Abstract

Any analysis of self-regulation that focuses solely on willpower in conflict-laden situations is insufficient. Research makes clear that the best way to reach one’s goals is not to resist temptations but to avoid temptations before they arrive; it further suggests that willpower is fragile and not to be relied on; and that the best self-regulators engage in willpower remarkably seldom.

Ainslie analyzes the concept of willpower, which he defines as the process of foregoing small short-term rewards in favor of superior long-term rewards. Willpower, according to this view, entails cognitive conflict between two desires, typically with a passing temptation in conflict with some longstanding goal. Here, we submit that any analysis of goal-directed behavior that is restricted to such in-the-heat-of-the-moment cognitive conflict – no matter how fine-grained and valid – will inevitably miss an indispensable part of the self-regulatory process. Instead, we suggest that deeper insights can be gained by also focusing on the various psychological processes that occur well before facing a temptation. Our commentary thus focuses less on the details of Ainslie’s proposal and more on what his proposal misses.

The disciplines of psychology, economics, and neuroscience presumably turned toward the scientific study of willpower because it appeared to predict a broad set of societally-important outcomes. Willpower, and the related concepts of self-control and self-regulation (Fujita, 2011; Inzlicht, Werner, Briskin, & Roberts, 2021), predict all manner of good outcomes, including academic achievement, health, wealth, even criminal offending ( Moffitt et al., 2011). Famously, 4 year old children who had superior willpower, as assessed by how long they could resist eating a marshmallow, grew up to be adolescents with better academic, social, and health outcomes that persisted into adulthood (Casey et al., 2011; Mischel, Shoda, & Rodriguez, 1989; cf. Watts, Duncan, & Quan, 2018).

The implication of these sorts of prospective studies is clear: willpower is critical for the good life. Or, so it seemed.

The problem is that children who grow up to become well-adjusted adults might not achieve this feat only via willpower. In fact, the importance of willpower is unsettled. Other processes seem more critical. Research over the past decade makes clear that the best way to reach one’s goals is not to fight temptations but to avoid them before they arrive. Research further suggests that willpower is fragile, and that the best self-regulators engage in willpower remarkably seldom.

The first clues that willpower may be overrated came from research examining people who appeared to be the best at meeting their goals. Such people have high trait self-control (Tangney, Baumeister, & Boone, 2004) or high levels of trait conscientiousness (Roberts, Lejuez, Krueger, Richards, & Hill, 2014). What came as a surprise to many at the time was that these people used willpower remarkably infrequently in their daily lives, markedly less than people with low self-control (Hofmann, Baumeister, Förster, & Vohs, 2012a). Instead, it appeared that their self-regulatory abilities were related to the routinization of goal-directed behaviors and the cultivation of good habits (de Ridder, Lensvelt-Mulders, Finkena, Stok, & Baumeister, 2012; Galla & Duckworth, 2015). Why might this be?

People high in trait self-control experience fewer desires that conflict with their longstanding goals; they experience fewer temptations, fewer and less pronounced cognitive conflicts (Hofmann et al., 2012a; Schneider, Gillebaart, & Mattes, 2019). One reason for this is that effective self-regulators pursue goals because they truly feel like they want—to pursue them and not because they feel they have-to pursue them (Converse, Juarez, & Hennecke, 2019). That is, they come up with reasons to pursue their goals that feel autonomous and authentic and not reasons that feel like an imposition (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Such want-to goals seem resistant to temptation, attracting fewer disruptive thoughts and emotions (even implicit ones) that might detract a person from meeting their goals (Milyavskaya, Inzlicht, Hope, & Koestner, 2015).

Effective self-regulators avoid having to use willpower because they make plans that structure their lives to avoid temptation from arising. They are planful and future-oriented, drawing up comprehensive strategies that anticipate and deal with potential obstacles to bring their future goals about (Ludwig, Srivastava, Berkman, & Donnellan, 2018; Ludwig, Srivastava, & Berkman, 2019). They often recruit several simultaneous strategies to achieve their goals, many of which are considered proactive, occurring before a temptation is encountered (Hennecke, Czikmatorni, & Brandstätter, 2019). For example, people high in trait conscientiousness have better romantic relationships, in part, because they avoid situations and actions that can lead to infidelity (Hill, Nickel, & Roberts, 2014).

By cultivating good habits, selecting personally meaningful goals, and avoiding temptation before it arises, effective self-regulators do not need to rely on willpower as often. And this is a good thing, as it is unclear whether willpower should be relied upon. Despite the controversy surrounding the empirical robustness of the concept of ego depletion (Friese, Loschelder, Gieseler, Frankenbach, & Inzlicht, 2019), fatigue, and its downstream consequences on attention, is real (Hockey, 2013). It has long been known that attentional control cannot be sustained indefinitely (Mackworth, 1948). The result of such limits is that people become less able or less willing to sustain their resolve after bouts of effortful work (Blain, Holland, & Pessiglione, 2016; Lin, Saunders, Friese, Evans, & Inzlicht, 2020), although such effects might be considerably smaller than previously thought. And, it is not just fatigue that can impede willpower; stress, bad moods, and alcohol also weaken it (Heatherton & Wagner, 2011).

The benefits of willpower are in doubt in other ways. Although resisting temptations is more effective than not resisting, the empirical success of resistance varies considerably across studies conducted in real life. Some studies find that resistance is adequate (Hennecke et al., 2019; Hofmann, Schmeichel, & Baddeley, 2012b), whereas others find that it was successful in fewer than half the occasions it was attempted (Milyavskaya, Saunders, & Inzlicht, in press). What is worse, when looking beyond success or failure in one particular situation, at least one study suggests there is little connection between regularly
engaging willpower and making progress on one’s goals (Milyavskaya & Inzlicht, 2017). Despite promises that willpower is one of the keys to goal attainment, in the long-run, people who use it may not be better at meeting their goals than people who don’t.

It is not yet clear if willpower is generally effective or not. What seems clear is that willpower is overrated. There are other, and arguably better, means to reach one’s goals; and the people who reach their goals already know it.
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Abstract
The distinction that Ainslie draws among the triple-phenomena “suppression,” “resolve,” and “habit” is a great advance in decision making theory. But the conceptual machinery “willpower,” and its underpinning distinction between small/soon (SS) rewards as opposed to large/later (LL) rewards, provides a faulty framework to understand the triple-phenomena.

This comment welcomes Ainslie’s distinction between three phenomena, what he calls “suppression,” “resolve,” and “habit.” He tries to provide a framework, namely, the term “willpower,” to unite the three. However, “willpower” turns out to be a non-scientific concept. For a concept to be scientific, it must denote a form or an organism, or a concept. For a concept to be scientific, it must denote a form or an organism, or a concept. Ainslie proposes “willpower” as a scientific concept on the position of a common function underpinning the three phenomena. The presumed willpower (1) maintains the suppression of impulses, temptations, and other distractions; (2) sustains the