ECONSTOR
Make Your Publications Visible.

A Service of
ZBW
Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft
Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Imas, Alex; Sadoff, Sally; Samek, Anya

Working Paper

Do People Anticipate Loss Aversion?

CESifo Working Paper, No. 5277

Provided in Cooperation with:
Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

Suggested Citation: Imas, Alex; Sadoff, Sally; Samek, Anya (2015) : Do People Anticipate Loss Aversion?, CESifo Working Paper, No. 5277, Center for Economic Studies and ifo Institute (CESifo), Munich

This Version is available at:
https://hdl.handle.net/10419/110779

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.

WWW.ECONSTOR.EU

Mitglied der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

The international platform of Ludwig-Maximilians University's Center for Economic Studies and the Ifo Institute

CESifo Working Papers

www.cesifo.org/wp

Do People Anticipate Loss Aversion?

Alex Imas
Sally Sadoff
Anya Samek

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 5277
CATEGORY 13: BEHAVIOURAL ECONOMICS
MARCH 2015

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded
- *from the SSRN website: www.SSRN.com*
- *from the RePEc website: www.RePEc.org*
- *from the CESifo website: www.CESifo-group.org/wp*

ISSN 2364-1428

CESifo
Center for Economic Studies & Ifo Institute

CESifo *Working Paper No. 5277*

Do People Anticipate Loss Aversion?

Abstract

There is growing interest in the use of loss contracts that offer performance incentives as upfront payments that employees can lose. Standard behavioral models predict a tradeoff in the use of loss contracts: employees will work harder under loss contracts than under gain contracts; but, anticipating loss aversion, they will prefer gain contracts to loss contracts. In a series of experiments, we test these predictions by measuring performance and preferences for payoff-equivalent gain and loss contracts. We find that people indeed work harder under loss than gain contracts, as the theory predicts. Surprisingly, rather than a preference for the gain contract, we find that people actually prefer loss contracts. In exploring mechanisms for our results, we find suggestive evidence that people do anticipate loss aversion but select into loss contracts as a commitment device to improve performance.

JEL-Code: D030.

Alex Imas
Social and Decision Sciences
Carnegie Mellon University
5000 Forbes Avenue, 319C Porter Hall
USA - 15213 Pittsburgh PA
aimas@andrew.cmu.edu

*Sally Sadoff**
University of California San Diego
Rady School of Management
Wells Fargo Hall, Room 4W121
9500 Gilman Drive #0553
USA - La Jolla, CA 92093-0553
ssadoff@ucsd.edu

Anya Samek
University of Wisconsin-Madison
School of Human Ecology
4214 Nancy Nicholas Hall
1300 Linden Drive
USA - Madison, WI 53706
asamak@wisc.edu

*corresponding author

March, 2014
This Version: March 10, 2015
We thank Christa Gibbs and Stephanie Schwartz for providing truly outstanding research assistance. This research has been conducted with IRB approval.

1 Introduction

Attempts to take advantage of findings from behavioral economics have become increasingly popular in management and public policy (Madrian, 2014). A prime example is the phenomenon of *loss aversion*, which predicts that gains and losses are evaluated relative to a reference point, and that losses loom larger than gains.[1] An important behavioral prediction of loss aversion is that individuals first endowed with a payment will work harder to avoid losing it than to earn the same amount presented as a gain. Recent work has explored whether the design of incentive contracts can exploit this insight to increase effort and performance in the workplace (Hossain and List, 2012; Fryer et al., 2012). These studies find that presenting incentives in the form of loss contracts (i.e., bonuses workers could potentially lose) increases productivity relative to payoff-equivalent gain contracts where the same bonuses are presented as gains.

A natural criticism of the economic significance of loss contracts is that if people are averse to losses, they will have a preference for gain contracts. In turn, firms may have to pay a premium for workers to accept loss contracts, which could outweigh their productivity benefits and make loss contracts inefficient. As we discuss further in the next section, a standard behavioral model of reference-dependent preferences makes two central predictions: first, in order to avoid potential losses, individuals will exert more effort under a loss contract than a gain contract; and second, anticipating this loss aversion, individuals will have a strict preference for the gain contract.[2]

[1] Kahneman and Tversky's (1979) seminal work on prospect theory introduced and formalized loss aversion. Since then, loss aversion has been used to explain a variety of behavioral anomalies including the endowment effect (Kahneman, Knetsch and Thaler, 1990) and status quo bias (Samuelson and Zeckhauser, 1988). For recent reviews of applications of reference dependent preferences, see Camerer et al. (2004), DellaVigna (2009), Barberis (2013) and Ericson and Fuster (2014).

[2] Models using the status-quo as the reference point (e.g., Thaler and Johnson, 1990) predict that individuals will work harder under loss-framed contracts conditional on the endowment being incorporated as the status-quo. If the expectation is taken as the reference point (e.g., Koszegi and

The intuition is that because losses are painful, people will work harder to avoid losing a bonus than they would to receive the same bonus offered as a gain. At the same time, working harder than is otherwise optimal in order to avoid losses lowers expected utility relative to working under a gain contract. If employees anticipate this difference in expected utility, they will demand a wage premium to work under a loss contract, which may offset the prospective productivity gains. As discussed above, several recent studies have provided evidence for the first prediction – that loss contracts increase workplace productivity (Brooks, Stremitzer, and Tontrup, 2011; Hossain and List 2012; Fryer et al., 2012).[3] However, less work has been done to directly investigate the second prediction, that individuals have a preference for gain contracts over loss contracts. Understanding individuals' preferences over contracts is critical to determining optimal contract design from the perspective of the firm or manager.

In this paper, we present results from a series of incentivized laboratory experiments that test how gain and loss contracts affect productivity, and measure the *ex ante* preferences for selecting into payoff-equivalent gain and loss contracts for the same task. We first test whether participants exert greater effort when payoff-equivalent incentives are presented as a loss contract rather than a gain contract. We then conduct a second experiment to examine whether people anticipate the differential effect of the loss contract in line with the standard behavioral model – that is, whether they prefer gain rather than loss contracts. To do this, we use the same task and compare participants' willingness to pay (WTP) to work under the loss con-

Rabin, 2006), then no difference between the frames should be observed either in effort or in contract preference. As such, in our context, a "standard behavioral model" refers to models assuming the status quo as the reference point.

[3]Note that field studies in some other contexts including incentives for student performance (Levitt et al., 2012) and child food choice (List and Samek, 2014) have not found significant differences in effort in loss and gain frames.

tract versus their WTP to work under the gain contract. Finally, we investigate the correlation of performance and selection into contracts with a separately elicited loss aversion parameter.[4]

In line with the standard model of prospect theory, we find that individuals assigned to the loss contract work harder than those assigned to the gain contract. However, we do not find support for the theoretical prediction that people prefer the gain contract to the loss contract. Surprisingly, people are willing to pay more to enter the loss contract than to enter the payoff-equivalent gain contract for the same task. We conclude that participants do not anticipate the differential effects of the loss contract in the direction predicted by standard behavioral theory.

To shed light on the mechanisms behind our results, we examine the relationship between performance, contract preferences and the separately elicited individual-level loss aversion parameter. We test the predictions of the standard behavioral model that more loss averse people are more sensitive to loss contracts. First, we test that performance under loss contracts is increasing in an individual's degree of loss aversion, and second that WTP for loss contracts is decreasing in an individual's degree of loss aversion. As discussed above, losses are more painful for people who are more loss averse and this leads to two predictions: greater loss aversion leads to greater effort when assigned to a loss contract, and this greater effort corresponds to lower expected welfare *ex ante*. In turn, if people anticipate their degree of loss aversion when selecting into a contract, more loss averse people will have a greater *ex ante* preference against loss contracts.

We find suggestive evidence to support the first prediction: performance under loss contracts increases with the degree of loss aversion while loss aversion has no

[4]Prior to conducting the experiments, we ran a series of pilots with a smaller sample, which are summarized in Appendix B. The results of the pilot experiments are consistent with the findings of the experiments reported here.

relationship with performance under the gain contract. However, we find no evidence for the second prediction; rather, willingness to pay for loss contracts seems to increase rather than decrease with the degree of loss aversion. As discussed in Section 6, our findings may provide support for a behavioral model that incorporates dynamic inconsistency in preferences. Particularly, in this framework loss contracts can be viewed as a commitment device which (sophisticated) workers select in order to improve their performance and thus increase their expected earnings. Those who are most sensitive to losses (i.e., the most loss averse) will both work hardest and have the highest WTP for loss contracts – consistent with our empirical results.

The few prior studies examining contract preferences in this context have found mixed evidence on selection into loss and gain contracts. Luft (1994) examines entry into gain and loss contracts (with an emphasis on calling them 'bonus' and 'penalty' contracts), and finds that participants are more likely to enter into contracts framed as gains. More recently, Brooks et al. (2014) find that entry rates for loss contracts are lower than gain contracts when the performance threshold is very high. In work conducted concurrently to our own, de Quidt (2014) examines the effect of framing on entry into contracts offered on the crowdsourcing platform Amazon Mechanical Turk. In line with our empirical results, but in contrast to standard behavioral theory, de Quidt (2014) finds that entry rates are higher in the loss-framed contract than in the gain-framed contract. To our knowledge, ours is the only study to separately examine preferences between contracts and the effect of contract type on productivity. This allows us to identify the role of loss aversion in both contract preference and productivity without issues of selection effects (which our results suggest could be a potentially serious confound). Ours is also the first study to investigate how performance and contract preferences vary by individuals' degree of loss aversion, which

allows us to identify potential mechanisms driving the results.[5]

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we discuss four theoretical predictions of a simple behavioral model of reference dependent preferences and loss aversion, which motivate our experimental design and analysis. Section 3 presents the design and results of our first experiment, which separately identifies the effect of contract type on productivity. Section 4 presents our second experiment investigating preferences over gain versus loss contracts. Section 5 describes our elicitation of an individual-level loss aversion parameter and subsequent tests. Section 6 discusses implications of the results, and Section 7 concludes.

2 Theoretical Predictions

We consider a standard behavioral model in which people derive additively separable utility from consumption net of costs, *net consumption utility*, as in the standard framework; and also derive *gain-loss utility* relative to a reference point, as in the prospect theory model. We assume the reference point is determined by the status quo (e.g., Thaler and Johnson, 1990). In our context, a performance incentive can be offered as a gain, in which the status quo is *not having* the incentive, or as a potential loss, in which the status quo is *having* the incentive. In gain contracts, people work to increase the probability they will receive the incentive. In loss contracts, people work to increase the probability they will avoid losing the incentive. There are two critical assumptions of this model. First, people experience utility relative to a reference point, deriving positive gain-loss utility from gains and negative gain-loss utility from

[5] De Quidt (2014) includes an unincentivized survey measure of risk preferences using hypothetical lotteries. Unlike our incentivized measure, this survey measure does not separately identify loss aversion from utility curvature in the gain and loss domains, and hence cannot be used as a clean test of the theory. Additionally, individuals who selected out of participating in the loss or gain contract did not complete the survey, making it difficult to examine the relationship between individuals' degree of risk preferences and selection into contracts.

losses (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979); utility from remaining at the reference point is normalized to zero. Second, losses loom larger than gains such that the negative gain-loss utility from a loss of x relative to the reference point is larger in absolute value than the positive gain-loss utility from a gain of x. This greater sensitivity to losses – *loss aversion* – leads to our first two predictions for relative performance under gain versus loss contracts. See Appendix A for proofs of all results.

Prediction 1: *If people are loss averse, performance will be higher under a loss contract than a gain contract.*

Under both a gain and loss contract, individuals choose optimal effort to maximize expected utility – i.e., the effort level at which the marginal benefits from increasing the likelihood of earning the incentive equal the marginal costs. Both contract types have identical marginal costs of effort and identical marginal benefits to consumption utility, and thus identical marginal benefits to net consumption utility. Where they differ is in their marginal benefits to gain-loss utility, which in the gain contract is the increased likelihood of experiencing a pleasant gain and in the loss contract is the increased likelihood of avoiding an unpleasant loss. If people are loss averse, the gain-loss utility from avoiding the loss is greater than the gain-loss utility from obtaining the gain. In turn, the marginal benefit of effort under loss contracts is greater than under gain contracts. People will therefore work harder under the loss contract than the gain contract.

Prediction 2: *Among people who are loss averse, performance differences between contracts are increasing in individuals' degree of loss aversion.*

As discussed above, a greater sensitivity to losses than gains leads to performance differences between gain and loss contracts. Larger differences in sensitivity will lead

to larger differences in performance. If a person is not at all loss averse, she is equally sensitive to gains and losses and her performance will not differ between contracts.[6]

Our next two behavioral predictions concern preferences over gain and loss contracts. We consider the decision between selecting into a contract and potentially earning the incentive, or accepting a fixed payment. The highest amount someone is willing to forgo in order to participate in the contract is her willingness to pay (WTP). A person's WTP is determined by her maximum expected utility from working under the contract – i.e., exerting the optimal level of effort as discussed in Prediction 1.

Prediction 3: *If people have dynamically consistent preferences and rational expectations, willingness to pay for the gain contract will be higher than willingness to pay for the loss contract.*

Under the behavioral model, expected utility is the sum of expected net consumption utility plus expected gain-loss utility. We first compare expected gain-loss utility across contracts. Gain-loss utility is positive for gains and negative for losses. As such, gain-loss utility is always (weakly) greater under gain contracts than loss contracts. This is because the worst a person can do under a gain contract is not receive the incentive; if she does not receive the incentive, the agent will remain at her reference point and derive zero gain-loss utility. Any positive probability of earning the incentive increases her expected gain-loss utility above zero. In contrast, under loss contracts the best a person can do is to keep the incentive – she will remain at her reference point and derive zero gain-loss utility. Any positive probability that she does not earn the incentive decreases her expected gain-loss utility below zero.

We now compare expected net consumption utility across contracts, which is the expected consumption utility minus effort costs as in the standard Expected Utility

[6] If a person is less sensitive to losses than she is to gains, performance will be higher under gain contracts and the gain-loss gap will increase as loss sensitivity decreases.

model:

$$e[u(b)] - c(e) \tag{1}$$

where the probability of earning the incentive $b > 0$ equals effort $e \in (0, 1)$, $u(\cdot)$ is consumption utility from the incentive and $c(\cdot)$ is the cost of effort. We assume u is increasing and concave and c is increasing and convex, and we normalize consumption utility from not receiving the incentive to zero. Let e_S^* maximize (1). As discussed in Prediction 1, optimal effort under the loss contract e_L^* will be greater than optimal effort under the gain contract e_G^*. By the same logic, e_G^* will be greater than e_S^* (because effort increases the marginal benefits to gain-loss utility). Because effort under the gain contract e_G^* does not equal e_S^*, it cannot maximize (1) – in particular, it is too high. Effort under the loss contract e_L^* is even farther from maximizing (1), as it is higher than e_G^*. Thus, $e_S^* u(b) - c(e_S^*) > e_G^* u(b) - c(e_G^*) > e_L^* u(b) - c(e_L^*)$. Expected net consumption utility is higher under gain contracts than loss contracts.

Note that because effort is higher under loss contracts than gain contracts, expected earnings will also be higher. However, this increase in effort represents a distortion from what is otherwise optimal from the perspective of maximizing consumption utility net of effort costs. It occurs because people are trying to compensate for the negative expected gain-loss utility imposed by facing the threat of potential losses.

Both expected gain-loss utility and expected net consumption utility are lower in loss contracts than gain contracts. If people have rational expectations, they will anticipate this difference and will have a higher willingness to pay for a gain contract than a loss contract. If people do not have rational expectations regarding their degree of loss aversion, and in turn, the differential effect of the loss contract on behavior, they will expect their reference point and optimal effort under the loss contract to be

the same as it is under the gain contract. In this case, willingness to pay for the loss contract will be equal to willingness to pay for the gain contract.

Prediction 4: *If people are dynamically consistent and have rational expectations, differences in willingness to pay will be larger among people who are more loss averse.*

As discussed above, a greater sensitivity to losses than gains decreases WTP for loss contracts through both a decrease in gain-loss utility and a distortion in effort (relative to gain-loss utility and effort under gain contracts). Larger differences in sensitivity lead to larger gaps in WTP for a gain contract compared to a loss contract.

Note that this model assumes that people are dynamically consistent. That is, the preferences of a person when choosing the contract are consistent with her preferences when working under a contract. As we discuss further in Section 6, individuals who have dynamically inconsistent preferences – where the relative weight placed on the cost of effort is disproportionately greater in the period the individual has to work than in the preceding periods – may actually prefer loss contracts as commitment devices to induce their future selves to work harder.

3 Experiment 1: Effort under gain and loss contracts

3.1 Experimental Design

To test whether people anticipate loss aversion, we first need to establish that individual effort is indeed differentially affected by the two contract types, which is what we set out to do in our first experiment. Experiment 1 was implemented with 83 subjects at Carnegie Mellon University (CMU), with 4-8 subjects in each session. Subjects were randomized at the session level to either a GAIN or LOSS treatment, which corresponded to working under a gain contract or a loss contract, respectively. Then,

subjects participated in a real-effort task where we offered them an incentive based on their performance. Performance in the real-effort task is the primary outcome measure in Experiment 1.

Upon arriving at the lab, subjects were assigned to a private computer station and given the instructions for the real-effort task, which were also read out loud. We used a one-shot version of the slider task developed and validated by Gill and Prowse (2012). In this task, subjects complete a series of sliders by moving them sequentially on their computer screen to an assigned point along a bar using their computer mouse. Subjects were incentivized to complete as many sliders as possible (max 30) in 1.5 minutes (see Appendix C for instructions and a screen shot of the task).

All subjects were offered a non-monetary incentive for completing more sliders than a previously determined exogenous threshold. In both treatments, the threshold was the average performance of subjects who previously completed the same task for a piece-rate.[7] In both treatments, the incentive was a custom made T-shirt with an unknown outside value and a subjective personal value (its actual cost was about $8). The exogenous threshold, which was the same for both the GAIN and LOSS treatments, assures that expectations about the level of effort required to end up with the incentive does not vary by treatment and does not depend on beliefs about the performance of other participants in the experiment. The value of the threshold was also unknown to subjects in advance, and hence beliefs were such that any increase in performance should increase the probability of ending up with the incentive.

In the GAIN treatment, the experimenter held up the T-shirt at the front of the

[7]Subjects were told that the threshold was determined by the average performance of a group of CMU students who worked on the same task but who were paid cash based on their performance. The previous group had worked on the task in the previous year, earning $0.50 per completed slider. Average earnings in the previous task were $9.50, which is similar to the cost of the non-financial incentive we offered participants in our experiment.

room and told subjects that they would receive it if their performance on the slider task was equal to or above the threshold; otherwise they would receive nothing. In the LOSS treatment, participants were first given the T-shirt, which remained at their station throughout the session. The experimenter told subjects that they would keep the T-shirt if their performance was equal to or above the threshold; otherwise they would have to return it. This design created two contracts that were equivalent in payoffs - requiring the same level of effort to end up with the incentive. However, in the GAIN treatment the contract incentivized participants to work to gain the payoff, whereas the LOSS treatment incentivized participants to work to avoid losing the same payoff. After learning about the incentive scheme, subjects performed the slider task.

At the end of the real-effort task, but before participants learned whether they earned the T-shirt, we endowed all participants with an additional $10 and elicited individual loss aversion parameters using a multiple price list (we discuss details and results in Section 5). After completing the experiment, subjects filled out a short survey and received payment from the task including a pre-announced show-up fee of $5. Participation in Experiment 1 took about 25 minutes.

3.2 Results

The behavioral model presented in Section 2 predicts that if people are loss averse, the number of sliders completed (performance) will be higher under a loss contract than a gain contract (Prediction 1). The results of Experiment 1 support this prediction. As illustrated in Figure 1, subjects in the GAIN treatment complete an average of 15.35 sliders ($N = 40$, $SD = 4.49$) while subjects in the LOSS treatment complete an average of 17.27 sliders ($N = 43, SD = 3.33$). The 0.4 standard deviation difference in

performance is statistically significant (Student's t-test 2-tailed $p = 0.03$, Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test of distribution $p = 0.05$).

Figure 2 provides a histogram of performance in each treatment. To ensure that our results are robust to outliers, we conduct non-parametric permutation tests on the performance distributions under the two contracts. We construct test statistics using permutation methods based on Schmid and Trede (1995) and run one-sided tests for stochastic dominance and separatedness of the distributions (see also Anderson, DiTraglia and Gerlach, 2011; DiTraglia, 2006; Imas, 2014). The test statistics identify the degree to which one distribution lies to the right of the other, and take into account both the consistency of the differences between the distributions (i.e. how often they cross) and the size of the differences (i.e., the magnitudes). We compute p-values by Monte-Carlo methods with 100,000 repetitions. The results reveal a significant difference between the performance distributions under the GAIN and LOSS contracts ($p = .02$), implying that the performance distribution in the LOSS treatment is shifted to the right of the performance distribution in the GAIN treatment.

4 Experiment 2: Anticipation of loss aversion and choice between contracts

4.1 Experimental Design

Next, we examine whether people anticipate loss aversion in line with the standard behavioral model – that is, whether they prefer to work under a gain rather than a loss contract. In Experiment 2, we elicited subjects' willingness to pay (WTP) to participate in one of the two incentive schemes used in the first experiment. As discussed in Section 2, if people anticipate the differential effect of the loss contract demonstrated by Experiment 1, then WTP to work under the gain contract will be

higher than WTP to work under the loss contract (Prediction 3). The elicited WTP is the primary outcome measure for Experiment 2.

Experiment 2 was implemented using 85 subjects at CMU, with 4-8 subjects in each session. Using a between-subject design, we randomized subjects to one of the two treatments described in Experiment 1: GAIN or LOSS. As in Experiment 1, subjects were randomized to treatment at the session level. Unlike in Experiment 1, rather than simply participating in the real-effort task, subjects were asked to indicate their WTP to participate.

Upon arriving at the lab, subjects were assigned to a private computer station and given the instructions, which were also read out loud. The experiment proceeded in two parts. In the first part, we explained the slider task (using the same instructions as in Experiment 1), and then elicited WTP to participate in the slider task with the T-shirt as the incentive. In both the GAIN and LOSS treatments, the experimenter held up the T-shirt at the front of the room and read the instructions describing either the gain or the loss contract from Experiment 1.

To elicit WTP, we asked subjects to make a series of trade-offs between either working under the respective contract (GAIN or LOSS) or receiving a sum of money.[8] We used a multiple price list, which has been employed as an incentive-compatible method to elicit attitudes for risk (Holt and Laury, 2002; Sprenger, 2013; Charness, Gneezy and Imas, 2013) and time preferences (Andersen et al. 2007). In our paradigm, participants made a series of decisions between either participating in the task or not participating and receiving an 'additional payment' at the end of the experiment. The additional payment was $0 for the first decision and increased to $5

[8]In this design, subjects are paying to participate with the foregone payoff from not participating. This is more natural for subjects who are used to earning money, rather than spending money, to participate in experiments. In addition, it models the opportunity costs employees are willing to forego in order to enter a contract and matches the theoretical model discussed in Section 2.

by the last decision in increments of $0.50 (see Appendix C for instructions).

We used a die roll to randomly choose a single decision from the list to be implemented. The additional payment offered in the implemented decision determined the opportunity cost of working under the contract. If a subject had indicated that she was willing to forego the payment and participate, then she participated and received no additional compensation. If a subject indicated she preferred to receive the payment, then she waited at the computer terminal during the 1.5 minutes of the task instead of participating (and received the additional payment at the end of the experiment).

In the second part of the experiment, those who were willing to pay the randomly selected cost participated in the contract described in Experiment 1. In the GAIN treatment, those who elected to participate completed the slider task and received the T-shirt if their performance was equal to or above the performance threshold. Those who opted to participate in the LOSS treatment were first given the T-shirt to keep at their desk, performed the slider task, and got to keep the T-shirt if their performance was equal to or above the threshold, or had to return it if their performance was below the threshold. Those who opted not to participate waited at their computer terminals until the slider task was complete.

Finally, at the end of the experiment (before participants learned whether they earned the T-shirt) we elicited individual loss aversion parameters. As in Experiment 1, we endowed all participants with an additional $10 and used multiple price lists, which we describe in detail in Section 5. At the end of the session, all participants filled out a short survey and received their pre-announced $5 show-up fee plus additional payments earned in the experiment. The session lasted approximately 45 minutes.

4.2 Results

The behavioral model discussed in Section 2 predicts that WTP to work under a gain contract will be higher than WTP to work under a loss contract (Prediction 3). To test this, we compare participants' maximum WTP to participate in the gain contract to maximum WTP to participate in the loss contract. We measure maximum WTP as the lowest 'additional payment' an individual chooses to accept rather than participate in the slider task and potentially earn the T-shirt.

The results from Experiment 2 do not support the prediction of the standard behavioral model. As shown in Figure 3, the maximum average WTP is higher for the LOSS contract (\$2.54, $N = 41$, $SD = \$1.73$) than the GAIN contract (\$1.76, $N = 44$, $SD = \$1.48$). This represents a statistically significant difference between LOSS and GAIN, which goes in the opposite direction than is predicted by the theory (Student's t-test 2-tailed $p = 0.03$, Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test of distribution $p = 0.04$).[9] Because WTP is censored at \$0 and \$5, we also use a Tobit regression to confirm our results. Regressing a treatment dummy (LOSS = 1, GAIN = 0) on WTP reveals a similar result: the coefficient on the dummy is 0.93 and is statistically significant ($p = 0.03$).

Figure 4 presents a histogram of maximum WTP by treatment. The majority of participants in the GAIN treatment prefer to receive \$1.00 (or less) rather than work under a gain contract and less than 5% are willing to pay the maximum allowed amount of \$5. In contrast, nearly a third of participants in the LOSS treatment are willing to pay at least \$4 to work under a loss contract, with half of those willing to

[9] Out of 85 participants, 92% have consistent choices – i.e., once they choose to accept the additional payment (rather than participate) they continue to do so for all higher values of the payment. Dropping participants who are not consistent (5 subjects in LOSS and 2 in GAIN) does not affect the results ($p = 0.04$ for the Student's t-test and the Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test when comparing LOSS and GAIN).

forgo \$5 in order to participate. To test for differences between the distributions, we run the same non-parametric distribution test as in Experiment 1. The results show that the distribution of WTP in the LOSS treatment is significantly to the right of the distribution in the GAIN treatment ($p = 0.03$).

5 The effect of loss aversion on performance and contract preferences

Anticipation of loss aversion in our standard behavioral model predicts that WTP to enter loss contracts should be lower than WTP to enter gain contracts, a hypothesis that is rejected by our data. An alternative possibility, that people fail to anticipate loss aversion, predicts no difference in WTP between the two contracts. This alternative is also rejected by our data. Instead, we find that people do anticipate loss aversion, but react to it in the opposite direction predicted by the standard behavioral model - people actually prefer the loss contract to the gain contract. What mechanisms drive these results? To shed light on this question, we examine the relationship between participants' behavior and a separately-elicited individual loss aversion parameter.

5.1 Construction of the loss aversion parameter

At the end of Experiments 1 and 2, we elicited individuals' preferences over a series of gambles using multiple price lists. Subjects received an additional \$10 and made a series of 30 binary decisions, choosing between sure payoffs or risky payoffs with outcomes to be determined by a coin flip. Only one decision was randomly determined to be paid out at the end of the experiment. Similar to Abdellaoui et al. (2008), the set of 30 decisions allows us to separately estimate the three parameters of a prospect

theory value function, α, β and λ, for each individual:

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} (x)^{\alpha} & if \quad x \geq 0 \\ -\lambda(-x)^{\beta} & if \quad x < 0 \end{cases}$$

where α is the risk aversion parameter in the gain domain, β is the risk aversion parameter in the loss domain, and λ is the loss aversion parameter.

To identify the parameter α, we asked participants to make a series of choices over gambles where all of the outcomes were positive. The multiple price list offered subjects a series of ten decisions between a lottery and a sure amount, where the lottery was constant for each decision and the sure amount gradually increased. The risky option was \$0 with 50% probability and \$5 with 50% probability; the sure option started at \$0.50 in the first decision and increased in \$0.50 increments to \$5 in the tenth decision. The choice pattern generally observed is that subjects start out choosing the lottery and then switch to the sure outcome when the sure outcome becomes large enough. The choice at which a subject switches is taken as the indifference point between the lottery and the sure outcome. Since all outcomes are positive, the formulation of the decision problem does not involve β or λ, and it is straightforward to estimate the parameter α.

The parameter β is estimated in a similar manner using a multiple price list with only negative outcomes. In the second set of 10 decisions, subjects made the choice between either a risky option of -\$5 with 50% probability and \$0 with 50% probability, or a sure option of -\$0.50 through -\$5.00 in increments of \$0.50. Here, the decision problem does not involve α or λ, so β is separately identified.

The final multiple price list offered mixed gambles. In the last set of 10 decisions, subjects made the choice between either a risky option of \$5 with 50% probability and \$-1 through -\$10 with 50% probability in increments of \$1, or a sure option of

\$0. We use the multiple price list with mixed gambles to estimate λ by setting up the decision problem at the indifference point and using the α and β parameters we estimated from the other two multiple price lists.

People who exhibited extreme risk attitudes by never switching were excluded from the analysis, leaving 134 subjects (for similar exclusion criteria, see Andreoni and Sprenger, 2012; Sprenger, 2013). The median λ in the sample is 1.59 (median $\alpha = 0.87$, $\beta = 0.87$), which corresponds to significant loss aversion as reported in prior work (Tversky and Kahneman, 1992; Abdellaoui et al. 2008).

5.2 Loss aversion and performance

Standard behavioral theory predicts that in Experiment 1, we should observe that the difference in performance between the Loss and Gain contracts should be increasing with the degree of loss aversion (Prediction 2). The more loss averse the individual, the harder she is willing to work to avoid experiencing a loss under the loss contract. Under a gain contract, since the individual does not face the possibility of a loss, we do not expect a significant relationship between loss aversion and performance.[10]

In Table 1, we examine the relationship between an individual's estimated loss aversion parameter λ and performance in gain and loss contracts. In all regressions, the outcome variable is the number of sliders completed. Column 1 includes participants in the GAIN treatment only, while column 2 includes participants in the LOSS treatment only. Column 3 includes all participants in Experiment 1, and adds a dummy variable for the treatment (0=GAIN, 1=LOSS) and the interaction of the treatment with the loss aversion parameter λ. Our estimates offer suggestive evidence

[10]Since loss aversion is measured as sensitivity to losses relative to gains, finding $\lambda > 1$ could indicate gain-loving rather than loss-aversion. In our analysis, we follow Abdellaoui et al. (2008) and Sprenger (2013) in interpreting $\lambda > 1$ as indicative of an aversion to losses. Note however that the between treatment analysis to test Prediction 2, as well as Prediction 4 below, holds under both interpretations.

for Prediction 2. Loss aversion has no significant relationship with performance in the GAIN treatment ($p = 0.44$). However, the coefficient on λ is positive and marginally significant in the LOSS treatment ($p = 0.06$). The interaction term is also positive but not significant at conventional levels ($p = 0.13$). These results offer suggestive support for the prediction of a differential effect of loss aversion on performance between the two contract types.

5.3 Loss aversion and contract preferences

The standard behavioral theory predicts that in Experiment 2, if individuals anticipate loss aversion, we should observe larger treatment effects on WTP among more loss averse individuals (Prediction 4). Individuals who are more loss averse should be willing to accept a smaller 'additional payment' instead of working under the LOSS contract since the loss frame will hurt them most. That is, WTP to enter the loss contract should be significantly decreasing in λ, while we do not expect a significant relationship between λ and WTP to enter the gain contract.

Examining the relationship between loss aversion and preferences between contracts in Experiment 2 does not support the prediction of the standard behavioral theory; in fact, our results suggest the opposite pattern. We find that those who exhibit greater loss aversion are willing to pay *more* to participate in the loss contract than the gain contract. Table 2, which has the same structure as Table 1 except that the dependent variable is WTP in Experiment 2, summarizes these results. Column 1 includes participants in the GAIN treatment only. Column 2 includes participants in the LOSS treatment only. Column 3 includes all participants in Experiment 2 and adds a dummy variable for the treatment (0=GAIN, 1=LOSS) and the interaction of the treatment with the loss aversion parameter λ. The standard behavioral

model predicts a more negative λ coefficient in the LOSS treatment than the GAIN treatment, and thus the interaction term should be negative. Our estimates do not support these predictions. The coefficient on λ is small and not significant for participants in the GAIN treatment. However, it is *positive* and marginally significant for participants in the LOSS treatment ($p = 0.07$). The interaction term is also positive and marginally significant ($p = 0.07$). Rather than avoiding loss contracts, our results suggest that more loss averse individuals are *more* likely to select into them.

6 Interpretation

Our results demonstrate that, as predicted, individuals do exert higher effort under loss contracts; but in contrast to the theory, they prefer loss contracts to gain contracts. Further, we find evidence that those who are most sensitive to losses are also the ones who are most likely to select into loss contracts. That is, the most loss averse individuals both work harder *and* have the highest WTP for loss contracts. As discussed in Section 2, the greater the upward distortion in effort under loss contracts (relative to gain contracts), the larger are the utility costs experienced under loss contracts. Why then would people want to enter a contract that induces them to work 'too hard' by imposing the pain of potential losses?

We suggest that one possible mechanism driving our results is that individuals select into loss contracts as a commitment device. Models with dynamic inconsistency in preferences have been used to explain suboptimal behavior in domains such as savings and health (Laibson, 1997; O'Donoghue and Rabin, 1999). In the workplace, dynamic inconsistency can take the following form. Individuals may enter into contracts with a preference for working hard and earning a performance bonus, but when it comes time to exert effort, their preferences reverse: they shirk and fail to earn

the incentive. As noted in related literature, if individuals are sophisticated about their dynamic inconsistency, they may anticipate this preference reversal and value commitment devices that impose costs on shirking (O'Donoghue and Rabin, 1999).

As such, loss contracts can be viewed as a commitment device by individuals with dynamically inconsistent preferences. People may recognize that they will work harder under the threat of potential losses than they would for potential gains and select into loss contracts in order to commit their future selves to improved performance and thus higher expected earnings. As a commitment device, loss contracts are most valuable to those whose behavior is distorted most by them. Thus, in contrast to the standard behavioral model but in line with our empirical results, individuals who are more loss averse should both work harder under loss contracts and be more willing to enter into them.

It should be noted that the benefits to the individual of choosing a loss contract as a commitment device are from the perspective of a long-run self, since the 'self' who is actually exerting the effort under a loss contract is worse off in expectation. As discussed in Section 2, barring a wedge between the preferences of the long-run and short-run selves - dynamic inconsistency - even if people anticipate the increase in expected earnings under the loss contract, they should still prefer the gain contract.

Recent work has demonstrated that workers are willing to enter dominated contracts that induce higher performance (Kaur et al., forthcoming).[11] These contracts – and commitment devices more generally – often include a loss component such as penalties for failing to meet performance targets (Kaur et al., forthcoming; Royer et al., forthcoming; Gine et al., 2010; Schwartz et al., 2014; John et al., 2011). However, to our knowledge, little research has examined the role of loss aversion in demand for commitment. More work is needed to understand how loss aversion affects preferences

[11]See also the work of Kaur et al. (2010), Cadena et al. (2011) and Augenblick et al. (2013).

between contracts as well as its role in the take up of commitment devices.

7 Conclusion

Understanding the extent to which there are tradeoffs between employee productivity and employee preferences is critical for managers and organizations considering the use of loss contracts. Standard behavioral models predict that such a tradeoff exists: employees will work harder under loss contracts than they will under equivalent gain contracts; but, anticipating loss aversion, employees will select into gain contracts rather than loss contracts. Despite growing interest in the use of loss contracts, little is known about the extent to which these tradeoffs exist in practice.

This study is among the first to examine both performance and preferences for gain versus loss contracts. We find that while individuals work harder under a loss contract than they do under a gain contract (as predicted), they prefer the former to the latter (in contrast to the standard prediction). We also find heterogeneity in susceptibility to loss contracts. More loss averse individuals exert higher effort *and* have a greater preference for loss contracts. This suggests that firms may not need to pay a premium to persuade potential employees to work under loss contracts, and that offering such contracts could be beneficial for all parties.

Our results also inform theory: Whether people anticipate loss aversion and how they react to it has important implications for modeling the decision-making of individuals with reference-dependent preferences. Our study is among the first to explore the general question of whether people anticipate loss aversion. We find evidence that people do anticipate the loss aversion, but rather than deterring them as predicted under standard models of reference dependence, greater loss aversion may make the preference for loss contracts stronger. Related work also finds evidence that people do

not anticipate loss aversion as predicted by standard behavioral models with rational expectations. In the context of eliciting willingness to pay and willingness to accept values for a mug, Loewenstein and Adler (1995) and Van Boven et al. (2000) find evidence that prior to being endowed, subjects under-estimate their willingness to accept.

Examining preferences and selection effects is crucial for applying behavioral insights in management and policy more broadly. For example, several studies find that people are reluctant to realize losses on assets (Barberis, 2013). If this is the case, whether and how people anticipate such behavior is critical for understanding their trading decisions. The anticipation of future preferences has been explored in other areas, such as models of rational addiction (Becker and Murphy, 1988), projection bias (Loewenstein et al., 2003) and time preferences (Laibson, 1997; O'Donoghue and Rabin, 1999). These models allow us to evaluate the extent to which we can view individuals' decision-making as rational and the extent to which people may be making optimization mistakes. Further studies in the lab and field can help shed light on this important yet under-explored question in the context of reference dependent preferences.

References

Abdellaoui, Mohammed, Han Bleichrodt, and Olivier L'Haridon. 2008. "A Tractable Method to Measure Utility and Loss Aversion under Prospect Theory." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 36(3): 245-66.

Anderson, Lisa R., Francis J. DiTraglia, and Jeffrey R. Gerlach. 2011. "Measuring Altruism in a Public Goods Experiment: A comparison of U.S. and Czech Subjects." *Experimental Economics*, 14(3): 426-37.

Andreoni, James and Charles Sprenger. 2012. "Risk Preferences are Not Time Preferences." *The American Economic Review*, 102(7): 3357-3376.

Augenblick, Ned, Muriel Niederle, and Charles Sprenger. 2013. "Working Over Time: Dynamic Inconsistency in Real Effort Tasks." NBER Working Paper 18734.

Barberis, Nicholas C. 2013. "Thirty Years of Prospect Theory in Economics: A Review and Assessment." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 27(1): 173-96.

Becker, Gary S., and Kevin M. Murphy. 1998. "A Theory of Rational Addiction." *Journal of Political Economy* 96(4): 675.

Brooks, Richard R. W., Alexander Stremitzer, and Stephan Tontrup. 2012. "Framing Contracts: Why Loss Framing Increases Effort." *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*, 168(1): 62-82.

Camerer, Colin F., George Loewenstein and Matthew Rabin, eds. 2004. *Advances in Behavioral Economics*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Charness, Gary, Uri Gneezy, and Alex Imas. 2013. "Experimental Methods: Eliciting Risk Preferences." *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 87: 43-51.

De Quidt, Jonathan. 2014. "Your Loss Is My Gain: A Recruitment Experiment with Framed Incentives." Working paper.

Dellavigna, Stefano. 2009. "Psychology and Economics: Evidence from the Field." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 47(2): 315-72.

DiTraglia, Francis Joseph. "Experimental Public Goods in Prague and Williamsburg: An International Comparison." 2006.

Ericson, Keith M. Marzilli, and Andreas Fuster. 2014. "The Endowment Effect." *Annual Review of Economics*, 6(1): 555-79.

Fryer Jr, Roland G., Steven D. Levitt, John A. List, and Sally Sadoff, 2012. "Enhancing the Efficacy of Teacher Incentives through Loss Aversion: A Field Experiment." NBER Working paper 18237.

Gill, David, and Victoria Prowse. 2012. "A Structural Analysis of Disappointment Aversion in a Real Effort Competition." *American Economic Review* 102(1): 469-503.

Gine, Xavier, Jessica Goldberg, Dan Silverman, and Dean Yang. 2012. "Revising Commitments: Time Preference and Time-Inconsistency in the Field." NBER Working Paper 18065.

Holt, Charles A., and Susan K. Laury.2002. "Risk Aversion and Incentive Effects." *American Economic Review* 92(5): 1644-655.

Hossain, Tanjim, and John A. List. 2012. "The Behavioralist Visits the Factory: Increasing Productivity Using Simple Framing Manipulations." *Management Science* 58(12): 2151-167.

Imas, Alex. 2014. "Working for the 'Warm Glow': On the Benefits and Limits of Prosocial Incentives." *Journal of Public Economics*, 114.

Kahneman, Daniel, and Amos Tversky. 1979."Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk." *Econometrica* 47(2): 263.

Kahneman, Daniel, Jack L. Knetsch, and Richard H. Thaler. 1990. "Experimental Tests of the Endowment Effect and the Coase Theorem." *Journal of Political Economy* 98(6): 1325.

Kaur, Supreet, Michael Kremer, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2010. "Self-Control and the Development of Work Arrangements." *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings*, 100 (2): 624-628.

Kaur, Supreet, Michael Kremer, and Sendhil Mullainathan. "Self-control at Work." Forthcoming, *Journal of Political Economy*

Koszegi, Botand, and Matthew Rabin. 2006. "A Model of Reference-Dependent Preferences." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 121(4): 1133-165.

Laibson, David. 1997. "Golden Eggs and Hyperbolic Discounting." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(2): 443-78.

Levitt, Steven D., John A. List, Susanne Neckermann and Sally Sadoff. 2012. "The Behavioralist Goes to School: Leveraging Behavioral Economics to Improve Educational Performance" NBER Working Paper 18165.

List, John A., and Anya Savikhin Samek. 2014. "The Behavioralist as Nutritionist: Leveraging Behavioral Economics To Improve Child Food Choice and Consumption." *Journal of Health Economics*, 133-46.

Loewenstein, George, Ted O'Donoghue, and Matthew Rabin. 2003. "Projection Bias in Predicting Future Utility." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(4): 1209-248.

Loewenstein, George, and Daniel Adler. "A Bias in the Prediction of Tastes." *The Economic Journal*, 105(431): 929.

Luft, Joan. 1994. "Bonus and Penalty Incentives Contract Choice by Employees." *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 18(2): 181-206.

Madrian, Brigitte C. 2014. "Applying Insights from Behavioral Economics to Policy Design." *Annual Review of Economics*, 6(1): 663-88.

O'Donoghue, Ted, and Matthew Rabin. 1999. "Doing It Now or Later." *American Economic Review* 89(1): 103-24.

Royer, Heather, Mark F Stehr, and Justin R Sydnor. "Incentives, Commitments and Habit Formation in Exercise: Evidence from a Field Experiment with Workers at a Fortune-500 Company."' Forthcoming, *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*

Samuelson, William, and Richard Zeckhauser. 1988. "Status Quo Bias in Decision Making." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 1(1): 7-59.

Schmid, Friedrich, and Mark Trede. 1995. "A Distribution Free Test for the Two Sample Problem for General Alternatives." *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 20(4): 409-19.

Schwartz, J, Mochon, D., Wyper, L., Maroba, J., Patel, D., and Ariely, D. 2014. "Healthier by Precommitment." *Psychological Science*, 25(2): 538-546.

Sprenger, Charles. 2013. "An Endowment Effect for Risk: Experimental Tests of Stochastic Reference Points," Mimeo

Thaler, Richard H., and Eric J. Johnson. 1990. "Gambling with the House Money and Trying to Break Even: The Effects of Prior Outcomes on Risky Choice." *Management Science* 36(6): 643-60.

Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman. 1992."Advances in Prospect Theory: Cumulative Representation of Uncertainty." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 5(4): 297-323.

Van Boven, L., D. Dunning, and G. Loewenstein. 2000." Egocentric Empathy Gaps between Owners and Buyers: Misperceptions of the Endowment Effect." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79 (1): 66-76.

Figure 1: Average Performance in Gain and Loss Contracts



Note: Average performance and standard error bars are shown for each treatment. The difference in average performance between Gain and Loss is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Figure 2: Distribution of Performance in Gain and Loss Contracts



Figure 3: Average WTP to Participate in Gain and Loss Contracts



Note: Average WTP and standard error bars are shown for each treatment. The difference in average WTP between Gain and Loss is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Figure 4: Distribution of WTP to Participate in Gain and Loss Contracts



A Proofs of Theoretical Predictions

To formalize the intuition discussed above, consider a representative agent whose utility V is given by:

$$V = V(e, b, r) = e[u(b) + v(b|r)] + [1 - e]v(0|r) - c(e)$$

where an individual receives a payoff $b > 0$ with probability equal to effort $e \in (0, 1)$ and receives 0 with probability $1-e$; $u(\cdot)$ corresponds to standard consumption utility over the payoff, $v(\cdot|r)$ is the gain-loss prospect theory value function and $c(\cdot)$ is the cost of effort e that an individual exerts to obtain the bonus.[12] Let u be an increasing and concave function of b, and c be an increasing and convex function of e. Normalize $u(0) = 0$. We define the utility derived in relation to a reference point r as follows

$$v(x|r) = \begin{cases} (x - r)^{\alpha} & if \quad x \geq r \\ \lambda(x - r)^{\beta} & if \quad x < r \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda > 1$ is the loss aversion parameter and we assume $\alpha = \beta$.[13] An individual chooses optimal effort e^* to maximize overall utility V:

$$\max_e V(e, b, r) = \max_e e[u(b) + v(b|r)] + [1 - e]v(0|r) - c(e)$$

Taking the status quo model of prospect theory, when working under the gain contract ($r = 0$), optimal effort in the gain contract e^*_G satisfies the following first order condition:

$$c'(e^*_G) = u(b) + b^{\alpha} \tag{2}$$

[12] In practice, we measure effort through performance, which we assume is increasing in effort e.

[13] Tversky and Kahneman (1992) estimate $\lambda = 2.25$ and median $\alpha = \beta = 0.88$. As discussed in Section 5, we estimate λ, α and β separately in our data and find similar support for our assumptions.

Under the loss contract ($r = b$), optimal effort in the loss contract e_L^* satisfies the following first order condition:

$$c'(e_L^*) = u(b) + \lambda b^\beta \tag{3}$$

The first order conditions lead to our first prediction:

Proof of Prediction 1 *If people are loss averse, performance will be higher under a loss contract than a gain contract.*

Proof. Under the assumptions that costs c are convex, the left hand sides of equation (2) and equation (3) are increasing in effort e. If $\lambda > 1$, then the right-hand side of equation (3) is greater than the right hand side of equation (2), $u(b) + \lambda b^\beta > u(b) + b^\alpha$ (under the assumption that $\alpha = \beta$).[14] Thus, optimal effort in the loss contract will be greater than optimal effort in the gain contract $e_L^* > e_G^*$. Under the assumption that performance is an increasing function of effort, performance will be higher under the loss contract than the gain contract. If $\lambda = 1$, optimal effort and performance will be the same in loss and gain contracts; if $\lambda > 1$, effort and performance will be higher in loss contracts. □

Note that by the same logic as Prediction 1, if $\lambda < 1$, effort and performance will be lower in loss contracts than gain contracts.

Proof of Prediction 2 *Among people who are loss averse, performance differences between contracts are increasing in individuals' degree of loss aversion.*

Proof. As discussed above, among people who are loss averse, greater optimal effort under loss contracts versus gain contracts is due to greater sensitivity to losses than gains $\lambda > 1$. The difference in optimal effort $e_L^* - e_G^*$ is increasing in the difference

[14] This result does not require that $\alpha = \beta$. It is sufficient that $\lambda > \frac{b^\alpha}{b^\beta}$.

in gain-loss utility λ (under the assumption that effort costs are convex). That is, the more loss averse someone is, the harder she will work to avoid losses relative to working for gains. Given the assumption that performance is an increasing function of effort, performance differences between loss and gain contracts will be higher among more loss averse people compared to less loss averse people. $\square$

Note that among people for whom $\lambda < 1$, effort and performance are higher under gain contracts and this difference increases as λ decreases. That is, if a person is less sensitive to losses than she is to gains, performance will be higher under gain contracts and the gain-loss gap will increase as loss sensitivity decreases.

We now consider the participation constraint in which individuals are offered a choice between a certain amount $w \geq 0$ or the chance to participate in the task and earn the uncertain payoff b. An individual will participate if $V(e^*, b, r) \geq u(w) + w^\alpha$, where $V(e^*, b, r)$ is the agent's utility under optimal effort e^*. Note as argued and demonstrated by Kahneman, Knetsch and Thaler (1990), individuals choosing between goods without being endowed with either behave as if their reference point was the status quo. We follow this assumption when outlining the decision problem between a certain payoff and the contract.

The greatest amount the agent would be willing to forgo in order to participate (i.e., maximum willingness to pay) in the gain contract w_G solves the following:

$$u(w_G) + w_G^\alpha = V(e_G^*, b, 0) \tag{4}$$

where e_G^* is optimal effort under the gain contract as defined in equation (2).

Assuming that the agent has rational expectations over her preferences under the loss contract, her maximum willingness to pay (WTP) to participate in the loss

contract w_L solves the following:

$$u(w_L) + w_L^\alpha = V(e_L^*, b, b) \tag{5}$$

where e_L^* is optimal effort under the loss contract as defined by equation (3).

Proof of Prediction 3 *If people have dynamically consistent preferences and rational expectations, willingness to pay for the gain contract will be higher than willingness to pay for the loss contract, $w_G > w_L$.*

Proof. Subtracting equation (5) from equation (4) gives:

$$[u(w_G) + w_G^\alpha] - [u(w_L) + w_L^\alpha] = V(e_G^*, b, 0) - V(e_L^*, b, b) \tag{6}$$

We will show that the right hand side is positive which implies that $w_G > w_L$ under the assumption that u is increasing. Expanding terms

$$\begin{aligned} V(e_G^*, b, 0) - V(e_L^*, b, b) &= \Big(e_G^*[u(b) + b^\alpha] - c(e_G^*)\Big) - \Big(e_L^* u(b) + [1 - e_L^*]\lambda(-b^\beta) - c(e_L^*)\Big) \\ &= \Big([e_G^* u(b) - c(e_G^*)] - [e_L^* u(b) - c(e_L^*)]\Big) + \Big(e_G^* b^\alpha + [1 - e_L^*]\lambda b^\beta\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

We first consider the term $e_G^* b^\alpha + [1 - e_L^*]\lambda b^\beta$ from (7), which is the difference in expected gain-loss utility under gain and loss contracts. From the assumptions that $e \in (0, 1)$, $b > 0$ and $\lambda > 1$, the term is positive[15]

$$e_G^* b^\alpha + [1 - e_L^*]\lambda b^\beta > 0 \tag{8}$$

We next consider the term $[e_G^* u(b) - c(e_G^*)] - [e_L^* u(b) - c(e_L^*)]$, which is the difference

[15]Note that this result requires only reference dependent preferences and does not depend on the degree of loss aversion as long as $\lambda > 0$.

between gain and loss contracts in expected consumption utility net of costs. This is Expected Utility from the standard framework where an agent chooses effort to maximize the following objective function:

$$\max_{e} e[u(b)] - c(e)$$

Optimal effort under the standard framework e_S^* satisfies the following first order condition:

$$c'(e_S^*) = u(b) \tag{9}$$

The right-hand side of equation (9) is less than the right-hand side of equation (2) (under the assumption that $b > 0$). Thus, $e_G^* > e_S^*$ (under the assumption that effort costs are convex). From Prediction 1, if people are loss averse, then $e_L^* > e_G^*$. Since e_S^* optimizes equation (9), e_G^* and e_L^* cannot be the optimal effort – they are too high. Because $e_L^* > e_G^*$, e_L^* is further from the optimal e_S^* than e_G^*. Thus, $e_S^* u(b) - c(e_S^*) > e_G^* u(b) - c(e_G^*) > e_L^* u(b) - c(e_L^*)$ and

$$[e_G^* u(b) - c(e_G^*)] - [e_L^* u(b) - c(e_L^*)] > 0 \tag{10}$$

By equations (6), (7), (8) and (10), $w_G > w_L$. The maximum WTP for the gain contract is higher than the maximum WTP for the loss contract. □

Note that if people do not have rational expectations regarding their degree of loss aversion, and in turn, the differential effect of the loss contract on behavior, they will expect their reference point and optimal effort under the loss contract to be the same as it is under the gain contract. In this case, the maximum WTP for the loss contract will be equal to maximum WTP for the gain contract, given by (4), $w_L = w_G = V(e_G^*, b, 0)$.

Our last prediction follows,

Proof of Prediction 4 *If people are dynamically consistent and have rational expectations, differences in willingness to pay will be larger among people who are more loss averse.*

Proof. We will show that the right hand side of equation (6) is increasing in λ. This implies that the difference in WTP for gain and loss contracts $w_G - w_L$ is increasing in loss aversion (under the assumptions that u is increasing and concave). Differentiating with respect to λ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}\big(V(e_G^*, b, 0) - V(e_L^*, b, b)\big) &= -\frac{\partial e_L^*}{\partial\lambda}u(b) - \frac{\partial e_L^*}{\partial\lambda}\lambda b^\beta + [1 - e_L^*]b^\beta + \frac{\partial c}{\partial e_L^*}\frac{\partial e_L^*}{\partial\lambda} \\ &= [1 - e_L^*]b^\beta + \frac{\partial e_L^*}{\partial\lambda}\Big(\frac{\partial c}{\partial e_L^*} - [(u)b + \lambda b^\beta]\Big) \\ &= [1 - e_L^*]b^\beta\end{aligned}$$

where the final equality follows from equation (3) which shows that $c'(e_L^*) - [(u)b + \lambda b^\beta] = 0$ evaluated at e_L^*. The right hand side is positive $[1 - e_L^*]b^\beta > 0$ under the assumptions that $e \in (0, 1)$ and $b > 0$. Thus $V(e_L^*, b, 0) - V(e_L^*, b, b)$ is increasing in λ which implies that the difference in willingness to pay for gain and loss contracts $w_G - w_L$ is increasing in individuals' degree of loss aversion. □

B Description of pilot experiments

Below we describe the design and results of two pilot experiments conducted prior to the experiments discussed in the main text. Pilot experiment 1 is analogous to Experiment 1 (Section 3). Pilot experiment 2 is analogous to Experiment 2 (Section 4).

Pilot experiment 1: Effort under gain and loss contracts

Experimental design

Pilot experiment 1 was implemented among 62 participants at the University of California San Diego. Subjects were randomized at the session level to either a GAIN or LOSS treatment and then participated in a one-shot task (sessions included 6 people on average and lasted about 15 minutes).

Upon arriving in the lab, subjects were assigned to a computer station and given the instructions, which were also read aloud. In both treatments, we first explained the task students would perform and then offered a performance-based incentive. For the real-effort task, we used the slider task discussed in Section 3. Subjects had 2 minutes to move up to 48 "sliders".

All subjects were offered an incentive for correctly completing more sliders than a previously determined threshold. The threshold was set within each treatment such that half of the participants in each group were expected to receive the incentive.[16] In the GAIN treatment, subjects received the incentive if their performance on the slider task was equal to or above the threshold. In the LOSS treatment, participants

[16]The threshold was determined by the average performance from a randomly chosen previous session of the same treatment. Participants were informed of what constituted the threshold, but not its value, prior to performing the effort task. In the first session of each treatment, we used an average from a previous pilot study.

were endowed with the incentive before performing the slider task and were told they would keep the incentive if their performance was equal to or above the threshold. If their performance was below the threshold, participants in the LOSS treatment had to return the incentive. This design created two payoff-equivalent contracts: one framed as a gain and the other framed as a loss (the intra-treatment threshold ensures that earnings do not differ across treatments even if average effort does).

In both treatments, the incentive was a custom made t-shirt with an unknown outside value and a subjective personal value (its actual cost was about $8). In the GAIN treatment, the experimenter held up the T-shirt at the front of the room and told subjects they would receive it if their performance on the slider task was equal to or above the threshold; otherwise they would receive nothing. In the LOSS treatment, participants were given a T-shirt, which remained at their station throughout the session. The experimenter told subjects that they would keep the T-shirt if their performance was equal to or above the threshold; otherwise they would have to return it. Subjects then performed the slider task for 2 minutes. After completing the task, subjects filled out a short survey and received payment, including a show-up fee of $5.

Results

Similar to the results of Experiment 1, the results in pilot experiment 1 support the prediction of the standard behavioral model that performance will be higher in loss contracts than gain contracts. Subjects in the GAIN treatment completed an average of 11.88 sliders ($N = 32$, $SD = 5.55$) compared to an average in the LOSS treatment of 15.27 sliders ($N = 30$, $SD = 4.44$). The 0.6 standard deviation difference in performance is statistically significant at the $p < 0.01$ level.

Pilot experiment 2: Anticipation of loss aversion and choice between contracts

Experimental design

In pilot experiment 2, we examine whether people anticipate loss aversion – that is, whether they are more likely to select into a gain rather than a loss contract. To do this, we elicited participants' willingness to pay to participate in each of the two incentive schemes used in pilot experiment 1.

Pliot experiment 2 was implemented among 60 participants at the University of Wisconsin-Madison BRITE (Behavioral Research Insights through Experiments) Laboratory. Using a between-subject design, we elicited willingness to pay to participate in one of the two treatments described in pilot experiment 1: GAIN or LOSS. As in pilot experiment 1, we randomized at the session level (sessions included 10 people on average and lasted about 40 minutes).

Upon arriving in the lab, subjects were assigned to a computer station and given the instructions, which were also read aloud. The experiment proceeded in two parts. In the first part, subjects were given 2 minutes to participate in the slider task for no pay. In the second part, we elicited willingness to pay (WTP) to participate in an incentivized version of the task. In the GAIN treatment, the experimenter held up the T-shirt at the front of the room and read the instructions describing the gain contract from pilot experiment 1. The LOSS treatment was identical except that the experimenter read the instructions describing the loss contract from pilot experiment 1.

Subjects were then asked to indicate their maximum WTP out of their $10 show-up fee to work under the offered contract. We elicited WTP using a multiple price list. In our paradigm, participants made a series of decisions between paying a price

and participating, or paying nothing and not participating. The decision to not participate was constant (i.e., $0) while the price to participate increased from $0 to $10 from the first decision to the last. We then used a die roll to randomly choose a single decision from the list to be implemented. If a subject indicated she was willing to pay the chosen cost, she participated and the cost was deducted from her show up fee. If she indicated she was not willing to pay the chosen cost, she did not participate and nothing was deducted from her show up fee.

In the GAIN treatment, those who paid to participate completed the slider task and received the T-shirt if their performance was above average. Participating subjects in the LOSS treatment were first given the T-shirt, then performed the slider task, and either got to keep the T-shirt or had to return it, again depending on their performance. At the end of the session, all participants filled out a short survey and received payment.

Results

Similar to Experiment 2, the results from pilot study 2 do not support the prediction of the standard behavioral model that WTP will be higher for the gain contract than the loss contract. As in Experiment 2, average WTP in Pilot study 2 was higher for the LOSS contract ($2.58, N=30, SD=$1.97) than the GAIN contract ($2.17, N=30, SD=$2.14).[17] Overall, we find no evidence that people prefer GAIN to LOSS.

[17]One participant in the gain treatment reported inconsistent WTP across the multiple price list. The results reported above use the subject's first switching point (i.e., lowest WTP). Dropping the participant from the analysis decreases average WTP in the gain treatment to $2.14.

C Instructions for Experiment 1 and 2

Instructions for all treatments

Welcome to our short experiment. You will get a $5 show up fee just for coming in today.

Please pay attention to the instructions carefully. You will be asked several questions throughout the study to make sure that you are reading and understanding the instructions. You will NOT get paid if you do not follow all instructions carefully.

Today you will perform a slider task.

In this task, you will see a screen with 30 sliders on it. In this part you will have 1.5 minutes (90 seconds) to move as many sliders as you can to the value indicated. Each slider you move to the value indicated is considered completed and earns you 1 point. You should only use your mouse to move sliders by clicking and dragging on the slider – using the keyboard is not allowed. You should try to complete as many sliders as you can.

The picture below shows you the slider task. The value that you need to move each slider to appears to the left of the slider. Dragging the slider changes the value on the right. Match the value on the right to the one on the left to complete the slider. You can complete sliders in any order you like



DO NOT CONTINUE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.

C.1 Instructions for GAIN Treatment

C.1.1 Part 1: Description of Task

Last year, participants at Carnegie Mellon participated in this same task and earned cash based on their performance. At the end of the study, your individual performance in the slider task will be compared to the average number of sliders completed by last year's participants.

If you complete as many or more sliders than the average from last year, you will receive this T-shirt (I will hold up the shirt now). If you complete less than the average, you will not receive this T-shirt.

The more sliders you complete, the higher your chance of receiving the T-shirt.

Your chance of getting the t-shirt in the task will depend on your individual

performance relative to last year's average. It does not depend on the performance of anyone else in this room.

[EXPERIMENT 2 ONLY - PARTICIPANTS COMPLETE ELICITATION OF WILLLINGNESS TO PAY (SECTION C.3.1)]

C.1.2 Part 2: Performance of Task

Slider Task Instructions

C.1.3 Part 1: Description of Task

You will now perform the slider task. **If you complete as many or more sliders than last years average, you will get the T-shirt as a bonus. If you complete fewer sliders than last year's average, you will not get the T-shirt.**

The more sliders you complete, the higher your chance of getting the T-shirt.

Welcome to the Slider Task. You have 90 seconds to complete as many of the sliders as possible. For each of the sliders below, please **use the mouse** to move the slider to the value indicated. For each correct slider, you will receive 1 point.

C.2 Instructions for LOSS Treatment

You will receive a t-shirt for performing the slider task (I will hold up the T-shirt now).

Last year, participants at Carnegie Mellon participated in this same task and earned cash based on their performance. At the end of the study, your individual performance in the slider task will be compared to the average number of sliders completed by last year's participants.

If you complete as many or more sliders than the average from last year, you will keep your T-shirt. If you complete fewer sliders than the average, you will give up your T-shirt.

The more sliders you complete, the higher your chance of keeping your T-shirt.

Your chance of keeping your t-shirt in the task will depend on your individual performance relative to last years average. It does not depend on the performance of anyone else in this room.

[EXPERIMENT 2 ONLY - PARTICIPANTS COMPLETE ELICITATION OF WILLLINGNESS TO PAY (SECTION C.3.2)]

C.2.1 Part 2: Performance of Task

Slider Task Instructions

PLEASE WAIT TO RECEIVE YOUR T-SHIRT FOR THE TASK

You will now perform the slider task. You were given a T-shirt to carry out this task. **If you complete as many or more sliders than last year's average, you will keep your T-shirt. If you complete fewer sliders than last year's average, you will lose your T-shirt.**

The more sliders you complete, the higher your chance of keeping your T-shirt and not losing it.

Welcome to the Slider Task. You have 90 seconds to complete as many of the sliders as possible. For each of the sliders below, please **use the mouse** to move the slider to the value indicated. For each correct slider, you will receive 1 point.

C.3 Elicitation of Willingness to Pay (WTP)

C.3.1 Instructions for GAIN Treatment

Do you want to participate?

In this part, you will make a series of decisions. In each line, you will decide either to participate in the slider task, **or** to get an additional amount of money between $0 and $10. After you are done making your decisions, we will roll a die to be the 'choice that counts.'

If you decide to participate in the slider task in the choice that counts, then: **You will perform the slider task. If you complete as many or more sliders than last years average, you will receive the T-shirt.**

If you decide to get the additional amount of money in the 'choice that counts,' then: **You will wait quietly for 1.5 minutes and will not participate in the task You will not have a chance to receive the T-shirt.**

You will not know which choice is the 'choice that counts' until after you have made your decisions. Because we are making a random draw, any of the choices could be the 'choice that counts.' Therefore, you should think carefully about the choice you make on each line. The more often you answer "YES", the greater your chances of participating in part 2.

Here is an example. Look at question 4 below. Suppose question 4 is chosen as the 'choice that counts.' If you said "YES" in question 4, you would participate in the slider task for a chance to get the T-shirt but receive no additional amount of money. If you said "NO" in question 4, you would receive a $1.50 additional amount of money but would not participate in the slider task.

If the additional payment is $1.50, do you want to participate in the slider task? a. Yes, I want to participate and have the opportunity of receiving the T-shirt. b.

No, I want to get $1.50 and not participate.

Please choose option (a) or (b) in each line. Only one choice will be the 'choice that counts.'

1) If the additional payment is $0, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to participate and have the opportunity of receiving the T-shirt.

b. No, I want to get $0 and not participate.

2) If the additional payment is $.50, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to participate and have the opportunity of receiving the T-shirt.

b. No, I want to get $.50 and not participate.

3) If the additional payment is $1, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to participate and have the opportunity of receiving the T-shirt.

b. No, I want to get $1 and not participate.

4) If the additional payment is $1.50, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to participate and have the opportunity of receiving the T-shirt.

b. No, I want to get $1.50 and not participate.

5) If the additional payment is $2, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to participate and have the opportunity of receiving the T-shirt.

b. No, I want to get $2 and not participate.

6) If the additional payment is $2.50, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to participate and have the opportunity of receiving the T-shirt.

b. No, I want to get $2.50 and not participate.

7) If the additional payment is $3, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to participate and have the opportunity of receiving the T-shirt.

b. No, I want to get $3 and not participate.

8) If the additional payment is $3.50, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to participate and have the opportunity of receiving the T-shirt.

b. No, I want to get $3.50 and not participate.

9) If the additional payment is $4, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to participate and have the opportunity of receiving the T-shirt.

b. No, I want to get $4 and not participate.

10) If the additional payment is $4.50, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to participate and have the opportunity of receiving the T-shirt.

b. No, I want to get $4.50 and not participate.

11) If the additional payment is $5, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to participate and have the opportunity of receiving the T-shirt.

b. No, I want to get $5 and not participate.

C.3.2 Instructions for LOSS Treatment

Do you want to participate?

In this part, you will make a series of decisions. In each line, you will decide either to participate in the slider task, **or** to get an additional amount of money between $0 and $10. After you are done making your decisions, we will roll a die to be the 'choice that counts.'

If you decide to participate in the slider task in the choice that counts, then: **You will be given the T-shirt now. You perform the slider task. If you complete as many or more sliders than last years average, you will keep the T-shirt.**

If you decide to get the additional amount of money in the 'choice that counts,' then: **You will wait quietly for 1.5 minutes and will not participate in the task You will not get the T-shirt now.**

You will not know which choice is the 'choice that counts' until after you have made your decisions. Because we are making a random draw, any of the choices could

be the 'choice that counts.' Therefore, you should think carefully about the choice you make on each line. The more often you answer "YES", the greater your chances of participating in part 2.

Here is an example. Look at question 4 below. Suppose question 4 is chosen as the 'choice that counts.' If you said "YES" in question 4, you would participate in the slider task for a chance to get the T-shirt but receive no additional amount of money. If you said "NO" in question 4, you would receive a $1.50 additional amount of money but would not participate in the slider task.

If the additional payment is $1.50, do you want to participate in the slider task? a. Yes, I want to receive the T-shirt now and participate in the slider task. b. No, I want to get $1.50 and not participate.

Please choose option (a) or (b) in each line. Only one choice will be the 'choice that counts.'

1) If the additional payment is $0, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to receive the T-shirt now and participate in the slider task.

b. No, I want to get $0 and not participate.

2) If the additional payment is $.50, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to receive the T-shirt now and participate in the slider task.

b. No, I want to get $.50 and not participate.

3) If the additional payment is $1, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to receive the T-shirt now and participate in the slider task.

b. No, I want to get $1 and not participate.

4) If the additional payment is $1.50, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to receive the T-shirt now and participate in the slider task.

b. No, I want to get $1.50 and not participate.

5) If the additional payment is $2, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to receive the T-shirt now and participate in the slider task.

b. No, I want to get $2 and not participate.

6) If the additional payment is $2.50, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to receive the T-shirt now and participate in the slider task.

b. No, I want to get $2.50 and not participate.

7) If the additional payment is $3, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to receive the T-shirt now and participate in the slider task.

b. No, I want to get $3 and not participate.

8) If the additional payment is $3.50, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to receive the T-shirt now and participate in the slider task.

b. No, I want to get $3.50 and not participate.

9) If the additional payment is $4, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to receive the T-shirt now and participate in the slider task.

b. No, I want to get $4 and not participate.

10) If the additional payment is $4.50, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to receive the T-shirt now and participate in the slider task.

b. No, I want to get $4.50 and not participate.

11) If the additional payment is $5, do you want to participate in the slider task?

a. Yes, I want to receive the T-shirt now and participate in the slider task.

b. No, I want to get $5 and not participate.