My own view... is that _akrasia_ in rational beings is as common as wine in France. (Searle, 2001, p. 10)

This chapter and the two that follow compare and contrast the three varieties of behaviorism that have proved most effective in understanding consumer behavior: radical behaviorism, teleological behaviorism, and picoeconomics. In the case of radical behaviorism, which has been extensively examined in earlier chapters, only a relatively brief overview is given, followed by an account of how this extensional behavioral science has contributed to behavioral economics. This provides material by which the contribution of teleological behaviorism and picoeconomics to the analysis of everyday consumer choice can be evaluated in succeeding chapters. In the case of teleological behaviorism and picoeconomics, a more general account is provided of their nature as modern behaviorisms, and their contributions to the analysis of more extreme consumer behaviors, those in which consumers forfeit self-control in the pursuit of their consumption goals, are considered. In addition, this chapter classifies radical behaviorism, teleological behaviorism and picoeconomics on a continuum of behaviorisms from extensional behavioral science to intentional behavioristic to superpersonal cognitive psychology.

**Radical behaviorism**

Radical behaviorism’s claim to be considered the paradigm extensional behavioral science rests upon its demonstrated capacity to predict and control behavior in the closed settings of the animal laboratory and its impressive ability to do likewise with respect to human behavior in the
relatively closed settings of the experimental situation and those in which applied behavior analysis projects typically take place. In these respects the experimental analysis of behavior succeeds admirably on its own terms as an extensional behavioral science. Its language is scrupulously extensional and Skinner for one went to enormous lengths to avoid intentional usages (except at times in popular accounts). Indeed, of the behaviorisms that are particularly relevant to the analysis of economic behavior, radical behaviorism is the clearest candidate for the required extensional behavioral science since it generally avoids intentional terms, successfully predicting and controlling behavior without their use – at least within the relatively closed settings of the experimental space. Teleological behaviorism neither avoids intentional terms, nor can it. Picoeconomics openly embraces them. In order to explore further the differences among these three behaviorisms, I should like to develop a framework that both derives from and extends Dennett’s work which illustrates how extensional behavioral science, intentional behaviorism, and a super-personal cognitive psychology are defined and related.

Radical behaviorism is the most extensional but radical behaviorists use intentional terms in popular expositions and interpretations of complex behavior. It may need far more intentionality in order to explain: Taylor (1964) has shown that stimulus and response are terms that rely intrinsically on intentionalistic assumptions, for instance, and I have argued that there are three remaining reasons why an explanation based on extensional behavioral science would need to be supplemented explicitly by the incorporation of intentionality. Taking it, however, as a science of behavior, we must admit that it predicts behavior exceedingly well – especially in relatively closed settings – and assists their influence/control. I would place it on the continuum from extensional behavioral science to cognitive psychology – just beyond the former pole in the cognitive direction.

**The behavioral economics of consumer choice**

Contributions to consumer research by behavioral economists working in the traditions of the experimental analysis of behavior and experimental economics (e.g., Alhadeff, 1982; Kagel, Battalio and Green, 1995) have not in general aroused interest among marketing scientists. Small exceptions have arisen where the subjects of behavioral economics research have been human rather than non-human animals as for instance in the case of the token economy (Foxall, 2002). The approach taken toward experimental economics by these authors nev-