

Risk and Time Preferences: Linking Experimental and Household Survey Data from Vietnam

By TOMOMI TANAKA, COLIN F. CAMERER, AND QUANG NGUYEN*

A fundamental question in development economics is the extent to which economic success is linked to basic features of human preferences. If people are extremely averse to financial risk, they may be reluctant to create businesses that may have inherently risky cash flows. If people are impatient, they may be reluctant to invest and educate their children. Taken together, risk aversion and impatience may explain, in part, why some people remain poor.

We conducted experiments in Vietnamese villages to directly measure risk and time preferences of individuals, and investigated how these preferences correlate with economic circumstances. Vietnam has several advantages as a field site:

- (i) Access to a 2002 living standard survey enabled us to link detailed survey responses from individuals directly to experimental responses by the same individuals.
- (ii) Most Vietnamese villagers are poor but literate. As a result, it is easy to motivate them with modest financial stakes and to ensure they comprehend instructions.
- (iii) The rise of household businesses in the market economy has created substantial variation in income. This income variation can be correlated with preference measures.

In any cross-sectional study like this, it is difficult to infer the direction of causality from correlation: do preferences cause economic circumstances (e.g., through business formation), or do circumstances create preferences as described by Samuel Bowles (1998)? An ideal study would use randomized assignment of individuals to economic circumstances. As an alternative, we employ an instrumental variable approach, using rainfall and household head's ability to work at the time of survey, which are unlikely to be correlated with preferences, as instrumental variables for income.

Beside contributing new data, our paper makes a methodological contribution to experimental development economics. Most previous experiments conducted in the field tested models of risk and time preferences that can be characterized by one parameter. See Juan-Camilo Cardenas

* Tanaka: School of Global Studies, Arizona State University, PO Box 875102, Tempe, AZ 85287-5102 (e-mail: tomomi.tanaka@asu.edu); Camerer: Division for the Humanities and Social Sciences, California Institute of Technology, MC 228-77, Pasadena CA 91125 (e-mail: camerer@hss.caltech.edu); Nguyen: Groupe d'Analyse et de Théorie Economique (GATE), CNRS, Faculté de Sciences Économiques et de Gestion, Université Lumière (Lyon 2) (e-mail: nguyenq@gate.cnrs.fr). This research was supported by a Behavioral Economics Small Grant from the Russell Sage Foundation, Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development, and internal Caltech funds to author Camerer. Comments from participants at the ESA meeting (October 2005), SEA meeting (November 2005), SJDM (November 2005), ASSA meeting (January 2007), audiences at Columbia, NYU, Bocconi, Emory, Hawaii, Caltech, UCSC, Claremont McKenna, Guelph, Carleton, Arizona State, a conference at UT-Dallas, and five thoughtful anonymous referees were helpful. Thanks to our research coordinators, Phan Dinh Khoi, Huynh Truong Huy, Nguyen Anh Quan, Nguyen Mau Dung, and research assistants, Bui Thanh Sang, Nguyen The Du, Ngo Nguyen Thanh Tam, Pham Thanh Xuan, Nguyen Minh Duc, Tran Quang Trung, and Tran Tat Nhat. We also thank Nguyen The Quan of the General Statistical Office for allowing us access to the 2002 household survey data.

and Jeffrey Carpenter (2008) for a review. These models often fit experimental data in Western educated populations (Shane Frederick, George Loewenstein, and Ted O'Donoghue 2002; Chris Starmer 2000) and field data (Camerer 2000) less well than models with multiple components of risk and time preferences. For example, in expected utility (EU) theory, risk preferences are characterized solely by the concavity of a utility function for money. But if risky choices express prospect theory preferences (Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky 1979), then utility concavity is not the only parameter influencing risk preferences; nonlinear weighting of probabilities, and aversion to loss compared to gain, also influence risk preferences. Our instruments are designed to measure these three parameters of prospect theory, rather than just one in EU.

Similarly, we measure three parameters in a general time discounting model (Jess Benhabib, Alberto Bisin, and Andrew Schotter 2007), rather than measuring a single exponential discount rate as in most other studies. If the exponential model is an adequate approximation, then our richer instruments will deliver parameter values of the extra variables that affirm the virtue of the simpler exponential.

Before proceeding to design details and results, it is useful to discuss how our approach compares to other field experiments. Field experiments in development are powerful tools for policy evaluation because they can randomize treatments in naturally occurring decision making to see how well a specific policy works in a specific setting with a proper control group (see Esther Duflo 2005 for a review). For example, Nava Ashraf, Dean Karlan, and Wesley Yin (2006) found that women who displayed lower discount rates in a hypothetical-question survey were more likely to open a commitment savings account offered by a bank in the Philippines.

Our approach is different. Our study is designed to collect preference measures experimentally and correlate those measures with demographic and economic variables (income, in particular) from the previous household survey. The goal is to contribute basic tools for field experimentation and to generate tentative observations about the correlation between preferences and economic circumstances. No single result will be as conclusive as more targeted studies that explore the effect of a specific policy. Nevertheless, the policy-specific approach and our broad approach are complementary. Targeted studies like that of Ashraf et al. tell broader studies, like ours, what to look for. And broader studies give a rich set of tentative results for more targeted studies to explore more carefully. Accumulation of empirical regularity will come most quickly from conducting both types of studies.

I. Selection of Research Sites and Research Methods

In July–August 2005, risk and time discounting experiments were conducted with members of households who were previously interviewed during a 2002 living standard measurement survey.¹ In the 2002 survey, 25 households were interviewed in each of 142 rural villages in the Mekong Delta (in the south) and 137 rural villages in the Red River Delta (in the north).² From these, we chose nine villages, five villages in the south and four villages in the north, with substantial differences in mean village income and market access. Some descriptive statistics about the nine experimental village sites are given in Table 1. The southern villages are indexed by S1–S5 (where

¹ A discrete trust game was conducted before the risk and time discounting experiments. Trust outcomes were not revealed until the end of the session and are reported elsewhere.

² The 2002 living standard survey covers total 354,360 households in Vietnam. According to the local government officials in our research sites, lists of all households in selected villages were submitted to district offices, and households were randomly selected from the lists for the survey.

TABLE 1—DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	N1	N2	N3	N4
Total number of subjects	22	16	18	21	21	17	22	24	20
Ethnic Chinese subjects	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean household income in 2002 (1 million dong)	36.6	35.8	20.3	18.5	15.0	28.0	17.5	9.1	7.2
Age (mean)	47.7	44.6	48.8	42.8	47.9	55.1	42.5	49.9	48.6
Gender (1 = male) (mean)	0.59	0.88	0.83	0.71	0.81	0.47	0.36	0.50	0.50
Education (years) (mean)	7.2	7.1	8.4	6.0	5.0	7.5	8.0	4.8	7.6
Literacy rate (mean)	0.95	0.94	0.95	0.95	0.91	0.89	0.95	0.83	0.90
Distance to nearest market	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	1.0	3.0	0.3
Rainfall (mm)	1,442	2,328	1,442	1,202	1,202	1,399	1,399	1,442	1,442
Number of household heads unable to work at the time of survey	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	2
Daily wage for male labor for harvesting (1,000 dong)	—	—	30	30	30	18	18	20	20

S1 indexes the highest village wealth and S5 indexes the lowest), and northern villages are indexed by N1–N4.³

A week before the experiments, research coordinators contacted local government officials in each research site and asked them to invite one person from each of the 25 previously surveyed households to the experiments. Experiments started at approximately 9 AM in the morning, and lasted about four hours. Subjects were given instructions and separate record sheets for each game. Illiterate subjects (8 percent) were given verbal instruction by research assistants. Subjects who had difficulty completing record sheets by themselves were also helped by research assistants who carefully avoided giving specific instructions about how to answer. The average experimental earning for three games was 174,141 dong (about 11 dollars)⁴, roughly 6 to 9 days' wages for casual unskilled labor.

II. Risk

A. Previous Findings

Ravi Kanbur and Lyn Squire (2001) describe the risk attitude of the poor as “a feeling of vulnerability.” Market fluctuations and natural disasters could put these villagers in a state of having little or losing what little they have. Empirical evidence suggests wealthier households invest in more risky productive activities and earn higher returns (Mark R. Rosenzweig and Hans P. Binswanger 1993). These premises are consistent with decreasing absolute risk aversion in EU theory; wealthier people are willing to take more risk than poorer people.

However, previous experimental studies conducted in developing countries give mixed results on wealth and risk preferences. Binswanger (1980, 1981) and Paul Mosley and Arjan Verschoor (2005) find no significant association between risk aversion and wealth. Uffe Nielsen (2001) finds positive relations between wealth and risk aversion, while Matte Wik et. al. (2004) and Mahmud Yesuf (2004) find negative correlations. However, they used EU and mix gain-only and gain-loss

³ Villages S1 and S3 are in Can Tho City, Village S2 is in Ca Mau Province, Villages S4 and S5 are in Tra Vinh Province, Villages N1 and N2 are in Vinh Phuc Province, and Villages N3 and N4 are in Thai Binh Province.

⁴ The exchange rate between the Vietnamese dong and US dollar does not fluctuate very much. On July 23, 2005, the exchange rate was 15,880 dong for one dollar, while it was 15,947 dong for one dollar on July 23, 2002.

gambles in their analysis, making it difficult to tell whether risk aversion comes solely from the concavity of utility function.

B. Measurement of Prospect Theory Parameters

We consider prospect theory as an alternative theoretical framework to EU, and conduct experiments with lotteries involving both gains and losses. We use cumulative prospect theory and the one-parameter form of Drazen Prelec's (1998) axiomatically derived weighting function. The values of prospects are $v(y) + \pi(p)(v(x) - v(y))$ (for $xy > 0$ and $|x| > |y|$) or $v(y) + \pi(p)v(x) + \pi(q)v(y)$, where p and q are the probabilities of outcomes x and y . We assume a piecewise power function for value, $v(x) = x^\sigma$ for gains $x > 0$, and $v(x) = -\lambda(-x)^\sigma$ for losses $x < 0$. The probability weighting function is $\pi(p) = 1/\exp[\ln(1/p)]^\alpha$.

Parameters σ and λ represent concavity of the value function, and the degree of loss aversion. The probability weighting function is linear if $\alpha = 1$, as it is in EU. If $\alpha < 1$, the weighting function is inverted S-shaped, i.e., individuals overweight small probabilities and underweight large probabilities, as shown by Tversky and Kahneman (1992). If $\alpha > 1$, then the weighting function is S-shaped, i.e., individuals underweight small probabilities and overweight large probabilities. The above model reduces to EU (with a reflected utility function at zero) if $\alpha = 1$ and $\lambda = 1$.

To elicit the three prospect theory parameters, we designed three series of paired lotteries as shown in Table 2. Each row is a choice between two binary lotteries, A or B. We enforced monotonic switching by asking subjects at which question they would "switch" from Option A to Option B in each series. They can switch to Option B starting with the first question, and they do not have to switch to Option B at all.⁵ After they complete three series of questions with the total of 35 choices, we draw a numbered ball from a bingo cage with 35 numbered balls to determine which row of choice will be played for real money. We then put back ten numbered balls in the bingo cage and played the selected lottery.

The difference in expected value between the lotteries (A relative to B) is shown in the right column. As one moves down the rows, the higher payoff in Option B increases and everything else is fixed. The choices are carefully designed so any combination of choices in the three series determines a particular interval of prospect theory parameter values. Table 3 illustrates the combinations of approximate values of σ , α , and λ for each switching point. "Never" indicates the cases in which a subject does not switch to Option B (i.e., always chooses A). The switching points in Series 1 and 2 jointly determine σ and α . For example, suppose a subject switched from Option A to B at the seventh question in Series 1. The combinations of (σ, α) that can rationalize this switch are (0.4, 0.4), (0.5, 0.5), (0.6, 0.6), (0.7, 0.7), (0.8, 0.8), (0.9, 0.9), or (1, 1). Now suppose the same subjects also switched from Option A to B at the seventh question in Series 2. Then the combinations of (σ, α) that rationalize that switch are (0.8, 0.6), (0.7, 0.7), (0.6, 0.8), (0.5, 0.9), or (0.4, 1). By intersecting these parameter ranges from Series 1 and 2, we obtain the approximate values of $(\sigma, \alpha) = (0.7, 0.7)$. Predictions of (σ, α) for all possible combinations of choices are given in Table A1 in the Web Appendix (available at <http://www.aeaweb.org/articles.php?doi=10.1257/aer.100.1.557>).

The loss aversion parameter λ is determined by the switching point in Series 3. Notice that λ cannot be uniquely inferred from switching in Series 3. Questions in Series 3 were constructed to make sure that λ takes similar values across different levels of σ . Table 3 shows the range of λ for each switching point for three values $\sigma = 0.2, 0.6$, and 1.

⁵ The instructions gave three examples. In one example a subject switches at the sixth question, in one example the subject chooses Option A for all questions, and in one example the subject chooses Option B for all questions. The three examples were given to help ensure that subjects do not feel that they are forced to switch.

TABLE 2—THREE SERIES OF PAIRWISE LOTTERY CHOICES (*in 1,000 dong*)

Option A		Option B		Expected payoff difference (A–B)
<i>Series 1</i>				
Balls 1–3	Balls 4–10	Ball 1	Balls 2–10	
40	10	68	5	7.7
40	10	75	5	7.0
40	10	83	5	6.0
40	10	93	5	5.2
40	10	106	5	3.9
40	10	125	5	2.0
40	10	150	5	–0.5
40	10	185	5	–4.0
40	10	220	5	–7.5
40	10	300	5	–15.5
40	10	400	5	–25.5
40	10	600	5	–45.5
40	10	1,000	5	–85.5
40	10	1,700	5	–155.5
<i>Series 2</i>				
Balls 1–9	Ball 10	Balls 1–7	Balls 8–10	
40	30	54	5	–0.3
40	30	56	5	–1.7
40	30	58	5	–3.1
40	30	60	5	–4.5
40	30	62	5	–5.9
40	30	65	5	–8.0
40	30	68	5	–10.1
40	30	72	5	–12.9
40	30	77	5	–16.4
40	30	83	5	–20.6
40	30	90	5	–25.5
40	30	100	5	–32.5
40	30	110	5	–39.5
40	30	130	5	–53.5
<i>Series 3</i>				
Balls 1–5	Balls 6–10	Balls 1–5	Balls 6–10	
25	–4	30	–21	6.0
4	–4	30	–21	–4.5
1	–4	30	–21	–6.0
1	–4	30	–16	–8.5
1	–8	30	–16	–10.5
1	–8	30	–14	–11.5
1	–8	30	–11	–13.0

C. Empirical Results

Figure 1 shows the distributions of choices made by subjects in Series 1 and 2. The numbers in the axes correspond to the switching points in Series 1 and 2.⁶ The height of a cone represents the number of subjects who switched at that particular combination of switching points in Series 1 and 2. Black cones represent the choices that are consistent with EU. There are not many subjects whose choices are consistent with EU. The mean estimated values of (σ, α) are (0.59, 0.74) and (0.63, 0.74) in the south and north, respectively. Elaine Liu (2008) replicated this risk experiment

⁶ Switching point 15 implies the subject never switched in that series.

TABLE 3—SWITCHING POINT (QUESTION AT WHICH PREFERENCE SWITCHES FROM OPTION A TO OPTION B) AND APPROXIMATIONS OF σ , α AND λ

Series 1 (questions 1–14)								Series 2 (questions 15–28)							
$\sigma \backslash \alpha$	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.0	$\sigma \backslash \alpha$	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.0
0.2	9	10	11	12	13	14	never	0.2	never	14	13	12	11	10	9
0.3	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	0.3	14	13	12	11	10	9	8
0.4	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	0.4	13	12	11	10	9	8	7
0.5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	0.5	12	11	10	9	8	7	6
0.6	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	0.6	11	10	9	8	7	6	5
0.7	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	0.7	10	9	8	7	6	5	4
0.8	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0.8	9	8	7	6	5	4	3
0.9	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	0.9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2
1.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1.0	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Series 3 (questions 29–35)

Switching question	$\sigma = 0.2$	$\sigma = 0.6$	$\sigma = 1$
1	$\lambda > 0.14$	$\lambda > 0.20$	$\lambda > 0.29$
2	$0.14 < \lambda < 1.26$	$0.20 < \lambda < 1.38$	$0.29 < \lambda < 1.53$
3	$1.26 < \lambda < 1.88$	$1.38 < \lambda < 1.71$	$1.53 < \lambda < 1.71$
4	$1.88 < \lambda < 2.31$	$1.71 < \lambda < 2.25$	$1.71 < \lambda < 2.42$
5	$2.31 < \lambda < 4.32$	$2.25 < \lambda < 3.73$	$2.42 < \lambda < 3.63$
6	$4.32 < \lambda < 5.43$	$3.73 < \lambda < 4.82$	$3.63 < \lambda < 4.83$
7	$5.43 < \lambda < 9.78$	$4.82 < \lambda < 9.13$	$4.83 < \lambda < 9.67$

Note: Bold indicates choices compatible with EU ($\alpha = 1$) and risk aversion.

with Chinese farmers and estimated average values (0.48, 0.69), which are reasonably close. The average derived value of α is significantly different from one at the 1 percent significance level by t -test, rejecting EU in favor of inverted-S shaped probability weighting (see Ming Hsu et al. (2009) for a review and neural measures). We regressed the curvature of the utility function (σ) using OLS regressions, and loss aversion (λ) by interval regressions using maximum likelihood techniques against individual-specific variables.⁷ We first ran regressions using household income as an independent variable.

The regression results are shown in columns 1 and 3 of Table 4. Looking first at σ (curvature of the utility function), the strongest effects suggest subjects who are more educated and older are more risk averse. The estimation result for loss aversion (λ) shows ethnic Chinese are less loss averse and people living in the south are more loss averse. Household income is not significantly correlated with either σ or λ .

Having learned that household income does not correlate with either risk aversion (in terms of concavity of utility function) or loss aversion, we decomposed household income into two variables, mean village income and relative income within the village (subtracting the mean and dividing by the within-village standard deviation).

Columns 2 and 4 of Table 4 contain the regression results of the estimations. Neither relative income nor mean income of the village correlates with concavity of utility function. However, mean village income is strongly correlated with loss aversion. Nevertheless, income variables may be endogenous, and it is difficult to know whether they explain risk preferences, or vice versa. We used rainfall and household head's ability to work at the time of survey as exogenous

⁷ The average estimated value of λ is 2.63, close to the 2.25 estimated by Tversky and Kahneman (1992), and is significantly different from one by t -test ($p < 0.001$). Liu's (2008) estimate is 3.47. For a further survey and evidence that loss aversion can be emotionally regulated, see Peter Sokol-Hessner et al. (2009).




FIGURE 1. DISTRIBUTION OF SWITCHING POINTS IN SERIES 1 AND 2

Notes: Experimental data. Black denotes switching point pairs consistent with EU.

instruments for income variables,⁸ and conducted the Hausman and Davidson-MacKinnon tests to investigate whether OLS is an inconsistent estimator for curvature of the utility function (σ) and loss aversion (λ). The results of both tests suggest OLS is an inconsistent estimator for σ (see Table 4). Therefore, we conducted instrumental variable two-stage least squares (IV-2SLS) regressions for the curvature of the utility function (σ). The IV regression results are shown in Table 5. The variable “head can’t work” is a dummy variable, taking the value one if the household head was not able to work at the time of the survey. The effect of mean income is now significant at the 10 percent level, i.e., individuals living in wealthier villages are less loss averse and also less risk averse. There are no significant effects of gender, which is interesting because many studies find that men are less averse to financial risk than women (e.g., Catherine C. Eckel and Philip Grossman 2008). Our findings suggest that these previous effects of gender may be

⁸ We tested several instrumental variables, e.g., funeral costs, natural disaster relief, crop failure due to natural disaster and pests, and selected rainfall and household head’s ability to work as instruments, since these variables yield the highest F -statistic in the regression.

TABLE 4—CORRELATIONS WITH DIMENSIONS OF RISK AVERSION (OLS)

	Dependent variable			
	σ (Value function curvature)		λ (Loss aversion)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Chinese	0.039 (0.115)	0.027 (0.121)	−3.273* (1.711)	−2.341 (1.769)
Age	−0.005** (0.002)	−0.005** (0.002)	0.042 (0.030)	0.049 (0.030)
Gender	−0.035 (0.056)	−0.028 (0.056)	−0.524 (0.791)	−0.557 (0.781)
Education	−0.019** (0.007)	−0.020*** (0.008)	0.098 (0.105)	0.141 (0.106)
Income	−0.001 (0.001)		−0.028 (0.017)	
Relative income		−0.011 (0.026)		−0.600 (0.371)
Mean income		0.000 (0.003)		−0.086** (0.043)
Distance to market	−0.008 (0.014)	−0.008 (0.015)	−0.178 (0.206)	−0.151 (0.205)
South	−0.033 (0.057)	−0.052 (0.064)	1.479* (0.810)	1.994** (0.888)
Constant	1.054*** (0.141)	1.038*** (0.144)	0.514 (1.997)	0.722 (2.000)
Observations	181	181	181	181
R^2	0.07	0.06		
Log likelihood			−436	−434
Hausman test	$\chi^2 = 5.23$ ($p = 0.022$)	$\chi^2 = 5.52$ ($p = 0.063$)	$\chi^2 = 0.27$ ($p = 0.999$)	$\chi^2 = 3.33$ ($p = 0.853$)
Davidson-MacKinnon test	F -statistic = 5.36 ($p = 0.021$)	F -statistic = 2.82 ($p = 0.063$)	$\chi^2 = 0.06$ ($p = 0.814$)	$\chi^2 = 0.87$ ($p = 0.814$)

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses.

*** Significant at the 1 percent level.

** Significant at the 5 percent level.

* Significant at the 10 percent level.

due to confounds with variables that often correlate with gender, such as income and education, which can be controlled for using our household survey.

III. Time Discounting

A. Previous Findings

Time discounting is another fundamental preference which may affect wealth accumulation. Most studies linking discount rates to wealth in both developed and developing societies use the exponential discounting model and show richer people are more patient (lower r).⁹ However, the exponential discounting model is often rejected by experimental and field data (Frederick,

⁹ Jerry Hausman (1979), Emily C. Lawrance (1991), and Glenn W. Harrison, Marten I. Lau and Melonie B. Williams (2002) report this relation in the United States and Denmark. John L. Pender (1996), Nielsen (2001), and Yesuf (2004) report it in India, Madagascar, and Ethiopia, respectively. Kris N. Kirby et al. (2002), and C. Leigh Anderson et al. (2004) did not find a wealth-patience relation in Bolivia and Vietnam, but their villages did not have as much income variation as we were able to design by handpicking villages.

TABLE 5—IV-2SLS REGRESSIONS FOR RISK AVERSION (σ)

<i>First stage</i>						
	Dependent variable					
	Income		Relative income		Mean income	
Rainfall	0.018	(0.006) ***	−0.000	(0.000)	0.019	(0.002) ***
Head of household can't work (dummy)	−11.846	(7.786)	−0.930	(0.380) **	−2.869	(2.584)
Chinese	6.741	(6.824)	0.196	(0.333)	10.942	(2.265) ***
Age	0.035	(0.128)	0.003	(0.006)	0.054	(0.042)
Gender	−5.129	(3.282)	−0.012	(0.160)	−2.063	(1.089) *
Education	0.706	(0.440)	0.036	(0.021) *	0.281	(0.146) *
Distance to market	−1.0673	(0.974)	0.021	(0.048)	−1.137	(0.323) ***
South	10.483	(3.277) ***	−0.040	(0.160)	9.340	(1.088) ***
Constant	−13.122	(10.671)	−0.179	(0.521)	−14.209	(3.541) ***
Observations	181		181		181	
R^2	0.15		0.05		0.58	
F -statistic	3.89		1.17		30.22	

<i>Second stage</i>						
	Dependent variable					
	σ (Value function curvature)					
Chinese	−0.035	(0.143)	−0.096	(0.138)		
Age	−0.006	(0.003) **	−0.006	(0.002) ***		
Gender	0.022	(0.073)	−0.006	(0.059)		
Education	−0.029	(0.010) ***	−0.028	(0.010) ***		
Income (IV)	0.010	(0.006)				
Relative income (IV)			0.049	(0.148)		
Mean income (IV)			0.010	(0.005) *		
Distance to market	−0.012	(0.017)	−0.013	(0.010)		
South	−0.155	(0.094)	−0.148	(0.080) *		
Constant	0.980	(0.174) ***	0.992	(0.160) ***		
Observations	181		181			
R^2	0.08		0.08			

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses.

*** Significant at the 1 percent level.

** Significant at the 5 percent level.

* Significant at the 10 percent level.

Loewenstein, and O'Donoghue 2002). For example, measured discount rates tend to decline over time¹⁰ (George Ainslie 1992) and exhibit a “present bias” or preference for immediate reward.¹¹ David Laibson (1997) proposed “quasi-hyperbolic” discounting model.¹²

B. Measurement of Time Discounting Parameters

We use a general model proposed by Benhabib, Bisin, and Schotter (2007), which allows us to test exponential, hyperbolic, quasi-hyperbolic discounting, and a more general form. The model

¹⁰ See Richard Thaler (1981), Uri Benzion, Amnon Rapoport, and Joseph Yagil (1989), Loewenstein and Prelec (1992), and Pender (1996).

¹¹ See Laibson (1997), Laibson et al. (1998), O'Donoghue and Matthew Rabin (1999), and George-Marios Angeletos et al. (2001).

¹² This formulation has been used to study retirement planning, gym membership, procrastination, deadlines, and addiction (B. Douglas Bernheim, Jonathan Skinner, and Stephen Weinberg 2001; Stefano DellaVigna and Ulrike Malmendier 2006; Peter Diamond and Botond Köszegi 2003; Laibson, Andrea Repetto, and Jeremy Tobacman 1998; O'Donoghue and Rabin 1999, 2001).

TABLE 6—COMPARISON OF EXPONENTIAL, HYPERBOLIC, AND QUASI-HYPERBOLIC DISCOUNTING MODELS

	Exponential	Hyperbolic	Quasi-hyperbolic	Equation (1)
μ ($\times 10^{-6}$)	6.26*** (0.319)	7.60*** (0.408)	8.58*** (0.544)	8.70 *** (0.553)
r	0.021*** (0.001)	0.046*** (0.004)	0.008*** (0.001)	0.078 (0.074)
β			0.644*** (0.019)	0.820*** (0.070)
θ				5.070*** (0.659)
Observations	5,340	5,340	5,340	5,340
Adjusted R^2	0.515	0.519	0.522	0.523

Notes: Robust standard errors are in parentheses. Standard errors are adjusted for within-subject correlations.

*** Significant at the 1 percent level.

assigns a value to reward y at time of $y\beta(1 - (1 - \theta)rt)^{1/(1-\theta)}$ for $t > 0$ (or simply y for immediate reward at $t = 0$).¹³

The three factors r , β , and θ separate conventional time discounting (r), present-bias (β), and hyperbolicity (θ) of the discount function. When $\beta = 1$, as θ approaches one the discounted value reduces to exponential discounting (e^{-rt}) in the limit. When $\theta = 2$ and $\beta = 1$, it reduces to true hyperbolic discounting ($1/(1 + rt)$). When $\theta = 1$ (in the limit) and β is free, it reduces to quasi-hyperbolic discounting (βe^{-rt}). The three-parameter form enables a way to compare three familiar models at once.

In our experiments, subjects make 75 choices between smaller rewards delivered today and larger rewards delivered at specified times in the future as follows: Option A: receive x dong today; or Option B: receive y dong in t days.

The reward x varies between 30,000 to 300,000 and the time delay t varies between three days and three months (see Table A2 in the Web Appendix).¹⁴

Before conducting the experiment, we chose and announced a trusted agent who would keep the money until delayed delivery date to ensure subjects believed the money would be delivered. The selected trusted persons were usually village heads or presidents of women's associations. In five villages, the trusted agents were also experimental subjects. Agreement letters of money delivery were signed between the trusted agents and the first author. Agents were instructed to deliver the money to the houses of experimental subjects, which tries to equalize the pure transaction costs of receiving money immediately (i.e., at the end of the experiment) or in the future.¹⁵

After subjects completed all 75 questions, we put 75 numbered balls in the bingo cage and drew one ball to determine a pairwise choice. The option chosen for that pair (i.e., A or B) determined how much money was to be delivered, and when.

¹³ The original Benhabib-Bisin-Schotter model includes the present bias in the form of a fixed cost. Zafer Akin and Abdullah Yavas (2007) estimate the model and find the present bias parameter in the form of a fixed cost is not well supported by the data.

¹⁴ The largest amount of y , 300,000 dong (about 19 dollars), is 15 days' wages in the rural north.

¹⁵ A referee suggested appropriately cautious wording: "There are many risks involved with leaving the money with the village head; one is that the village head will give out the money early, another is that the village head will keep the money for himself, another is that the village head will encourage those players who will be receiving a lot of money in the future to redistribute it within the village as earnings are no longer anonymous. These issues may affect the values of r , β , and θ in different ways. Given the difficulties in experimental design we did the best we can, and these are interesting issues for future research."

We denote the probability of choosing immediate reward of x over the delayed reward of y in t days by $P(x > (y, t))$, and use a logistic function to describe this relation as follows:

$$(1) \quad P(x > (y, t)) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\mu(x - y\beta(1 - (1 - \theta)rt)^{1/(1-\theta)}))}$$

We estimate the parameters μ , β , θ , and r in the logistic equation above. The variable μ is a response sensitivity or noise parameter.

C. Empirical Results

Estimation results comparing specific functions are given in Table 6. We fitted the logistic function (1) by using a nonlinear least-squares regression procedure.¹⁶ The estimated values of (r, β, θ) are $(0.078, 0.82, 5.07)$.¹⁷ This implies subjects should trade 6,151 dong today for 10,000 dong in a week, and 4,971 dong today for 10,000 dong in three weeks.

In addition to the general model (1) (shown in the far right column), we estimated exponential, hyperbolic, and quasi-hyperbolic discounting models. Estimating the full model (1) with unrestricted θ does not improve R^2 much compared with the estimation of the quasi-hyperbolic model, so we focus attention only on the quasi-hyperbolic discounting.

Next, we estimate the following logistic function (2) to see whether demographic variables correlate with individual difference in present bias (β) and discount rates (r):

$$(2) \quad P(x > (y, t)) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\mu(x - y\beta \exp[-rt]))},$$

where $\beta = \beta_0 + \sum \beta_i X_i$, $r = r_0 + \sum r_i X_i$, and demographic variables and associated coefficients are represented by X_i and β_i or r_i .

Table 7 shows the results from regressing estimates of the quasi-hyperbolic discounting model, allowing β and r to depend on demographic variables. We conducted nonlinear estimations of the logistic function (2), using household income as an independent variable for the first regression (reported in column (1)), and relative and mean village income as independent variables for the second regression (reported in column (2)).¹⁸ The variable “trusted agent” is a dummy variable, taking the value 1 if the subject is a trusted agent for money delivery. The variable “risk payment” corresponds to the amount of money the subject received in the risk experiment.

The largest effects are on discount rates r . Household income and mean village income are positively related with patience (lower r). None of the income variables explains individual difference in present bias (β) while the estimated coefficient of β in Table 6 (0.644) indicates subjects are present biased. This implies people are present biased regardless of their wealth, and the degree of present bias is comparable to estimates from a variety of other studies.¹⁹

¹⁶ We excluded data from three subjects who made alternating responses across consecutive rows.

¹⁷ t -tests of $\theta = 1$ (quasi-hyperbolic discounting) and each of the restrictions $\beta = \theta = 1$ (exponential discounting) and $\beta = 1$ and $\theta = 2$ (hyperbolic discounting) reject all restrictions at $p > 0.0001$.

¹⁸ The coefficients of explanatory variables for r (discount rates) are multiplied by 100.

¹⁹ See Alexander L. Brown, Camerer, and Zhikang Eric Chua (2009) for a review of quasi-hyperbolic model estimates.

TABLE 7—CORRELATIONS WITH PRESENT BIAS AND DISCOUNT RATES (OLS)

	β (Present bias)		r (Discount rate)	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
μ ($\times 10^{-6}$)	8.93*** (0.59)	9.14*** (0.61)		
Constant (β_0, r_0)	0.673*** (0.096)	0.676*** (0.098)	0.021*** (0.004)	0.023*** (0.004)
Chinese	−0.037 (0.086)	−0.046 (0.089)	−0.199 (0.337)	−0.019 (0.316)
Trusted agent	−0.043 (0.080)	−0.032 (0.080)	−0.189 (0.265)	0.085 (0.293)
Age	0.001 (0.002)	0.001 (0.002)	−0.013** (0.005)	−0.012** (0.005)
Gender	0.013 (0.039)	0.015 (0.039)	−0.122 (0.141)	−0.121 (0.130)
Education	−0.009 (0.005)	−0.009 (0.006)	−0.037** (0.017)	−0.023 (0.015)
Income	0.510 (0.658)		−4.530** (1.782)	
Relative income		0.000 (0.019)		0.016 (0.065)
Mean village income		1.196 (2.381)		−29.838*** (7.512)
Distance to market	0.013 (0.012)	0.013 (0.012)	−0.010 (0.037)	0.000 (0.034)
South	−0.053 (0.046)	−0.059 (0.050)	−0.153 (0.152)	0.080 (0.163)
Risk payment	−0.819 (1.011)	−0.928 (1.015)	−7.144** (3.593)	−4.115 (3.602)
Observations	5,340	5,340		
Adjusted R^2	0.52	0.52		
Davidson and MacKinnon test	F -statistic = 4.58 ($p = 0.011$)	F -statistic = 3.18 ($p = 0.014$)		

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses. Standard errors are adjusted for within-subject correlations. The estimated coefficients of explanatory variables for r (discount rates) are multiplied by 100.

*** Significant at the 1 percent level.

** Significant at the 5 percent level.

* Significant at the 10 percent level.

The amount of money made in the risk game earlier in the experimental session is weakly correlated with patience: individuals who received higher payments in the risk game exhibit lower discount rates r . The choices made by the individuals who were assigned the role of money delivery were not significantly different from those of other subjects.²⁰ We also conducted regressions using instrumental variables (IV) for income variables, because the results of the Davidson-MacKinnon test suggest OLS is an inconsistent estimator. Table 8 shows the regression results from the IV estimations. It indicates household income, as well as a mean village income correlate with lower discount rates.

²⁰ We also conducted regressions without the data of the five subjects who were assigned the role of money delivery. There were few changes in regression results (see Web Appendix Table A3).

TABLE 8—CORRELATIONS WITH PRESENT BIAS AND DISCOUNT RATES (IV-2SLS)

	β (Present bias)		r (Discount rate)	
	(3)	(4)	(3)	(4)
μ ($\times 10^{-6}$)	9.09*** (0.61)	9.09*** (0.18)		
Constant (β_0, r_0)	0.664*** (0.098)	0.643*** (0.113)	0.024*** (0.004)	0.023*** (0.004)
Chinese	−0.055 (0.078)	−0.086 (0.106)	−0.023 (0.337)	0.161 (0.358)
Trusted agent	−0.039 (0.078)	−0.065 (0.075)	−0.334 (0.223)	−0.147 (0.239)
Age	0.000 (0.001)	0.000 (0.001)	−0.015** (0.006)	−0.013** (0.006)
Gender	0.037 (0.045)	0.032 (0.040)	−0.162 (0.140)	−0.051 (0.140)
Education	−0.012 (0.007)	−0.010 (0.008)	−0.002 (0.020)	−0.019 (0.022)
Income (IV)	3.801 (4.497)		−38.985*** (13.313)	
Relative income (IV)		−0.044 (0.144)		−0.128 (0.437)
Mean village income (IV)		5.994 (4.878)		−36.264** (14.907)
Distance to market	0.012 (0.012)	0.010 (0.012)	0.034 (0.039)	0.034 (0.040)
South	−0.081 (0.060)	−0.091 (0.055)	0.239 (0.213)	0.176 (0.212)
Risk payment	−1.078 (1.104)	−1.605 (1.417)	−5.404 (3.993)	−5.022 (4.4507)
Observations	5,340	5,340		
Adjusted R^2	0.52	0.52		

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses. We adjusted standard errors for correlations within individuals. The estimated coefficients of explanatory variables for r (discount rates) are multiplied by 100.

*** Significant at the 1 percent level.

** Significant at the 5 percent level.

* Significant at the 10 percent level.

IV. Conclusion

We conducted experiments in Vietnamese villages to investigate how income and other demographic variables are correlated with risk and time preference.

Our results suggest mean village income is related to risk and time preferences. People living in poor villages are not necessarily afraid of uncertainty, in the sense of income variation; instead, they are averse to loss. When we introduce instrumental variables for income variables, mean village income is also significantly correlated with risk aversion (concavity of the utility function). From the time discounting experiment, we found that mean village income is correlated with lower discount rates, that is, people living in wealthy villages are not only less risk averse but also more patient.

Household income is correlated with patience (lower interest rate) but not with risk preference, which is consistent with the classic result of Binswanger (1980, 1981). Our results also demonstrate that people are present biased regardless of their income levels and economic environments.

These results are exploratory and the experimental measures are not perfect. Furthermore, in a cross-sectional study like this, it is difficult to conclude much about the direction of causality between preferences and economic circumstances because the study was not designed to do so.

We used instrumental variables to deal with the income endogeneity problem. However, preferences and circumstances may be causal in both directions.

Finally, one contribution of our study is to show how to expand measurements of risk and time preferences beyond one-parameter expected utility and exponential discounting, replacing those models with prospect theory and the Benhabib et al. three-parameter discounting model. The parameters we measure are comparable to those in other studies (particularly the first direct replication using our risk preference measurement method, by Liu (2008) studying Chinese farmers) and correlate in interesting ways with household measures.

REFERENCES

- Ainslie, George.** 1992. *Picoeconomics: The Strategic Interaction of Successive Motivational States within the Person*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Akin, Zafer, and Abdullah Yavas.** 2007. "An Experimental Analysis of Time-Inconsistency in Long-Run Projects." Unpublished.
- Anderson, C. Leigh, Maya Dietz, Andrew Gordon, and Marieka Klawitter.** 2004. "Discount Rates in Vietnam." *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 52(4): 873–87.
- Angeletos, George-Marios, David Laibson, Andrea Repetto, Jeremy Tobacman, and Stephen Weinberg.** 2001. "The Hyperbolic Consumption Model: Calibration, Simulation, and Empirical Evaluation." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 15(3): 47–68.
- Ashraf, Nava, Dean Karlan, and Wesley Yin.** 2006. "Tying Odysseus to the Mast: Evidence from a Commitment Savings Product in the Philippines." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121(2): 635–72.
- Benhabib, Jess, Alberto Bisin, and Andrew Schotter.** 2007. "Hyperbolic Discounting: An Experimental Analysis." <http://homepages.nyu.edu/~as7/pshype1205withfigures.pdf>.
- Ben Zion, Uri, Amnon Rapoport, and Joseph Yagil.** 1989. "Discount Rates Inferred from Decisions: An Experimental Study." *Management Science*, 35(3): 270–84.
- Bernheim, B. Douglas, Jonathan Skinner, and Stephen Weinberg.** 2001. "What Accounts for the Variation in Retirement Wealth among US Households?" *American Economic Review*, 91(4): 832–57.
- Binswanger, Hans P.** 1980. "Attitudes toward Risk: Experimental Measurement in Rural India." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 62(3): 395–407.
- Binswanger, Hans P.** 1981. "Attitudes toward Risk: Theoretical Implications of an Experiment in Rural India." *Economic Journal*, 91(364): 867–90.
- Bowles, Samuel.** 1998. "Endogenous Preferences: The Cultural Consequences of Markets and Other Economic Institutions." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 36(1): 75–111.
- Brown, Alexander L., Colin F. Camerer, and Zhikang Eric Chua.** 2009. "Learning and Visceral Temptation in Dynamic Saving Experiments." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(1): 197–231.
- Camerer, Colin F.** 2000. "Prospect Theory in the Wild: Evidence from the Field." In *Choices, Values, and Frames*, ed. D. Kahneman and A. Tversky, 288–300. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cardenas, Juan-Camilo, and Jeffrey Carpenter.** 2008. "Behavioural Development Economics: Lessons from Field Labs in the Developing World." *Journal of Development Studies*, 44(3): 311–38.
- DellaVigna, Stefano, and Ulrike Malmendier.** 2006. "Paying Not to Go to the Gym." *American Economic Review*, 96(3): 694–719.
- Diamond, Peter, and Botond Köszegi.** 2003. "Quasi-hyperbolic Discounting and Retirement." *Journal of Public Economics*, 87(9–10): 1839–72.
- Duflo, Esther.** 2005. "Field Experiments in Development Economics." Paper presented at World Congress of the Econometric Society 2005, London.
- Eckel, Catherine C., and Philip Grossman.** 2008. "Differences in the Economic Decisions of Men and Women: Experimental Evidence." In *Handbook of Experimental Economics Results*. Vol. 1, ed. Charles Plott and Vernon L. Smith, 509–19. New York: Elsevier.
- Frederick, Shane, George Loewenstein, and Ted O'Donoghue.** 2002. "Time Discounting and Time Preference: A Critical Review." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 40(2): 351–401.
- Harrison, Glenn W., Morten I. Lau, and Melonie B. Williams.** 2002. "Estimating Individual Discount Rates in Denmark: A Field Experiment." *American Economic Review*, 92(5): 1606–17.
- Hausman, Jerry A.** 1979. "Individual Discount Rates and the Purchase and Utilization of Energy-Using Durables." *Bell Journal of Economics*, 10(1): 33–54.

- Hsu, Ming, Ian Krajbich, Chen Zao, and Colin F. Camerer.** 2009. "Neural Response to Reward Anticipation under Risk is Nonlinear in Probabilities." *Journal of Neuroscience*, 29(7): 2231–37.
- Kahneman, Daniel, and Amos Tversky.** 1979. "Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision Under Risk." *Econometrica*, 47(2): 263–91.
- Kanbur, Ravi, and Lyn Squire.** 2001. "The Evolution of Thinking about Poverty: Exploring the Interactions." In *Frontiers of Development Economics: The Future in Perspective*, ed. G. M. Meier and J. E. Stiglitz, 183–226. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kirby, Kris N., Ricardo Godoy, Victoria Reyes-Garcia, Elizabeth Byron, Lilian Apaza, William Leonard, Eddy Perez, Vincent Vadez, and David Wilkie.** 2002. "Correlates of Delay-Discount Rates: Evidence from Tsimane' Amerindians of the Bolivian Rain Forest." *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 23(3): 291–316.
- Laibson, David.** 1997. "Golden Eggs and Hyperbolic Discounting." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(2): 443–77.
- Laibson, David, Andrea Repetto, and Jeremy Tobacman.** 1998. "Self-Control and Saving for Retirement." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 29(1): 91–172.
- Lawrance, Emily C.** 1991. "Poverty and the Rate of Time Preference: Evidence from Panel Data." *Journal of Political Economy*, 99(1): 54–77.
- Liu, Elaine.** 2008. "Time to Change What to Sow: Risk Preferences and Technology Adoption Decisions of Cotton Farmers in China." <http://www.class.uh.edu/econ/faculty/emliu/adoption.pdf>.
- Loewenstein, George, and Drazen Prelec.** 1992. "Anomalies in Intertemporal Choice: Evidence and an Interpretation." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107(2): 573–97.
- Mosley, Paul, and Arjan Verschoor.** 2005. "Risk Attitudes and the 'Vicious Circle of Poverty.'" *European Journal of Development Research*, 17(1): 59–88.
- Nielsen, Uffe.** 2001. "Poverty and Attitudes Towards Time and Risk: Experimental Evidence from Madagascar." <http://www.environmental-economics.dk/papers/PTR-experim.pdf>.
- O'Donoghue, Ted, and Matthew Rabin.** 1999. "Doing It Now or Later." *American Economic Review*, 89(1): 103–24.
- O'Donoghue, Ted, and Matthew Rabin.** 2001. "Choice and Procrastination." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116(1): 121–60.
- Pender, John L.** 1996. "Discount Rates and Credit Markets: Theory and Evidence from Rural India." *Journal of Development Economics*, 50(2): 257–96.
- Prelec, Drazen.** 1998. "The Probability Weighting Function." *Econometrica*, 66(3): 497–527.
- Rosenzweig, Mark R., and Hans P. Binswanger.** 1993. "Wealth, Weather Risk and the Composition and Profitability of Agricultural Investments." *Economic Journal*, 103(416): 56–78.
- Sokol-Hessner, Peter, Ming Hsu, Nina G. Curley, Mauricio R. Delgado, Colin F. Camerer, and Elizabeth A. Phelps.** 2009. "Thinking Like a Trader Selectively Reduces Individuals' Loss Aversion." *PNAS*, 106(13): 5035–40.
- Starmer, Chris.** 2000. "Developments in Non-expected Utility Theory: The Hunt for a Descriptive Theory of Choice under Risk." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 38(2): 332–82.
- Thaler, Richard.** 1981. "Some Empirical-Evidence on Dynamic Inconsistency." *Economics Letters*, 8(3): 201–07.
- Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman.** 1992. "Advances in Prospect Theory: Cumulative Representation of Uncertainty." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 5(4): 297–323.
- Wik, Mette, Tewodros Aragie Kebede, Olvar Bergland, and Stein Holden.** 2004. "On the Measurement of Risk Aversion from Experimental Data." *Applied Economics*, 36(21): 2443–51.
- Yesuf, Mahmud.** 2004. "Risk, Time and Land Management under Market Imperfections: Applications to Ethiopia." PhD diss. Göteborg University.

This article has been cited by:

1. Yoro Sidibé, Sébastien Foudi, Unai Pascual, Mette Termansen. 2018. Adaptation to Climate Change in Rainfed Agriculture in the Global South: Soil Biodiversity as Natural Insurance. *Ecological Economics* **146**, 588-596. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Yu-Jen Hsiao, Wei-Che Tsai. 2018. Financial literacy and participation in the derivatives markets. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **88**, 15-29. [[Crossref](#)]
3. I-Chun Tsai. 2018. Investigating Gender Differences in Real Estate Trading Sentiments. *The American Economist* **5**, 056943451774638. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Patrick S. Ward, Andrew R. Bell, Klaus Droppelmann, Tim G. Benton. 2018. Early adoption of conservation agriculture practices: Understanding partial compliance in programs with multiple adoption decisions. *Land Use Policy* **70**, 27-37. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Zan Yang, Ying Fan, Liqing Zhao. 2018. A Reexamination of Housing Price and Household Consumption in China: The Dual Role of Housing Consumption and Housing Investment. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* . [[Crossref](#)]
6. Hiroshi Yamada. 2017. Hunger enhances consistent economic choices in non-human primates. *Scientific Reports* **7**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
7. Douadia Bougherara, Xavier Gassmann, Laurent Piet, Arnaud Reynaud. 2017. Structural estimation of farmers' risk and ambiguity preferences: a field experiment. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* **44**:5, 782-808. [[Crossref](#)]
8. Giuseppe Albanese, Guido de Blasio, Paolo Sestito. 2017. Trust, risk and time preferences: evidence from survey data. *International Review of Economics* **64**:4, 367-388. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Pavlo R. Blavatskyy. 2017. Probabilistic intertemporal choice. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **73**, 142-148. [[Crossref](#)]
10. Aneeqe Javaid, Marco A. Janssen, Hauke Reuter, Achim Schlöter. 2017. When Patience Leads to Destruction: The Curious Case of Individual Time Preferences and the Adoption of Destructive Fishing Gears. *Ecological Economics* **142**, 91-103. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Felix Holzmeister. 2017. oTree: Ready-made apps for risk preference elicitation methods. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance* **16**, 33-38. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Awa Sanou, Lenis Saweda O. Liverpool-Tasie, Robert Shupp. 2017. Eliciting Risk Attitudes in the Field: Surveys or Experimental Methods? An Empirical Comparison in Rural Niger. *The Journal of Development Studies* **82**, 1-21. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Mequanint B. Melesse, Francesco Cecchi. 2017. Does Market Experience Attenuate Risk Aversion? Evidence from Landed Farm Households in Ethiopia. *World Development* **98**, 447-466. [[Crossref](#)]
14. Tianzhuo Liu, Huifang Jiao. 2017. Insights into the Effects of Cognitive Factors and Risk Attitudes on Fire Risk Mitigation Behavior. *Computational Economics* **44**. . [[Crossref](#)]
15. Eyal Lahav, Tal Shavit, Uri Benzion. 2017. Don't Let Them Fool You. *YOUNG* **6**, 110330881771362. [[Crossref](#)]
16. Ratul Mahanta, Daisy Das. 2017. Flood induced vulnerability to poverty: Evidence from Brahmaputra Valley, Assam, India. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* **24**, 451-461. [[Crossref](#)]
17. Ismael Rodriguez-Lara, Giovanni Ponti. 2017. Social motives vs social influence: An experiment on interdependent time preferences. *Games and Economic Behavior* **105**, 177-194. [[Crossref](#)]
18. ROBERT EUGENE LOBEL, MARCELO CABUS KLOTZLE, PAULO VITOR JORDÃO DA GAMA SILVA, ANTONIO CARLOS FIGUEIREDO PINTO. 2017. PROSPECT THEORY: A PARAMETRIC ANALYSIS OF FUNCTIONAL FORMS IN BRAZIL. *Revista de Administração de Empresas* **57**:5, 495-509. [[Crossref](#)]

19. Anna Lindqvist, Fredrik Björklund. 2017. How predictions of economic behavior are affected by the socio-economic status of the target person. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 1-18. [[Crossref](#)]
20. Tracy Xiao Liu. 2017. All-pay auctions with endogenous bid timing: an experimental study. *International Journal of Game Theory* 14. . [[Crossref](#)]
21. C. Königsheim, M. Lukas, M. Nöth. 2017. Individual Preferences and the Exponential Growth Bias. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* . [[Crossref](#)]
22. Tristan Le Cotty, Elodie Maître d'Hôtel, Raphael Soubeyran, Julie Subervie. 2017. Linking Risk Aversion, Time Preference and Fertiliser Use in Burkina Faso. *The Journal of Development Studies* 44, 1-16. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Pan He, Marcella Veronesi, Stefanie Engel. 2017. Consistency of Risk Preference Measures: An Artefactual Field Experiment from Rural China. *The Journal of Development Studies* 1, 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
24. Hanna Freudenreich, Oliver Mußhoff. 2017. Insurance for Technology Adoption: An Experimental Evaluation of Schemes and Subsidies with Maize Farmers in Mexico. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 14. . [[Crossref](#)]
25. Steven Huddart, Abdullah Yavas. 2017. The Efficiency of Stock-Based Incentives: Experimental Evidence. *Journal of Behavioral Finance* 57, 1-23. [[Crossref](#)]
26. Elisabeth Vollmer, Daniel Hermann, Oliver Mußhoff. 2017. Is the risk attitude measured with the Holt and Laury task reflected in farmers' production risk?. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 44:3, 399-424. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Rachid Laajaj. 2017. Endogenous time horizon and behavioral poverty trap: Theory and evidence from Mozambique. *Journal of Development Economics* 127, 187-208. [[Crossref](#)]
28. Daichi Shimamoto, Hiroyuki Yamada, Ayako Wakano. 2017. The Effects of Risk Preferences on the Adoption of Post-Harvest Technology: Evidence from Rural Cambodia. *The Journal of Development Studies* 83, 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
29. Golo-Friedrich Bauermeister, Daniel Hermann, Oliver Musshoff. 2017. Consistency of determined risk attitudes and probability weightings across different elicitation methods. *Theory and Decision* 46. . [[Crossref](#)]
30. Haoran He, Marie Claire Villeval. 2017. Are group members less inequality averse than individual decision makers?. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 138, 111-124. [[Crossref](#)]
31. Stephen A. Atlas, Eric J. Johnson, John W. Payne. 2017. Time Preferences and Mortgage Choice. *Journal of Marketing Research* 54:3, 415-429. [[Crossref](#)]
32. Hjördis Hardardóttir. 2017. Long term stability of time preferences and the role of the macroeconomic situation. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 60, 21-36. [[Crossref](#)]
33. Yasuyuki Sawada, Hiroyuki Nakata, Tomoaki Kotera. 2017. Self-Production, Friction, and Risk Sharing against Disasters: Evidence from a Developing Country. *World Development* 94, 27-37. [[Crossref](#)]
34. Alessandra Cassar, Andrew Healy, Carl von Kessler. 2017. Trust, Risk, and Time Preferences After a Natural Disaster: Experimental Evidence from Thailand. *World Development* 94, 90-105. [[Crossref](#)]
35. Yasuyuki Sawada, Yoshito Takasaki. 2017. Natural Disaster, Poverty, and Development: An Introduction. *World Development* 94, 2-15. [[Crossref](#)]
36. Anna Bartczak, Susan Chilton, Mikołaj Czajkowski, Jürgen Meyerhoff. 2017. Gain and loss of money in a choice experiment. The impact of financial loss aversion and risk preferences on willingness to pay to avoid renewable energy externalities. *Energy Economics* 65, 326-334. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Wencong Lu, Abdul Latif, Raza Ullah. 2017. Simultaneous adoption of contract farming and off-farm diversification for managing agricultural risks: the case of flue-cured Virginia tobacco in Pakistan. *Natural Hazards* 86:3, 1347-1361. [[Crossref](#)]

38. Mei Wang, Marc Oliver Rieger, Thorsten Hens. 2017. The Impact of Culture on Loss Aversion. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* 30:2, 270-281. [[Crossref](#)]
39. Lukas Menkhoff, Sahra Sakha. 2017. Estimating risky behavior with multiple-item risk measures. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 59, 59-86. [[Crossref](#)]
40. Hong Chao, Chun-Yu Ho, Xiangdong Qin. 2017. Risk taking after absolute and relative wealth changes: The role of reference point adaptation. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 54:2, 157-186. [[Crossref](#)]
41. Tabea Herrmann, Olaf Hübler, Lukas Menkhoff, Ulrich Schmidt. 2017. Allais for the poor: Relations to ability, information processing, and risk attitudes. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 54:2, 129-156. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Fatemeh Kimiyaghalam, Shaheen Mansori, Meysam Safari, Stanley Yap. 2017. Parents' Influence on Retirement Planning in Malaysia. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal* 45:3, 315-325. [[Crossref](#)]
43. Xavier Giné, Jessica Goldberg, Dan Silverman, Dean Yang. 2017. Revising Commitments: Field Evidence on the Adjustment of Prior Choices. *The Economic Journal* 118. . [[Crossref](#)]
44. Kaiyu Lyu, Thomas J. Barré. 2017. Risk aversion in crop insurance program purchase decisions. *China Agricultural Economic Review* 9:1, 62-80. [[Crossref](#)]
45. Daniel Paravisini, Veronica Rappoport, Enrichetta Ravina. 2017. Risk Aversion and Wealth: Evidence from Person-to-Person Lending Portfolios. *Management Science* 63:2, 279-297. [[Crossref](#)]
46. Hongrui Liu, Ling Wang, Meilin Yao, Hang Yang, Dongmei Wang. 2017. Self-other decision-making differences in loss aversion: A regulatory focus perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 47:2, 90-98. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Sophie Clot, Charlotte Y. Stanton, Marc Willinger. 2017. Are impatient farmers more risk-averse? Evidence from a lab-in-the-field experiment in rural Uganda. *Applied Economics* 49:2, 156-169. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Ryan O. Murphy, Robert H. W. ten Brincke. 2017. Hierarchical Maximum Likelihood Parameter Estimation for Cumulative Prospect Theory: Improving the Reliability of Individual Risk Parameter Estimates. *Management Science* . [[Crossref](#)]
49. Matthew P. Taylor. 2017. INFORMATION ACQUISITION UNDER RISKY CONDITIONS ACROSS REAL AND HYPOTHETICAL SETTINGS. *Economic Inquiry* 55:1, 352-367. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Jianjun Jin, Rui He, Haozhou Gong, Xia Xu, Chunyang He. 2017. Farmers' Risk Preferences in Rural China: Measurements and Determinants. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 14:7, 713. [[Crossref](#)]
51. Marko Pitesa, Stefan Thau, Madan M. Pillutla. 2017. Workplace trust as a mechanism of employee (dis)advantage: The case of employee socioeconomic status. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 37, 83-101. [[Crossref](#)]
52. Aneeqe Javaid, Micaela M. Kulesz, Achim Schlüter, Alexandra Ghosh, Narriman S. Jiddawi. 2016. Time Preferences and Natural Resource Extraction Behavior: An Experimental Study from Artisanal Fisheries in Zanzibar. *PLOS ONE* 11:12, e0168898. [[Crossref](#)]
53. Pavlo Blavatskyy. 2016. Temporal dominance and relative patience in intertemporal choice. *Economic Theory* . [[Crossref](#)]
54. Angelino C. G. Viceisza. 2016. CREATING A LAB IN THE FIELD: ECONOMICS EXPERIMENTS FOR POLICYMAKING. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 30:5, 835-854. [[Crossref](#)]

55. Matteo M. Galizzi, Marisa Miraldo, Charitini Stavropoulou, Marjon van der Pol. 2016. Doctor–patient differences in risk and time preferences: A field experiment. *Journal of Health Economics* **50**, 171–182. [[Crossref](#)]
56. Jianjun Jin, Wenyu Wang, Xiaomin Wang. 2016. Farmers' Risk Preferences and Agricultural Weather Index Insurance Uptake in Rural China. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science* **7**:4, 366–373. [[Crossref](#)]
57. Ondřej Krčál, Michal Kvasnička, Rostislav Staněk. 2016. External validity of prospect theory: The evidence from soccer betting. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* **65**, 121–127. [[Crossref](#)]
58. Tamás Csermely, Alexander Rabas. 2016. How to reveal people's preferences: Comparing time consistency and predictive power of multiple price list risk elicitation methods. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* **53**:2–3, 107–136. [[Crossref](#)]
59. Farhad Zulfiqar, Raza Ullah, Muhammad Abid, Abid Hussain. 2016. Cotton production under risk: a simultaneous adoption of risk coping tools. *Natural Hazards* **84**:2, 959–974. [[Crossref](#)]
60. A. Suzuki. 2016. Role of risks in surviving the global market: evidence from the pineapple sector in Ghana. *Acta Horticulturae* :1128, 221–228. [[Crossref](#)]
61. Stein T. Holden, John Quiggin. 2016. Climate risk and state-contingent technology adoption: shocks, drought tolerance and preferences. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* . [[Crossref](#)]
62. Ola Andersson, Håkan J. Holm, Jean-Robert Tyran, Erik Wengström. 2016. RISK AVERSION RELATES TO COGNITIVE ABILITY: PREFERENCES OR NOISE?. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **14**:5, 1129–1154. [[Crossref](#)]
63. Joachim Schleich, Xavier Gassmann, Corinne Faure, Thomas Meissner. 2016. Making the implicit explicit: A look inside the implicit discount rate. *Energy Policy* **97**, 321–331. [[Crossref](#)]
64. Shahab E. Saqib, Mokbul Morshed Ahmad, Sanaullah Panezai, Irfan Ahmad Rana. 2016. An empirical assessment of farmers' risk attitudes in flood-prone areas of Pakistan. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* **18**, 107–114. [[Crossref](#)]
65. Raza Ullah, Ganesh P. Shivakoti, Farhad Zulfiqar, Muhammad Asif Kamran. 2016. Farm risks and uncertainties. *Outlook on Agriculture* **45**:3, 199–205. [[Crossref](#)]
66. Alex Imas. 2016. The Realization Effect: Risk-Taking After Realized Versus Paper Losses. *American Economic Review* **106**:8, 2086–2109. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
67. Arjan Verschoor, Ben D'Exelle, Borja Perez-Viana. 2016. Lab and life: Does risky choice behaviour observed in experiments reflect that in the real world?. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **128**, 134–148. [[Crossref](#)]
68. Marit Hinnosaar. 2016. Time inconsistency and alcohol sales restrictions. *European Economic Review* **87**, 108–131. [[Crossref](#)]
69. David R. Just, Richard E. Just. 2016. Empirical Identification of Behavioral Choice Models under Risk. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **98**:4, 1181–1194. [[Crossref](#)]
70. Golo-Friedrich Bauermeister, Oliver Mußhoff. 2016. Konstante Wahrscheinlichkeiten vs. konstante Auszahlungsbeträge: Auswirkungen auf die ermittelte Risikoeinstellung und beobachtete Inkonsistenzrate in lotteriebasierten Experimenten. *Schmalenbachs Zeitschrift für betriebswirtschaftliche Forschung* **68**:2, 145–166. [[Crossref](#)]
71. Raza Ullah, Ganesh P. Shivakoti, Asif Kamran, Farhad Zulfiqar. 2016. Farmers versus nature: managing disaster risks at farm level. *Natural Hazards* **82**:3, 1931–1945. [[Crossref](#)]
72. Aude Ridier, Karim Chaib, Caroline Roussy. 2016. A Dynamic Stochastic Programming model of crop rotation choice to test the adoption of long rotation under price and production risks. *European Journal of Operational Research* **252**:1, 270–279. [[Crossref](#)]

73. Xiaodong Du, Hongli Feng, David A. Hennessy. 2016. Rationality of Choices in Subsidized Crop Insurance Markets. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* aaw035. [[Crossref](#)]
74. Arthur E. Attema, Han Bleichrodt, Yu Gao, Zhenxing Huang, Peter P. Wakker. 2016. Measuring Discounting without Measuring Utility. *American Economic Review* **106**:6, 1476-1494. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
75. Sudhanshu Handa, Bruno Martorano, Carolyn T. Halpern, Audrey Pettifor, Harsha Thirumurthy. 2016. Time Discounting and Credit Market Access in a Large-Scale Cash Transfer Programme. *Journal of African Economies* **25**:3, 367-387. [[Crossref](#)]
76. Sabine Liebenehm, Bernard Bett, Cristobal Verdugo, Mohamed Said. 2016. Optimal Drug Control under Risk of Drug Resistance - The Case of African Animal Trypanosomosis. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* **67**:2, 510-533. [[Crossref](#)]
77. Florian Weigert. 2016. Crash Aversion and the Cross-Section of Expected Stock Returns Worldwide. *Review of Asset Pricing Studies* **6**:1, 135-178. [[Crossref](#)]
78. Quang Nguyen. 2016. Linking loss aversion and present bias with overspending behavior of tourists: Insights from a lab-in-the-field experiment. *Tourism Management* **54**, 152-159. [[Crossref](#)]
79. Haoran He, Keyu Wu. 2016. Choice set, relative income, and inequity aversion: An experimental investigation. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **54**, 177-193. [[Crossref](#)]
80. Eko Ruddy Cahyadi, Hermann Waibel. 2016. Contract Farming and Vulnerability to Poverty among Oil Palm Smallholders in Indonesia. *The Journal of Development Studies* **52**:5, 681-695. [[Crossref](#)]
81. Stephen G. Dimmock, Roy Kouwenberg, Peter P. Wakker. 2016. Ambiguity Attitudes in a Large Representative Sample. *Management Science* **62**:5, 1363-1380. [[Crossref](#)]
82. Leandro S. Carvalho, Silvia Prina, Justin Sydnor. 2016. The effect of saving on risk attitudes and intertemporal choices. *Journal of Development Economics* **120**, 41-52. [[Crossref](#)]
83. Babette Never. 2016. Behave and save?. *Energy Research & Social Science* **15**, 34-44. [[Crossref](#)]
84. Sang Hun Lee, Hyun Gook Kang. 2016. Integrated framework for the external cost assessment of nuclear power plant accident considering risk aversion: The Korean case. *Energy Policy* **92**, 111-123. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Deep Mukherjee, Mohammad Arshad Rahman. 2016. To drill or not to drill? An econometric analysis of US public opinion. *Energy Policy* **91**, 341-351. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Heiner Schumacher. 2016. Insurance, self-control, and contract flexibility. *European Economic Review* **83**, 220-232. [[Crossref](#)]
87. Xiaojun Yang, Fredrik Carlsson. 2016. Influence and choice shifts in households: An experimental investigation. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **53**, 54-66. [[Crossref](#)]
88. Jaimie W. Lien, Jie Zheng, Xiaohan Zhong. 2016. Preference submission timing in school choice matching: testing fairness and efficiency in the laboratory. *Experimental Economics* **19**:1, 116-150. [[Crossref](#)]
89. Alexander K. Koch, Julia Nafziger. 2016. Goals and bracketing under mental accounting. *Journal of Economic Theory* **162**, 305-351. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Stephen G. Dimmock, Roy Kouwenberg, Olivia S. Mitchell, Kim Peijnenburg. 2016. Ambiguity aversion and household portfolio choice puzzles: Empirical evidence. *Journal of Financial Economics* **119**:3, 559-577. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Leandro S. Carvalho, Stephan Meier, Stephanie W. Wang. 2016. Poverty and Economic Decision-Making: Evidence from Changes in Financial Resources at Payday. *American Economic Review* **106**:2, 260-284. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]

92. Qianqian MAO, Wenlue WANG, Shunji ONIKI, Masaru KAGATSUME, Jin YU. 2016. Experimental Measure of Rural Household Risk Preference: The Case of the SLCP Area in Northern Shaanxi, China. *Japan Agricultural Research Quarterly: JARQ* 50:3, 253-265. [[Crossref](#)]
93. Shinsuke Ikeda. Overborrowing, Overeating, and Addictive Behavior 113-151. [[Crossref](#)]
94. Pamela Jakiela, Owen Ozier. 2016. Does Africa Need a Rotten Kin Theorem? Experimental Evidence from Village Economies. *The Review of Economic Studies* 83:1, 231-268. [[Crossref](#)]
95. Christopher J. Paul, Erika S. Weinthal, Marc F. Bellemare, Marc A. Jeuland. 2016. Social capital, trust, and adaptation to climate change: Evidence from rural Ethiopia. *Global Environmental Change* 36, 124-138. [[Crossref](#)]
96. Diego Ubfal. 2016. How general are time preferences? Eliciting good-specific discount rates. *Journal of Development Economics* 118, 150-170. [[Crossref](#)]
97. Mickael Beaud, Marc Willinger. 2016. Quels déterminants de la prise de risque? Les réponses de l'économie expérimentale. *L'Actualité économique* 92:1-2, 49. [[Crossref](#)]
98. May Attallah. 2016. Représentativité et hétérogénéité des préférences dans les expériences de laboratoire. *L'Actualité économique* 92:1-2, 403. [[Crossref](#)]
99. Oleg Urminsky, Gal Zauberman. The Psychology of Intertemporal Preferences 141-181. [[Crossref](#)]
100. Luís Santos-Pinto, Adrian Bruhin, José Mata, Thomas Åstebro. 2015. Detecting heterogeneous risk attitudes with mixed gambles. *Theory and Decision* 79:4, 573-600. [[Crossref](#)]
101. Stephen G. Dimmock, Roy Kouwenberg, Olivia S. Mitchell, Kim Peijnenburg. 2015. Estimating ambiguity preferences and perceptions in multiple prior models: Evidence from the field. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 51:3, 219-244. [[Crossref](#)]
102. Jan-Erik Lönngqvist, Markku Verkasalo, Gari Walkowitz, Philipp C. Wichardt. 2015. Measuring individual risk attitudes in the lab: Task or ask? An empirical comparison. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 119, 254-266. [[Crossref](#)]
103. Kerri Brick, Martine Visser. 2015. Risk preferences, technology adoption and insurance uptake: A framed experiment. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 118, 383-396. [[Crossref](#)]
104. Gul Deniz Salali, Andrea Bamberg Migliano. 2015. Future Discounting in Congo Basin Hunter-Gatherers Declines with Socio-Economic Transitions. *PLOS ONE* 10:9, e0137806. [[Crossref](#)]
105. Jin Jianjun, Gao Yiwei, Wang Xiaomin, Pham Khanh Nam. 2015. Farmers' risk preferences and their climate change adaptation strategies in the Yongqiao District, China. *Land Use Policy* 47, 365-372. [[Crossref](#)]
106. Raza Ullah, Ganesh P. Shivakoti, Ghaffar Ali. 2015. Factors effecting farmers' risk attitude and risk perceptions: The case of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 13, 151-157. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Ned Augenblick, Muriel Niederle, Charles Sprenger. 2015. Working over Time: Dynamic Inconsistency in Real Effort Tasks. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 130:3, 1067-1115. [[Crossref](#)]
108. Anna Bartczak, Susan Chilton, Jürgen Meyerhoff. 2015. Wildfires in Poland: The impact of risk preferences and loss aversion on environmental choices. *Ecological Economics* 116, 300-309. [[Crossref](#)]
109. Oliver Gloede, Lukas Menkhoff, Hermann Waibel. 2015. Shocks, Individual Risk Attitude, and Vulnerability to Poverty among Rural Households in Thailand and Vietnam. *World Development* 71, 54-78. [[Crossref](#)]
110. Felix Povel. 2015. Measuring Exposure to Downside Risk with an Application to Thailand and Vietnam. *World Development* 71, 4-24. [[Crossref](#)]

111. Julie A. Nelson. 2015. ARE WOMEN REALLY MORE RISK-AVERSE THAN MEN? A RE-ANALYSIS OF THE LITERATURE USING EXPANDED METHODS. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 29:3, 566-585. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Raza Ullah, Damien Jourdain, Ganesh P. Shivakoti, Shobhakar Dhakal. 2015. Managing catastrophic risks in agriculture: Simultaneous adoption of diversification and precautionary savings. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 12, 268-277. [[Crossref](#)]
113. Hubert de La Bruslerie. 2015. Decreasing term structure of psychological discount rates: Experimental estimation and determinants. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance* 6, 13-26. [[Crossref](#)]
114. Yongqiang Wang, Yan Wang, Xuexi Huo, Yuchun Zhu. 2015. Why some restricted pesticides are still chosen by some farmers in China? Empirical evidence from a survey of vegetable and apple growers. *Food Control* 51, 417-424. [[Crossref](#)]
115. Stephan Meier, Charles D. Sprenger. 2015. Temporal Stability of Time Preferences. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 97:2, 273-286. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Simone Schaner. 2015. Do Opposites Detract? Intrahousehold Preference Heterogeneity and Inefficient Strategic Savings. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 7:2, 135-174. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
117. Maria Apostolova-Mihaylova, William Cooper, Gail Hoyt, Emily C. Marshall. 2015. Heterogeneous gender effects under loss aversion in the economics classroom: A field experiment. *Southern Economic Journal* 81:4, 980-994. [[Crossref](#)]
118. Marco Casari, Davide Dragone. 2015. Choice reversal without temptation: A dynamic experiment on time preferences. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 50:2, 119-140. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Matthias Rieger. 2015. Risk aversion, time preference and health production: Theory and empirical evidence from Cambodia. *Economics & Human Biology* 17, 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
120. Avshalom Elmalech, David Sarne, Barbara J. Grosz. 2015. Problem restructuring for better decision making in recurring decision situations. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems* 29:1, 1-39. [[Crossref](#)]
121. Ben D'Exelle, Arjan Verschoor. 2015. Investment Behaviour, Risk Sharing and Social Distance. *The Economic Journal* 125:584, 777. [[Crossref](#)]
122. Curtis J. Simon, John T. Warner, Saul Pleeter. 2015. DISCOUNTING, COGNITION, AND FINANCIAL AWARENESS: NEW EVIDENCE FROM A CHANGE IN THE MILITARY RETIREMENT SYSTEM. *Economic Inquiry* 53:1, 318-334. [[Crossref](#)]
123. Patrick S. Ward, Vartika Singh. 2015. Using Field Experiments to Elicit Risk and Ambiguity Preferences: Behavioural Factors and the Adoption of New Agricultural Technologies in Rural India. *The Journal of Development Studies* 51:6, 707. [[Crossref](#)]
124. Yasuyuki Todo, Hitoshi Sato. 2014. Effects of presidents' characteristics on internationalization of small and medium firms in Japan. *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 34, 236-255. [[Crossref](#)]
125. Patrick S. Ward, David L. Ortega, David J. Spielman, Vartika Singh. 2014. Heterogeneous Demand for Drought-Tolerant Rice: Evidence from Bihar, India. *World Development* 64, 125-139. [[Crossref](#)]
126. Laurens M. Bouwer, Elissaios Papyrakis, Jennifer Poussin, Clemens Pfurtscheller, Annegret H. Thieken. 2014. The Costing of Measures for Natural Hazard Mitigation in Europe. *Natural Hazards Review* 15:4, 04014010. [[Crossref](#)]
127. OLGA STODDARD, ANDREAS LEIBBRANDT. 2014. AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY ON THE RELEVANCE AND SCOPE OF NATIONALITY AS A COORDINATION DEVICE. *Economic Inquiry* 52:4, 1392-1407. [[Crossref](#)]

128. David Eil, Jaimie W. Lien. 2014. Staying ahead and getting even: Risk attitudes of experienced poker players. *Games and Economic Behavior* **87**, 50-69. [[Crossref](#)]
129. Robin Chark, Soo Hong Chew, Songfa Zhong. 2014. Extended present bias: a direct experimental test. *Theory and Decision* . [[Crossref](#)]
130. Alan de Brauw, Patrick Eozenou. 2014. Measuring Risk Attitudes among Mozambican Farmers. *Journal of Development Economics* . [[Crossref](#)]
131. Elaine M. Liu, Juanjuan Meng, Joseph Tao-yi Wang. 2014. Confucianism and preferences: Evidence from lab experiments in Taiwan and China. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **104**, 106-122. [[Crossref](#)]
132. Raymundo M. Campos-Vazquez, Emilio Cuilty. 2014. The role of emotions on risk aversion: A Prospect Theory experiment. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* **50**, 1-9. [[Crossref](#)]
133. Eric Duquette, Nathaniel Higgins, John Horowitz. 2014. Inferring discount rates from time-preference experiments. *Economics Letters* **123**:2, 212-215. [[Crossref](#)]
134. David J. Pannell, Rick S. Llewellyn, Marc Corbeels. 2014. The farm-level economics of conservation agriculture for resource-poor farmers. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **187**, 52-64. [[Crossref](#)]
135. Martin Eling, Shailee Pradhan, Joan T Schmit. 2014. The Determinants of Microinsurance Demand. *The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance - Issues and Practice* **39**:2, 224-263. [[Crossref](#)]
136. Marc Oliver Rieger, Mei Wang, Thorsten Hens. 2014. Risk Preferences Around the World. *Management Science* 141223041315002. [[Crossref](#)]
137. Ola Andersson, Håkan J. Holm, Jean-Robert Tyran, Erik Wengström. 2014. Deciding for Others Reduces Loss Aversion. *Management Science* 141223041315002. [[Crossref](#)]
138. Lu-Ming Tseng, Yue-Min Kang. 2014. The influences of sales compensations, management stringency and ethical evaluations on product recommendations made by insurance brokers. *Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance* **22**:1, 26-42. [[Crossref](#)]
139. Michela Coppola. 2014. Eliciting risk-preferences in socio-economic surveys: How do different measures perform?. *The Journal of Socio-Economics* **48**, 1-10. [[Crossref](#)]
140. Géraldine Bocquého, Florence Jacquet, Arnaud Reynaud. 2014. Expected utility or prospect theory maximisers? Assessing farmers' risk behaviour from field-experiment data. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* **41**:1, 135-172. [[Crossref](#)]
141. Michael Callen, Mohammad Isaqzadeh, James D. Long, Charles Sprenger. 2014. Violence and Risk Preference: Experimental Evidence from Afghanistan. *American Economic Review* **104**:1, 123-148. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
142. Charles A. Holt, Susan K. Laury. Assessment and Estimation of Risk Preferences 135-201. [[Crossref](#)]
143. Eric J. Johnson, Roger Ratcliff. Computational and Process Models of Decision Making in Psychology and Behavioral Economics 35-47. [[Crossref](#)]
144. Craig R. Fox, Russell A. Poldrack. Prospect Theory and the Brain 533-567. [[Crossref](#)]
145. Stephan Meier, Charles D. Sprenger. 2013. Discounting financial literacy: Time preferences and participation in financial education programs. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **95**, 159-174. [[Crossref](#)]
146. Catherine Eckel, Cathleen Johnson, Claude Montmarquette. 2013. Human capital investment by the poor: Informing policy with laboratory experiments. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **95**, 224-239. [[Crossref](#)]
147. J. François Outreville. 2013. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELATIVE RISK AVERSION AND THE LEVEL OF EDUCATION: A SURVEY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THE DEMAND FOR LIFE INSURANCE. *Journal of Economic Surveys* n/a-n/a. [[Crossref](#)]

148. Michal Bauer, Julie Chytilová. 2013. Women, Children and Patience: Experimental Evidence from Indian Villages. *Review of Development Economics* 17:4, 662-675. [[Crossref](#)]
149. Sera Linardi, Tomomi Tanaka. 2013. Competition as a savings incentive: A field experiment at a homeless shelter. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 95, 240-251. [[Crossref](#)]
150. Elaine M. Liu. 2013. Time to Change What to Sow: Risk Preferences and Technology Adoption Decisions of Cotton Farmers in China. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 95:4, 1386-1403. [[Crossref](#)]
151. Stephen Gould, Rania W. Semaan, Lauren Trabold. 2013. "How I think you are investing": Gendered, social metacognitive influences on consumers' investing perspectives. *Social Influence* 8:4, 251-267. [[Crossref](#)]
152. Emmanuel Kemel, Corina Paraschiv. 2013. Prospect Theory for joint time and money consequences in risk and ambiguity. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 56, 81-95. [[Crossref](#)]
153. Fredrik Carlsson, Peter Martinsson, Ping Qin, Matthias Sutter. 2013. The influence of spouses on household decision making under risk: an experiment in rural China. *Experimental Economics* 16:3, 383-401. [[Crossref](#)]
154. Dean Spears. 2013. Poverty and probability: aspiration and aversion to compound lotteries in El Salvador and India. *Experimental Economics* 16:3, 263-284. [[Crossref](#)]
155. Tao Ye, Ming Wang. 2013. Exploring risk attitude by a comparative experimental approach and its implication to disaster insurance practice in China. *Journal of Risk Research* 16:7, 861-878. [[Crossref](#)]
156. Géraldine Bocquého, Florence Jacquet, Arnaud Reynaud. 2013. Reversal and magnitude effects in long-term time preferences: Results from a field experiment. *Economics Letters* 120:1, 108-111. [[Crossref](#)]
157. Elaine M. Liu, JiKun Huang. 2013. Risk preferences and pesticide use by cotton farmers in China. *Journal of Development Economics* 103, 202-215. [[Crossref](#)]
158. Matthew P. Taylor. 2013. Bias and brains: Risk aversion and cognitive ability across real and hypothetical settings. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 46:3, 299-320. [[Crossref](#)]
159. Christoph Saenger, Matin Qaim, Maximo Torero, Angelino Viceisza. 2013. Contract farming and smallholder incentives to produce high quality: experimental evidence from the Vietnamese dairy sector. *Agricultural Economics* 44:3, 297-308. [[Crossref](#)]
160. Thea Nielsen, Alwin Keil, Manfred Zeller. 2013. Assessing farmers' risk preferences and their determinants in a marginal upland area of Vietnam: a comparison of multiple elicitation techniques. *Agricultural Economics* 44:3, 255-273. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Mary Riddell. 2013. How Do Long-Shot Outcomes Affect Preferences for Climate Change Mitigation?. *Southern Economic Journal* 130405125034007. [[Crossref](#)]
162. Mary Riddell, Sonja Kolstoe. 2013. Heterogeneity in life-duration preferences: Are risky recreationists really more risk loving?. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 46:2, 191-213. [[Crossref](#)]
163. Thomas Vischer, Thomas Dohmen, Armin Falk, David Huffman, Jürgen Schupp, Uwe Sunde, Gert G. Wagner. 2013. Validating an ultra-short survey measure of patience. *Economics Letters* . [[Crossref](#)]
164. Rahul Deb, Tavneet Suri. 2013. Endogenous emergence of credit markets: Contracting in response to a new technology in Ghana. *Journal of Development Economics* 101, 268-283. [[Crossref](#)]
165. Yan Li, Liyan Yang. 2013. Prospect theory, the disposition effect, and asset prices. *Journal of Financial Economics* 107:3, 715-739. [[Crossref](#)]
166. Gary Charness, Uri Gneezy, Alex Imas. 2013. Experimental methods: Eliciting risk preferences. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 87, 43-51. [[Crossref](#)]

167. Olivier Toubia, Eric Johnson, Theodoros Evgeniou, Philippe Delquié. 2013. Dynamic Experiments for Estimating Preferences: An Adaptive Method of Eliciting Time and Risk Parameters. *Management Science* **59**:3, 613-640. [[Crossref](#)]
168. Joseph Cook, Susmita Chatterjee, Dipika Sur, Dale Whittington. 2013. Measuring risk aversion among the urban poor in Kolkata, India. *Applied Economics Letters* **20**:1, 1-9. [[Crossref](#)]
169. James Andreoni,, Charles Sprenger. 2012. Estimating Time Preferences from Convex Budgets. *American Economic Review* **102**:7, 3333-3356. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
170. Ruokang Han, Taiki Takahashi. 2012. Psychophysics of time perception and valuation in temporal discounting of gain and loss. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **391**:24, 6568-6576. [[Crossref](#)]
171. Fredrik Carlsson, Haoran He, Peter Martinsson, Ping Qin, Matthias Sutter. 2012. Household decision making in rural China: Using experiments to estimate the influences of spouses. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **84**:2, 525-536. [[Crossref](#)]
172. Alison Booth, Patrick Nolen. 2012. Salience, risky choices and gender. *Economics Letters* **117**:2, 517-520. [[Crossref](#)]
173. Hans-Martin Gaudecker, Arthur Soest, Erik Wengström. 2012. Experts in experiments. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* **45**:2, 159-190. [[Crossref](#)]
174. Mary Riddel. 2012. Comparing risk preferences over financial and environmental lotteries. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* **45**:2, 135-157. [[Crossref](#)]
175. Hailemariam Teklewold. 2012. The impact of shadow prices and farmers' impatience on the allocation of a multipurpose renewable resource in Ethiopia. *Environment and Development Economics* **17**:04, 479-505. [[Crossref](#)]
176. Christian Thöni, Jean-Robert Tyran, Erik Wengström. 2012. Microfoundations of social capital. *Journal of Public Economics* **96**:7-8, 635-643. [[Crossref](#)]
177. Arnaud Reynaud, Stéphane Couture. 2012. Stability of risk preference measures: results from a field experiment on French farmers. *Theory and Decision* **73**:2, 203-221. [[Crossref](#)]
178. Maarten J. Voors,, Eleonora E. M. Nillesen,, Philip Verwimp,, Erwin H. Bulte,, Robert Lensink,, Daan P. Van Soest. 2012. Violent Conflict and Behavior: A Field Experiment in Burundi. *American Economic Review* **102**:2, 941-964. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
179. Michal Bauer,, Julie Chytilová,, Jonathan Morduch. 2012. Behavioral Foundations of Microcredit: Experimental and Survey Evidence from Rural India. *American Economic Review* **102**:2, 1118-1139. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
180. Bram Tucker. 2012. Do Risk and Time Experimental Choices Represent Individual Strategies for Coping with Poverty or Conformity to Social Norms?. *Current Anthropology* **53**:2, 149-180. [[Crossref](#)]
181. Hans P. Binswanger-Mkhize. 2012. Is There Too Much Hype about Index-based Agricultural Insurance?. *Journal of Development Studies* **48**:2, 187-200. [[Crossref](#)]
182. Andrew M. Brooks, C. Monica Capra, Gregory S. Berns. 2012. Neural insensitivity to upticks in value is associated with the disposition effect. *NeuroImage* **59**:4, 4086-4093. [[Crossref](#)]
183. TOMOMI TANAKA, TAKESHI MUROOKA. 2012. SELF-CONTROL PROBLEMS AND CONSUMPTION-SAVING DECISIONS: THEORY AND EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE*. *Japanese Economic Review* no-no. [[Crossref](#)]
184. Louise S. L. Teh, Lydia C. L. Teh, U. Rashid Sumaila. 2011. Low Discounting Behavior among Small-Scale Fishers in Fiji and Sabah, Malaysia. *Sustainability* **3**:12, 897-913. [[Crossref](#)]
185. Quang Nguyen. 2011. Does nurture matter: Theory and experimental investigation on the effect of working environment on risk and time preferences. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* . [[Crossref](#)]

186. Karna Basu. 2011. Hyperbolic Discounting and the Sustainability of Rotational Savings Arrangements. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* 3:4, 143-171. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
187. Daniel M. Bartels, Oleg Urminsky. 2011. On Intertemporal Selfishness: How the Perceived Instability of Identity Underlies Impatient Consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research* 38:1, 182-198. [[Crossref](#)]
188. Arthur E. Attema, Han Bleichrodt, Kirsten I. M. Rohde, Peter P. Wakker. 2010. Time-Tradeoff Sequences for Analyzing Discounting and Time Inconsistency. *Management Science* 56:11, 2015-2030. [[Crossref](#)]
189. QUANG NGUYEN, PINGSUN LEUNG. 2010. How nurture can shape preferences: an experimental study on risk preferences of Vietnamese fishers. *Environment and Development Economics* 15:05, 609-631. [[Crossref](#)]
190. Gharad Bryan, Dean Karlan, Scott Nelson. 2010. Commitment Devices. *Annual Review of Economics* 2:1, 671-698. [[Crossref](#)]