



Endogenous context in a dictator game



Linda Thunström^a, Todd L. Cherry^{b,c,*}, David M. McEvoy^b, Jason F. Shogren^a

^a Department of Economics and Finance, University of Wyoming, Laramie WY USA

^b Department of Economics, Appalachian State University, Boone NC USA

^c CICERO Center for International Climate and Environmental Research, Oslo, Norway

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 19 February 2016

Revised 2 August 2016

Accepted 4 August 2016

Available online 4 August 2016

JEL classification:

C7

C9

D0

Keywords:

Dictator game

Context, Deservingness

Preference shaping

Endogenous information

ABSTRACT

The early characterization of humans as narrowly self-interested agents has unraveled in recent decades due to advances in the behavioral sciences. There is convincing evidence that peoples' preferences and decisions are shaped by their relationship with others and the context of their interactions. While previous studies have demonstrated that context can shape preferences, we consider whether people endogenously shape their own preferences by choosing their context. Using a one-shot game, we explore whether dictators actively seek or avoid information regarding the deservingness of their recipient. We find that four out of five dictators endogenously choose to close the social distance gap by finding out the deservingness level of their recipients, and they act on that frame – the deserving get more, the undeserving get less. We further show that the decision to seek more information about the recipient is systematic, explained by the cultural worldviews of the dictator.

© 2016 Published by Elsevier Inc.

Be careful the environment you choose for it will shape you.

–D. Clement Stone

1. Introduction

John Stuart Mill's early characterization of humans as narrowly self-interested agents is a valuable precept of neoclassical economic theory, a simplifying starting point that has served economists well when modeling individual behavior (Persky, 1995). Research from the behavioral sciences however has provided considerable evidence that our interests are more nuanced than the presumption, with preferences being shaped by our relationship with others and the context of our interactions (e.g., see Tversky and Simonson, 1993). How context shapes preferences matters because it follows that standard welfare measures used in policy analyses are transient artifacts contingent on context. The efficacy of policy analysis therefore can benefit from a better understanding of the interplay between context and preferences. Herein we contribute to this effort by exploring the notion that context and social preferences are endogenous choices rather than exogenous determinants. While previous studies find that context can shape

preferences, we consider whether people endogenously shape their own preferences by choosing their context.¹

Following the literature, we use a variant of the dictator game to show that context about the recipient deservingness affects dictator behavior (e.g., Engel, 2011; Cherry and Shogren, 2008). We extend this finding to explore whether dictators actively seek or avoid a richer context about recipient deservingness—context that may be costly to the dictator. If they choose to avoid knowing about recipient deservingness, dictators are choosing to maintain social distance—hiding from the more demanding context. But if dictators choose to know recipient deservingness, they act to close the social distance gap. They want to draw upon the more personal context, be less *homo economicus* and more human.

Our study connects two strands of the dictator game literature. First, to identify a robust non-material context that shapes other-regarding behavior, we draw from the deservingness literature that shows dictators show more generosity to more deserving recipients (e.g., Engel, 2011; Cherry and Shogren, 2008). And second, we introduce endogeneity by following the strategic or willful ignorance literature that shows dictators often justify maximizing their own payoffs by avoiding information about how their actions may

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: cherrytl@appstate.edu (T.L. Cherry).

¹ We note that other studies have considered the endogenous selection of policies, institutions and group membership (e.g., Kosfeld et al. 2009; Sutter et al., 2010; Cherry et al., 2014; Gürrer, 2014).

lower the payoffs of recipients (e.g., Dana et al., 2007; Feiler, 2014). The resulting framework allows us to examine whether dictators choose to maintain or reduce the social distance of recipients, and therefore choose the context that shapes their social preferences.

Our results reveal that 4 of 5 dictators choose to close the social distance gap—they choose to be more human, though not always more humane. The majority chose to know about the deservingness of the recipient, and they acted on that frame—the deserving get more, the undeserving get less. We verify the decision to close the social distance gap is systematic, explained by the cultural worldviews of the dictator.

2. The experiment

The experimental design is based on a one-shot anonymous dictator game. The absence of strategic concerns makes the dictator game a useful framework to examine other-regarding behavior (see, e.g., Hoffman et al., 1996). When recruited, subjects were assigned to group A (dictators) or B (recipients). The two groups did not have any contact before, during, or after the session. Subjects were randomly matched across groups to form pairs. The dictators decided how to split \$10 with their randomly matched recipient. To make an offer, dictators had three minutes to open a sealed envelope, fill out the enclosed decision card, and place the completed decision card back in the envelope. Dictators were called one by one to exit the room, taking their envelope to a station outside the room to receive their payment (\$10 minus the offer). Administrators delivered the offers along with a copy of the instructions to the recipient (available on request).²

Our 3 × 2 design varies two treatment variables in the basic dictator game framework—*recipient deservingness* (high, low or uncertain) and *information origin* (exogenous or endogenous).

2.1. Recipient deservingness

To vary recipient deservingness in the eyes of dictators, we exploit differences in the investment that recipients make in participating in the study. Prior to making offers, dictators knew they were matched with a recipient that either: accepted the invitation to participate and showed up to different rooms at different times (*high*), rejected the invitation to participate but were identified from those individuals in the recruiting database that received an invitation but did not attempt to register for the experiment (*low*), or was equally likely to have accepted or rejected the invitation to participate (*uncertain*). Similar information about recipients is used in Cherry and Shogren (2008) and they find that this measure of deservingness significantly influences dictators' behavior. Note that we are drawing from this literature to replicate a context that has previously established the importance of other-regarding preferences in decision making. From this, we construct a setting that allows dictators the choice of their context and therefore their social preferences.³

Note that all dictators were informed that the distribution of recipients were equally split between high and low types, but only dictators in the high and low treatments knew the deservingness of their recipient. Deservingness levels were not revealed to dictators in the uncertain treatment.

2.2. Information origin

Recipient deservingness was revealed to dictators in one of two ways—*exogenous* or *endogenous*. In the exogenous treatments, the instructions informed dictators about the deservingness of their recipient. In one treatment dictators were informed that the Player B they were matched with accepted the invitation to participate and showed up (in another room) on time (*exogenous-high*). In another treatment, the dictators were informed that their recipient was invited to participate but rejected the invitation (*exogenous-low*), and in a third treatment the dictators were uncertain about the participation decision of the recipients but, like in all treatments, knew the distribution was equally split (*exogenous-uncertain*). This created three treatments which correspond to Cherry and Shogren (2008). We extend this design to allow dictators the choice to know or avoid information about recipient deservingness.

In the endogenous treatment, dictators made an active decision whether to learn about the participation decision of their recipients. To facilitate this, in each endogenous information session, dictators were provided with two envelopes. An envelope labeled "INFO" contained a decision card that included information on the recipient's participation decision, while the decision card in the envelope marked "NO INFO" did not reveal the recipient's participation decision. Specifically, the dictators' instructions stated:

- If you want to learn about Player B, open the envelope labeled INFO. Fill out the decision card and place it back in the envelope.
- If you do not want to learn about Player B, you must open the envelope labeled NO INFO. Fill out the decision card and place it back in the envelope.

Dictators could only open one envelope to make an offer.⁴ If dictators chose to learn recipient deservingness, the split was categorized as either *endogenous-high* or *endogenous-low*, each with a 50-50 likelihood. If dictators chose to not learn about the recipient deservingness, the split was placed in the *endogenous-uncertain* case. The exogenous treatments replicate previous studies that show recipient deservingness influences dictator offers (e.g., Cherry and Shogren 2008). The endogenous treatments extend the design to consider whether dictators choose to be ignorant about recipient deservingness.

2.3. Worldviews

To explore whether dictator behavior is random or systematic, we elicit the individual worldviews of dictators as possible determinants of seeking or avoiding additional context. After the split, dictators completed a survey that elicited their cultural worldviews. We follow the literature by using the short-form instrument from Kahan et al. (2011). Dictators used a six-level Likert scale to indicate their (dis)agreement to two sets of six statements (1=strongly disagree to 6=strongly agree). One set of statements captures hierarchy-egalitarianism worldviews: "attitudes toward social orderings that connect authority to stratified social roles based on highly conspicuous and largely fixed characteristics such as gender, race, and class" (p. 51, Kahan et al., 2011). Another set of statements captures individualism-communitarianism worldviews: "attitudes toward social orderings that expect individuals to secure their own well-being without assistance or interference from society versus those that assign society the obligation to secure collective welfare and the power to override competing individual interests" (p. 51, Kahan et al., 2011). The sum of scores for each set of

² In Grossman (2014) and Dana et al. (2007), dictators choose between two options that split different or uncertain total amounts.

³ Other social distance contexts from the literature would be plausible, such as reducing anonymity by revealing a person's family name (Charness and Gneezy, 2008).

⁴ This no-default design feature follows Larson and Capra (2009) and Grossman (2014), which show that default settings to show that default options on information significantly affect dictator behavior.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5034168>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5034168>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)