

# Prospect Theory

Christopher Teixeira  
April 28, 2010

# Problem Motivation

Utility theory used as a means of evaluating consequences of decisions.

However, the utility of some consequences does not necessarily follow the axioms of Utility Theory according to some subject matter experts.

# Prospect Theory

According to Hastie and Dawes (Page 294), Prospect Theory has three major characteristics:

1. Reference level dependence.
2. Gain and loss satiation.
3. Loss aversion.

# Problem Description

Goal: Analyze the second characteristic of "Gain and Loss Satiation" in Prospect Theory.

Problem can be looked at from two angles:

1. Determine a constant  $a$  such that a person's value function is approximately equal to  $v(x) = x^a$  for all  $x > 0$ .
2. For the null hypothesis that  $v(x)$  is a linear function, consider the alternative hypothesis that is not linear.

Example: Take  $2 \cdot v(x_1)$  and  $v(2 \cdot x_1)$ .

# Hypothesis

$$H_0: \text{mean}_1 - \text{mean}_2 = 0$$

$$H_1: \text{mean}_1 - \text{mean}_2 > 0$$

where  $\text{mean}_1$  is the mean from  $2*U(\text{lower gain})$  and  $\text{mean}_2$  is the mean from the  $U(\text{two times the lower gain})$

$$H_0: \text{mean}_1 - \text{mean}_2 = 0$$

$$H_1: \text{mean}_1 - \text{mean}_2 < 0$$

where  $\text{mean}_1$  is the mean from  $2*U(\text{lower loss})$  and  $\text{mean}_2$  is the mean from the  $U(\text{two times the lower loss})$

# Data Collection

- Created a survey online consisting of four questions.
  - Two questions deal with the utility of two positive events
  - Two questions deal with the utility of two negative events
  - Assigned a group of questions randomly to the participants.
- Distributed the survey via social networking sites
- Received 47 responses

# Data Analysis

$$t = \frac{(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) - d_0}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}}},$$

Used the T Test for testing the difference between two means with unknown variances within Excel 2007.

	<i>Higher Gain</i>	<i>Two Lower Gains</i>
Mean	139.8617021	192.1489362
Variance	5569.779371	5130.651249
Observations	47	47
Hypothesized Mean	0	
df	92	
t Stat	-3.465324985	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.000403217	
t Critical one-tail	1.661585397	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.000806434	
t Critical two-tail	1.986086272	

	<i>Larger Loss</i>	<i>Two Smaller Losses</i>
Mean	167.4468085	92.46808511
Variance	14472.68733	312.7326549
Observations	47	47
Hypothesized Mean	0	
df	48	
t Stat	4.227368804	
P(T<=t) one-tail	5.26738E-05	
t Critical one-tail	1.677224197	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.000105348	
t Critical two-tail	2.010634722	

# Conclusions

Results from the T test suggest that there is enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis in support of the alternative hypothesis.

Given the fact that questions were monetarily based, there could be a bias or other factors that might have played into the answers.



# Future Work

- Test the results from the survey for the alpha and lambda value given in Hastie and Dawes (Page 294).
- Test different questions for a comparison to work related problems

# Questions

# References

Hastie, Reid, and Robyn M. Dawes. *Rational Choice in an Uncertain World: the Psychology of Judgment and Decision Making*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2001. Print.