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Institutional Design and Human Motivation

1. INSTITUTIONAL DESIGN AND HOMO ECONOMICUS
Institutions

• “Rules” which affect outcomes of various social interactions:

• “The same individuals, with the same motivations and capacities, will interact to generate quite different aggregate outcomes under differing sets of rules, with quite different implications for the well-being of every participant.“ (Brennan & Buchanan 1985, p. 4)
Designing institutions

• Institutions evolve spontaneously but also by conscious design
• Society as „constructed“ environment (Coleman)
Coleman (1993, p.14): vision of sociology as a design science

• “What does this (...) mean for sociology and sociologists? It implies a future in the design of organizations, institutions, and social environments – design intended to optimize relevant outcomes. (...) It is the task of sociologist to aid in that construction, to bring to it the understanding of social processes, to ensure that this reconstruction of society is not naive, but sophisticated, to ensure, one might say, that it is indeed a rational reconstruction of society.”
Three decision levels in designing institutions

1. Rational decisions with respect to the criteria institutions should fulfill
   - Maximizing „social welfare“, „wealth“
   - Just redistribution etc.
   - Efficiency, profit maximization
2. Rational decisions with respect to choice of specific rules which are consistent with the criteria (constitutional choice)
3. Decisions with regard to choices within rules (subject area)
First order decisions

Harsanyi, Rawls
• Veil of ignorance
• Rationality
  – Harsanyi: Expected utility maximization
  – Rawls: Maximin
• Normative Criterion
  – Harsanyi: Rule utilitarianism
  – Rawls: difference principle

Buchanan
• Veil of uncertainty
• Rationality
  – Choice of model of man (third order decision level)
  – Expected utility
  – Quasi-risk aversion
• Normative Criterion:
  Outcomes of rules should be efficient (Pareto)
Third order decisions: Real actors under constraints of rules

Second order decisions: Rules

First order decisions: Desired outcomes (efficiency)
Buchanan doctrine
(3rd order decisions)

• “Homo economicus, the rational, self-oriented maximizer of contemporary economic theory, is, we believe, the appropriate model of human behavior for use in evaluating the workings of different institutional orders” (Brennan and Buchanan 1985)

• Why?
  – Homo economicus is not the most “realistic” model for all situations, however:
  – Uncertainty about properties (preferences) of agents
    ⇒ Quasi risk aversive choice among models of man
  – More “optimistic” models will create risks of societal losses greater than expected gains
Arguments pro homo economicus: Crowding out effects

Gresham’s law of politics:
“(...) when many persons are involved in a social interaction, the narrow pursuit of self-interest by a subset will induce all persons to behave similarly, simply in order to protect themselves against members of the subset”.

(Brennan & Buchanan 1985, p. 68)
First and second order decisions in T=0: Constitutional choice of $i=1,2,...,N$ individuals among rules (Buchanan)

Veil of uncertainty

“Quasi risk aversion” in choice of man model; situational context of rules

Rationality

Rules proposed by $i=1,2,...,N$

Unanimous agreement

Rules
Third order decisions in $T=1,2,\ldots$: Anticipated decisions *within* rules (post-constitutional)

**Rules**

**Outcomes**

**Macro**

**Micro**

- Restrictions, Preferences

**Aggregation**

- Model of man: *homo economicus*

**Individual actions**
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2. SOME PROBLEMS OF HOMO ECONOMICUS
Homo economicus

• Self-interested preferences
• Rationality

N.B. Sociologists might instead talk about „rational egoism“ model instead of „homo economicus“
## Models of man

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Selfish motivation</th>
<th>Non-selfish motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Self regarding</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Outcome oriented</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completely rational:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Consistent preferences</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Expected utility axioms</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Common knowledge (CKR)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Backward induction</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homo economicus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundedly rational:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Cognitive capacities limited: biases, heuristics</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Preference reversals: time inconsistency, framing</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Other choice anomalies</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dual self (Kahneman)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>S1: heuristics</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>S2: conscious deliberation</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Prospect theory</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social preferences (e.g. inequity aversion)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strong reciprocity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic preferences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Altruism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anti-social preferences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Process regarding social preferences**

**Social rationality (Lindenberg)**

**Model of frame selection (MDF) (Esser, Kroneberg)**
Cognitive psychology
Behavioral economics

Anomalies
Prospect theory, Dual process models etc.
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Liberal paternalism, „nudging“, and institutional design

- Example: organ donation
- Two rules which would induce identical behavior of homo economicus: opt-in vs. presumed consent
- Countries with presumed consent show much higher proportions of donors (in accordance with behavioral theory)

Voss: Institutional design and human motivation
Choice anomalies

• Systematic violations of rationality axioms:
  – Allais paradox: independence axiom violated
  – Reference point and framing effects: Asymmetric value function with respect to gains and losses
  – Endowment effect, sunk cost effect, opportunity costs vs. out-of-pocket costs
  – Etc.

• The homo economicus model is not the most pessimistic („worst case“) model because anomalies can yield individually and/or collectively suboptimal outcomes

• ⇒ Rational agents will want to design institutions which cope with inefficiencies due to these anomalies
„Social“ motives

• Examples
  – „Intrinsic“ motivation vs. instrumental material incentives
  – Social preferences (e.g. fairness)
  – Strong reciprocity vs. instrumental reciprocity

• Designing institutions on the basis of homo economicus assumptions may destroy socially desirable effects of such preferences (if they exist)
Crowding out „good“ motives by interventions

- Crowding *out* effects with respect to „intrinsic motivation“ (Deci et al., Bruno Frey etc.): External interventions perceived as *controlling* can reduce intrinsic motivation and yield inferior outcomes.

- Crowding *in* effects: In some cases intrinsic motivations may be fostered by interventions which are perceived as *supportive*.

- Strong reciprocity can survive in a population of rational egoists if they can identify each other (R. Frank, and others).
3. WHY HOMO ECONOMICUS ASSUMPTIONS ARE USEFUL IN INSTITUTIONAL DESIGN
Choice anomalies

• Individually and/or collectively suboptimal outcomes (e.g. sunk cost effect)
  – Homo economicus would be better off in terms of material outcomes than boundedly rational agents

• Evaluating the suboptimality of anomalous behavior is based on homo economicus model

• ⇒ normative evaluation of outcomes necessarily is based on homo economicus model
Intrinsic and social motivation

• Homo economicus: rules which change relative prices of alternatives are powerful („power of incentives“)

• Crowding out-effects vs. incentive effects work in opposing directions: There is no clear evidence about the net effect

• Institutional domains where no intrinsic or social motives can be expected:
Institutional domains and situations

• Incentive pay; *no intrinsic motivation* (auto glass repair firm) (Lazear 2000): significant sorting and productivity rise effects due to piece-rate wage; no quality reduction due to incentive pay

• *Anonymous* markets (e.g. financial markets): automated high speed trading creates incentives for „sniping“ and (criminal) „spoofing“ ⇒ PD-like wasteful arms races to invest in even quicker connections to stock exchange places
  – Only interventions which change relative prices useful
Institutional domains and situations: „Asymmetric society“-thesis

• Profit-oriented corporate actors (Coleman): Motives to exploit anomalous consumer behavior (e.g. impulsiveness); consumer protection should not assume altruistic or pro-social motives by corporate actors [on the other hand: natural persons’ behavior may be regulated by „nudging“]
Institutional domains and situations

• Environmental behavior in every day-decisions: Relative prices are relevant
  – Diekmann & Preisendörfer (1992 etc.): Low cost hypothesis

• Three stylized facts:
  1. Moral standards of pro-environmental behavior have a positive effect on behavior
  2. Costs of pro-environmental behavior negatively affect behavior
  3. Interaction effects: The positive effect of moral standards declines with increasing costs
Die Low-Cost-Hypothese
Theoretische Grundlagen und empirische Implikationen

Henning Best · Clemens Kroneberg
Simple microeconomic explanation

• Basic idea: marginal decisions (environmental behavior is matter of degree vs. binary decision and „SEU“-analysis)
• Cobb-Douglas utility function
• Environmental behavior as a normal (composite) consumption good E with market prices p(E)
• Other goods with market prices p(X)
• Exponents $\alpha$ ($0 < \alpha < 1$) measure relative interests which are allocated to E and X
• Constrained optimization gives individual demand functions
Econ 201 analysis of environmental behavior

E environmental good; X other good

\( p(E), p(X) \) prices of one unit of \( E \) and of \( X \)

\( m = Ep(E) + Xp(X) \) (budget constraint)

Cobb Douglas utility function
(\( \alpha \) measures fraction of interest allocated to \( E \).)

\( U = u(E, X) = E^\alpha X^{1-\alpha} \)

The demand functions for \( E \) and \( X \) are, respectively,

\[ E = \frac{\alpha m}{p(E)} \quad \text{and} \quad X = \frac{(1-\alpha)m}{p(X)}. \]

Now the three stylized facts follow:

1. \( \frac{\partial E}{\partial \alpha} = \frac{m p(E)}{p(E)^2} = \frac{m}{p(E)} > 0. \) (positive effect of \( \alpha \))

2. \( \frac{\partial E}{\partial p(E)} = \frac{-\alpha m}{p(E)^2} < 0. \) (relative price effect)

3. \( \frac{\partial m}{\partial p(E)} = \frac{-m}{p(E)^2} < 0. \) (interaction effect)
Homo economicus effects

• Increasing relative prices of E decreases demand with respect to E
• The larger the fraction $\alpha$ allocated to E the higher the demand of E
• There is an interaction effect: the positive effect of $\alpha$ on E decreases with increases in the price $p(E)$
Aggregate behavior

• Aggregate behavior is an additive function of individual demand schedules
• Aggregate demand functions are negatively inclined: increasing costs of pro-environmental behavior reduce the demand (ceteris paribus)
• Conversely, decreasing costs (due to external interventions) increase the quantity demanded
Gary S. Becker (1962): Aggregate level price effects can be expected among irrational agents

- $i=1,...,n$ actors, two normal goods, with budget lines $m_i$
- Denote $M$ as the sum of individual budget lines $m_i$
- Irrational agents choose impulsively (at random) a point on her budget lines
- Aggregate demand $x$ for good $x$ with price $p$ is expected to be $\frac{1}{2} \frac{M}{p_x}$
- If the price increases, the demand will decrease:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{M}{2p_x} < 0.$$
• “One of the core insights of economics is that relative prices (and scarcity) strongly influence behavior. One of the core insights of sociology is that the definition of the situation influences behavior.” (Lindenberg 1990, p. 742).
Letter from the president of DGS (November 2005): membership fees increase from 60 to 150 € p.a.
List of members who have chosen „exit“ from DGS (largest number of exits ever) after price increase
Not only sociologists but even Capuchin monkeys act like homo economicus

Fig. 1.—A capuchin must decide how to spend a budget of coins. The tray at the front of the testing chamber holds the monkey's budget, and each of the two experimenters displays in one hand a food reward in a small tray; his other hand is empty and outstretched. The subject enters the testing chamber (frame A), takes a token from the tray (frame B), places it in the hand of an experimenter (frame C), and receives a food reward from a tray in his other hand (frame D). The film clip from which these pictures are drawn is available from Chen on request.
How Basic Are Behavioral Biases? Evidence from Capuchin Monkey Trading Behavior

M. Keith Chen
Yale University and Cowles Foundation

Venkat Lakshminarayanan and Laurie R. Santos
Yale University
Monkeys’ behavior is consistent with revealed preference approach (GARP) with negatively inclined demand functions.
• Sociologists, capuchin monkeys and other irrational agents predictably react on relative price changes
• The negative slope of the aggregate demand function does not depend on specific preferences
• Even when dealing with „irrational“ agents the Homo economicus model is appropriate as an instrument to design institutional changes
Falk and Fischbacher (2005, p. 183)

• “In particular, for comparative static predictions of aggregate behavior, self-interest models may make empirically correct predictions because models with more complex motivational assumptions predict the same outcome*“.

• * or nothing at all (added by T.V.)
4. CONCLUSION: SOME PROPOSITIONS
Propositions

1. There is a large set of bounded rationality and non-selfish motive-models with partially contradictory predictions. It seems impossible to select one element from this set as a theoretical tool suitable for every problem of institutional design.

2. There clearly are institutional domains which require design principles consistent with homo economicus assumptions:
   - Competitive, anonymous markets (highspeed trading in financial markets), auctions
   - Profit-oriented corporate actors’ behavior (in relations with natural persons)
   - Aggregate behavior in large groups of unconnected actors with high stakes
3. In large-scale aggregate behavior it seems, in general, to be the case that homo economicus models and many more complicated alternative theories yield very similar, if not the same, predictions. In this case: Why not use standard homo economicus model?

4. Non-standard models are appropriate in special situations involving decisions at the margin, e.g. certain “low cost“ situations. However, non-standard models offer no clear predictions about structural variables which affect outcomes of institutional design (e.g. repeated interactions, network effects) and must therefore be combined with standard models.
5. Institutional design is, in general, a complex task with considerable uncertainty about its possible effects. Many, if not all, attempts of conscious design are prone to generate non-intended consequences. One should keep in mind that a trial-and-error process of „piecemeal-engineering“ (Popper) – albeit guided by theoretical principles – is needed.
Two false propositions

1. Homo economicus represents the uniquely optimal model for institutional analysis.
2. Homo economicus is useless in institutional analysis.
A note of caution

• “The policy of assigning all authority to a central agency to design rules is based on a false conception that there are only a few rules that need to be considered and that only experts know these options and can design optimal policies. Our empirical research strongly challenges this assumption. There are thousands of individual rules that can be used to manage resources. No one, including a scientifically trained professional staff, can do a complete analysis of any particular situation.” Elinor Ostrom (2005, p. 269)
Thank you for your attention