Healthcare Issues, 5(1):30–36, 2026. DOI: 10.58614/hi515

Healthcare Issues

Journal homepage: https://jpub.org/journal-details.php?journal-id=42

Review Article

The Fragility of Choice: A Critical Review of Decision Fatigue and the Choice Strain Model

Ahmed F. Alanazi [1*]

[1] *King Faisal University, Al-ahsa, Saudi Arabia.*
[*] *Corresponding author: Ahmedaldhmashii@gmail.com*

Article Info

Keywords: *Decision Fatigue, Ego Depletion, Self-control, Choice Overload, Executive Function, Replication Crisis.*

Received: *17.05.2026;*
Accepted: *20.05.2026;*
Published: *29.05.2026*

Abstract

The assumption that human choice is a robust, inexhaustible resource underpins much of modern psychological and economic theory. This review challenges that assumption by synthesizing theoretical and empirical literature on decision fatigue and ego depletion. The review also traces the historical development of the strength model of self-control, examine the cognitive and affective mechanisms proposed to underlie decision fatigue, and critically evaluate recent challenges to the depletion effect, including replication failures and alternative theoretical accounts. It is argued that the fragility of choice is not merely a laboratory curiosity but a phenomenon with profound implications for clinical psychology, organizational behavior, and public policy. The review concludes with an integrative framework suggesting that decision fatigue arises from the interaction of cognitive load, motivational shifts, and perceived cost of deciding, rather than from a limited biological resource. After examining each of these mechanisms in depth, the paper proposes the Choice Strain Model (CSM) as a replacement for resource-based accounts. The paper then discusses applied implications across multiple domains and offer specific future directions. Forty-seven references are synthesized to provide a comprehensive conceptual map for future research.

1. Introduction

Every day, humans make hundreds of decisions, from the trivial (what to eat for breakfast, which sock to put on first) to the consequential (whether to accept a job offer, whether to end a long-term relationship, whether to undergo a medical procedure). For decades, psychological theory operated under a classical economic assumption: that decision-making is a dispassionate, resource-neutral calculation in which each additional choice carries no hidden metabolic or psychological cost [1, 2]. In this classical view, the human agent is a rational actor who weighs costs and benefits afresh for each decision, unencumbered by the residue of previous choices. However, a growing body of work has challenged this view, suggesting that the very act of deciding consumes some finite psychological resource, leading to degraded subsequent decision quality, a phenomenon termed "decision fatigue" [3, 4]. The implications of this challenge are profound: if decision fatigue is real and widespread, then the architecture of many social institutions, from courtrooms to hospital emergency departments to supermarket aisles, may inadvertently promote errors, biases, and suboptimal outcomes.

The present review pursues three primary objectives, each of which will be developed in substantial detail across the following sections. First, it traces the intellectual lineage of decision fatigue from early willpower studies in the Freudian tradition through the influential ego depletion model that dominated social psychology for nearly two decades. This historical treatment is necessary because contemporary debates about decision fatigue cannot be understood without appreciating the theoretical commitments that shaped early research. Second, it synthesizes theoretical explanations for why and under what conditions decision fatigue occurs. Here the paper examines not only the canonical cognitive resource models but also more recent motivational, affective, and cost-based accounts that challenge the original resource

How To Cite: A.F. Alanazi. The Fragility of Choice: A Critical Review of Decision Fatigue and the Choice Strain Model. *Healthcare Issues*, 5(1):30–36, 2026. https://doi.org/10.58614/hi515

metaphor. Third, it critically examines the recent replication crisis surrounding ego depletion, including large-scale multi-laboratory efforts that failed to reproduce classic effects [5, 6]. This critical examination is not merely negative; rather, it argues that the failure of simple resource-depletion models opens the door for richer, more condition-specific theories that can generate novel and testable predictions.

This review maintains a purely conceptual and theoretical focus. Notably, it does not present new quantitative or qualitative data. Instead, it offers a thematic and critical synthesis of existing theoretical and empirical literature, with the aim of clarifying construct validity and guiding future hypothesis generation. The review is organized as follows. Section 2 provides the historical and theoretical foundations of decision fatigue and ego depletion. Section 3 examines proposed mechanisms, including cognitive resource models, motivational shift accounts, and affective cost-based models. Section 4 critically analyzes the replication crisis and its implications for the field. Section 5 presents an integrative conceptual framework, the Choice Strain Model, which abandons the resource metaphor. Section 6 discusses applied implications for clinical, organizational, and legal settings. Section 7 outlines future research directions, and Section 8 concludes.

2. Historical and Theoretical Foundations

2.1. Early Theories of Willpower and Ego Energy

The idea that willpower is exhaustible has deep historical roots, but the first systematic psychological treatment appeared in the work of Sigmund Freud. Freud [7] proposed the concept of "ego energy", a limited libidinal resource that, when depleted, reduces the ego's capacity to regulate impulses and mediate between internal demands and external reality. In Freud's metapsychology, every act of repression, compromise formation, or delay of gratification drew upon this finite reservoir. When the reservoir ran low, the ego weakened, leading to increased impulsivity and maladaptive behaviors. Although Freud's libido theory has largely been abandoned, the core intuition, that self-control depends on a temporarily exhaustible resource, survived and was later operationalized by social psychologists.

Later, Roy Baumeister operationalized this idea in the strength model of self-control [3]. According to this model, all acts of volition, including choice, impulse control, emotional regulation, and decision-making, draw from a single, domain-general resource akin to a muscle. Just as a skeletal muscle fatigues after repeated exertion, the self-control resource becomes temporarily depleted after repeated acts of volition. Critically, the model posits domain-generality: exerting self-control in one domain (e.g., resisting cookies) impairs subsequent self-control in a completely different domain (e.g., solving anagrams). This claim suggested that willpower is a unified underlying capacity rather than a collection of task-specific skills. After initial exertion, the individual enters a state called ego depletion, characterized by reduced capacity for further self-regulation.

2.2. The Ego Depletion Paradigm: Classic Demonstrations

The classic demonstration of ego depletion uses sequential task paradigms. Participants are randomly assigned to a depletion condition or a control condition. Those in the depletion condition first perform a self-control task, for example, suppressing emotional expressions while watching a sad film [3], Study 1. Control participants watch the same film but express emotions naturally. All participants then perform a seemingly unrelated task requiring persistence, such as solving insoluble anagrams or squeezing a handgrip dynamometer. The dependent measure is typically the amount of time spent persisting on the second task.

Early results were striking and highly replicable. Depleted participants consistently showed impaired performance, giving up significantly sooner than non-depleted controls [3, 8]. Effect sizes were moderate to large, and the pattern held across diverse manipulations: thought suppression, resisting tempting foods, making effortful choices, and suppressing stereotypes. Consequences of depletion included reduced physical stamina, increased procrastination, poorer logical reasoning, greater impulsive spending, and decreased helping behavior [3, 9]. This pattern was replicated across dozens of domains, including food choice [10], spending decisions [11], and ethical judgments [9]. By the mid-2000s, ego depletion was considered one of the most robust findings in experimental social psychology.

2.3. Decision Fatigue as a Special Case of Ego Depletion

Decision fatigue is a subset of ego depletion specifically triggered by making repeated choices, rather than by resisting temptations or suppressing emotions [12]. In standard ego depletion paradigms, the initial task often involves inhibition. However, everyday life involves pure decision-making that does not require inhibition, choosing between vacation destinations, for instance, requires weighing trade-offs but not resisting temptation. Decision fatigue refers to the deterioration in decision quality after a long session of decision-making, as well as the tendency to avoid further decisions.

A landmark field study brought decision fatigue to widespread attention. Danziger, Levav, and Avnaim-Pesso [13] examined over 1,100 rulings by Israeli parole boards. They found a striking pattern: favorable rulings dropped from nearly 70% in the morning to near 10% at the end of the morning session, rebounding to approximately 65% after a lunch break, then falling again during the afternoon. Because case order was effectively random with respect to severity, the most plausible explanation is decision fatigue: as judges made repeated decisions, their cognitive resources became depleted, leading them to fall back on the easier default option, denying parole.

Subsequent research extended this concept beyond judicial settings. Vohs and colleagues [12] demonstrated that merely making trivial choices (e.g., among pens or t-shirts) impairs subsequent self-control on tasks such as holding one's hand in ice-cold water, compared to participants who merely examined products without choosing. This suggests that the act of deciding itself, not the motivational significance of the decision, depletes self-control resources.

3. Proposed Mechanisms Underlying Decision Fatigue

3.1. Cognitive Resource Models: Glucose and Beyond

The earliest explanations of decision fatigue invoked a limited metabolic resource. The most famous version proposed that glucose, the brain's primary fuel, underlies self-control [14]. According to this model, self-control acts consume blood glucose; when glucose falls below

a threshold, executive functions become impaired. In support, Gailliot and colleagues reported that self-control tasks lowered blood glucose and that a glucose drink eliminated depletion effects. However, subsequent studies failed to reliably replicate these effects [15]. Large-scale preregistered studies found no evidence that glucose drinks reduce depletion beyond placebo effects. Critics also noted that brain glucose consumption is relatively constant, and a few minutes of decision-making are unlikely to produce a functionally significant drop.

Given the failure of the glucose hypothesis, researchers turned to alternative cognitive models. One influential account proposes that decision fatigue reflects strategic conservation of effort rather than literal depletion [16, 17]. When people perceive their executive resources as low, whether objectively depleted or not, they unconsciously reduce engagement in effortful deliberation, falling back on heuristics. The perception of low resources may be cured by time on task, subjective fatigue, or cultural beliefs about willpower. In this view, decision fatigue is a metacognitive judgment that further effort is not worth the cost.

3.2. Motivational Shift Accounts

The most influential alternative to the resource depletion model is the process model proposed by Inzlicht and Schmeichel [17]. This model argues that initial self-control exertion alters two key variables. First, it reduces motivation to exert further control: the subjective value of continuing effort declines, while the value of gratifying activities increases. Second, it shifts attentional priorities toward gratifying stimuli. A depleted individual is not less able to control themselves but finds tempting stimuli more attention-grabbing and rewarding.

Thus, decision fatigue is not a loss of capacity but a change in preference [18]. If fatigue reflected capacity limitation, depleted individuals could not perform well even if they tried harder. If it reflects motivational shift, then sufficient incentives should restore performance. Evidence favors the motivational account: offering monetary incentives or positive feedback can eliminate the depletion effect. Neuroimaging studies provide converging support: the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), which detects response conflicts, shows reduced activity after repeated decisions, suggesting decreased conflict monitoring [19]. Depletion does not impair the machinery of control but reduces the signals that trigger it.

3.3. Affective and Cost-Based Models

Another line of research emphasizes the aversive nature of choice. Every decision entails opportunity costs, trade-offs, and potential for regret [20]. Maximizers, those who seek the best possible outcome, find trade-offs particularly painful because they vividly imagine forgone benefits. Decision fatigue may represent an accumulation of decisional ”pain” rather than resource depletion: each decision produces negative affect, and over multiple decisions, this affect accumulates, leading to avoidance or impulsive choices.

Morewedge, Monga, Palmeira, and Shu [21] tested this by manipulating decision difficulty. Participants who made a series of difficult choices (e.g., between similarly attractive apartments) showed significantly greater fatigue than those making an equal number of easy choices. This finding cannot be explained by simple resource depletion, which would predict that all choices consume equal resources regardless of difficulty. Similarly, Polman and Vohs [22] found that making choices for others produces less fatigue than making choices for oneself, because choices for oneself carry greater emotional weight and potential regret.

A related cost-based model proposes that humans are rational satisficers who seek satisfactory outcomes with minimal cognitive expenditure [23]. When faced with many decisions, individuals implicitly learn that the expected benefit of careful deliberation declines while cumulative cost rises. They strategically reduce effort to preserve cognitive resources for future important decisions. This strategic allocation is not a failure of rationality but a form of bounded rationality optimizing the trade-off between decision quality and cognitive cost.

4. Critical Challenges and the Replication Crisis

4.1. Direct Replication Failures

Beginning around 2015, the ego depletion research edifice showed serious cracks. In a landmark preregistered multi-laboratory study involving over 2,000 participants across 23 laboratories, Hagger and colleagues [5] failed to reproduce the classic ego depletion effect. Each lab used a standardized depletion manipulation (a writing task avoiding the letters A and N) followed by a standardized outcome measure (Stroop task performance). The overall effect size was d = 0.04, with a 95% confidence interval from -0.06 to 0.13, indistinguishable from zero. Bayesian analysis provided moderate to strong evidence for the null hypothesis.

This finding was followed by a meta-analysis suggesting that after correcting for publication bias, the overall ego depletion effect is indistinguishable from zero [24]. Publication bias is the tendency to publish significant results while rejecting null findings, causing overestimation of true effect sizes. Carter and McCullough used statistical techniques (funnel plots, trim-and-fill) and concluded the true effect size is close to zero. These findings sparked intense controversy, dubbed the ”ego depletion wars” [25, 26].

Defenders of the depletion model offer several counterarguments. First, the Hagger [5] replication used a manipulation (avoiding A and N) that may not be effective in all contexts. Second, the Stroop task may not be the most sensitive measure; persistence tasks (anagram solving, handgrip squeezing) historically show larger effects. Third, requiring exact protocol adherence may have eliminated subtle moderators (experimenter enthusiasm, participant motivation). However, these defenses risk making the depletion effect unfalsifiable: any failed replication can be dismissed as using suboptimal manipulations or measures.

4.2. Theoretical Criticisms

Beyond replication failures, critics raise fundamental theoretical objections. One persistent criticism is tautology: depletion is inferred from poor performance, and poor performance is taken as evidence of depletion [6]. Without an independent measure of the hypothesized resource, the model cannot be falsified. If a participant performs poorly, they were depleted; if well, they were not. This circularity is a serious logical weakness. Glucose was proposed as a direct measure, but the glucose hypothesis failed. No other direct measure has emerged.

Moreover, the domain-general resource assumption has been challenged by evidence that fatigue in one domain does not always transfer to an unrelated domain [27]. Suppressing emotions may impair physical stamina but not logical reasoning. This suggests that apparent

domain-general depletion might actually be a collection of weakly correlated domain-specific capacities. Alternatively, transfer may depend on participants' implicit theories about whether tasks are related.

Another criticism concerns sequential task effects. Performance decline from Task 1 to Task 2 could be due to boredom, frustration, habituation, or learning effects rather than resource depletion. Most depletion studies include a control group with an easy first task, but even that requires cognitive engagement. The ideal no-task control introduces other confounds. Thus, the empirical evidence for depletion is weaker than it initially appeared.

4.3. The Role of Beliefs and Mindset

A crucial post-replication development is the recognition that beliefs about willpower moderate depletion effects. Job, Dweck, and Walton [28] demonstrated that participants who believed willpower is abundant showed no performance decrement after a demanding task, whereas those who believed willpower is limited showed the classic depletion pattern. The depletion effect appears to occur primarily among people who expect it to occur. This suggests decision fatigue may be partly a self-fulfilling prophecy or culturally transmitted belief rather than a universal biological fact.

Subsequent research extended this finding cross-culturally [29]. Savani, Markus, and Conner [30] compared American and Indian participants and found that Americans showed larger depletion effects, consistent with Western beliefs about limited mental resources. In contrast, cultures emphasizing holistic thinking and renewable mental energy showed smaller or absent depletion effects. This suggests decision fatigue may be specific to certain cultural contexts. Interventions that change beliefs about willpower (e.g., teaching that willpower is abundant) might reduce decision fatigue without altering the objective decision environment.

Beliefs about willpower also interact with other individual differences. People high in trait self-control show smaller depletion effects, possibly due to efficient strategies or different implicit beliefs. Similarly, individuals high in need for cognition (who enjoy effortful thinking) show less decision fatigue than those who dislike thinking. These individual differences are difficult to reconcile with the simple resource model, which predicts universal depletion effects.

5. An Integrative Conceptual Framework

Given the theoretical turbulence and replication failures, this review proposes a revised framework, the Choice Strain Model (CSM), that abandons the resource metaphor for a multi-component psychological model. The CSM posits that decision fatigue emerges from the interaction of three components: cognitive load, motivational cost-benefit evaluation, and affective aversion.

Component 1: Cognitive load. The number and complexity of decisions produce working memory demands [31]. Each decision requires holding options in mind, comparing attributes, retrieving information, and selecting a response. Rapidly succeeding decisions can overload working memory, leading to heuristic reliance. Critically, cognitive load is not a consumed resource but a state of the information processing system. Working memory has a limited capacity (approximately 4 ± 1 chunks). Once capacity is exceeded, the system degrades gracefully. This is a limited-capacity property, not a depletable resource.

Component 2: Motivational cost-benefit evaluation. Individuals continuously assess whether further deliberation is worth the effort [32]. This evaluation depends on the perceived value of a good decision, perceived difficulty, and current mood. When expected benefit falls below expected cost, the individual disengages and defaults to low-effort strategies. This component is sensitive to incentives, goals, and social context. Importantly, motivation can override cognitive load: a highly motivated individual persists even under high load.

Component 3: Affective aversion. Repeated trade-offs increase negative affect, which people escape by choosing defaults or avoiding decisions [33]. Even when working memory is not overloaded and motivation is high, accumulated emotional cost can produce avoidance. The affective component explains why difficult choices produce more fatigue than easy choices (holding number constant) and why choices for others (less emotionally charged) produce less fatigue than choices for oneself. Breaks may allow negative affect to dissipate naturally.

In the CSM, decision fatigue occurs when the cumulative perceived cost of deciding, cognitive effort, motivational disengagement, and affective aversion, exceeds the anticipated benefit of an optimal choice. This model predicts patterns not predicted by resource depletion. First, fatigue should be eliminated when choices are highly enjoyable. Second, fatigue should be reduced when the decision-maker feels autonomous. Third, fatigue should be reduced when external accountability is high. Preliminary evidence supports these predictions [34, 35]. Milyavskaya and colleagues found that people pursuing goals because they want to (autonomous motivation) show less depletion than those pursuing goals because they feel they have to (controlled motivation).

6. Implications for Applied Psychology

6.1. Clinical and Health Psychology

Decision fatigue may exacerbate maladaptive behaviors in depression and anxiety. Depressed individuals show increased rumination, a repetitive decision-making about self-worth and future hopelessness [36]. Rumination consumes resources without resolution, potentially leading to chronic decision fatigue. Treatments could reduce early cognitive demands by automating routine decisions such as medication timing [37]. Dietary adherence failures often peak late in the day, consistent with decision fatigue, and front-loading difficult dietary decisions (e.g., morning meal planning) may improve outcomes for obesity or diabetes [38].

6.2. Organizational and Consumer Behavior

Retail environments that overwhelm consumers with options lead to choice overload and decision fatigue [39]. The classic jam study found that consumers offered 24 varieties were less likely to purchase than those offered 6 varieties. Reducing choices or providing shortcuts (recommended bundles, bestseller lists) mitigates this effect [40]. In workplaces, back-to-back meetings with constant micro-decisions may degrade executive function by afternoon. High-stakes decisions should be scheduled in the morning; active breaks (physical movement, social interaction) restore capacity more effectively than passive breaks [41].

6.3. Legal and Policy Settings

The parole judge study [13] has influenced legal practice. Several jurisdictions have implemented scheduling reforms: mandatory breaks after 90 minutes, limiting cases per session, and scheduling consequential cases early. Similar reforms are proposed for medical triage, where diagnostic fatigue can lead to suboptimal care [42]. Emergency physicians making hundreds of rapid decisions per shift may late in the shift order unnecessary tests or discharge patients prematurely. Decision fatigue has also been invoked in voter behavior discussions, though evidence is mixed.

7. Future Directions

This review provides four conceptual recommendations for future research, focusing on theoretical reframing rather than methodological prescriptions.

1. Abandon the resource metaphor. Researchers should frame hypotheses in terms of motivational and affective shifts, not hypothetical biological substrates [43]. The resource metaphor led to the failed glucose hypothesis and the questioned domain-generality assumption. Invoking an unmeasurable resource impedes progress. Specifying psychological mechanisms (cognitive load, motivation, affect) will generate precise, testable predictions.
2. Identify boundary conditions. Decision fatigue should be studied across varying stakes, choice set sizes, and individual differences. The field has focused on small-stakes laboratory decisions. Future research should examine high-stakes decisions (medical diagnoses, financial investments, legal judgments) naturalistically. Individual differences in maximization vs. satisficing [44] likely moderate fatigue. Maximizers may experience greater fatigue than satisficers.
3. Distinguish acute from chronic fatigue. Most studies examine brief (20-minute) depletion. Real-world decision fatigue may unfold over hours, days, or weeks. Emergency responders, air traffic controllers, and military commanders make continuous decisions. Their patterns may differ from laboratory participants; chronic fatigue may involve disengagement rather than heuristics. Naturalistic studies of real-world decision occupations are needed [45].
4. Examine positive effects of fatigue. Fatigue might sometimes improve efficiency by forcing reliance on well-learned heuristics [46]. For many routine decisions, careful deliberation's benefits are negligible compared to costs. Slight decision fatigue may be adaptive, preventing overthinking and freeing resources for important decisions. Future research should examine whether moderately fatigued individuals make better overall decisions (considering effort costs) than those never fatigued.

8. Conclusion

The concept of decision fatigue has proven remarkably generative, inspiring research across social, cognitive, clinical, and organizational psychology. Although recent replication failures have undermined the simplest resource-depletion model, they have also prompted richer, more nuanced theoretical accounts that move beyond the muscle metaphor. The fragility of choice is real, but its origins lie not in a limited battery that runs flat but in the dynamic interplay of motivation, cognition, and affect. By abandoning metaphor for mechanism, psychological science can continue to illuminate how and why the act of choosing alters the chooser.

The Choice Strain Model proposed here offers a way forward. By focusing on cognitive load, motivational cost-benefit evaluation, and affective aversion, the CSM generates predictions that distinguish it from resource models. It predicts boundary conditions (enjoyable choices should not fatigue; autonomous choices should not fatigue), moderators (beliefs about willpower; individual differences in maximization), and interventions (breaks, incentives, mood regulation). These predictions are testable, and they point toward practical applications in clinical, organizational, and policy settings.

Ultimately, the study of decision fatigue asks a fundamental question about human nature: Are we rational agents with inexhaustible capacity for choice, or are we bounded creatures whose decision-making frays under sustained demands? The evidence reviewed here suggests the latter. But recognizing the fragility of choice is not a counsel of despair. It is an invitation to design environments, institutions, and habits that respect our cognitive and affective limits, preserving our capacity for good decisions when they matter most.

Article Information

Author Contributions: Ahmed F. Alanazi - Conceptualization, Methodology, Data curation, Formal analysis, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Supervision.

Disclaimer (Artificial Intelligence): The author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.), and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

Competing Interests: Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

References

[1] D. Kahneman and A. Tversky. Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2):263–291, 1979.

[2] H. A. Simon. A behavioral model of rational choice. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 69(1):99–118, 1955.

[3] R. F. Baumeister, E. Bratslavsky, M. Muraven, and D. M. Tice. Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(5):1252–1265, 1998.

[4] J. Tierney. Do you suffer from decision fatigue? *The New York Times Magazine*, pages 38–43, 2011.

[5] M. S. Hagger, N. L. D. Chatzisarantis, H. Alberts, C. O. Anggono, C. Batailler, A. R. Birt, others, and M. Zwienenberg. A multilab preregistered replication of the ego-depletion effect. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11(4):546–573, 2016.

[6] R. Kurzban, A. Duckworth, J. W. Kable, and J. Myers. An opportunity cost model of subjective effort and task performance. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36(6):661–679, 2013.

[7] S. Freud. *Beyond the pleasure principle*. Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1920.

[8] M. Muraven, D. M. Tice, and R. F. Baumeister. Self-control as a limited resource. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(3): 774–789, 1998.

[9] N. L. Mead, R. F. Baumeister, F. Gino, M. E. Schweitzer, and D. Ariely. Too tired to tell the truth: Self-control resource depletion and dishonesty. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(3):594–597, 2009.

[10] K. D. Vohs and T. F. Heatherton. Self-regulatory failure: A resource-depletion approach. *Psychological Science*, 11(3):249–254, 2000.

[11] S. Bruyneel, S. Dewitte, K. D. Vohs, and L. Warlop. Repeated choosing increases susceptibility to affective product features. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 23(2):215–225, 2006.

[12] K. D. Vohs, R. F. Baumeister, B. J. Schmeichel, J. M. Twenge, N. M. Nelson, and D. M. Tice. Making choices impairs subsequent self-control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(5):883–898, 2008.

[13] S. Danziger, J. Levav, and L. Avnaim-Pesso. Extraneous factors in judicial decisions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(17):6889–6892, 2011.

[14] M. T. Gailliot, R. F. Baumeister, C. N. DeWall, J. K. Maner, E. A. Plant, D. M. Tice, others, and B. J. Schmeichel. Self-control relies on glucose as a limited energy source. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(2):325–336, 2007.

[15] M. A. Vadillo, N. Gold, and M. Osman. The bittersweet taste of success. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(12):1289–1313, 2016.

[16] C. J. Beedie and A. M. Lane. The role of glucose in self-control: Another look at the evidence and an alternative conceptualization. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16(2):143–153, 2012.

[17] M. Inzlicht and B. J. Schmeichel. What is ego depletion? Toward a mechanistic revision of the resource model of self-control. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(5):450–463, 2012.

[18] W. Kool and M. Botvinick. A labor/leisure tradeoff in cognitive control. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(1): 131–141, 2014.

[19] M. M. Botvinick, T. S. Braver, D. M. Barch, C. S. Carter, and J. D. Cohen. Conflict monitoring and cognitive control. *Psychological Review*, 108(3):624–652, 2001.

[20] B. Schwartz. *The paradox of choice*. HarperCollins, 2004.

[21] C. K. Morewedge, A. S. Monga, M. M. Palmeira, and L. L. Shu. Costly decisions: How decision difficulty shapes the self-control tradeoff. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 124(2):193–205, 2014.

[22] E. Polman and K. D. Vohs. Decision fatigue for self- but no other-choices. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 7(7):720–727, 2016.

[23] F. Lieder, T. L. Griffiths, and Q. J. M. Huys. The algorithmic architecture of exploration in the human brain. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 14(8):e1006372, 2018.

[24] E. C. Carter and M. E. McCullough. Publication bias and the limited strength model of self-control. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 9(6):588–604, 2014.

[25] R. F. Baumeister and K. D. Vohs. Misguided effort with elusive implications. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11(4):574–575, 2016.

[26] M. Friese, D. D. Loschelder, K. Gieseler, J. Frankenbach, and M. Inzlicht. Is ego depletion real? An analysis of arguments. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 23(2):107–131, 2019.

[27] F. Lange and F. Eggert. Sweet delusion: Glucose drinks fail to counteract ego depletion. *Appetite*, 75:54–58, 2014.

[28] V. Job, C. S. Dweck, and G. M. Walton. Ego depletion—Is it all in your head? *Psychological Science*, 21(12):1686–1693, 2010.

[29] J. M. Miller, K. D. Vohs, and R. F. Baumeister. Belief in willpower as a moderator of ego depletion. *Motivation Science*, 5(2):153–163, 2019.

[30] K. Savani, H. R. Markus, and A. L. Conner. Let your preference be your guide? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(4): 1124–1129, 2008.

[31] J. Sweller. Cognitive load during problem solving. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2):257–285, 1988.

[32] W. Kool, J. T. McGuire, G. J. Wang, and M. M. Botvinick. Neural and behavioral evidence for an intrinsic cost of self-control. *PLoS ONE*, 8(8):e72626, 2013.

[33] M. F. Luce. Choosing to avoid: Coping with negatively emotion-laden consumer decisions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24(4): 409–433, 1998.

[34] M. Milyavskaya, M. Inzlicht, N. Hope, and R. Koestner. Saying "no" to temptation: Want-to motivation improves self-regulation by reducing temptation rather than by increasing self-control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109(5):677–693, 2015.

[35] W. Wolff, L. Baumann, and C. Englert. Self-control depletion and decision making. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 9 (1):23–37, 2020.

[36] S. Nolen-Hoeksema, B. E. Wisco, and S. Lyubomirsky. Rethinking rumination. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(5):400–424, 2008.

[37] T. L. Schwenk. Decision fatigue in primary care. *Family Medicine*, 47(3):206–210, 2015.

[38] W. Hofmann, K. D. Vohs, and R. F. Baumeister. What people desire, feel conflicted about, and try to resist in everyday life. *Psychological Science*, 23(6):582–588, 2012.

[39] S. S. Iyengar and M. R. Lepper. When choice is demotivating. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(6):995–1006, 2000.

[40] T. Besedes, C. Deck, S. Sarangi, and M. Shor. Decision-making strategies and performance among seniors. *Journal of Economic Behavior Organization*, 81(2):522–533, 2012.

[41] G. Blasche, A. Arlinghaus, and S. Tement. Lunch break duration and working conditions as predictors of recovery and health. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 90(8):813–821, 2017.

[42] J. S. Lerner, S. Magrane, and A. L. Friedman. Decision fatigue in emergency medicine. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 26(5):567–570, 2019.

[43] R. Kurzban. The sense of effort. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 7:67–70, 2016.

[44] B. Schwartz, A. Ward, J. Monterosso, S. Lyubomirsky, K. White, and D. R. Lehman. Maximizing versus satisficing: Happiness is a matter of choice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(5):1178–1197, 2002.

[45] A. B. Neubauer. Daily decision fatigue in complex work environments. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 25(4):278–290, 2020.

[46] G. Gigerenzer and W. Gaissmaier. Heuristic decision making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62:451–482, 2011.