

Benndorf, Volker; Kübler, Dorothea; Normann, Hans-Theo

Working Paper

Privacy concerns, voluntary disclosure of information, and unraveling: An experiment

DICE Discussion Paper, No. 168

Provided in Cooperation with:

Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE), Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf

Suggested Citation: Benndorf, Volker; Kübler, Dorothea; Normann, Hans-Theo (2014) : Privacy concerns, voluntary disclosure of information, and unraveling: An experiment, DICE Discussion Paper, No. 168, ISBN 978-3-86304-167-0, Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE), Düsseldorf

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/104605>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

DISCUSSION PAPER

No 168

Privacy Concerns, Voluntary Disclosure of Information, and Unraveling: An Experiment

Volker Benndorf,
Dorothea Kübler,
Hans-Theo Normann

November 2014

IMPRINT

DICE DISCUSSION PAPER

Published by

düsseldorf university press (dup) on behalf of
Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, Faculty of Economics,
Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE), Universitätsstraße 1,
40225 Düsseldorf, Germany
www.dice.hhu.de

Editor:

Prof. Dr. Hans-Theo Normann
Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE)
Phone: +49(0) 211-81-15125, e-mail: normann@dice.hhu.de

DICE DISCUSSION PAPER

All rights reserved. Düsseldorf, Germany, 2014

ISSN 2190-9938 (online) – ISBN 978-3-86304-167-0

The working papers published in the Series constitute work in progress circulated to stimulate discussion and critical comments. Views expressed represent exclusively the authors' own opinions and do not necessarily reflect those of the editor.

Privacy Concerns, Voluntary Disclosure of Information, and Unraveling: An Experiment*

Volker Benndorf[†] Dorothea Kübler[‡] Hans-Theo Normann[§]

November 2014

Abstract

We study the voluntary revelation of private information in a labor-market experiment where workers can reveal their productivity at a cost. While rational revelation improves a worker's payoff, it imposes a negative externality on others and may trigger further revelation. Such unraveling can be observed frequently in our data although less often than predicted. Equilibrium play is more likely when subjects are predicted to conceal their productivity than when they should reveal. This tendency of under-revelation, especially of low-productivity workers, is consistent with the level- k model. A loaded frame where the private information concerns the workers' health status leads to less revelation than a neutral frame.

JEL Classification numbers: C72, C90, C91

Keywords: information revelation, level- k reasoning, privacy.

* We are grateful to Ismael Martínez-Martínez, Scott Peppet, and audiences and seminar participants at EEA Gothenburg, ESA New York, Göttingen, Heidelberg, RES Manchester and SABE Granada for helpful comments. Thanks to Nina Bonge who programmed and helped conducting the experiments. Financial support through CRC 649 ("Economic Risk") is gratefully acknowledged.

[†] Duesseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE), Tel: +49 211 8115058, +49 211 8115499; email: *benndorf@dice.hhu.de*.

[‡] WZB Berlin and Technical University Berlin, Tel: +49 30 25491 440; email: *kuebler@wzb.eu*.

[§] Duesseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE), Tel: +49 211 8115297, +49 211 8115499; email: *normann@dice.hhu.de*.

1 Introduction

Privacy concerns and the treatment of personal data are at the center of current policy debates.¹ With the rise of digital data processing and the increased communication of information via the Internet, a wealth of personal data can be easily accumulated and distributed. As a result, private enterprises and governmental institutions alike face new challenges of how to adequately handle the private data of their citizens and clients.

Situations where subjects *voluntarily* disclose private information are regarded as increasingly important. For example, prospective tenants or job applicants often voluntarily disclose verified personal information. In the US, online services such as MyBackground-Check.com provide verified information on drug tests, criminal records and previous rental addresses to prospective landlords or employers.² New-generation passports and identity cards may contain biometric data; often these are optional. Finally, health or pregnancy tests are often voluntarily provided to existing or future employers.³ A large part of the privacy debate regards it as highly relevant whether or not the revelation of sensitive information is voluntary or not.⁴

But even when the disclosure of personal information is voluntary, privacy issues can arise due to unraveling effects. Unraveling is a signaling process which works as follows: in a world where credible signals can easily be obtained and distributed, these signals will be used by those with the best medical records, credit scores, etc. This can force others to disclose similar information about themselves because not disclosing will be interpreted as a signal of low quality. In other words, unraveling is the result of signaling where revelation of high quality leads to expectations of low quality for those who do not disclose and, in turn, to more revelation. Thus, granting people the right to decide whether to disclose can be less of a voluntary choice than it seems at first sight. Or, as Posner (1998, p. 103) succinctly puts it “*As for privacy in general, it is difficult to see how a pooling equilibrium is avoided in which privacy is ‘voluntarily’ surrendered, making the legal protection of privacy futile.*”

The importance of the unraveling argument is also reflected in the legal debate. Peppet (2011) summarizes the legal perspective and argues that the voluntary disclosure of private information is crucial because of unraveling effects. The challenge to regulating voluntary

¹ To quantify this statement, we conducted a Google Books Ngram Viewer comparison of several keywords and compared them to the term “privacy concerns”. We found that the use of the term “privacy concerns” in the English literature has been increasing steadily since the 1970s. This is in contrast to other topics like “nuclear threat” (in decline and nowadays occurring less frequently than “privacy concerns”) or “racial discrimination” (more frequent than “privacy concerns”, but also in decline).

² Connolly (2008) explicitly advises applicants in the job market to use such online services (pp. 59-60).

³ Some of Apple Inc. suppliers screened their workers with health and pregnancy test (Apple Inc., 2012). See also New-York Times, January 26, 2012. Further examples, discussed in Peppet (2011), include car insurance policies or rental car contracts where drivers can voluntarily agree to have the car monitored with GPS-based systems.

⁴ See Curtis (2006) for the debate in Australia, Acharya and Kasprzycki (2010) for Canada, Probst (2011) for Germany, Grijpink (2001) for the Netherlands.

disclosure is that there are always some agents in whose interest it is to disclose their information. Limits to inquiry that forbid an uninformed party from seeking information from an informed counterpart may not be sufficient as the informed party might feel that it is in her interest to disclose the information. A means to avoid unraveling may be to completely forbid the use of certain information, as for example in the 2008 US *Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act* (GINA) which prohibits the use of genetic information by insurers.

We study the voluntary disclosure of information in a laboratory experiment with the help of a revelation game. In a labor market, workers can truthfully reveal their productivity at a positive cost. Costly and truthful revelation can be seen as a way to overcome the lemons problem (Akerlof, 1970). Rational revelation imposes an externality on others because it lowers the wage paid to other workers. Complete unraveling occurs when all workers reveal—except for the one with the lowest productivity who is identified by the fact that she does not reveal her productivity.

Our research questions are to what extent subjects reveal their productivity in an experiment, and whether these choices are in line with the equilibrium predictions. We further investigate how revelation choices depend on the productivity of the worker, on the characteristics of the market, and on the contextual framing of the choice.

We consider markets where revelation comes at a positive cost. Such costs may consist of the time and effort of the player involved or the payments to (legal, medical, etc.) specialists who conduct the certification. This does not only appear realistic in some cases, it also allows for a richer outcome space: not all players reveal their productivity in equilibrium. With zero revelation costs, revealing is always rational and there cannot be any mistaken revelation decisions. In contrast, if the costs of revelation are strictly positive, the share of workers who reveal depends on the revelation cost and the distribution of productivities. Depending on these parameters, there may be equilibria with complete unraveling, with partial unraveling, or with no revelation at all.

We implement three different variants of experimental markets where either a high, a medium or a low degree of unraveling should occur according to the theory. We focus on the revelation decisions of the workers: employers are not represented by laboratory participants, so all results are driven by the behavior of the workers. Including employers in our experiments would come at the expense of adding another potential confound of unraveling (for example, social preferences between the worker and the employers).

Our results are as follows. The equilibrium predictions for the three markets capture the differences in observed aggregate revelation rates across these markets well. We observe a significant amount of unraveling. At the same time, we find that revelation rates are somewhat lower than in equilibrium in two of the three markets. Workers who are supposed to reveal their productivity in equilibrium fail to take the equilibrium choice significantly more often than workers who should conceal. We will argue that this pattern is consistent with behavioral models such as the level- k model of bounded rationality

(see the literature survey below). We also find a statistically and economically significant framing effect: there is more revelation in the neutrally framed sessions. Thus, it appears that our labor-market frame where workers can provide employers with a health certificate triggers privacy concerns.

Taken together, our results confirm the concerns about voluntary revelation raised in the privacy debate. We observe robust revelation rates, suggesting this behavior is likely to occur in voluntary disclosure regimes in the field where incentives for revelation may be even stronger (see our Conclusion). Thus, unraveling effects should be considered in the context of privacy policies.

In the next section, we review the relevant literature. Section 3 introduces the revelation game and Section 4 the experimental implementation and the different treatments. Section 5 reports on the results. Section 6 investigates reasons for the behavioral patterns we observe and Section 7 concludes.

2 Related Literature

Following the introduction of the lemons problem by Akerlof (1970), the costly but truthful revelation of private information—the certificate solution to the lemons problem—was suggested by Viscusi (1978). Subsequently, it was shown by Grossman and Hart (1980), Grossman (1981), Milgrom (1981), Jovanovic (1982), and Milgrom and Roberts (1986) that taking no action (not acquiring a certificate) may reveal an agent’s type when other agents have an incentive to disclose information. Specifically, they pointed out that complete unraveling will result when revelation costs are negligible.

More recently, Hermalin and Katz (2006) investigated the impact of privacy regimes on consumer and producer rents in markets with price discrimination, taking into account unraveling effects. They argue that markets may be ex post efficient due to unraveling. However, laws banning unraveling can improve welfare ex ante because the socially wasteful revelation costs can be avoided.

While information disclosure has received much attention in the theoretical literature, only Forsythe, Isaac, and Palfrey (1989) have studied unraveling in an experiment. They study a game where sellers have superior information about the good compared to the buyers and can decide whether to reveal this information. The game has multiple Nash equilibria. Full unraveling in the sense of sellers disclosing their private information about the good takes place in the unique sequential equilibrium, which experimental subjects learn to play in the course of several rounds of play. Our game differs from the one in Forsythe et al. (1989) in several aspects. As mentioned above, we introduce strictly positive revelation costs, and subjects in the experiment only take on the role of sellers (workers), not of buyers (employers). Also, our game has a unique Nash equilibrium with partial unraveling.

There is also an empirical literature on the topic based on field data. Jin (2005) reports evidence on incomplete unraveling among Health Maintenance Organizations which may disclose information on the quality of their services on a voluntary basis. As for mandatory disclosure Jin and Leslie (2003) find that the introduction of hygiene quality grade cards for restaurants increases the consumers' sensitivity for hygiene issues in restaurants. More recently, Lewis (2011) pointed out that a lack of (voluntarily provided) ex-post verifiable information on used cars (photos, text hinting at rust, scratches, etc.) has a negative influence on the selling price in internet auctions.

Our experiments have some bearing on the question of how people make choices regarding their personal data. To our knowledge, we are the first to study the unraveling of privacy experimentally.⁵ Related to our framing treatment, there is a study on the framing effects of defaults used in electronic commerce for various privacy settings (Johnson, Bellman, and Lohse, 2002). Experiments have also been used to investigate decisions regarding personal data. When making purchasing decisions, consumers have been found to provide personal data freely, even when it is relatively easy and costless to avoid it (see Acquisti and Grossklags, 2005; Beresford, Kübler, and Preibusch, 2012). This behavior in combination with a strong concern for privacy protection voiced in surveys has been called the *privacy paradox*.

In an experiment on information acquisition and revelation by Schudy and Utikal (2012), the impact of different data security schemes on information acquisition is investigated. In the experiments, subjects can acquire the results of a binary test (for example, an HIV test). The data security regimes are perfect privacy (no one but the testee gets to know the test result), imperfect privacy (there is a 50% chance that the results of the test will be leaked to a player interacting with the testee), and automatic dissemination where the test results are automatically disclosed to both players in a group. The authors find that almost all subjects take the test (that is, they acquire information) in perfect privacy and in imperfect privacy. The only treatment where incomplete information acquisition is observed is automatic dissemination, that is, the treatment where all test results are revealed to both players. We do not study information acquisition decisions, but our focus is on the externality imposed on others by revealing private information.

Our main behavioral model, the level- k model, was introduced by Stahl and Wilson (1995) and Nagel (1995). Its original application was to explain subjects' behavior in beauty-contest games (see, for example, Bosch-Domenech, Montalvo, Nagel, and Satorra, 2002; Kocher and Sutter, 2005; Brañas Garza, Garcia-Muñoz, and González, 2012). Further applications include private-value auctions (Crawford and Iriberri, 2007) or centipede games (Kawagoe and Takizawa, 2012; Ho and Su, 2013). Some games such as the "11-20 money request game" have specifically been designed for the elicitation of k -levels (Arad

⁵ Signaling games are broadly related to the revelation game we study. The experimental literature on signaling includes early contributions like Miller and Plott (1985), Brandts and Holt (1992), Potters and van Winden (1996), and Cooper, Garvin, and Kagel (1997), and more recent papers like Kübler, Müller, and Normann (2008), Cooper and Kagel (2009) and de Haan, Offerman, and Sloof (2011).

and Rubinstein, 2012; Lindnera and Sutter, 2013). Extensions of the model have been developed by Camerer, Ho, and Chong (2004) and Goeree and Holt (2004).

3 The Revelation Game

Our design is based on a simple labor market which we call revelation game. There are $n \geq 2$ workers with $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Worker i has productivity θ_i . Let $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n\}$ and assume w.l.o.g. that $\theta_1 \leq \theta_2 \leq \dots \leq \theta_n$.

All n workers simultaneously choose between two actions, to *reveal* or to *conceal* their productivity. Revelation causes a cost of $c > 0$ and correctly reveals the worker's productivity. Let $I_i \in \{0, 1\}$ be a function indicating whether worker i has chosen to reveal her productivity, with $I_i = 1$ denoting revelation and $I_i = 0$ concealment.

Workers' payoffs are as follows. If worker i chooses to reveal, i earns her productivity minus the revelation cost. If not, she receives the average productivity of all workers who have chosen not to reveal. Formally, i 's payoff is

$$\Pi_i = \begin{cases} \theta_i - c & \text{if } I_i = 1 \text{ (reveal)} \\ \sum_{j=1}^n (1 - I_j) \theta_j / \sum_{j=1}^n (1 - I_j) & \text{if } I_i = 0 \text{ (conceal)}. \end{cases}$$

These payoffs can be thought to arise in a competitive labor market where two or more employers bid for workers and earn the workers' (expected) productivity. The employers in this labor market know the set Θ , that is, they know the n payoff functions of the n workers, but do not know which worker has which payoff function. Employers earn an expected payoff of zero. Since employers are not part of our game, this is a static game of complete information and the equilibrium concept is Nash equilibrium.⁶

Proposition 1. *In any pure strategy Nash equilibrium of the revelation game, we have $I_n^* \geq I_{n-1}^* \geq \dots \geq I_2^* \geq I_1^* = 0$.*

The proof can be found in Appendix C. The proposition has two implications. First, there is a sorting effect in that $I_i < I_j$ for $i > j$ is impossible. The revelation decisions are monotonic in the productivity. Second, at least worker 1 (and possibly more workers) will

⁶ If workers first take the revelation decisions and employers then bid a wage, this results in a dynamic game with incomplete information. This game with employers is analyzed in another paper (Benndorf, 2014). The same worker productivities are implemented for the three markets. Some of the predictions remain the same (in Markets A and B), but in Market C there is a unique equilibrium in pure strategies in the game without employers, but two pure and one mixed equilibria in the game with employers. As for differences in behavior, Benndorf (2014) shows that the revelation decisions of workers are similar in both games, the main differences being that high-productivity workers reveal slightly more frequently and that low-productivity workers reveal slightly less frequently compared to the same workers in the game without employers.

conceal in equilibrium. Here, the positive revelation cost in our model leads to interesting departures from the previous literature. For $c = 0$, our model suggests that all players (except for the worker with the lowest productivity who is indifferent) reveal. For $c > 0$, the proposition allows for the pattern of equilibrium actions $I_1 = \dots = 0 < I_m = \dots = I_n = 1$, with $1 < m \leq n$. Accordingly, in our markets described below, the model predicts several low-productivity workers to conceal. (Of course, when revelation costs are prohibitively high, $I_1 = I_2 = \dots = I_n = 0$).

Furthermore, multiple equilibria can exist when $c > 0$. To characterize the conditions under which there is a unique equilibrium, the following definition is helpful:

Definition 1. Let $\bar{\theta}(s) = \frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s \theta_i$. Further, define $C = \{i | \theta_i - c \leq \bar{\theta}(i)\}$ and $R = \{i | \theta_i - c \geq \bar{\theta}(i)\}$.

In words, $\bar{\theta}(s)$ is the average of the productivities of all workers $1, 2, \dots, s$. The set C contains all workers whose best response is to conceal given that all workers with lower (higher) productivity conceal (reveal). And R is the set of all workers whose best response is to reveal given that all workers with lower (higher) productivity conceal (reveal). When $c = 0$, $\theta_i - c \geq \bar{\theta}(i)$ holds for all $i \geq 1$, so $R = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, n\}$.

Proposition 2. *The revelation game has a unique pure strategy equilibrium if and only if $\max(C) < \min(R)$.*

See the Appendix for a proof. While the games we use in our experiment all have a unique pure strategy equilibrium, it is easy to construct cases with multiple equilibria and/or cases with mixed equilibria with the help of the proposition.⁷

4 Experimental Design and Procedures

In each of our experimental markets, there are $n = 6$ workers. We design three different markets, A, B, and C, with different realizations of Θ . The cost of revelation, c , always equals 100 experimental currency units; it does not vary across workers, markets or treatments. The different productivities in each market are reported in Table 1. The entries in bold type indicate that the corresponding worker reveals her productivity in equilibrium.

⁷ Suppose $n = 3$, $c = 100$, $\theta_1 = 200$, $\theta_2 = 402$ and $\theta_3 = 403$. We have $\bar{\theta}(1) = 200$, $\bar{\theta}(2) = 301$ and $\bar{\theta}(3) = 335$. Therefore, $C = \{1, 3\}$ and $R = \{2\}$. There are multiple equilibria: in one pure strategy Nash equilibrium, all workers conceal and we have $\theta_i - c < 335$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$; in a second pure strategy Nash equilibrium, workers two and three reveal and we have $\theta_1 - c < 200$, $\theta_{2,3} - c > \frac{200 + \theta_{2,3}}{2}$; there is also a mixed equilibrium where worker one reveals with zero probability while the workers two and three reveal with the probabilities $\frac{64}{67}$ and $\frac{33}{34}$, respectively. Another possibility to generate mixed equilibria is to require $\bar{\theta}(j) = \theta_j - c$ for at least one worker j .

The revelation costs in our experiment are relatively high. Such high costs may exist in the field with a complicated certification process requiring a number of costly tests (say, fMRI scans or dangerous medical analyses like cardiac catheters) or elaborate legal procedures. When it comes to the digital dissemination of simple information in the field, revelation costs may be rather low.

The three markets are played on a rotating basis. In period 1 subjects play Market A, in period 2 they play Market B, and in period 3 Market C is played before they start all over again with Market A. Each market is played five times, totaling 15 periods altogether.

Productivity	Market A	Market B	Market C
θ_1	200	200	200
θ_2	210	448	280
θ_3	230	510	360
θ_4	260	551	440
θ_5	300	582	520
θ_6	600	607	600

Table 1: Workers' productivities in the three different markets. Entries in bold face indicate that the player reveals in equilibrium ($I_i = 1$).

At the beginning of the experiment, subjects were randomly allocated into groups of six, and they stayed in their group for the whole experiment (fixed matching). The productivities θ_i , expressed in experimental currency units, were randomly assigned to the workers in each period. The instructions emphasized that this allocation of productivities was without replacement such that each productivity value occurs exactly once in each group and in each period.

The Nash equilibrium for the three markets is as follows. In Market A, only worker 6 reveals her productivity. That is, we have $I_6 = 1 > I_5 = \dots = I_1 = 0$ in equilibrium. In Market B, all workers except for worker 1 reveal: $I_6 = \dots = I_2 = 1 > I_1 = 0$, and in Market C, we have $I_6 = I_5 = I_4 = 1 > I_3 = I_2 = I_1 = 0$. The motivation for employing Markets A to C is that we need qualitatively different equilibrium outcomes to be able to infer whether there is too much or too little revelation. For example, Market B may show that subjects reveal too little, but given that almost all workers should reveal in equilibrium, we need to contrast this with Market A where only one of six workers reveal in Nash equilibrium.

We consider two treatments:

- The baseline treatment, called **LOADED**, is based on the revelation game described in the previous section with one peculiarity. It employs a loaded labor-market frame. Subjects are told that they are acting as *workers* in a *labor market*. Their productivity is referred to as their *health status*, and subjects are informed that they need to decide whether or not to *buy a health certificate*.

- In our second treatment, NEUTRAL, we remove the labor market frame. The productivity is called *number* and the decision is whether to disclose this number (*yes*, *no*).

Our treatments are motivated as follows. The LOADED treatment is thought to resemble a real-world situation where the disclosure of sensitive personal data may play a role. We opted for a combination of a labor market and medical data, but there are other examples that could have been chosen (e.g., landlords may require prospective tenants to disclose details on their lifestyle or banks might ask for information on a customer’s personal situation). Of course, we do not know how these alternative frames affect behavior, but our intuition is that a loaded frame that explicitly asks for the disclosure of sensitive information should raise more privacy concerns among our subjects than a more neutrally framed treatment. Hence, the NEUTRAL treatment is implemented in order to control for the possibility of subjects’ privacy concerns elicited by the framing. If the subjects care for privacy and if our frame elicits these privacy concerns, there should be more revelation in the NEUTRAL treatment compared to the baseline treatment with the loaded frame.

The feedback given to the participants at the end of a period was as follows. In all sessions, subjects were informed of their own profits and the market wage of that period. In 11 of the 23 groups of the LOADED treatment, we gave the subjects additional information about the choices of all six workers in the group. Our hypothesis was that the additional feedback would support learning. In Appendix A, we analyze the differences between the two feedback formats in detail. However, we do not find any effect of the additional feedback whatsoever. Therefore, we ignore the differences in feedback in the LOADED treatment and pool the data in the main parts of the papers.

	LOADED	NEUTRAL	Σ
number of participants	138	66	204
number of independent groups	23	11	34
number of sessions	6	3	9
groups per session	3-4	3-4	

Table 2: Treatments.

We note that several features of the experimental design suggest that there might be more unraveling in the field compared to our laboratory setting. First, the simultaneous move structure necessitates players to anticipate the decisions of the other market participants. In contrast, in a sequential setting unraveling occurs even if players are only myopically best responding to the choices of others. Second, our groups of six players are matched together for the entire experiment consisting of 15 rounds. Cooperation (in the sense of joint-payoff maximization) would induce them to conceal their productivity to save on the revelation costs, again making unraveling less likely. Field settings, by

contrast, may often be of a one-shot nature. Third, in our experiment the productivity of the workers is not attained by merit, but assigned randomly. Revelation might increase if workers feel entitled to a higher wage because they have invested in their productivity (compare for example, Hoffman, McCabe, Shachat, and Smith, 1994; Konow, 1996). Finally, we point out that there is also one reason why unraveling might be softened in the field. Here, the information to be revealed is more sensitive. However, as mentioned above, we also implement the LOADED treatment which is thought to resemble such situations.

The experiments were conducted between July and September 2011 at the experimental lab at the Technical University Berlin, using the z-Tree software package by Fischbacher (2007) and Greiner’s (2004) on-line recruitment system. In total, 204 subjects participated in the experiment, a session lasted around 60 minutes, and subjects earned between 8.19€ and 12.51€. The average payment was 10.70€. More details on the number of participants and the independent observations gathered in this experiment can be found in Table 2.

5 Results

When we report non-parametric tests, we conservatively count each group of six players as one independent observation, and we report two-sided p -values. For the regression analyses, we employ clustering at the group level.

5.1 Main Findings

Our first research question is to what extent subjects reveal their productivity. Figure 1 displays the relevant revelation rates per market, averaged across the six workers and all periods. We observe substantial revelation rates throughout. Conspicuously, the equilibrium predictions capture the differences in observed revelation rates between the three markets well. As in equilibrium, we observe more revelation in Market B than in Market C, and there is more revelation in Market C than in Market A.

Observation 1. *In all markets and all treatments, we observe substantial levels of revelation. The differences between markets are well organized by the predictions.*

Whereas prediction and behavior are rather consistent in Market A, too little revelation compared to the prediction is observed in Market B, especially for LOADED. Using a sign test, revelation rates are significantly below the prediction in Markets B and C of both LOADED and NEUTRAL (all $p < 0.05$). Although statistically significant, the difference is small in Market C in the NEUTRAL treatment. In the rest of the paper, we will investigate the reasons for the observed differences between markets regarding the consistency of choices with the equilibrium predictions.




Figure 1: Average revelation rates (solid circle), standard deviations (calculated using group averages) and predictions (dashed line).

We next study the equilibrium consistency of choices at the individual level. Table 3 reports the results of probit regressions with *Consistency* as the dependent variable. *Consistency* indicates whether a subject behaves in line with the Nash prediction. The dummy variable *Reveal* indicates the equilibrium action of the corresponding decision ($Reveal = 1$). The dummy for the treatment with the loaded frame is *Loaded*, and *Period* captures possible time trends. We report results when the data from all markets are pooled (probit regression (1)) as well as probits for each market separately ((3), (4) and (6)). The regressions (2), (5) and (7) will be discussed in Section 6.

The regressions in Table 3 suggest three findings. The first result is that subjects who should reveal in equilibrium are less likely to behave according to this prediction compared to subjects who are predicted to conceal. We will analyze this further in the following paragraphs. Second, the loaded frame reduces the likelihood of observing the equilibrium action, with the exception of Market A (see Section 5.2). The third result is that there is a moderate positive and statistically significant time trend except in regression (6) (see Section 5.3).

The first and foremost observation in Table 3 is that *Reveal* is highly significant in regressions (1), (3) and (6). The marginal effect of *Reveal* on the consistency of the decision with the equilibrium prediction is -24.41% in regression (1). In the LOADED treatment, workers conceal when the equilibrium calls for revelation in 16%, 38%, and 33% of the corresponding decisions in Markets A, B and C, respectively. In contrast, the corresponding frequencies for workers who reveal when the equilibrium predicts concealment are only 6%, 10%, and 6%. This difference is highly significant using a non-parametric test (Wilcoxon signed-rank test, $p < 0.001$). In NEUTRAL these figures read 11%, 26%, and

	All markets		Market A	Market B		Market C	
Consistency	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
<i>Reveal</i>	-1.098*** (0.105)	-0.423*** (0.107)	-0.577*** (0.162)	-1.108*** (0.175)	-0.143 (0.222)	-1.010*** (0.134)	-0.264* (0.147)
<i>Loaded</i>	-0.367*** (0.129)	-0.417*** (0.147)	-0.249 (0.205)	-0.402*** (0.148)	-0.485*** (0.179)	-0.400*** (0.141)	-0.455*** (0.157)
<i>Period</i>	0.0639*** (0.0175)	0.0732*** (0.0198)	0.0863** (0.0382)	0.0722*** (0.0261)	0.0893*** (0.0316)	0.0433 (0.0349)	0.0462 (0.0388)
<i>Min_k</i>		-0.419*** (0.0307)			-0.448*** (0.0408)		-0.663*** (0.0666)
<i>Constant</i>	1.693*** (0.130)	2.125*** (0.159)	1.581*** (0.201)	1.576*** (0.200)	2.044*** (0.219)	1.758*** (0.188)	2.455*** (0.223)
Observations	3,060	3,060	1,020	1,020	1,020	1,020	1,020
Pseudo R2	0.136	0.225	0.0474	0.0694	0.206	0.122	0.202
Standard errors adjusted for 34 clusters (groups)							
*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$							

Table 3: Probit regression results on the equilibrium consistency of choices.

16% (if the prediction is to reveal) and 3%, 0%, and 5% (for workers with a prediction to conceal) and the difference is also significant (Wilcoxon signed-rank test, $p = 0.001$). It appears that subjects are biased against revealing their productivity, and therefore the equilibrium consistency is much higher for concealing.

Observation 2. *In both LOADED and NEUTRAL, workers who are predicted to reveal in equilibrium violate the prediction significantly more often than workers who are predicted to conceal in equilibrium.*

We further break down the behavior of the workers for the different productivities. Table 4 summarizes the equilibrium prediction and actual play for all six workers separately in the three markets. Consider workers who are expected to reveal in equilibrium, denoted by the entry of 1 in the “Equilibrium” row. Here, the differences between actual revelation rates and predictions are large, ranging from 15% up to 68% in LOADED. The table shows that the inconsistencies with equilibrium play are negatively correlated with worker productivity for those workers who should reveal in equilibrium, that is, workers of lower productivity fail to reveal more often than workers of high productivity. (A sign test on the signs of Spearman’s ρ calculated for each group yields $p \leq 0.001$ for both, LOADED and NEUTRAL). In contrast, inconsistencies with equilibrium play are not correlated with productivity when workers should conceal in equilibrium, and these inconsistencies are also generally small (analogous sign tests yield $p = 0.455$ for LOADED and $p = 0.508$ for NEUTRAL). In NEUTRAL, the under-revelation result is less pronounced, but again a correlation for out-of-equilibrium conceal decisions as well as no correlation for out-of-equilibrium reveal decisions can be found.

Worker	Market A			Market B			Market C		
	Nash	Loaded	Neutral	Nash	Loaded	Neutral	Nash	Loaded	Neutral
1	0	0.02	0.04	0	0.10	0.00	0	0.04	0.04
2	0	0.07	0.02	1	0.32	0.35	0	0.03	0.04
3	0	0.04	0.02	1	0.44	0.71	0	0.09	0.09
4	0	0.06	0.02	1	0.65	0.78	1	0.41	0.62
5	0	0.10	0.07	1	0.81	0.91	1	0.77	0.93
6	1	0.84	0.89	1	0.85	0.96	1	0.83	0.98

Table 4: Average revelation rates across markets and treatments. In the columns entitled “Nash”, an entry of 0 denotes that the worker is predicted to conceal while 1 denotes that the worker is predicted to reveal.

Observation 3. *In both LOADED and NEUTRAL, choices inconsistent with the equilibrium prediction are correlated with productivity when workers reveal in equilibrium but not when they should conceal.*

From Table 4 it can also be taken that the discrepancy between revelation rates and predictions at the market level (see Figure 1) is related to the equilibrium share of reveal decisions. In Market A, only one in six workers is predicted to reveal and only minor discrepancies to the prediction occur. In Market B, it is the other way round: five in six workers are predicted to reveal and major discrepancies to the prediction occur. This reflects the observed tendency of under-revelation.

5.2 Framing Effect

As is apparent from the results reported above, subjects in the NEUTRAL treatment reveal more often than in LOADED. A more detailed analysis suggests the following differences:

- Averaging across all markets and all workers, we find that more decisions are in line with the equilibrium prediction in NEUTRAL (87.8%) than with the loaded frame (79.8%). This difference is significant (Mann-Whitney U-Test, $p = 0.027$). *Loaded* remains significant when we control for *Reveal* and *Period* in regression (1), Table 3. The marginal effect of *Loaded* is -7.55%.
- Looking at markets separately (see Figure 1), revelation rates are higher in NEUTRAL than in LOADED for Markets B and C. The regressor *Loaded* is significant in regressions (4) and (6), Table 3.
- The higher level of equilibrium play in NEUTRAL has a distinct pattern: there are more equilibrium revelation choices, but not more equilibrium conceal decisions in NEUTRAL compared to LOADED. Averaging across the three markets in LOADED, we observe 34.2% conceal decisions of workers who should reveal in equilibrium and 6.2% reveal decisions for workers who should conceal in equilibrium. For NEUTRAL,

the corresponding numbers are 20.8% and 3.6%. The decrease from 34.2% to 20.8% is significant (Mann-Whitney U-Test, $p = 0.024$), but the decrease from 6.2% to 3.6% is not (Mann-Whitney U-Test, $p = 0.356$).

Observation 4. *In NEUTRAL, subjects reveal their productivity more often than in LOADED. While there are significantly more choices consistent with equilibrium in NEUTRAL, this effect is quantitatively and statistically significant only for workers who should reveal in equilibrium.*

These findings suggest that the labor market frame in combination with the health certificate affects choices. It gives rise to preferences not restricted to the monetary incentives of the game. A share of subjects were more reluctant to disclose their productivity in the loaded treatment where private information concerned the subject’s health status. Hence, revelation of private information increases or decreases depending on the contextual frame, without any real privacy issues at stake in the experiment.

5.3 Learning




Figure 2: Fraction of decisions consistent with equilibrium across treatments and markets over time.

Do subjects learn to play the equilibrium over time? Figure 2 shows the frequency of choices consistent with equilibrium over the five periods that each market was played. There is a moderate increase in equilibrium decisions in all three markets and in both treatments. The significance of *Period* in Table 3 for all markets as well as for Market A and B separately confirm the learning effect. However, the learning effect is relatively small in Market A because decisions are already close to the equilibrium in the first period. In Markets B and C, the equilibrium is not reached even after five periods of play.

Observation 5. *Learning is rather limited in the revelation game. The share of decisions consistent with equilibrium increases moderately in all markets of both treatments LOADED and NEUTRAL.*

6 Behavioral forces against revelation

Despite a relatively large congruence of the data with the theoretical predictions at the market level (Observation 1), we trust it is worthwhile to further investigate Observations 2 and 3 which suggest that there is a substantial tendency to under-reveal. We consider (i) level- k reasoning, (ii) quantal response equilibrium, and (iii) inequality aversion.⁸ Whereas the analysis is not aimed at conducting a horse race among behavioral models, we believe that level k or a limited depth of reasoning is a prime and parsimonious model for explaining our data. Accordingly, we focus on the level- k model here and relegate quantal response equilibrium and inequality aversion to the appendix. As none of the models can explain the observed framing effect, we focus on the treatment NEUTRAL while keeping in mind that in LOADED the under-revelation is even more pronounced.

To apply level- k reasoning to the revelation game, we assume that level-0 players randomize between their two actions (both equally likely), although the exact level-0 assumption qualitatively does not matter much for our game.⁹ We then calculate the best replies for $k > 1$ where level- k' players (for $k' > 0$) believe that all other players reason at level $k = k' - 1$.

Figure 3 displays the required levels of reasoning for players to pick their equilibrium action in the various markets for different productivities. The fewest iterations are required in Market A ($k=1$ throughout). The highest level- k requirement occurs in Market B for player 2 who has to perform five steps of reasoning. Level- k reasoning yields Nash equilibrium choices for a finite number of steps.

Figure 3 also shows that taking the (equilibrium) decision to conceal merely requires a level of $k = 1$ throughout. By contrast, revealing requires up to $k = n - 1$ levels. As this property is central to our research question, we prove this generally. It is impossible, for example, that a worker reveals when she is a level-1 type but conceals when she is level 2. The proof of the following proposition can be found in the appendix.

⁸ Preferences for efficiency or surplus maximization may be relevant here, too. Revealing is socially wasteful and so subjects with a preference for maximizing total welfare may be disinclined to reveal. It is, however, not straightforward to disentangle preferences for equality and total surplus, see Engelmann (2012). While we discuss the impact of social preferences under the label inequality aversion, we note that a preference for total surplus may also have explanatory power.

⁹ A different yet plausible assumption for level-0 types is that all workers conceal with probability one. In that case, it is straightforward to check that Markets A and B remain as in Figure 3, but in Market C also worker 5 reveals when $k = 1$ and worker 4 when $k = 2$. Less plausible in our view is the level-0 assumption that all workers reveal with probability one. If so, the prediction is the same as in the case where all workers conceal with probability one with all k -levels augmented by one. The logic is that when all players reveal, the $k = 1$ reply for all workers is to conceal with probability one.




Figure 3: Minimum k -level required to play the Nash equilibrium action. Conceal decisions (shaded areas) require $k = 1$ throughout whereas revelation often demand $k > 1$.

Proposition 3. *Applying the level- k model to the revelation game, workers who conceal if they are level $k > 1$ also conceal if they are level $k = 1$.*

Proposition 3 and the level- k patterns in Figure 3 offer an explanation of Observations 2 and 3. Under the assumption that at least some players display limited depth of reasoning, Proposition 3 and Figure 3 imply (i) disproportionately more concealment in general, (ii) more consistency with the equilibrium prediction for workers who conceal than for those who reveal in equilibrium, and (iii) a positive correlation of equilibrium revelation decisions with productivities which does not hold for equilibrium conceal decisions.

An intriguing prediction the level- k model makes is that the frequency of conceal decisions should be equal to the frequency of reveal decisions by worker 6 because all of these decisions require at least reasoning at level $k = 1$ (see Figure 3). We find support for this hypothesis as we observe no significant differences in the fraction of equilibrium choices by those players (Wilcoxon signed-rank test, $p = 0.216$).¹⁰

The relevance of level- k reasoning can also be taken from the regression analysis in Table 3. In regressions (2), (5) and (7), we additionally consider the cardinal variable Min_k . This is the minimum k -level required for an individual worker to choose her

¹⁰ In LOADED, there is more under-revelation by worker 6 than over-revelation by those workers who conceal in equilibrium. This can be attributed to the framing effect causing lower revelation rates.

equilibrium action. (Since $Min_k = 1$ for all workers in Market A, we cannot perform the analysis for this market). The explanatory variable Min_k is highly significant in all three regressions. Higher requirements on subjects' reasoning lower the likelihood for equilibrium play. Min_k also takes away some of the explanatory power of *Reveal*. Thus, beyond the bias subjects exhibit against revelation due to the framing effect, it is the cognitive requirement of revelation for low-productivity workers that explains our results. As low-productivity workers who are predicted to reveal need to anticipate other workers' behavior quite accurately, their decisions are more challenging compared to workers who should conceal and whose decisions are less dependent on others' choices. It follows that these low-productivity workers are more prone to making decisions that are inconsistent with the equilibrium.

7 Conclusion

We study experimental labor markets where workers can voluntarily reveal private data (their productivity) at a cost. We analyze whether and to what degree voluntary disclosure of private information may result in unraveling of privacy. The paper contains several arguments which, at first sight, appear to qualify Posner's (1998) view that privacy cannot be maintained. These arguments are as follows.

First, we show theoretically that if the cost of revelation is sufficiently high, the unraveling process may be mitigated. The equilibria of our different market games may entail unraveling and the complete disclosure of private information. However, unraveling can also be only partial in that, for instance, three or even five out of six workers are predicted to conceal and to maintain their privacy. Our experimental data documents that the equilibria are generally good predictors for the observed differences between markets.

Second, we identify behavioral forces that may further diminish workers' revelation behavior. Level- k reasoning predicts that players will conceal frequently, and only with fully rational players will there be complete unraveling. Out-of-equilibrium revelation, by contrast, will be rare as concealing in equilibrium does not require more than one step of reasoning (level $k = 1$). Our experimental data is nicely in line with the level- k predictions. We not only observe the tendency towards incomplete unraveling, our data also documents that this incompleteness is driven by exactly those agents who face an especially difficult decision according to the level- k model.

Third, we observe a framing effect which suggests that personal privacy concerns may also reduce the subjects' propensity to disclose private information. Our first treatment uses a loaded labor-market frame where the wording suggests that the information to be disclosed is particularly sensitive; in a second treatment this loaded frame is removed. Our data shows that subjects reveal significantly less frequently with the loaded frame compared to the neutral frame. We believe that this framing effect is driven by the subjects' privacy concerns that are switched on in the privacy-sensitive frame and switched

off in the neutral frame.

Do these results and arguments refute Posner’s (1998) suspicion that the protection of privacy is futile? By and large, we do not believe so. We observe a substantial degree of revelation in our lab experiment (roughly forty percent overall where fifty percent are predicted). Our results do not suggest that voluntary revelation is unimportant in the privacy debate. On the other hand, if the mechanism underlying unraveling is well understood, it can be stopped as evidenced by the GINA legislation. Thus, the protection of privacy need not be futile in the end.

Finally, the level of revelation we observe may only constitute a lower bound since there are reasons why revelation in other settings may be stronger. First, decision making may be sequential rather than simultaneous. If so, unraveling may occur even for myopic players, weakening the level- k argument. Also, the repeated interaction within groups we employ makes the externality more salient and may limit unraveling. In a setting with one-shot interactions, there may be more unraveling. Third, players whose productivity is earned by merit (rather than being random) might feel entitled to a higher payoff and thus be more inclined to reveal. Further research will indicate whether these arguments have bite in explaining the unraveling of private information.

Bibliography

- L. Acharya and T. Kasprzycki. Biometrics and government. Technical report, Parliamentary Information and Research Service, Library of Parliament, Ottawa, Canada, 2010.
- A. Acquisti and J. Grossklags. Privacy and rationality in individual decision making. *IEEE Security and Privacy*, 3:24–30, 2005.
- G. Akerlof. The market for “lemons”: Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 84(3):488–500, 1970.
- Apple Inc. Apple supplier responsibility report. Technical report, Apple Inc., 2012.
- A. Arad and A. Rubinstein. The 11-20 money request game: A level- k reasoning study. *American Economic Review*, 102(7):3561–73, 2012.
- V. Benndorf. Voluntary disclosure of information and unraveling in the market for lemons: An experiment. Unpublished mimeo, 2014.
- A. R. Beresford, D. Kübler, and S. Preibusch. Unwillingness to pay for privacy: A field experiment. *Economics Letters*, 117(1):25–27, 2012.
- M. Blanco, D. Engelmann, and H. Normann. A within-subject analysis of other-regarding preferences. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 72(2):321–338, 2011.

- A. Bosch-Domenech, J. Montalvo, R. Nagel, and A. Satorra. One, two,(three), infinity,...: Newspaper and lab beauty-contest experiments. *American Economic Review*, 92(5):1687–1701, 2002.
- P. Brañas Garza, T. Garcia-Muñoz, and R. H. González. Cognitive effort in the beauty contest game. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 83(2):254–260, 2012.
- J. Brandts and C. A. Holt. An experimental test of equilibrium dominance in signaling games. *American Economic Review*, 82(5):1350–1365, 1992.
- C. F. Camerer, T.-H. Ho, and J.-K. Chong. A cognitive hierarchy model of games. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119(3):861–898, 2004.
- A. Connolly. *101 ways to score higher on your GMAT: What you need to know about the graduate management admission test explained simply*. Atlantic Publishing Company (FL), 2008.
- D. J. Cooper and J. H. Kagel. The role of context and team play in cross-game learning. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 7(5):1101–1139, 2009.
- D. J. Cooper, S. Garvin, and J. H. Kagel. Signalling and adaptive learning in an entry limit pricing game. *RAND Journal of Economics*, 28:662–683, 1997.
- V. P. Crawford and N. Iriberri. Level-k auctions: Can a nonequilibrium model of strategic thinking explain the winner’s curse and overbidding in private-value auctions? *Econometrica*, 75(6):1721–1770, 2007.
- K. Curtis. Biometrics institute - privacy code. Technical report, Biometrics Institute Ltd, PO Box 567, Crows Nest NSW 1585, Australia, 2006.
- T. de Haan, T. Offerman, and R. Sloof. Noisy signaling: theory and experiment. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 73(2):402–428, 2011.
- D. Engelmann. How not to extend models of inequality aversion. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 81(2):599–605, 2012.
- E. Fehr and K. Schmidt. A theory of fairness, competition, and cooperation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114(3):817–868, 1999.
- U. Fischbacher. z-tree: Zurich toolbox for ready-made economic experiments. *Experimental Economics*, 10(2):171–178, 2007.
- R. Forsythe, M. R. Isaac, and T. R. Palfrey. Theories and tests of “blind bidding” in sealed-bid auctions. *RAND Journal of Economics*, 20(2):214–238, 1989.
- J. Goeree and C. Holt. A model of noisy introspection. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 46(2):365–382, 2004.

- B. Greiner. An online recruitment system for economic experiments. In K. Kremer and V. Macho, editors, *Forschung und wissenschaftliches Rechnen 2003. GWDG Bericht 63*, pages 79–93. Ges. fuer Wiss. Datenverarbeitung, Goettingen, 2004.
- J. Grijpink. Biometrics and privacy. *Computer Law and Security Report*, 17:154–160, 2001.
- S. J. Grossman. The informational role of warranties and private disclosure about product quality. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 24(3):461–483, 1981.
- S. J. Grossman and O. D. Hart. Disclosure laws and takeover bids. *Journal of Finance*, 35(2):323–334, 1980.
- P. A. Haile, A. Hortaçsu, and G. Kosenok. On the empirical content of quantal response equilibrium. *American Economic Review*, 98(1):180–200, 2008.
- B. Hermalin and M. Katz. Privacy, property rights and efficiency: The economics of privacy as secrecy. *Quantitative Marketing and Economics*, 4(3):209–239, 2006.
- T.-H. Ho and X. Su. A dynamic level-k model in sequential games. *Management Science*, 59(2):452–469, 2013.
- E. Hoffman, K. McCabe, K. Shachat, and V. Smith. Preferences, property rights, and anonymity in bargaining games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 7(3):346–380, 1994.
- G. Z. Jin. Competition and disclosure incentives: An empirical study of HMOs. *RAND Journal of Economics*, 36(1):93–112, 2005.
- G. Z. Jin and P. Leslie. The effect of information on product quality: Evidence from restaurant hygiene grade cards. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(2):409–451, 2003.
- E. J. Johnson, S. Bellman, and G. L. Lohse. Framing and privacy: Why opting in-opting out. *Marketing Letters*, 13(1):5–15, 2002.
- B. Jovanovic. Truthful disclosure of information. *Bell Journal of Economics*, 13(1):36–44, 1982.
- T. Kawagoe and H. Takizawa. Level-k analysis of experimental centipede games. *Journal Of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 82(2):548–566, 2012.
- M. G. Kocher and M. Sutter. The decision maker matters: Individual versus group behaviour in experimental beauty-contest games. *Economic Journal*, 115(500):200–223, 2005.
- J. Konow. A positive theory of economic fairness. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 31(1):13–35, 1996.

- D. Kübler, W. Müller, and H.-T. Normann. Job-market signaling and screening: An experimental comparison. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 64(1):219–236, 2008.
- G. Lewis. Asymmetric information, adverse selection and online disclosure: The case of ebay motors. *American Economic Review*, 101(4):1535–46, September 2011.
- F. Lindnera and M. Sutter. Level-k reasoning and time pressure in the 11–20 money request game. *Economics Letters*, 120(3):542–545, 2013.
- R. McKelvey and T. Palfrey. Quantal response equilibria for normal form games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 10(1):6–38, 1995.
- P. Milgrom. Good news and bad news: Representation theorems and applications. *Bell Journal of Economics*, 12(2):380–391, 1981.
- P. Milgrom and J. Roberts. Relying on the information of interested parties. *RAND Journal of Economics*, 17(1):18–32, 1986.
- R. M. Miller and C. R. Plott. Product quality signaling in experimental markets. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 53:837–872, 1985.
- R. Nagel. Unraveling in guessing games: An experimental study. *American Economic Review*, 85(5):1313–1326, 1995.
- S. R. Peppet. Unraveling privacy: The personal prospectus & the threat of a full disclosure future. *Northwestern University Law Review*, 105(3):1153–1203, 2011.
- R. A. Posner. Privacy. In P. Newman, editor, *The new palgrave dictionary of economics and the law*. United Kingdom. Macmillan Reference, 1998.
- J. Potters and F. van Winden. Comparative statics of a signaling game: An experimental study. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 25(3):329–353, 1996.
- T. Probst. German privacy and data protection principles on biometrics for passports and public administration. Technical report, Unabhängiges Landeszentrum für Datenschutz Schleswig-Holstein, Kiel, Germany, 2011.
- S. Schudy and V. Utikal. The influence of (im) perfect data privacy on the acquisition of personal health data. *Research Paper Series - Thurgau Institute of Economics and Department of Economics at the University of Konstanz*, 76:1–32, 2012.
- D. Stahl and P. Wilson. On players’ models of other players: Theory and experimental evidence. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 10(1):218–254, 1995.
- W. K. Viscusi. A note on “lemons” markets with quality certification. *Bell Journal of Economics*, 9(1):277–279, 1978.

Appendices

A Feedback and data pooling

As mentioned in the main text, we gave different feedback in the LOADED treatment. Generally, subjects were informed of their own profits and the market wage of that period. In our sub-treatment Base (12 groups) this was the only feedback subjects received. In 11 groups of the LOADED treatment, we gave the subjects additional information about the choices of all six workers in the group (sub-treatment Feed). Our hypothesis was that the additional feedback would support learning.

The data from both sub-treatments is hardly distinguishable. In Market A, 18.3% reveal in Base compared to 19.4% in Feed. The same pattern can be observed on the other markets. In Market B, we observe 52.8% and 53.3% of revelation in the sub-treatments without and with detailed feedback, respectively. In Market C, the revelation rate is 36.1% for both variants. There are no significant differences concerning subjects' revelation behavior on any market (Mann-Whitney U-Tests, $p = 0.819$, $p = 0.843$ and $p = 0.964$ for the markets A, B and C, respectively). Note that this result also holds true when comparing individual periods. The revelation rates in Base and Feed are not significantly different in any of the 15 periods.

Considering the behavior of the different workers, we find even less differences concerning the two feedback conditions. Table 5 reports the corresponding averages and p -values. Again, none of the differences between Base and Feed is significant.

Worker	Market A			Market B			Market C		
	Base	Feed	p-val.	Base	Feed	p-val.	Base	Feed	p-val.
1	0.017	0.018	1.000	0.133	0.073	0.603	0.050	0.036	1.000
2	0.067	0.073	0.857	0.333	0.309	1.000	0.033	0.036	1.000
3	0.033	0.055	0.727	0.400	0.491	0.536	0.117	0.055	0.314
4	0.067	0.055	0.964	0.650	0.655	0.929	0.383	0.436	0.770
5	0.100	0.091	0.947	0.833	0.782	0.641	0.767	0.764	0.948
6	0.817	0.873	0.632	0.817	0.891	0.316	0.817	0.836	0.538

Table 5: Average revelation and p -values (Mann-Whitney U-Tests) by workers in the two feedback conditions.

B Further behavioral models

Quantal Response Equilibrium

Quantal Response Equilibrium (McKelvey and Palfrey, 1995) takes decision errors into account: workers do not always choose the best response with probability one but they

choose better alternatives more frequently than others. Therefore, QRE allows for out-of-equilibrium choices to conceal and reveal one's productivity.




Figure 4: QRE predictions for Market B.

We employ the logit equilibrium variant of QRE. Worker i believes that the other workers will choose to reveal with certain probabilities and calculates her expected payoff from concealing based on this belief (the payoff from revealing is simply the productivity minus the revelation cost). Workers make better choices more frequently. In particular, choice probabilities are specified to be ratios of exponential functions where expected payoffs are multiplied with λ , the rationality parameter. This parameter captures deviations from the Nash equilibrium: if $\lambda = 0$, behavior is completely noisy and both choices are equally likely regardless of their expected payoff; as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, workers choose the best response with probability one. In the logit equilibrium, beliefs and choice probabilities are consistent.

As an example, Figure 4 displays the QRE predictions (revelation frequencies given the rationality parameter λ) for Market B. We note that QRE can explain the under-revelation result: for any $\lambda > 0$, the error probabilities are higher for workers 2 to 6 who reveal in equilibrium than for worker 1, suggesting too little revelation. The relationship between the probability of revealing and λ is even non-monotonic for some workers, so a higher λ can be associated with less revelation. The intuition is that the likelihood that worker 6 reveals must meet a certain threshold before other workers start preferring revelation over concealment. Thus, λ must be high enough. On the other hand, the higher the parameter λ , the more weight the best response gets such that the propensity to conceal can increase in λ as long as worker 6 does not reveal with a significantly high

probability. Such a non-monotonicity cannot be observed for workers that should conceal in equilibrium in any of our markets. Qualitatively, Market C looks the same as Figure 4. In Market A, there are no non-monotonicities since all workers except worker 1 conceal in equilibrium.

We conduct a maximum-likelihood estimation of the QRE parameter λ for the treatment NEUTRAL. Following Haile, Hortaçsu, and Kosenok (2008), the estimation is implemented jointly for our three markets such that there is only one free parameter in the model we estimate. We find an estimate of $\lambda = 0.035$ with a standard error of 0.0015, suggesting that λ significantly differs from zero.¹¹

Worker	Market A			Market B			Market C		
	Nash	QRE	Neutral	Nash	QRE	Neutral	Nash	QRE	Neutral
1	0	<0.01	0.04	0	<0.01	0.00	0	<0.01	0.04
2	0	0.01	0.02	1	0.27	0.35	0	0.02	0.04
3	0	0.02	0.02	1	0.60	0.71	0	0.21	0.09
4	0	0.06	0.02	1	0.78	0.78	1	0.67	0.62
5	0	0.20	0.07	1	0.87	0.91	1	0.93	0.93
6	1	>0.99	0.89	1	0.92	0.96	1	0.99	0.98

Table 6: QRE estimates and data from NEUTRAL

Table 6 summarizes the QRE prediction for the λ we estimated from the data and contrasts this prediction with our findings. Overall, QRE fits the data well. It correctly predicts the degree of under-revelation (of workers 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 in Market B; and workers 4, 5, and 6 in Market C). The predicted and observed frequencies of revelation are remarkably similar. Also, the low revelation frequencies of low-productivity workers who should conceal in equilibrium are predicted rather well (workers 1, 2, and 3 in Market A; and workers 1 and 2 in Market C).

On the other hand, the QRE predictions for some of the workers who conceal in equilibrium do not perform as well. QRE predicts substantial rates of out-of-equilibrium revelation decisions with about 20% for worker 5 in Market A and for worker 3 in Market C. In both cases, less than 10% revelation is observed. Nevertheless, the QRE model is able to capture the overall patterns of behavior and can therefore account for the lower revelation rates that we observed compared to the equilibrium.

Inequality aversion

Does fairness prevent the full revelation of private information? In our game, when the highest productivity worker chooses to reveal, it increases her own payoff but imposes a

¹¹ Separate estimates for the three markets yield $\lambda_A = 0.026$, $\lambda_B = 0.039$ and $\lambda_C = 0.029$. The QRE estimate for the three markets in LOADED is $\lambda = 0.017$

negative externality on others.¹² Similarly, given worker n reveals, the same can hold true for worker $n - 1$. Accordingly, inequality-averse subjects may be less inclined to reveal their productivity than the standard model of selfish payoff maximizers suggests. While such motives may play only a minor role in large markets like the labor market, they may be important in smaller groups (small teams or enterprises) and in our experimental groups of six.

We use the model of inequality aversion proposed by Fehr and Schmidt (1999) (henceforth F&S) where players are concerned not only about their own material payoff but also about the difference between their own payoff and other players' payoffs. As a consequence the players' utility is

$$U_i(x_i, x_j) = x_i - \frac{\alpha_i}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \max[x_j - x_i, 0] - \frac{\beta_i}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \max[x_i - x_j, 0]$$

where, x_i and x_j denote the monetary payoffs to players i and j , and α_i and β_i denote i 's aversion toward disadvantageous inequality (envy) and advantageous inequality (greed), respectively. Standard preferences occur for $\alpha = \beta = 0$. Following F&S, we assume $0 \leq \beta_i < 1$.

There are two complications regarding the impact of inequality aversion. One issue is that the effect on inequality of (not) revealing one's productivity will often be ambiguous: a worker may find that concealing reduces the advantageous inequality with respect to less productive workers but it may also increase the payoff difference to the more productive workers provided they reveal. So this worker may stick with her (standard) equilibrium action even if she is inequality averse. Another complication is that there are multiple equilibria. It is not straightforward to show which of the $2^6 = 64$ possible outcomes can be an equilibrium for inequality-averse players and which cannot.

To tackle these issues we employ simulations based on a calibrated version of the model to identify the F&S equilibria of the revelation game. The model is calibrated using the joint distribution of the α and β parameters observed in Blanco, Engelmann, and Normann (2011). For each subject, they derive an α_i from rejection behavior in the ultimatum game and a β_i from a modified dictator game. There are 61 subjects in this data set with 58 different α_i - β_i types.¹³ Note that we need the *joint* distribution of the parameters, which is unavailable elsewhere. The computer simulations are implemented as follows: In each trial, the program randomly assigns an α_i - β_i parameter combination to each of the six workers (with replacement), where the 61 α_i - β_i types in the Blanco

¹² As an example, consider Market A. The Nash equilibrium has only worker 6 revealing her productivity, and worker 6 earns 500 points in equilibrium whereas all others earn 240 points. If worker 6 did not reveal, everybody would earn 300 points. It follows that, for a sufficiently inequality-averse subject, concealing may yield a higher utility than revealing.

¹³ There are no significant differences between the distributions of α that Blanco et al. (2011) elicit and the one assumed in Fehr and Schmidt (1999). The β distributions differ, but they are still roughly comparable.

et al. (2011) data were equally likely. Given the realization of inequality parameters, the program then systematically checks which of the 64 possible outcomes turns out to be an equilibrium. Note that there can be multiple equilibria, which is also the reason why the percentages do not add up to 100%. For the three markets A, B, and C separately, we ran 100,000 trials.

No.	Actions of workers						Market		
	I_1	I_2	I_3	I_4	I_5	I_6	A	B	C
1	0	1	1	1	1	1	–	90.5%	–
2	0	0	1	1	1	1	–	3.9%	–
3	0	0	0	1	1	1	–	7.2%	61.9%
4	0	0	0	0	1	1	–	9.5%	20.2%
5	0	0	0	0	0	1	80.3%	14.8%	17.0%
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	19.7%	55.6%	8.4%
7	0	0	0	0	1	0	–	–	5.2%

Table 7: Summary of F&S equilibria. Note: because of multiple equilibria, the figures do not always add up to one hundred percent.

The simulation results are summarized in Table 7 which can be read as follows. First, note that seven equilibria emerge out of the 64 possible outcomes where each is described in a separate row of the table. In equilibrium 1, only worker 1 chooses to conceal while all the other workers reveal. This strategy profile was an F&S equilibrium in 90.5% of the 100,000 simulations of Market B where it is also the standard Nash equilibrium. There appear to be no F&S parameters which support this outcome as an equilibrium for Market A or C.

Overall, inequality aversion is consistent with our results. The simulations show that there are equilibria with F&S preferences where fewer players reveal than in a standard Nash equilibrium, and there are no F&S equilibria where more players reveal than in a Nash equilibrium.

Having said that, there are some aspects of the simulations that show the limits of inequality aversion for rationalizing our data. Firstly, and perhaps surprisingly, the standard Nash equilibrium is very often also an equilibrium with F&S preferences. In all three markets, it is the most frequent equilibrium: 90.5% (Market B), 80.3% (Market A) and 61.9% (Market C) of the 100,000 random realizations of α_i - β_i parameter combinations. Relatedly, the F&S equilibria consistent with our data occur with rather low frequencies. In other words, there are only a few F&S parameter combinations that support these equilibria. For instance, in Market B, we observe especially little revelation by workers 2 and 3 which may be captured by the F&S equilibria numbered 2 and 3. However, these equilibria do not occur often in the simulations. Moreover, the calibrated F&S model predicts that there is an equilibrium in which no worker reveals (equilibrium 6), and this

equilibrium occurs in more than 50% of the runs for Market B where we in fact observe a lot of revelation, in line with the equilibrium prediction.

Secondly, the simulations show that coordination problems may occur due to multiple equilibria. In Market B there is a unique equilibrium in 26.6% of the cases, two equilibria in 65.5%, and three equilibria in 7.9% of the cases. The corresponding values for Market C are 87.3% and 12.7% for one or two equilibria, respectively. It is unclear how inequality-averse players can resolve the coordination problems resulting from multiple equilibria. In Market A, we always found a unique equilibrium, but this market is not strongly supportive of inequality aversion either. The equilibrium for Market A can be found analytically: worker 6 will not reveal if and only if $\beta_i > 200/260 \approx 0.8$. This condition will be met for 20% in the data set of Blanco et al. (2011) (and our simulations indicate exactly the same frequency for the occurrence of this equilibrium). In NEUTRAL this equilibrium occurs, however, only with a frequency of 11%. While the loaded frame leads to results closer to the prediction, inequality aversion should not be driven by the frame.

Overall, we can explain the observed outcomes as equilibria when players have F&S preferences, but there are a number of problems which limit the explanatory power of inequality aversion.

Discussion of behavioral models

Our goal has been to investigate behavioral models that might suggest how behavioral forces affect revelation. The three canonical behavioral models studied all suggest that players might be biased not to reveal. By contrast, we found hardly any support for a hypothesis suggesting that players reveal too much as compared to the equilibrium.

We believe that level- k rationality or a limited depth of reasoning is an intuitive model that explains our data surprisingly well. Level k implies that equilibrium concealment only requires $k = 1$ whereas revelation may require higher levels of reasoning. When higher levels of reasoning are increasingly rare among subjects, it follows for our setup that there is generally too little revelation; the lower the worker’s productivity, the less likely the worker will reveal if the equilibrium calls for revelation; and there are virtually no equilibrium-inconsistent reveal decisions. This is what we see in the data.

In different manners level k and QRE take into account that the payoff from concealing will *ceteris paribus* become more attractive than the payoff from revealing, $\theta_i - c$, for workers with low θ . It requires a “high level of rationality” (high k or high λ) for unraveling to occur to the extent predicted in equilibrium. Thus, both models suggest that the unraveling process might be stuck after a few players, leading to less revelation.

Markets played by fully rational yet inequality-averse players may also unravel only incompletely. The negative externality imposed on others may make even high-productivity workers conceal. On the other hand, inequality aversion supports the Nash equilibrium

with standard preferences. Another difficulty is that multiple equilibria occur, which reduces the predictive power of such preferences.

C Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1.

Proof. We first show that $I_1^* = 0$. By concealing, the lowest-productivity worker earns at least θ_1 (namely when all other workers reveal, otherwise more), but worker 1 earns $\theta_1 - c < \theta_1$ by revealing. Hence, concealing is strictly dominant for worker 1 and we have $I_1^* = 0$ in equilibrium.

Next, we prove that $I_i^* = 0 \wedge I_j^* = 1$ only if $\theta_i < \theta_j$ strictly. Consider an equilibrium outcome with $I_i^* = 0$ and $I_j^* = 1$ and denote $\theta' = \sum_{m \neq i,j} (1 - I_m) \theta_m$ and $I' = \sum_{m \neq i,j} (1 - I_m)$. Now $I_i^* = 0$ and $I_j^* = 1$ are best replies to action profile I' if and only if

$$\theta_i - c \leq \frac{\theta_i + \theta'}{1 + I'} \quad (1)$$

$$\theta_j - c \geq \frac{\theta_i + \theta_j + \theta'}{2 + I'} \quad (2)$$

where the inequality for player i follows from $I_i = 0$ and the inequality for j follows from $I_j = 1$. Solving both equations for θ' , we obtain

$$-c + (\theta_i - c)I' \leq \theta' \leq \theta_j - \theta_i - 2c + (\theta_j - c)I' \quad (3)$$

and

$$0 \leq -c + (\theta_j - \theta_i)(1 + I') \quad (4)$$

which holds only if $\theta_i < \theta_j$ strictly. Since $I_i^* = 0 < 1 = I_j^*$ only if $\theta_i < \theta_j$, we cannot have $I_{i+1}^* < I_i^*$ and thus $I_n^* \geq I_{n-1}^* \geq \dots \geq I_2^* \geq I_1^*$ as claimed. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.

Proof. We first show that, if $\min(R) > \max(C)$ as asserted in the proposition, we get a unique equilibrium. Assume that, say, $R = \{n, n-1, \dots, m\}$ and $C = \{m-1, m-2, \dots, 1\}$. Then the pure strategy action profile

$$1 = I_n^* = I_{n-1}^* = \dots = I_m^* > I_{m-1}^* = \dots = I_2^* = I_1^* = 0$$

is a Nash equilibrium by the definition of R and C .

Now consider another pure strategy equilibrium candidate where, from Proposition 1, we only need to consider outcomes where $I_n^* \geq I_{n-1}^* \geq \dots \geq I_2^* \geq I_1^* = 0$. Assume first

that more workers reveal in this equilibrium candidate than in the first equilibrium, that is, workers $m-1$ to $m-k$, $k \geq 1$, reveal in this alleged equilibrium (whereas they conceal in the first equilibrium):

$$1 = I_n^* = I_{n-1}^* = \dots = I_m^* = I_{m-1}^* = \dots = I_{m-k}^* > I_{m-k-1}^* = \dots = I_2^* = I_1^* = 0$$

For this to be a Nash equilibrium, we necessarily need $\theta_{m-k} - c \geq \frac{1}{m-k} \sum_{j=1}^{m-k} \theta_j$. However, this requires that $m-k \in R$ which is a violation of $\min(R) > \max(C)$. Consider a different pure strategy equilibrium candidate where fewer workers reveal; say, workers m to $m+k$, $k \geq 0$ conceal (whereas they reveal in the first equilibrium). Here, we necessarily need $\theta_{m+k} - c \leq \frac{1}{m+k} \sum_{j=1}^{m+k} \theta_j$ for this outcome to be a Nash equilibrium. Hence, $m+k \in C$ which violates the assumption in the proposition. Hence, if $\min(R) > \max(C)$, the first Nash equilibrium is the unique pure-strategy equilibrium.

We now show the “only if” part of the proposition by proving that if $\min(R) > \max(C)$ is violated, multiple equilibria result. Let m be the highest worker in C and l be the lowest worker in R and assume the violation: $m > l$. First, note that $m \in C$ iff $\theta_m - c \leq \bar{\theta}(m)$ which, implies that concealment is a best-response for the workers $1, \dots, m$ given that the remaining workers reveal. From $m = \max(C)$ it follows that $\theta_{m+1} - c > \frac{\theta_{m+1} + \sum_{j=1}^m \theta_j}{m+1}$ and, by the definition of m , the inequality will also hold for all workers $m+1, \dots, n$. Hence, we have a Nash equilibrium where the workers $1, \dots, m$ conceal and the workers $m+1, \dots, n$ reveal. Second, note that $l = \min(R)$ implies $\theta_{l-1} - c < \frac{\theta_{l-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{l-2} \theta_j}{l-1}$, that is, concealment is a best-response for the workers $1, \dots, l-1$ given that the remaining workers reveal. As for the remaining workers, $l \in R$ implies $\theta_l - c \geq \frac{\theta_l + \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} \theta_j}{l}$ and the same inequality will hold for all workers l, \dots, n . Hence we have a second Nash equilibrium where the workers $1, \dots, l-1$ conceal and the workers l, \dots, n reveal. Hence, if $\min(R) > \max(C)$ is violated, multiple equilibria occur and the proposition follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.

Proof. We prove the proposition by establishing a contradiction: suppose some worker conceals for $k = 2$ but reveals for $k = 1$. This yields a contradiction because, as we will show, the expected payoff from concealing is higher if $k = 1$ than if $k = 2$.

We first derive the best reply of a $k = 1$ player. Player i (when $k = 1$) believes that all other players randomize across both actions with a probability of 0.50. To calculate the payoff from concealing, player i needs to take into account all possible contingencies that may arise (no other player concealing, one of the $n-1$ other players concealing and so on) which yields a complex combinatoric expression. Specifically, player i (when $k = 1$) will reveal if and only if

$$\theta_i - c \geq \frac{\theta_i \sum_{a=0}^{n-1} \frac{\binom{n-1}{a}}{a+1} + (\sum_{j \neq i} \theta_j) (\sum_{a=1}^{n-1} \frac{\binom{n-2}{a-1}}{a+1})}{2^{n-1}} \quad (5)$$

or

$$\theta_i - c \geq \frac{\theta_i \sum_{a=0}^{n-2} \frac{\binom{n-2}{a}}{a+1} + (\sum_{j \in I} \theta_j) (\sum_{a=1}^{n-1} \frac{\binom{n-2}{a-1}}{a+1})}{2^{n-1}} \quad (6)$$

where the numerator arises because all possibilities occur with equal probability.

Note that, if (6) is met for player i , it will also be met for all workers with $\theta_j \geq \theta_i$. This follows from the observation that the factor of θ_i on the RHS of (6) is strictly smaller than one. Hence (when $k = 1$), workers $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m$ will conceal and workers $\theta_{m+1}, \dots, \theta_n$ will reveal for some $m \geq 1$, unless we have the trivial case where all workers conceal.

As a next step, we show that a necessary condition for worker i to reveal (when $k = 1$) is $\theta_i > \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j}{n}$. To prove this, we evaluate RHS of (6) when $\theta_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j$. Simple but tedious combinatorics show a rather intuitive result, namely that this expression is greater or equal than the average worker productivity if and only if $\theta_i \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j$. Thus, (6) will be met only if worker i 's productivity is above average.

We now establish the fact that the condition for a $k = 2$ worker to conceal is weaker than the condition for a $k = 1$ worker to conceal. When $k = 2$, worker i believes that all other players are level $k = 1$, and, accordingly, that $\{\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_m\}$ will conceal with probability one. Player i will conceal (when $k = 2$) if and only if

$$\theta_i - c \leq \frac{\theta_i + \sum_{i=1}^m \theta_j}{m+1}. \quad (7)$$

Now, for worker i to reveal when $k = 1$ necessarily requires $\theta_i - c \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j$ but to conceal when $k = 2$ requires (7). Putting these condition together, we obtain

$$\frac{\theta_i + \sum_{i=1}^m \theta_j}{m+1} \geq \theta_i - c > \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \theta_j}{n}. \quad (8)$$

This, however, cannot hold: it cannot be that the average of the low-productivity workers $1, \dots, m$ plus worker i is larger than the average productivity of all workers because $\theta_i > \sum_j \theta_j / n$ for all $i > m$.

Since the condition for revealing as a $k = 1$ player contradicts the condition for concealing as a $k = 2$ player, it cannot be that player i reveals as a level $k = 1$ but conceals as level $k = 2$. Hence, if player i conceals for $k = 2$, she will do so with $k = 1$ steps of reasoning.

Finally and intuitively, similar arguments show that a worker will conceal if $k = 2$ if she conceals when $k = 3$ and so on for a higher k . With a higher k , high types will “drop out” by revealing, leading to even lower concealment wages. Hence, workers who conceal for some k' will not reveal when $k < k'$. \square

D Instructions

Loaded

Welcome to this experiment on economic decision making.

Please read these instructions carefully. The experiment is conducted anonymously, that is, you will not get to know which of the other participants interacted with you or which participant acted in which role. Please note that now that the experiment has started, you must not talk to other participants. If you have any questions, please raise your hand and we will come to you.

In this experiment all participants act as workers. The workers in this experiment differ with respect to their state of health. The state of health of a worker determines his or her productivity and hence also the revenue of a fictional employer (played by the computer). Furthermore, there are in total three different labor markets, which are played on a rotating basis: labor market A, labor market B and labor market C. At the beginning of each period, you will see a screen showing which market is being played in that period. There are six different workers with different states of health.

	Labor Market A	Labor Market B	Labor Market C
Worker 1	200	200	200
Worker 2	210	448	280
Worker 3	230	510	360
Worker 4	260	551	440
Worker 5	300	582	520
Worker 6	600	607	600
Average	300	483	400

Table 1: State of health of the workers 1-6 in the three labor markets.

In the table above you can see the different workers of this experiment and their state of health. Suppose market B is being played in this period. If the fictional employer (who is played by the computer) is hiring, for example, worker 3, then worker 3 will create a revenue of 510 points for the employer. Worker 1 will create a revenue of 200 points due to worse health. In a period where market C is being played the workers 1 and 3 create revenues of 200 (worker 1) or 360 points (worker 3). The state of health of any worker is of course completely fictional and is determined randomly by the computer.

The experiment lasts for 15 periods. At the beginning of a period a random draw will determine whether you act in the role of worker 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6, and you will also be informed about the labor market being played in that period. Each group consists of six workers of different states of health. There is exactly one worker 1, one worker 2, one worker 3, and so on, and one worker 6 in each group. All workers between 1 and 6 occur

exactly once in each group. As mentioned before you will be informed about the market being played (A, B or C) at the beginning of a period.

Your task in the experiment:

In each period all workers have to make the following decision. You choose whether or not to buy a health certificate at a cost of 100 points. The health certificate will reveal your state of health and will affect your payment in that period. Your payments depend on whether you purchased the health certificate:

1. If you choose to buy the health certificate you will receive your state of health in points as a wage payment minus the costs of 100 points.
2. If you do not purchase the health certificate your wage payment will be the average state of health of all participants who did not purchase the health certificate.

All workers decide simultaneously whether to purchase the health certificate. When you decide, you will not know how many (if any) of the other workers have chosen to buy the certificate. You will also not know the final market wage when making your decision. This information will be given only at the end of a period.

Once all workers have made their decisions you will receive detailed information on the period's results. The next period will begin as soon as all participants have read the summary and clicked on "Continue". Here is an example of the decision screen for market A and worker 1 with a state of health of 200:

Your health condition: 200	Period 1
Labor Market A	
Participant 1	200
Participant 2	210
Participant 3	230
Participant 4	260
Participant 5	300
Participant 6	600
<p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">You can purchase a health certificate that will reveal your health condition to the employer(s).</p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: x-small;">Do you want to pay 100 ECU to buy the certificate revealing your productivity? If yes, you will receive your productivity as a wage. If you do not want to disclose your health condition you will receive the average productivity of all workers who did not reveal their health condition.</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 10px;"><input type="radio"/> Yes, I would like to buy a health certificate. <input type="radio"/> No, I do not want to buy a health certificate.</div>	
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px; display: inline-block;">OK</div>	

Example:

Suppose market B is being played this period. The average state of health of all employees is:

$$\frac{200 + 448 + 510 + 551 + 582 + 607}{6} = \frac{2898}{6} = 483$$

The market wage would equal 483 points in this case. Now each worker decides whether to reveal his or her state of health. Once all participants have made their choice everybody will receive detailed information on the results. The table above also lists the average state of health for the markets A and C.

Assume that the workers 3 and 5 have revealed their state of health. In this case worker 3 would receive a wage payment of 510 points and worker 5 a wage payment of 582 points. Both chose to reveal their state of health and as a consequence both have to pay the costs of 100 points. Worker 3 earns $510 - 100 = 410$ points and worker 5 earns $582 - 100 = 482$ points in that period. The other workers (1, 2, 4, and 6) do not have to pay the costs and will receive the market wage as a payment. In this example the average state of health of all workers who do not have a health certificate is: $\frac{200+448+551+607}{4} = \frac{1806}{4} = 451.5$ points. This is also the market wage for the workers 1, 2, 4 and 6. In the experiment you receive this information after you have made your decision.

As mentioned earlier, the experiment will last 15 periods in total.

After the experiment your earnings will be converted at a rate of: 500 points = 1 Euro. Furthermore, we will round up your payoff to the next 50-cent amount.

At the end of the experiment, please wait inside your cubicle until we call you to pick up your payment. Please return any documents you have received from us.

If you have any further questions please raise your hand now!

Neutral

Welcome to this experiment on economic decision making.

Please read these instructions carefully. The experiment is conducted anonymously, that is, you will not get to know which of the other participants interacted with you or which participant acted in which role. Please note that now that the experiment has started, you must not talk to other participants. If you have any questions, please raise your hand and we will come to you.

In this experiment, participants act in the role of six different players. The players in this experiment differ with respect to a number that is allotted to each player. These numbers influence the profits that players can realize in three different variants of this experiment (Variant A, Variant B and Variant C). The three variants are played on a rotating basis. At the beginning of each period, you will see a screen showing which

variant is being played in that period. There are always six different players with different numbers.

	Variant A	Variant B	Variant C
Player 1	200	200	200
Player 2	210	448	280
Player 3	230	510	360
Player 4	260	551	440
Player 5	300	582	520
Player 6	600	607	600
Average	300	483	400

Table 1: Numbers of the players 1-6 in the three variants.

In the table above you can see the different players of this experiment and their numbers. Suppose variant B is being played in this period. This implies that in that period for example player 3 will have the number 510 while player 1's number will be 200. In a period where variant C is played, the same players will have the numbers 200 (player 1) and 360 (player 3).

The experiment lasts for 15 periods. At the beginning of a period a random draw will determine whether you act in the role of player 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6, and you will also be informed about the variant being played in that period. Each group consists of six players with different numbers. There is exactly one player 1, one player 2, one player 3, and so on, and one player 6 in each group. All players between 1 and 6 occur exactly once in each group. As mentioned before you will be informed about the variant being played (A, B or C) at the beginning of a period.

Your task in the experiment:

In each period all players have to make the following decision. You choose between the actions "yes" and "no". This decision will affect your payments in the following way:

1. If you choose "yes", your payment will equal your number (from the corresponding variant) minus a cost of 100 points.
2. If you choose "no" you will receive the average number of all players who did not choose "yes" as your payment.

All players decide simultaneously whether they would like to choose "yes" or "no". When you decide, you will not know how many (if any) of the other players have chosen "yes" or "no". You will also not know the average number of the players who did not choose "yes" when making your decision. This information will be given only at the end of a period.

Once all players have made their decisions you will receive detailed information on the period's results. The next period will begin as soon as all participants have read the summary and clicked on "Continue". Here is an example of the decision screen for variant A and player 5 with a number of 300:

Your number: 300	Period 1
------------------	----------

Variant A

Player 1	200
Player 2	210
Player 3	230
Player 4	260
Player 5	300
Player 6	600

☐ Yes (I will receive my number minus a cost of 100 points).
☐ No (I will receive the average of the numbers of all players who do not choose "yes")

Example:

Suppose variant B is being played this period. In the beginning, as long as nobody decided to choose "yes", the average of the numbers of all players who did not choose "yes" is:

$$\frac{200 + 448 + 510 + 551 + 582 + 607}{6} = \frac{2898}{6} = 483$$

Hence, if all players chose "no" they would all receive a payment of 483 points.

Assume that the players 3 and 5 have chosen "yes". Player 3's number equals 510 points and player 5's number equals 582 points. Both chose "yes" and as a consequence both have to pay the costs of 100 points. Player 3 earns $510 - 100 = 410$ points and player 5 earns $582 - 100 = 482$ points in that period. The other players (1, 2, 4, and 6) do not have to pay the costs and will receive the average of the numbers of all players who did not choose "yes" as a payment. In this example that is: $\frac{200 + 448 + 551 + 607}{4} = \frac{1806}{4} = 451.5$ points. This is also the payment for the players 1, 2, 4 and 6. In the experiment you receive this information after you have made your decision.

In Table 1 you will also find the averages of all numbers in the variants A and C. Once all participants have reached their decision, everybody will receive detailed information about the results.

As mentioned earlier, the experiment will last 15 periods in total.

After the experiment your earnings will be converted at a rate of: 500 points = 1 Euro. Furthermore, we will round up your payoff to the next 50-cent amount.

At the end of the experiment, please wait inside your cubicle until we call you to pick up your payment. Please return any documents you have received from us.

If you have any further questions please raise your hand now!

PREVIOUS DISCUSSION PAPERS

- 168 Benndorf, Volker, Kübler, Dorothea and Normann, Hans-Theo, Privacy Concerns, Voluntary Disclosure of Information, and Unraveling: An Experiment, November 2014.
- 167 Rasch, Alexander and Wenzel, Tobias, The Impact of Piracy on Prominent and Non-prominent Software Developers, November 2014.
Forthcoming in: Telecommunications Policy.
- 166 Jeitschko, Thomas D. and Tremblay, Mark J., Homogeneous Platform Competition with Endogenous Homing, November 2014.
- 165 Gu, Yiquan, Rasch, Alexander and Wenzel, Tobias, Price-sensitive Demand and Market Entry, November 2014.
- 164 Caprice, Stéphane, von Schlippenbach, Vanessa and Wey, Christian, Supplier Fixed Costs and Retail Market Monopolization, October 2014.
- 163 Klein, Gordon J. and Wendel, Julia, The Impact of Local Loop and Retail Unbundling Revisited, October 2014.
- 162 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus, Haucap, Justus and Wey, Christian, Raising Rivals' Costs Through Buyer Power, October 2014.
- 161 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus and Köhler, Katrin, Exchange Asymmetries for Bads? Experimental Evidence, October 2014.
- 160 Behrens, Kristian, Mion, Giordano, Murata, Yasusada and Suedekum, Jens, Spatial Frictions, September 2014.
- 159 Fonseca, Miguel A. and Normann, Hans-Theo, Endogenous Cartel Formation: Experimental Evidence, August 2014.
Forthcoming in: Economics Letters.
- 158 Stiebale, Joel, Cross-Border M&As and Innovative Activity of Acquiring and Target Firms, August 2014.
- 157 Haucap, Justus and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, The Happiness of Economists: Estimating the Causal Effect of Studying Economics on Subjective Well-Being, August 2014.
Forthcoming in: International Review of Economics Education.
- 156 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Lange, Mirjam R. J., The Impact of Tariff Diversity on Broadband Diffusion – An Empirical Analysis, August 2014.
- 155 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, On Discovery, Restricting Lawyers, and the Settlement Rate, August 2014.
- 154 Hottenrott, Hanna and Lopes-Bento, Cindy, R&D Partnerships and Innovation Performance: Can There be too Much of a Good Thing?, July 2014.
- 153 Hottenrott, Hanna and Lawson, Cornelia, Flying the Nest: How the Home Department Shapes Researchers' Career Paths, July 2014.
- 152 Hottenrott, Hanna, Lopes-Bento, Cindy and Veugelers, Reinhilde, Direct and Cross-Scheme Effects in a Research and Development Subsidy Program, July 2014.
- 151 Dewenter, Ralf and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Do Expert Reviews Really Drive Demand? Evidence from a German Car Magazine, July 2014.

- 150 Bataille, Marc, Steinmetz, Alexander and Thorwarth, Susanne, Screening Instruments for Monitoring Market Power in Wholesale Electricity Markets – Lessons from Applications in Germany, July 2014.
Published in: Economics Letters, 125 (2014), pp.223-225.
- 149 Kholodilin, Konstantin A., Thomas, Tobias and Ulbricht, Dirk, Do Media Data Help to Predict German Industrial Production?, July 2014.
- 148 Hogrefe, Jan and Wrona, Jens, Trade, Tasks, and Trading: The Effect of Offshoring on Individual Skill Upgrading, June 2014.
- 147 Gaudin, Germain and White, Alexander, On the Antitrust Economics of the Electronic Books Industry, September 2014 (Previous Version May 2014).
- 146 Alipranti, Maria, Milliou, Chrysovalantou and Petrakis, Emmanuel, Price vs. Quantity Competition in a Vertically Related Market, May 2014.
Published in: Economics Letters, 124 (2014), pp.122-126.
- 145 Blanco, Mariana, Engelmann, Dirk, Koch, Alexander K. and Normann, Hans-Theo, Preferences and Beliefs in a Sequential Social Dilemma: A Within-Subjects Analysis, May 2014.
Published in: Games and Economic Behavior, 87 (2014), pp.122-135.
- 144 Jeitschko, Thomas D., Jung, Yeonjei and Kim, Jaesoo, Bundling and Joint Marketing by Rival Firms, May 2014.
- 143 Benndorf, Volker and Normann, Hans-Theo, The Willingness to Sell Personal Data, April 2014.
- 142 Dauth, Wolfgang and Suedekum, Jens, Globalization and Local Profiles of Economic Growth and Industrial Change, April 2014.
- 141 Nowak, Verena, Schwarz, Christian and Suedekum, Jens, Asymmetric Spiders: Supplier Heterogeneity and the Organization of Firms, April 2014.
- 140 Hasnas, Irina, A Note on Consumer Flexibility, Data Quality and Collusion, April 2014.
- 139 Baye, Irina and Hasnas, Irina, Consumer Flexibility, Data Quality and Location Choice, April 2014.
- 138 Aghadadashli, Hamid and Wey, Christian, Multi-Union Bargaining: Tariff Plurality and Tariff Competition, April 2014.
- 137 Duso, Tomaso, Herr, Annika and Suppliet, Moritz, The Welfare Impact of Parallel Imports: A Structural Approach Applied to the German Market for Oral Anti-diabetics, April 2014.
Published in: Health Economics, 23 (2014), pp. 1036-1057.
- 136 Haucap, Justus and Müller, Andrea, Why are Economists so Different? Nature, Nurture and Gender Effects in a Simple Trust Game, March 2014.
- 135 Normann, Hans-Theo and Rau, Holger A., Simultaneous and Sequential Contributions to Step-Level Public Goods: One vs. Two Provision Levels, March 2014.
Forthcoming in: Journal of Conflict Resolution.
- 134 Bucher, Monika, Hauck, Achim and Neyer, Ulrike, Frictions in the Interbank Market and Uncertain Liquidity Needs: Implications for Monetary Policy Implementation, July 2014 (First Version March 2014).

- 133 Czarnitzki, Dirk, Hall, Bronwyn, H. and Hottenrott, Hanna, Patents as Quality Signals? The Implications for Financing Constraints on R&D?, February 2014.
- 132 Dewenter, Ralf and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Media Bias and Advertising: Evidence from a German Car Magazine, February 2014.
Published in: Review of Economics, 65 (2014), pp. 77-94.
- 131 Baye, Irina and Sapi, Geza, Targeted Pricing, Consumer Myopia and Investment in Customer-Tracking Technology, February 2014.
- 130 Clemens, Georg and Rau, Holger A., Do Leniency Policies Facilitate Collusion? Experimental Evidence, January 2014.
- 129 Hottenrott, Hanna and Lawson, Cornelia, Fishing for Complementarities: Competitive Research Funding and Research Productivity, December 2013.
- 128 Hottenrott, Hanna and Rexhäuser, Sascha, Policy-Induced Environmental Technology and Inventive Efforts: Is There a Crowding Out?, December 2013.
- 127 Dauth, Wolfgang, Findeisen, Sebastian and Suedekum, Jens, The Rise of the East and the Far East: German Labor Markets and Trade Integration, December 2013.
Forthcoming in: Journal of European Economic Association.
- 126 Wenzel, Tobias, Consumer Myopia, Competition and the Incentives to Unshroud Add-on Information, December 2013.
Published in: Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 98 (2014), pp. 89-96.
- 125 Schwarz, Christian and Suedekum, Jens, Global Sourcing of Complex Production Processes, December 2013.
Published in: Journal of International Economics, 93 (2014), pp. 123-139.
- 124 Defever, Fabrice and Suedekum, Jens, Financial Liberalization and the Relationship-Specificity of Exports, December 2013.
Published in: Economics Letters, 122 (2014), pp. 375-379.
- 123 Bauernschuster, Stefan, Falck, Oliver, Heblich, Stephan and Suedekum, Jens, Why Are Educated and Risk-Loving Persons More Mobile Across Regions?, December 2013.
Published in: Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 98 (2014), pp. 56-69.
- 122 Hottenrott, Hanna and Lopes-Bento, Cindy, Quantity or Quality? Knowledge Alliances and their Effects on Patenting, December 2013.
Forthcoming in: Industrial and Corporate Change.
- 121 Hottenrott, Hanna and Lopes-Bento, Cindy, (International) R&D Collaboration and SMEs: The Effectiveness of Targeted Public R&D Support Schemes, December 2013.
Published in: Research Policy, 43 (2014), pp.1055-1066.
- 120 Giesen, Kristian and Suedekum, Jens, City Age and City Size, November 2013.
Published in: European Economic Review, 71 (2014), pp. 193-208.
- 119 Trax, Michaela, Brunow, Stephan and Suedekum, Jens, Cultural Diversity and Plant-Level Productivity, November 2013.
- 118 Manasakis, Constantine and Vlassis, Minas, Downstream Mode of Competition With Upstream Market Power, November 2013.
Published in: Research in Economics, 68 (2014), pp. 84-93.

- 117 Sapi, Geza and Suleymanova, Irina, Consumer Flexibility, Data Quality and Targeted Pricing, November 2013.
- 116 Hinloopen, Jeroen, Müller, Wieland and Normann, Hans-Theo, Output Commitment Through Product Bundling: Experimental Evidence, November 2013.
Published in: *European Economic Review*, 65 (2014), pp. 164-180.
- 115 Baumann, Florian, Denter, Philipp and Friehe Tim, Hide or Show? Endogenous Observability of Private Precautions Against Crime When Property Value is Private Information, November 2013.
- 114 Fan, Ying, Kühn, Kai-Uwe and Lafontaine, Francine, Financial Constraints and Moral Hazard: The Case of Franchising, November 2013.
- 113 Aguzzoni, Luca, Argentesi, Elena, Buccirosi, Paolo, Ciari, Lorenzo, Duso, Tomaso, Tognoni, Massimo and Vitale, Cristiana, They Played the Merger Game: A Retrospective Analysis in the UK Videogames Market, October 2013.
Forthcoming in: *Journal of Competition Law and Economics* under the title: "A Retrospective Merger Analysis in the UK Videogame Market".
- 112 Myrseth, Kristian Ove R., Riener, Gerhard and Wollbrant, Conny, Tangible Temptation in the Social Dilemma: Cash, Cooperation, and Self-Control, October 2013.
- 111 Hasnas, Irina, Lambertini, Luca and Palestini, Arsen, Open Innovation in a Dynamic Cournot Duopoly, October 2013.
Published in: *Economic Modelling*, 36 (2014), pp. 79-87.
- 110 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Competitive Pressure and Corporate Crime, September 2013.
- 109 Böckers, Veit, Haucap, Justus and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Benefits of an Integrated European Electricity Market, September 2013.
- 108 Normann, Hans-Theo and Tan, Elaine S., Effects of Different Cartel Policies: Evidence from the German Power-Cable Industry, September 2013.
Published in: *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 23 (2014), pp.1037-1057.
- 107 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Klein, Gordon J., Rickert, Dennis and Wey, Christian, Bargaining Power in Manufacturer-Retailer Relationships, September 2013.
- 106 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Design Standards and Technology Adoption: Welfare Effects of Increasing Environmental Fines when the Number of Firms is Endogenous, September 2013.
- 105 Jeitschko, Thomas D., NYSE Changing Hands: Antitrust and Attempted Acquisitions of an Erstwhile Monopoly, August 2013.
Published in: *Journal of Stock and Forex Trading*, 2 (2) (2013), pp. 1-6.
- 104 Böckers, Veit, Giessing, Leonie and Rösch, Jürgen, The Green Game Changer: An Empirical Assessment of the Effects of Wind and Solar Power on the Merit Order, August 2013.
- 103 Haucap, Justus and Muck, Johannes, What Drives the Relevance and Reputation of Economics Journals? An Update from a Survey among Economists, August 2013.
- 102 Jovanovic, Dragan and Wey, Christian, Passive Partial Ownership, Sneaky Takeovers, and Merger Control, August 2013.
Published in: *Economics Letters*, 125 (2014), pp. 32-35.

- 101 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Klein, Gordon J., Rickert, Dennis and Wey, Christian, Inter-Format Competition Among Retailers – The Role of Private Label Products in Market Delineation, August 2013.
- 100 Normann, Hans-Theo, Requate, Till and Waichman, Israel, Do Short-Term Laboratory Experiments Provide Valid Descriptions of Long-Term Economic Interactions? A Study of Cournot Markets, July 2013.
Published in: *Experimental Economics*, 17 (2014), pp. 371-390.
- 99 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus, Haucap, Justus and Wey, Christian, Input Price Discrimination (Bans), Entry and Welfare, June 2013.
- 98 Aguzzoni, Luca, Argentesi, Elena, Ciari, Lorenzo, Duso, Tomaso and Tognoni, Massimo, Ex-post Merger Evaluation in the UK Retail Market for Books, June 2013.
Forthcoming in: *Journal of Industrial Economics*.
- 97 Caprice, Stéphane and von Schlippenbach, Vanessa, One-Stop Shopping as a Cause of Slotting Fees: A Rent-Shifting Mechanism, May 2012.
Published in: *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 22 (2013), pp. 468-487.
- 96 Wenzel, Tobias, Independent Service Operators in ATM Markets, June 2013.
Published in: *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 61 (2014), pp. 26-47.
- 95 Coublucq, Daniel, Econometric Analysis of Productivity with Measurement Error: Empirical Application to the US Railroad Industry, June 2013.
- 94 Coublucq, Daniel, Demand Estimation with Selection Bias: A Dynamic Game Approach with an Application to the US Railroad Industry, June 2013.
- 93 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Status Concerns as a Motive for Crime?, April 2013.
- 92 Jeitschko, Thomas D. and Zhang, Nanyun, Adverse Effects of Patent Pooling on Product Development and Commercialization, April 2013.
Published in: *The B. E. Journal of Theoretical Economics*, 14 (1) (2014), Art. No. 2013-0038.
- 91 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Private Protection Against Crime when Property Value is Private Information, April 2013.
Published in: *International Review of Law and Economics*, 35 (2013), pp. 73-79.
- 90 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Cheap Talk About the Detection Probability, April 2013.
Published in: *International Game Theory Review*, 15 (2013), Art. No. 1350003.
- 89 Pagel, Beatrice and Wey, Christian, How to Counter Union Power? Equilibrium Mergers in International Oligopoly, April 2013.
- 88 Jovanovic, Dragan, Mergers, Managerial Incentives, and Efficiencies, April 2014 (First Version April 2013).
- 87 Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Klein Gordon J., Bargaining Power and Local Heroes, March 2013.
- 86 Bertschek, Irene, Cerquera, Daniel and Klein, Gordon J., More Bits – More Bucks? Measuring the Impact of Broadband Internet on Firm Performance, February 2013.
Published in: *Information Economics and Policy*, 25 (2013), pp. 190-203.
- 85 Rasch, Alexander and Wenzel, Tobias, Piracy in a Two-Sided Software Market, February 2013.
Published in: *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 88 (2013), pp. 78-89.

- 84 Bataille, Marc and Steinmetz, Alexander, Intermodal Competition on Some Routes in Transportation Networks: The Case of Inter Urban Buses and Railways, January 2013.
- 83 Haucap, Justus and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Google, Facebook, Amazon, eBay: Is the Internet Driving Competition or Market Monopolization?, January 2013.
Published in: International Economics and Economic Policy, 11 (2014), pp. 49-61.
- 82 Regner, Tobias and Riener, Gerhard, Voluntary Payments, Privacy and Social Pressure on the Internet: A Natural Field Experiment, December 2012.
- 81 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus and Wey, Christian, The Effects of Remedies on Merger Activity in Oligopoly, December 2012.
- 80 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Optimal Damages Multipliers in Oligopolistic Markets, December 2012.
- 79 Duso, Tomaso, Röller, Lars-Hendrik and Seldeslachts, Jo, Collusion through Joint R&D: An Empirical Assessment, December 2012.
Published in: The Review of Economics and Statistics, 96 (2014), pp.349-370.
- 78 Baumann, Florian and Heine, Klaus, Innovation, Tort Law, and Competition, December 2012.
Published in: Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics, 169 (2013), pp. 703-719.
- 77 Coenen, Michael and Jovanovic, Dragan, Investment Behavior in a Constrained Dictator Game, November 2012.
- 76 Gu, Yiquan and Wenzel, Tobias, Strategic Obfuscation and Consumer Protection Policy in Financial Markets: Theory and Experimental Evidence, November 2012.
Forthcoming in: Journal of Industrial Economics under the title "Strategic Obfuscation and Consumer Protection Policy".
- 75 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Jovanovic, Dragan, Competition in Germany's Minute Reserve Power Market: An Econometric Analysis, November 2012.
Published in: The Energy Journal, 35 (2014), pp. 139-158.
- 74 Normann, Hans-Theo, Rösch, Jürgen and Schultz, Luis Manuel, Do Buyer Groups Facilitate Collusion?, November 2014 (First Version November 2012).
Forthcoming in: Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization.
- 73 Riener, Gerhard and Wiederhold, Simon, Heterogeneous Treatment Effects in Groups, November 2012.
Published in: Economics Letters, 120 (2013), pp 408-412.
- 72 Berlemann, Michael and Haucap, Justus, Which Factors Drive the Decision to Boycott and Opt Out of Research Rankings? A Note, November 2012.
- 71 Muck, Johannes and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, First Mover Advantages in Mobile Telecommunications: Evidence from OECD Countries, October 2012.
- 70 Karaçuka, Mehmet, Çatik, A. Nazif and Haucap, Justus, Consumer Choice and Local Network Effects in Mobile Telecommunications in Turkey, October 2012.
Published in: Telecommunications Policy, 37 (2013), pp. 334-344.
- 69 Clemens, Georg and Rau, Holger A., Rebels without a Clue? Experimental Evidence on Partial Cartels, April 2013 (First Version October 2012).
- 68 Regner, Tobias and Riener, Gerhard, Motivational Cherry Picking, September 2012.

- 67 Fonseca, Miguel A. and Normann, Hans-Theo, Excess Capacity and Pricing in Bertrand-Edgeworth Markets: Experimental Evidence, September 2012.
Published in: Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics, 169 (2013), pp. 199-228.
- 66 Riener, Gerhard and Wiederhold, Simon, Team Building and Hidden Costs of Control, September 2012.
- 65 Fonseca, Miguel A. and Normann, Hans-Theo, Explicit vs. Tacit Collusion – The Impact of Communication in Oligopoly Experiments, August 2012.
Published in: European Economic Review, 56 (2012), pp. 1759-1772.
- 64 Jovanovic, Dragan and Wey, Christian, An Equilibrium Analysis of Efficiency Gains from Mergers, July 2012.
- 63 Dewenter, Ralf, Jaschinski, Thomas and Kuchinke, Björn A., Hospital Market Concentration and Discrimination of Patients, July 2012 .
Published in: Schmollers Jahrbuch, 133 (2013), pp. 345-374.
- 62 Von Schlippenbach, Vanessa and Teichmann, Isabel, The Strategic Use of Private Quality Standards in Food Supply Chains, May 2012.
Published in: American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 94 (2012), pp. 1189-1201.
- 61 Sapi, Geza, Bargaining, Vertical Mergers and Entry, July 2012.
- 60 Jentzsch, Nicola, Sapi, Geza and Suleymanova, Irina, Targeted Pricing and Customer Data Sharing Among Rivals, July 2012.
Published in: International Journal of Industrial Organization, 31 (2013), pp. 131-144.
- 59 Lambarraa, Fatima and Riener, Gerhard, On the Norms of Charitable Giving in Islam: A Field Experiment, June 2012.
- 58 Duso, Tomaso, Gugler, Klaus and Szücs, Florian, An Empirical Assessment of the 2004 EU Merger Policy Reform, June 2012.
Published in: Economic Journal, 123 (2013), F596-F619.
- 57 Dewenter, Ralf and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, More Ads, More Revs? Is there a Media Bias in the Likelihood to be Reviewed?, June 2012.
Published in: Economic Modelling, 44 (2014), pp. 156-161.
- 56 Böckers, Veit, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Müller Andrea, Pull-Forward Effects in the German Car Scrappage Scheme: A Time Series Approach, June 2012.
- 55 Kellner, Christian and Riener, Gerhard, The Effect of Ambiguity Aversion on Reward Scheme Choice, June 2012.
Published in: Economics Letters, 125 (2014), pp. 134-137.
- 54 De Silva, Dakshina G., Kosmopoulou, Georgia, Pagel, Beatrice and Peeters, Ronald, The Impact of Timing on Bidding Behavior in Procurement Auctions of Contracts with Private Costs, June 2012.
Published in: Review of Industrial Organization, 41 (2013), pp.321-343.
- 53 Benndorf, Volker and Rau, Holger A., Competition in the Workplace: An Experimental Investigation, May 2012.
- 52 Haucap, Justus and Klein, Gordon J., How Regulation Affects Network and Service Quality in Related Markets, May 2012.
Published in: Economics Letters, 117 (2012), pp. 521-524.
- 51 Dewenter, Ralf and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Less Pain at the Pump? The Effects of Regulatory Interventions in Retail Gasoline Markets, May 2012.

- 50 Böckers, Veit and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, The Extent of European Power Markets, April 2012.
Published in: Energy Economics, 46 (2014), pp. 102-111.
- 49 Barth, Anne-Kathrin and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, How Large is the Magnitude of Fixed-Mobile Call Substitution? - Empirical Evidence from 16 European Countries, April 2012.
Published in: Telecommunications Policy, 38 (2014), pp. 771-782.
- 48 Herr, Annika and Suppliet, Moritz, Pharmaceutical Prices under Regulation: Tiered Co-payments and Reference Pricing in Germany, April 2012.
- 47 Haucap, Justus and Müller, Hans Christian, The Effects of Gasoline Price Regulations: Experimental Evidence, April 2012.
- 46 Stühmeier, Torben, Roaming and Investments in the Mobile Internet Market, March 2012.
Published in: Telecommunications Policy, 36 (2012), pp. 595-607.
- 45 Graf, Julia, The Effects of Rebate Contracts on the Health Care System, March 2012,
Published in: The European Journal of Health Economics, 15 (2014), pp.477-487.
- 44 Pagel, Beatrice and Wey, Christian, Unionization Structures in International Oligopoly, February 2012.
Published in: Labour: Review of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations, 27 (2013), pp. 1-17.
- 43 Gu, Yiquan and Wenzel, Tobias, Price-Dependent Demand in Spatial Models, January 2012.
Published in: B. E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, 12 (2012), Article 6.
- 42 Barth, Anne-Kathrin and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Does the Growth of Mobile Markets Cause the Demise of Fixed Networks? – Evidence from the European Union, January 2012.
Forthcoming in: Telecommunications Policy.
- 41 Stühmeier, Torben and Wenzel, Tobias, Regulating Advertising in the Presence of Public Service Broadcasting, January 2012.
Published in: Review of Network Economics, 11/2 (2012), Article 1.

Older discussion papers can be found online at:

<http://ideas.repec.org/s/zbw/dicedp.html>

Heinrich-Heine-University of Düsseldorf

**Düsseldorf Institute for
Competition Economics (DICE)**

Universitätsstraße 1 _ 40225 Düsseldorf
www.dice.hhu.de