Probability Weighting in Recursive Evaluation of Two-Stage Prospects

Mohammed Abdellaoui., Olivier L'haridon, Antoine Nebout-Javal

► To cite this version:

Mohammed Abdellaoui., Olivier L'haridon, Antoine Nebout-Javal. Probability Weighting in Recursive Evaluation of Two-Stage Prospects. SABE-IAREP International Congress in Behavioural Economics and Economic Psychology, SABE-IAREP., Jul 2014, Lake Tahoe, United States. 32 p. hal-02796753

HAL Id: hal-02796753

https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02796753

Submitted on 5 Jun 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Probability Weighting in Recursive Evaluation of Two-Stage Prospects

Mohammed Abdellaoui. [*] Olivier L'Haridon [†] Antoine Nebout [‡]

July 22, 2014

[*] HEC Paris, France
[†] Université de Rennes, France
[‡] INRA, ALISS, France.

Outline

1/ Introductory remarks

2/ Conceptual framework

3/ Experimental study

4/ Concluding remarks

Why investigating the evaluation of Two-stage prospects?

Two-stage prospect and reduction of compound lotteries



Table 1: compound risk and its reduced one-stage lottery

- ☐ Rational Decision makers (DMs) reduce compound risks, represented by compound lotteries, into single stage lotteries by using the Reduction of compound prospects axiom (RCP).

⇒ Rational DMs should exhibit a perfect neutrality toward compound risk.

However...

Three observations on compound risk

1. Reduction of compound prospects have been descriptively challenged in many empirical investigations:
   - Bar Hillel (1973), Bernasconi & Loomes (1992), Budescu & Fisher (2001), Abdellaoui, Klibanoff & Placido (2014), Nebout & Dubois (2014)...

2. Following Becker & Brownson (1964) and Yates and Zukowski (1976), Segal (1987, 1990) represented ambiguous bets as two-stage prospects.

3. Prospect Theory (PT) is the most succesful descriptive model of decision making under risk and ambiguity.

   $\Rightarrow$ Would it still be the case when dealing with attitudes toward two-stage prospects?

Theoretical and Empirical Background

Background: One-stage prospects

- $(x, p; y)$ denotes the one-stage *prospect* resulting in outcome x with probability p and in outcome y with probability $1 - p$ with $x \geq y \geq 0$.
  - Probability p is generated using a known urn containing 100 balls numbered from 1 to 100, i.e. drawing a ball which has a number between 1 and $p \times 100$.
- $(x, E_p; y)$ denotes the corresponding ambiguous prospect. The probability $P(E_p)$ is unknown to the DM.
  - We use an unknown containing 100 balls numbered from 1 to 100 in unknown proportions, i.e. drawing a ball which has a number between 1 and $p \times 100$. Symmetry arguments imply $P(E_p) = p$. (Chew & Sagi, 2006, 2008)

Background: Evaluation of one-stage prospects

- Under Expected Utility (EU), prospects are evaluated as follows:

$$EU(x, p; y) = pu(x) + (1 - p)u(y)$$

  - Where u is the utility function (and a risk attitude index).
  - Violations of EU popularized by Kahneman & Tversky.

- Under Prospect Theory (PT), prospects are evaluated as follows in the gain domain:

$$PT(x, p; y) = w(p)u(x) + (1 - w(p))u(y)$$

  - u is the utility function.
  - w is the probability weighting function. w is strictly increasing and satisfies $w(0) = 0$ and $w(1) = 1$.

$\Rightarrow$ Many experimental evidence on RDU under risk and ambiguity.

Probability weighting under risk and ambiguity



⇒ Ambiguity increases **likelihood insensitivity.**

How to evaluate two-stage prospects?



- Traditional Recursive Expected Utility (TREU):

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \times EU(P) + \frac{1}{2} \times EU(Q)$$

How to evaluate two-stage prospects?



- Recursive Expected Utility without RCP (REU):

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \times \phi\left[EU(P)\right] + \frac{1}{2} \times \phi\left[EU(Q)\right]$$

  - Kreps & Porteus (1978) introduced this transformed EU functionnal to account for delayed resolution of uncertainty.
  - Klibanof & al. (2005) used the same preference functinnal to model ambiguity. (Seo, 2009, Ergin & Gul (2008),...)

How to evaluate two-stage prospects?



- Recursive Prospect Theory (RPT):

$$\Rightarrow \pi_1 \times \phi\left[PT(P)\right] + \pi_2 \times \phi\left[PT(Q)\right]$$

  - Segal (1987) suggested this recursive form of RDU to model ambiguity attitudes through second-order probabilities.
  - Abdellaoui & Zank (2014) provide the first axiomatization of this general form of Prospect Theory.

Experimental Design

Experiment: outline

62 subjects:

- Parts 1 & 2: certainty equivalents for known and unknown Ellsberg urns (2×13 equivalents).
- Parts 3 & 4: matching probabilities for two-stage prospects (2×10 equivalents).
- Payment: show up 10 euros + RIS (max 50 euros).
- Individual interviews (about 45 minutes).

Under RPT, we aim to elicit the following functionals:

	Elicitation 1: Risk	Elicitation 2: Ambiguity
Attitudes towards 1-stage prospects	u w	$\tilde{u}$ $\tilde{w}$
Attitudes towards 2-stage prospects	w^*	$\tilde{w}^*$

Certainty equivalents for one-stage prospects

	$c \sim (x,p;y)$ and $\tilde{c} \sim (x,E_p;y)$						$c_p \sim (x,p;y)$ and $\tilde{c}_p \sim (x,E_p;y)$						
x	50	40	50	50	25	10	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
y	25	20	10	35	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
p	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.02	0.06	0.17	0.33	0.50	0.67	0.94
E_p	E_{30}	E_{30}	E_{30}	E_{30}	E_{30}	E_{30}	E_2	E_6	E_{17}	E_{33}	E_{50}	E_{67}	E_{94}

- Under risk, we elicit c and c_p following Abdellaoui & al. (2008).
- Under ambiguity, we elicit $\tilde{c}$ and $\tilde{c}_p$ following Abdellaoui & al. (2011).

$\Rightarrow$ We can compare our results to these benchmark studies.



CE1 Id45 (17)
Affichage Settings
Alternative A
Exemples
Alternative B
0 €
5 €
10 €
15 €
20 €
25 €
30 €
35 €
40 €
45 €
50 €
n° 1 à 50 vous gagnez : 50 €
sinon 0 €
n° 1 à 100 vous gagnez : 25 €
OK


CE1 Id45 (13)
Affichage Settings
Alternative A
Alternative B
15 €
15.5 €
16 €
16.5 €
17 €
17.5 €
18 €
18.5 €
19 €
19.5 €
20 €
n° 1 à 50 vous gagnez : 50 €
sinon 0 €
n° 1 à 100 vous gagnez : 18 €
OK

Matching probabilities for two-stage prospects

$((\bar{x}, p), q) \sim (\bar{x}, r)$ and $((\bar{x}, E_p), q) \sim (\bar{x}, \tilde{r})$										
q	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
p	0.06	0.17	0.33	0.50	0.94	0.06	0.17	0.50	0.75	0.94
E_p	E_6	E_{17}	E_{33}	E_{50}	E_{94}	E_6	E_{17}	E_{50}	E_{75}	E_{94}

- $\bar{x} = 50$.
- 10 matching probabilities for risky second stage stage, r and 10 for ambiguous second stage $\tilde{r}$.
- 2 first stage probability levels: 1/3 and 2/3.

$\Rightarrow$ Elicitation, comparison and test of 4 second stage probability weighting functions.


CE1 Id1 (39)
Affichage Settings
Exemples
Alternative A
(Deux tirages)
Tirage Preliminaire
Rien n'est gagné
Vous tirez une boule dans l'urne
n° 1 à 30 vous gagnez : 50 €
sinon 0 €
0 boules
10 boules
20 boules
30 boules
40 boules
50 boules
60 boules
70 boules
80 boules
90 boules
100 boules
Alternative B
(Un seul tirage)
n° 1 à 10 vous gagnez : 50 €
sinon 0 €
OK


CE1 Id1 (52)
Affichage Settings
Alternative A
(Deux tirages)
Exemples
Alternative B
(Un seul tirage)
Tirage Preliminaire
Rien n'est gagné
Vous tirez une boule dans l'urne
30 boules
31 boules
32 boules
33 boules
34 boules
35 boules
36 boules
37 boules
38 boules
39 boules
40 boules
n° 1 à 50 vous gagnez :
50 €
sinon
0 €
n° 1 à 35 vous gagnez :
50 €
sinon
0 €
OK

Model Specification

Model specification: TREU and REU

Using the equivalence revealed by the elicitation of the matching probability r:

$$((\bar{x}, p), q) \sim (\bar{x}, r)$$

we infer the following equalities:

1. Under TREU, we have:

$$q \times p = r$$

2. Under REU, we have:

$$q \times \phi(p) = \phi(r)$$

Where ϕ is a transformation function.

Parametric specification: $\phi(x) = x^{1/\theta}$.

Model specification RPT

- Under RPT, we have:

Setup	RPT-r RPT for *"risk-risk"*	RPT-a RPT for *"risk-ambiguity"*
One-stage	$c \sim (x, p; y)$ $u(c) = w(p)u(x) + (1 - w(p))u(y)$	$c \sim (x, p; y)$ $u(c) = w(p)u(x) + (1 - w(p))u(y)$ $\tilde{c} \sim (x, E_p; y)$ $u(\tilde{c}) = \tilde{w}(p)u(x) + (1 - \tilde{w}(p))u(y)$
Two-stage	$((\bar{x}, p), q) \sim ((\bar{x}, m), 1)$ $w(q)w^{\star}(p) = w^{\star}(\tilde{m})$	$((\bar{x}, E_p), q) \sim ((\bar{x}, \tilde{m}), 1)$ $w(q)\tilde{w}^{\star}(p) = w^{\star}(\tilde{m})$

- Parametric specifications:

$$u(x) = x^{\alpha} \text{ and } w(p) = exp(-(-ln(p)^{\gamma})^{\delta}.$$

Results

Results: RCP and TREU

p	$q = 1/3$		$q = 2/3$	
	$\#(\Delta \gtrless 0)$	t-test	$\#(\Delta \gtrless 0)$	t-test
0.06	60/2	8.42^{**}	48/14	2.12^{**}
0.17	38/24	3.65^{**}	27/35	-0.22^{ns}
0.33	26/28	2.26^{*}	-	-
0.50	39/23	3.39^{**}	24/38	-1.96^{*}
0.75	-	-	24/25	0.33^{ns}
0.94	27/35	0.69^{ns}	40/22	1.99^{**}

Table 2: RCP ($\Delta = (r - pq)/pq$)

- RCP is globally violated, thus TREU is not descriptively valid for evaluating two-stage prospects.
- Overall, we observe preference for the compound prospect, especially for $q = 1/3$.

Results: REU under risk

Here, we present the descriptive statistics of the 3 OLS estimations of θ, assuming $\phi(x) = x^{1/\theta}$ under risk (i.e. only using the matching probabilities, r)

	Probability q		
	$1/3$	$2/3$	$\{1/3, 2/3\}$
Mean	0.89	1.03	0.91
Median	0.90	0.98	0.91
Std	0.18	0.35	0.18
IQR	0.75-0.98	0.83-1.23	0.79-1.01

- At an aggregate level, ϕ is convex for $q = 1/3$ but exhibits linearity for $q = 2/3$.
- Impact of probability q on the shape of function ϕ is confirmed by a paired t-test ($p < 0.01$).

$\Rightarrow$ Inconsistent with REU in which the probabilistic structure of the two-stage prospect should not impact the shape of ϕ.

Results: RPT under risk

Stage	func	param	Estimates			
			Mean	Median	Std	IQR
First	u	α	0.94	0.93	0.26	0.74-1.10
	w	γ	1.06	1.07	0.32	0.85-1.22
		δ	0.62	0.61	0.20	0.48-0.77
Second	$w^*_{1/3}$	$\gamma^*_{1/3}$	1.01	0.96	0.42	0.74-1.18
		$\delta^*_{1/3}$	1.20	1.15	0.29	1.03-1.35
	$w^*_{2/3}$	$\gamma^*_{2/3}$	1.66	1.63	0.52	1.25-2.04
		$\delta^*_{2/3}$	0.90	0.85	0.28	0.69-1.07

- Function, $w^\star$, depends on probability q. While it is close to linearity for $q = 1/3$, it is convex for $q = 2/3$.

$\Rightarrow$ Inverse than for REU but same problem (differences both for elevation and curvature between $w^*_{1/3}$ and $w^*_{2/3}$).

Results: RPT under risk



⇒

Additional results

- Adding ambiguity (first and second stage) does not change our main results i.e.
  - Impact of probability q on the shape of function ϕ.
  - Stage dependent pwf.
  - Dependence of the second stage pwf on the first stage probability.
- Benchmark results are found for the single stage pwf under risk and ambiguity.
- No association between RCP and ambiguity attitudes ($\neq$ from Halevy, 2008 and Segal).

Concluding remarks

1. Recursive evaluation of two-stage prospects is more complex than allowed by any existing recursive model.

2. In Kreps and Porteus (or KMM) integral, function ϕ is sensitive to the first-stage probability of winning.

3. Second-stage probability weighting is very sensitive to the first-stage winning probability.

$\Rightarrow$ Abdellaoui & Zank (2014) first axiomatized a RPT model that could account for our experimental findings.

Thank you for your attention!