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1 Emotions: Mood

- Emotions play a role in several of the phenomena considered so far:
  - Self-control problems $\rightarrow$ Temptation
  - Projection bias in food consumption $\rightarrow$ Hunger
  - Social preferences in giving $\rightarrow$ Empathy
  - Gneezy-List (2006) transient effect of gift $\rightarrow$ Hot-Cold gift-exchange

- Psychology: Large literature on emotions (Loewenstein and Lerner, 2003)
  - Message 1: Emotions are very important
  - Message 1: Different emotions operate very differently: anger $\neq$ mood
• Consider two examples of emotions:
  – Mood
  – Arousal

• Psychology: even minor mood manipulations have a substantial impact on behavior and emotions
  – On sunnier days, subjects tip more at restaurants (Rind, 1996)
  – On sunnier days, subjects express higher levels of overall happiness (Schwarz and Clore, 1983)

• Should this impact economic decisions?
• Field: Impact of mood fluctuations on stock returns:
  – Daily weather and Sport matches
  – No effect on fundamentals
  – However: If good mood leads to more optimistic expectations $\rightarrow$ Increase in stock prices

• Evidence:
  – **Saunders (1993):** Days with higher cloud cover in New York are associated with lower aggregate US stock returns
  – **Hirshleifer and Shumway (2003)** extend to 26 countries between 1982 and 1997
    * Use weather of the city where the stock market is located
    * Negative relationship between cloud cover (de-trended from seasonal averages) and aggregate stock returns in 18 of the 26 cities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>(\hat{\beta}_c)</th>
<th>t-Statistic</th>
<th>(\hat{\gamma}_c)</th>
<th>(\chi^2)</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>3984</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.0963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>2436</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.4649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
<td>2565</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.2054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td>3617</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.6259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>3997</td>
<td>-0.018*</td>
<td>-3.25</td>
<td>-0.036*</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>4042</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.8999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>3963</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.1445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>2725</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>-0.034*</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.0452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.9488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td>3999</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.4124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuala Lumpur</td>
<td>3863</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>4003</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.2355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>3760</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.2353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>2878</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.9023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>3674</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.6116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>3961</td>
<td>-0.014*</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.0549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>4013</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>-0.035*</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>0.0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>3877</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.0688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>3879</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>-0.027*</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.0474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td>2988</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.3267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>2636</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.3935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>3890</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.9588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>3653</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.0889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taipei</td>
<td>3784</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.4164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>3907</td>
<td>-0.013*</td>
<td>-2.14</td>
<td>-0.026*</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.0425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zurich</td>
<td>3851</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.3465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Cities (naive)</td>
<td>92445</td>
<td>-0.011*</td>
<td>-4.42</td>
<td>-0.019*</td>
<td>41.30</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Cities (PCSE)</td>
<td>92445</td>
<td>-0.010*</td>
<td>-3.97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- **Magnitude:**
  - Days with completely covered skies have daily stock returns .11 percent lower than days with sunny skies
  - Five percent of a standard deviation
  - Small magnitude, but not negligible

- After controlling for cloud cover, other weather variables such as rain and snow are unrelated to returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All games</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>638</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>−0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elimination games</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Cup elimination games</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>−0.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental cups elimination games</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>−0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>−0.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group games</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Cup group games</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>−0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental cups group games</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>−0.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>−0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Close qualifying games</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Cup close qualifying games</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>−0.049</td>
<td>−0.52</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>−0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Championship close qualifying games</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>−0.095</td>
<td>−0.78</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>−0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>−0.130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results:

- Compared to a day with no match, a loss lowers daily returns (significantly) by .21 percent. (Surprisingly, a win has essentially no effect)

- More important matches, such as World Cup elimination games, have larger effects

- Effect does not appear to depend on whether the loss was expected or not

- International matches in other sports have a consistent, though smaller, effect (24 countries)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wins</th>
<th></th>
<th>Losses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>β&lt;sub&gt;W&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>t-val</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All games</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice hockey</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Interpretations:
  - Mood impacts risk aversion or perception of volatility
  - Mood is projected to economic fundamentals
• Simonsohn (2007): Subtle role of mood

  – Weather on the day of campus visit to a prestigious university (CMU)
  
  – Students visiting on days with more cloud cover are significantly *more* likely to enroll
  
  – Higher cloud cover induces the students to focus more on academic attributes versus social attributes of the school
  
  – Support from laboratory experiment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent variable (1=yes, 0=no)</td>
<td>Enrollment Baseline</td>
<td>Enrollment Adds other weather variables</td>
<td>Enrollment Adds Average weather conditions</td>
<td>Enrollment Predicts with weather from two days prior to visit but with admission decision as dependent variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.342***</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.407***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
<td>(0.164)</td>
<td>(0.253)</td>
<td>(0.157)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud Cover on day of visit</td>
<td>0.018**</td>
<td>0.027**</td>
<td>0.032***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0-clear skies to 10-overcast)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud Cover two days prior to visit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Temperature (max)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Temperature (min)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Speed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain precipitation (in inches)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(0.061)</td>
<td>(0.119)</td>
<td>(0.144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow precipitation (in inches)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average weather conditions for calendar date (DF=6)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month dummies</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Observations</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-square</td>
<td>0.0095</td>
<td>0.0146</td>
<td>0.0573</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Emotions: Arousal

- Separate impact of emotions: Arousal

- Ariely-Loewenstein (2005): Sexual arousal
  - Control group: Students
  - Treatment group: Students that are sexually aroused
  - Subjects in treatment group report a substantially higher willingness to engage in behavior that may lead to date rape
  - (Projection bias)
• **Josephson (1987):** Arousal due to violent content
  
  – Control group exposed to non-violent clip
  
  – Treatment group exposed to violent clip
  
  – Treatment group more likely to display more aggressive behavior, such as aggressive play during a hockey game
  
  – Impact not due to imitation (violent movie did not involve sport scenes)

• Consistent finding from large set of experiments (Table 11)

• **Dahl-DellaVigna (2009):** Field evidence — Exploit timing of release of blockbuster violent movies
Model. Consumer chooses between strongly violent movie $a^v$, mildly violent movie $a^m$, non-violent movie $a^n$, or alternative social activity $a^s$

- Utility depends on quality of movies $\rightarrow$ Demand functions $P(a^j)$

Heterogeneity:

- High taste for violence (Young): $N_y$ consumers
- Low taste for violence (Old): $N_o$ consumers
- Aggregate demand for group $i$: $N_i P(a^i_j)$

Production function of violence $V$ (not part of utility fct.) depends on $a^v$, $a^m$, $a^n$, and $a^s$:

$$\ln V = \sum_{i=y, o} \sum_{j=v, m, n} \alpha_i^j N_i P(a_i^j) + \sigma_i N_i (1 - P(a_i^v) - P(a_i^m) - P(a_i^n))$$
• Estimate ($A^j$ is total attendance to movie of type $j$)

$$\ln V = \beta_0 + \beta^v A^v + \beta^m A^m + \beta^n A^n + \epsilon$$

• Estimated impact of exposure to violent movies $\beta^v$:

$$\beta^v = x^v(\alpha^v_y - \sigma_y) + (1 - x^v)(\alpha^v_o - \sigma_o)$$

• First point — Estimate of net effect
  – Direct effect: Increase in violent movie exposure $\Rightarrow \alpha^v_i$
  – Indirect effect: Decrease in Social Activity $\Rightarrow \sigma_i$

• Second point — Estimate on self-selected population:
  – Estimate parameters for group actually attending movies
  – Young over-represented: $x^v > N^y / (N^y + N^o)$
Comparison with Psychology experiments

- Natural Experiment. Estimated impact of exposure to violent movies $\beta^v$:

$$
\beta^v = x^v (\alpha^v_y - \sigma_y) + (1 - x^v) (\alpha^v_o - \sigma_o)
$$

- Psychology Experiments. Manipulate $a$ directly, holding constant $a_s$ out of equilibrium

$$
\beta^v_{lab} = \frac{N_y}{N_y + N_o} \alpha^v_y + (1 - \frac{N_y}{N_y + N_o}) \alpha^v_o
$$

Two differences:

- ‘Shut down’ alternative activity, and hence $\sigma_i$ does not appear
- Weights representative of (student) population, not of population that selects into violent movies
• Movie data
  – Revenue data: Weekend (top 50) and Day (top 10) from *The Numbers*
  – Violence Ratings from 0 to 10 from *Kids In Mind* (Appendix Table 1)
  – Strong Violence Measure $A_v^t$: Audience with violence 8-10 (Figure 1a)
  – Mild Violence Measure $A_m^t$: Audience with violence 5-7 (Figure 1b)

• Assault data
  – Source: National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)
  – All incidents of aggravated assault, simple assault, and intimidation from 1995 to 2004
  – Sample: Agencies with no missing data on crime for $\geq 7$ days
  – Sample: 1995-2004, days in weekend (Friday, Saturday, Sunday)
• **Regression Specification.** (Table 3)

\[
\log V_t = \beta^v A^v_t + \beta^m A^m_t + \beta^n A^n_t + \Gamma X_t + \varepsilon_t
\]

- Coefficient \( \beta^v \) is percent increase in assault for one million people watching strongly violent movies day \( t \) \( (A^v_t) \) (Similarly \( \beta^m \) and \( \beta^n \))

- Cluster standard errors by week

• **Results.**

- No effect of movie exposure in morning or afternoon (Columns 1-2)

- Negative effect in the evening (Column 3)

- Stronger negative effect the night after (Column 4)
### TABLE III
THE EFFECT OF MOVIE VIOLENCE ON SAME-DAY ASSAULTS BY TIME OF DAY

Panel A. Benchmark Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification:</th>
<th>Instrumental Variable Regressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dep. Var.:</td>
<td>Log (Number of Assaults in Day t in Time Window)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Of Strongly Violent Movies (in millions of people in Day t)</td>
<td>-0.0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0066)</td>
<td>(0.0050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Of Mildly Violent Movies (in millions of people in Day t)</td>
<td>-0.0106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0060)*</td>
<td>(0.0045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Of Non-Violent Movies (in millions of people in Day t)</td>
<td>-0.0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0060)</td>
<td>(0.0046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Day</td>
<td>6AM-12PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control Variables:  
- Full Set of Controls: X X X X  
- Audience Instrumented With Predicted Audience Using Next Week's Audience: X X X X  

N = 1563  
N = 1563  
N = 1563  
N = 1562
Additional Results:

- No Medium-Run Effects.
  * No effect on Monday and Tuesday of weekend exposure
  * No effect one, two, or three weeks later

- Placebo:
  * No effect on crime the week after
  * No effect if randomly draw year and reassign dates

- Similar result for DVD-VHS Rentals
• **Summary of Findings:**

1. Violent movies lower same-day violent crime in the evening (incapacitation)

2. Violent movies lower violent crime in the night after exposure (less consumption of alcohol in bars)

3. No lagged effect of exposure in weeks following movie attendance —> No intertemporal substitution

4. Strongly violent movies have slightly *smaller* impact compared to mildly violent movies in the night after exposure

• Interpret Finding 4 in light of Lab-Field debate
Finding 4. Non-monotonicity in Violent Content

- Night hours: \( \hat{\beta}^v = -0.0192 \) versus \( \hat{\beta}^m = -0.0205 \)

- Odd if more violent movies attract more potential criminals

- Model above \( \rightarrow \) Can estimate direct effect of violent movies if can control for selection
  \[
  \alpha^v - \alpha = \beta^v - \left( \beta^n + \frac{x^v - x^n}{x^m - x^n} (\beta_m - \beta_n) \right)
  \]

- Do not observe selection of criminals \( x^j \), but observe selection of correlated demographics (young males)
- IMDB ratings data — Share of young males among raters increases with movie violence (Figure 2) \(\Rightarrow\) Use as estimate of \(x^j\)

- Compute \(\hat{\alpha}^v - \alpha = .011\) \( (p = .08)\), about one third of total effect

- Pattern consistent with arousal induced by strongly violent movies \( (\alpha^v > \alpha^m)\)

- Bottom-line 1: Can reconcile with laboratory estimates

- Bottom-line 1: Can provide benchmark for size of arousal effect
FIGURE II
Share of Young Males in Audience As Function of Movie Violence (Internet Movie Database Data)
• Differences from laboratory evidence (Levitt-List, 2007): Exposure to violent movies is
  – Less dangerous than alternative activity ($\alpha^v < \sigma$)
    (Natural Experiment)
  – More dangerous than non-violent movies ($\alpha^v > \alpha^n$)
    (Laboratory Experiments and indirect evidence above)

• Both types of evidence are valid for different policy evaluations
  – Laboratory: Banning exposure to unexpected violence
  – Field: Banning temporarily violent movies
• This leaves a number of open questions

• Example: Peer Effects through the media.
  
  – To what extent do we imitate role models in the media?
  
  – Ongoing work: Movies with Car races \(\rightarrow\) Dangerous driving \(\rightarrow\) Car accidents?
  
  – Can measure exact duration of car chases and intensity
  
  – Is imitation higher for characters of same race and gender?
3 Methodology: Lab and Field

- What do we learn about the relationship between lab experiments and field evidence?

- Contentious topic recently since List-Levitt (JEP, 2007)

- To simplify, define field evidence as:
  - Natural Experiments
  - Field Experiments

- Let us start from Dahl-DellaVigna example
• **Difference 1.** Differences in comparison group

  – *Lab Experiment:* Activity in control group exogenously assigned

  – *Natural Experiment:* Activity in control group chosen to max utility

  – Notice: *Field Experiments* are (usually) like lab experiments

• Implication: Parameters estimated very different

• Write down model: what parameter are you estimating?
• Difference 2. Self-Selection

  – *Lab Experiment*: Subjects are group of students unaware of nature of task $\rightarrow$ No selection

  – *Natural Experiment*: People self-select into a setting

  – *Field Experiments*: Can have self-selection too

• Different purposes:

  – Often useful to control for self-selection and impose a treatment

  – However, can lose external validity $\rightarrow$ Put people in a situation they normally would not be in
• Example: Social preferences
  – I give $10 if confronted with fund-raiser asking for money
  – However: I do all possible to avoid this interaction
  – → Without sorting: Frequent giving
  – → With sorting: No giving

• Notice: One can integrate sorting into laboratory experiments
• **Difference 3.** Differences in context

• Example 1: Dahl-DellaVigna
  – Laboratory experiments on movie violence: 15-min, clips (to save time)
  – Field: Full-length movies

• Example 2: Dictator experiment
  – Laboratory: Have been given $10 – Give it to anonymous subject
  – Field: Have earned money – Give some of it to someone

• Example 3: Prisoner Dilemma experiment
  – Framed as ‘Community Game’ → Low defection
  – Framed as ‘Wall-Street Game’ → High defection

• Tension for laboratory experiments: Resemble field at cost of losing experimental controls
• **Difference 4.** Demand effects in the laboratory
  
  - Subjects generate the effect that they think experimenter is looking for
  - Social preference!

• Example: Dictator game
  
  - I was given $10 and asked how much to give —> Inference: Should give some away

• Field evidence does not have this feature

• However:
  
  - This is genuine phenomenon also in field (Obedience)
  - Trade-off between demand effects and loss of control in the field
• Related: Anonymity
  – Situations are rarely double-blind even in experiments
  – If subjects worry about experimenter, this affects behavior

• Again: Same issue also in the field

• Advantage of lab: Can control for this by running double-blind sessions
• **Difference 5.** Differences in Stakes
  
  – Laboratory: Small stakes
  
  – Field: Large stakes

• Examples:
  
  – Dictator Games for $10 vs. $100+ of charitable giving
  
  – Aggressive hockey play in Violence experiments vs. violent crime

• However:
  
  – Evidence not consistent that large stakes change behavior
  
  – In field, many repeated interactions, all with small stakes
4 Happiness

- Is there a more direct way to measure utility?

- What about happiness questions?
  - ‘Taken all together, how would you say things are these days, would you say that you are very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy?’
  - or ‘How satisfied are you with your life as a whole?’
  - Response on 1 to 7 of 0 to 10 scale
  - Could average response measure utility?

- There are a number of issues:
1. *(Noise I)* Is the measure of happiness just noise?

2. *(Noise II)* Even if valid, there are no incentives, how affected is it by irrelevant cues?

3. *(Scale)* Happiness is measured on discrete intervals, with ceiling and floor effect

4. *(Content)* What exactly does the measure capture? Instantaneous utility? Discounted utility?

- Revealed preference approach remains heavily favored by economists (myself included)

- Still, significant progress in last 10-15 years on taking some role in economics
• **Issue 1 (Noise I).** To address,
  
  – Take happiness measure $h$
  
  – Does it respond to well-identified, important shifters $X$ which affect important economic outcomes?

• **Oreopoulos (AER 2006).** Exploit binding compulsory schooling laws to study returns to education

• UK: 1947 increase in minimum schooling from 14 to 15
• Northern Ireland: 1957 increase from 14 to 15
Clear impact on earnings: compare earnings for adults aged 32-64 as a
function of year of birth

Figure 6. Average annual log earnings by year aged 14 (Great Britain)
- Implied returns to compulsory education: 0.148 (0.046)

**Figure 7. Average Annual Log Earnings by Year Aged 14**

*(Northern Ireland)*
• Oreopoulous (JPubE 2007): Did this affect happiness measures?
  – Question on 1-4 scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Mean</th>
<th>(2) OLS</th>
<th>(3) IV</th>
<th>(4) Initial observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>89279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = not at all satisfied, 4 = very satisfied)</td>
<td>(0.0093)***</td>
<td>(0.0073)***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with life</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.0516</td>
<td>89279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = very or fairly satisfied, 0 = not satisfied or not at all satisfied)</td>
<td>(0.0046)***</td>
<td>(0.0033)***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.0235</td>
<td>89279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = very satisfied)</td>
<td>(0.0023)***</td>
<td>(0.0135)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.0667</td>
<td>24565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = not so happy, 2 = fairly happy, 3 = very happy)</td>
<td>(0.013)***</td>
<td>(0.0093)***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All regressions include fixed effects for age, sex, birth year, and nation interacted with survey year. Data are grouped into means by age, sex, birth year, nation, and survey year. Huber–White standard errors are shown from clustering by nation. Single, double, and triple asterisks indicate significant coefficients at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels respectively. Samples include all adults aged 18 to 65. See text for more data specifics.
• Results:
  – One year of additional (compulsory) education increases happiness somewhere between 2 and 8 percent
  – In addition, large effects on health and wealth
  – Reinforces puzzle: Why don’t people stay in school longer?

• Happiness response captures real information

• Happiness answer also responds to cues (Issue 2), has scale effects (Issue 3), but valid enough to use in combination with other measures

• However, Issue 4: How would we use happiness measure as part of economic research?
• Research agenda by Dan Benjamin, Ori Heffetz, Miles Kimball, Alex Rees-Jones
  - Study Econ101a-type simple issues with happiness measures
  - Critical to know how to correctly interpret these measures

  - How does happiness (subjective well-being) relate to choice?
  - Compare forecasted happiness with choice in several hypothetical scenarios
  - Forecasts of happiness predict choice quite well, but other factors also play a role
• Paper 2. **Benjamin et al. (AER forthcoming)**
  
  – Medical students choosing match for residency
  – Survey to elicit ranking of medical schools for residency + Ask anticipated happiness
  – How well does happiness predict choice relative to other factors?
• Some evidence that one can also elicit intertemporal happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Weight Estimates for Multi-Question Indices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness during residency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness in first 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness in rest of career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness after retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other important work on happiness:

- **Luttmer (QJE 2005):** Documents relative aspect of happiness: An increase in income of neighbors (appropriately instrumented) lower life satisfaction.

- **Stevenson and Wolfers (Brookings 2008):**
  - Debunks Easterlin paradox (income growth over time does not increase happiness)
  - Clear link over time between log income and happiness

- **Finkelstein, Luttmer, Notowidigdo (JEEA 2014):**
  - How does marginal utility of consumption vary with health? Needed for optimal policies
  - Observe changes in happiness for varying health
5 Market Reaction to Biases: Introduction

- So far, we focused on consumer deviations from standard model

- Who exhibits these deviations?

1. **Self-control and naivete**. Consumers (health clubs, food, credit cards, smoking), Employees (retirement saving, benefit take-up), Students (homework)

2. **Reference dependence**. Workers (labor supply, increasing wages), (inexperienced) traders (sport cards), Investors, Consumers (insurance), House owners

3. **Social preferences**. Consumers (giving to charities), Employees (effort, strikes)
4. **Biased Beliefs.** Individual investors, CEOs, Consumers (purchases, betting)

5. **Inattention.** Individual investors, Consumers (eBay bidding, taxation)

6. **Menu Effects.** Individual investors, Voter, Consumers (loans, 410(k) plans)

7. **Social Pressure and Persuasion.** Voters, Employees (productivity), Individual investors (and analysts)

8. **Emotions.** Individual investors, Consumers

- What is missing from picture?
• Experienced agents
  – Firms
  – Broadly speaking, market interactions with ‘rational’ agents

• Market interactions
  – Everyone ‘born’ with biases
  – But: Effect of biases lower if:
    * learning with plenty of feedback
    * advice, access to consulting
    * specialization
    * Competition ‘drives out of market’ (BUT: See last lecture)

• For experienced agents these conditions are more likely to be satisfied
• **Implications? Study biases in the market**

• **Six major instances:**
  - Interaction between firms and consumers (contract design, price choice)
  - Interaction between experienced and inexperienced investors (noise traders and behavioral finance)
  - Interaction between managers and investors (corporate finance)
  - Interaction between employers and employees (labor economics)
  - Interaction between politicians and voters (political economy)
  - Institutional design
6  Market Reaction to Biases: Pricing

- Consider now the case in which consumers purchasing products have biases
- Firm maximize profits
- Do consumer biases affect profit-maximizing contract design?
- How is consumer welfare affected by firm response?
- DellaVigna and Malmendier (QJE 2004). Consumers with $\left(\beta, \hat{\beta}, \delta\right)$ preferences
6.1 Self-Control I

MARKET (I). INVESTMENT GOODS

- Monopoly
- Two-part tariff: $L$ (lump-sum fee), $p$ (per-unit price)
- Cost: set-up cost $K$, per-unit cost $a$

Consumption of investment good

Payoffs relative to best alternative activity:

- Cost $c$ at $t = 1$, stochastic
  - non-monetary cost
  - experience good, distribution $F(c)$
- Benefit $b > 0$ at $t = 2$, deterministic
FIRM BEHAVIOR. Profit-maximization

\[
\max_{L,p} \delta \left\{ L - K + F (\beta \delta b - p) (p - a) \right\}
\]

s.t. \( \beta \delta \left\{ -L + \int_{-\infty}^{\hat{\beta} \delta b - p} (\delta b - p - c) dF (c) \right\} \geq \beta \delta \bar{u} \)

- Notice the difference between \( \beta \) and \( \hat{\beta} \)
- Substitute for \( L \) to maximize

\[
\max_{L,p} \delta \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\hat{\beta} \delta b - p} (\delta b - p - c) dF (c) + F (\beta \delta b - p) (p - a) - K - \beta \delta \bar{u} \right\}
\]
Solution for the per-unit price $p^*$:

\[ p^* = a \quad \text{[exponentials]} \]

\[ - (1 - \hat{\beta}) \delta b \frac{f (\beta \delta b - p^*)}{f (\beta \delta b - p^*)} \quad \text{[sophisticates]} \]

\[ - \frac{F (\hat{\beta} \delta b - p^*) - F (\beta \delta b - p^*)}{f (\beta \delta b - p^*)} \quad \text{[naives]} \]

Features of the equilibrium

1. *Exponential agents* ($\beta = \hat{\beta} = 1$).
   Align incentives of consumers with cost of firm
   \[ \implies \text{marginal cost pricing: } p^* = a. \]
\[ p^* = a \]  
\[ - (1 - \hat{\beta}) \delta b \frac{f(\hat{\beta} \delta b - p^*)}{f(\beta \delta b - p^*)} \]  
\[ - \frac{F(\hat{\beta} \delta b - p^*) - F(\beta \delta b - p^*)}{f(\beta \delta b - p^*)} \]  

2. **Hyperbolic agents.** Time inconsistency  
\[ \implies \text{below-marginal cost pricing: } p^* < a. \]

(a) **Sophisticates** \((\beta = \hat{\beta} < 1)\): commitment.

(b) **Naives** \((\beta < \hat{\beta} = 1)\): overestimation of consumption.
MARKET (II). LEISURE GOODS

Payoffs of consumption at $t = 1$:

- Benefit at $t = 1$, stochastic
- Cost at $t = 2$, deterministic

$\Rightarrow$ Use the previous setting: $-c$ is “current benefit”, $b < 0$ is “future cost.”

Results:

1. *Exponential agents.*
   
   Marginal cost pricing: $p^* = a$, $L^* = K$ (PC).

2. *Hyperbolic agents* tend to overconsume. $\Rightarrow$
   
EXTENSIONS

- *Perfect Competition*. Can write maximization problem as

$$\max_{L,p} - L + \int_{-\infty}^{\beta \delta b - p} (\delta b - p - c) \, dF(c)$$

s.t. $$\delta \{ L - K + F(\beta \delta b - p) (p - a) \} = 0$$

- Implies the same solution for $$p^*$$.

- *Heterogeneity*. Simple case of heterogeneity:

  - Share $$\mu$$ of fully naive consumers ($$\beta < \hat{\beta} = 1$$)
  - Share $$1 - \mu$$ of exponential consumers ($$\beta = \hat{\beta} = 1$$)

  - At $$t = 0$$ these consumers pool on same contract, given no immediate payoffs
• Maximization (with Monopoly):

$$\max_{L,p} \delta \{ L - K + [\mu F(\beta \delta b - p) + (1 - \mu)(\delta b - p)](p - a) \}$$

s.t. \(-L + \int_{-\infty}^{\delta b - p} (\delta b - p - c) dF(c) \geq \bar{u}\)

• Solution:

$$p^* = a - \mu \frac{F(\delta b - p) - F(\beta \delta b - p)}{- \mu f(\beta \delta b - p) + (1 - \mu)f(\delta b - p)}$$

• The higher the fraction of naives \(\mu\), the higher the underpricing of \(p\)
EMPIRICAL PREDICTIONS

Two predictions for time-inconsistent consumers:

1. Investment goods (Proposition 1):
   (a) Below-marginal cost pricing
   (b) Initial fee (Perfect Competition)

2. Leisure goods (Corollary 1)
   (a) Above-marginal cost pricing
   (b) Initial bonus or low initial fee (Perfect Competition)
FIELD EVIDENCE ON CONTRACTS

- US Health club industry ($11.6bn revenue in 2000)
  - monthly and annual contracts
  - Estimated marginal cost: $3-$6 + congestion cost
  - Below-marginal cost pricing despite small transaction costs and price discrimination

- Vacation time-sharing industry ($7.5bn sales in 2000)
  - high initial fee: $11,000 (RCI)
  - minimal fee per week of holiday: $140 (RCI)
• Credit card industry ($500bn outstanding debt in 1998)
  – Resale value of credit card debt: 20% premium (Ausubel, 1991)
  – No initial fee, bonus (car / luggage insurance)
  – Above-marginal-cost pricing of borrowing

• Gambling industry: Las Vegas hotels and restaurants:
  – Price rooms and meals below cost, at bonus
  – High price on gambling
WELFARE EFFECTS

Result 1. Self-control problems $+$ Sophistication $\Rightarrow$ First best

- Consumption if $c \leq \beta \delta b - p^*$

- Exponential agent:
  - $p^* = a$
  - consume if $c \leq \delta b - p^* = \delta b - a$

- Sophisticated time-inconsistent agent:
  - $p^* = a - (1 - \beta)\delta b$
  - consume if $c \leq \beta \delta b - p^* = \delta b - a$

- Perfect commitment device

- Market interaction maximizes joint surplus of consumer and firm
Result 2. Self-control + Partial naiveté $\Rightarrow$ Real effect of time inconsistency

- $p^* = a - [F(\delta b - p^*) - F(\beta \delta b - p^*)]/f(\beta \delta b - p^*)$

- Firm sets $p^*$ so as to accentuate overconfidence

- Two welfare effects:
  - Inefficiency: $\text{Surplus}_{\text{naive}} \leq \text{Surplus}_{\text{soph}}$.
  - Transfer (under monopoly) from consumer to firm

- Profits are increasing in naivete’ $\hat{\beta}$ (monopoly)

- $\text{Welfare}_{\text{naive}} \leq \text{Welfare}_{\text{soph}}$.

- Large welfare effects of non-rational expectations
6.2 Self-Control II

- Eliaz and Spiegler (RES 2006), Contracting with Diversely Naive Agents.

- Extend DellaVigna and Malmendier (2004):
  - incorporate heterogeneity in naiveté
  - allow more flexible functional form in time inconsistency
  - different formulation of naiveté
• Setup:
  1. Actions:
     - Action $a \in [0, 1]$ taken at time 2
     - At time 1 utility function is $u(a)$
     - At time 2 utility function is $v(a)$
  2. Beliefs: At time 1 believe:
     - Utility is $u(a)$ with probability $\theta$
     - Utility is $v(a)$ with probability $1 - \theta$
     - Heterogeneity: Distribution of types $\theta$
  3. Transfers:
     - Consumer pays firm $t(a)$
     - Restrictive assumption: no cost to firm of providing $a$
• Therefore:
  
  – Time inconsistency ($\beta < 1$) $\rightarrow$ Difference between $u$ and $v$
  
  – Naiveté ($\hat{\beta} > \beta$) $\rightarrow$ $\theta > 0$
  
  – Partial naiveté here modelled as stochastic rather than deterministic
  
  – Flexibility in capturing time inconsistency (self-control, reference dependence, emotions)
Main result:

Proposition 1. There are two types of contracts:
1. Perfect commitment device for sufficiently sophisticated agents ($\theta < \bar{\theta}$)
2. Exploitative contracts for sufficiently naive agents ($\theta > \bar{\theta}$)

Commitment device contract:
- Implement $a_\theta = \max_a u (a)$
- Transfer:
  * $t (a_\theta) = \max_a u (a)$
  * $t (a) = \infty$ for other actions
- Result here is like in DM: Implement first best
• Exploitative contract:
  – Agent has negative utility:
    \[ u(a_{\theta}^v) - t(a_{\theta}^v) < 0 \]
  – Maximize overestimation of agents:
    \[ a_{\theta}^{u} = \arg \max (u(a) - v(a)) \]
6.3 Bounded Rationality

- **Gabaix and Laibson** (2003), *Competition and Consumer Confusion*

- Non-standard feature of consumers:
  - Limited ability to deal with complex products
  - Imperfect knowledge of utility from consuming complex goods

- Firms are aware of bounded rationality of consumers
  \[ \rightarrow \text{design products \& prices to take advantage of bounded rationality of consumers} \]
Example: Checking account. Value depends on

- interest rates
- fees for dozens of financial services (overdrafts, more than $x$ checks per months, low average balance, etc.)
- bank locations
- bank hours
- ATM locations
- web-based banking services
- linked products (e.g. investment services)

Given such complexity, consumers do not know the exact value of products they buy.
Model

- Consumers receive noisy, *unbiased* signals about product value.
  - Agent $a$ chooses from $n$ goods.
  - True utility from good $i$:
    \[
    Q_i - p_i
    \]
  - Utility signal
    \[
    U_{ia} = Q_i - p_i + \sigma_i \varepsilon_{ia}
    \]
  
  $\sigma_i$ is complexity of product $i$.
  $\varepsilon_{ia}$ is zero mean, iid across consumers and goods, with density $f$ and cumulative distribution $F$.
  (Suppress consumer-specific subscript $a$; $U_i \equiv U_{ia}$ and $\varepsilon_i \equiv \varepsilon_{ia}$.)
• Consumer decision rule: Picks the one good with highest signal $U_i$ from $(U_i)_{i=1}^n$.

**Market equilibrium with exogenous complexity.** Bertrand competition with

- $Q_i$: quality of a good,
- $\sigma_i$: complexity of a good,
- $c_i$: production cost
- $p_i$: price

- Simplification: $Q_i, \sigma_i, c_i$ identical across firms. (*Problem: How should consumers choose if all goods are known to be identical?*)

- Firms maximize profit $\pi_i = (p_i - c_i) D_i$

- Symmetry reduces demand to

$$D_i = \int f(\varepsilon_i) F \left( \frac{p_j - p_i + \sigma \varepsilon_i}{\sigma} \right)^{n-1} d\varepsilon_i$$
Example of demand curves

Gaussian noise $\varepsilon \sim N(0,1)$, 2 firms

Demand curve faced by firm 1:

\[
D_1 = P(\frac{Q - p_1 + \sigma \varepsilon_1}{Q - p_2 + \sigma \varepsilon_2}) = P\left(\frac{p_2 - p_1}{\sigma \sqrt{2}} > \sigma \sqrt{2} \eta\right) \text{ with } \eta = (\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1)/\sqrt{2} \sim N(0,1)
\]

\[
D_1 = \Phi\left(\frac{p_2 - p_1}{\sigma \sqrt{2}}\right)
\]

Usual Bertrand case ($\sigma = 0$): infinitely elastic demand at $p_1 = p_2$

\[
D_1 \in \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } p_1 < p_2 \\
[0, 1] & \text{if } p_1 = p_2 \\
0 & \text{if } p_1 > p_2
\end{cases}
\]
Complexity case ($\sigma > 0$): Smooth demand curve, no infinite drop at $p_1 = p_2$. At $p_1 = p_2 = p$ demand is $1/2$.

$$\max_{p_1} \Phi \left( \frac{p_2 - p_1}{\sigma \sqrt{2}} \right) [p_1 - c_1]$$

$$f.o.c.: -\frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2}} \phi \left( \frac{p_2 - p_1}{\sigma \sqrt{2}} \right) [p_1 - c_1] + \Phi \left( \frac{p_2 - p_1}{\sigma \sqrt{2}} \right) = 0$$

**Intuition for non-zero mark-ups:** Lower elasticity increases firm mark-ups and profits. Mark-up proportional to complexity $\sigma$. 
Endogenous complexity

- Consider Normal case $\Rightarrow$ For $\sigma \to \infty$

$$\max_{p_1} \Phi \left( \frac{p_2 - p_1}{\sigma \sqrt{2}} \right) [p_1 - c_1] \to \max_{p_1} \frac{1}{2} [p_1 - c_1]$$

Set $\sigma \to \infty$ and obtain infinite profits by letting $p_1 \to \infty$

(Choices are random, Charge as much as possible)

- Gabaix and Laibson: Concave returns of complexity $Q_i (\sigma_i)$
  Firms increase complexity, unless “clearly superior” products in model with heterogenous products.

In a nutshell: market does not help to overcome bounded rationality. Competition may not help either
• More work on Behavioral IO:

• **Heidhus-Koszegi (2006, 2007)**
  - Incorporate reference dependence into firm pricing
  - Assume reference point rational exp. equilibrium (**Koszegi-Rabin**)
  - Results on
    * Price compression (consumers hate to pay price higher than reference point)
    * But also: Stochastic sales

• **Gabaix-Laibson (QJE 2006)**
  - Consumers pay attention to certain attributes, but not others (Shrouded attributes)
- Form of limited attention
- Firms charge higher prices on shrouded attributes (add-ons)
- Similar to result in *DellaVigna-Malmendier (2004)*: Charge more on items consumers do not expect to purchase

- **Ellison (2006):** Early, concise literature overview
• Latest work: *Empirical Behavioral IO*
  
  – Document non-standard behavior
  
  – Estimate structurally
  
  – Document firm response to non-standard feature

• e.g.: Ben Handel’s work

• Zarek and Avner at work on this!

• ....
7 Next Lecture

- Market Response to Biases
  - Employees: Behavioral Labor
  - Investors: Behavioral Finance
  - Voters: Behavioral Political Economy