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ABSTRACT
Psychologists often explore the impact of one act on a subsequent related act. With an eye to the marketing literature, this paper explores two properties of sequential choices that involve the resolution of competing goals. Reinforcement occurs when the goals driving the first choice are made stronger by that choice and result in a congruent subsequent choice. Balance occurs when the first choice satisfies or extinguishes the goals that led to the original decision, producing an incongruent subsequent choice. This review relates a number of psychological frameworks that account for reinforcement or balance responses in sequential choice, and identifies theoretically relevant moderating variables that lead to either response.
Reinforcement vs. Balance Responses in Sequential Choice

“You got to know when to hold ‘em, know when to fold ‘em”

Many aspects of life mirror the dilemma popularized in Kenny Roger’s song, The Gambler. A strategic action can leave one with a poker hand where the question is whether to continue with the original plan or to shift to a new strategy. In the realm of consumer behavior, sequential choice raises similar issues that are relevant to researchers concerned with policy, management, and theory. Consider the following questions:

- Does a shopper’s first purchase in a store alter his likelihood of making subsequent purchases in the store?
- Is a dieter who orders the low-fat entrée more or less likely to order the low-fat dessert?
- Will turning down a large request from a charity alter the reaction to a more modest request made later?
- Are self-help systems that allow balanced deviations from a norm more effective than systems that proscribe all undesired behavior?

These four questions reflect sequential choice scenarios. Each begins with an initial decision that resolves conflicting goals and is followed by a related decision that shares the same conflict. For example, one might first choose a healthy, but not particularly tasty, appetizer and then later choose an artery-clogging, but delicious desert. We focus on whether having made an initial choice supports or extinguishes the cognitions and emotions that led to that decision. When the first choice bolsters a goal, leading to a similar later choice, we term that “reinforcement.” When the first choice satisfies the goal, allowing for an alternative goal to drive the later choice, we term that “balance.”

Since reinforcement and balance are descriptive rather than theoretical terms, we propose that their occurrence depends on the theoretical mechanism operant at the time. We will review a number of theoretical mechanisms that result in goals being reinforced or balanced across successive choices. These mechanisms differ in terms of the time span over which they work, ranging from those that are fragile and short-lived to those that endure.

Within the realm of human behavior, reinforcement and balance with respect to successive actions comprises an enormous topic. This paper provides a selective review with the examples being ones that have particular relevance to the marketing literature. The table gives an overview of the mechanisms we will discuss. As it indicates, the way in which reinforcement and balance manifest depends on the time separating the

---

1 This paper was drawn from the discussion in the “Preference Construction in Sequential Choice” session at the Invitational Choice Symposium in June 2007. Participants were James R. Bettman, Ravi Dhar, Ap Dijksterhuis, Ayelet Fishbach, Ran Kivetz, Nathan Novemsky, Daphna Oyserman, John Payne, Drazen Prelec, Norbert Schwarz, Itamar Simonson, Yaacov Trope, and the authors.

2 The terms “highlighting” and “balancing” have been used analogously (Dhar and Simonson 1999).
sequential choices. Some mechanisms relate to short-term memory and more automatic processes, while others evoke fundamental constructs of meaning and self identity that can have sustained impact over days or weeks, and finally, still others involve multiple decisions over months or years. Within each time span we will review the theoretical mechanisms that lead to either reinforcement or balance, and will summarize moderators of the effect.

Table
Mechanism Driving Reinforcement vs. Balance in Sequential Choice
(Examples are in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time span</th>
<th>Reinforcement</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitory</td>
<td>Mindsets (shopping momentum) Peak experiences</td>
<td>Boredom (inherent rule variability) Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(minutes, hours)</td>
<td>(highlighting) Abstract construal (goal focus)</td>
<td>depletion (limited will power)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enduring</td>
<td>Self perception (foot-in-the-door) Cognitive</td>
<td>Guilt (door-in-the-face) Licensing (goal progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(days, weeks)</td>
<td>consistency (goal commitment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Asceticism (Alcoholics Anonymous and Calvinism)</td>
<td>The golden mean (Weight Watchers and Catholicism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(months, years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before beginning, a methodological comment is relevant. Proving the appropriateness of a particular mechanism between sequential choices is often very difficult. Indeed, as the next section details, endogeneity of sequential choices results in methodological problems which can obfuscate an already complicated story.

Methodological issues complicating understanding sequential choice

Determining the influence of one choice on another evokes two methodological problems. First, there is history, produced by external causes that drive both the first and second choice. Then there is contamination in which the consequences of the first choice may contaminate or obscure the ability to assess its impact on the second choice.

The problem of history arises because the same factor that led to the first choice may lead to the second choice. For example, a person who, through personal preference, buys a low-fat entrée is also likely to be the one who buys a low-fat dessert. If so, the conditional probabilities across heterogeneous respondents cannot isolate the impact of the first decision. A solution to history has been to experimentally manipulate the probability of the first choice, and the critical test is whether increasing the probability of choosing a healthy entrée increases (reinforces) or decreases (balances) the probability of selecting a healthy desert.

Notice that the credibility of such an experiment depends on how the first choice is manipulated. The requirements are clear: the manipulation should influence the
likelihood of the first choice without altering the relationship between the two choices. As an example of an inappropriate manipulation, suppose a promotion for a healthy lifestyle is used to increase the likelihood of choosing a low-fat entrée. A confound arises because the health promotion will simultaneously increase the likelihood of the choice of a low-fat dessert. A more appropriate manipulation is one that demonstrably affects only the first choice. Possibilities include providing an asymmetrically dominated alternative that only favors the healthy alternative or using non-conscious word association (e.g., the sole of a shoe) to promote a healthy choice (e.g., Dover sole). Both manipulations should alter the probability of the first choice without a direct impact on the second choice.

The second methodological issue relates to confounds arising from consequences of the first choice. For example, does the chosen entrée turn out to be tasty or filling? Does choosing it inspire comments from people at the table? Does the choice of entrée complement or supplement other attributes of the desert? Prior research has demonstrated that the outcome of an initial choice can affect the choices one makes subsequently (Novemsky and Dhar 2005). As such, careful testing of both the choices and the manipulations is required to avoid alternative accounts.

In summary, determining the impact of one choice on another is plagued by outside influences and intervening causes. While these can be circumvented, it is our belief that these methodological issues exacerbate the difficulty of resolving theoretical conflicts in experimental work on sequential choice. The subsequent indeterminacy may account for the durability of these issues through the years. For example, fractious conflict about the basis of cognitive dissonance versus self perception has continued for the past thirty years and can be expected to continue for at least thirty more.

The distinction between history and intervening events is relevant to the time lapse between the choices. When the choices are distant in time, then the major theoretical confounds come from intervening events that cloud the influence of a given choice. By contrast, for the proximate choices that we examine next, the major challenge involves teasing apart the effect of the first choice itself from its own historic causes.

**Balance and Reinforcement Immediately Following Choice**

In the short run, reinforcement is an appropriate default. That is, unless there is a strong intervening event or negative reaction to the first choice (e.g., to eat a potato chip), then it is likely that the second choice will be similar to the first (e.g., to eat another potato chip). However, as we will demonstrate, even in the short-term individuals sometimes balance their actions across sequential choices. Below we provide two particularly compelling examples of short run reinforcement and two examples of short run balance.

The reinforcement example comes from Dhar, Huber and Khan (2007) in what they call “shopping momentum.” The idea is that making an initial purchase causes people to be more likely to purchase other products in that store. In a series of experiments, they manipulate the attractiveness of a first choice and show that the choice to begin spending on one product increases the likelihood of continuing that action by purchasing a second
product. In two linked experiments the authors give evidence that these results are consistent with Gollwitzer’s theory of mindsets, where the first choice moves the consumer from a deliberation mindset (whether to pursue) to an implementation mindset (how to pursue). The first experiment demonstrates that an initial purchase increases implementation thoughts, while the second experiment shows that experimentally cueing implementation thoughts increases purchases. The results of these two experiments provide a mechanism whereby mindsets can drive reinforcement between temporally proximal actions.

The authors define two important boundary conditions that reveal the automatic yet fragile nature of the reinforcing effect of shopping momentum. First, the effect is not observed with hypothetical purchase scenarios as consumers are unable to intuit the impact of their initial purchase. Second, highlighting the susceptibility of mindsets to be overridden by new information, the authors found that shopping momentum is substantially reduced if consumers must use a different source of money to pay for the second item.

In contrast to the reinforcing sequential choice behavior observed in the shopping momentum research, there are examples of consumers engaging in short-term balancing. In a particularly relevant series of experiments, Drolet (2002) finds strong support for what she terms “inherent rule variability.” Inherent rule variability stipulates that consumers gain utility from variation and balance in their decision strategies. To show it, Drolet first asks respondents to make choices either from product categories where they are more likely to choose brand name over private label products (cereal and soda) or from product categories where they are more likely to choose private label over brand name products (cotton swabs and sugar). She then gives all participants the same target choice from a product category pre-tested for relatively equivalent preferences across the brand name and the private label products (aspirin). She finds that those who initially chose from the sets that favored choice of the brand name were subsequently more likely to choose the private label product in the target choice. The reverse is true for those who initially chose from the sets favoring the private label products. This pattern is then replicated across a variety of decision strategies such as seeking low prices or choosing the compromise option.

Two differences between the shopping momentum and inherent rule variability studies may account for their contrasting results. First, there are structural differences in the choice tasks. The tests of inherent rule variability have two initial choices, thus the variability may occur because of satiation from the repetition of the first decision strategy. Second, the tests of inherent rule variability involve hypothetical choice scenarios whereas shopping momentum involves actual decisions. When making a series of hypothetical choices, one is often put in a role of considering what the appropriate decision might be. This self reflection contrasts with the relatively mindless response to an initial purchase in shopping momentum. It is in keeping with the idea that reinforcement exhibited in goal continuity is the default (mindless) behavior, but one which can be very easily disrupted by internal or external stimulation.
Indeed, as further evidence for the fragility of these short run carryover effects, researchers have documented other factors that can be manipulated to generate short-term reinforcement versus balance behaviors. Below we elaborate on three examples, resource depletion that leads to balance, desire for peak experience that leads to reinforcement, and construal level that leads to either, depending on whether one’s mindset is abstract or concrete.

Consider first resource depletion, in which initial choices requiring self-control deplete the mental resources that restrain behavior (Muraven and Baumeister 2000; for a review see Baumeister et al. in press). Novemsky and colleagues (2007) demonstrate that a consumer’s level of depletion can affect self-control on choices between vices and virtues. Compared with a control condition, participants who initially underwent a depletion manipulation were significantly more likely to choose the more indulgent option in a subsequent, unrelated choice task. The results of this laboratory study were echoed by a clever field experiment. Students exiting the library after long hours of study (depleted group) were more likely to choose to watch a low-brow comedy, whereas students just entering the library (control group) were able to exert a comparatively greater degree of self control and were more likely to choose a high-brow film.

In consumers’ pursuit of memorable events, Dhar and Simonson (1999) find evidence of deliberate reinforcement. For instance, if an individual has spent a lot of money for a great seat at a ballgame, he is expected to subsequently be more likely to splurge for a premium beer than to save money by drinking a regular domestic beer. The researchers reason that “peak goal fulfillment has a special status that consumers try to achieve from time to time, and they are willing to pay the price for such memorable experiences” (p. 40).

A general factor that alters reinforcement versus balance is the level of abstraction at which choices are processed. Construal level theory posits that with greater psychological distance, consumers will construe a choice more abstractly, forming a higher-level representation focused on central features (Trope and Liberman 2003; for a review see Trope, Liberman, and Wakslak 2007). Conversely, reducing psychological distance leads to more concrete construals, characterized by lower-level representations enriched with details (Trope and Liberman, 2003). In the short-term, sequential choices typically generate balance because the enriched detail emphasizes conflicts between goals. By contrast, a more abstract mindset can serve to reinforce one’s higher order goals across choices (Fishbach, Zhang and Dhar 2006). Supporting their work, Goldsmith, Khan and Dhar (2007) demonstrate that under an abstract mindset, an initial virtuous action increases one’s likelihood of making a subsequent virtuous choice, illustrating reinforcement of “good works” across choices. Conversely, under a concrete mindset, the same initial virtuous action sates one’s goal to be virtuous and decreases one’s likelihood of making a subsequent virtuous choice. Although there can be chronic individual differences in construal level (Vallacher and Wegner 1987), experimentally induced mindsets have only a fleeting effect on behavior. As such, like resource depletion, construal level generally exerts short-term effects on sequential choices which are unlikely to endure.
To summarize, we have illustrated that patterns of behavior (reinforcement or balance) across such short-term sequential choices are fragile and thus lend themselves to a host of both external and internal moderators that emphasize different aspects of the choice. Building on these results, we will next explore more enduring mechanisms underlying reinforcement versus balance that exert longer lasting effects.

**Enduring Mechanisms of Reinforcement vs. Balance**

When an individual perceives a choice to be an expression of long-term beliefs, attitudes or goals, then the effects of that choice tend to persist over time. In most instances of self-perception (Bem 1972), the individual strives to be consistent, thus reinforcing an original choice. In other instances, however, individuals are susceptible to a range of influences that lead them to balance the goals driving their first and later choices.

The enduring impact of self-perception on future decisions has been demonstrated in over four decades of studies examining the positive impact of the decision to comply with an initial small request on the likelihood to comply with a subsequent larger request (Burger 1999). This foot-in-the-door effect was first demonstrated in a study conducted by Freedman and Fraser (1966) where researchers knocked on the doors of people’s homes and asked them to sign a petition either on the issue of safe driving or keeping California beautiful. Two weeks later, researchers returned with the larger request of installing a very large sign in their front lawn that read, “Drive Carefully.” Perceiving their previous decision to comply as evidence that they are “the kind of person who does this sort of thing, who agrees to requests made by strangers, who takes actions on things he believes in, who cooperates with good causes” (p.201), those participants who had been presented with the initial small request of signing the petition (regardless of the issue) were significantly more likely to comply with the large request of installing the sign on their lawn than were those who had not been presented with the initial request. Consistent with a self-perception account the reinforcement effect dissipates amongst individuals who have a low need for consistency (Cialdini et al. 1995).

In contrast, when the response to an initial request is not perceived as a reflection of one’s self, this long-term effect of reinforcement can be reversed, resulting in balance. Instead of an initial very small foot-in-the-door request that results in preliminary compliance, Cialdini (1975) demonstrated a door-in-the-face effect in which a rejection of an initial very large request produces an increased willingness to later comply with a moderate request. What is important here is that the theoretical mechanism is no longer self image, but instead guilt arising from acquiescence to the social norms of concession and reciprocity (Cialdini et al. 1975).

Self-perception also underlies decision reinforcement in goal-directed behaviors. Fishbach and Dhar (2005), for instance, found that when an initial choice is perceived as evidence of one’s commitment to a particular goal, the individual will be more likely to inhibit competing goals and reinforce that goal in a subsequent choice. They found students were significantly more likely to pass up the competing goal of being social by
not going out with friends that evening after they were asked to indicate whether they felt committed to academic tasks from the initial decision to study hard all day. In contrast, when commitment to one’s goals is certain (and self-perception thus unnecessary), the initial choice may be interpreted as satisfactory progress towards the goal, licensing the individual to balance the effort with a gratifying subsequent choice. For example, students in that same study were more likely go out with their friends that evening after they were asked to indicate whether they felt they had made progress in their academic tasks based on their initial decision to study hard all day (Fishbach and Dhar 2005).

Other researchers have similarly documented balance through self-licensing. For instance, after making a virtuous choice (e.g., to donate two hours to charity), people feel licensed to choose a vice (e.g., a pair of designer jeans instead of a vacuum cleaner) (Khan and Dhar 2005); and after exerting a large amount of effort in a rewards program for a virtuous product, consumers feel guilt-free in their choice of a more luxurious reward (Kivetz and Simonson 2002).

Even though these licensing-type effects have typically been demonstrated among participants within the relatively short duration of one experimental session, the underlying roles of self-perception and identity suggest that these effects can persist over hours, days, or even weeks. Consider the foot-in-the-door effect in which the second request was made two full weeks after the first request. Note, however, that participants were reminded of their decision to be helpful in the first request, allowing self perceptions to lead to compliance once again. Importantly though, whether reinforcement or balance will occur in that delayed second choice also depends on the certainty of the goal and its impact on attention. When individuals are certain about their goal (to be charitable, for example), they are more likely to attend to evidence of progress, and will feel licensed to balance in their subsequent choice. In contrast, when individuals are uncertain about their goal, they are more likely attend to evidence of goal commitment and will feel motivated to continue in that goal pursuit through reinforcement (Koo and Fishbach in press).

*Ongoing Strategies of Reinforcement versus Balance*

The previous examples of reinforcement and balance largely focus on a single choice that has downstream implications for a later choice. However there are numerous cases in which ongoing patterns of choices reveal either reinforcement or balance. Here we will present two examples of each and then summarize the contexts in which they are likely to occur. Our first example relates to strategies for long-term self control, while the second identifies contrasting strategies to support religious compliance. Although the causal links are less clear for ongoing strategies than for short-term binary choices, the reinforcement and balance implicit in these lifelong strategies are highly relevant to the individual and society. Further, many of the determinants that drive reinforcement in local choice also appear in patterns of ongoing actions.

We first consider the way reinforcement versus balance differentially support the self-help strategies that deal with persistent life problems of alcoholism and obesity. Consider
first the philosophy of reinforcement that underlies Alcoholics Anonymous (A.A.). To be a member of A.A., an individual is required to set the goal of complete sobriety: “to stop drinking and learn how to live a normal, happy life without alcohol” (Alcoholics Anonymous 2007). There is no room for wavering or bargaining. An individual’s success record is limited only to the time since the last deviating decision (i.e., sip of alcohol) so that the sobriety count starts from scratch with any relapse. Similar to reinforcement from self image, AA holds that alcoholism is an integral part of one’s identity, with each related choice reflecting on one’s character. A.A. members acknowledge that they are alcoholics today—despite being drink free for many years. They do not say that they are “cured.” Once people have lost their ability to control their drinking, they can never again be sure of drinking safely—or, in other words, they can never become “former alcoholics” or “ex-alcoholics.” But in A.A., they can only be sober alcoholics (Alcoholics Anonymous 2007).

In contrast, Weight Watchers strategy of self restraint endorses a philosophy of balancing. With the overarching goal of limiting individuals’ caloric intake to promote weight loss, Weight Watchers assigns points to foods and exercise, allowing a set number of points to be consumed per week (Weight Watchers 2007). This method allows individuals to balance their good versus bad decisions. For example, if one eats a high point piece of chocolate cake now, she can later make up for it with a decision to snack on low point carrots or to exercise. A balance strategy, therefore, does not require every single decision to promote the overarching goal. Indeed, as described on the packaging from another weight loss program, Nutrisystem, a relapse does not start one from scratch: “FORGIVE AND FORGET: Don’t beat yourself up if something tempts you beyond control…One slip-up doesn’t wipe out all of your good efforts.”

There is an intriguing parallel between these contemporary self-help systems and Max Weber’s (1958) classic contrast between Calvinism and Catholicism (see Figure). In a classic version of reinforcement, the teachings of John Calvin encourage a virtuous life through the doctrine of predestination whereby one’s salvation depends not on acts but on grace. The uncertainty of who is chosen generates a need on the part of a Calvinist to confirm such selection by continually doing good works. This uncertainty leads to a pattern of reinforcement in which good works imply salvation, and these in turn lead to more good works. The reverse is also true: sin can reinforce more sin. Once a Calvinist believes that his own weaknesses (or wrong choices) are signs of his not being in a state of grace, the rational response is still more weakness, as good acts cannot, in themselves, be redemptive.

Weber contrasts this reinforcement pattern with that of Catholicism. In Catholicism, all are sinners, but this original sin can be countered through good works. Indeed the Catholic sacraments of confession and penance imply that moderate sins can be balanced by good behaviors.

When does a reinforcement lifestyle emerge as opposed to one of balance? It is informative to note that the popularity of Calvinism in its more rigid form has declined, while the adaptability of Catholicism has enabled it to prosper over time and across
diverse cultures. One account of this divergence is that Calvinism requires a supportive and homogeneous social order in order to support its ascetic lifestyle, something that is increasingly difficult today with the expansion of multicultural societies. The need for a stable social order to support reinforcement may also explain why alcohol is better controlled by reinforcing rigidity while obesity is best attacked through a system of balanced rewards and punishments, since it is possible to avoid those drinking alcohol in ways that are very difficult with respect to food consumption. In summary, for ongoing strategies of self-control, external stability likely leads to reinforcement while instability leads to balance.

**Figure**
Max Weber’s Contrast between Catholicism and Calvinism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[The Catholic] conscientiously fulfilled his traditional duties. He could use [his good works] to atone for particular sins, to better his chances for salvation, or towards the end of his life, as a sort of insurance premium.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[The Calvinist] could not hope to atone for hours of weakness or thoughtlessness by increasing good will at other times. The god of Calvinism demanded of his believers not single good works, but a life of good works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary and Conclusion**

Though the extant research has largely focused on choices made in isolation, our daily lives consist of choices made in sequence. This review has identified some of the theoretical mechanisms that drive consumers’ tendency to hold ‘em versus to fold ‘em in sequential choice. We have discussed a number of contexts and processes that lead to reinforcement or balance.
First is it useful to maintain a broad distinction between shorter term, longer term, and ongoing sequential choices. For short-term sequential choices, patterns of reinforcement or balance can be determined by lower-level internal drivers, such as one’s mindset or desire for variety. These short-term drivers are fragile and can be moderated by a host of internal and external factors, such as the tradeoffs being made or the level of abstraction at which the choice set is processed. Alternately, patterns of reinforcement or balance across choices separated in time are likely to be driven by higher-level factors that are central to the self, such as identity or guilt. As such, these patterns are more likely to endure and are less likely to be impacted by transitory states, such as depletion. Finally, for ongoing patterns of choices, either reinforcement or balance can emerge as viable strategies, but the success of either strategy depends on the stability of the social and personal environment.

Looking broadly at reinforcement and balance across sequential choices, two overarching patterns emerge. The first pattern identifies that reinforcement is more likely for strategic decisions that reflect the self. Sustained reinforcement, both in the short-term and in the long-term, is likely to be driven by a strategic desire for higher-order goal pursuit (short-term) or self-perception (long-term). The second pattern relates to the degree of variance that occurs in the thoughts or stimuli presented to respondents in the short run or in the degree of social stability in the long run. The general finding is that variability is hostile to reinforcement but supportive of balance.

Further research

This review is novel in offering reinforcement and balance as descriptive terms to describe contrasting findings in the literature on consumer sequential choices. Although future research ought to continue focusing on the theoretical frameworks that generate these opposing behaviors, there are certainly promising areas of inquiry that build from the distinction between reinforcement and balance.

The research cited here refers to the choices, rather than the goals or the critical self images behind the choices. However, it would be informative to explore why some goals or individual characteristics are more amenable to balance than others. For example one cannot generally balance acts of honesty against those of dishonesty. Similarly, calling a person loyal does not allow random acts of disloyalty. By contrast, people who are spontaneous, inquisitive, or energetic can reasonably suffer periods when they are predictable, uncurious, or simply tired. Thus, an important research question involves the identification of goal characteristics that are amenable to balance and those that require consistency.

Further, future research should probe the concepts of reinforcement and balancing at a deeper level in an effort to identify when each might be the natural default. While this review cites evidence indicating that reinforcement may be more dispositional and balance more situation-based, when individuals see choices as deviations from their equilibrium the default behavior may be to balance in an effort to remain consistent (Fishbach and Dhar 2007).
Additionally, most research examines the series of choices consumers make, leaving how consumers actually experience those choice sequences understudied. It is thus important to examine whether consumers’ tendencies to reinforce or balance across choices within a consumption episode, or even throughout life, lead to better overall experiences.

Finally, research is needed to define normative guidelines for when balance is more adaptive to the individual. With respect to self control, the two strategies appear differentially adaptive depending on the context, but we lack general theories for when one is better than the other. For example, further research is necessary to identify when strategies of pure reinforcement, represented by Alcoholics Anonymous, will be more effective in driving goal pursuit compared with strategies of balance, represented by Weight Watchers.
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