social Science* **78**, 102154. [Crossref]

37. Paul Heidhues, Philipp Strack. 2021. Identifying Present Bias from the Timing of Choices. *American Economic Review* **111**:8, 2594-2622. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

38. Justin Downs. 2021. Information gathering by overconfident agents. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy* **30**:3, 554-568. [Crossref]

39. Victor H Aguiar, Nail Kashaev. 2021. Stochastic Revealed Preferences with Measurement Error. *The Review of Economic Studies* **88**:4, 2042-2093. [Crossref]

40. Tomáš Želinský. 2021. Intertemporal Choices of Children and Adults from Poor Roma Communities: A Case Study from Slovakia. *Eastern European Economics* **59**:4, 378-405. [Crossref]

41. Sunny Yi, Yeon W. Lee, Timothy Connerton, Cheong-Yeul Park. 2021. Should I stay or should I go? Visit frequency as fitness centre retention strategy. *Managing Sport and Leisure* **26**:4, 268-286. [Crossref]

42. Sally Dibb, Alessandro Merendino, Hussan Aslam, Lindsey Appleyard, William Brambley. 2021. Whose rationality? Muddling through the messy emotional reality of financial decision-making. *Journal of Business Research* **131**, 826-838. [Crossref]

43. Luis Rodrigo Arnabal. 2021. Optimal design of sin taxes in the presence of nontaxable sin goods. *Health Economics* **30**:7, 1580-1599. [Crossref]

44. Paul Adams, Stefan Hunt, Christopher Palmer, Redis Zaliauskas. 2021. Testing the effectiveness of consumer financial disclosure: Experimental evidence from savings accounts. *Journal of Financial Economics* **141**:1, 122-147. [Crossref]

45. Oren Bar-Gill. 2021. Price discrimination with consumer misperception. *Applied Economics Letters* **28**:10, 829-834. [Crossref]

46. Jean-Claude Mbarushimana, Christopher R. Gustafson, Henriette Gitungwa, Eliana Zeballos. 2021. The Relationship between Bodyweight Status and Weight Perception Explains Differences in Calories Ordered in a Food Choice Exercise. *Nutrients* **13**:6, 1794. [Crossref]

47. Piotr Białowolski, Andrzej Cwynar, Wiktor Cwynar. 2021. Decomposition of the Financial Capability Construct: A Structural Model of Debt Knowledge, Skills, Confidence, Attitudes, and Behavior. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning* **32**:1, 5-20. [Crossref]

48. Taisuke Imai, Tom A Rutter, Colin F Camerer. 2021. Meta-Analysis of Present-Bias Estimation using Convex Time Budgets. *The Economic Journal* **131**:636, 1788-1814. [Crossref]

49. Haofeng Jin, Zhentong Lu, Liqiang Huang, Junsheng Dou. 2021. Not too much nor too little: Salience bias in mobile plan choices. *Telecommunications Policy* **45**:4, 102071. [Crossref]

50. David J. Freeman. 2021. Revealing Naïveté and Sophistication from Procrastination and Preproperation. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* **13**:2, 402-438. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

51. Arno Apffelstaedt, Lydia Mechtenberg. 2021. Competition for Context-Sensitive Consumers. *Management Science* **67**:5, 2828-2844. [Crossref]

52. Kathrin Schlafmann. 2021. Housing, Mortgages, and Self-Control. *The Review of Financial Studies* **34**:5, 2648-2687. [Crossref]

53. Sarthak Gaurav. 2021. Dynamic Inconsistency and Incentive Design: Insights from Behavioural Economics for HR Managers. *NHRD Network Journal* **14**:2, 193-205. [Crossref]

54. John Gathergood, Hiroaki Sakaguchi, Neil Stewart, Jörg Weber. 2021. How Do Consumers Avoid Penalty Fees? Evidence from Credit Cards. *Management Science* **67**:4, 2562-2578. [Crossref]

55. Matthew A. Ladwig, Christopher N. Sciamanna, Liza S. Rovniak, David E. Conroy, Jinger S. Gottschall, Matthew L. Silvis, Joshua M. Smyth, Ming Wang, Brandon J. Auer. 2021. Comparative effectiveness of an adult social physical play versus traditional group exercise program for adherence and fitness: Protocol for a randomized-controlled trial. *Contemporary Clinical Trials Communications* **21**, 100736. [Crossref]

56. Patrick Arni, Davide Dragone, Lorenz Goette, Nicolas R. Ziebarth. 2021. Biased health perceptions and risky health behaviors—Theory and evidence. *Journal of Health Economics* **76**, 102425. [Crossref]

57. Wolfgang Habla, Paul Muller. 2021. Experimental evidence of limited attention at the gym. *Experimental Economics* **61**. . [Crossref]

58. Theresa Kuchler, Michaela Pagel. 2021. Sticking to your plan: The role of present bias for credit card paydown. *Journal of Financial Economics* **139**:2, 359-388. [Crossref]

59. Philipp Weinschenk. 2021. On the benefits of time-inconsistent preferences. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **182**, 185-195. [Crossref]

60. Jim Engle-Warnick, Julie Héroux, Claude Montmarquette. 2021. Willingness to pay to reduce future risk: a fundamental issue to invest in prevention behaviour. *Economic and Political Studies* **9**:1, 17-36. [Crossref]

61. Fernando Gómez, Mireia Artigot. Ex-Post Fairness Controls and Contract Design: The Spanish Experience 133-150. [Crossref]

62. Indranil Goswami, Oleg Urminsky. 2021. Don't fear the meter: How longer time limits bias managers to prefer hiring with flat fee compensation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **162**, 42-58. [Crossref]

63. Pol Campos-Mercade, Armando N. Meier, Florian H. Schneider, Erik Wengström. 2021. Prosociality predicts health behaviors during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Public Economics* **128**, 104367. [Crossref]

64. Julia Puaschunder. Towards a Utility Theory of Privacy and Information Sharing and the Introduction of Hyper-Hyperbolic Discounting in the Digital Big Data Age 68-111. [Crossref]

65. Katja Berger, Christina Schamp, Mark Heitmann, Klaus Wertenbroch. 2021. Precommitment-based Pricing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **11**. . [Crossref]

66. Marco Lafratta. Understanding the Intertemporal Choice: A Methodological Review 260-269. [Crossref]

67. Matthew Levy, Pasquale Schiraldi. 2021. Identification of Intertemporal Preferences From Choice Set Variation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **61**. . [Crossref]

68. Manu M. Savani. Commitment Devices for Health 35-54. [Crossref]

69. Julia Puaschunder. A Utility Theory of Privacy and Information Sharing 428-448. [Crossref]

70. Malte Ackermann. Forms of MaaS 65-89. [Crossref]

71. Sophie Bienenstock. Consumer Bias: Consumer Misperception; Consumer Irrationality 1-5. [Crossref]

72. Shaun Edmonds. Is Injury "On Brand"? Examining the Contexts of the CrossFit Injury Connection 405-428. [Crossref]

73. Timothy Dombrowski, R. Kelley Pace, Dimuthu Ratnadiwakara, V. Carlos Slawson, Jr.. 2020. Deductible Choice in Flood Insurance: Who Chooses the Maximum?. *Journal of Housing Research* **29**:sup1, S144-S169. [Crossref]

74. Haewon Yoon. 2020. Impatience and Time Inconsistency in Discounting Models. *Management Science* **66**:12, 5850-5860. [Crossref]

75. Matthew Rand, Paul Norman, Elizabeth Goyder. 2020. A systematic review of interventions to increase attendance at health and fitness venues: identifying key behaviour change techniques. *BMC Public Health* **20**:1. . [Crossref]

76. Brad R. Humphreys, Jane E. Ruseski, Jie Yang. 2020. Household consumption decisions: will expanding sports betting impact health?. *Review of Economics of the Household* **18**:4, 1079-1100. [Crossref]

77. Erwin Bulte, John A List, Daan van Soest. 2020. Toward an Understanding of the Welfare Effects of Nudges: Evidence from a Field Experiment in the Workplace. *The Economic Journal* **130**:632, 2329-2353. [Crossref]

78. Bige Kahraman. 2020. Fee Complexity and Investor Mistakes in Retail Financial Markets. *Quarterly Journal of Finance* 2150004. [Crossref]

79. Matthew Rand, Elizabeth Goyder, Paul Norman, Robert Womack. 2020. Why do new members stop attending health and fitness venues? The importance of developing frequent and stable attendance behaviour. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* **51**, 101771. [Crossref]

80. Erika L. Kirgios, Graelin H. Mandel, Yeji Park, Katherine L. Milkman, Dena M. Gromet, Joseph S. Kay, Angela L. Duckworth. 2020. Teaching temptation bundling to boost exercise: A field experiment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **161**, 20-35. [Crossref]

81. John Beshears, Harry Kosowsky. 2020. Nudging: Progress to date and future directions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **161**, 3-19. [Crossref]

82. Uri Simonsohn, Joseph P. Simmons, Leif D. Nelson. 2020. Specification curve analysis. *Nature Human Behaviour* **4**:11, 1208-1214. [Crossref]

83. Damon Clark, David Gill, Victoria Prowse, Mark Rush. 2020. Using Goals to Motivate College Students: Theory and Evidence From Field Experiments. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **102**:4, 648-663. [Crossref]

84. Katharina Dowling, Puneet Manchanda, Martin Spann. 2020. The existence and persistence of the pay-per-use bias in car sharing services. *International Journal of Research in Marketing* **35**. . [Crossref]

85. Jing Ai, Lin Zhao, Wei Zhu. 2020. Self-Control, Effort Procrastination, and Competitive Equilibrium in Insurance Markets. *Journal of Risk and Insurance* **87**:3, 751-782. [Crossref]

86. Arvid O. I. Hoffmann, Leonora Risse. 2020. Do good things come in pairs? How personality traits help explain individuals' simultaneous pursuit of a healthy lifestyle and financially responsible behavior. *Journal of Consumer Affairs* **54**:3, 1082-1120. [Crossref]

87. Wenjie Wang, Takanori Ida, Hideki Shimada. 2020. Default effect versus active decision: Evidence from a field experiment in Los Alamos. *European Economic Review* **128**, 103498. [Crossref]

88. David S. Ahn, Ryota Iijima, Todd Sarver. 2020. Naivete about temptation and self-control: Foundations for recursive naive quasi-hyperbolic discounting. *Journal of Economic Theory* **189**, 105087. [Crossref]

89. Laurens Cherchye, Bram De Rock, Rachel Griffith, Martin O'Connell, Kate Smith, Frederic Vermeulen. 2020. A new year, a new you? Within-individual variation in food purchases. *European Economic Review* **127**, 103478. [Crossref]

90. Johannes Meya, Panu Poutvaara, Robert Schwager. 2020. Pocketbook voting, social preferences, and expressive motives in referenda. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **175**, 185-205. [Crossref]

91. Ulrike Malmendier, Adam Szeidl. 2020. Fishing for fools. *Games and Economic Behavior* **122**, 105-129. [Crossref]

92. Nancy E Mayo, Kedar KV Mate, Ryan Reid, Pierre Duquette, Yves Lapierre, Ruth Barclay, Mark Bayley, Susan Bartlett, Ross Andersen. 2020. Participation in and outcomes from a 12-month tailored exercise programme for people with multiple sclerosis (MSTEP©): a randomized trial. *Clinical Rehabilitation* **34**:7, 927-937. [Crossref]

93. Jonathan Cohen, Keith Marzilli Ericson, David Laibson, John Myles White. 2020. Measuring Time Preferences. *Journal of Economic Literature* **58**:2, 299-347. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

94. Uttara Balakrishnan, Johannes Haushofer, Pamela Jakiela. 2020. How soon is now? Evidence of present bias from convex time budget experiments. *Experimental Economics* **23**:2, 294-321. [Crossref]

95. Pablo Schenone. 2020. Revealed Preference Implications of Backward Induction and Subgame Perfection. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* **12**:2, 230-256. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

96. Ryan Bubb, Patrick L. Warren. 2020. An Equilibrium Theory of Retirement Plan Design. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **12**:2, 22-45. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

97. Mariana Carrera, Heather Royer, Mark Stehr, Justin Sydnor. 2020. The Structure of Health Incentives: Evidence from a Field Experiment. *Management Science* **66**:5, 1890-1908. [Crossref]

98. Katharina Dowling, Daniel Guhl, Daniel Klapper, Martin Spann, Lucas Stich, Narine Yegoryan. 2020. Behavioral biases in marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* **48**:3, 449-477. [Crossref]

99. Pascal Ohlhausen, Nina Langen. 2020. When A Combination of Nudges Decreases Sustainable Food Choices Out-of-Home—The Example of Food Decoys and Descriptive Name Labels. *Foods* **9**:5, 557. [Crossref]

100. Arif Ahmed. 2020. Rationality and Future Discounting. *Topoi* **39**:2, 245-256. [Crossref]

101. Kelsey Jack, Grant Smith. 2020. Charging Ahead: Prepaid Metering, Electricity Use, and Utility Revenue. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **12**:2, 134-168. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

102. Michael D. Frakes, Melissa F. Wasserman. 2020. Procrastination at the Patent Office?. *Journal of Public Economics* **183**, 104140. [Crossref]

103. Hannes Kuch. 2020. The market, competition, and structural exploitation. *Constellations* **27**:1, 95-110. [Crossref]

104. Jennifer Savary, Ravi Dhar. 2020. The Uncertain Self: How Self-Concept Structure Affects Subscription Choice. *Journal of Consumer Research* **46**:5, 887-903. [Crossref]

105. Jessica Leight, Nicholas Wilson. 2020. Framing Flexible Spending Accounts: A Large-Scale Field Experiment on Communicating the Return on Medical Savings Accounts. *Health Economics* **29**:2, 195-208. [Crossref]

106. Florian Zimmermann. 2020. The Dynamics of Motivated Beliefs. *American Economic Review* **110**:2, 337-363. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

107. Anett John. 2020. When Commitment Fails: Evidence from a Field Experiment. *Management Science* **66**:2, 503-529. [Crossref]

108. James Kennedy. 2020. Subjective Wellbeing and the Discount Rate. *Journal of Happiness Studies* **21**:2, 635-658. [Crossref]

109. Alberto Bisin, Kyle Hyndman. 2020. Present-bias, procrastination and deadlines in a field experiment. *Games and Economic Behavior* **119**, 339-357. [Crossref]

110. David L. Weimer. 2020. When Are Nudges Desirable? Benefit Validity When Preferences Are Not Consistently Revealed. *Public Administration Review* **80**:1, 118-126. [Crossref]

111. Julia Puaschunder. Towards a Utility Theory of Privacy and Information Sharing and the Introduction of Hyper-Hyperbolic Discounting in the Digital Big Data Age 157-200. [Crossref]

112. Luis Santos-Pinto, Leonidas Enrique de la Rosa. Overconfidence in Labor Markets 1-42. [Crossref]

113. Laura Blow, Martin Browning, Ian Crawford. 2020. Nonparametric Analysis of Time-Inconsistent Preferences. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

114. Matthew Levy, Pasquale Schiraldi. 2020. Identification of Intertemporal Preferences in History-Dependent Dynamic Discrete Choice Models. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

115. Sumit Agarwal, Wenlan Qian, Ruth Tan. Payment 221-246. [Crossref]

116. Julia Puaschunder. Behavioral Economics 3-42. [Crossref]

117. Aditya Saraf, Anna R. Karlin, Jamie Morgenstern. Competition Alleviates Present Bias in Task Completion 266-279. [Crossref]

118. Rawley Heimer, Zwetelina Iliewa, Alex Imas, Martin Weber. 2020. Dynamic Inconsistency in Risky Choice: Evidence from the Lab and Field. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

119. Seung Han Yoo. 2020. Membership Mechanism. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

120. Ganesh Iyer, Zemin (Zachary) Zhong. 2020. Pushing Information: Realized Uncertainty and Notification Design. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **57**. . [Crossref]

121. Antonio Gargano, Alberto G. Rossi. 2020. There's an App for That: Goal-Setting and Saving in the FinTech Era. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

122. Mario J. Rizzo, Glen Whitman. Escaping Paternalism **22**, . [Crossref]

123. Klaus Mann, Michael Möcker, Joachim Grosser. 2019. Adherence to long-term prophylactic treatment: microeconomic analysis of patients' behavior and the impact of financial incentives. *Health Economics Review* **9**:1. . [Crossref]

124. Catherine M. Sabiston, Angela J. Fong, Erin K. O'Loughlin, Sarkis Meterissian. 2019. A mixed-methods evaluation of a community physical activity program for breast cancer survivors. *Journal of Translational Medicine* **17**:1. . [Crossref]

125. Matthias Fahn, Hendrik Hakenes. 2019. Teamwork as a Self-Disciplining Device. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* **11**:4, 1-32. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

126. David S Ahn, Ryota Iijima, Yves Le Yaouanq, Todd Sarver. 2019. Behavioural Characterizations of Naivete for Time-Inconsistent Preferences. *The Review of Economic Studies* **86**:6, 2319-2355. [Crossref]

127. Jose A. Guajardo. 2019. How Do Usage and Payment Behavior Interact in Rent-to-Own Business Models? Evidence from Developing Economies. *Production and Operations Management* **28**:11, 2808-2822. [Crossref]

128. K. P. Madsen, T. Kjær, T. Skinner, I. Willaing. 2019. Time preferences, diabetes self-management behaviours and outcomes: a systematic review. *Diabetic Medicine* **36**:11, 1336-1348. [Crossref]

129. Bard Harstad. 2019. Technology and Time Inconsistency. *Journal of Political Economy* . [Crossref]

130. Daniel W. Elfenbein, Raymond Fisman, Brian McManus. 2019. Does Cheap Talk Affect Market Outcomes? Evidence from eBay. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **11**:4, 305-326. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

131. Nicolao Bonini, Stefania Pighin, Enrico Rettore, Lucia Savadori, Federico Schena, Sara Tonini, Paolo Tosi. 2019. Overconfident people are more exposed to "black swan" events: a case study of avalanche risk. *Empirical Economics* **57**:4, 1443-1467. [Crossref]

132. Matthew C. Harris, Lawrence M. Kessler. 2019. Habit formation and activity persistence: Evidence from gym equipment. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **166**, 688-708. [Crossref]

133. Irit Nitzan, Danit Ein-Gar. 2019. The "Commitment Projection" Effect: When Multiple Payments for a Product Affect Defection from a Service. *Journal of Marketing Research* **56**:5, 842-861. [Crossref]

134. Trine Kjær, Betina Højgaard, Dorte Gyrd-Hansen. 2019. Physical exercise versus shorter life expectancy? An investigation into preferences for physical activity using a stated preference approach. *Health Policy* **123**:8, 790-796. [Crossref]

135. Laura Abrardi, Carlo Cambini. 2019. Incentivizing self-control effort. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **164**, 13-30. [Crossref]

136. ALEXIA GAUDEUL, MAGDALENA C. KACZMAREK. 2019. Going along with the default does not mean going on with it: attrition in a charitable giving experiment. *Behavioural Public Policy* **6**, 1-32. [Crossref]

137. Maximilian Mihm, Kemal Ozbek. 2019. On the identification of changing tastes. *Games and Economic Behavior* **116**, 203-216. [Crossref]

138. Shou Chen, Shengpeng Xiang, Hongbo He. 2019. Do Time Preferences Matter in Intertemporal Consumption and Portfolio Decisions?. *The B.E. Journal of Theoretical Economics* **19**:2. . [Crossref]

139. Wessel Kraaij, Suzan Verberne, Saskia Koldijk, Elsbeth de Korte, Saskia van Dantzig, Maya Sappelli, Muhammad Shoaib, Steven Bosems, Reinoud Achterkamp, Alberto Bonomi, John Schavemaker, Bob Hulsebosch, Thymen Wabeke, Miriam Vollenbroek-Hutten, Mark Neerincx, Marten van Sinderen. 2019. Personalized support for well-being at work: an overview of the SWELL project. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction* **52**. . [Crossref]

140. Dirk Bergemann, Juuso Välimäki. 2019. Dynamic Mechanism Design: An Introduction. *Journal of Economic Literature* **57**:2, 235-274. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

141. Liad Weiss, Ran Kivetz. 2019. Opportunity Cost Overestimation. *Journal of Marketing Research* **56**:3, 518-533. [Crossref]

142. Ran Spiegler. 2019. Behavioral Economics and the Atheoretical Style. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* **11**:2, 173-194. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

143. Archana Dang, Pushkar Maitra, Nidhiya Menon. 2019. Labor market engagement and the body mass index of working adults: Evidence from India. *Economics & Human Biology* **33**, 58-77. [Crossref]

144. Dominik Schreyer, Sascha L. Schmidt, Benno Torgler. 2019. Football Spectator No-Show Behavior. *Journal of Sports Economics* **20**:4, 580-602. [Crossref]

145. Yehong Yang, Guohua Cao. 2019. Optimal Financing and Dividend Strategies with Time Inconsistency in a Regime Switching Economy. *Complexity* **2019**, 1-11. [Crossref]

146. Leonhard K. Lades, Wilhelm Hofmann. 2019. Temptation, self-control, and inter-temporal choice. *Journal of Bioeconomics* **21**:1, 47-70. [Crossref]

147. Sneha Mantri, Stephanie Wood, John E. Duda, James F. Morley. 2019. Understanding physical activity in Veterans with Parkinson disease: A mixed-methods approach. *Parkinsonism & Related Disorders* **61**, 156-160. [Crossref]

148. Tarek Abdallah. 2019. On the Benefit (Or Cost) of Large-Scale Bundling. *Production and Operations Management* **28**:4, 955-969. [Crossref]

149. Andrea Dechant, Martin Spann, Jan U. Becker. 2019. Positive Customer Churn: An Application to Online Dating. *Journal of Service Research* **22**:1, 90-100. [Crossref]

150. Aditya M. Prakash, Qiao-chu He, Xiang Zhong. 2019. Incentive-driven post-discharge compliance management for chronic disease patients in healthcare service operations. *IISE Transactions on Healthcare Systems Engineering* **9**:1, 71-82. [Crossref]

151. Avishalom Tor. Justifying Competition Law in the Face of Consumers' Bounded Rationality 3-25. [Crossref]

152. JPMorgan Chase Institute. How do consumers respond to real income shocks? 141-160. [Crossref]

153. Amitabh Chandra, Benjamin Handel, Joshua Schwartzstein. Behavioral economics and health-care markets 459-502. [Crossref]

154. Keith Marzilli Ericson, David Laibson. Intertemporal choice 1-67. [Crossref]

155. Jungkeun Kim. 2019. The impact of different price promotions on customer retention. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* **46**, 95-102. [Crossref]

156. R. Joseph Huddleston. 2019. Think Ahead: Cost Discounting and External Validity in Foreign Policy Survey Experiments. *Journal of Experimental Political Science* **6**:02, 108-119. [Crossref]

157. Valeria Di Cosmo, Elisa Trujillo-Baute. 2019. From Forward to Spot Prices: Producers, Retailers and Loss Averse Consumers in Electricity Markets. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

158. Julia M. Puaschunder. 2019. Time ≠ Time ≠ Time: A Research Agenda Mental Temporal Accounting and the Opening of Contract Theory for Work-Leisure Trade-Off Attention. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

159. Stefano Giglio, Matteo Maggiori, Johannes Stroebel, Stephen P. Utkus. 2019. Five Facts About Beliefs and Portfolios. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

160. Kuo-Ping Chang. 2019. Behavioral Economics Versus Traditional Economics: Are They Very Different?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

161. Julia M. Puaschunder. 2019. Time ≠ Time ≠ Time: Mental Temporal Accounting. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

162. Steffen Andersen, Cristian Badarinza, Lu Liu, Julie Marx, Tarun Ramadorai. 2019. Reference Points in the Housing Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

163. Holger Strulik. 2019. I shouldn't eat this donut: Self-control, body weight, and health in a life cycle model. *The Journal of the Economics of Ageing* 14, 100175. [Crossref]

164. Emmet Sullivan. 2019. 'Pain of No Gain' - Using Hypocrisy to Increase Commitments to Physical Fitness. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

165. Arvid O. I. Hoffmann, Leonora Risse. 2019. Do Good Things Come in Pairs? How Personality Traits Help Explain Individuals' Simultaneous Pursuit of a Healthy Lifestyle and Financially Responsible Behavior. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

166. Sophie Bienenstock. Consumer Bias 350-354. [Crossref]

167. Zachary Breig, Matthew Gibson, Jeffrey Shrader. 2019. Why Do We Procrastinate? Present Bias and Optimism. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

168. Katharina Dowling, Lucas Stich, Martin Spann. 2019. An Experimental Analysis of Overconfidence in Tariff Choice. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

169. Ieva Eskyte, Ana Manzano, George Pepper, Sue Pavitt, Helen Ford, Hilary Bekker, Jeremy Chataway, Klaus Schmierer, David Meads, Edward Webb, Barbara Potrata. 2019. Understanding treatment decisions from the perspective of people with relapsing remitting multiple Sclerosis: A critical interpretive synthesis. *Multiple Sclerosis and Related Disorders* 27, 370-377. [Crossref]

170. Paul Heidhues, Philipp Strack. 2019. Identifying Present-Bias from the Timing of Choices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

171. Andy Brownback, Alex Imas, Michael Kuhn. 2019. Behavioral Food Subsidies. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

172. Henrique de Oliveira, Rohit Lamba. 2019. Rationalizing Dynamic Choices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 84. . [Crossref]

173. . Gyms Running on Empty 162-166. [Crossref]

174. Selin A. Malkoc, Gal Zauberman. 2018. Psychological analysis of consumer intertemporal decisions. *Consumer Psychology Review* 82. . [Crossref]

175. Lorenzo Casaburi, Jack Willis. 2018. Time versus State in Insurance: Experimental Evidence from Contract Farming in Kenya. *American Economic Review* 108:12, 3778-3813. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

176. Itai Ater, Vardit Landsman. 2018. Testing Alternative Learning Theories: Evidence From Subscription Contracts. *The Journal of Industrial Economics* 66:4, 763-815. [Crossref]

177. Ruth F. Hunter, Jianjun Tang, George Hutchinson, Susan Chilton, David Holmes, Frank Kee. 2018. Association between time preference, present-bias and physical activity: implications for designing behavior change interventions. *BMC Public Health* 18:1. . [Crossref]

178. Sophie Bienenstock. 2018. Utility Misperception in a Vertically Differentiated Duopoly. *Review of Law & Economics* 14:3. . [Crossref]

179. Shengpeng Xiang, Shou Chen, Hongbo He. 2018. An equivalent approximation approach for the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations in intertemporal decision problems. *Optimal Control Applications and Methods* **39**:6, 1976-1988. [Crossref]

180. Renato Gomes, Jean Tirole. 2018. Missed Sales and the Pricing of Ancillary Goods*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **133**:4, 2097-2169. [Crossref]

181. Bruno Contini, Toralf Pusch. 2018. Identifying bounded rationality with panel data: evidence from the labor markets of Italy and Germany. *Mind & Society* **17**:1-2, 71-84. [Crossref]

182. Joshua Blumenstock, Michael Callen, Tarek Ghani. 2018. Why Do Defaults Affect Behavior? Experimental Evidence from Afghanistan. *American Economic Review* **108**:10, 2868-2901. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

183. Yang Wang, Frank A. Sloan. 2018. Present bias and health. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* **57**:2, 177-198. [Crossref]

184. Suzanne B. Shu, Stephen D. Shu. 2018. The Psychology of Decumulation Decisions During Retirement. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences* **5**:2, 216-223. [Crossref]

185. Uzma Afzal, Giovanna d'Adda, Marcel Fafchamps, Simon Quinn, Farah Said. 2018. Two Sides of the Same Rupee? Comparing Demand for Microcredit and Microsaving in a Framed Field Experiment in Rural Pakistan. *The Economic Journal* **128**:614, 2161-2190. [Crossref]

186. Koen van der Swaluw, Mattijs S. Lambooij, Jolanda J. P. Mathijssen, Maarten Schipper, Marcel Zeelenberg, Stef Berkhout, Johan J. Polder, Henriëtte M. Prast. 2018. Physical activity after commitment lotteries: examining long-term results in a cluster randomized trial. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine* **41**:4, 483-493. [Crossref]

187. Armin Falk, Florian Zimmermann. 2018. Information Processing and Commitment. *The Economic Journal* **128**:613, 1983-2002. [Crossref]

188. Axel Börsch-Supan, Klaus Härtl, Duarte Nuno Leite. 2018. Who cares about the day after tomorrow? Pension issues when households are myopic or time inconsistent. *Review of Development Economics* **22**:3, 953-989. [Crossref]

189. Sabine Moser, Jan H. Schumann, Florian von Wangenheim, Fabian Uhrich, Felix Frank. 2018. The Effect of a Service Provider's Competitive Market Position on Churn Among Flat-Rate Customers. *Journal of Service Research* **21**:3, 319-335. [Crossref]

190. Nina Biljanovska, Spyros Palligkinis. 2018. Control thyself: Self-control failure and household wealth. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **92**, 280-294. [Crossref]

191. Nicholas Barberis. 2018. Richard Thaler and the Rise of Behavioral Economics. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* **120**:3, 661-684. [Crossref]

192. David P. Byrne, Andrea La Nauze, Leslie A. Martin. 2018. Tell Me Something I Don't Already Know: Informedness and the Impact of Information Programs. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **100**:3, 510-527. [Crossref]

193. Lukas M. Wenner. 2018. Do sellers exploit biased beliefs of buyers? An experiment. *Games and Economic Behavior* **110**, 194-215. [Crossref]

194. Sophie Bienenstock, Maïva Ropaul. 2018. On the benefits of being naive: the choice of contract duration with projection bias. *European Journal of Law and Economics* **45**:3, 469-496. [Crossref]

195. Roel van Veldhuizen, Joep Sonnemans. 2018. Nonrenewable Resources, Strategic Behavior and the Hotelling Rule: An Experiment. *The Journal of Industrial Economics* **66**:2, 481-516. [Crossref]

196. Yun-Ho Lee. 2018. The Overconfidence of Financial Literacy of Korean University Students. *Theory and Research in Citizenship Education* **50**:2, 137-157. [Crossref]

197. David Laibson. 2018. Private Paternalism, the Commitment Puzzle, and Model-Free Equilibrium. *AEA Papers and Proceedings* **108**, 1-21. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

198. Daniele Pennesi. 2018. Perfectionism and willpower. *Economic Theory Bulletin* **6**:1, 101-110. [Crossref]

199. Koen van der Swaluw, Mattijs S Lambooij, Jolanda J P Mathijssen, Maarten Schipper, Marcel Zeelenberg, Stef Berkhout, Johan J Polder, Henriëtte M Prast. 2018. Commitment Lotteries Promote Physical Activity Among Overweight Adults—A Cluster Randomized Trial. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine* **52**:4, 342-351. [Crossref]

200. Hang Ren, Tingliang Huang. 2018. Modeling customer bounded rationality in operations management: A review and research opportunities. *Computers & Operations Research* **91**, 48-58. [Crossref]

201. Mariana Carrera, Heather Royer, Mark Stehr, Justin Sydnor. 2018. Can financial incentives help people trying to establish new habits? Experimental evidence with new gym members. *Journal of Health Economics* **58**, 202-214. [Crossref]

202. Jana Friedrichsen,, Kornelia Hagen,, Lilo Wagner. 2018. Stupsen und Schubsen (Nudging): Ein neues verhaltensbasiertes Regulierungskonzept?. *Vierteljahrshefte zur Wirtschaftsforschung* **87**:1, 5-13. [Crossref]

203. Daniel Horn, Hubert Janos Kiss. 2018. Which preferences associate with school performance?— Lessons from an exploratory study with university students. *PLOS ONE* **13**:2, e0190163. [Crossref]

204. Sophie Bienenstock. Consumer Bias 1-5. [Crossref]

205. Bruno S. Frey. Happiness and Television Viewing 51-54. [Crossref]

206. B. Douglas Bernheim, Dmitry Taubinsky. Behavioral Public Economics 381-516. [Crossref]

207. John Beshears, James J. Choi, David Laibson, Brigitte C. Madrian. Behavioral Household Finance 177-276. [Crossref]

208. Stefano DellaVigna. Structural Behavioral Economics 613-723. [Crossref]

209. Ulrike Malmendier. Behavioral Corporate Finance 277-379. [Crossref]

210. Daniel Houser, Daniel Schunk, Joachim Winter, Erte Xiao. 2018. Temptation and commitment in the laboratory. *Games and Economic Behavior* **107**, 329-344. [Crossref]

211. Bradley J. Baker, Jeremy S. Jordan, Daniel C. Funk. 2018. Run Again Another Day: The Role of Consumer Characteristics and Satisfaction in Repeat Consumption of a Sport-Related Experience Product. *Journal of Sport Management* **32**:1, 38-52. [Crossref]

212. Andre Boik. 2018. Prediction and Identification in Two-Sided Markets. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

213. Nicholas Barberis. 2018. Richard Thaler and the Rise of Behavioral Economics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

214. David S. Ahn, Ryota Iijima, Todd Sarver. 2018. Naïvett About Temptation and Self-Control: Foundations for Naive Quasi-Hyperbolic Discounting. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

215. Koen van der Swaluw, Mattijs Lambooij, Jolanda Mathijssen, Maarten Schipper, Marcel Zeelenberg, Stef Berkhout, Johan Polder, Henriette M. Prast. 2018. Physical Activity after Commitment Lotteries: Examining Long-Term Results in a Cluster Randomized Trial. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

216. Julia M. Puaschunder. 2018. A Utility Theory of Privacy and Information Sharing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

217. Dirk Bergemann, Juuso Valimaki. 2018. Dynamic Mechanism Design: An Introduction. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

218. Felix Kölle, Lukas Wenner. 2018. Time-Inconsistent Generosity: Present Bias Across Individual and Social Contexts. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

219. Wolfgang Habla, Paul Muller. 2018. Experimental and Non-Experimental Evidence on Limited Attention and Present Bias at the Gym. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

220. Valeria Di Cosmo, Elisa Trujillo-Baute. 2018. From Forward to Spot Prices: Producers, Retailers and Loss Averse Consumers in Electricity Markets. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

221. Veronica Marotta, Alessandro Acquisti. 2018. Interrupting Interruptions: A Digital Experiment on Social Media and Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

222. David S. Ahn, Ryota Iijima, Yves Le Yaouanq, Todd Sarver. 2018. Behavioral Characterizations of Naiveté for Time-Inconsistent Preferences. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

223. Holger Strulik. 2018. I Shouldn't Eat this Donut: Self-Control, Body Weight, and Health in a Life Cycle Model. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

224. Indranil Goswami, Oleg Urminsky. 2018. Don't Fear the Meter: How Longer Time Limits Yield Biased Preferences for Flat Fee Contracts. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

225. Katharina Massner, Puneet Manchanda, Martin Spann. 2018. The Existence and Persistence of the Pay-Per-Use Bias in Car Sharing Services. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

226. Anja Lambrecht. Pricing Services Online, Economics of 10721-10727. [Crossref]

227. Takeshi Murooka, Marco A. Schwarz. 2018. The timing of choice-enhancing policies. *Journal of Public Economics* **157**, 27-40. [Crossref]

228. Michael Frakes, Melissa F. Wasserman. 2018. Knowledge Spillovers and Learning in the Workplace: Evidence from the U.S. Patent Office. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **33**. . [Crossref]

229. Todd D. Gerarden, Richard G. Newell, Robert N. Stavins. 2017. Assessing the Energy-Efficiency Gap. *Journal of Economic Literature* **55**:4, 1486-1525. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

230. Liam Delaney, Leonhard K. Lades. 2017. Present Bias and Everyday Self-Control Failures: A Day Reconstruction Study. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* **30**:5, 1157-1167. [Crossref]

231. David Bradford, Charles Courtemanche, Garth Heutel, Patrick McAlvanah, Christopher Ruhm. 2017. Time preferences and consumer behavior. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* **55**:2-3, 119-145. [Crossref]

232. Ryota Nakamura, Marc Suhrcke, Daniel John Zizzo. 2017. A triple test for behavioral economics models and public health policy. *Theory and Decision* **83**:4, 513-533. [Crossref]

233. Christopher N. Sciamanna, Andrew J. Mowen, Jennifer L. Kraschnewski, Joshua M. Smyth, Liza S. Rovniak, David E. Conroy, Kalen Kearcher, Courtney Redman, Matthew Silvis, Brandon J. Auer, Ming Wang, Erik Lehman, Dino Messina. 2017. Why just exercise if you can play? Interest in a modified sports program to enhance physical activity among primary care patients. *Preventive Medicine Reports* **8**, 273-278. [Crossref]

234. Christopher Tsoukis, Frédéric Tournemaine, Max Gillman. 2017. Hybrid Exponential-Hyperbolic Discounting and Growth Without Commitment. *The Manchester School* **85**, e45-e74. [Crossref]

235. Yan Yuan, Toshiyuki Sueyoshi. 2017. Effects of balance transfer offers on consumer short-term finance: evidence from credit card data. *Journal of Economic Structures* **6**:1. . [Crossref]

236. Manel Baucells, Woonam Hwang. 2017. A Model of Mental Accounting and Reference Price Adaptation. *Management Science* **63**:12, 4201-4218. [Crossref]

237. Simon Condliffe, Ebru Işgın, Brynne Fitzgerald. 2017. Get thee to the gym! A field experiment on improving exercise habits. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* **70**, 23-32. [Crossref]

238. Giacomo Calzolari, Mattia Nardotto. 2017. Effective Reminders. *Management Science* **63**:9, 2915-2932. [Crossref]

239. Christine L. Exley, Jeffrey K. Naecker. 2017. Observability Increases the Demand for Commitment Devices. *Management Science* **63**:10, 3262-3267. [Crossref]

240. Alessandro Lizzeri, Leeat Yariv. 2017. Collective Self-Control. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* **9**:3, 213-244. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

241. Keith Marzilli Ericson. 2017. On the Interaction of Memory and Procrastination: Implications for Reminders, Deadlines, and Empirical Estimation. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **15**:3, 692-719. [Crossref]

242. Carin van der Cruijsen, Lola Hernandez, Nicole Jonker. 2017. In love with the debit card but still married to cash. *Applied Economics* **49**:30, 2989-3004. [Crossref]

243. Naomi Mandel, Maura L. Scott, Sunghoon Kim, Rajiv K. Sinha. 2017. Strategies for improving self-control among naïve, sophisticated, and time-consistent consumers. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **60**, 109-125. [Crossref]

244. Joaquín Gómez-Miñambres, Eric Schniter. 2017. Emotional calibration of self-control. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* **68**, 110-118. [Crossref]

245. Andrea Fosfuri, Christian Helmers, Catherine Roux. 2017. Shared Ownership of Intangible Property Rights: The Case of Patent Coassignments. *The Journal of Legal Studies* **46**:2, 339-369. [Crossref]

246. Stephen A. Atlas, Eric J. Johnson, John W. Payne. 2017. Time Preferences and Mortgage Choice. *Journal of Marketing Research* **54**:3, 415-429. [Crossref]

247. Sofronis Clerides, Pascal Courty. 2017. Sales, Quantity Surcharge, and Consumer Inattention. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **99**:2, 357-370. [Crossref]

248. Markus K. Brunnermeier, Filippos Papakonstantinou, Jonathan A. Parker. 2017. Optimal Time-Inconsistent Beliefs: Misplanning, Procrastination, and Commitment. *Management Science* **63**:5, 1318-1340. [Crossref]

249. Hongli Xu, Hai Yang, Jing Zhou, Yafeng Yin. 2017. A Route Choice Model with Context-Dependent Value of Time. *Transportation Science* **51**:2, 536-548. [Crossref]

250. Zsombor Z. Méder, János Flesch, Ronald Peeters. 2017. Naiveté and sophistication in dynamic inconsistency. *Mathematical Social Sciences* **87**, 40-54. [Crossref]

251. Jaime Schultz. 2017. Reimagining Obesity. *Quest* **69**:2, 236-255. [Crossref]

252. Santiago I. Sautua. 2017. Does uncertainty cause inertia in decision making? An experimental study of the role of regret aversion and indecisiveness. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **136**, 1-14. [Crossref]

253. David R. Just. 2017. The Behavioral Welfare Paradox: Practical, Ethical and Welfare Implications of Nudging. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review* **46**:1, 1-20. [Crossref]

254. Hui-Chih Hung, Chung-Yu Chung, Muh-Cherng Wu, Wan-Ling Shen. 2017. A membership pricing policy to facilitate service scale-expansion. *The Service Industries Journal* **37**:3-4, 167-189. [Crossref]

255. Eric Cardella, Bradley T. Ewing, Ryan B. Williams. 2017. Price volatility and residential electricity decisions: Experimental evidence on the convergence of energy generating source. *Energy Economics* **62**, 428-437. [Crossref]

256. Kirsten I.M. Rohde, Willem Verbeke. 2017. We like to see you in the gym—A field experiment on financial incentives for short and long term gym attendance. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **134**, 388-407. [Crossref]

257. KimJaeHwi, ###. 2017. The effect of usage representation and behavior control on pay-per-use choic. *The Korean Journal of Consumer and Advertising Psychology* **18**:1, 43-66. [Crossref]

258. Gianmarco León, Edward Miguel. 2017. Risky Transportation Choices and the Value of a Statistical Life. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **9**:1, 202-228. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

259. Yun Shi, Xiangyu Cui. Time Inconsistency and Self-Control Optimization Problems: Progress and Challenges 33-42. [Crossref]

260. P. Dupas, E. Miguel. Impacts and Determinants of Health Levels in Low-Income Countries 3-93. [Crossref]

261. Sumit Agarwal, Itzhak Ben-David, Vincent Yao. 2017. Systematic mistakes in the mortgage market and lack of financial sophistication. *Journal of Financial Economics* **123**:1, 42-58. [Crossref]

262. R. Alexander Bentley, Michael J. O'Brien. 2017. Mapping multiple drivers of human obesity. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* **40**. . [Crossref]

263. Jon Kleinberg, Sigal Oren, Manish Raghavan. Planning with Multiple Biases 567-584. [Crossref]

264. Hong Ru, Antoinette Schoar. 2017. Do Credit Card Companies Screen for Behavioral Biases?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

265. Axel H. BBrsch-Supan, Klaus HHrtl, Duarte Nuno Leite. 2017. Who Cares About the Day after Tomorrow? Pension Issues When Households are Myopic or Time Inconsistent. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

266. Julia M. Puaschunder. 2017. Nudgitize Me! A Behavioral Finance Approach to Minimize Losses and Maximize Profits from Heuristics and Biases. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

267. Hanming Fang, Zenan Wu. 2017. Life Insurance and Life Settlement Markets with Overconfident Policyholders. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

268. Hang Ren, Tingliang Huang. 2017. Modeling Bounded Rationality in Operations Management: A Review and Research Opportunities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

269. Alexia Gaudeul, Magdalena Claudia Kaczmarek. 2017. Does Nudging Intentions Translate into Action? Why Nudging Pledges to Charities Does Not Result in Increased Donations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

270. David S. Ahn, Ryota Iijima, Todd Sarver. 2017. Naivett About Temptation and Self-Control: Foundations for Naive Quasi-Hyperbolic Discounting. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

271. Mutlu zcan. 2017. Shrouded Data Collection in Messaging Networks - The Role of Consumer Expectations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

272. Dirk Bergemann, Juuso Valimaki. 2017. Dynamic Mechanism Design: An Introduction. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

273. Daniel Horn, Hubert Janos Kiss. 2017. Which Preferences Associate with School Performance? Lessons from a University Classroom Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

274. Alexander W. Cappelen, Gary Charness, Mathias Ekstrrm, Uri Gneezy, Bertil Tungodden. 2017. Exercise Improves Academic Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

275. Nicholas Butler. 2017. Extensive Form Generalized Games. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

276. Victor Aguiar, Nail Kashaev. 2017. Stochastic Revealed Preferences with Measurement Error: Testing for Exponential Discounting in Survey Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

277. Nadia Linciano, Paola Soccorso, Daniela Di Cagno, Luca Panaccione, Gianni Nicolini, Matteo Ploner, Caterina Lucarelli, Gianni Brighetti, Enrico Maria Cervellati, Emanuela Rinaldi, Riccardo Viale, Duccio Martelli, Barbara Alemanni, Gabriella Agrusti, Giovanni Ferri, Claudio Giannotti, Caterina Cruciani, Ugo Rigoni. 2017. Challenges in Ensuring Financial Competencies: Essays on How to Measure Financial Knowledge, Target Beneficiaries and Deliver Educational Programmes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

278. Julia M. Puaschunder. 2017. Towards a Utility Theory of Privacy and Information Sharing and the Introduction of Hyper-Hyperbolic Discounting in the Digital Big Data Age. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

279. John Gathergood, Hiroaki Sakaguchi, Neil Stewart, Joerg Weber. 2017. Learning, Liquidity and Credit Card Fees. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

280. Kelsey Brown, Dixie Stanforth. 2017. GO GREEN WITH OUTDOOR ACTIVITY. *ACSM'S Health & Fitness Journal* **21**:1, 10-15. [Crossref]

281. Matteo M. Galizzi, Marisa Miraldo, Charitini Stavropoulou, Marjon van der Pol. 2016. Doctor–patient differences in risk and time preferences: A field experiment. *Journal of Health Economics* **50**, 171-182. [Crossref]

282. Markus Haavio, Kaisa Kotakorpi. 2016. Sin licenses revisited. *Journal of Public Economics* **144**, 40-51. [Crossref]

283. Qiyan Ong, Walter Theseira. 2016. Does choosing jobs based on income risk lead to higher job satisfaction in the long run? Evidence from the natural experiment of German reunification. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* **65**, 95-108. [Crossref]

284. Thomas Aronsson, Tomas Sjögren. 2016. Quasi-hyperbolic discounting, paternalism and optimal mixed taxation. *Mathematical Social Sciences* **84**, 24-36. [Crossref]

285. Mark Armstrong. 2016. Nonlinear Pricing. *Annual Review of Economics* **8**:1, 583-614. [Crossref]

286. Hunt Allcott. 2016. Paternalism and Energy Efficiency: An Overview. *Annual Review of Economics* **8**:1, 145-176. [Crossref]

287. Rafay A. Siddiqui, Frank May, Ashwani Monga. 2016. Time Window as a Self-Control Denominator: Shorter Windows Shift Preference toward Virtues and Longer Windows toward Vices. *Journal of Consumer Research* **1**, ucw064. [Crossref]

288. Sophie Bienenstock. 2016. Consumer education: why the market doesn't work. *European Journal of Law and Economics* **42**:2, 237-262. [Crossref]

289. UMIT G. GURUN, GREGOR MATVOS, AMIT SERU. 2016. Advertising Expensive Mortgages. *The Journal of Finance* **71**:5, 2371-2416. [Crossref]

290. Eyal Peer, Alessandro Acquisti. 2016. The impact of reversibility on the decision to disclose personal information. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* **33**:6, 428-436. [Crossref]

291. Stefanie Lena Hille. 2016. The Myth of the Unscrupulous Energy User's Dilemma: Evidence from Switzerland. *Journal of Consumer Policy* **39**:3, 327-347. [Crossref]

292. Niels Vermeer. 2016. Age Anchors and the Expected Retirement Age: An Experimental Study. *De Economist* **164**:3, 255-279. [Crossref]

293. Zhongmin Wang, Minbo Xu. 2016. Selling a dollar for more than a dollar? Evidence from online penny auctions. *Information Economics and Policy* **36**, 53-68. [Crossref]

294. Jeffrey R. Brown, Anne M. Farrell, Scott J. Weisbenner. 2016. Decision-making approaches and the propensity to default: Evidence and implications. *Journal of Financial Economics* **121**:3, 477-495. [Crossref]

295. Levent Neyse, Steven Bosworth, Patrick Ring, Ulrich Schmidt. 2016. Overconfidence, Incentives and Digit Ratio. *Scientific Reports* **6**:1. . [Crossref]

296. Jing Ai, Lin Zhao, Wei Zhu. 2016. Contracting with Present-Biased Consumers in Insurance Markets. *The Geneva Risk and Insurance Review* **41**:2, 107-148. [Crossref]

297. Alex Imas. 2016. The Realization Effect: Risk-Taking After Realized Versus Paper Losses. *American Economic Review* **106**:8, 2086-2109. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

298. Marit Hinnosaar. 2016. Time inconsistency and alcohol sales restrictions. *European Economic Review* **87**, 108-131. [Crossref]

299. Pia Pinger, Isabel Ruhmer-Krell, Heiner Schumacher. 2016. The compromise effect in action: Lessons from a restaurant's menu. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **128**, 14-34. [Crossref]

300. Thomas M. Eisenbach, Martin C. Schmalz. 2016. Anxiety in the face of risk. *Journal of Financial Economics* **121**:2, 414-426. [Crossref]

301. Richard H. Thaler. 2016. Behavioral Economics: Past, Present, and Future. *American Economic Review* **106**:7, 1577-1600. [Citation] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

302. Koen van der Swaluw, Mattijs S. Lambooij, Jolanda J.P. Mathijssen, Maarten Schipper, Marcel Zeelenberg, Johan J. Polder, Henriëtte M. Prast. 2016. Design and protocol of the weight loss lottery- a cluster randomized trial. *Contemporary Clinical Trials* **49**, 109-115. [Crossref]

303. Benny Mantin, Eran Rubin. 2016. Fare Prediction Websites and Transaction Prices: Empirical Evidence from the Airline Industry. *Marketing Science* **35**:4, 640-655. [Crossref]

304. Fabio Paglieri. 2016. Social choice for one: On the rationality of intertemporal decisions. *Behavioural Processes* **127**, 97-108. [Crossref]

305. Linus Mattauch, Monica Ridgway, Felix Creutzig. 2016. Happy or liberal? Making sense of behavior in transport policy design. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* **45**, 64-83. [Crossref]

306. Andrew C. Pickett, Andrew Goldsmith, Zack Damon, Matthew Walker. 2016. The Influence of Sense of Community on the Perceived Value of Physical Activity: A Cross-Context Analysis. *Leisure Sciences* **38**:3, 199-214. [Crossref]

307. Mark A. Holmgren, Vicki A. McCracken, Jill J. McCluskey. 2016. Should I ski today? The economics of ski resort season passes. *Leisure/Loisir* **40**:2, 131-148. [Crossref]

308. Ulrike Malmendier. 2016. The Bidder's Curse: Reply. *American Economic Review* **106**:4, 1195-1213. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

309. Heiner Schumacher. 2016. Insurance, self-control, and contract flexibility. *European Economic Review* **83**, 220-232. [Crossref]

310. Yuan Tian. 2016. Optimal capital structure and investment decisions under time-inconsistent preferences. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* **65**, 83-104. [Crossref]

311. John L. Crompton. 2016. A policy framework for analyzing multi-use pass pricing decisions. *Managing Sport and Leisure* **21**:2, 91-101. [Crossref]

312. Ke Wang, Jinwen Sun, Liang Liang, Xiaoyan Li. 2016. Optimal contracts and the manufacturer's pricing strategies in a supply chain with an inequity-averse retailer. *Central European Journal of Operations Research* **24**:1, 107-125. [Crossref]

313. Alexei Alexandrov. 2016. Competing for Consumers with Self-Control Problems. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy* **25**:1, 179-194. [Crossref]

314. Eva Ascarza, Raghuram Iyengar, Martin Schleicher. 2016. The Perils of Proactive Churn Prevention Using Plan Recommendations: Evidence from a Field Experiment. *Journal of Marketing Research* **53**:1, 46-60. [Crossref]

315. Marlon L. Williams. 2016. Bank overdraft pricing and myopic consumers. *Economics Letters* **139**, 84-87. [Crossref]

316. Tomomi Tanaka, Colin F. Camerer, Quang Nguyen. Risk and Time Preferences: Linking Experimental and Household Survey Data from Vietnam 3-25. [Crossref]

317. Shinsuke Ikeda. Coping with Self-Destructive Behavior 153-180. [Crossref]

318. Nathan L. Meikle, Elizabeth R. Tenney, Don A. Moore. 2016. Overconfidence at work: Does overconfidence survive the checks and balances of organizational life?. *Research in Organizational Behavior* **36**, 121-134. [Crossref]

319. Eva R. Porras. Contributors to the Bubble Formation and Contagion Process 55-89. [Crossref]

320. Jon Kleinberg, Sigal Oren, Manish Raghavan. Planning Problems for Sophisticated Agents with Present Bias 343-360. [Crossref]

321. Alexander Chisler, Yulia Volkova, Evgeny Pyshkin. Handle with IT Addiction 1-5. [Crossref]

322. Daniele Pennesi. 2016. When Perfectionism Becomes Willpower. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

323. William J. Luther. 2016. Patience and Principles. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

324. BBrd Harstad. 2016. Investment Policy for Time-Inconsistent Discounters. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

325. Geng Li, Weifeng Wu, Vincent W. Yao. 2016. Do People Leave Money on the Table? Evidence from Joint Mortgage Applications and the Minimum FICO Rule. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

326. Marit Hinnosaar. 2016. Time Inconsistency and Alcohol Sales Restrictions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

327. Richard H. Thaler. 2016. Behavioral Economics: Past, Present and Future. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

328. Lukas M. Wenner. 2016. Do Sellers Exploit Biased Beliefs of Buyers? An Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

329. Axel H. BBrsch-Supan, Klaus HHrtl. 2016. Social Security and Public Insurance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

330. Damon Clark, David Gill, Victoria L. Prowse, Mark Rush. 2016. Using Goals to Motivate College Students: Theory and Evidence from Field Experiments. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

331. Ravi Bapna. 2016. Monetizing Freemium Communities: Does Paying for Premium Increase Social Engagement?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

332. Gianluca Rospo, Viola Valsecchi, Alberto G Bonomi, Inge WJ Thomassen, Saskia van Dantzig, Antonio La Torre, Francesco Sartor. 2016. Cardiorespiratory Improvements Achieved by American College of Sports Medicine's Exercise Prescription Implemented on a Mobile App. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth* 4:2, e77. [Crossref]

333. Michael Frakes, Melissa F. Wasserman. 2016. Procrastination in the Workplace: Evidence from the U.S. Patent Office. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 61. . [Crossref]

334. Anastassia Fedyk. 2016. Asymmetric Naivete: Beliefs About Self-Control. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 1. . [Crossref]

335. A. Börsch-Supan, K. Härtl, D.N. Leite. Social Security and Public Insurance 781-863. [Crossref]

336. Todd Rogers, Erin Frey. Changing Behavior Beyond the Here and Now 723-748. [Crossref]

337. Devin G. Pope, Justin R. Sydnor. Behavioral Economics 800-827. [Crossref]

338. Oleg Urminsky, Gal Zauberman. The Psychology of Intertemporal Preferences 141-181. [Crossref]

339. Jan U. Becker, Martin Spann, Timo Schulze. 2015. Implications of minimum contract durations on customer retention. *Marketing Letters* 26:4, 579-592. [Crossref]

340. Ulrike Malmendier, Timothy Taylor. 2015. On the Verges of Overconfidence. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 29:4, 3-8. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

341. Michael D. Grubb. 2015. Overconfident Consumers in the Marketplace. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 29:4, 9-36. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

342. Matthew O. Jackson, Leeat Yariv. 2015. Collective Dynamic Choice: The Necessity of Time Inconsistency. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* 7:4, 150-178. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

343. Paul Heidhues, Botond Kőszegi. 2015. On the Welfare Costs of Naiveté in the US Credit-Card Market. *Review of Industrial Organization* 47:3, 341-354. [Crossref]

344. Michael D. Grubb. 2015. Behavioral Consumers in Industrial Organization: An Overview. *Review of Industrial Organization* **47**:3, 247-258. [Crossref]

345. Jean-Denis Garon, Alix Masse, Pierre-Carl Michaud. 2015. Health club attendance, expectations and self-control. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **119**, 364-374. [Crossref]

346. Maoyong Fan, Yanhong Jin. 2015. The Effects of Weight Perception on Adolescents' Weight-Loss Intentions and Behaviors: Evidence from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Survey. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **12**:11, 14640-14668. [Crossref]

347. Young-Soo Kim, Do-Hyung Park, Se-Bum Park. 2015. Tariff choice of online contents based on usage goal and self-control: can I control myself?. *Internet Research* **25**:5, 852-867. [Crossref]

348. Pamela Wicker, Dennis Coates, Christoph Breuer. 2015. Physical activity and subjective well-being: the role of time. *The European Journal of Public Health* **25**:5, 864-868. [Crossref]

349. Fredrik Carlsson, Olof Johansson-Stenman, Pham Khanh Nam. 2015. Funding a new bridge in rural Vietnam: a field experiment on social influence and default contributions. *Oxford Economic Papers* **67**:4, 987-1014. [Crossref]

350. Decio Coviello, Andrea Ichino, Nicola Persico. 2015. THE INEFFICIENCY OF WORKER TIME USE. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **13**:5, 906-947. [Crossref]

351. Philip Babcock, Kelly Bedard, Gary Charness, John Hartman, Heather Royer. 2015. LETTING DOWN THE TEAM? SOCIAL EFFECTS OF TEAM INCENTIVES. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **13**:5, 841-870. [Crossref]

352. David R. Just, Andrew S. Hanks. 2015. The Hidden Cost of Regulation: Emotional Responses to Command and Control. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **97**:5, 1385-1399. [Crossref]

353. Joachim Weimann. 2015. Die Rolle von Verhaltensökonomik und experimenteller Forschung in Wirtschaftswissenschaft und Politikberatung. *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik* **16**:3, 231-252. [Crossref]

354. Stefan Roth, Thomas Robbert, Lennart Straus. 2015. On the sunk-cost effect in economic decision-making: a meta-analytic review. *Business Research* **8**:1, 99-138. [Crossref]

355. Ernesto Reuben, Paola Sapienza, Luigi Zingales. 2015. Procrastination and impatience. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* **58**, 63-76. [Crossref]

356. Dirk Bergemann, Philipp Strack. 2015. Dynamic revenue maximization: A continuous time approach. *Journal of Economic Theory* **159**, 819-853. [Crossref]

357. Sumit Agarwal, Souphala Chomsisengphet, Chunlin Liu, Nicholas S. Souleles. 2015. Do Consumers Choose the Right Credit Contracts?. *Review of Corporate Finance Studies* **4**:2, 239-257. [Crossref]

358. Yacheng Sun, Shibo Li, Baohong Sun. 2015. An Empirical Analysis of Consumer Purchase Decisions Under Bucket-Based Price Discrimination. *Marketing Science* **34**:5, 646-668. [Crossref]

359. Brian C. Cadena, Benjamin J. Keys. 2015. Human Capital and the Lifetime Costs of Impatience. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **7**:3, 126-153. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

360. Erin Todd Bronchetti, David B. Huffman, Ellen Magenheim. 2015. Attention, intentions, and follow-through in preventive health behavior: Field experimental evidence on flu vaccination. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **116**, 270-291. [Crossref]

361. Heather Royer, Mark Stehr, Justin Sydnor. 2015. Incentives, Commitments, and Habit Formation in Exercise: Evidence from a Field Experiment with Workers at a Fortune-500 Company. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **7**:3, 51-84. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

362. Maria De Paola, Vincenzo Scoppa. 2015. Procrastination, academic success and the effectiveness of a remedial program. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **115**, 217-236. [Crossref]

363. Garth Heutel. 2015. Optimal policy instruments for externality-producing durable goods under present bias. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **72**, 54-70. [Crossref]

364. Oren Bar-Gill, Cass R. Sunstein. 2015. Regulation as Delegation. *Journal of Legal Analysis* **7**:1, 1-36. [Crossref]

365. Andrew Leigh. 2015. How behavioural economics does and can shape public policy. *The Economic and Labour Relations Review* **26**:2, 339-346. [Crossref]

366. Hanming Fang, Yang Wang. 2015. ESTIMATING DYNAMIC DISCRETE CHOICE MODELS WITH HYPERBOLIC DISCOUNTING, WITH AN APPLICATION TO MAMMOGRAPHY DECISIONS. *International Economic Review* **56**:2, 565-596. [Crossref]

367. Derek Ong Lai Teik. 2015. Enhancing the experience of needs satisfaction through service engagement: A case of commercial fitness centers in Malaysia. *Journal of Global Scholars of Marketing Science* **25**:2, 109-121. [Crossref]

368. Marco Casari, Davide Dragone. 2015. Choice reversal without temptation: A dynamic experiment on time preferences. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* **50**:2, 119-140. [Crossref]

369. Mara Ewers, Florian Zimmermann. 2015. IMAGE AND MISREPORTING. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **13**:2, 363-380. [Crossref]

370. Amit Poddar, Cameron M. Ellis, Timucin Ozcan. 2015. Imperfect Recall: The Impact of Composite Spending Information Disclosure on Credit Card Spending. *Journal of Consumer Policy* **38**:1, 93-104. [Crossref]

371. M. Tolga Akçura, Zafer D. Ozdemir, Mohammad S. Rahman. 2015. Online Intermediary as a Channel for Selling Quality-Differentiated Services. *Decision Sciences* **46**:1, 37-62. [Crossref]

372. Guillermo Gallego, Ruxian Wang, Ming Hu, Julie Ward, Jose Luis Beltran. 2015. No Claim? Your Gain: Design of Residual Value Extended Warranties Under Risk Aversion and Strategic Claim Behavior. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* **17**:1, 87-100. [Crossref]

373. Michael K. Lim, Ho-Yin Mak, Ying Rong. 2015. Toward Mass Adoption of Electric Vehicles: Impact of the Range and Resale Anxieties. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* **17**:1, 101-119. [Crossref]

374. Jonathan D. Ketcham, Claudio Lucarelli, Christopher A. Powers. 2015. Paying Attention or Paying Too Much in Medicare Part D. *American Economic Review* **105**:1, 204-233. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

375. Dan Acland, Matthew R. Levy. 2015. Naiveté, Projection Bias, and Habit Formation in Gym Attendance. *Management Science* **61**:1, 146-160. [Crossref]

376. Charlotte Cabane, Michael Lechner. 2015. Physical Activity of Adults: A Survey of Correlates, Determinants, and Effects. *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik* **235**:4-5. . [Crossref]

377. Eva Ascarza, Raghuram Iyengar, Martin Schleicher. 2015. The Perils of Proactive Churn Prevention Using Plan Recommendations: Evidence from a Field Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

378. Manel Baucells, Giampaolo Viglia. 2015. Correlation Between Anomalies and Theories of Mental Accounting. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

379. Dirk Bergemann, Philipp Strack. 2015. Dynamic Revenue Maximization: A Continuous Time Approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

380. Jeffrey R. Brown, Anne M. Farrell, Scott J. Weisbenner. 2015. Decision-Making Approaches and the Propensity to Default: Evidence and Implications. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

381. Oren Bar-Gill, Cass R. Sunstein. 2015. Regulation As Delegation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

382. Carin <!>van der Cruijsen, Lola Hernnndez, Nicole Jonker. 2015. In Love with the Debit Card But Still Married to Cash. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

383. Todd Gerarden, Richard G. Newell, Robert N. Stavins. 2015. Assessing the Energy-Efficiency Gap. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

384. David S. Ahn, Todd Sarver. 2015. Comparative Measures of Naivet. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

385. Brad R. Humphreys, Jane E. Ruseski, Li Zhou. 2015. Physical Activity, Present Bias, and Habit Formation: Theory and Evidence from Longitudinal Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

386. Uri Simonsohn, Joseph P. Simmons, Leif D. Nelson. 2015. Specification Curve: Descriptive and Inferential Statistics on All Reasonable Specifications. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

387. Paul Heidhues, Botond Koszegi, Philipp Strack. 2015. Unrealistic Expectations and Misguided Learning. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

388. Magda Osman. 2015. Behavioral Economics: Where Is It Heading?. *Psychology* **06**:09, 1114-1124. [Crossref]

389. Patti Lou Watkins, Vicki Ebbeck, Susan S. Levy. 2014. Overcoming weight bias: promoting physical activity and psychosocial health. *Ethnicity and Inequalities in Health and Social Care* **7**:4, 187-197. [Crossref]

390. Abi Adams, Laurens Cherchye, Bram De Rock, Ewout Verriest. 2014. Consume Now or Later? Time Inconsistency, Collective Choice, and Revealed Preference. *American Economic Review* **104**:12, 4147-4183. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

391. Matthew O. Jackson, Leeat Yariv. 2014. Present Bias and Collective Dynamic Choice in the Lab. *American Economic Review* **104**:12, 4184-4204. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

392. Keith Brand, Martin Gaynor, Patrick McAlvanah, David Schmidt, Elizabeth Schneirov. 2014. Economics at the FTC: Office Supply Retailers Redux, Healthcare Quality Efficiencies Analysis, and Litigation of an Alleged Get-Rich-Quick Scheme. *Review of Industrial Organization* **45**:4, 325-344. [Crossref]

393. Dominique Cappelletti, Luigi Mittone, Matteo Ploner. 2014. Are default contributions sticky? An experimental analysis of defaults in public goods provision. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **108**, 331-342. [Crossref]

394. Maria De Paola, Francesca Gioia, Vincenzo Scoppa. 2014. Overconfidence, omens and gender heterogeneity: Results from a field experiment. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **45**, 237-252. [Crossref]

395. Nana Kwame Anokye, Subhash Pokhrel, Julia Fox-Rushby. 2014. Economic analysis of participation in physical activity in England: implications for health policy. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* **11**:1. . [Crossref]

396. Ofer H. Azar. 2014. Optimal strategy of multi-product retailers with relative thinking and reference prices. *International Journal of Industrial Organization* **37**, 130-140. [Crossref]

397. Joshua Tasoff, Robert Letzler. 2014. Everyone believes in redemption: Nudges and overoptimism in costly task completion. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **107**, 107-122. [Crossref]

398. Silvia Prina, Heather Royer. 2014. The importance of parental knowledge: Evidence from weight report cards in Mexico. *Journal of Health Economics* **37**, 232-247. [Crossref]

399. Stephen Leider, Özge Şahin. 2014. Contracts, Biases, and Consumption of Access Services. *Management Science* **60**:9, 2198-2222. [Crossref]

400. Timothy Gubler, Lamar Pierce. 2014. Healthy, Wealthy, and Wise. *Psychological Science* **25**:9, 1822-1830. [Crossref]

401. Eugenio J. Miravete, Ignacio Palacios-Huerta. 2014. Consumer Inertia, Choice Dependence, and Learning from Experience in a Repeated Decision Problem. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **96**:3, 524-537. [Crossref]

402. Torsten J. Gerpott, Nima Ahmadi. 2014. Antecedents of international mobile Internet tariff type preferences : an empirical study of roaming customers. *info* **16**:4, 71-87. [Crossref]

403. John Cawley. 2014. THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT PERMITS GREATER FINANCIAL REWARDS FOR WEIGHT LOSS: A GOOD IDEA IN PRINCIPLE, BUT MANY PRACTICAL CONCERNS REMAIN. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* **33**:3, 810-820. [Crossref]

404. M. Rabin. 2014. Incorporating limited rationality into economics. *Voprosy Ekonomiki* :5, 45-65. [Crossref]

405. Alexander Peysakhovich. 2014. How to commit (if you must): Commitment contracts and the dual-self model. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **101**, 100-112. [Crossref]

406. Ziran Zou, Shou Chen, Lei Wedge. 2014. Finite horizon consumption and portfolio decisions with stochastic hyperbolic discounting. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **52**, 70-80. [Crossref]

407. Bart Cockx, Corinna Ghirelli, Bruno Van der Linden. 2014. Is it socially efficient to impose job search requirements on unemployed benefit claimants with hyperbolic preferences?. *Journal of Public Economics* **113**, 80-95. [Crossref]

408. Leonhard K. Lades. 2014. Impulsive consumption and reflexive thought: Nudging ethical consumer behavior. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **41**, 114-128. [Crossref]

409. SANXI LI, JIANYE YAN, BINQING XIAO. 2014. CONTRACT DESIGN AND SELF-CONTROL WITH ASYMMETRIC INFORMATION. *Economic Inquiry* **52**:2, 618-624. [Crossref]

410. Guillaume Roels, Xuanming Su. 2014. Optimal Design of Social Comparison Effects: Setting Reference Groups and Reference Points. *Management Science* **60**:3, 606-627. [Crossref]

411. Hui Xiong, Ying-Ju Chen. 2014. Product Line Design with Seller-Induced Learning. *Management Science* **60**:3, 784-795. [Crossref]

412. Maoyong Fan, Yanhong Jin. 2014. Obesity and Self-control: Food Consumption, Physical Activity, and Weight-loss Intention. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* **36**:1, 125-145. [Crossref]

413. Avner Ben-Ner, Darla J. Hamann, Gabriel Koepp, Chimnay U. Manohar, James Levine. 2014. Treadmill Workstations: The Effects of Walking while Working on Physical Activity and Work Performance. *PLoS ONE* **9**:2, e88620. [Crossref]

414. Ariel A. Casarin. 2014. Regulated price reforms and unregulated substitutes: the case of residential piped gas in Argentina. *Journal of Regulatory Economics* **45**:1, 34-56. [Crossref]

415. Katherine L. Milkman, Julia A. Minson, Kevin G. M. Volpp. 2014. Holding the Hunger Games Hostage at the Gym: An Evaluation of Temptation Bundling. *Management Science* **60**:2, 283-299. [Crossref]

416. John K. Ashton, Robert S. Hudson. 2014. Do Lenders Cross-Subsidise Loans by Selling Payment Protection Insurance?. *International Journal of the Economics of Business* **21**:1, 121-138. [Crossref]

417. M.V Pauly. Demand for Insurance That Nudges Demand 167-174. [Crossref]

418. T. Bradford Bitterly, Robert Mislavsky, Hengchen Dai, Katherine L. Milkman. 2014. Want/Should Conflict: A Synthesis of Past Research. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

419. Todd Rogers, Erin Lynn Frey. 2014. Changing Behavior Beyond the Here and Now. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

420. Guillermo Gallego, Ruxian Wang, Ming Hu, Julie Ward, Jose Luis Beltran. 2014. No Claim? Your Gain: Design of Residual Value Extended Warranties Under Risk Aversion and Strategic Claim Behavior. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

421. David P. Byrne, Andrea La Nauze, Leslie A. Martin. 2014. Tell Me Something I Don't Already Know: Informedness and External Validity in Information Programs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

422. Anastassia Fedyk. 2014. Overcoming Overconfidence: Teamwork and Self-Control. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

423. Christine Exley, Jeffrey Naecker. 2014. Observability Increases the Demand for Commitment Devices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

424. Nina Biljanovska, Spyros Palligkinis. 2014. Control Thyself: Self-Control Failure and Household Wealth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

425. Charlotte Cabane, Michael Lechner. 2014. Physical Activity of Adults: A Survey of Correlates, Determinants, and Effects. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

426. Jennifer Savary, Ravi Dhar. 2014. When Quitting Feels Like Giving Up: Self-Signaling in Retention Choice. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

427. Wen Zhang, Yuhong Li. 2014. A Study on Consumer Behavior of Commercial Health and Fitness Club—A Case of Consumers in Liverpool. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management* **04**:01, 58-69. [Crossref]

428. Gianna Giudicati, Massimo Riccaboni, Anna Romiti. 2013. Experience, socialization and customer retention: Lessons from the dance floor. *Marketing Letters* **24**:4, 409-422. [Crossref]

429. Mohammed Abdellaoui, Han Bleichrodt, Olivier l'Haridon. 2013. Sign-dependence in intertemporal choice. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* **47**:3, 225-253. [Crossref]

430. Ofer H. Azar. 2013. Competitive strategy when consumers are affected by reference prices. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **39**, 327-340. [Crossref]

431. Brian C. Cadena, Benjamin J. Keys. 2013. Can Self-Control Explain Avoiding Free Money? Evidence from Interest-Free Student Loans. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **95**:4, 1117-1129. [Crossref]

432. John Cawley, Joshua A. Price. 2013. A case study of a workplace wellness program that offers financial incentives for weight loss. *Journal of Health Economics* **32**:5, 794-803. [Crossref]

433. Itai Ater, Vardit Landsman. 2013. Do Customers Learn from Experience? Evidence from Retail Banking. *Management Science* **59**:9, 2019-2035. [Crossref]

434. Hunt Allcott. 2013. The Welfare Effects of Misperceived Product Costs: Data and Calibrations from the Automobile Market. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **5**:3, 30-66. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

435. Erica L. Plambeck, Qiong Wang. 2013. Implications of Hyperbolic Discounting for Optimal Pricing and Scheduling of Unpleasant Services That Generate Future Benefits. *Management Science* **59**:8, 1927-1946. [Crossref]

436. Pascaline Dupas,, Jonathan Robinson. 2013. Why Don't the Poor Save More? Evidence from Health Savings Experiments. *American Economic Review* **103**:4, 1138-1171. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

437. Matthew Rabin. 2013. Incorporating Limited Rationality into Economics. *Journal of Economic Literature* **51**:2, 528-543. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

438. Abraham Lioui. 2013. Time consistent vs. time inconsistent dynamic asset allocation: Some utility cost calculations for mean variance preferences. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* **37**:5, 1066-1096. [Crossref]

439. J. Piening, T. Ehrmann, B. Meiseberg. 2013. Competing risks for train tickets – An empirical investigation of customer behavior and performance in the railway industry. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review* **51**, 1-16. [Crossref]

440. Judy B. Springer, Susie D. Lamborn, Diane M. Pollard. 2013. Maintaining Physical Activity over Time: The Importance of Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction in Developing the Physically Active Self. *American Journal of Health Promotion* **27**:5, 284-293. [Crossref]

441. Fabian Uhrich, Jan H. Schumann, Florian von Wangenheim. 2013. The Impact of Consumption Goals on Flat-Rate Choice. *Journal of Service Research* **16**:2, 216-230. [Crossref]

442. Fabian Herweg, Konrad Mierendorff. 2013. UNCERTAIN DEMAND, CONSUMER LOSS AVERSION, AND FLAT-RATE TARIFFS. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **11**:2, 399-432. [Crossref]

443. H. Schmale, T. Ehrmann, A. Dilger. 2013. Buying without using – biases of German BahnCard buyers. *Applied Economics* **45**:7, 933-941. [Crossref]

444. Will Gans, Anna Alberini, Alberto Longo. 2013. Smart meter devices and the effect of feedback on residential electricity consumption: Evidence from a natural experiment in Northern Ireland. *Energy Economics* **36**, 729-743. [Crossref]

445. Kristian Ove R. Myrseth, Conny E. Wollbrant. 2013. A theory of self-control and naïveté: The blights of willpower and blessings of temptation. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **34**, 8-19. [Crossref]

446. Thomas Robbert, Stefan Roth, Bernd Skiera. Die Macht des Selbstzwangs – Wie sich Konsumenten mit Tarifen selbst disziplinieren 145-166. [Crossref]

447. Anja Lambrecht. Pricing Services Online, Economics of 1-8. [Crossref]

448. Adib Bagh, Hemant K. Bhargava. 2013. How to Price Discriminate When Tariff Size Matters. *Marketing Science* **32**:1, 111-126. [Crossref]

449. Philipp Schreiber, Martin Weber. 2013. Time Inconsistent Preferences and the Annuitization Decision. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

450. David M. Muir, Katja Seim, Maria Ana Vitorino. 2013. Drip Pricing When Consumers Have Limited Foresight: Evidence from Driving School Fees. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

451. Umit G. Gurun, Gregor Matvos, Amit Seru. 2013. Advertising Expensive Mortgages. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

452. Michael K. Lim, Ho-Yin Mak, Ying Rong. 2013. Toward Mass Adoption of Electric Vehicles: Impacts of the Range and Resale Anxieties. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

453. Thomas M. Eisenbach, Martin C. Schmalz. 2013. Up Close It Feels Dangerous: 'Anxiety' in the Face of Risk. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

454. Guillaume Roels, Xuanming Su. 2013. Optimal Design of Social Comparison Effects: Setting Reference Groups and Reference Points. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

455. Yann Girard, Stefan Goldbach. 2013. Self-Selection into Contests: Theory and Experimental Evidence. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

456. Quang Nguyen. 2013. Flexibility or Commitment: Insights from a Reference Dependent Preferences Model. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

457. Nina Biljanovska, Spyros Palligkinis. 2013. Control Thyself: Self-Control Failure and Household Wealth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

458. Alexander Peysakhovich. 2013. How to Commit (If You Must): Commitment Contracts and the Dual-Self Model. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

459. Eva Ascarza, Anja Lambrecht, Naufel Vilcassim. 2012. When Talk is "Free": The Effect of Tariff Structure on Usage under Two- and Three-Part Tariffs. *Journal of Marketing Research* **49**:6, 882-899. [Crossref]

460. Paul De Grauwe, Pablo Rovira Kaltwasser. The Exchange Rate in a Behavioral Finance Framework 111-132. [Crossref]

461. Jonathan D. Ketcham,, Claudio Lucarelli,, Eugenio J. Miravete,, M. Christopher Roebuck. 2012. Sinking, Swimming, or Learning to Swim in Medicare Part D. *American Economic Review* **102**:6, 2639-2673. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

462. A E Attema. 2012. Developments in time preference and their implications for medical decision making. *Journal of the Operational Research Society* **63**:10, 1388-1399. [Crossref]

463. Constança Esteves-Sorenson, Fabrizio Perretti. 2012. Micro-costs: Inertia in Television Viewing. *The Economic Journal* **122**:563, 867-902. [Crossref]

464. Oren Bar-Gill, Rebecca Stone. 2012. Pricing Misperceptions: Explaining Pricing Structure in the Cell Phone Service Market. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies* **9**:3, 430-456. [Crossref]

465. Leonhard K. Lades. 2012. Towards an incentive salience model of intertemporal choice. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **33**:4, 833-841. [Crossref]

466. Fredrik Carlsson, Olof Johansson-Stenman. 2012. Behavioral Economics and Environmental Policy. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* **4**:1, 75-99. [Crossref]

467. Mark Armstrong,, John Vickers. 2012. Consumer Protection and Contingent Charges. *Journal of Economic Literature* **50**:2, 477-493. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

468. Avi Goldfarb, Teck-Hua Ho, Wilfred Amaldoss, Alexander L. Brown, Yan Chen, Tony Haitao Cui, Alberto Galasso, Tanjim Hossain, Ming Hsu, Noah Lim, Mo Xiao, Botao Yang. 2012. Behavioral models of managerial decision-making. *Marketing Letters* **23**:2, 405-421. [Crossref]

469. Danit Ein-Gar, Jacob Goldenberg, Lilach Sagiv. 2012. The role of consumer self-control in the consumption of virtue products. *International Journal of Research in Marketing* **29**:2, 123-133. [Crossref]

470. Liam J. A. Lenten. 2012. Comparing Attendances and Memberships in the Australian Football League: The Case of Hawthorn. *The Economic and Labour Relations Review* **23**:2, 23-38. [Crossref]

471. Ian Larkin,, Stephen Leider. 2012. Incentive Schemes, Sorting, and Behavioral Biases of Employees: Experimental Evidence. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* **4**:2, 184-214. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

472. ###. 2012. Self-Control and Provision of Education Subsidies. *Journal of Economic Research (JER)* **17**:1, 61-76. [Crossref]

473. Alexia Gaudeul, Robert Sugden. 2012. Spurious Complexity and Common Standards in Markets for Consumer Goods. *Economica* **79**:314, 209-225. [Crossref]

474. O. Bar-Gill, O. Board. 2012. Product-Use Information and the Limits of Voluntary Disclosure. *American Law and Economics Review* **14**:1, 235-270. [Crossref]

475. TOMOMI TANAKA, TAKESHI MUROOKA. 2012. SELF-CONTROL PROBLEMS AND CONSUMPTION-SAVING DECISIONS: THEORY AND EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE*. *Japanese Economic Review* **63**:1, 23-37. [Crossref]

476. Damon Jones. 2012. Inertia and Overwithholding: Explaining the Prevalence of Income Tax Refunds. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **4**:1, 158-185. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

477. Jan Krämer, Lukas Wiewiorra. 2012. Beyond the flat rate bias: The flexibility effect in tariff choice. *Telecommunications Policy* **36**:1, 29-39. [Crossref]

478. Zafer Akin. 2012. Intertemporal decision making with present biased preferences. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **33**:1, 30-47. [Crossref]

479. Giuseppe Catenazzo, Jennifer D'Urso, Emmanuel Fragnière, Jean Tuberosa. Influences of Public Ecological Awareness and Price on Potable Water Consumption in Geneva 499-513. [Crossref]

480. Eva Ascarza, Anja Lambrecht, Naufel J. Vilcassim. 2012. When Talk is 'Free': The Effect of Tariff Structure on Usage under Two- and Three-Part Tariffs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

481. Robin Chark, Soo Hong Chew, Songfa Zhong. 2012. A Direct Experimental Test of the Hyperbolic Discounting Hypothesis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

482. Julia M. Puaschunder. 2012. The Future is Now: How Joint Decision Making Curbs Hyperbolic Discounting but Blurs Social Responsibility in the Intergenerational Equity Public Policy Domain. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

483. Joshua Tasoff, Robert Letzler. 2012. Everyone Believes in Redemption: Overoptimism and Nudges. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

484. Mark Grinblatt, Seppo Ikaheimo, Matti Keloharju, Samuli Knüpfer. 2012. IQ and Mutual Fund Choice. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

485. Mohammad Saifur Rahman, Tolga Akcura, Zafer D. Ozdemir. 2012. Using an Online Intermediary as an Additional Channel for Selling Quality Differentiated Services. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

486. Alessandro Lizzeri, Leeat Yariv. 2012. Collective Self-Control. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

487. Elisa Brodi. 2012. 'Product-Attribute Information' and 'Product-Use Information': Smart Disclosure and New Policy Implications for Consumers' Protection. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

488. Paolo Crosetto, Alexia Gaudeul. 2012. Do Consumers Prefer Offers that are Easy to Compare? An Experimental Investigation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

489. Abi Adams, Laurens Cherchye, Bram De Rock, Ewout Verriest. 2012. Consume Now or Later? Time Inconsistency, Collective Choice and Revealed Preference. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

490. Matthew O. Jackson, Leeat Yariv. 2012. Present Bias and Collective Dynamic Choice in the Lab. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

491. Qiyan Ong, Walter Theseira. 2012. Does Risk Based Job Choice Matter for Job Satisfaction? Evidence from the German Reunification Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

492. Bruno S. Frey, Margit Osterloh. 2012. Motivation Governance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

493. Alessandro Ancarani, Carmela Di Mauro. The Human Side of Supply Chains 290-314. [Crossref]

494. Avi Goldfarb,, Mo Xiao. 2011. Who Thinks about the Competition? Managerial Ability and Strategic Entry in US Local Telephone Markets. *American Economic Review* **101**:7, 3130-3161. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

495. Anna Breman. 2011. Give more tomorrow: Two field experiments on altruism and intertemporal choice. *Journal of Public Economics* **95**:11-12, 1349-1357. [Crossref]

496. Uri Gneezy,, Stephan Meier,, Pedro Rey-Biel. 2011. When and Why Incentives (Don't) Work to Modify Behavior. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **25**:4, 191-210. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

497. Alois Stutzer, Lorenz Goette, Michael Zehnder. 2011. Active Decisions and Prosocial Behaviour: A Field Experiment on Blood Donation. *The Economic Journal* **121**:556, F476-F493. [Crossref]

498. Klaus Backhaus, Matthias Koch, Susanne Stingel. 2011. Biased Tariff Choices: Exploring Role Effects in B to B Settings. *Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing* **18**:4, 357-379. [Crossref]

499. Claire I. Tsai, Min Zhao. 2011. Predicting Consumption Time: The Role of Event Valence and Unpacking. *Journal of Consumer Research* **38**:3, 459-473. [Crossref]

500. David K. Levine. 2011. Neuroeconomics?. *International Review of Economics* **58**:3, 287-305. [Crossref]

501. Pascaline Dupas. 2011. Health Behavior in Developing Countries. *Annual Review of Economics* **3**:1, 425-449. [Crossref]

502. Barbara von Tigerstrom, Tamara Larre, JoAnne Sauder. 2011. Using the Tax System to Promote Physical Activity: Critical Analysis of Canadian Initiatives. *American Journal of Public Health* **101**:8, e10-e16. [Crossref]

503. Ronald L. Goettler, Karen Clay. 2011. Tariff Choice with Consumer Learning and Switching Costs. *Journal of Marketing Research* **48**:4, 633-652. [Crossref]

504. Jean M. Abraham, Roger Feldman, John A. Nyman, Nathan Barleen. 2011. What Factors Influence Participation in an Exercise-Focused, Employer-Based Wellness Program?. *INQUIRY: The Journal of Health Care Organization, Provision, and Financing* **48**:3, 221-241. [Crossref]

505. S. DellaVigna. 2011. Psychology and Economics: Evidence from the Field. Part III. Nonstandard Decision Making and Market Response. *Voprosy Ekonomiki* :6, 82-106. [Crossref]

506. Hunt Allcott. 2011. Consumers' Perceptions and Misperceptions of Energy Costs. *American Economic Review* **101**:3, 98-104. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

507. S. Nageeb Ali. 2011. Learning Self-Control *. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **126**:2, 857-893. [Crossref]

508. S. DellaVigna. 2011. Psychology and Economics: Evidence from the Field. Part I: Nonstandard Preferences (Introduction by S. Pyastolov). *Voprosy Ekonomiki* :4, 47-77. [Crossref]

509. Ulrike Malmendier,, Young Han Lee. 2011. The Bidder's Curse. *American Economic Review* **101**:2, 749-787. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

510. John D. Hey, Luca Panaccione. 2011. Dynamic decision making: what do people do?. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* **42**:2, 85-123. [Crossref]

511. Alessandro Bucciol, Daniel Houser, Marco Piovesan. 2011. Temptation and productivity: A field experiment with children. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **78**:1-2, 126-136. [Crossref]

512. Fabian Herweg, Daniel Müller. 2011. Performance of procrastinators: on the value of deadlines. *Theory and Decision* **70**:3, 329-366. [Crossref]

513. Christian Heumann, Marion Freudenschuss, Florian v. Wangenheim, Markus Wübben. 2011. Realisierung von Cross-Selling Potenzialen durch das Management von kundeninitiierten Kontakten. *Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft* **81**:S2, 31-55. [Crossref]

514. David Card, Michael Ransom. 2011. Pension Plan Characteristics and Framing Effects in Employee Savings Behavior. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **93**:1, 228-243. [Crossref]

515. David R Just, Brian Wansink. 2011. The Flat-Rate Pricing Paradox: Conflicting Effects of "All-You-Can-Eat" Buffet Pricing. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **93**:1, 193-200. [Crossref]

516. C. Fritz Foley. 2011. Welfare Payments and Crime. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **93**:1, 97-112. [Crossref]

517. Andrew Chiu, George Wu. Prospect Theory . [Crossref]

518. Stephen Duncan, Cameron Hepburn, Antonis Papachristodoulou. 2011. Optimal harvesting of fish stocks under a time-varying discount rate. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **269**:1, 166-173. [Crossref]

519. Alexei Alexandrov. 2011. Competing for Consumers with Self-control Problems. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

520. Ian Larkin, Stephen Leider. 2011. Incentive Schemes, Sorting and Behavioral Biases of Employees: Experimental Evidence. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

521. Matthew O. Jackson, Leeat Yariv. 2011. Collective Dynamic Choice: The Necessity of Time Inconsistency. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

522. Oren Bar-Gill, Oliver J. Board. 2011. Product Use Information and the Limits of Voluntary Disclosure. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

523. Fabian Herweg, Konrad Mierendorff. 2011. Uncertain Demand, Consumer Loss Aversion, and Flat-Rate Tariffs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

524. Kaifu Zhang, Paddy V. Padmanabhan. 2011. Feature Overload. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

525. Stephen Leider, Ozge Sahin. 2011. Contracts, Biases and Consumption of Access Services. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

526. Marco Casari, Davide Dragone. 2011. Impatience, Anticipatory Feelings and Uncertainty: A Dynamic Experiment on Time Preferences. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

527. Danit Ein-Gar, Jacob Goldenberg, Lilach Sagiv. 2011. The Role of Consumers' Self-Control in the Consumption of Virtue Products. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

528. Kristian Ove R. Myrseth, Conny E. Wollbrant. 2011. Naïve and Capricious: Stumbling into the Ring of Self-Control Conflict. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

529. Giacomo Calzolari, Mattia Nardotto. 2011. Nudging with Information: A Randomized Field Experiment on Reminders and Feedback. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

530. Zvi Bodie, Henriette M. Prast. 2011. Rational Pensions for Irrational People: Behavioral Science Lessons for the Netherlands. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

531. Paolo Crosetto, Alexia Gaudeul. 2011. Do Consumers Prefer Offers that are Easy to Compare? An Experimental Investigation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

532. Abraham Lioui. 2011. Time Consistent vs. Time Inconsistent Dynamic Asset Allocation: Some Utility Cost Calculations for Mean Variance Preferences. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

533. Avi Goldfarb, Teck H. Ho, Wilfred Amaldoss, Alexander L. Brown, Yan Chen, Tony Haitao Cui, Alberto Galasso, Tanjim Hossain, Ming Hsu, Noah Lim, Mo Xiao, Botao Yang. 2011. Behavioral Models of Managerial Decision-Making. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

534. Tabea Bucher-Koenen, Carsten Schmidt. 2011. Time (In)Consistent Food Choice of Children and Teenagers. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

535. Justin Sydnor. 2010. (Over)insuring Modest Risks. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **2**:4, 177-199. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

536. X. Henry Wang, Bill Z. Yang. 2010. The sunk-cost effect and optimal two-part pricing. *Journal of Economics* **101**:2, 133-148. [Crossref]

537. Chris M. Wilson, Catherine Waddams Price. 2010. Do consumers switch to the best supplier?. *Oxford Economic Papers* **62**:4, 647-668. [Crossref]

538. Gharad Bryan, Dean Karlan, Scott Nelson. 2010. Commitment Devices. *Annual Review of Economics* **2**:1, 671-698. [Crossref]

539. Orazio P. Attanasio,, Guglielmo Weber. 2010. Consumption and Saving: Models of Intertemporal Allocation and Their Implications for Public Policy. *Journal of Economic Literature* **48**:3, 693-751. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

540. Alessandro Bucciol, Daniel Houser, Marco Piovesan. 2010. Willpower in children and adults: a survey of results and economic implications. *International Review of Economics* **57**:3, 259-267. [Crossref]

541. Cameron Hepburn, Stephen Duncan, Antonis Papachristodoulou. 2010. Behavioural Economics, Hyperbolic Discounting and Environmental Policy. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **46**:2, 189-206. [Crossref]

542. Peter Kooreman, Henriëtte Prast. 2010. What Does Behavioral Economics Mean for Policy? Challenges to Savings and Health Policies in the Netherlands. *De Economist* **158**:2, 101-122. [Crossref]

543. Jan Kramer, Lukas Wiewiorra. Consumer perception of mobile telephony tariffs with cost caps 1-8. [Crossref]

544. Joshua D. Angrist,, Jörn-Steffen Pischke,. 2010. The Credibility Revolution in Empirical Economics: How Better Research Design is Taking the Con out of Econometrics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **24**:2, 3-30. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

545. Justine Hastings,, Ebonya Washington. 2010. The First of the Month Effect: Consumer Behavior and Store Responses. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **2**:2, 142-162. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

546. Tomomi Tanaka,, Colin F. Camerer,, Quang Nguyen. 2010. Risk and Time Preferences: Linking Experimental and Household Survey Data from Vietnam. *American Economic Review* **100**:1, 557-571. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

547. Katherine L. Milkman, Todd Rogers, Max H. Bazerman. 2010. I'll have the ice cream soon and the vegetables later: A study of online grocery purchases and order lead time. *Marketing Letters* **21**:1, 17-35. [Crossref]

548. Brad R. Humphreys, Jane E. Ruseski. 2010. Problems With Data on the Sport Industry. *Journal of Sports Economics* **11**:1, 60-76. [Crossref]

549. Moshe Ben-Akiva. Planning and Action in a Model of Choice 19-34. [Crossref]

550. Zafer Akin. 2010. Intertemporal Decision Making with Present Biased Preferences. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

551. James I. Stewart. 2010. Why did Farmers Belong to Interest Groups? Evidence on the Causes of Membership from the Farmers' Alliance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

552. Timothy S. Simcoe, Alberto Galasso. 2010. CEO Over-Confidence and Innovation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

553. Daniel Houser, Daniel Schunk, Joachim K. Winter, Erte Xiao. 2010. Temptation and Commitment in the Laboratory. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

554. Joshua D. Angrist, Jörn-Steffen Pischke. 2010. The Credibility Revolution in Empirical Economics: How Better Research Design is Taking the Con Out of Econometrics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

555. Jeff Holman, Farhan Zaidi. 2010. The Economics of Prospective Memory. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

556. Natalia Shestakova. 2010. Overcoming Consumer Biases in the Choice of Pricing Schemes: A Lab Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

557. Sofronis Clerides, Pascal Courty. 2010. Sales, Quantity Surcharge, and Consumer Inattention. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

558. Johannes Binswanger, Katherine Grace Carman. 2010. The Miracle of Compound Interest: Does Our Intuition Fail?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

559. Decio Coviello, Andrea Ichino, Nicola Persico. 2010. Don't Spread Yourself Too Thin: The Impact of Task Juggling on Workers' Speed of Job Completion. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

560. Ernesto Reuben, Paola Sapienza, Luigi Zingales. 2010. Procrastination and Impatience. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

561. Ronald L. Goettler, Karen B. Clay. 2010. Tariff Choice with Consumer Learning and Switching Costs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

562. Andre Bonfrer, George Knox, J. Eliashberg, Jeongwen Chiang. 2010. A First-Passage Time Model for Predicting Inactivity in a Contractual Setting. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

563. Hanming Fang, Dan Silverman. 2009. TIME-INCONSISTENCY AND WELFARE PROGRAM PARTICIPATION: EVIDENCE FROM THE NLSY. *International Economic Review* **50**:4, 1043-1077. [Crossref]

564. Zafer Akin. 2009. Imperfect information processing in sequential bargaining games with present biased preferences. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **30**:4, 642-650. [Crossref]

565. George Knox, Jehoshua Eliashberg. 2009. The consumer's rent vs. buy decision in the rentailer. *International Journal of Research in Marketing* **26**:2, 125-135. [Crossref]

566. Katherine L. Milkman, Todd Rogers, Max H. Bazerman. 2009. Highbrow Films Gather Dust: Time-Inconsistent Preferences and Online DVD Rentals. *Management Science* **55**:6, 1047-1059. [Crossref]

567. Stefano DellaVigna. 2009. Psychology and Economics: Evidence from the Field. *Journal of Economic Literature* **47**:2, 315-372. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

568. Marco Casari. 2009. Pre-commitment and flexibility in a time decision experiment. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* **38**:2, 117-141. [Crossref]

569. Anna Aizer, Pedro Dal Bó. 2009. Love, hate and murder: Commitment devices in violent relationships. *Journal of Public Economics* **93**:3-4, 412-428. [Crossref]

570. Alejandro Ponce, Enrique Seira, Guillermo Zamarripa. 2009. Do Consumers Borrow on Their Cheapest Credit Card? Evidence From Mexico. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

571. Nicholas Barberis. 2009. A Model of Casino Gambling. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

572. Oren Bar-Gill. 2009. Pricing Misperception: Explaining Pricing Structure in the Cellular Service Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

573. John K. Ashton, Robert Hudson. 2009. Should the Joint Provision of Credit Insurance with Unsecured Lending Be Prohibited? An Examination of the UK Payment Protection Insurance Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

574. Alexia Gaudeul, Robert Sugden. 2009. Spurious Complexity and Common Standards in Markets for Consumer Goods. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

575. Katherine L. Milkman, Todd Rogers, Max H. Bazerman. 2009. Highbrow Films Gather Dust: Time-Inconsistent Preferences and Online DVD Rentals. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

576. Wei Wei, Charles Møller. 2009. Supply Chain Flexibility: Review and Future Directions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

577. W. Kip Viscusi, Joel Huber, Jason Bell. 2008. Estimating discount rates for environmental quality from utility-based choice experiments. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* **37**:2-3, 199-220. [Crossref]

578. Oz Shy. 2008. Measuring the cost of making payment decisions. *The Journal of Socio-Economics* **37**:6, 2411-2416. [Crossref]

579. Nicholas Economides, Katja Seim, V. Brian Viard. 2008. Quantifying the benefits of entry into local phone service. *The RAND Journal of Economics* **39**:3, 699-730. [Crossref]

580. John Beshears, James J. Choi, David Laibson, Brigitte C. Madrian. 2008. How are preferences revealed?. *Journal of Public Economics* **92**:8-9, 1787-1794. [Crossref]

581. DANIEL GOTTLIEB. 2008. Competition over Time-Inconsistent Consumers. *Journal of Public Economic Theory* **10**:4, 673-684. [Crossref]

582. Eric A. Finkelstein, Justin G. Trogdon, Derek S. Brown, Benjamin T. Allaire, Pam S. Dellea, Sachin J. Kamal-Bahl. 2008. The Lifetime Medical Cost Burden of Overweight and Obesity: Implications for Obesity Prevention. *Obesity* **16**:8, 1843-1848. [Crossref]

583. Mark Dodd. 2008. Obesity and time-inconsistent preferences. *Obesity Research & Clinical Practice* **2**:2, 83-89. [Crossref]

584. Katherine L. Milkman, Todd Rogers, Max H. Bazerman. 2008. Harnessing Our Inner Angels and Demons: What We Have Learned About Want/Should Conflicts and How That Knowledge Can Help Us Reduce Short-Sighted Decision Making. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* **3**:4, 324-338. [Crossref]

585. Ted O'Donoghue, Matthew Rabin. 2008. Procrastination on long-term projects. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **66**:2, 161-175. [Crossref]

586. Don A. Moore, Francis J. Flynn. 2008. 9 The Case for Behavioral Decision Research in Organizational Behavior. *The Academy of Management Annals* **2**:1, 399-431. [Crossref]

587. Ernesto Reuben, Paola Sapienza, Luigi Zingales. 2008. Procrastination and Impatience. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

588. Zhijian (James) Huang, K. Jeremy Ko. 2008. Time-Inconsistent Risk Preferences in a Laboratory Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

589. Ping Xiao, Tat Y. Chan, Chakravarthi Narasimhan. 2008. Product Bundling Under Three-Part Tariffs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

590. Zafer Akin. 2008. Imperfect Information Processing in Sequential Bargaining Games with Present Biased Preferences. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

591. Anton Suvorov, Jeroen van de Ven. 2008. Goal Setting as a Self-Regulation Mechanism. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

592. Nicholas Economides, Katja Seim, V. Brian Viard. 2008. Quantifying the Benefits of Entry into Local Phone Service. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

593. George Knox, J. Eliashberg. 2008. The Consumer's Rent Vs. Buy Decision in the Rentailer. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

594. Gary Charness, Uri Gneezy. 2008. Incentives to Exercise. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

595. Don A. Moore, Francis J. Flynn. 2008. 9 The Case for Behavioral Decision Research in Organizational Behavior. *Academy of Management Annals* **2**:1, 399-431. [Crossref]

596. Gregory S. Berns, David Laibson, George Loewenstein. 2007. Intertemporal choice – toward an integrative framework. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **11**:11, 482-488. [Crossref]

597. Michael Conlin, Ted O'Donoghue, Timothy J. Vogelsang. 2007. Projection Bias in Catalog Orders. *American Economic Review* **97**:4, 1217-1249. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

598. Susanna Esteban, Eiichi Miyagawa, Matthew Shum. 2007. Nonlinear pricing with self-control preferences. *Journal of Economic Theory* **135**:1, 306-338. [Crossref]

599. Bruno S. Frey, Christine Benesch, Alois Stutzer. 2007. Does watching TV make us happy?. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **28**:3, 283-313. [Crossref]

600. Steven D. Levitt, John A. List. 2007. Viewpoint: On the generalizability of lab behaviour to the field. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique* **40**:2, 347-370. [Crossref]

601. Steven D. Levitt, John A. List. 2007. What Do Laboratory Experiments Measuring Social Preferences Reveal About the Real World?. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **21**:2, 153-174. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

602. 2007. Book Reviews. *Journal of Economic Literature* **45**:1, 165-218. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

603. Benjamin E. Hermalin, Avery W. Katz, Richard Craswell. Chapter 1 Contract Law 3-138. [Crossref]

604. Leonard Lee, Michael I. Norton. 2007. The Fees -> Savings Link, or Purchasing Fifty Pounds of Pasta. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

605. Zafer Akin, Abdullah Yavas. 2007. An Experimental Analysis of Time-Inconsistency in Long-Run Projects. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

606. Uri Simonsohn, Dan Ariely. 2007. When Rational Sellers Face Non-Rational Buyers: Evidence from Herding on eBay. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

607. Stephan Meier, Charles Sprenger. 2007. Impatience and Credit Behavior: Evidence from a Field Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

608. Chris M. Wilson, Catherine Waddams Price. 2007. Do Consumers Switch to the Best Supplier?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

609. Drew Fudenberg. 2006. Advancing Beyond Advances in Behavioral Economics. *Journal of Economic Literature* **44**:3, 694-711. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

610. Anja Lambrecht, Bernd Skiera. 2006. Paying Too Much and Being Happy about It: Existence, Causes, and Consequences of Tariff-Choice Biases. *Journal of Marketing Research* **43**:2, 212-223. [Crossref]

611. Claus Bjorn Jorgensen. 2006. Field Evidence on the Law of Small Numbers. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

612. Nicholas Economides. 2006. Quantifying the Benefits of Entry into Local Phone Service. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

613. Henrik Cronqvist. 2006. Advertising and Portfolio Choice. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

614. W. Kip Viscusi, Joel C. Huber. 2006. Hyperbolic Discounting of Public Goods. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

615. Christine Benesch, Bruno S. Frey, Alois Stutzer. 2006. TV Channels, Self Control and Happiness. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

616. Xavier Gabaix, David I. Laibson. 2005. Shrouded Attributes, Consumer Myopia, and Information Suppression in Competitive Markets. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

617. Alessandro Ancarani, Carmela Di Mauro. The Human Side of Supply Chains 1453-1476. [Crossref]