

参考文献

本書全体に関して：

・ Dhimi, S. (2016) *The Foundations of Behavioral Economic Analysis*, Oxford University Press

第1章 リスク選好と期待効用理論

期待効用理論について：

・ Bleichrodt, H., C. Li, I. Moscati, P. P. Wakker (2016) “Nash was a first to axiomatize expected utility.” *Theory and Decision*, 81, 309-312.

・ Briggs, R. A. (2019) “Normative theories of rational choice: expected utility.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rationality-normative-utility/>

・ Fishburn, P. and P. Wakker (1995) “The invention of the independence condition for preferences.” *Management Science*, 41, 1130-1144.

・ Moscati, I. (2016) “How economists came to accept expected utility theory: the case of Samuelson and Savage.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 30, 219-236.

・ Savage, L. J. (1954) *The Foundations of Statistics*, Dover Publication

リスク選好測定手法に関するサーベイ論文：

・ Charness, G., U. Gneezy, and A. Imas (2013) “Experimental methods: eliciting risk preferences.” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 87, 43-51.

・ Crosetto, P. and A. Filippin (2016) “A theoretical and experimental appraisal of four risk elicitation methods.” *Experimental Economics*, 19, 613-641.

・ Holzmeister, F. (2017) “oTree: ready-made apps for risk preference elicitation methods.” *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 16, 33-38.

・ Holzmeister, F. and M. Stefan (2019) “The risk elicitation puzzle revisited: across-methods (in)consistency?” mimeo.

「パスカルの賭け」について：

・ パスカル『パンセ』

・ イアン・ハッキング(2013)『確率の出現』慶應義塾大学出版会.

・ Hájek, A. (2017) “Pascal’s wager.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/pascal-wager/>

・ Jordan, J. (2006) *Pascal's Wager Pragmatic Argument and Belief in God*, Oxford University Press.

実験1 サンクトペテルブルクのパラドックス

- ・ Bernoulli, D. (1738/1954) "Exposition of a new theory on the measurement of risk." *Econometrica*, 22, 23-36.
- ・ Dutka, J. (1988) "On the St. Petersburg Paradox." *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, 39, 13-39.
- ・ Cox, J. C., V. Sadiraj, B. Vogt (2009) "On the empirical relevance of St. Petersburg lotteries." *Economics Bulletin*, 29(1), 214-220.
- ・ Cox, J. C. and V. Sadiraj (2008) "Risky decision in the large and in the small: theory and experiment." Cox, J. C. and G. W. Harrison eds. *Risk Aversion in Experiments (Research in Experimental Economics, Vol. 12)*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, pp. 9-40.
- ・ Cox, J. C., E. B. Kroll, M. Lichters, V. Sadiraj, B. Vogt (2019) "The St. Petersburg paradox despite risk-seeking preferences: an experimental study." *Business Research*, 12, 27-44.
- ・ Neugebauer, T. (2010) "Moral impossibility in the Petersburg paradox: a literature survey and experimental evidence." mimeo. (←実験1)
- ・ Samuelson, P. A. (1977) "St. Petersburg paradoxes: defanged, dissected, and historically described." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 15, 24-55.
- ・ Seidl, C. (2013) "The Petersburg paradox at 300." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 46, 247-264.

実験2 リスク回避性

- ・ Gneezy, U. and J. Potters (1997) "An experiment on risk taking and evaluation periods." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(2), 631-645. (←実験2)

実験3 リスクに対する態度の測定

- ・ Becker G. M, M. H, DeGroot, J. Marschak (1964) "Measuring utility by a single-response sequential method". *Behavioral Science*, 9 (3), 226-32. (←実験3)
- ・ 川越敏司(2007)『実験経済学』(東京大学出版会), 第2章.

実験4 相対的リスク回避度の測定

- ・ Dave, C., C. C. Eckel, C. A. Johnson, C. Rojas (2010) "Eliciting risk preferences: when is simple better?" *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 41, 219-243.

・ Holt, C. A. and S. K. Laury (2002) "Risk aversion and incentive effects." *American Economic Review*, 92(5), 1644-1655. (←実験4)

・ Pratt, J. W. (1964) "Risk aversion in the small and in the large." *Econometrica*, 32, 122-136.

実験5 相対的リスク回避度の測定 (その2)

・ Crosetto, P. and A. Filippin (2016) "The 'bomb' risk elicitation task." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 47, 31-65. (←実験5)

第1章まとめ

コラム1 パロンドのパラドックス

- ・ 神永正博(2014)『直観を裏切る数学』講談社ブルーバックス.
- ・ Gorroochurn, P. (2018)『確率は迷う 道標となった古典的な33の問題』共立出版.
- ・ Parrondo's paradox https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parrondo's_paradox.
- ・ Shu, J.-J. and Q.-W. Wang (2015) "Beyond Parrondo's paradox." *Scientific Reports*, 4, 4244, <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep04244>

第2章 プロスペクト理論

プロスペクト理論全般について：

- ・ Barberis, N. C. (2013) "Thirty years of prospect theory in economics: a review and assessment." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27, 173-196.
- ・ Kahneman, D. and A. Tversky (1979) "Prospect theory: an analysis of decision under risk." *Econometrica*, 47, 263-291.
- ・ Lewndowski, M. (2017) "Prospect theory versus expected utility theory: assumptions, predictions, intuition and modeling of risk attitudes." *Central European Journal of Economic Modelling and Econometrics*, 9, 275-321.
- ・ Schmidt, U., C. Starmer, R. Sugden (2008) "Third-generation prospect theory." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 36, 203-223.
- ・ Starmer, C. (2000) "Development in non-expected utility theory: the hunt for a descriptive theory of choice under risk." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 38, 332-382.
- ・ Tversky, A. and D. Kahneman (1992) "Advances in prospect theory: cumulative representation of uncertainty." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 5, 297-323.
- ・ Wakker, P. P. (2010) *Prospect Theory For Risk and Ambiguity*, Cambridge University Press.
- ・ Yaqub, M. Z., G. Saz, D. Hussain (2009) "A meta analysis of the empirical evidence on expected utility theory." *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 15, 117-133.

・ イツァーク・ギルボア『不確実性下の意思決定理論』勁草書房

実験6 サンクトペテルブルクのパラドックス (その2)

・ Samuelson, P. A. (1977) "St. Petersburg paradoxes: defanged, dissected, and historically described." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 15, 24-55. (←実験6)

実験7 アレのパラドックス(共通結果効果)

実験8 アレのパラドックス (共通比率効果)

・ Allais, M. (1953) "Le comportement de l'homme rationnel devant le risque: critique des postulats et axiomes de l'école Américaine". *Econometrica*, 21, 503-546. (←実験7、実験8)

確率重み付け関数:

・ Gonzalez, R. and G. Wu (1999) "On the shape of the probability weighting function." *Cognitive Psychology*, 38, 129-166.

・ Ingersoll, J. (2008) "Non-monotonicity of the Tversky-Kahneman probability-weighting function: a cautionary note." *European Financial Management*, 14, 385-390.

・ Prelec, D. (1998) "The probability weighing function." *Econometrica*, 66, 497-527.

実験9 損失回避性の測定

・ Ariely, D., J. Huber, K. Wertenbroch (2005) "When do losses loom larger than gains?" *Journal of Marketing Research*, XLII, 134-138.

・ Köbberling, V. and P. P. Wakker (2005) "An index of loss aversion." *Journal of Economic Theory*, 12, 119-131. (←実験9)

・ Tversky, A. and D. Kahneman (1991) "Loss aversion in riskless choice: a reference-dependent model." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1039-1061.

損失回避性に対する批判:

・ Gal, D. and D. D. Rucker (2018) "The loss of loss aversion: will it loom larger than its gain?" *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 28, 497-516.

・ Harinek, F., E. Van Dijk, I. Van Beest, P. Mersmann (2008) "When gains loom larger than losses: Reversed loss aversion for small amounts of money." *Psychological Science*, 18, 1099-1105.

・ Mukherjee, S., A. Sahay, V. S. C. Pammi, N. Srinivasan (2017) "is loss -aversio magnitude-dependent? measuring prospective affective judgements regarding gains and losses." *Judgement and Decision Making*, 12, 81-89.

・ Novemsky, N. and D. Kahneman (2005) "The boundaries of loss aversion." *Journal of*

Marketing Research, 42, 119-128.

損失回避性に関する実証研究：

- ・ Abdellaoui, M., H. Bleichrodt, H. Kammoun (2013) “Do financial professionals behave according to prospect theory? an experimental study.” *Theory and Decision*, 74, 411-429.
- ・ Camerer, C., L. Babcock, G. Lowenstein, R. Thaler (1997) “Labor supply of New York city cab drivers: one day at a time.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112, 407-441.
- ・ Crawford, V. P. and J. Meng (2011) “New York city cab drivers’ labor supply revisited: reference -dependent preference with rational-expectations targets for hours and income.” *American Economic review*, 101:5, 1912-1932.
- ・ Fehr, E. and L. Goette (2007) “Do workers work more if wages are high? evidence from a randomized field experiment.” *American Economic Review*, 97:1, 298-317.
- ・ Pope, D. G. and M. E. Schweitzer (2011) “Is Tiger Woods loss averse? persistent bias in the face of experience, competition, and high stakes.” American Economic Review, 101, 129-157.

実験 10 プロスペクト理論の価値関数の測定

- ・ Abdellaoui, M., H. Bleichrodt, C. Paraschiv (2007) “Loss aversion under prospect theory: a parameter-free measurement.” *Management Science*, 53, 1659-1674.
- ・ Abdellaoui, M., H. Bleichrodt, O. L’Haridon (2008) “A tractable method to measure utility and loss aversion under prospect theory.” *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 36, 245-266.
- ・ Booij, A. S. and G. van de Kuilen (2009) “A parameter-free analysis of the utility of money for the general population under prospect theory.” *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 30, 561-66. (←**実験 10**)
- ・ Wakker, P. P. and Deneffe (1996) “Eliciting von Neumann-Morgenstern utilities when probabilities are distorted or unknown.” *Management Science*, 42, 1131-1150.
- ・

第2章まとめ

プロスペクト理論とサンクトペテルブルクのパラドックスに関して：

- ・ Blavatsky, P. R. (2005) “Back to the St. Petersburg paradox?” *Management Science*, 51, 677-678.
- ・ Dierkes M. and V. Sejdiu (2019) “The need for discontinuous probability weighting functions: how cumulative prospect theory is torn between the Allais paradox and the St. Petersburg paradox.” mimeo.
- ・ Pfiffelmann, M. (2011) “Solving the St, Petersburg paradox in cumulative prospect theory:

the right amount of probability weighting.” *Theory and Decision*, 71, 325-341.

・ Rieger, M. O. and M. Wang (2006) “Cumulative prospect theory and the St. Petersburg paradox.” *Economic Theory*, 28, 665-679.

コラム 2 リスク回避性のパラドックス

・ O’Donoghue, T. and J. Somerville (2018) “Modeling risk aversion in economics.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 32, 91-114.

・ Rabin, M. (2000) “Risk aversion and expected -utility theory: a calibration theorem.” *Econometrica*, 68, 1281-1292.

・ Rabin, M. and R. H. Thaler (2001) “Risk aversion.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 15, 219-232.

第 3 章 時間選好・社会的選好・認知能力

実験 11 時間選好の測定

時間選好に関するサーベイ論文：

・ Andreoni, J., M. A. Kuhn, C. Sprenger (2015) “Measuring time preferences: a comparison of experimental methods.” *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 116, 451-464.

・ Cheung, S. L. (2016) “Recent developments in the experimental elicitation of time preference.” *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 11, 1-8.

・ Frederick, S., G. Lowenstein, T. O’Donoghue (2002) “Time discounting and time preference: a critical review.” *Journal of Economic Literature*, XL, 351-401.

・ Leibson, D. (1997) “Golden eggs and hyperbolic discounting.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 443-477.

・ Rose, J. and M. Rose (2019) “Ready-made oTree apps for time preference elicitation methods.” *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 23, 23-28.

時間選好の測定手法：

・ Abdellaoui, M., H. Bleichrodt, O. L’Haridon, C. Paraschiv (2013) “is there one unifying concept of utility? an experimental comparison of utility under risk and utility over time.” *Management Science*, 59, 2153-2169.

・ Andersen, S., G. Harrison, M. I. Lau, E. E. Ruström (2008) “Eliciting risk and time preferences.” *Econometrica*, 76, 583-618. (←**実験 11 冒頭**)

・ Attema, A., H. Bleichrodt, Y. Gao, Z. Huang, P. P. Wakker (2016) “Measuring discounting without measuring utility.” *American Economic Review*, 106(6), 1476-1494. (←**実験 11**)

・ Attema, A., H. Bleichrodt, O. L’Haridon, P. Peretti-Watel, V. Seror (2018) “Discounting

health and money: new evidence using a more robust method." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 56, 117-140.

・ Coller, M. and M. B. Williams (1999) "Eliciting individual discount rates." *Experimental Economics*, 2, 107-127.

・ Laury, S. K., M. M. McInnes, J. T. Swarthout (2012) "avoiding the curves: direct elicitation of time preferences." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 44, 181-217.

・ Takeuchi, K. (2011) "non-parametric test of time consistency: present bias and future bias." *Games and Economic Behavior*, 71, 456-478.

・ Tanaka, T., C. Camerer, Q. Nguyen (2010) "Risk and time preferences: linking experimental and household survey data from Vietnam." *American Economic Review*, 100:1, 557-571.

実験 12 社会的選好の測定

社会的価値志向性(SVO)テスト :

・ Chen, C.-C., I.-M. Chiu, J. Smith, and T. Yamada (2013) "Too smart ot be selfish? measures of cognitive ability, social preferences, and consistency." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 90, 112-122. (←実験 12 冒頭)

・ Greiff, M., K. A. Ackermann, R. O. Murphy (2018) "Playing a game or making a decision? methodological issues in the measurement of distributional preferences." *Games*, 9, 80.

・ Millet, K. and S. Dewitte (2006) "Altruistic behavior as a costly signal of general intelligence." *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41, 316-326.

・ Murphy, R. O. and K. A. Ackermann (2014) "Social value orientation: theoretical and measurement issues in the study of social preferences." *Personality and Social Psychology review*, 18, 13-41.

・ Van Lange, P. A. M., W. Otten, E. M. N. De Bruin, and J. A. Joireman (1997) "Development of prosocial, individualistic, and competitive orientations: theory and preliminary evidence." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(4), 733-746.

・ 森久美子(2015)「社会的価値志向性研究の現在—測定法をめぐる問題—」, 関西学院大学社会学部紀要, 第 120 号, 33-51.

社会的選好の測定手法 :

・ Charness, G. and M. Rabin (2002) "Understanding social preferences with simple tests." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(3), 817-869.

・ Kerschbamer, R. (2015) "The geometry of distributional preferences and a non-parametric identification approach: the equality equivalence test." *European Economic Review*, 76, 85-103. (←実験 12)

- ・ E. Holzmeister, F. and Kerschbamer, R. (2019) “oTree: the equality equivalence test.” *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 22, 214-222.
- ・ 川越敏司(2007)『実験経済学』(東京大学出版会), 第4章.
- ・ ピーター・モファット『経済学のための実験統計学』勁草書房, 第15章.

実験13 ベルリン・ニューメラシー・テスト

- ・ Cokely, E., M. Galesic, E. Schulz, S. Ghazal (2012) “Measuring risk literacy: the Berlin numeracy test.” *Judgement and Decision Making*, 7, 25-47. (←実験13)
- Millroth, P., H. Nilsson, P. Juslin (2019) “The decision paradoxes motivating prospect theory: the prevalence of the paradoxes increases with numerical ability.” *Judgement and Decision Making*, 14, 513-533.
- ・ 広田すみれ(2015)「日本の一般市民のニューメラシーや教育水準が意思決定バイアスに与える影響」 *Cognitive Studies*, 22(3), 409-425.

実験14 認知熟考テスト

- ・ Frederick, S. (2005) “Cognitive reflection and decision making.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 4, 25-42.
- ・ Noori, M. (2016) “Cognitive reflection as a predictor of susceptibility to behavioral anomalies.” *Judgement and Decision Making*, 11, 114-120.
- ・ Toplak, M. E., E.F., West, . E. Stanovich (2011) “The cognitive reflection test as a predictor of performance on heuristics-and-biases tasks.” *Memory and Cognition*, 39, 1275-1289.
- ・ Toplak, M. E., E.F., West, . E. Stanovich (2014) “Assessing miserly information processing: an expansion of the cognitive reflection test.” *Thinking and Reasoning*, 2, 147-168. (←実験14)
- ・ Thomson, K. S. and D. M. Oppenheimer (2016) “Investigating an alternate form of the cognitive reflection test.” *Judgement and Decision Making*, 11, 99-113.

実験15 複合問題

統一理論について：

- Schneider, M. (2018) “Modeling interactions between risk, time, and social preferences.” mimeo. (←実験15)

リスク選好と時間選好：

- ・ Abdellaoui, M., E. Diecidue, A. Öncüler (2011) “Risk preferences at different time periods: an experimental investigation.” *Management Science*, 57, 975-987.
- ・ Andreoni, J. and C. Sprenger (2012) “Risk preference are not time preference.” *American*

Economic Review, 102:7, 3357-3376.

• Baucells, M. and F. H. Heukamp (2010) “Common ratio using delay.” *Theory and Decision*, 68, 149-158.

• Baucells, M. and F. H. Heukamp (2012) “Probability and time trade-off.” *Management Science*, 58, 831-842.

• Halevy, Y. (2008) “Strotz meets Allais: diminishing impatience and the certainty effect.” *American Economic Review*, 98:3, 1145-1162.

• Keren, G. and P. Roelofsma (1995) “immediacy and certainty in intertemporal choice.” *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 63, 287-297.

リスク選好と社会的選好：

• Brock, M. A. Lange, E. Y. Ozbay (2013) “Dictating the risk: experimental evidence on giving in risky environments.” *American Economic Review*, 103:1, 415-437.

• Krawczyk, M. and F. Le Lec (2010) “ ‘Give me a chance!’ an experiment in social decision under risk.” *Experimental Economics*, 13, 500-511.

• Saito, K. (2013) “Social preference under risk: equality of opportunity versus equality of outcome.” *American Economic Review*, 103:7, 3084-3101.

時間選好と社会的選好：

• Kovarik, J. (2009) “Giving it now or later: altruism and discounting.” *Economics Letters*, 102, 152-154.

認知能力と各選好との関係：

• Calvillo, D. P. and J. N. Burgeno (2015) “Cognitive reflection predicts the acceptance of unfair ultimatum game offers.” *Judgement and Decision Making*, 10, 332-341.

• Cokely, E. and C. Kelley (2009) “Cognitive ability and superior decision making under risk: a protocol analysis and process model evaluation.” *Judgement and Decision Making*, 4, 20-33.

• Dohmen, T. A. Falk, D. Huffman, U. Sunde (2010) “Are risk aversion and impatience related to cognitive ability?” *American Economic Review*, 100, 1238-1260.

• Dohmen, T. A. Falk, D. Huffman, U. Sunde (2018) “On the relationship between cognitive ability and risk preference.” *Journal of Economic perspectives*, 32, 115-134.

• Lilleholt, L. (2019) “Cognitive ability and risk aversion: a systematic review and meta analysis.” *Judgement and Decision Making*, 14, 234-279.

• Millet, K. and A. Aydinli (2019) “Cognitive reflection, 2D:4D and social value orientation.” *PLOS ONE* 14(2): e0212767.

• Ponti, G. and I. Rodriguez-Lara (2015) “Social preferences and cognitive reflection:

evidence from a dictator game experiment.” *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 9. Article 146, 1-8.

第3章まとめ

コラム3 パサデナ・パラドックス

・ Peterson, M. (2019) “The St. Petersburg Paradox.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/paradox-stpetersburg/>