

JEN PARK

Stanford Graduate School of Business
655 Knight Way
Stanford, CA 94305

(917) 930-0838
jenhp@stanford.edu
jenhp.com

EDUCATION

Stanford Graduate School of Business , Stanford, CA <i>Ph.D., Marketing</i>	2016 – Present
New York University , New York, NY <i>M.A., Psychology</i>	2016
Korea University , Seoul, Korea <i>B.S., Business & Psychology</i>	2014
The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania (Exchange Program)	2011

RESEARCH INTERESTS

Judgment & Decision Making	Framing & Context Effects
Digital Interfaces, Platforms, & Information	Prosocial & Pro-environmental Behavior

PUBLICATIONS & MANUSCRIPTS UNDER REVIEW *equal contribution

Park, Jen H.,* Szu-chi Huang,* Bella Rozenkrants, and Daniella Kupor (2020), “Subjective Age and the Greater Good,” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 31(3), 429-449.

Park, Jen H. and Itamar Simonson, “Rejecting Options Increases Commitment after Option Evaluation,” invited for resubmit at *Journal of Consumer Research*.

SELECT RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

Park, Jen H. “Subjective Rejections: Consumers Rely on Personal Taste versus Quality Cues When Making Rejections.”

Park, Jen H., Szu-chi Huang, and Aradhna Krishna, “The Simple Act of Clicking Can Facilitate Motivated Reasoning for Indulgent Choices.”

Park, Jen H., Kristen Duke, and Itamar Simonson, “Choice vs. Rating as a Determinant of Staying the Course.”

Park, Jen H., Samina Lutfeali, and Yewon Kim, “Choice Architecture of Sustainable Products.”

Park, Jen H., and Melanie Brucks, “Online vs. Offline Evaluation of Innovative Products.”

AWARDS & FELLOWSHIPS

Stanford Community Impact Award, <i>Stanford Alumni Association</i>	2021
AMA-Sheth Doctoral Consortium Fellow	2021
Invited Participant, 11 th Invitational Choice Symposium	2019
Catherine S. Muther Fellowship, <i>Stanford University</i>	2017
The Copses Family Foundation Fellowship, <i>Stanford University</i>	2016
Professional Academic Achievement & Thought Leadership Award, <i>New York University</i>	2015
Finalist, NYU “Threesis” Academic Challenge, <i>New York University</i>	2015
Dean’s Student Travel Grant, <i>New York University</i>	

CHAired SYMPOSIA

Park, Jen H. and Daniella Kupor (2020), “The Hidden Persuaders of Prosocial Contribution,” *Society for Consumer Psychology*, Huntington Beach, CA.

Park, Jen H. (2018), “New Insights into Dynamic Framing of Choices in the Online Consumer Environment,” *Association for Consumer Research*, Dallas TX.

RESEARCH PRESENTATIONS

Park, Jen H., Szu-chi Huang, and Daniella Kupor (2020), “Subjective Age and the Greater Good,” *Association for Consumer Research*, Virtual.

Park, Jen H. and Itamar Simonson (2020), “Swipe Left for No: Why Options that Survive Rejection Are More Likely to Be Purchased,” *Association for Consumer Research*, Virtual.

Park, Jen H. and Szu-chi Huang (2020), “What’s in a Click? The Simple Act of Clicking Can Facilitate Motivated Reasoning for Indulgent Choices,” *Society for Consumer Psychology*, Huntington Beach, CA.

Park, Jen H., Szu-chi Huang, and Daniella Kupor (2020), “Subjective Age and the Greater Good,” *Society for Consumer Psychology*, Huntington Beach, CA.

Park, Jen H. and Itamar Simonson (2020), “Swipe Left for No: Why Options That Survive Rejection Are More Likely to Be Purchased,” *Society for Personality and Social Psychology*, New Orleans, LA.

Park, Jen H. and Szu-chi Huang (2020), “What’s in a Click? The Simple Act of Clicking Can Facilitate Motivated Reasoning for Indulgent Choices,” *Society for Personality and Social Psychology*, New Orleans, LA.

Park, Jen H. and Itamar Simonson (2019), “Swipe Left for No: Why Options That Survive Rejection Are More Likely to Be Purchased,” *Society for Judgment and Decision Making*, Montreal, Canada.

Park, Jen H. and Szu-chi Huang (2019), “What’s in a Click? The Simple Act of Clicking Can Facilitate Motivated Reasoning for Indulgent Choices,” *Society for Judgment and Decision Making*, Montreal, CA.

Park, Jen H. and Szu-chi Huang (2019), “Augmented Reality Dissected: Decoupling the Visual and Interactive Elements of AR in Encouraging Consumers to Read Food Reviews,” *Association for Consumer Research*, Atlanta, GA.

Park, Jen H. and Itamar Simonson (2018), “The Effect of Rejection Frames on Commitment to Choice,” *Society for Judgment and Decision Making*, New Orleans, LA.

Park, Jen H. and Itamar Simonson (2018), “The Effect of Rejection Frames on Commitment to Choice,” *Political Psychology Research Group*, Stanford University.

Park, Jen H. (2018), “Omission Bias in Gain vs. Loss Domain,” *Association for Consumer Research*, Dallas, TX.

Park, Jen H. and Itamar Simonson (2018), “The Effect of Rejection Frames on Commitment to Choice,” *Association for Consumer Research*, Dallas, TX.

Park, Jen H. and Yaacov Trope (2016), “When ‘Free’ Means Different from ‘\$0’: Abstract vs. Concrete Mindset Effect on ‘Free’ Promotional Offers,” *Society for Personality and Social Psychology*, San Diego, CA.

Park, Jen H., Petra Schmid, and David Amodio (2015), “Money or Power? Power Promotes Costly Punishment of Unfair Behavior,” *Association for Consumer Research*, New Orleans, LA.

Park, Jen H., Petra Schmid, and David Amodio (2015), “Power Increases Instrumental Memory for People’s Attributes,” *Society for the Study of Motivation*, New York, NY.

Park, Jen H. and Barry Cohen (2015), “It Pays to Be Inconsistent with the Stereotype: How Counter-Stereotypes of Job Positions Can Positively Affect Evaluations,” *Eastern Psychological Association*, Philadelphia, PA.

EMPLOYMENT & LAB WORK

Institute of Human Development and Social Change , <i>New York, NY</i>	Aug 2015 – May 2016
- Project Coordinator	
NYU Social Neuroscience Lab , <i>New York University</i>	Sep 2014 – Mar 2016
- Research Assistant (Advisor: David Amodio)	
Spontaneous Inferences and Decisions Lab , <i>New York University</i>	Oct 2014 – Aug 2015
- Research Assistant (Advisor: James Uleman)	

TEACHING

Behavioral Economics and the Psychology of Decision Making (PhD), <i>Stanford University</i>	2020, 2021
- Course Assistant (Itamar Simonson)	
Product Launch (MBA), <i>Stanford University</i>	2019, 2021
- Course Assistant (Jonathan Levav)	
Marketing Management (MBA), <i>Stanford University</i>	2019, 2020
- Course Assistant/Grader (Stephanie Tully & Stephen Anderson-McDonald)	
Applied Behavioral Economics (MBA), <i>Stanford University</i>	2018
- Course Assistant (Itamar Simonson)	
Social Psychology (Undergraduate), <i>New York University</i>	2015
- Teaching Assistant (James Uleman)	
Introduction to Psychology (Undergraduate), <i>New York University</i>	2014
- Teaching Assistant (Edgar Coons)	

SERVICE

PhD Organization of Women, <i>Stanford Graduate School of Business</i>	
- Co-president	2020 – 2021
- Executive Officer	2018 – 2020
Splash Academic Outreach Program for Grades 9-12, <i>Stanford University</i>	
- Teacher (Behavioral Economics)	2018 – 2021
Stanford Undergraduate Research Association Mentor, <i>Stanford University</i>	2020 – 2021
SPSP Peer Advising Program Mentor	2020 – 2021
Association for Consumer Research Conference Reviewer	2016 – 2021
Society for Consumer Psychology Conference Reviewer	2018 – 2020
Journal of Consumer Research Trainee Reviewer	2018

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Association for Consumer Research (ACR)	Society for Consumer Psychology (SCP)
Society for Judgment and Decision Making (SJDm)	Society for Personality Social Psychology (SPSP)
American Marketing Association (AMA)	

REFERENCES

Itamar Simonson (Advisor) Professor of Marketing, Emeritus Stanford GSB itamars@stanford.edu 650-725-8981	Jonathan Levav Professor of Marketing Stanford GSB jlevav@stanford.edu 650-725-0351	Szu-chi Huang Associate Professor of Marketing Stanford GSB huangsc@stanford.edu 650-725-5040
--	---	--

SELECT ABSTRACTS

Park, Jen H. and Itamar Simonson, “Rejecting Options Increases Commitment after Option Evaluation,” invited for resubmit at *Journal of Consumer Research*.

Most options considered by consumers are rejected or not chosen, yet not all rejections are created equal. This paper examines how decision interfaces that allow consumers to make “explicit” rejection (i.e., decision to explicitly exclude an option from further consideration) can influence the evaluation process and ultimate purchase likelihood. Specifically, the authors propose that compared to “implicit” rejections in which option exclusion is implied (i.e., decision to not add the option or to look at more options), explicit rejections increase psychological closure with respect to the rejected options, thereby facilitating a sense of evaluation closure and readiness for commitment (i.e., purchase) to one of the non-rejected options. This research tests a range of decision interfaces commonly employed in the web—including like-or-dislike buttons, left-or-right swipes, and shopping carts—and the resulting decision processes across different product categories. The implications of explicit option rejection for our understanding of consumer decision-making in the current information environment are discussed.

Park, Jen H. “Subjective Rejections: Consumers Rely on Personal Taste versus Quality Cues When Making Rejections,” *manuscript in preparation*.

A fundamental dilemma that consumers often face is between choosing based on product quality, represented by objective attributes (e.g., customer ratings, specs), and based on personal taste, represented by subjective attributes (e.g., aesthetics). We propose that the way consumers resolve this quality–taste conflict is contingent on whether they approach their decision as a choice or rejection. In particular, the present research shows that rejecting one’s own taste is more painful and objectionable—or associated with greater loss aversion—than rejecting the criteria related to product quality that are essentially constructed by others. Six experiments that mimic the online shopping experience demonstrate that participants who reject (vs. choose) options are more likely to keep options that highlight their idiosyncratic preferences and reason their decision based on their taste (e.g., I personally like a black car) over quality cues (e.g., this car has lower miles). We also examine boundary conditions and demonstrate that the effect does not occur when the decision is reversible, made for others, or made under time pressure. Through these findings, we identify a novel driver of “survival of taste” in the current information environment and discuss its theoretical and practical implications.

Park, Jen H.,* Szu-chi Huang,* Bella Rozenkrants, and Daniella Kupor (2020), “Subjective Age and the Greater Good,” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*. (*equal contribution)

Contradicting existing associations between old age and negative societal consequences, such as being frail and unproductive, this research finds that people contribute more to the greater good of society (e.g., by helping strangers in need) when they feel subjectively older. We document this phenomenon in both the laboratory and the field and find that this heightened desire to contribute to the greater good occurs because feeling subjectively older increases consumers’ perceived responsibility for others’ welfare. We further uncover a divergent impact of subjective age versus chronological age on giving to distant others: Whereas older subjective age increases perceived responsibility for distant others’ welfare and thus contributions to distant others, older chronological age does not. These findings connect the classic theories of prosocial behavior with new research on subjective age and illuminate a psychological driver that nudges people to take actions that benefit distant others.