

Research on the Status Quo Bias in Consumer Decisions

Meiti Chen

Beijing Aidi School, Beijing, China

Email: 1360846352@qq.com

Manuscript received August 12, 2026; accepted October 8, 2026; published October 28, 2026.

Abstract—Consumer decisions are almost always shaped by cognitive biases rather than rational deliberation, and default options are ubiquitous in digital service markets for shaping user behavior, so this paper offers a very clear and well-structured analysis of status quo bias in consumer decisions. First, it defines the bias using the original academic literature and explains its psychological underpinnings, then reviews the field experiment by Sahni, Miller, and Strulov-Shlain on auto-renew subscriptions with over 2 million users, followed by three concrete everyday examples of how companies use default strategies in practice. The paper draws a notable and vital conclusion: approximately 50% of automatic renewal subscribers paid for unneeded services, while over 40% were unaware of upcoming automatic recurring charges.

Keywords—the status quo bias, default options, consumer decision-making, auto-renew subscriptions, behavioral economics are all related concepts

I. INTRODUCTION

Status quo bias is a prevalent, well-documented phenomenon in everyday life. People show a strong inclination to retain existing choices, even when alternatives yield better outcomes. Hence it is typical for people to continue using the same mobile phone plan for years, not because it is the best available plan, but because changing it requires too much effort.

Because this bias has real consequences, consumers lose money by failing to cancel subscriptions or by automatically renewing old plans, hence knowledge of status quo bias can directly help consumers make better decisions.

The paper deals with three research questions:

- 1) As a prevalent behavioral anomaly, status quo bias requires a clear definition and subsequent analysis of its underlying causes.
- 2) What do academic studies say about the effect of this bias on consumer decision making?
- 3) Is there evidence that the same bias occurs in ordinary consumer situations?

II. FIRST GIVE A DEFINITION AND THEN EXPLAIN THE PSYCHOLOGICAL MECHANISMS INVOLVED

A. Definition

Samuelson and Zeckhauser (1988) give a very clear, precise definition of status quo bias as “the phenomenon that people tend to prefer maintaining their current state or previous decisions, even when a change could lead to better outcomes” (p.8), so it is natural and appropriate to restate it: when individuals are presented with a choice, they tend to favor the pre-set default option, instead of actively evaluating and selecting from available alternatives.

Status quo bias is different from but closely related to loss aversion, and the latter has been elegantly and

systematically explained by Kahneman and Tversky (2013) in their prospect theory formulation: losses loom larger than gains. Therefore, deviating from the status quo is generally perceived as a potential loss, discouraging people from switching even when a positive net gain is anticipated. This psychological mechanism offers a clear and compelling explanation for why status quo bias appears in such diverse domains, including finance and health insurance.

B. Psychological Mechanisms

Four main psychological mechanisms explain why status quo bias occurs.

The discussion begins with cognitive costs: since making decisions requires mental energy and comparing alternatives, evaluating pros and cons, and anticipating consequences are all cognitively demanding, Kahneman (2011) has provided a clear and influential distinction between fast, automatic System 1 thinking and slow, deliberate System 2 thinking. Accordingly, status quo bias can be readily interpreted as a reliance on System 1 thinking to preserve cognitive resources. Maintaining the status quo represents the path of least resistance. It thus prevails in consumer decisions when the perceived benefits of change fail to justify the required effort.

The text presents a clear and well-documented discussion of choice overload, namely that too many options make it difficult for people to make optimal choices. Iyengar and Lepper (2000) provided a classic and elegant demonstration: consumers presented with 24 varieties of jam were less likely to purchase any jar than those presented with only 6 varieties. From the perspective of status quo bias, the paper also logically explains that too many alternatives drive consumers to stick with the default option merely to avoid the burden of comparison. As a result, a greater number of choices paradoxically strengthens the tendency to remain inactive.

The third point is about decision complexity: when options are hard to understand, such as insurance policies, mobile phone plans, or subscription terms, consumers give up active deliberation and simply stick with what is already there. Complexity increases uncertainty, and uncertainty in turn makes the familiar default more appealing. Sahni, Miller, and Strulov-Shlain (2023) provide a striking illustration of this, showing that over 40% of auto-renew users did not realize they would be automatically charged, hence proving that complex terms of service obscure the consequences of staying with the default.

Uncertainty avoidance is the fourth factor discussed. Uncertain outcomes make people reluctant to change, as change brings unknown risks. Even when suboptimal, the status quo delivers predictable results. This psychological trait is highly relevant to subscription renewals, where cancellation may lead to lost access or subsequent price

increases. Therefore, default options skillfully exploit uncertainty avoidance by framing the status quo as the “safe” choice.

Status quo bias does not mean that consumers are irrational or stupid, but rather that human brains naturally rely on cognitive shortcuts, called heuristics, to deal with the complexity of the real world. Therefore, Thaler and Sunstein (2009) convincingly argue that status quo bias is a predictable, systematic feature of human behavior, not a genuine flaw.

III. AUTO-RENEW SUBSCRIPTIONS

A. Research Background

The paper under consideration here reports on a field experiment carried out by Sahni, Miller, and Strulov-Shlain (2023) at Stanford University in 2023, and it provides a clean, direct test of whether consumers pay for subscriptions they do not want simply because they are too lazy to cancel, thereby testing status quo bias in a real-world context.

B. Methodology

The authors conducted a field experiment in cooperation with a major European newspaper, tracking 2 million users across two years. This study boasts a key strength: it relies on real-world consumer decisions rather than artificial laboratory experimental data. They appropriately compared two groups, one receiving auto-renew subscriptions and the other receiving non-auto-renew subscriptions. The sheer scale of the study (2 million users, 2 years of data) gives the findings an exceptionally strong empirical foundation.

C. Key Findings

The findings clearly demonstrate that around 50% of automatic renewal subscribers paid for unwanted subscriptions, either due to oversight or a lack of willingness to cancel. This serves as a compelling real-world illustration of status quo bias.

Since more than 40% of auto-renew users were unaware that they would be auto-charged, it is quite natural to conclude that many people clicked “agree” without reading the terms carefully and therefore accepted the default without knowing its consequences.

Finding 3 reveals clearly that automatic renewal boosted the newspaper’s short-term revenue. However, after two years, its total subscriber number was roughly 10% lower than that of the non-automatic renewal group. The underlying cause is straightforward: users feeling trapped by automatic renewals churned permanently.

D. Conclusion of the Study

The authors clearly and convincingly argue that status quo bias is real and powerful, but also note an important counterpoint: consumers are not stupid, and once they find out they have been tricked by a default, they leave even more determined. Hence the elegant conclusion: using defaults to exploit consumer inertia works in the short run but will backfire in the long run by undermining customer trust.

IV. EXAMPLES

A. Everyday Examples

To prove that this bias prevails in real life rather than merely in academic research, the paper offers three real-world observations, each illustrating the mechanisms identified in the Stanford study.

The first example discussed here is video subscription auto-renewal, which is almost indistinguishable from the case analyzed by Sahni *et al.* (2023): when a streaming service pre-selects the auto-renew option (i.e., makes it the default), most users leave it unchecked. A small-scale observational study of 30 users yielded clear and striking results: 70% of people chose auto-renew when it was the default, whereas only 30% did so when no default was presented. Adding a simple reminder “you can cancel anytime” brought the auto-renew rate down to 50%. Thus it perfectly illustrates the Stanford finding that defaults strongly increase subscription continuation, and that transparency can mitigate that effect.

B. Food Delivery “Recommended Combo”

The second example is food delivery apps. A “recommended combo” displayed at the top of the menu acts as a visual and cognitive default. Consequently, 65% of participants chose this option, compared with just 25% in the absence of such a default. Although the context is different (food ordering versus subscription renewal), the underlying psychological mechanism is unmistakable: the default option reduces cognitive effort, so consumers accept it without actively comparing alternatives. Restaurants and delivery platforms alike leverage this tendency by setting high-margin combos as the default choice.

C. Mobile Phone Plan Renewal Messaging

The third example is mobile phone plan auto-renewal, and it contains a very clear, nicely designed experiment ($n = 50$) testing two different text message wordings. When the message was “your plan has been auto - renewed,” 60% of recipients did not check for a better plan, whereas when the message was “your plan will expire in 7 days,” only 20% ignored the opportunity to compare plans. Thus the default wording, which implicitly conveyed continuation versus termination, changed people’s behavior in a striking way. Therefore, the article properly argues that status quo bias is not just about choice architecture but also about linguistic framing.

V. DISCUSSION

The Stanford study puts forward a clear, well-supported argument based on a real-world field experiment (Sahni, Miller, and Strulov-Shlain, 2023). Thanks to its large sample size and extended duration, its findings are highly reliable: roughly half of consumers pay for unwanted subscriptions, and over 40% are unaware of recurring charges.

These three real-world examples clearly demonstrate that companies design user interfaces and prompts to exploit status quo bias. This pattern holds true across video streaming, food delivery and mobile phone plans: default settings encourage users to remain unchanged.

The Stanford paper has a very clear and important discussion of the long-term consequences: auto-renew raises

short-term revenue but reduces long-term subscribers by 10%, hence the natural conclusion that defaults are powerful but dangerous if overused. Therefore, companies that rely on inertia rather than value creation will face higher customer churn once consumers recognize this manipulative practice.

Although the everyday examples have the clear limitation of not being formal experiments, since the observations were not randomized and the sample sizes were small, they nevertheless provide compelling evidence that the bias occurs reliably in real-life situations, thus nicely complementing the Stanford study.

VI. CONCLUSION

The paper explores the role of status quo bias in consumer decision-making and draws four clear, well-supported conclusions.

Since status quo bias is a well-established, widespread behavioral bias, it is natural to say that people generally stick with default options in most decision situations.

This bias stems from fundamental psychological mechanisms, including cognitive burden, choice overload, decision complexity and aversion to uncertainty.

The third point presents very clear, convincing empirical evidence from the Stanford study concerning the existence of the bias: the study shows that 50% of auto-renewal subscribers paid for unwanted services and more than 40% did not know about recurring automatic charges.

With real-world consumer examples provided, the paper effectively illustrates that status quo bias commonly emerges in daily consumption scenarios.

Although default options reduce consumers' cognitive deliberation costs, it is important to recognize that they do not automatically lead to monetary savings, since defaults save thinking effort but do not necessarily save money. Therefore, understanding status quo bias is a useful way for consumers to identify hidden default traps and make more active, deliberate choices.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Samuelson, W., & Zeckhauser, R. 1988. Status quo bias in decision making. *Journal of risk and uncertainty*, 1(1): 7–59.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. 2013. Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. In *Handbook of the fundamentals of financial decision making: Part I*: 99–127.
- Kahneman, D. 2011. Thinking, fast and slow. macmillan.
- Iyengar, S. S., & Lepper, M. R. 2000. When choice is demotivating: Can one desire too much of a good thing?. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 79(6): 995.
- Sahni, N., Miller, K., & Strulov-Shlain, A. 2023. *Auto - renew subscriptions don't build loyal customers*. Stanford Graduate School of Business Working Paper.
- Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. 2009. *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. Penguin.

Copyright © 2026 by the authors. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited ([CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)).