THE MARSHMALLOW EXPERIMENT

A child. A tempting treat.
The challenge of waiting.

Researcher
Walter Mischel · with colleagues

Research tradition
Delayed gratification · self-control

Classic setting
Stanford preschool studies, late 1960s onward

Can a child wait for a bigger reward—or will the immediate marshmallow win?

A guide to the famous task, what researchers observed, what later studies found, and why the popular story needs careful interpretation.

01 / THE QUESTION

What is delayed gratification?

Delayed gratification means choosing to wait for a larger or more valuable reward instead of taking a smaller reward available immediately.

The marshmallow experiment made this abstract idea easy to see. A child is placed in a room with a tempting treat. The researcher explains that the child can eat it now—or wait until the researcher returns and receive a second treat.

The task is not simply a test of “willpower.” A child’s decision can depend on how tempting the reward is, how long the wait feels, whether the promise seems reliable, and what strategies help the child manage attention.

THE IMMEDIATE OPTION	THE DELAY OPTION
Eat the treat now. Receive one reward right away.	Wait for the researcher. Receive a larger reward later.

Core idea: waiting is a choice made under temptation and uncertainty—not a personality label.

02 / THE CLASSIC TASK

How was it conducted?

Versions of the procedure varied. This describes the well-known two-reward setup, not every study.

01 **A child is brought into a room.**
The child sits with a preferred treat, such as a marshmallow, cookie, or pretzel.

02 **The researcher explains the choice.**
Eat the treat now, or wait until the researcher returns to receive a second treat.

03 **The researcher leaves the room.**
The child is alone for the waiting period, with the reward visible in the classic setup.

04 **The child chooses—or the wait ends.**
If the child eats it, the immediate option is taken; if they wait, the promised reward is delivered.

05 **Researchers record behavior.**
They measure whether the child waits and, in some versions, how long.

Procedure matters: the promised wait, reward type, instructions, and reliability of the adult can affect the child’s decision.

03 / THE STRATEGIES

What helped children wait?

Mischel and colleagues explored how children’s attention and mental strategies shaped waiting. A visible treat can make temptation more salient; redirecting attention can make the delay easier.

ATTENTION TO THE TREAT	DISTRACTION & REFRAMING
Looking at or thinking about the reward can intensify temptation.	Children may play, sing, cover their eyes, or imagine the treat differently.

A useful distinction is between “hot” processes—immediate, emotionally vivid temptation—and “cool” processes—more deliberate attention, planning, and mental representation. The child is not necessarily resisting by force alone; they may be changing what they attend to.

> Self-control can involve designing the situation and redirecting attention—not merely gritting your teeth.

Waiting and later outcomes

Follow-up work by Mischel, Shoda, and Peake (1990) reported associations between preschool delay behavior and some later measures, including academic-related outcomes.

The findings attracted attention because they suggested that behavior in a brief childhood task might relate to later development. Popular accounts often transformed this into a simple message: children who wait are destined to succeed.

That conclusion is too strong. The task is a specific behavior in a particular setting. It does not measure a child’s entire self-control capacity, intelligence, character, or future.

Association is not destiny. Early follow-up results were intriguing, but they do not establish that waiting itself causes later achievement.

05 / MODERN REASSESSMENT

What later research added

IMPORTANT POINT	WHAT RESEARCH SUGGESTS	HOW TO READ IT
Context and resources matter	A child’s environment—including stability and access to reliable resources—can shape whether waiting is sensible.	Taking the immediate reward may be rational when future promises feel uncertain.
Prediction is not causation	Associations between waiting and later outcomes do not prove that training delay alone improves life outcomes.	Look for confounds and causal designs.
Effects may shrink with controls	Watts, Duncan, and Quan (2018) found associations with later achievement were substantially reduced after accounting for family background and early cognitive ability.	The popular headline overstates the strength of the prediction.
Not a universal trait test	Performance can vary with reward preference, instructions, adult credibility, and the child’s situation.	Interpret behavior within context.

Better conclusion: the task can illuminate waiting behavior, but later outcomes reflect many interacting factors—family, opportunity, cognition, environment, and more.

06 / THE MECHANISM

Why would trust change the choice?

Imagine the researcher promises a second treat after the wait. If the child believes the promise is dependable, waiting may be attractive. If the child has learned that promises are often broken, taking the treat now may be a reasonable response.

RELIABLE FUTURE	UNCERTAIN FUTURE
Waiting is more likely to pay off when the promised reward is credible.	Taking the immediate reward may protect against the possibility that the second reward never arrives.

This is why the experiment can be interpreted not only as self-control, but also as a decision under uncertainty and a response to the environment. Researchers have tested how adult reliability and contextual cues influence delay behavior.

> A child who takes the treat now may not be “bad at self-control.” They may be making a choice based on what they expect will happen.

07 / THINK LIKE A RESEARCHER

Do not memorize the waiting time.

01 What exactly is being measured?

Is it delay tolerance, attention control, trust in the researcher, reward preference, or a mixture?

02 What alternative explanation exists?

Could family background, prior experiences with unreliable promises, or the child’s preferred treat influence waiting?

03 How could you test the trust mechanism?

Randomly vary whether an adult keeps earlier promises, then compare waiting behavior while holding reward and wait period constant.

04 What would a causal claim require?

A design that separates the effect of waiting behavior itself from background factors correlated with it.

Research sequence: observe a behavior → list plausible mechanisms → derive distinct predictions → design a test that separates them.

THE TAKEAWAY

The Marshmallow Experiment is a memorable study of delayed gratification. Its lasting value is not a ranking of children, but the questions it raises about attention, temptation, trust, and the environment in which choices are made.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Mischel, W., Ebbesen, E. B., & Zeiss, A. R. (1972). “Cognitive and attentional mechanisms in delay of gratification.” Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 21(2), 204–218.

Mischel, W., Shoda, Y., & Peake, P. K. (1990). “Predicting adolescent cognitive and self-regulatory competencies from preschool delay of gratification: Identifying diagnostic conditions.” Developmental Psychology, 26(6), 978–986.

Watts, T. W., Duncan, G. J., & Quan, H. (2018). “Revisiting the marshmallow test: A conceptual replication investigating links between early delay of gratification and later outcomes.” Psychological Science, 29(7), 1159–1177.