Thirty Years of Prospect Theory in Economics: A Review and Assessment

Nicholas C. Barberis

In 1979, two Israeli psychologists, Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky, already famous for their work on judgment heuristics, published a paper in the journal *Econometrica* titled "Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk." The paper accomplished two things. It collected in one place a series of simple but compelling demonstrations that, in laboratory settings, people systematically violate the predictions of expected utility theory, economists' workhorse model of decision making under risk. It also presented a new model of risk attitudes called "prospect theory," which elegantly captured the experimental evidence on risk taking, including the documented violations of expected utility.

More than 30 years later, prospect theory is still widely viewed as the best available description of how people evaluate risk in experimental settings. Kahneman and Tversky's papers on prospect theory have been cited tens of thousands of times and were decisive in awarding Kahneman the Nobel Prize in economic sciences in 2002. (Tversky would surely have shared the prize had he not passed away in 1996 at the age of 59.)

It is curious, then, that so many years after the publication of the 1979 paper, there are relatively few well-known and broadly accepted applications of prospect theory in economics. One might be tempted to conclude that, even if prospect theory is an excellent description of behavior in experimental settings, it is less relevant outside the laboratory. In my view, this lesson would be incorrect. Rather, the main reason that it has taken so long to apply prospect theory in economics is that, in a sense that I make precise in the next section, it is hard to know exactly *how* to apply

• Nicholas C. Barberis is the Stephen and Camille Schramm Professor of Finance, Yale School of Management, New Haven, Connecticut.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/jep.27.1.173.

doi=10.1257/jep.27.1.173

it. While prospect theory contains many remarkable insights, it is not ready-made for economic applications.

Over the past decade, researchers in the field of behavioral economics have put a lot of thought into how prospect theory should be applied in economic settings. This effort is bearing fruit. A significant body of theoretical work now incorporates the ideas in prospect theory into more traditional models of economic behavior, and a growing body of empirical work tests the predictions of these new theories. In this essay, after first reviewing prospect theory and the difficulties inherent in applying it, I discuss some of this recent work. It is too early to declare this research effort an unqualified success, but the rapid progress of the last decade makes me optimistic that at least some of the insights of prospect theory will eventually find a permanent and significant place in mainstream economic analysis.

The Prospect Theory Model

The original version of prospect theory is described in Kahneman and Tversky (1979). While this paper contains all of the theory's essential insights, the specific model it proposed has some limitations: it can be applied to gambles with at most two nonzero outcomes, and it predicts that people will sometimes choose dominated gambles. In 1992, Kahneman and Tversky published a modified version of their theory known as "cumulative prospect theory" which resolves these problems. This version is the one typically used in economic analysis, and it is the version I briefly review here.

Consider a gamble

$$(x_{-m}, p_{-m}; x_{-m+1}, p_{-m+1}; \ldots; x_0, p_0; \ldots; x_{n-1}, p_{n-1}; x_n, p_n),$$

where the notation should be read as "gain x_{-m} with probability p_{-m} , x_{-m+1} with probability p_{-m+1} , and so on," where the outcomes are arranged in increasing order, so that $x_i < x_j$ for i < j, and where $x_0 = 0$. For example, a 50:50 bet to lose \$100 or gain \$200 would be expressed as $(-\$100, \frac{1}{2}; \$200, \frac{1}{2})$. Under expected utility theory, an individual evaluates the above gamble as

$$\sum_{i=-m}^n p_i U(W+x_i),$$

where *W* is current wealth and $U(\cdot)$ is an increasing and concave utility function. Under cumulative prospect theory, by contrast, the gamble is evaluated as

$$\sum_{i=-m}^n \pi_i v(x_i),$$

where $v(\cdot)$, the "value function," is an increasing function with v(0) = 0, and where π_i are "decision weights."¹

This formulation illustrates the four elements of prospect theory: 1) reference dependence, 2) loss aversion, 3) diminishing sensitivity, and 4) probability weighting. First, in prospect theory, people derive utility from *gains and losses*, measured relative to some reference point, rather than from absolute levels of wealth: the argument of $v(\cdot)$ is x_i , not $W + x_i$. Kahneman and Tversky motivate this assumption, known as "reference dependence," with explicit experimental evidence (see, for example, Problems 11 and 12 in their 1979 paper), but also by noting that our perceptual system works in a similar way: we are more attuned to *changes* in attributes such as brightness, loudness, and temperature than we are to their absolute magnitudes.

Second, the value function $v(\cdot)$ captures "loss aversion," the idea that people are much more sensitive to losses—even small losses—than to gains of the same magnitude. Informally, loss aversion is generated by making the value function steeper in the region of losses than in the region of gains. This can be seen in Figure 1, which plots a typical value function; the horizontal axis represents the dollar gain or loss x, and the vertical axis, the value v(x) assigned to that gain or loss. Notice that the value placed on a \$100 gain, v(100), is smaller in absolute magnitude than v(-100), the value placed on a \$100 loss. Kahneman and Tversky infer loss aversion from the fact that most people turn down the gamble $(-\$100, \frac{1}{2}; \$110, \frac{1}{2})$. As Rabin (2000) shows, it is very hard to understand this fact in the expected utility framework: the dollar amounts are so small relative to typical wealth levels that under expected utility the gamble is evaluated in an essentially risk-neutral way; given its positive expected value, it is therefore attractive. For a loss-averse individual, however, the gamble is unappealing: the pain of losing \$100 far outweighs the pleasure of winning \$110.

Third, as shown in Figure 1, the value function is concave in the region of gains but convex in the region of losses. This element of prospect theory is known as diminishing sensitivity because it implies that, while replacing a \$100 gain (or loss) with a \$200 gain (or loss) has a significant utility impact, replacing a \$1,000 gain (or loss) with a \$1,100 gain (or loss) has a smaller impact. The concavity over gains captures the finding that people tend to be risk averse over moderate probability gains: they typically prefer a certain gain of \$500 to a 50 percent chance of \$1,000. However, people also tend to be risk *seeking* over losses: they prefer a 50 percent chance of losing \$1,000 to losing \$500 for sure. This motivates the convexity over losses.²

¹ In taking $U(\cdot)$ to be increasing and concave and its argument to be the level of wealth, I am following the standard convention in applications of expected utility. The assumptions about the form of $U(\cdot)$ capture a simple intuition: that people prefer more wealth to less, and that an additional dollar has a smaller utility impact at higher wealth levels. The concavity assumption generates risk aversion: it predicts that people will prefer a gamble's expected value to the gamble itself.

² While the convexity of the value function over losses captures one important psychological intuition, it ignores another. An individual facing a loss that represents a large fraction of wealth will be *very* sensitive, not insensitive, to any additional losses. For some applications, it is important to take this into account.



Figure 1 The Prospect Theory Value Function

Notes: The graph plots the value function proposed by Tversky and Kahneman (1992) as part of cumulative prospect theory, namely $v(x) = x^{\alpha}$ for $x \ge 0$ and $v(x) = -\lambda(-x)^{\alpha}$ for x < 0, where x is a dollar gain or loss. The authors estimate $\alpha = 0.88$ and $\lambda = 2.25$ from experimental data. The plot uses $\alpha = 0.5$ and $\lambda = 2.5$ so as to make loss aversion and diminishing sensitivity easier to see.

The fourth and final component of prospect theory is probability weighting. In prospect theory, people do not weight outcomes by their objective probabilities p_i but rather by transformed probabilities or decision weights π_i . The decision weights are computed with the help of a weighting function $w(\cdot)$ whose argument is an objective probability. The solid line in Figure 2 shows the weighting function proposed by Tversky and Kahneman (1992). As is visible in comparison with the dotted line—a 45 degree line, which corresponds to the expected utility benchmark—the weighting function overweights low probabilities and underweights high probabilities.

In cumulative prospect theory, the weighting function is applied to cumulative probabilities—for example, to the probability of gaining *at least* \$100, or of losing \$50 *or more*. For the purposes of understanding the applications I describe later, the main thing the reader needs to know about probability weighting is that it leads the individual to overweight the *tails* of any distribution—in other words, to overweight unlikely extreme outcomes. Kahneman and Tversky infer this, in



Figure 2 The Probability Weighting Function

Notes: The graph plots the probability weighting function proposed by Tversky and Kahneman (1992) as part of cumulative prospect theory, namely $w(P) = P^{\delta}/(P^{\delta} + (1-P)^{\delta})^{1/\delta}$, where *P* is an objective probability, for two values of δ . The solid line corresponds to $\delta = 0.65$, the value estimated by the authors from experimental data. The dotted line corresponds to $\delta = 1$, in other words, to linear probability weighting.

part, from the fact that people like both lotteries and insurance—they prefer a 0.001 chance of \$5,000 to a certain gain of \$5, but also prefer a certain loss of \$5 to a 0.001 chance of losing \$5,000—a combination of behaviors that is difficult to explain with expected utility. Under cumulative prospect theory, the unlikely state of the world in which the individual gains or loses \$5,000 is overweighted in his mind, thereby explaining these choices. More broadly, the weighting function reflects the certainty equivalents people state for gambles that offer \$100, say, with probability p. For example, in an experimental study by Gonzalez and Wu (1999), subjects state an average certainty equivalent of \$10 for a 0.05 chance of \$100, and \$63 for a 0.9 chance of \$100. These findings motivate the overweighting of low tail probabilities and the underweighting of high tail probabilities, respectively.

Kahneman and Tversky emphasize that the transformed probabilities π_i do not represent erroneous beliefs; rather, they are decision weights. In the

framework of prospect theory, someone who is offered a 0.001 chance of winning \$5,000 knows exactly what it means for something to have a 0.001 probability of occurring; however, when evaluating the gamble, this person weights the \$5,000 by more than 0.001.³

Subsequent to Tversky and Kahneman's (1992) paper on cumulative prospect theory, several studies have used more sophisticated techniques, in conjunction with new experimental data, to estimate the value function $v(\cdot)$ and the weighting function $w(\cdot)$ more accurately (Gonzalez and Wu 1999; Abdellaoui 2000; Bruhin, Fehr-Duda, and Epper 2010). These studies confirm the properties of these functions identified by Kahneman and Tversky: the loss aversion and diminishing sensitivity features of the value function, and the inverse S-shape of the weighting function. They provide especially strong support for probability weighting.

Challenges in Applying Prospect Theory

I noted earlier that the reason that developing applications of prospect theory in economics is taking a long time is because it is not always obvious how, exactly, to apply it. The central idea in prospect theory is that people derive utility from "gains" and "losses" measured relative to a reference point. But in any given context, it is often unclear how to define precisely what a gain or loss is, not least because Kahneman and Tversky offered relatively little guidance on how the reference point is determined.

An example from finance may help to make this difficulty more concrete. Suppose that we want to predict what kind of portfolio an investor with prospect theory preferences will hold. Right away, we need to specify the "gains" and "losses" the investor is thinking about. Are they gains and losses in overall wealth, in the value of total stock market holdings, or in the value of specific stocks? If the investor's focus is on gains and losses in the value of his stock market holdings, does a "gain" in the stock market simply mean that the return on the stock market was positive? Or does it mean that the stock market return exceeded the risk-free rate, or the return the investor *expected* to earn? And is the investor thinking about annual gains and losses or about monthly or even weekly fluctuations?

Some researchers have been scared off by the lack of a clear answer to these questions. Other researchers, however, have grasped the challenge of trying to understand how people conceptualize gains and losses in different contexts. The best way to tackle this question—and the main approach researchers are taking—is to derive the predictions of prospect theory under a variety of plausible definitions

³ For more information about the mechanics of probability weighting, see Tversky and Kahneman (1992), Wakker (2010), or Barberis (2012). It is interesting to think about the psychological foundations of probability weighting. Tversky and Kahneman (1992) and Gonzalez and Wu (1999) offer an interpretation based on the principle of diminishing sensitivity, while Rottenstreich and Hsee (2001) give an affect-based interpretation. More recently, Bordalo, Gennaioli, and Shleifer (2012) argue that salience is an important driver of probability weighting.

of gains and losses, and to then test these predictions, both in the laboratory and in the field. Through this process, we are gradually developing better theories of how people construe these gains and losses.

One significant attempt to clarify how people think about gains and losses is the work of Kőszegi and Rabin (2006, 2007, 2009). In these papers, the authors propose a framework for applying prospect theory in economics that they argue is both disciplined and portable across different contexts. Their framework has several elements, but the most important is the idea that the reference point people use to compute gains and losses is their *expectations*, or "beliefs . . . held in the recent past about outcomes." In particular, they propose that people derive utility from the difference between consumption and *expected* consumption, where the utility function exhibits loss aversion and diminishing sensitivity. To close the model, they also assume, as a first pass, that expectations are rational, in that they match the distribution of outcomes that people will face if they follow the plan of action that is optimal, given their expectations. This framework underlies a number of the applications I describe in the next section, especially those outside the area of finance (in financial settings, a reference point such as the risk-free rate may be at least as plausible as one based on expectations).

Kőszegi and Rabin (2006) also emphasize, as do other authors, that the question at hand is not whether we should replace traditional models with models in which people derive utility *only* from gains and losses, but rather whether it is useful to consider models in which people derive utility from both gains and losses *and*, as in traditional analysis, from consumption levels. After all, even if gains and losses matter, consumption levels surely matter too, and it would be a mistake to ignore them. In some models based on prospect theory, people do derive utility only from gains and losses. However, this modeling choice simply reflects a desire for tractability, not a belief that consumption levels do not matter.

While it is widely agreed that prospect theory offers an accurate description of risk attitudes in experimental settings, some have questioned whether its predictions will retain their accuracy outside the laboratory, where the stakes are often higher and where people may have significant experience making the decision at hand. Some direct evidence bears on this issue. For example, studies using data from game shows offering large prizes and from experiments conducted in poor countries where a US researcher's budget represents a large amount of money have found that prospect theory continues to provide a good description of behavior under strong financial incentives (Kachelmeier and Shehata 1992; Post, van den Assem, Baltussen, and Thaler 2008). And while List (2003, 2004) presents evidence that prospect theory is less accurate in describing the actions of experienced traders-I return to this evidence below-Pope and Schweitzer (2011) show that prospect theory plays a role even in the behavior of highly experienced and well-incentivized professionals: in particular, professional golfers are significantly more likely to make a putt for par than a putt for scores other than par, a finding that is consistent with loss aversion relative to the reference point of par.

In the end, the best way to find out whether prospect theory can shed light on behavior in real-world settings is to derive its predictions in these settings and to confront these predictions with data. I now discuss research of this type.

Applications

Prospect theory is, first and foremost, a model of decision making under risk. As such, the most obvious places to look for applications are areas such as finance and insurance where attitudes to risk play a central role. I therefore start by discussing efforts to integrate prospect theory into these two fields and then turn to other areas of economics.⁴

Finance

Finance is the field of economics where prospect theory has been most actively applied. The research in this area applies prospect theory in three main contexts: 1) the cross section of average returns, where the goal is to understand why some financial assets have higher average returns than others; 2) the aggregate stock market; and 3) the trading of financial assets over time. I take each of these in turn.

Why do some securities have higher average returns than others? The bestknown framework for thinking about this question is the famous Capital Asset Pricing Model, or CAPM. This model, which is typically derived by assuming, among other things, that investors evaluate risk according to expected utility, says that securities with higher "betas"—securities whose returns covary more with the return on the overall market—should have higher average returns. Unfortunately, this prediction has not received much empirical support (in this journal, Fama and French 2004). This raises the question: Can we do a better job explaining the cross section of average returns using a model in which investors evaluate risk in a psychologically more realistic way—specifically, according to prospect theory?

In Barberis and Huang (2008), my coauthor and I study asset prices in a oneperiod economy populated by investors who derive prospect theory utility from the change in the value of their portfolios over the course of the period. In this model, prospect theory leads to a new prediction, a prediction that does not emerge from the traditional analysis based on expected utility: namely, that a security's *skewness* in the distribution of its returns—even idiosyncratic skewness that is unrelated to the return on the overall market—will be priced. In particular, a positively skewed security—informally, a security whose return distribution has a right tail that is longer than its left tail—will be overpriced, relative to the price it would command in an economy with expected utility investors, and will earn a lower average return.

The intuition for this result is straightforward. By taking a significant position in a positively skewed stock, say, investors give themselves the chance—a small chance,

⁴ See Camerer (2000), DellaVigna (2009), and Part IV of Kahneman (2011) for very useful, earlier discussions of prospect theory applications in economics.

admittedly—of becoming wealthy should the stock post an extraordinary right-tail performance, in other words, should it turn out to be "the next Google." Recall that under the probability weighting component of prospect theory, investors overweight the tails of the distribution they are considering—here, the distribution of potential gains and losses in wealth. This means that they overweight the unlikely state of the world in which they make a lot of money by investing in the positively skewed stock. As a result, they are willing to pay a high price for the stock, even when it means earning a low average return on it.⁵

Over the past five years, prospect theory's implications for the cross section of average returns have received significant empirical support. First, several papers, using a variety of techniques to measure skewness, have confirmed the basic prediction that more positively skewed stocks will have lower average returns (Boyer, Mitton, and Vorkink 2010; Bali, Cakici, and Whitelaw 2011; Conrad, Dittmar, and Ghysels forthcoming).

Second, several papers have argued that the skewness prediction from prospect theory can shed light on other empirical patterns. For example, a well-known puzzle is that the long-term average return of stocks that conduct an initial public offering is below that of a control group of stocks—stocks of firms that are similar to the issuing firms on important dimensions, but that happened not to do an offering. One interesting property of returns on initial public offering stocks, however, is that they are highly positively skewed: most of these stocks don't perform particularly well, but some, like Google, or Microsoft, do incredibly well. As such, prospect theory says that stocks that do an offering *should* have lower average returns. Consistent with this hypothesis, Green and Hwang (2012) find that, the higher the predicted skewness of an initial public offering stock, the lower is its long-term average return.

Researchers have used the pricing of skewness predicted by prospect theory to address several other financial phenomena: the low average return of distressed stocks, of bankrupt stocks, of stocks traded over the counter, and of out-of-themoney options (all of these assets have positively skewed returns); the low relative valuations of conglomerates as compared to single-segment firms (single-segment firms have more skewed returns); and the lack of diversification in many house-hold portfolios (households may choose to be undiversified in positively skewed stocks so as to give themselves at least a small chance of becoming wealthy). As such, prospect theory offers a unifying way of thinking about a number of seemingly unrelated facts.⁶

⁵ One attractive feature of this prediction, especially in light of the earlier discussion, is that it appears to be robust to different ways of defining what a "gain" or "loss" means to investors. In our model in Barberis and Huang (2008), investors derive prospect theory utility from changes in total wealth. The prediction that skewness will be priced continues to hold, however, if investors instead derive prospect theory utility from changes in the value of specific stocks that they own; indeed, in this case, the prediction follows even more directly. The prediction is also likely to survive the presence of expected utility investors in the economy. These investors may try to correct the overpricing of skewed securities by selling them short, but due to the risks and costs of this strategy, their efforts are unlikely to be successful.

⁶ More discussion of these applications can be found in Mitton and Vorkink (2007), Eraker and Ready (2011), and Boyer and Vorkink (2011).

The *aggregate* stock market is the context for the best-known application of prospect theory in finance, namely Benartzi and Thaler's (1995) idea that prospect theory, and loss aversion in particular, can explain the famous equity premium puzzle: the fact that the average return of the US stock market has historically exceeded the average return of Treasury bills by a much greater margin than predicted by traditional consumption-based models of asset prices. According to Benartzi and Thaler, an individual who is thinking about investing in the stock market considers the historical distribution of annual stock market returns—annual because the performance of asset classes is often reported in annual terms. Since the investor is loss averse, the high dispersion of this distribution is very unappealing. To compensate for this, and thus to ensure that the investor is willing to hold his share of the supply of equity, the stock market needs to have a high *average* return, one that is significantly higher than on a safe asset like Treasury bills.⁷

Benartzi and Thaler's (1995) explanation relies not only on prospect theory, but also on an assumption known as "narrow framing," which occurs when an individual evaluates a risk separately from other concurrent risks. This manifests itself, in Benartzi and Thaler's argument, in the way investors apply prospect theory to changes in the value of one specific component of their wealth—namely, their stock market holdings. Narrow framing has been linked to many empirical findings (for example, in Barberis, Huang, and Thaler (2006), we argue that the widespread aversion to a 50:50 bet to win \$110 or lose \$100 is evidence not only of loss aversion but of narrow framing as well). However, we do not, as yet, have a full understanding of when and why narrow framing occurs.⁸

While Benartzi and Thaler's (1995) hypothesis is viewed by many as a plausible explanation of the equity premium puzzle, there are few direct empirical tests of it. The work that has followed their paper has instead focused on formalizing the original argument (for example, Barberis, Huang, and Santos 2001; Andries 2012; Pagel 2012a). There is, however, some evidence for the related idea that loss aversion and narrow framing can explain the nonparticipation puzzle: the fact that, historically, most households did not participate in the stock market. Dimmock and

⁸ Why do we need narrow framing, rather than just loss aversion, to understand why people reject a 50:50 bet to win \$110 or lose \$100? Consider an individual who is loss averse but who does not engage in narrow framing. When offered the 50:50 bet, this individual does not evaluate it in isolation, but in combination with other concurrent risks—financial risk, say, or labor income risk. Loosely speaking, these other risks diversify the risk of the 50:50 bet, making it more appealing. Indeed, Barberis, Huang, and Thaler (2006) show that, unless risk aversion is implausibly high, the individual will accept the bet. This suggests that, when people turn the bet down, as they typically do, narrow framing is at work: they reject the bet because they are loss averse *and* because they evaluate it in isolation.

⁷ While Benartzi and Thaler (1995) focus on loss aversion, probability weighting also contributes to the high equity premium predicted by prospect theory. The reason is that the aggregate stock market is *negatively* skewed: it is subject to occasional large crashes. If investors overweight these rare events, they will require an even higher equity premium than that predicted by loss aversion alone (De Giorgi and Legg 2012). Probability weighting can therefore generate both the *high* average return on the overall stock market and the *low* average return on, for example, initial public offering stocks. In each case, the skewness of the asset, positive or negative, plays a key role.

Kouwenberg (2010), for example, find that survey-based measures of loss aversion predict stock market participation in a cross section of households.

The third main strand of prospect theory research in finance is aimed at understanding how people trade financial assets over time. One target of interest is the "disposition effect," the empirical finding that both individual investors and mutual fund managers have a greater propensity to sell stocks that have risen in value since purchase, rather than stocks that have fallen in value (Odean 1998; Frazzini 2006). This behavior is puzzling because, over the horizon that these investors trade, stock returns exhibit "momentum": stocks that have recently done well continue to outperform, on average, while those that have done poorly continue to lag. As such, investors should concentrate their selling among stocks with poor past performance—but they do the opposite. This apparent unwillingness to sell stocks at a loss relative to purchase price has an important counterpart in the real estate market. Using data on Boston condominium prices from the 1990s, Genesove and Mayer (2001) find that if we take two condos, A and B, such that the two condos have the same expected selling price, but where A is expected to sell for less than its original purchase price while B is not, then the ask price that the seller posts for condo A is significantly higher than that for condo B, on average.

A long-standing idea is that this reluctance to sell assets at a loss follows naturally from prospect theory—in particular, from the convexity of the value function $v(\cdot)$ in the region of losses (Shefrin and Statman 1985). The intuition is that, if a stock (or a piece of real estate) performs poorly, this brings its owner into the loss region of the value function, where, because of the convexity, the owner becomes risk seeking. As a result, this investor holds on to the stock (or the real estate) in the hope of breaking even later on.

A number of recent papers have tried to formalize this intuition, but that task turns out to be harder than expected. In particular, some researchers have argued that, for the argument to work, the value function needs to be much more convex over losses than the experimental evidence suggests that it actually is. This issue continues to be debated (Barberis and Xiong 2009; Meng 2012).

Meanwhile, some authors have argued that the disposition effect in both the stock market and the real estate market can be better understood as a consequence of "realization utility," the idea that people derive utility *directly* from selling an asset at a gain relative to purchase price—and disutility from selling at a loss—perhaps because they think that selling assets at a gain relative to purchase price is a good recipe for long-term wealth accumulation (or conversely, that selling assets at a loss relative to purchase price is a poor recipe for wealth accumulation). In Barberis and Xiong (2012), my coauthor and I show that, if the time discount rate is sufficiently positive, even *linear* realization utility can generate a strong disposition effect, as well as other empirically observed trading patterns. While this explanation for the disposition effect differs from that based on the convexity of the prospect theory value function, it is ultimately still rooted in prospect theory, in that it relies on the investor deriving utility from gains and losses rather than from absolute wealth levels.

Insurance

Insurance is another area of economics where attitudes to risk play a central role. As such, it too is a promising place to look for applications of prospect theory. The most important consumer insurance markets are those for property and casualty insurance, mortality insurance (the main products here are life insurance and annuities), and health insurance. Thus far, prospect theory has been used to shed light on the first two of these three markets.

Sydnor (2010) studies the insurance decisions of 50,000 customers of a large home insurance company. The main decision that these households have to make is to choose a deductible from a menu of four possibilities: \$100, \$250, \$500, and \$1,000. Sydnor finds that the households that choose a \$500 deductible pay an average premium of \$715 per year. In choosing this policy, these households all turned down a policy with a \$1,000 deductible whose average premium was just \$615 per year. Given that the annual claim rate is approximately 5 percent, these households agreed to pay \$100 a year to insure against a 5 percent chance of paying an additional \$500 in the event of a claim! In an expected utility framework, this choice can only be rationalized by unreasonably high levels of risk aversion.

What explains this behavior? Sydnor (2010) ultimately favors an approach based on the probability weighting component of prospect theory. Under probability weighting, a household overweights tail events—in this context, the state of the world in which a claim occurs and it has to pay the deductible. Due to its extra focus on this unlikely but unpleasant outcome, the household is willing to pay a higher premium for a policy with a lower deductible. Sydnor also notes that the extent to which prospect theory can explain the data depends on the household's reference point. If the reference point is simply the household's wealth at the time it is choosing an insurance policy, then prospect theory can go some of the way, but not all the way, toward explaining the high premium the household chooses to pay. However, if, as Kőszegi and Rabin (2007) propose, the reference point is expectations about future outcomes, then prospect theory may be able to explain fully the choices we observe. The intuition is that, since a premium is a payment that a household *expects* to make, while a deductible is a payment that arises only in the unlikely event of a claim, the household doesn't experience as much loss aversion when it pays the premium as it does when it pays the deductible. As a result, it is willing to pay a higher premium.

Barseghyan, Molinari, O'Donoghue, and Teitelbaum (forthcoming) pursue this line of research further. They analyze a formal structural model of insurance choice for a prospect theory household whose reference point is its expectations about future outcomes, and estimate the model using data on home and automobile insurance choices. They, too, find evidence that probability weighting plays a role in household decisions. More precisely, their estimates suggest that, when a household chooses a policy, it significantly overweights the state of the world in which it has to file a claim. As with Sydnor's analysis, this could be because it overestimates the probability of having to file a claim; or because, as in probability weighting, it applies inflated decision weights to tail outcomes. There are several puzzles relating to the market for mortality insurance, but the best known is the annuitization puzzle: the fact that, at the point of retirement, people allocate a much smaller fraction of their wealth to annuity products than normative models suggest they should (in this journal, Benartzi, Previtero, and Thaler 2011).

Hu and Scott (2007) argue that prospect theory offers a way of understanding why annuities are unpopular. In their framework, people think of an annuity as a risky gamble whose payoff—unknown at the moment of retirement—is the present value of the payouts to be received from the annuity before death, minus the amount initially paid for the annuity. Thus, if someone purchases an annuity at age 65 and dies at age 66, this represents a large "loss": the individual paid a lot for the annuity but received very little in return. Conversely, if this person lives until the age of 90, this represents a large "gain," in the sense that much more was received from the annuity than was initially paid in. Hu and Scott show that, if the annuity is viewed as a gamble in this way, and if it is evaluated according to prospect theory, then it will be unattractive. Loss aversion plays the largest role here: simply put, the annuity is unappealing because the individual is more sensitive to the potential loss on the annuity (if he dies soon) than to the potential gain (if he lives a long time). But probability weighting also matters: while the chance of dying very soon and hence receiving a large loss on the annuity is low, probability weighting means that this unlikely event looms large in the decision maker's thinking.9

The Endowment Effect

Prospect theory was originally developed as a theory of risky choice. However, in an influential paper, Thaler (1980) argues that several of the ideas in the theory may also be useful for thinking about *riskless* choice. The natural framework, formalized by Tversky and Kahneman (1991) and Kőszegi and Rabin (2006), is one where the individual derives utility from consumption relative to some reference level of consumption; and where the utility function exhibits loss aversion and diminishing sensitivity, so that, for example, the individual is more sensitive to declines in consumption relative to the reference point than to increases. A large literature, starting with Thaler (1980), has argued that some experimental findings that come under the label "endowment effect" offer strong support for this prospect theory model of riskless choice.

The term "endowment effect" actually refers to two distinct findings that may or may not be related. The first is sometimes known as "exchange asymmetries," and the second, as "WTA/WTP gaps," the gaps between willingness to accept and willingness to pay.¹⁰

⁹ See Gottlieb (2012) for more discussion of this and other applications of prospect theory in the market for mortality insurance.

¹⁰ The term "endowment effect" can be confusing not just because it refers to two separate empirical findings, but also because it is sometimes used to refer to evidence, and sometimes to a *theory* of that evidence, one based on prospect theory. Here, I use it to refer only to evidence.

The classic reference on exchange asymmetries is Knetsch (1989). He gives half the participants in his experiment a mug, and the other half, a candy bar. After a few minutes, during which the participants are asked to complete an unrelated questionnaire, Knetsch asks those who initially received the mug whether they would like to exchange it for the candy, and those who initially received the candy, whether they would like to exchange it for the mug. If, as in traditional economic analysis, preferences over goods do not depend on initial endowments, then whether a participant chooses to go home with a mug or with candy should not depend on the good that this participant was initially given. In fact, Knetsch finds that the initial allocation has a huge effect on subsequent choice: 89 percent of those initially given a mug opt to keep it, while only 10 percent of those initially given candy opt to exchange it for a mug.

The standard reference for willingness-to-accept/willingness-to-pay gaps is Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler (1990), and specifically, their Experiment 5. In this experiment, half the participants are given a mug and are asked to state, for a given list of prices, whether, for each price, they would give up the mug in exchange for that amount of money; in other words, they are asked their willingness to accept. The remaining participants are asked to state, for a given list of prices, whether, for each price, they would be willing to pay that amount of money to obtain the mug; in other words, they are asked their willingness to pay. According to traditional analysis, there should be almost no difference between these two measures. Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler (1990) find large differences, however: the median willingness to pay is \$2.25 but the median willingness to accept is \$5.75.

A leading hypothesis is that these two findings reflect the same underlying psychology of loss aversion. In the exchange asymmetry experiment, participants view an exchange as "losing" the item they were initially given and "gaining" the other item. Since they are more sensitive to losses than to gains, an exchange is unattractive, which explains why most of them stick with their initial endowment. Similarly, in the willingness-to-accept/willingness-to-pay experiment, loss aversion predicts that people will demand much more money in order to give up a mug they have previously received—here, giving up the mug is a "loss"—than they will be willing to pay in order to get one; getting a mug is the corresponding "gain." ¹¹

List (2003, 2004) questions the robustness of exchange asymmetries. He conducts Knetsch-type experiments at a sports card market. His participants include both nondealers and dealers; in other words, people who do not trade sports memorabilia very often, and people who do. He finds strong evidence of exchange asymmetries in the first group, but not in the second: dealers are much more willing to exchange an initial object they are given for another one of similar value. List

¹¹ Samuelson and Zeckhauser (1988) apply this logic more broadly. They argue that, since departing from the status quo usually entails gaining something but also losing something, and since, under loss aversion, losses loom larger than gains, people will exhibit a "status quo bias": they will cling too tightly to the status quo. They present both experimental and field evidence consistent with such a bias.

uses this evidence to suggest that prospect theory may be less useful in describing the behavior of experienced economic actors.

However, Kőszegi and Rabin (2006) argue that List's results may be fully consistent with prospect theory, albeit with an implementation of prospect theory that takes the reference point to be a person's expectations about future outcomes. Intuitively, there are fewer exchange asymmetries among dealers because dealers *expect* to exchange objects that come into their possession, and, as a result, do not experience much loss aversion when they give up the objects. This hypothesis is now being formally tested (Ericson and Fuster 2011; Heffetz and List 2011).

Plott and Zeiler (2005, 2007) show that changes in experimental conditions can significantly affect the magnitude of exchange asymmetries and willingnessto-accept/willingness-to-pay gaps, leading them to question the loss aversion interpretation of these effects. For example, they suggest that the exchange asymmetries documented by Knetsch (1989) may be due to subjects' (incorrectly) perceiving the object they were initially given as more valuable, or to them thinking of the initial object as a gift, one that it would be impolite to exchange. Plott and Zeiler's results have attracted a lot of attention, but remain controversial. For example, Kőszegi and Rabin (2006) argue, once again, that the results are consistent with loss aversion when the reference point is the decision maker's expectations. As I noted above, this hypothesis is currently being tested.

Consumption–Savings Decisions

Kőszegi and Rabin (2009) propose a way of incorporating the ideas in prospect theory into a dynamic model of consumption choice. The model builds on the authors' earlier idea that expectations are an important reference point. At each time *t*, the individual derives utility from two sources: 1) from the difference between actual consumption at time *t* and what that person recently expected consumption at that time to be, but also 2) from the difference between the individual's currently projected consumption at each future date and the consumption that person recently expected at that date. These utility terms incorporate loss aversion: the individual is more sensitive to news that consumption at some point will be lower than expected than to news that it will be higher than expected. The authors also assume that the individual is more sensitive to news that *current* consumption is different from its recently expected level than to news that future consumption will differ from its recently expected level.

This framework has some interesting implications. First, it suggests a new motive for precautionary saving: an individual facing income uncertainty will save more today so as to reduce the expected pain from finding out, later on, that it has become necessary to consume less than previously planned. Second, an individual has a tendency to overconsume, but for a reason that is quite different from the one noted in the literature on hyperbolic discounting. Specifically, in each period, the person has an incentive to surprise himself with a little extra consumption. While this comes at the cost of lower consumption later, the fact that the individual is less sensitive to news about future consumption than to news about current consumption makes the tradeoff worthwhile. Pagel (2012b) builds on these insights to show, in a more comprehensive analysis, that the Kőszegi and Rabin (2009) framework can explain a number of facts about household consumption. For example, she finds that the precautionary saving and overconsumption motives I just described combine to produce a realistic hump-shaped pattern of consumption over the lifecycle. She also finds that the framework can shed light on the "excess sensitivity" and "excess smoothness" puzzles, whereby consumption appears to adjust insufficiently to income shocks. The intuition is that, upon receiving a negative income shock, the individual prefers to lower *future* consumption rather than current consumption. After all, news that future consumption will be lower than expected is less painful than news that current consumption is lower than expected. Moreover, when, at some future time, the individual actually lowers consumption, the pain will be limited because, by that point, expectations will have adjusted downwards.

Industrial Organization

When consumers have prospect theory preferences, firms may adopt a corresponding strategy for price setting. For example, Heidhues and Kőszegi (2012) consider a risk-neutral monopolist selling to a consumer who is loss averse, both in the dimension of the good the consumer is thinking of buying and in the dimension of money. As suggested by Kőszegi and Rabin (2006), the reference point is determined by expectations about future outcomes. In other words, the consumer derives utility from the amount of money spent relative to the amount of money he *expected* to spend; and the utility derived from obtaining the good depends on the probability with which the consumer expected to obtain it (the higher this probability, the lower the utility of obtaining the good).

It turns out that the optimal pricing strategy for this monopolist is one that supermarkets and other retailers often use in practice, namely to set a price that jumps back and forth every so often between a high "regular" price and a variety of lower sale prices. The full intuition for this conclusion has several components, but one key idea is that, by occasionally setting a low sale price at which the consumer is certain to want to buy, the firm ensures that the consumer will buy even at high prices that exceed his valuation of the good. The reason is that, because the consumer expects to obtain the good with some probability (specifically, when there is a sale on), loss aversion means that it will be painful to leave the store without the good, even if its price is high. Indeed, it turns out that, by alternating between high and low prices, the firm can induce the consumer to pay an *average* price that exceeds his valuation of the good.

Labor Supply

Prospect theory may be helpful for understanding some aspects of how labor supply reacts to wages. Research on this topic has centered on the labor supply of cab drivers. It may seem odd to focus on such a narrow segment of the labor market, but there is a reason. Models of labor supply typically assume that workers can choose the quantity of hours that they work. Driving a cab is one profession where this is literally true. Using data on cab drivers in New York City, Camerer, Babcock, Loewenstein, and Thaler (1997) find that the number of hours that a driver works on a given day is strongly inversely related to his average hourly wage on that day. Although they do not present a formal model, the authors suggest that the data are consistent with a framework in which the driver derives prospect theory utility from the difference between his daily income and some target level, or reference level, of income. In particular, due to loss aversion, earning \$20 less than the target is much more painful than earning \$20 more than the target is pleasurable. It is easy to see that a driver with these preferences will typically stop work for the day after reaching the target income level. Since the driver reaches this target more quickly on days when earnings are higher, he stops working sooner on these days.¹²

A key difficulty in providing further evidence for Camerer et al.'s (1997) hypothesis is that it is not clear what determines a driver's target income. Kőszegi and Rabin (2006) break this impasse by proposing that the target is based on the driver's expectations. Specifically, they propose a model of labor supply in which the worker derives utility from the absolute levels of income and hours worked, as in traditional analysis; but in which the worker also derives prospect theory utility, on a daily basis, from the difference between income and *expected* income, and from the difference between the number of hours worked and the expected number of hours worked.

Crawford and Meng (2011) analyze this model in detail. They point out that, to a first approximation, a driver with these preferences will stop working either when he hits the income target—loss aversion means that the marginal utility of an additional dollar is much lower once he reaches this target—or when he hits the hours target (again, loss aversion means that it is much more painful to work an additional hour once this target is reached). The authors test this prediction, again using data on New York City cab drivers. As suggested by Kőszegi and Rabin, they identify a driver's targets for income and hours on the job with expected income and hours on the job, and estimate these using the driver's history of income earned and hours worked on each day of the week. The data seem to support this model. In particular, drivers appear to stop when they reach the *second* of the two targets; note that this is the income target if the driver's earnings early in the shift are lower than expected, and the hours target otherwise. These results broadly confirm Camerer et al.'s (1997) initial hypothesis, but also show the importance of identifying a driver's target with his expectations and of allowing for loss aversion both in the dimension of income

 $^{^{12}}$ This study was received skeptically in some quarters: for example, Farber (2005, 2008). The skepticism arose, in part, because Camerer et al.'s (1997) results seemed to suggest, counterintuitively, that people work less when their expected wage is high. However, Kőszegi and Rabin (2006) argue that this is not the right interpretation of the evidence. Cab drivers probably *do* work more on days when their expected earnings are higher. What Camerer et al. (1997) show is that they stop working when their earnings early in a shift have been unexpectedly high. There is no contradiction here. Intra-day wages are not significantly autocorrelated: unexpectedly high wages in the morning do not affect expected earnings in the afternoon.

and in the dimension of hours worked: the data are not consistent with a model in which the driver is loss averse *only* in the dimension of income.

Other Applications

There are other promising applications of prospect theory that I will not discuss in detail. Some recent papers study contracting between a principal and an agent when the agent has prospect theory preferences. Insights from these papers can help explain the prevalence of stock *options*, rather than just stock, in the compensation packages of both executive and nonexecutive employees (Dittman, Maug, and Spalt 2010; Spalt forthcoming).

Prospect theory has also been applied, with some success, to understanding betting markets. Snowberg and Wolfers (2010) show that probability weighting, in particular, offers a good way of thinking about one of the best-known betting anomalies, the "favorite-longshot bias," in which the market odds of longshots in horse races significantly overstate their chance of winning. In Barberis (2012), I use probability weighting to explain a broader phenomenon, namely, the popularity of casino gambling. In a dynamic setting—a casino that offers gamblers a sequence of bets, say—probability weighting predicts a time inconsistency, in the sense that the action that an individual takes in some specific state of the world may differ from the action that the individual previously planned to take in that state. I analyze this inconsistency and argue that, far from being an unattractive feature of prospect theory, it may actually be helpful for understanding observed behavior—for example, the way people often gamble longer in casinos than they were originally intending, particularly when losing.

There are areas of economics where prospect theory has not been applied very extensively, even though it has the potential to offer useful insights. Public finance, health economics, and macroeconomics are three such fields. To give just one example among many, the concept of loss aversion relative to a reference point may be a helpful way of thinking about the downward rigidity of nominal wages that plays a significant role in some models of the business cycle.

All of the applications discussed above fall under the umbrella of positive economics: we used prospect theory to make sense of observed behavior. Some applications, however, use the insights of prospect theory in a more *prescriptive* way: to nudge people toward behaviors that are viewed as more desirable. For example, Fryer, Levitt, List, and Sadoff (2012), Levitt, List, Neckerman, and Sadoff (2012), and Hossain and List (forthcoming) find that teachers, students, and factory workers, respectively, exert more effort when they are given monetary incentives framed as losses rather than gains—a finding that is consistent with loss aversion. Loss aversion is also a major influence in the design of Thaler and Benartzi's (2004) Save More Tomorrow framework for increasing saving in retirement plans: in this framework, employees' saving rates are increased only when they receive pay raises, thereby protecting them from any painful "losses" in nominal take-home pay.

The common preference for lottery-like payoffs, a preference embedded in probability weighting, has also been used to encourage a range of behaviors. In

many countries, banks offer savings' accounts that, in lieu of paying interest, enter depositors into a lottery. These products have proven popular, particularly among low-income individuals (Kearney, Tufano, Guryan, and Hurst 2010); for legal reasons, however, they are not available in the United States. In a different setting, Volpp et al. (2008a, b) try to encourage people to lose weight, or to stick to a drug regimen, by entering them into a lottery if they lose a certain number of pounds or remember to take their pills on time. This turns out to be an effective intervention.

Discussion

One might have thought that, more than 30 years after the publication of Kahneman and Tversky's (1979) paper on prospect theory, we would have a clear sense of how important a role their theory can play in economic analysis. This is not the case. Because of the difficulties inherent in applying prospect theory in economics, it is only in the last few years that we have made real progress in doing so. Indeed, this research effort is still in its early stages. While it is too soon, then, to draw any firm conclusions about prospect theory's place in economics, a few observations seem appropriate.

At this point, the fields of economics where prospect theory has been most extensively applied are finance and insurance. This emphasis is not surprising. Prospect theory came into being as a model of decision making under risk; it may therefore be best suited to settings where attitudes to risk play a crucial role. Indeed, until a few years ago, the only significant applications of prospect theory outside finance and insurance were the endowment effect and the work on the labor supply of cab drivers—a remarkably short list, and one that can be criticized: the endowment effect for being "only" an experimental finding, and the work on labor supply for being relevant to a potentially narrow segment of the working population. Nonetheless, a clear trend of the past few years is that prospect theory has extended its reach into several other areas of economics—to consumption choice, to industrial organization, to contract theory, to name just a few—and has done so in promising ways. This trend is sure to continue. Ten years from now, prospect theory's visibility in these other areas may well match or exceed its visibility in finance.

The research described in this paper also gives us a preliminary sense of the relative importance of the various components of prospect theory in economic decision making. Reference dependence is the most basic idea in prospect theory, and if any element of the theory finds a permanent place in economic analysis, it will surely be this one. Loss aversion clearly also plays a useful role in many of the applications discussed above. Diminishing sensitivity, by contrast, seems much less important. It features in one of our applications—the disposition effect—but even there, its role is unclear. Probability weighting, on the other hand, has drawn increasing interest in recent years. Indeed, within the risk-related areas of finance, insurance, and gambling, probability weighting plays a more central role than loss aversion and has attracted significantly more empirical support.

The fundamental difficulty in applying prospect theory in economics is that, even if we accept that the carriers of utility are gains and losses, it is often unclear what a gain or loss represents in any given situation. This difficulty remains unresolved; addressing it is a key challenge. Kőszegi and Rabin (2006) provide a very thoughtful analysis of this issue, but their proposal remains a hypothesis in need of more testing and, in any case, is unlikely to be completely correct. This may be particularly true in the field of finance where there are natural reference points other than expectations, and where the gains and losses that investors think about are often more likely to be the monetary gains and losses on specific investments ("narrow framing") rather than the gains and losses in consumption that Kőszegi and Rabin (2006) stress.

In this essay, I have argued that a variety of observed behaviors stem from individuals thinking about risk in the way described by prospect theory. If subsequent research confirms this claim, the natural next question is: Should anything be done about it? If people avoid annuities, "overpay" for initial public offerings, or go to casinos because they evaluate risk according to prospect theory, does that mean that these behaviors are "mistakes"? If so, should there be an effort to change people's behavior? These questions are difficult to answer because we do not, as yet, have a full understanding of whether loss aversion or probability weighting should be thought of as mistakes. One possible approach to studying this issue is to explain to people, in an appropriate way, that they may be acting the way they are because of prospect theory preferences; and to then see if, armed with this information, they change their behavior.¹³

Even prospect theory's most ardent fan would concede that economic analysis based on this theory is unlikely to replace the analysis that we currently present in our introductory textbooks. It makes sense to teach students the fundamental concepts of economics using a traditional utility function, not least because this is simpler than using prospect theory. Indeed, while Mankiw's best-selling undergraduate economics textbook devotes part of a chapter to behavioral economics, it makes no specific mention of prospect theory anywhere in its 900 pages. However, as prospect theory becomes more established in economics, a reasonable vision for future textbooks is that, once they complete the traditional coverage of some topic—of consumer behavior, say, or of consumption-savings decisions, industrial organization, or labor supply—they will follow this with a section or chapter that asks: Can we make more sense of the data using models that are based on psychologically more realistic assumptions? I expect prospect theory to figure prominently in some of these, as yet unwritten, chapters.

¹³ A behavior that is closely associated with prospect theory and that *is* widely viewed as a mistake is narrow framing: evaluating a risk in isolation rather than in combination with other concurrent risks. If some phenomenon—nonparticipation in the stock market, say—is traced to narrow framing, it is easier to make a case for trying to change the pattern of thinking that underlies the phenomenon.

■ I am very grateful to David Autor, Botond Kőszegi, John List, Ted O'Donoghue, Matthew Rabin, Andrei Shleifer, and Timothy Taylor for extensive comments on an early draft of this essay.

References

Abdellaoui, Mohammed. 2000. "Parameter-free Elicitation of Utility and Probability Weighting Functions." *Management Science* 46(11): 1497–1512.

Andries, Marianne. 2012. "Consumptionbased Asset Pricing with Loss Aversion." http:// ssrn.com/abstract=2140880.

Bali, Turan G., Nusret Cakici, and Robert F. Whitelaw. 2011. "Maxing Out: Stocks as Lotteries and the Cross-section of Expected Returns." *Journal of Financial Economics* 99(2): 427–46.

Barberis, Nicholas. 2012. "A Model of Casino Gambling." *Management Science* 58(1): 35–51.

Barberis, Nicholas, and Ming Huang. 2008. "Stocks as Lotteries: The Implications of Probability Weighting for Security Prices." *American Economic Review* 98(5): 2066–2100.

Barberis, Nicholas, Ming Huang, and Tano Santos. 2001. "Prospect Theory and Asset Prices." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 116(1): 1–53.

Barberis, Nicholas, Ming Huang, and Richard H. Thaler. 2006. "Individual Preferences, Monetary Gambles, and Stock Market Participation: A Case for Narrow Framing." *American Economic Review* 96(4): 1069–90.

Barberis, Nicholas, and Wei Xiong. 2009. "What Drives the Disposition Effect? An Analysis of a Long-standing Preference-based Explanation." *Journal of Finance* 64(2): 751–84.

Barberis, Nicholas, and Wei Xiong. 2012. "Realization Utility." *Journal of Financial Economics* 104(2): 251–71.

Barseghyan, Levon, Francesca Molinari, Ted O'Donoghue, and Joshua C. Teitelbaum. Forthcoming. "The Nature of Risk Preferences: Evidence from Insurance Choices." *American Economic Review.*

Benartzi, Shlomo, Alessandro Previtero, and Richard H. Thaler. 2011. "Annuitization Puzzles." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 25(4): 143–64.

Benartzi, Shlomo, and Richard H. Thaler. 1995. "Myopic Loss Aversion and the Equity Premium Puzzle." Quarterly Journal of Economics 110(1): 73–92.

Bordalo, Pedro, Nicola Gennaioli, and Andrei Shleifer. 2012. "Salience Theory of Choice under Risk." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127(3): 1243–85.

Boyer, Brian, Todd Mitton, and Keith Vorkink. 2010. "Expected Idiosyncratic Skewness." *Review of Financial Studies* 23(1): 169–202.

Boyer, Brian H., and Keith Vorkink. 2011. "Stock Options as Lotteries." http://ssrn.com /abstract=1787365.

Bruhin, Adrian, Helga Fehr-Duda, and Thomas Epper. 2010. "Risk and Rationality: Uncovering Heterogeneity in Probability Distortion." *Econometrica* 78(4): 1375–1412.

Camerer, Colin F. 2000. "Prospect Theory in the Wild: Evidence from the Field." Chap. 16 in *Choices, Values and Frames*, edited by Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky. Cambridge University Press.

Camerer, Colin, Linda Babcock, George Loewenstein, and Richard Thaler. 1997. "Labor Supply of New York City Cabdrivers: One Day at a Time." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112(2): 407–441.

Conrad, Jennifer, Robert F. Dittmar, and Eric Ghysels. Forthcoming. "Ex Ante Skewness and Expected Stock Returns." *Journal of Finance*.

Crawford, Vincent, and Juanjuan Meng. 2011. "New York City Cab Drivers' Labor Supply Revisited: Reference-Dependent Preferences with Rational-Expectations Targets for Hours and Income." *American Economic Review* 101(5): 1912–32.

De Giorgi, Enrico, and Shane Legg. 2012. "Dynamic Portfolio Choice and Asset Pricing with Narrow Framing and Probability Weighting." *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 36(7): 951–72.

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

Dimmock, Stephen G., and Roy Kouwenberg.

2010. "Loss-aversion and Household Portfolio Choice." Journal of Empirical Finance 17(3): 441–59.

Dittman, Ingolf, Ernst Maug, and Oliver Spalt. 2010. "Sticks or Carrots? Optimal CEO Compensation when Managers are Loss Averse." *Journal of Finance* 65(6): 2015–50.

Eraker, Bjorn, and Mark Ready. 2011. "Do Investors Overpay for Stocks with Lottery-like Payoffs? An Examination of the Returns on OTC Stocks." http://ssrn.com/abstract=1733225.

Ericson, Keith M. Marzilli, and Andreas Fuster. 2011. "Expectations as Endowments: Evidence on Reference-Dependent Preferences from Exchange and Valuation Experiments." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 126(4): 1879–1907.

Fama, Eugene F., and Kenneth R. French. 2004. "The Capital Asset Pricing Model: Theory and Evidence." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 18(3): 25–46.

Farber, Henry S. 2005. "Is Tomorrow Another Day? The Labor Supply of New York City Cabdrivers." *Journal of Political Economy* 113(1): 46–82.

Farber, Henry S. 2008. "Reference-Dependent Preferences and Labor Supply: The Case of New York City Taxi Drivers." *American Economic Review* 98(3): 1069–82.

Frazzini, Andrea. 2006. "The Disposition Effect and Underreaction to News." *Journal of Finance* 61(4): 2017–46.

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

Genesove, David, and Christopher Mayer. 2001. "Loss Aversion and Seller Behavior: Evidence from the Housing Market." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 116(4): 1233–60.

Gonzalez, Richard, and George Wu. 1999. "On the Shape of the Probability Weighting Function." *Cognitive Psychology* 38(1): 129–66.

Gottlieb, Daniel. 2012. "Prospect Theory, Life Insurance, and Annuities." Wharton School Research Paper 44. http://ssrn.com/abstract=2119041.

Green, T. Clifton, and Byoung-Hyoun Hwang. 2012. "Initial Public Offerings as Lotteries: Skewness Preference and First-Day Returns." *Management Science* 58(2): 432–44.

Heffetz, Ori, and John A. List. 2011. "Is the Endowment Effect a Reference Effect?" NBER Working Paper 16715.

Heidhues, Paul, and Botond Kőszegi. 2012. "Regular Prices and Sales." http://emlab.berkeley .edu/~botond/rps.pdf.

Hossain, Tanjim, and John A. List. Forthcoming. "The Behavioralist Visits the Factory: Increasing Productivity Using Simple Framing Manipulations." *Management Science*. (Published online before print, July 18, 2012, http://mansci.journal .informs.org/content/early/2012/07/18/mnsc .1120.1544.abstract.)

Hu, Wei-Yin, and Jason S. Scott. 2007. "Behavioral Obstacles in the Annuity Market." *Financial Analysts Journal* 63(6): 71–82.

Kachelmeier, Steven J., and Mohamed Shehata. 1992. "Examining Risk Preferences under High Monetary Incentives: Experimental Evidence from the People's Republic of China." *American Economic Review* 82(5): 1120–41.

Kahneman, Daniel. 2011. *Thinking, Fast and Slow.* New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

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): 1325–48.

Kahneman, Daniel, and Amos Tversky. 1979. "Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk." *Econometrica* 47(2): 263–91.

Kearney, Melissa Schettini, Peter Tufano, Jonathan Guryan, and Erik Hurst. 2010. "Making Savers Winners: An Overview of Prize-linked Savings Products." NBER Working Paper 16433.

Knetsch, Jack L. 1989. "The Endowment Effect and Evidence of Nonreversible Indifference Curves." *American Economic Review* 79(5): 1277–84.

Kőszegi, Botond, and Matthew Rabin. 2006. "A Model of Reference-Dependent Preferences." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 121(4): 1133–65.

Kőszegi, Botond, and Matthew Rabin. 2007. "Reference-Dependent Risk Attitudes." *American Economic Review* 97(4): 1047–73.

Kőszegi, Botond, and Matthew Rabin. 2009. "Reference-Dependent Consumption Plans." *American Economic Review* 99(3): 909–36.

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

List, John A. 2003. "Does Market Experience Eliminate Market Anomalies?" *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118(1): 41–71.

List, John A. 2004. "Neoclassical Theory versus Prospect Theory: Evidence from the Marketplace." *Econometrica* 72(2): 615–25.

Meng, Juanjuan. 2012. "Can Prospect Theory Explain the Disposition Effect? A New Perspective on Reference Points." http://ssrn.com /abstract=1851883.

Mitton, Todd, and Keith Vorkink. 2007. "Equilibrium Underdiversification and the Preference for Skewness." *Review of Financial Studies* 20(4): 1255–88. Odean, Terrance. 1998. "Are Investors Reluctant to Realize Their Losses?" *Journal of Finance* 53(5): 1775–98.

Pagel, Michaela. 2012a. "Expectations-based Reference-Dependence and Asset Pricing." Unpublished paper.

Pagel, Michaela. 2012b. "Expectations-based Reference-Dependent Life-cycle Consumption." Unpublished paper.

Plott, Charles R., and Kathryn Zeiler. 2005. "The Willingness to Pay–Willingness to Accept Gap, the 'Endowment Effect,' Subject Misconceptions, and Experimental Procedures for Eliciting Valuations." *American Economic Review* 95(3): 530–45.

Plott, Charles R., and Kathryn Zeiler. 2007. "Exchange Asymmetries Incorrectly Interpreted as Evidence of Endowment Effect Theory and Prospect Theory?" *American Economic Review* 97(4): 1449–66.

Pope, Devin G., and Maurice E. Schweitzer. 2011. "Is Tiger Woods Loss Averse? Persistent Bias in the Face of Experience, Competition, and High Stakes." *American Economic Review* 101(1): 129–57.

Post, Thierry, Martin J. van den Assem, Guido Baltussen, and Richard H. Thaler. 2008. "Deal or No Deal? Decision Making under Risk in a Large-Payoff Game Show." *American Economic Review* 98(1): 38–71.

Rabin, Matthew. 2000. "Risk Aversion and Expected-Utility Theory: A Calibration Theorem." *Econometrica* 68(5): 1281–92.

Rottenstreich, Yuval, and Christopher K. Hsee. 2001. "Money, Kisses, and Electric Shocks: on the Affective Psychology of Risk." *Psychological Science* 12(3): 185–90.

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

Shefrin, Hersh, and Meir Statman. 1985. "The

Disposition to Sell Winners Too Early and Ride Losers Too Long: Theory and Evidence." *Journal of Finance* 40(3): 777–90.

Snowberg, Erik, and Justin Wolfers. 2010. "Explaining the Favorite–Long Shot Bias: Is it Risk-Love or Misperceptions?" *Journal of Political Economy* 118(4): 723–46.

Spalt, Oliver. Forthcoming. "Probability Weighting and Employee Stock Options." *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis.*

Sydnor, Justin. 2010. "(Over)insuring Modest Risks." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 2(4): 177–99.

Thaler, Richard H. 1980. "Toward a Positive Theory of Consumer Choice." *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 1(1): 39–60.

Thaler, Richard H., and Shlomo Benartzi. 2004. "Save More Tomorrow: Using Behavioral Economics to Increase Employee Saving." *Journal* of *Political Economy* 112(S1): S164–S187.

Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman. 1991. "Loss Aversion in Riskless Choice: A Reference-Dependent Model." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 106(4): 1039–61.

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

Volpp, Kevin G., Leslie K. John, Andrea B. Troxel, Laurie Norton, Jennifer Fassbender, and George Loewenstein. 2008a. "Financial Incentivebased Approaches for Weight Loss." *JAMA* 300(22): 2631–37.

Volpp, Kevin G., George Loewenstein, Andrea B. Troxel, Jalpa Dosli, Maureen Price, Mitchell Laskin, and Stephen E. Kimmel. 2008b. "A Test of Financial Incentives to Improve Warfarin Adherence." *BMC Health Services Research* 8: 272.

Wakker, Peter P. 2010. Prospect Theory: For Risk and Ambiguity. Cambridge University Press.

This article has been cited by:

- 1. Xuhui Wang, Xuequn Wang, Zilong Liu, Wen Chang, Yuansi Hou, Zhihe Zhao. 2022. Too generous to be fair? Experiments on the interplay of what, when, and how in data breach recovery of the hotel industry. *Tourism Management* **88**, 104420. [Crossref]
- 2. Jesús Martín-Fernández, Ángel López-Nicolás, Juan Oliva-Moreno, Héctor Medina-Palomino, Elena Polentinos-Castro, Gloria Ariza-Cardiel. 2021. Risk aversion, trust in institutions and contingent valuation of healthcare services: trying to explain the WTA-WTP gap in the Dutch population. *Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation* **19**:1. [Crossref]
- 3. Kai Ruggeri, Hannes Jarke, Lama El-Zein, Helen Verdeli, Tomas Folke. 2021. Mental health and decisions under risk among refugees and the public in Lebanon. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 8:1. . [Crossref]
- 4. In Do Hwang. 2021. Prospect theory and insurance demand: Empirical evidence on the role of loss aversion. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* **95**, 101764. [Crossref]
- 5. Eric Mao. 2021. The structural characteristics of esports gaming and their behavioral implications for high engagement: A competition perspective and a cross-cultural examination. *Addictive Behaviors* **123**, 107056. [Crossref]
- 6. Suiwen (Sharon) Zou, James F. Petrick. 2021. Left-Digit Effect in Tourists' Price Evaluations: The Moderating Role of Price Level and Composite Price. *Journal of Travel Research* 60:8, 1654-1666. [Crossref]
- 7. Jochen Ruß, Stefan Schelling. 2021. Return smoothing in life insurance from a client perspective. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **101**, 91-106. [Crossref]
- 8. Jordan Moore. 2021. Stock loan lotteries and individual investor welfare. *Review of Behavioral Finance* 13:5, 610-630. [Crossref]
- 9. Özgür Kıbrıs, Yusufcan Masatlioglu, Elchin Suleymanov. 2021. A theory of reference point formation. *Economic Theory* **40**. . [Crossref]
- Giuseppe M. Ferro, Tatyana Kovalenko, Didier Sornette. 2021. Quantum decision theory augments rank-dependent expected utility and Cumulative Prospect Theory. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 86, 102417. [Crossref]
- 11. Helen X.H. Bao, Joelle Ng. 2021. Tradable parking permits as a transportation demand management strategy: A behavioural investigation. *Cities* **96**, 103463. [Crossref]
- 12. Hollie L. Tripp, Justin C. Strickland, Melissa Mercincavage, Janet Audrain-McGovern, Eric C. Donny, Andrew A. Strasser. 2021. Tailored Cigarette Warning Messages: How Individualized Loss Aversion and Delay Discounting Rates Can Influence Perceived Message Effectiveness. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18:19, 10492. [Crossref]
- Junyi Chai, Zhiquan Weng, Wenbin Liu. 2021. Behavioral Decision Making in Normative and Descriptive Views: A Critical Review of Literature. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management* 14:10, 490. [Crossref]
- 14. Jasman Tuyon, Zamri Ahmad. 2021. Dynamic risk attributes in Malaysia stock markets: Behavioural finance insights. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* 26:4, 5793-5814. [Crossref]
- 15. Mariya Burdina, Scott Hiller. 2021. When Falling Just Short is a Good Thing: The Effect of Past Performance on Improvement. *Journal of Sports Economics* 22:7, 777-798. [Crossref]
- 16. Yuan-Na Huang, Si-Chu Shen, Shu-Wen Yang, Yi Kuang, Yun-Xiao Li, Shu Li. 2021. Asymmetrical Property of the Subproportionality of Weighting Function in Prospect Theory: Is It Real and How Can It Be Achieved?. Symmetry 13:10, 1928. [Crossref]

- Benjamin L. Collier, Daniel Schwartz, Howard C. Kunreuther, Erwann O. Michel-Kerjan. 2021. Insuring large stakes: A normative and descriptive analysis of households' flood insurance coverage. *Journal of Risk and Insurance* 4. . [Crossref]
- 18. Ling Li, Wayne Xinwei Wan. 2021. The Effect of Expected Losses on the Hong Kong Property Market. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 41. . [Crossref]
- 19. Poornima Tapas, Deepa Pillai. 2021. Prospect theory: an analysis of corporate actions and priorities in pandemic crisis. *International Journal of Innovation Science* ahead-of-print: ahead-of-print. . [Crossref]
- Ping Wang, Luping Sun, Lijun Zhang, Rakesh Niraj. 2021. Reference points in consumer choice models: A review and future research agenda. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 45:5, 985-1006. [Crossref]
- Kendall Atterbury. 2021. Rethinking Why We Do What We Do: Individual Placement and Support. Psychiatric Services 72:9, 1088-1090. [Crossref]
- Minghui Cheng, Dan M. Frangopol. 2021. Life-cycle optimization of structural systems based on cumulative prospect theory: Effects of the reference point and risk attitudes. *Reliability Engineering* & System Safety 13, 108100. [Crossref]
- 23. Danny Zhao-Xiang Huang. 2021. Environmental, social and governance factors and assessing firm value: valuation, signalling and stakeholder perspectives. *Accounting & Finance* 62. [Crossref]
- 24. Stephen G Dimmock, Roy Kouwenberg, Olivia S Mitchell, Kim Peijnenburg. 2021. Household Portfolio Underdiversification and Probability Weighting: Evidence from the Field. *The Review of Financial Studies* 34:9, 4524-4563. [Crossref]
- Chong Jia, Ruixue Zhang, Dan Wang. 2021. Evolutionary Game Analysis of BIM Adoption among Stakeholders in PPP Projects. *Complexity* 2021, 1-14. [Crossref]
- 26. Mariano Puglisi, Vincenzo Fasone, Giulio Pedrini, Deborah Gervasi, Guglielmo Faldetta. 2021. Using a dual system of reasoning in small businesses: Entrepreneurial decisions and subjective risk intelligence. International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal 47. [Crossref]
- 27. Wenhui Zhou, Dongmei Wang, Weixiang Huang, Pengfei Guo. 2021. To Pool or Not to Pool? The Effect of Loss Aversion on Queue Configurations. *Production and Operations Management* 60. . [Crossref]
- Julien Benistant, Rémi Suchon. 2021. It does (not) get better: Reference income violation and altruism. Journal of Economic Psychology 85, 102380. [Crossref]
- Eyal Baharad, Ruth Ben-Yashar. 2021. Judgment Aggregation by a Boundedly Rational Decision-Maker. Group Decision and Negotiation 30:4, 903-914. [Crossref]
- 30. Christophe Bontemps, Douadia Bougherara, Céline Nauges. 2021. Do Risk Preferences Really Matter? The Case of Pesticide Use in Agriculture. *Environmental Modeling & Assessment* 26:4, 609-630. [Crossref]
- Donata Bessey. 2021. Loss Aversion and Health Behaviors: Results from Two Incentivized Economic Experiments. *Healthcare* 9:8, 1040. [Crossref]
- 32. Semen Yu. BOGATYREV. 2021. Heuristics as a new way of adjusting the end market value. *Finance and Credit* 27:7, 1581-1599. [Crossref]
- 33. Andrea Marín Radoszynski, Pierre Pinson. 2021. Electric demand response and bounded rationality: mean-field control for large populations of heterogeneous bounded-rational agents. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **379**:2202, 20190429. [Crossref]
- 34. Matthew Backus, Thomas Blake, Dimitriy Masterov, Steven Tadelis. 2021. Expectation, Disappointment, and Exit: Evidence on Reference Point Formation from an Online Marketplace. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **8**. [Crossref]

- 35. David Peón, Manel Antelo. 2021. The effect of behavioral biases on financial decisions. *Revista Estrategia Organizacional* 10:2. [Crossref]
- 36. Ran Barniv, Wei Li, Timothy Miller. 2021. Independence of Intrinsic Valuations and Stock Recommendations – Experimental Evidence from Equity Research Analysts and Investors. *Journal of Behavioral Finance* 6, 1-14. [Crossref]
- 37. Ian M. McDonald. 2021. A Keynesian model of aggregate demand in the long-run. *Metroeconomica* **72**:3, 442-459. [Crossref]
- Fabrizio Bernardi, Marco Cozzani. 2021. Soccer Scores, Short-Term Mood and Fertility. European Journal of Population 37:3, 625-641. [Crossref]
- Kurt Matzler, Josef Mazanec, Andreas Strobl, Karin Teichmann. 2021. Customer satisfaction management: Exploring temporal changes in nonlinearities in satisfaction formation of skiers. *Problems and Perspectives in Management* 19:2, 398-417. [Crossref]
- Joshua C. Peterson, David D. Bourgin, Mayank Agrawal, Daniel Reichman, Thomas L. Griffiths. 2021. Using large-scale experiments and machine learning to discover theories of human decisionmaking. *Science* 372:6547, 1209-1214. [Crossref]
- 41. Ryan Greenaway-McGrevy, Kade Sorensen. 2021. A Time-Varying Hedonic Approach to quantifying the effects of loss aversion on house prices. *Economic Modelling* **99**, 105491. [Crossref]
- 42. Amin Zokaei Ashtiani, Marc Oliver Rieger, David Stutz. 2021. Nudging against panic selling: Making use of the IKEA effect. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance* **30**, 100502. [Crossref]
- 43. Marco Giacoletti, Christopher A. Parsons. 2021. Peak-Bust rental spreads. *Journal of Financial Economics* 113. . [Crossref]
- 44. Diego F. Rincon, Hugo Fernando Rivera-Trujillo, Lorena Mojica-Ramos, Felipe Borrero-Echeverry. 2021. Sampling plans promoting farmers' memory provide decision support in Tuta absoluta management. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* 41:3. [Crossref]
- 45. S.Y BOGATYREV. 2021. BEHAVIORAL DEVIATIONS OF THE MARKET VALUE OF MACHINERY, EQUIPMENT, VEHICLES AND CURRENCY ASSETS. AZIMUTH OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH: ECONOMICS AND ADMINISTRATION 10:35. [Crossref]
- Semen Yu. BOGATYREV. 2021. New finance: Psychological measurement of value. *Finance and Credit* 27:5, 1156-1177. [Crossref]
- 47. Semen Yu. BOGATYREV. 2021. Simulation of emotional differences in the structured query language for databases of financial markets. *Financial Analytics: Science and Experience* 14:2, 156-173. [Crossref]
- Alexander J. Stewart, Joshua B. Plotkin. 2021. The natural selection of good science. Nature Human Behaviour 5. . [Crossref]
- 49. Andrew J. Keith, Darryl K. Ahner. 2021. A survey of decision making and optimization under uncertainty. *Annals of Operations Research* **300**:2, 319-353. [Crossref]
- 50. Carlo Barone, Katherin Barg, Mathieu Ichou. 2021. Relative risk aversion models: How plausible are their assumptions?. *Rationality and Society* **33**:2, 143-175. [Crossref]
- 51. Paloma Escamilla-Fajardo, David Parra-Camacho, Juan Manuel Núñez-Pomar. 2021. Entrepreneurship and Resilience in Spanish Sports Clubs: A Cluster Analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18:10, 5142. [Crossref]
- 52. Sergei Yu. BOGATYREV. 2021. Looking into bubbles in financial markets and the emotional side of corporate forecast completion through modeling in the structured query language of financial databases. *Finance and Credit* 27:4, 833-850. [Crossref]
- 53. Fabio Tramontana. 2021. When a boundedly rational monopolist meets consumers with reference dependent preferences. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 184, 30-45. [Crossref]

- 54. Branka Matyska. 2021. Salience, systemic risk and spectral risk measures as capital requirements. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* **125**, 104085. [Crossref]
- 55. Inês F. G. Reis, Marta A. R. Lopes, Carlos Henggeler Antunes. 2021. Energy literacy: an overlooked concept to end users' adoption of time-differentiated tariffs. *Energy Efficiency* 14:4. [Crossref]
- 56. Thi Nha Truc Phan, Philippe Bertrand, Xuan Vinh Vo, Kirsten Jones. 2021. Investigating financial decision-making when facing skewed distributions of return: A survey study in Vietnam. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* 27. [Crossref]
- 57. Jack Clark Francis. 2021. Reformulating prospect theory to become a von Neumann–Morgenstern theory. *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting* 56:3, 965-985. [Crossref]
- 58. Chelsea Rae Austin, Donna D. Bobek, Scott Jackson. 2021. Does prospect theory explain ethical decision making? Evidence from tax compliance. Accounting, Organizations and Society 101, 101251. [Crossref]
- 59. Katarzyna Cieslik, Francesco Cecchi, Elias Assefa Damtew, Shiferaw Tafesse, Paul C. Struik, Berga Lemaga, Cees Leeuwis. 2021. The role of ICT in collective management of public bads: The case of potato late blight in Ethiopia. World Development 140, 105366. [Crossref]
- 60. Sergei Yu. BOGATYREV. 2021. The sentiment analysis method in finance: The psychological-financial index. *Finance and Credit* 27:3, 561-584. [Crossref]
- 61. Valerij Gamukin, Olga Miroshnichenko. 2021. Influence of the Average per Capita Income on Credit and Savings Behavior of the Population in Russia. *Living Standards of the Population in the Regions of Russia* 17:1, 57-66. [Crossref]
- 62. Shuping Wu, Zan Yang. 2021. Government Behavior on Urban Land Supply: Does it Follow a Prospect Preference?. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*. [Crossref]
- 63. Minglun Ren, Jiqiong Liu, Shuai Feng, Aifeng Yang. 2021. Pricing and return strategy of online retailers based on return insurance. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* 59, 102350. [Crossref]
- 64. Basile Garcia, Fabien Cerrotti, Stefano Palminteri. 2021. The description-experience gap: a challenge for the neuroeconomics of decision-making under uncertainty. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 376:1819, 20190665. [Crossref]
- 65. Leilei Shi, Binghong Wang, Xinshuai Guo, Honggang Li. 2021. A price dynamic equilibrium model with trading volume weights based on a price-volume probability wave differential equation. *International Review of Financial Analysis* 74, 101603. [Crossref]
- 66. Peter J. Phillips, Gabriela Pohl. 2021. Crowd counting: a behavioural economics perspective. *Quality* & *Quantity* 80. . [Crossref]
- 67. Helen X. H. Bao, Charlotte Chunming Meng, Jing Wu. 2021. Reference dependence, loss aversion and residential property development decisions. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 63. . [Crossref]
- 68. Douadia Bougherara, Lana Friesen, Céline Nauges. 2021. Risk Taking with Left- and Right-Skewed Lotteries*. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 62:1, 89-112. [Crossref]
- 69. Ann K. Tank, Anne M. Farrell. 2021. Is Neuroaccounting Taking a Place on the Stage? A Review of the Influence of Neuroscience on Accounting Research. *European Accounting Review* 70, 1-35. [Crossref]
- Matthew P. Taylor. 2021. Liking the long-shot ... but just as a friend. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 9. . [Crossref]
- 71. Weiwei Wang, Haiwei Zhou, Lidan Guo. 2021. Emergency water supply decision-making of transboundary river basin considering government-public perceived satisfaction. *Journal of Intelligent* & Fuzzy Systems 40:1, 381-401. [Crossref]

- 72. Judith Kreuter. Ideas and Objects, Meaning and Causation—Frame Analysis from a Modernist Social Constructivism Perspective 73-143. [Crossref]
- 73. Yu Yu, Weiwei Zhu, Qinfen Shi, Shangwen Zhuang. 2021. Common set of weights in data envelopment analysis under prospect theory. *Expert Systems* **38**:1. [Crossref]
- 74. Tsung-Yu Chen, Pin-Huang Chou, Kuan-Cheng Ko, S. Ghon Rhee. 2021. Non-parametric momentum based on ranks and signs. *Journal of Empirical Finance* **60**, 94-109. [Crossref]
- 75. Tanusree Dutta, Manas Kumar Mandal. Consumer Happiness and Decision Making: The Way Forward 153-161. [Crossref]
- 76. Diyan Lestari. Earning Announcement and Stock Return: Evidence from Indonesia 167-181. [Crossref]
- 77. G. Charles-Cadogan. 2021. Market Instability, Investor Sentiment, and Probability Judgment Error in Index Option Prices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **101**. [Crossref]
- 78. Fabio Petri. Uncertainty and General Equilibrium 727-830. [Crossref]
- 79. Manel Baucells. 2021. Range Utility Theory. SSRN Electronic Journal 80. . [Crossref]
- 80. William J. Bazley, Sima Jannati, George M. Korniotis. 2021. Grit, Loss Aversion, and Investor Behavior. SSRN Electronic Journal 134. [Crossref]
- Yaojia Tang, Luna Wang. 2021. How Chinese Web Users Value Their Personal Information: An Empirical Study on WeChat Users. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management* Volume 14, 987-999. [Crossref]
- Gaosheng Ju. 2021. Asset Pricing Based on Micro Consumption. SSRN Electronic Journal 138. . [Crossref]
- 83. Nan Zhou. Prospect Theory and Its Applications in Travel Behavior Research 37-43. [Crossref]
- 84. Panagiotis E. Petrakis, Kyriaki I. Kafka, Pantelis C. Kostis, Dionysis G. Valsamis. Rationality and Loss Aversion 189-208. [Crossref]
- A. Afolalu Sunday, M. Ikumapayi Omolayo, Osise Okwilagwe, M. Emetere Moses, A. Adaramola Bernard. 2021. Evaluation of Effective Maintenance and Reliability Operation Management – A Review. *E3S Web of Conferences* 309, 01012. [Crossref]
- 86. Yuhui Ruan, Weisin Chen, Chenyang Zhuang, Hong Lin. 2021. Health-Related Perceptions of Older Adults/Patients with Degenerative Lumbar Diseases (ODLs) are associated with their Quality of Life: a Mixed-Methods Study. *Patient Preference and Adherence* Volume 15, 2303–2311. [Crossref]
- 87. Christer Pursiainen, Tuomas Forsberg. Prospects of Loss and Gain 89-116. [Crossref]
- 88. Syden Mishi, Robert Mwanyepedza, Florence Katsande, Zintle Sikhunyana. 2020. Risk aversion, path dependency and financial economic decision-making in low-income communities: Experimental evidence from South Africa. *Journal of Economic and Financial Sciences* **13**:1. [Crossref]
- 89. JUNYI CHAI. Behavioral Decision Makings: Reconciling Behavioral Economics and Decision Systems 8-13. [Crossref]
- 90. Ying (Jessica) Cao, Alfons Weersink, Emma Ferner. 2020. A Risk Management Tool or an Investment Strategy? Understanding the Unstable Farm Insurance Demand via a Gain-Loss Framework. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review* 49:3, 410-436. [Crossref]
- 91. Mustafa Abdallah, Parinaz Naghizadeh, Ashish R. Hota, Timothy Cason, Saurabh Bagchi, Shreyas Sundaram. 2020. Behavioral and Game-Theoretic Security Investments in Interdependent Systems Modeled by Attack Graphs. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems* 7:4, 1585-1596. [Crossref]
- 92. Charles Bellemare, Sabine Kröger, Kouamé Marius Sossou. 2020. Optimal frequency of portfolio evaluation in a choice experiment with ambiguity and loss aversion. *Journal of Econometrics*. [Crossref]

- 93. Mathew P. White, Gregory N. Bratman, Sabine Pahl, Gerald Young, Deborah Cracknell, Lewis R. Elliott. 2020. Affective reactions to losses and gains in biodiversity: Testing a prospect theory approach. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 72, 101502. [Crossref]
- 94. Immanuel Lampe, Daniel Würtenberger. 2020. Loss aversion and the demand for index insurance. Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization 180, 678-693. [Crossref]
- 95. Cédric Gutierrez, Tomasz Obloj, Douglas H. Frank. 2020. Better to have led and lost than never to have led at all? Lost leadership and effort provision in dynamic tournaments. *Strategic Management Journal* 18. [Crossref]
- 96. Keaton Miller. 2020. Sharing the sacrifice, minimizing the pain: Optimal wage reductions. *Economics Letters* **196**, 109503. [Crossref]
- 97. Luca Caneparo. 2020. Financing the (Environmental) Quality of Cities with Energy Efficiency Investments. *Sustainability* 12:21, 8809. [Crossref]
- 98. Rocío Rodríguez-Rivero, Isabel Ortiz-Marcos, Virginia Díaz-Barcos, Sergio Andrés Lozano. 2020. Applying the strategic prospective approach to project management in a development project in Colombia. *International Journal of Project Management* 38:8, 534-547. [Crossref]
- 99. Eric Le Fur, J. François Outreville. 2020. Real Options and Reduction of Basic Risk of Index-Based Climate Agricultural Insurance. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* **12**. [Crossref]
- 100. Mengqi Zhan. 2020. When to speak up at work: a review of employee voice and silence behavior using a prospect approach. *Atlantic Journal of Communication* **28**:5, 273-288. [Crossref]
- 101. Graham Dove, Martina Balestra, Devin Mann, Oded Nov. 2020. Good for the Many or Best for the Few?. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 4:CSCW2, 1-22. [Crossref]
- 102. Anthony F. Lucas, S. Ray Cho, A. K. Singh. 2020. Impact of Casino Free Play on the Wagering Behavior of Light- and Medium-User Groups: The Importance of Winning at the Bottom of the Database. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly* 4, 193896552096304. [Crossref]
- 103. Ruiqing Miao, Madhu Khanna. 2020. Harnessing Advances in Agricultural Technologies to Optimize Resource Utilization in the Food-Energy-Water Nexus. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 12:1, 65-85. [Crossref]
- 104. Markus Dertwinkel-Kalt, Mats Köster. 2020. Salience and Skewness Preferences. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 18:5, 2057-2107. [Crossref]
- 105. Novi Swandari Budiarso, Abdul Wahab Hasyim, Rusman Soleman, Irfan Zam Zam, Winston Pontoh. 2020. Investor behavior under the Covid-19 pandemic: the case of Indonesia. *Investment Management* and Financial Innovations 17:3, 308-318. [Crossref]
- 106. Atta Ur Rehman, Tiffany Lyche, Kwame Awuah-Offei, V.S.S. Nadendla. 2020. Effect of text message alerts on miners evacuation decisions. *Safety Science* **130**, 104875. [Crossref]
- 107. S. Rasoul Etesami, Walid Saad, Narayan B. Mandayam, H. Vincent Poor. 2020. Smart routing of electric vehicles for load balancing in smart grids. *Automatica* **120**, 109148. [Crossref]
- 108. Jeffrey Berejikian, Zachary Zwald. 2020. Why language matters: Shaping public risk tolerance during deterrence crises. *Contemporary Security Policy* 41:4, 507-540. [Crossref]
- 109. Tevfik Uyar, Mahmut Paksoy. 2020. Framing Effect in Safety Risk Probability Assessment: A Prospect Theory Approach. The International Journal of Aerospace Psychology 30:3-4, 119-129. [Crossref]
- 110. Damien de Walque. 2020. The use of financial incentives to prevent unhealthy behaviors: A review. *Social Science & Medicine* 261, 113236. [Crossref]
- 111. Muhammed Bolomope, Abdul-Rasheed Amidu, Olga Filippova, Deborah Levy. 2020. Property investment decision-making behaviour amidst market disruptions: an institutional perspective. *Property Management* ahead-of-print:ahead-of-print. [Crossref]

- 112. Adam E. Howe, Zachary A. Karazsia. 2020. A long way to peace: identities, genocide, and state preservation in Burma, 1948–2018. *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 8:4, 677-697. [Crossref]
- 113. Angie Andrikogiannopoulou, Filippos Papakonstantinou. 2020. History-Dependent Risk Preferences: Evidence from Individual Choices and Implications for the Disposition Effect. *The Review of Financial Studies* 33:8, 3674-3718. [Crossref]
- 114. Zhihong Wang, Yangyang Li, Fu Gu, Jianfeng Guo, Xiaojun Wu. 2020. Two-sided matching and strategic selection on freight resource sharing platforms. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 125014. [Crossref]
- 115. Nicola Pensiero. 2020. To leave or not to leave? Understanding the support for the United Kingdom membership in the European Union: Identity, attitudes towards the political system and socio-economic status. *Rationality and Society* **32**:3, 255-277. [Crossref]
- 116. Tobias Thomas Prietzel. 2020. The effect of emotion on risky decision making in the context of prospect theory: a comprehensive literature review. *Management Review Quarterly* 70:3, 313-353. [Crossref]
- 117. Nicholas Rohde, Kam Ki Tang, Conchita D'Ambrosio, Lars Osberg, Prasada Rao. 2020. Welfarebased income insecurity in the us and germany: evidence from harmonized panel data. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 176, 226-243. [Crossref]
- 118. Sunghyun Kim, Melissa R. Beck. 2020. Impact of relative and absolute values on selective attention. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 27:4, 735-741. [Crossref]
- 119. Suzanne G. M. Fifield, David G. McMillan, Fiona J. McMillan. 2020. Is there a risk and return relation?. *The European Journal of Finance* 26:11, 1075-1101. [Crossref]
- 120. John A. Parnell, William 'Rick' Crandall. 2020. The contribution of behavioral economics to crisis management decision-making. *Journal of Management & Organization* 26:4, 585-600. [Crossref]
- 121. NOAH SPENCER. 2020. Prospect theory and the potential for lottery-based subsidies. *Behavioural Public Policy* **78**, 1-18. [Crossref]
- 122. Cailing Feng, Mulyadi Robin, Lisan Fan, Xiaoyu Huang. 2020. Commitment to change. *Personnel Review* 49:5, 1069-1090. [Crossref]
- 123. Peter J Phillips, Gabriela Pohl. 2020. Space Junk: Behavioural Economics and the Prioritisation of Solutions. *Defence and Peace Economics* 6, 1-16. [Crossref]
- 124. Tapadhir Das, Abdel Rahman Eldosouky, Shamik Sengupta. Think Smart, Play Dumb: Analyzing Deception in Hardware Trojan Detection Using Game Theory 1-8. [Crossref]
- 125. Kai Ruggeri, Sonia Alí, Mari Louise Berge, Giulia Bertoldo, Ludvig D. Bjørndal, Anna Cortijos-Bernabeu, Clair Davison, Emir Demić, Celia Esteban-Serna, Maja Friedemann, Shannon P. Gibson, Hannes Jarke, Ralitsa Karakasheva, Peggah R. Khorrami, Jakob Kveder, Thomas Lind Andersen, Ingvild S. Lofthus, Lucy McGill, Ana E. Nieto, Jacobo Pérez, Sahana K. Quail, Charlotte Rutherford, Felice L. Tavera, Nastja Tomat, Chiara Van Reyn, Bojana Većkalov, Keying Wang, Aleksandra Yosifova, Francesca Papa, Enrico Rubaltelli, Sander van der Linden, Tomas Folke. 2020. Replicating patterns of prospect theory for decision under risk. *Nature Human Behaviour* 4:6, 622-633. [Crossref]
- 126. Mehrdad Salimitari, Shameek Bhattacharjee, Mainak Chatterjee, Yaser P. Fallah. 2020. A Prospect Theoretic Approach for Trust Management in IoT Networks Under Manipulation Attacks. *ACM Transactions on Sensor Networks* 16:3, 1-26. [Crossref]
- 127. Paulo E U de Souza, Caroline P C Chanel, Melody Mailliez, Frédéric Dehais. 2020. Predicting Human Operator's Decisions Based on Prospect Theory. *Interacting with Computers* **32**:3, 221-232. [Crossref]
- 128. Ryan Greenaway-McGrevy, Cameron Haworth. 2020. Loss aversion in New Zealand housing. *New Zealand Economic Papers* 54:2, 138-160. [Crossref]

- Tobias Dalhaus, Barry J. Barnett, Robert Finger. 2020. Behavioral weather insurance: Applying cumulative prospect theory to agricultural insurance design under narrow framing. *PLOS ONE* 15:5, e0232267. [Crossref]
- 130. Shuoli Zhao, Chengyan Yue. 2020. Risk preferences of commodity crop producers and specialty crop producers: An application of prospect theory. *Agricultural Economics* **51**:3, 359-372. [Crossref]
- 131. Stephen Walmsley, Andrew Gilbey. 2020. Applying prospect theory to pilot weather-related decisionmaking: The impact of monetary and time considerations on risk taking behaviour. *Applied Cognitive Psychology* **34**:3, 685-698. [Crossref]
- 132. S. French, S. Haywood, D.H. Oughton, C. Turcanu. 2020. Different types of uncertainty in nuclear emergency management. *Radioprotection* 55, S175-S180. [Crossref]
- 133. Muhittin Sagnak, Yigit Kazancoglu, Yesim Deniz Ozkan Ozen, Jose Arturo Garza-Reyes. 2020. Decision-making for risk evaluation: integration of prospect theory with failure modes and effects analysis (FMEA). *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management* 37:6/7, 939-956. [Crossref]
- 134. Peter J Phillips, Gabriela Pohl. 2020. Terrorism, lightning and falling furniture. *Behavioral Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression* 12:2, 140-156. [Crossref]
- 135. Lucy F. Ackert, Richard Deaves, Jennifer Miele, Quang Nguyen. 2020. Are Time Preference and Risk Preference Associated with Cognitive Intelligence and Emotional Intelligence?. *Journal of Behavioral Finance* 21:2, 136-156. [Crossref]
- 136. François Desmoulins-Lebeault, Luc Meunier, Sima Ohadi. 2020. Does Implied Volatility Pricing Follow the Tenets of Prospect Theory?. *Journal of Behavioral Finance* 21:2, 157-173. [Crossref]
- 137. Robert Ugochukwu Onyeneke, Christiana Ogonna Igberi, Jonathan Ogbeni Aligbe, Felix Abinotam Iruo, Mark Umunna Amadi, Stanley Chidi Iheanacho, Emmanuel Emeka Osuji, Jane Munonye, Christian Uwadoka. 2020. Climate change adaptation actions by fish farmers: evidence from the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria. Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics 64:2, 347-375. [Crossref]
- 138. Peter John Robinson, W.J. Wouter Botzen. 2020. Flood insurance demand and probability weighting: The influences of regret, worry, locus of control and the threshold of concern heuristic. *Water Resources and Economics* **30**, 100144. [Crossref]
- 139. Susan R. Fisk, Jon Overton. 2020. Bold or reckless? The impact of workplace risk-taking on attributions and expected outcomes. *PLOS ONE* 15:3, e0228672. [Crossref]
- Philip Quinn, Andy Cockburn. 2020. Loss Aversion and Preferences in Interaction. *Human–Computer Interaction* 35:2, 143-190. [Crossref]
- 141. Junyi Chai, Eric W.T. Ngai. 2020. Decision-making techniques in supplier selection: Recent accomplishments and what lies ahead. *Expert Systems with Applications* 140, 112903. [Crossref]
- 142. Yanlong Song, Siyuan Lu, Ann L Smiley-Oyen. 2020. Differential motor learning via reward and punishment. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 73:2, 249-259. [Crossref]
- 143. Xiu Cheng, Ruyin Long, Hong Chen. 2020. A policy utility dislocation model based on prospect theory: A case study of promoting policies with low-carbon lifestyle. *Energy Policy* 137, 111134. [Crossref]
- 144. Maria Teresa V. D. Alves. 2020. Do Accounting and Finance Master's Students Apply Prospect Theory?. *Revista CEA* 6:11, 45-69. [Crossref]
- 145. Tommi Rissanen, Liubov Ermolaeva, Lasse Torkkeli, Ali Ahi, Sami Saarenketo. 2020. The role of home market context in business model change in internationalizing SMEs. *European Business Review* 32:2, 257-275. [Crossref]

- 146. Deborah Susan Levy, Catherine Frethey-Bentham, William Ka Shing Cheung. 2020. Asymmetric framing effects and market familiarity: experimental evidence from the real estate market. *Journal of Property Research* 37:1, 85-104. [Crossref]
- 147. V. P. Samarina, T. P. Skufina, A. V. Samarin, S. V. Baranov. Russia's Agro Industrial Complex: Economic and Political Influence Factors and State Support 579-593. [Crossref]
- 148. Junyi Chai, Eric W.T. Ngai. 2020. The variable precision method for elicitation of probability weighting functions. *Decision Support Systems* 128, 113166. [Crossref]
- 149. Anthony F. Lucas, Jasmine Nemati. 2020. Free-play impact by customer segment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 84, 102316. [Crossref]
- 150. Aurélien Baillon, Han Bleichrodt, Vitalie Spinu. 2020. Searching for the Reference Point. *Management Science* **66**:1, 93-112. [Crossref]
- 151. Rafael Santamaría, Juan Aguarón, José María Moreno-Jiménez. 2020. A multicriteria approach based on Analytic Hierarchy Process and compromise programming in portfolio selection. *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis* 27:1-2, 141-146. [Crossref]
- 152. Donato Masciandaro. 2020. What Bird is That? Central Banking and Monetary Policy in the Last Forty Years. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 153. Cheoljun Eom, Jong Won Park. 2020. Effects of the fat-tail distribution on the relationship between prospect theory value and expected return. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance* 51, 101052. [Crossref]
- 154. Fausto Panunzi, Nicola Pavoni, Guido Tabellini. 2020. Economic Shocks and Populism: The Political Implications of Reference-Dependent Preferences. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 155. Cédric Gutierrez, Tomasz Obloj, Frank Douglas. 2020. Better to Have Led and Lost than Never to Have Led at All? Lost Leadership and Effort Provision in Dynamic Tournaments. SSRN Electronic Journal 57. . [Crossref]
- 156. Lê Thị Minh Hằng, Hoang Van Hai, Nguyen Truong Son. 2020. The role of reference-dependent preferences in the idiosyncratic volatility puzzle: Evidence from Korea. *Cogent Economics & Finance* 8:1, 1838686. [Crossref]
- 157. Muhammad Hasnain Abbas Naqvi, Yushi Jiang, Miao Miao, Mishal Hasnain Naqvi. 2020. Linking biopsychosocial indicators with financial risk tolerance and satisfaction through macroeconomic literacy: A structural equation modeling approach. *Cogent Economics & Finance* 8:1, 1730079. [Crossref]
- 158. Olivier Arnaud Le Courtois, Xia Xu. 2020. A Complete Ranking of Risky Prospects Consistent with Stochastic Dominance. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 159. Giuseppe Ferro, Tatyana Kovalenko, Didier Sornette. 2020. Estimation and Comparison Between Rank-Dependent Expected Utility, Cumulative Prospect Theory and Quantum Decision Theory. SSRN Electronic Journal 125. [Crossref]
- 160. Stelios Arvanitis, Olivier Scaillet, Nikolas Topaloglou. 2020. Spanning analysis of stock market anomalies under Prospect Stochastic Dominance. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 161. Matti Koivuranta, Marko Korhonen. 2019. Misperception explains favorite-longshot bias: evidence from the Finnish and Swedish harness horse race markets. *Empirical Economics* 57:6, 2149-2160. [Crossref]
- 162. José F. Tudón M.. 2019. Perception, utility, and evolution. *Economic Theory Bulletin* 7:2, 191-208. [Crossref]
- 163. Oliver Herrmann, Richard Jong-A-Pin, Lambert Schoonbeek. 2019. A prospect-theory model of voter turnout. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 168, 362-373. [Crossref]

- 164. Ashish R. Hota, Shreyas Sundaram. 2019. Game-Theoretic Vaccination Against Networked SIS Epidemics and Impacts of Human Decision-Making. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network* Systems 6:4, 1461-1472. [Crossref]
- 165. Yue Guan, Anuradha M. Annaswamy, H. Eric Tseng. Cumulative Prospect Theory Based Dynamic Pricing for Shared Mobility on Demand Services 2239-2244. [Crossref]
- 166. Florian Knobloch, Mark A.J. Huijbregts, Jean-Francois Mercure. 2019. Modelling the effectiveness of climate policies: How important is loss aversion by consumers?. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 116, 109419. [Crossref]
- 167. Miguel Carreras. 2019. 'What do we have to lose?': Local economic decline, prospect theory, and support for Brexit. *Electoral Studies* 62, 102094. [Crossref]
- 168. Jascha-Alexander Koch, Michael Siering. 2019. The recipe of successful crowdfunding campaigns. *Electronic Markets* 29:4, 661-679. [Crossref]
- 169. Wei-Min Ma, Hui Zhang, Neng-Li Wang. 2019. Improving outpatient satisfaction by extending expected waiting time. *BMC Health Services Research* 19:1. . [Crossref]
- 170. Beatrice D'Ippolito, Antonio Messeni Petruzzelli, Umberto Panniello. 2019. Archetypes of incumbents' strategic responses to digital innovation. *Journal of Intellectual Capital* 20:5, 662-679. [Crossref]
- 171. Thomas A. Loughran. 2019. Behavioral criminology and public policy. Criminology & Public Policy 18:4, 737-758. [Crossref]
- 172. Jacqueline N. Zadelaar, Wouter D. Weeda, Lourens J. Waldorp, Anna C.K. Van Duijvenvoorde, Neeltje E. Blankenstein, Hilde M. Huizenga. 2019. Are individual differences quantitative or qualitative? An integrated behavioral and fMRI MIMIC approach. *NeuroImage* 202, 116058. [Crossref]
- 173. Eleanna Galanaki. 2019. Effects of employee benefits on affective and continuance commitment during times of crisis. *International Journal of Manpower* 41:2, 220-238. [Crossref]
- 174. Yinfei Chen, Injazz J. Chen. 2019. Mediated power and sustainable supplier management (SSM). International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management 49:8, 861-878. [Crossref]
- 175. Reto Foellmi, Adrian Jaeggi, Rina Rosenblatt-Wisch. 2019. Loss aversion at the aggregate level across countries and its relation to economic fundamentals. *Journal of Macroeconomics* **61**, 103136. [Crossref]
- 176. Lieven Baele, Joost Driessen, Sebastian Ebert, Juan M Londono, Oliver G Spalt. 2019. Cumulative Prospect Theory, Option Returns, and the Variance Premium. *The Review of Financial Studies* 32:9, 3667-3723. [Crossref]
- 177. Shigeru Asaba, Tetsuo Wada. 2019. The Contact-Hitting R&D Strategy of Family Firms in the Japanese Pharmaceutical Industry. *Family Business Review* **32**:3, 277-295. [Crossref]
- 178. Jinrui Pan, Craig S. Webb, Horst Zank. 2019. Delayed probabilistic risk attitude: a parametric approach. *Theory and Decision* 87:2, 201-232. [Crossref]
- 179. Simon Dietz, Frank Venmans. 2019. The endowment effect, discounting and the environment. *Journal* of Environmental Economics and Management **97**, 67-91. [Crossref]
- 180. Kylie N. Fernandez, Nichole R. Lighthall. 2019. Reward Responsiveness and Inhibition Traits Differentially Predict Economic Biases in Gain and Loss Contexts. *Frontiers in Psychology* 10. . [Crossref]
- 181. Tommy G\u00e4rling, Dawei Fang, Martin Holmen. 2019. Review of behavioral explanations of how rankbased incentives influence risk taking by investment managers in mutual fund companies. *Review of Behavioral Finance* 12:2, 136-150. [Crossref]
- 182. Rosanna Smart, Mark A. R. Kleiman. 2019. Association of Cannabis Legalization and Decriminalization With Arrest Rates of Youths. *JAMA Pediatrics* 173:8, 725. [Crossref]

- 183. Tobias Brünner, Jochen Reiner, Martin Natter, Bernd Skiera. 2019. Prospect theory in a dynamic game: Theory and evidence from online pay-per-bid auctions. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 164, 215-234. [Crossref]
- 184. Corinna Lorenz, Jutta Kray. 2019. Are Mid-Adolescents Prone to Risky Decisions? The Influence of Task Setting and Individual Differences in Temperament. *Frontiers in Psychology* **10**. [Crossref]
- 185. Evan Gilbert, Luke Meiklejohn. 2019. A comparative analysis of risk measures: A portfolio optimisation approach. *Investment Analysts Journal* **48**:3, 223-239. [Crossref]
- 186. Bhavani Shanker Uppari, Sameer Hasija. 2019. Modeling Newsvendor Behavior: A Prospect Theory Approach. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* 21:3, 481-500. [Crossref]
- 187. Andreas Richter, Jochen Ruß, Stefan Schelling. 2019. Insurance customer behavior: Lessons from behavioral economics. *Risk Management and Insurance Review* 22:2, 183-205. [Crossref]
- 188. Mohit Anand, Ruiqing Miao, Madhu Khanna. 2019. Adopting bioenergy crops: Does farmers' attitude toward loss matter?. *Agricultural Economics* **50**:4, 435-450. [Crossref]
- 189. Arjun Chatrath, Rohan A. Christie-David, Hong Miao, Sanjay Ramchander. 2019. Losers and prospectors in the short-term options market. *Journal of Futures Markets* **39**:6, 721-743. [Crossref]
- 190. Katarzyna M. Werner, Horst Zank. 2019. A revealed reference point for prospect theory. *Economic Theory* **67**:4, 731-773. [Crossref]
- 191. Robert S. Nason, Michael Carney, Isabelle Le Breton-Miller, Danny Miller. 2019. Who cares about socioemotional wealth? SEW and rentier perspectives on the one percent wealthiest business households. *Journal of Family Business Strategy* 10:2, 144-158. [Crossref]
- 192. Christine M. Constantinople, Alex T. Piet, Carlos D. Brody. 2019. An Analysis of Decision under Risk in Rats. *Current Biology* 29:12, 2066-2074.e5. [Crossref]
- 193. Yuxi Zhao, Piers Thompson. 2019. Investments in managerial human capital: Explanations from prospect and regulatory focus theories. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship* 37:4, 365-394. [Crossref]
- 194. Giuseppe Ciccarone, Francesco Giuli, Enrico Marchetti. 2019. Macroeconomic equilibrium and nominal price rigidities under imperfect rationality. *Journal of Macroeconomics* 60, 60-78. [Crossref]
- 195. William A.V. Clark, William Lisowski. 2019. Extending the human capital model of migration: The role of risk, place, and social capital in the migration decision. *Population, Space and Place* 25:4, e2225. [Crossref]
- 196. Jannick Töppel, Timm Tränkler. 2019. Modeling energy efficiency insurances and energy performance contracts for a quantitative comparison of risk mitigation potential. *Energy Economics* 80, 842-859. [Crossref]
- 197. Ahmad Naimzada, Nicolò Pecora, Fabio Tramontana. 2019. A cobweb model with elements from prospect theory. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* 29:2, 763-778. [Crossref]
- 198. Zuo Quan Xu, Xun Yu Zhou, Sheng Chao Zhuang. 2019. Optimal insurance under rank-dependent utility and incentive compatibility. *Mathematical Finance* 29:2, 659-692. [Crossref]
- 199. Jeremy Draghi. 2019. Links between evolutionary processes and phenotypic robustness in microbes. Seminars in Cell & Developmental Biology 88, 46-53. [Crossref]
- 200. Sebastian Oelrich. 2019. Making regulation fit by taking irrationality into account: the case of the whistleblower. *Business Research* 12:1, 175-207. [Crossref]
- 201. Tiantian Mao, Fan Yang. 2019. Characterizations of risk aversion in cumulative prospect theory. *Mathematics and Financial Economics* 13:2, 303-328. [Crossref]
- 202. Maximilian Lude, Reinhard Prügl. 2019. Risky Decisions and the Family Firm Bias: An Experimental Study Based on Prospect Theory. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* **43**:2, 386-408. [Crossref]

- 203. Suiwen (Sharon) Zou, James F. Petrick. 2019. Testing the Effect of Price Framing on Nonresidents' Perceptions of Dual Pricing in State Parks: An Application of Prospect Theory. *Leisure Sciences* 120, 1-22. [Crossref]
- 204. Giorgio Consigli, Asmerilda Hitaj, Elisa Mastrogiacomo. 2019. Portfolio choice under cumulative prospect theory: sensitivity analysis and an empirical study. *Computational Management Science* 16:1-2, 129-154. [Crossref]
- 205. Ian M. McDonald. 2019. John Maynard Keynes, Joan Robinson and the prospect theory approach to money wage determination. *Metroeconomica* **70**:1, 45-67. [Crossref]
- 206. Joel Maxcy, Pamela Wicker, Joachim Prinz. 2019. Happiness as a Reward for Torture: Is Participation in a Long-Distance Triathlon a Rational Choice?. *Journal of Sports Economics* 20:2, 177-197. [Crossref]
- 207. Takahiro Kubo, Taro Mieno, Koichi Kuriyama. 2019. Wildlife viewing: The impact of money-back guarantees. *Tourism Management* **70**, 49-55. [Crossref]
- 208. Andre Hofmeyr, Harold Kincaid. 2019. Prospect theory in the wild: how good is the nonexperimental evidence for prospect theory?. *Journal of Economic Methodology* 26:1, 13-31. [Crossref]
- 209. Mercedes Bern-Klug, Jaswinder Singh, Jinyu Liu, Laura Shinkunas. 2019. Prospect Theory Concepts Applied to Family Members of Nursing Home Residents with Cancer: A Good Ending Is a Gain. *Journal of Social Work in End-of-Life & Palliative Care* 15:1, 34-54. [Crossref]
- 210. Zeev Shtudiner, Galit Klein, Moti Zwilling, Jeffrey Kantor. 2019. The value of souvenirs: Endowment effect and religion. *Annals of Tourism Research* 74, 17-32. [Crossref]
- 211. Ashish R. Hota, Shreyas Sundaram. 2019. Game-Theoretic Protection Against Networked SIS Epidemics by Human Decision-Makers. *IFAC-PapersOnLine* **51**:34, 145-150. [Crossref]
- 212. Gerelt Tserenjigmid. 2019. Choosing with the worst in mind: A reference-dependent model. *Journal* of Economic Behavior & Organization 157, 631-652. [Crossref]
- 213. Brendan Markey-Towler. 2019. The New Microeconomics: A Psychological, Institutional, and Evolutionary Paradigm with Neoclassical Economics as a Special Case. *American Journal of Economics* and Sociology 78:1, 95-135. [Crossref]
- 214. Ola Mahmoud. 2019. Investor Psychology and Sustainable Finance. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 215. Kuo-Ping Chang. 2019. Behavioral Economics Versus Traditional Economics: Are They Very Different?. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 216. Thomas E. Lambert. 2019. Rationality and Capitalist Schooling. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 217. Jianbo Luo. 2019. Unemployment and Happiness Adaptation: The Role of the Living Standard. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 218. Olivier l';Haridon, Ferdinand M. Vieider. 2019. All over the map: A worldwide comparison of risk preferences. *Quantitative Economics* 10:1, 185-215. [Crossref]
- 219. Virginia Gianinazzi. 2019. Framing Bias in Mortgage Refinancing Decisions and Monetary Policy Pass-Through. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 220. Alessandro Roncaglia. . [Crossref]
- 221. Neel Ocean, Peter Howley. 2019. Using Prospect Theory to Improve the Design of Agricultural Subsidy Schemes. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 222. Helen X. H. Bao, Joelle Ng. 2019. Tradable Parking Permits as a Transportation Demand Management Strategy: A Behavioural Investigation. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]

- 223. Michael I. C. Nwogugu. Perception-Based Decisions, Strategic Alliances and Optimal Financial Contracting: Auctions, Strategic Alliances and a Critique of Third-Generation Prospect Theory and Related Approaches 263-339. [Crossref]
- 224. Michael I. C. Nwogugu. Some Knowledge-Representation, Group-Decision and Risk-Perception Implications of Board-Governance Models and the Corporations-Model 537-607. [Crossref]
- 225. Peter Jones. 2019. Loss Aversion and Property Tax Avoidance. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 226. José Luis Iparraguirre. Behavioural Economics and Policy 369-385. [Crossref]
- 227. Kazuya FUJITA, Kensuke OKADA. 2019. Precision of the Cumulative Prospect Theory Model for Estimating the Subjective Probability. *Kodo Keiryogaku (The Japanese Journal of Behaviormetrics)* 46:2, 53-71. [Crossref]
- 228. Burçin Güçlü, Miguel Ángel Canela, Inés Alegre. An Exploratory Analysis Using Co-Authorship Network 166-200. [Crossref]
- 229. Helen X. H. Bao, Chunming Meng, Jing Wu. 2019. Reference Dependence, Loss Aversion and Residential Property Development Decisions. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 230. Jessica A. Wachter, Michael J. Kahana. 2019. A Retrieved-Context Theory of Financial Decisions. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 231. Steffen Andersen, Cristian Badarinza, Lu Liu, Julie Marx, Tarun Ramadorai. 2019. Reference Points in the Housing Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 232. Steven J. Kachelmeier, Dan Rimkus. 2019. Does Audit Effort Impede the Willingness to Impose Audit Adjustments?. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 233. Leilei Shi, Bing-Hong Wang, Xinshuai Guo, Honggang Li. 2019. A Price Dynamic Equilibrium Model with Trading Volume Weights Based on a Price-Volume Probability Wave Differential Equation. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 234. Cláudia Seabra, Elisabeth Kastenholz, José Luís Abrantes, Manuel Reis. 2018. Peacefulness at home: impacts on international travel. *International Journal of Tourism Cities* 4:4, 413-428. [Crossref]
- 235. Jinhai Yan, Helen X.H. Bao. 2018. A prospect theory-based analysis of housing satisfaction with relocations: Field evidence from China. *Cities* 83, 193-202. [Crossref]
- 236. A. R. Faizliev, E. V. Korotkovskaya, S. P. Sidorov, F. M. Smolov, A.A. Vlasov. 2018. Utility Maximization for an Investor with Asymmetric Attitude to Gains and Losses over the Mean–Variance Efficient Frontier. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* 1141, 012017. [Crossref]
- 237. Hanno Hildmann. 2018. Designing Behavioural Artificial Intelligence to Record, Assess and Evaluate Human Behaviour. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction* **2**:4, 63. [Crossref]
- 238. Henrik Lando. 2018. Why do business losses cause conflict?. Journal of Strategic Contracting and Negotiation 4:4, 219-232. [Crossref]
- Sumeet Singh, Jonathan Lacotte, Anirudha Majumdar, Marco Pavone. 2018. Risk-sensitive inverse reinforcement learning via semi- and non-parametric methods. *The International Journal of Robotics Research* 37:13-14, 1713-1740. [Crossref]
- 240. Henry Kimani Mburu, Alex P. Tang. 2018. The adoption of voluntary clawback provisions and the broader commitment hypothesis. *Advances in Accounting* **43**, 60-69. [Crossref]
- 241. Sebastian Strunz, Harry Schindler. 2018. Identifying Barriers Toward a Post-growth Economy A Political Economy View. *Ecological Economics* 153, 68-77. [Crossref]
- 242. Konstantinos Georgalos, Ivan Paya, David A. Peel. 2018. On the contribution of the Markowitz model of utility to explain risky choice in experimental research. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 138. [Crossref]

- 243. Maria do Castelo Gouveia, Elisabete Duarte Neves, Luís Cândido Dias, Carlos Henggeler Antunes. 2018. Performance evaluation of Portuguese mutual fund portfolios using the value-based DEA method. *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 69:10, 1628-1639. [Crossref]
- 244. Barbara Vis, Dieuwertje Kuijpers. 2018. Prospect theory and foreign policy decision-making: Underexposed issues, advancements, and ways forward. *Contemporary Security Policy* **39**:4, 575-589. [Crossref]
- 245. Arie Harel, Jack Clark Francis, Giora Harpaz. 2018. Alternative utility functions: review, analysis and comparison. *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting* 51:3, 785-811. [Crossref]
- 246. G. Charles-Cadogan. 2018. Losses loom larger than gains and reference dependent preferences in Bernoulli's utility function. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 154, 220-237. [Crossref]
- 247. Ines Ben Salah Mahdi, Mouna Boujelbène Abbes. 2018. Behavioral explanation for risk taking in Islamic and conventional banks. *Research in International Business and Finance* **45**, 577-587. [Crossref]
- 248. Thomas Köhne, Christoph Brömmelmeyer. 2018. The New Insurance Distribution Regulation in the EU—A Critical Assessment from a Legal and Economic Perspective. *The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance Issues and Practice* 43:4, 704-739. [Crossref]
- 249. Nicholas R. Magliocca, Margaret Walls. 2018. The role of subjective risk perceptions in shaping coastal development dynamics. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* **71**, 1-13. [Crossref]
- 250. Francisco J. Bahamonde-Birke. 2018. Estimating the reference frame: A smooth twice-differentiable utility function for non-compensatory loss-averse decision-making. *Journal of Choice Modelling* 28, 71-81. [Crossref]
- 251. Kui Du, Ye Dai. 2018. The doctrine of the mean: Reference groups and public information systems development. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems* 27:3, 257-273. [Crossref]
- 252. Cheng Jie, Prashanth L. A., Michael Fu, Steve Marcus, Csaba Szepesvari. 2018. Stochastic Optimization in a Cumulative Prospect Theory Framework. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 63:9, 2867-2882. [Crossref]
- 253. Özge Dilaver, Robert Calvert Jump, Paul Levine. 2018. AGENT-BASED MACROECONOMICS AND DYNAMIC STOCHASTIC GENERAL EQUILIBRIUM MODELS: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?. Journal of Economic Surveys 32:4, 1134-1159. [Crossref]
- 254. Xiaotian Liu, Huayue Zhang, Shengmin Zhao. 2018. Can prospect theory explain the disposition effect? An analysis based on value function. *China Finance Review International* 8:3, 235-255. [Crossref]
- 255. Shin-Ming Guo, Tienhua Wu, Yenming J. Chen. 2018. Over- and under-estimation of risks and counteractive adjustment for cold chain operations. *The International Journal of Logistics Management* 29:3, 902-921. [Crossref]
- 256. Richa Pandey, V. Mary Jessica. 2018. Measuring behavioural biases affecting real estate investment decisions in India: using IRT. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis* 11:4, 648-668. [Crossref]
- 257. Micah G. Edelson, Rafael Polania, Christian C. Ruff, Ernst Fehr, Todd A. Hare. 2018. Computational and neurobiological foundations of leadership decisions. *Science* **361**:6401. [Crossref]
- 258. Evanthia K. Zervoudi. 2018. Value Functions for Prospect Theory Investors: An Empirical Evaluation for U.S. Style Portfolios. *Journal of Behavioral Finance* **19**:3, 319–333. [Crossref]
- 259. Martina Björkman Nyqvist, Lucia Corno, Damien de Walque, Jakob Svensson. 2018. Incentivizing Safer Sexual Behavior: Evidence from a Lottery Experiment on HIV Prevention. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 10:3, 287-314. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]
- 260. Mark-Jan Boes, Arjen Siegmann. 2018. Intergenerational risk sharing under loss averse preferences. Journal of Banking & Finance 92, 269-279. [Crossref]

- 261. Nicholas Barberis. 2018. Richard Thaler and the Rise of Behavioral Economics. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 120:3, 661-684. [Crossref]
- 262. Glynn T Tonsor. 2018. Producer Decision Making under Uncertainty: Role of Past Experiences and Question Framing. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **100**:4, 1120-1135. [Crossref]
- 263. Brett Parnell, Merlin Stone, Eleni Aravopoulou. 2018. How leaders manage their business models using information. *The Bottom Line* **31**:2, 150-167. [Crossref]
- 264. Richard H. Thaler. 2018. From Cashews to Nudges: The Evolution of Behavioral Economics. *American Economic Review* 108:6, 1265-1287. [Citation] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]
- 265. Chao Gong, Chunhui Xu, Ji Wang. 2018. An Efficient Adaptive Real Coded Genetic Algorithm to Solve the Portfolio Choice Problem Under Cumulative Prospect Theory. *Computational Economics* 52:1, 227-252. [Crossref]
- 266. Venky Nagar, Madhav V. Rajan, Korok Ray. 2018. An information-based model for the differential treatment of gains and losses. *Review of Accounting Studies* 23:2, 622-653. [Crossref]
- 267. Jörn Obermann, Patrick Velte. 2018. Determinants and consequences of executive compensationrelated shareholder activism and say-on-pay votes: A literature review and research agenda. *Journal of Accounting Literature* 40, 116-151. [Crossref]
- 268. Samuel N. Kirshner, Lusheng Shao. 2018. Internal and external reference effects in a two-tier supply chain. *European Journal of Operational Research* 267:3, 944-957. [Crossref]
- 269. Jobst Heitzig, Wolfram Barfuss, Jonathan Donges. 2018. A Thought Experiment on Sustainable Management of the Earth System. *Sustainability* **10**:6, 1947. [Crossref]
- 270. Murat Cubuktepe, Ufuk Topcu. Verification of Markov Decision Processes with Risk-Sensitive Measures 2371-2377. [Crossref]
- 271. Burak Cem Konduk. 2018. The elephant in the room of mutual forbearance. *Journal of Strategy and Management* 11:2, 257-279. [Crossref]
- 272. Ting Hu, Cynthia M. Gong. 2018. Does reference point matter in the leverage–return relationship? Evidence from the US stock market. *Applied Economics* **50**:21, 2339-2355. [Crossref]
- 273. Ted O'Donoghue, Jason Somerville. 2018. Modeling Risk Aversion in Economics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **32**:2, 91-114. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]
- 274. Orestis Kopsacheilis. 2018. The role of information search and its influence on risk preferences. *Theory and Decision* **84**:3, 311-339. [Crossref]
- 275. Jan-Emmanuel De Neve, George Ward, Femke De Keulenaer, Bert Van Landeghem, Georgios Kavetsos, Michael I. Norton. 2018. The Asymmetric Experience of Positive and Negative Economic Growth: Global Evidence Using Subjective Well-Being Data. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 100:2, 362-375. [Crossref]
- 276. Arifur Rahman, Geoffrey I. Crouch, Jennifer H. Laing. 2018. Tourists' temporal booking decisions: A study of the effect of contextual framing. *Tourism Management* 65, 55-68. [Crossref]
- 277. Alex Rees-Jones. 2018. Quantifying Loss-Averse Tax Manipulation. The Review of Economic Studies 85:2, 1251-1278. [Crossref]
- 278. Leighton Vaughan Williams, Ming-Chien Sung, Peter A. F. Fraser-Mackenzie, John Peirson, Johnnie E. V. Johnson. 2018. Towards an Understanding of the Origins of the Favourite-Longshot Bias: Evidence from Online Poker Markets, a Real-money Natural Laboratory. *Economica* 85:338, 360-382. [Crossref]
- 279. HanNa Lim. Decision-Making under Risk 43-64. [Crossref]
- 280. Hamza Bahaji. 2018. Are employee stock option exercise decisions better explained through the prospect theory?. *Annals of Operations Research* 262:2, 335-359. [Crossref]

- 281. Yuxin Xie, Soosung Hwang, Athanasios A. Pantelous. 2018. Loss aversion around the world: Empirical evidence from pension funds. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 88, 52-62. [Crossref]
- 282. Rosario Macera. 2018. Present or future incentives? On the optimality of fixed wages with moral hazard. Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization 147, 129-144. [Crossref]
- 283. Alex Markle, George Wu, Rebecca White, Aaron Sackett. 2018. Goals as reference points in marathon running: A novel test of reference dependence. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* **56**:1, 19-50. [Crossref]
- 284. Natalie Stoeckl, Christina Hicks, Marina Farr, Daniel Grainger, Michelle Esparon, Joseph Thomas, Silva Larson. 2018. The Crowding Out of Complex Social Goods. *Ecological Economics* 144, 65-72. [Crossref]
- 285. Scott G Wallace, Jordan Etkin. 2018. How Goal Specificity Shapes Motivation: A Reference Points Perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research* 44:5, 1033-1051. [Crossref]
- 286. Peter J. Phillips, Gabriela Pohl. 2018. The Deferral of Attacks: SP/A Theory as a Model of Terrorist Choice when Losses Are Inevitable. *Open Economics* 1:1, 71-85. [Crossref]
- 287. Zhi Zuo, Xiao-Feng Pan. Policy, Environment, and Energy 3720-3733. [Crossref]
- 288. Yefim Shulman. Towards a Broadening of Privacy Decision-Making Models: The Use of Cognitive Architectures 187-204. [Crossref]
- 289. Mariusz Doszyń. Propensity to Risk and the Prospect Theory 47-60. [Crossref]
- 290. Ted O'Donoghue, Charles Sprenger. Reference-Dependent Preferences 1-77. [Crossref]
- 291. Nancy Kim. Framing Effects and Prospect Theory 158-177. [Crossref]
- 292. Michael I. C. Nwogugu. Financial Indices, Joint Ventures and Strategic Alliances Invalidate Cumulative Prospect Theory, Third-Generation Prospect Theory, Related Approaches and Intertemporal Asset Pricing Theory: HCI and Three New Decision Models 515-563. [Crossref]
- 293. Torben Schubert, Elisabeth Baier, Christian Rammer. 2018. Firm capabilities, technological dynamism and the internationalisation of innovation: A behavioural approach. *Journal of International Business Studies* **49**:1, 70-95. [Crossref]
- 294. Ryan O. Murphy, Robert H. W. ten Brincke. 2018. Hierarchical Maximum Likelihood Parameter Estimation for Cumulative Prospect Theory: Improving the Reliability of Individual Risk Parameter Estimates. *Management Science* 64:1, 308-326. [Crossref]
- 295. Nicholas Barberis. 2018. Richard Thaler and the Rise of Behavioral Economics. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 296. Alexander Harin. 2018. Forbidden Zones and Biases for the Expectation: New Mathematical Results for Behavioral and Social Sciences. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 297. Jordan Moore. 2018. Stock Loan Lotteries and Individual Investor Performance. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 298. Cary Frydman, Lawrence J. Jin. 2018. Efficient Coding and Risky Choice. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 299. François Desmoulins-Lebeault, Jean-François Gajewski, Luc Meunier. 2018. What can we learn from neurofinance?. *Finance* **39**:2, 93. [Crossref]
- 300. Ai He, Dashan Huang, Guofu Zhou. 2018. Pricing Error Reversal: A Diagnostic Test of Asset Pricing Models. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 301. Stephen G. Dimmock, Roy R. P. Kouwenberg, Olivia S. Mitchell, Kim Peijnenburg. 2018. Household Portfolio Underdiversification and Probability Weighting: Evidence from the Field. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 302. Jasman Tuyon, Zamri Ahmad. 2018. Psychoanalysis of Investor Irrationality and Dynamism in Stock Market. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Economics* 30:1, 1-31. [Crossref]

- 303. John Robertson. Prospect Theory, Loss Aversion, and the Impact of Social Media and Online Activity: Political Affect and the 2016 American Presidential Elections 63-95. [Crossref]
- 304. Yanlong Song, Ann L. Smiley-Oyen. 2017. Probability differently modulating the effects of reward and punishment on visuomotor adaptation. *Experimental Brain Research* 235:12, 3605-3618. [Crossref]
- 305. Janne Artell, Anni Huhtala. 2017. What Are the Benefits of the Water Framework Directive? Lessons Learned for Policy Design from Preference Revelation. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 68:4, 847-873. [Crossref]
- 306. Ryota Nakamura, Marc Suhrcke, Daniel John Zizzo. 2017. A triple test for behavioral economics models and public health policy. *Theory and Decision* 83:4, 513-533. [Crossref]
- 307. John Talberth, Michael Weisdorf. 2017. Genuine Progress Indicator 2.0: Pilot Accounts for the US, Maryland, and City of Baltimore 2012–2014. *Ecological Economics* 142, 1-11. [Crossref]
- 308. Björn Häckel, Stefan Pfosser, Timm Tränkler. 2017. Explaining the energy efficiency gap Expected Utility Theory versus Cumulative Prospect Theory. *Energy Policy* **111**, 414-426. [Crossref]
- 309. Zheng Fang, Yoko Niimi. 2017. Does everyone exhibit loss aversion? Evidence from a panel quantile regression analysis of subjective well-being in Japan. *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 46, 79-90. [Crossref]
- 310. Douadia Bougherara, Xavier Gassmann, Laurent Piet, Arnaud Reynaud. 2017. Structural estimation of farmers' risk and ambiguity preferences: a field experiment. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 44:5, 782-808. [Crossref]
- 311. Melaku Berhe, Dana Hoag, Girmay Tesfay, Tewodros Tadesse, Shunji Oniki, Masaru Kagatsume, Catherine M. H. Keske. 2017. The effects of adaptation to climate change on income of households in rural Ethiopia. *Pastoralism* 7:1. [Crossref]
- Shinichiro Iwata, Michio Naoi. 2017. The asymmetric housing wealth effect on childbirth. *Review of Economics of the Household* 15:4, 1373-1397. [Crossref]
- 313. Mykel R Taylor, Glynn T Tonsor, Nicholas D Paulson, Brenna Ellison, Jonathan Coppess, Gary D Schnitkey. 2017. Is it Good to Have Options? The 2014 Farm Bill Program Decisions. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 39:4, 533-546. [Crossref]
- 314. Alex Moss, Andrew Clare, Stephen Thomas, James Seaton. 2017. Can sector-specific REIT strategies outperform a diversified benchmark?. *Journal of European Real Estate Research* 10:3, 366-383. [Crossref]
- 315. Yongwu Li, Zuo Quan Xu. 2017. Optimal insurance design with a bonus. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 77, 111-118. [Crossref]
- 316. Metin Sengul, Tomasz Obloj. 2017. Better Safe Than Sorry: Subsidiary Performance Feedback and Internal Governance in Multiunit Firms. *Journal of Management* 43:8, 2526-2554. [Crossref]
- 317. Martin Klein, Marc Deissenroth. 2017. When do households invest in solar photovoltaics? An application of prospect theory. *Energy Policy* **109**, 270-278. [Crossref]
- 318. Tina Saebi, Lasse Lien, Nicolai J. Foss. 2017. What Drives Business Model Adaptation? The Impact of Opportunities, Threats and Strategic Orientation. Long Range Planning 50:5, 567-581. [Crossref]
- 319. Qiqi Cheng, Guibing He. 2017. Deciding for Future Selves Reduces Loss Aversion. Frontiers in Psychology 8. . [Crossref]
- 320. William A. V. Clark, William Lisowski. 2017. Prospect theory and the decision to move or stay. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114:36, E7432-E7440. [Crossref]
- 321. Shidao Geng, Wenli Li, Xiaofei Qu, Lirong Chen. 2017. Design for the pricing strategy of returnfreight insurance based on online product reviews. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications* 25, 16-28. [Crossref]

- 322. Ranoua Bouchouicha, Ferdinand M. Vieider. 2017. Accommodating stake effects under prospect theory. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 55:1, 1-28. [Crossref]
- 323. Katherine Lacasse. 2017. Going with your gut: How William James' theory of emotions brings insights to risk perception and decision making research. *New Ideas in Psychology* **46**, 1-7. [Crossref]
- 324. Helen X.H. Bao, Cynthia Miao Gong. 2017. Reference-dependent analysis of capital structure and REIT performance. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* 69, 38-49. [Crossref]
- 325. Maya Lazar, Amir Levkowitz, Amit Oren, Doron Sonsino. 2017. A note on receptiveness to loss in structured Investment. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* 69, 92-98. [Crossref]
- 326. Baibing Li, David A. Hensher. 2017. Risky weighting in discrete choice. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* **102**, 1-21. [Crossref]
- 327. Guantao Ai, Yuanchang Deng. An overview of prospect theory in travel choice behavior under risk 1128-1133. [Crossref]
- 328. Elizabeth Bruch, Fred Feinberg. 2017. Decision-Making Processes in Social Contexts. *Annual Review* of Sociology 43:1, 207-227. [Crossref]
- 329. David Peón, Manel Antelo, Anxo Calvo-Silvosa. 2017. An inclusive taxonomy of behavioral biases. *European Journal of Government and Economics* 6:1, 24. [Crossref]
- 330. Daniel Osberghaus. 2017. Prospect theory, mitigation and adaptation to climate change. *Journal of Risk Research* 20:7, 909-930. [Crossref]
- 331. Anni Huhtala, Piia Remes. 2017. Quantifying the social costs of nuclear energy: Perceived risk of accident at nuclear power plants. *Energy Policy* **105**, 320-331. [Crossref]
- 332. Ian M. McDonald. 2017. 'We Will End Up Being a Third Rate Economy ... A Banana Republic': How Behavioural Economics Can Improve Macroeconomic Outcomes. *Australian Economic Review* 50:2, 137-151. [Crossref]
- 333. Eric J. Allen, Patricia M. Dechow, Devin G. Pope, George Wu. 2017. Reference-Dependent Preferences: Evidence from Marathon Runners. *Management Science* 63:6, 1657-1672. [Crossref]
- 334. Koen de Koning, Tatiana Filatova, Okmyung Bin. 2017. Bridging the Gap Between Revealed and Stated Preferences in Flood-prone Housing Markets. *Ecological Economics* **136**, 1-13. [Crossref]
- 335. Parasuram Balasubramanian, Victor M. Bennett, Lamar Pierce. 2017. The wages of dishonesty: The supply of cheating under high-powered incentives. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 137, 428-444. [Crossref]
- 336. Jaroslava Hlouskova, Ines Fortin, Panagiotis Tsigaris. 2017. The consumption-investment decision of a prospect theory household: A two-period model. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **70**, 74-89. [Crossref]
- 337. Bruno De Borger, Amihai Glazer. 2017. Support and opposition to a Pigovian tax: Road pricing with reference-dependent preferences. *Journal of Urban Economics* **99**, 31-47. [Crossref]
- 338. Alex Imas, Sally Sadoff, Anya Samek. 2017. Do People Anticipate Loss Aversion?. Management Science 63:5, 1271-1284. [Crossref]
- 339. Sébastien Hélie, Farzin Shamloo, Keisha Novak, Dan Foti. 2017. The roles of valuation and reward processing in cognitive function and psychiatric disorders. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1395:1, 33-48. [Crossref]
- 340. Xiuli Chen, Kieran Mohr, Joseph M. Galea. 2017. Predicting explorative motor learning using decision-making and motor noise. *PLOS Computational Biology* 13:4, e1005503. [Crossref]
- 341. Ekaterina Chernobai, Tarique Hossain. 2017. Determinants of house buyers' expected holding periods in boom and bust markets in California. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis* 10:2, 256-281. [Crossref]

- 342. Amedeo Piolatto, Matthew D. Rablen. 2017. Prospect theory and tax evasion: a reconsideration of the Yitzhaki puzzle. *Theory and Decision* 82:4, 543-565. [Crossref]
- 343. Stefan Schiller. 2017. The Quest for Rationality: Chief Financial Officers' and Accounting Master's Students' Perception of Economic Rationality. *SAGE Open* **7**:2, 215824401770448. [Crossref]
- 344. Viktor Koziuk. 2017. Central Bank Independence and Financial Stability: Orthodox and Heterodox Approaches. *Visnyk of the National Bank of Ukraine* :239, 6-27. [Crossref]
- 345. Satakhun Kosavinta, Donyaprueth Krairit, Do Ba Khang. 2017. Decision making in the predevelopment stage of residential development. *Journal of Property Investment & Finance* 35:2, 160-183. [Crossref]
- 346. Doron Sonsino, Mosi Rosenboim, Tal Shavit. 2017. The valuation "by-tranche" of composite investment instruments. *Theory and Decision* **82**:3, 353-393. [Crossref]
- 347. Han Bleichrodt, Martin Filko, Amit Kothiyal, Peter P. Wakker. 2017. Making Case-Based Decision Theory Directly Observable. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* **9**:1, 123-151. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]
- 348. Zhihua Li, Kirsten I. M. Rohde, Peter P. Wakker. 2017. Improving one's choices by putting oneself in others' shoes An experimental analysis. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 54:1, 1-13. [Crossref]
- 349. Nicholas Rohde, Kam Ki Tang, Lars Osberg, D.S. Prasada Rao. 2017. Is it vulnerability or economic insecurity that matters for health?. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 134, 307-319. [Crossref]
- 350. Huijun Wang, Jinghua Yan, Jianfeng Yu. 2017. Reference-dependent preferences and the risk-return trade-off. *Journal of Financial Economics* 123:2, 395-414. [Crossref]
- 351. Sergei Sidorov, Andrew Khomchenko, Sergei Mironov. Optimal Portfolio Selection for an Investor with Asymmetric Attitude to Gains and Losses 157-169. [Crossref]
- 352. Dorina Palade, Simon Alfano, Dirk Neumann. Say It at the Right Time: Publication Time of Financial News 62-74. [Crossref]
- 353. Hans Rüdiger Pfister, Helmut Jungermann, Katrin Fischer. Entscheiden unter Unsicherheit 169-224. [Crossref]
- 354. Moira Nicolson, Gesche Huebner, David Shipworth. 2017. Are consumers willing to switch to smart time of use electricity tariffs? The importance of loss-aversion and electric vehicle ownership. *Energy Research & Social Science* 23, 82-96. [Crossref]
- 355. Niels Geiger. 2017. The Rise of Behavioral Economics: A Quantitative Assessment. *Social Science History* 41:3, 555-583. [Crossref]
- 356. Jordan Moore. 2017. Stock Loan Lotteries and Individual Investment Performance. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 357. Victor Stango, Joanne Yoong, Jonathan Zinman. 2017. The Quest for Parsimony in Behavioral Economics: New Methods and Evidence on Three Fronts. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 358. In Do Hwang. 2017. Behavioral Aspects of Household Portfolio Choice: Effects of Loss Aversion on Life Insurance Uptake and Savings. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 359. Nikolaos Karampatsas, Soheila Malekpour. 2017. Beyond Market Mood: Stock Sentiment and the Response to Corporate Earnings Announcements. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 360. Jordan Moore. 2017. Stock Loan Lotteries and Individual Investor Performance. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 361. Eric Webb, Qiuping Yu, Kurt Bretthauer. 2017. Linking Delay Announcements, Abandonment, and Staffing: A Behavioral Perspective. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]

- 362. Victor Stango, Joanne Yoong, Jonathan Zinman. 2017. Quicksand or Bedrock for Behavioral Economics? Assessing Foundational Empirical Questions. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 363. Suzanne G.M. Fifield, David G. McMillan, Fiona Jayne McMillan. 2017. Is There a Risk and Return Relation?. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 364. Zane L. Swanson, Richard Alltizer. 2017. A Comparison of the Clean Surplus And Prospect Theory Valuation Models. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 365. Zhaohui Li, Michael Joseph Seiler, Hua Sun. 2017. Prospect Theory, Reverse Disposition Effect and the Housing Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 366. Leilei Shi, Boris Podobnik, Andrea Fenu. 2017. Coherent Preferences and Price Reference Point Jumps in Stock Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
- 367. L'académie royale des sciences de Suède. 2017. Richard H. Thaler. Intégrer économie et psychologie. *Revue française d'économie* XXXII:4, 3. [Crossref]
- 368. Dong Soo Kim, Mingyu Joo, Greg M. Allenby. 2017. An Economic Model Explaining Reference Price Effects. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 369. Arun Muralidhar. 2017. A Very Simple Goals and Risk-Based Asset Pricing Model (or Asset Pricing with Heterogeneous Investors). *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 370. Qiuping Yu, Gad Allon, Achal Bassamboo. 2017. The Reference Effect of Delay Announcements: A Field Experiment. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 371. Tomasz Obloj, Cedric Gutierrez, Frank Douglas. 2017. Better to Have Led and Lost than Never to Have Led at All? Competitive Dethronement, the Endowment Effect, and Risk Taking. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 372. Eliezer M. Fich, Guosong Xu. 2017. Are Market Reactions to M&As Biased by Overextrapolation of Salient News?. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 373. Helen X. H. BAO, Cynthia M. GONG. 2016. ENDOWMENT EFFECT AND HOUSING DECISIONS. International Journal of Strategic Property Management 20:4, 341-353. [Crossref]
- 374. Ryan O. Murphy, Sandra Andraszewicz, Simon D. Knaus. 2016. Real options in the laboratory: An experimental study of sequential investment decisions. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance* 12, 23-39. [Crossref]
- 375. Hang Lu, William F. Siemer, Meghan S. Baumer, Daniel J. Decker, Alexander Gulde. 2016. Effects of Message Framing and Past Experience on Intentions to Prevent Human–Coyote Conflicts. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 21:6, 506-521. [Crossref]
- 376. Eva Bazant, Hally Mahler, Michael Machaku, Ruth Lemwayi, Yusuph Kulindwa, Jackson Gisenge Lija, Baraka Mpora, Denice Ochola, Supriya Sarkar, Emma Williams, Marya Plotkin, James Juma. 2016. A Randomized Evaluation of a Demand Creation Lottery for Voluntary Medical Male Circumcision Among Adults in Tanzania. *JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes* 72:4, S285-S292. [Crossref]
- 377. Yuxin Xie, Athanasios A. Pantelous, Chris Florackis. 2016. Disappointment aversion and the equity premium puzzle: new international evidence. *The European Journal of Finance* 22:12, 1189-1203. [Crossref]
- 378. Stefan Tscharaktschiew. 2016. The private (unnoticed) welfare cost of highway speeding behavior from time saving misperceptions. *Economics of Transportation* **7-8**, 24-37. [Crossref]
- 379. Cary Frydman, Colin F. Camerer. 2016. The Psychology and Neuroscience of Financial Decision Making. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 20:9, 661-675. [Crossref]
- Kerim Keskin. 2016. Equilibrium Notions for Agents with Cumulative Prospect Theory Preferences. Decision Analysis 13:3, 192-208. [Crossref]

- 381. Rinat Avraham, Dina Van Dijk, Tzahit Simon-Tuval. 2016. Regulatory focus and adherence to selfcare behaviors among adults with type 2 diabetes. *Psychology, Health & Medicine* 21:6, 696-706. [Crossref]
- 382. Ashish R. Hota, Siddharth Garg, Shreyas Sundaram. 2016. Fragility of the commons under prospecttheoretic risk attitudes. *Games and Economic Behavior* **98**, 135-164. [Crossref]
- Philip Morrison, William A.V. Clark. 2016. Loss aversion and duration of residence. *Demographic Research* 35, 1079-1100. [Crossref]
- 384. Hubert Dichtl, Wolfgang Drobetz, Lawrence Kryzanowski. 2016. Timing the stock market: Does it really make no sense?. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance* 10, 88-104. [Crossref]
- 385. Daniel F. Stone, Jeremy Arkes. 2016. Reference Points, Prospect Theory, and Momentum on the PGA Tour. *Journal of Sports Economics* 17:5, 453-482. [Crossref]
- 386. . The structure of behavioural economic theories 106-127. [Crossref]
- 387. Berber Kramer. 2016. When expectations become aspirations: reference-dependent preferences and liquidity constraints. *Economic Theory* **61**:4, 685-721. [Crossref]
- 388. Andreas Matzke, Thomas Volling, Thomas S. Spengler. 2016. Upgrade auctions in build-to-order manufacturing with loss-averse customers. *European Journal of Operational Research* 250:2, 470-479. [Crossref]
- 389. Leena Lankoski, N. Craig Smith, Luk Van Wassenhove. 2016. Stakeholder Judgments of Value. Business Ethics Quarterly 26:2, 227-256. [Crossref]
- 390. Arthur Korteweg, Roman Kräussl, Patrick Verwijmeren. 2016. Does it Pay to Invest in Art? A Selection-Corrected Returns Perspective. *Review of Financial Studies* 29:4, 1007-1038. [Crossref]
- 391. Petr Houdek, Petr Koblovský. 2016. Behavioural Finance and Organisations: A Review. Acta Oeconomica Pragensia 24:2, 33-45. [Crossref]
- 392. Adriaan R. Soetevent, Liting Zhou. 2016. Loss Modification Incentives for Insurers Under Expected Utility and Loss Aversion. *De Economist* 164:1, 41-67. [Crossref]
- 393. Jasman Tuyon, Zamri Ahmad. 2016. Behavioural finance perspectives on Malaysian stock market efficiency. *Borsa Istanbul Review* 16:1, 43-61. [Crossref]
- 394. Mohammed Abdellaoui, Han Bleichrodt, Olivier L'Haridon, Dennie van Dolder. 2016. Measuring Loss Aversion under Ambiguity: A Method to Make Prospect Theory Completely Observable. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 52:1, 1-20. [Crossref]
- 395. AMEDEO PIOLATTO, GWENOLA TROTIN. 2016. Optimal Income Tax Enforcement under Prospect Theory. *Journal of Public Economic Theory* 18:1, 29-41. [Crossref]
- 396. Selcen Ozturkcan, Sercan Sengun. Pleasure in Pain: How Accumulation in Gaming Systems Can Lead to Grief 41-55. [Crossref]
- 397. Lenz Belzner, Matthias Hölzl, Nora Koch, Martin Wirsing. Collective Autonomic Systems: Towards Engineering Principles and Their Foundations 180-200. [Crossref]
- 398. Sergiy Verstyuk. 2016. Log, Stock and Two Simple Lotteries. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 399. Stephan MMller. 2016. Decisions Under Uncertainty in Social Contexts. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 400. Peter J. Phillips, Gabriela Pohl. 2016. Tension within Terrorist Groups: The Role of Aspirations in Conflicting Assessments of Identity Definingg Versus Genericc Actions. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 401. Pawee Maryniak. 2016. Ewolucja Teorii UUytecznooci (The Evolution of Utility Theory). SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]

- 402. Brendan MarkeyyTowler. 2016. Economics Cannot Isolate Itself from Political Theory: A Mathematical Demonstration. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 403. Jose Tudon Maldonado. 2016. Perception, Utility and Evolution. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 404. Kolja Johannsen. 2016. Dead Cat Bounce Demand Reversal Following the Bursting of a Bubble. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 405. Maya Lazar, Amir Levkowitz, Amit Oren. 2016. A Note on Receptiveness to Loss in Structured Investment. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 406. Frannois Desmoulins-Lebeault, Luc Meunier, Sima Ohadi. 2016. Market Estimation of a Prospect Theoretic Value Function. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 407. Thomas Köhne. Marketingforschung und Kundenverhalten als Grundlagen des Versicherungsmarketings 75-128. [Crossref]
- 408. Parasuram Balasubramanian, Victor Manuel Bennett, Lamar Pierce. 2016. The Wages of Dishonesty: The Supply of Cheating under High-Powered Incentives. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 409. Craig R. Fox, Carsten Erner, Daniel J. Walters. Decision Under Risk 41-88. [Crossref]
- 410. Gideon Keren, George Wu. A Final Glance Backwards and a Suggestive Glimpse Forwards 973-984. [Crossref]
- 411. Stijn Claessens. 2015. An Overview of Macroprudential Policy Tools. Annual Review of Financial Economics 7:1, 397-422. [Crossref]
- 412. An Chen, Felix Hentschel, Jakob K. Klein. 2015. A utility- and CPT-based comparison of life insurance contracts with guarantees. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 61, 327-339. [Crossref]
- 413. Thomas C. Brown, Mark D. Morrison, Jacob A. Benfield, Gretchen Nurse Rainbolt, Paul A. Bell. 2015. Exchange asymmetry in experimental settings. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 120, 104-116. [Crossref]
- 414. Darren Duxbury. 2015. Behavioral finance: insights from experiments II: biases, moods and emotions. *Review of Behavioral Finance* 7:2, 151-175. [Crossref]
- 415. Carolin Bock, Maximilian Schmidt. 2015. Should I stay, or should I go? How fund dynamics influence venture capital exit decisions. *Review of Financial Economics* 27, 68-82. [Crossref]
- 416. Alan Waring. 2015. Managerial and non-technical factors in the development of human-created disasters: A review and research agenda. *Safety Science* **79**, 254-267. [Crossref]
- 417. Jürgen Vandenbroucke. 2015. A Cumulative Prospect View on Portfolios that Hold Structured Products. *Journal of Behavioral Finance* 16:4, 297-310. [Crossref]
- 418. John Cullis, Philip Jones, Alan Lewis, Cinzia Castiglioni, Edoardo Lozza. 2015. Do poachers make harsh gamekeepers? Attitudes to tax evasion and to benefit fraud. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* 58, 124-131. [Crossref]
- 419. Lei Jin, Tony Tam. 2015. Investigating the effects of temporal and interpersonal relative deprivation on health in China. Social Science & Medicine 143, 26-35. [Crossref]
- 420. Chia-Han Lee. Prospect theoretic user satisfaction in wireless communications networks 195-200. [Crossref]
- 421. Bruce A. Babcock. 2015. Using Cumulative Prospect Theory to Explain Anomalous Crop Insurance Coverage Choice. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **97**:5, 1371-1384. [Crossref]
- 422. Younjun Kim, Catherine L. Kling, Jinhua Zhao. 2015. Understanding Behavioral Explanations of the WTP-WTA Divergence Through a Neoclassical Lens: Implications for Environmental Policy. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 7:1, 169-187. [Crossref]
- 423. Moshe A. Milevsky, Thomas S. Salisbury. 2015. Optimal retirement income tontines. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 64, 91-105. [Crossref]

- 424. Donald X. He, Jason C. Hsu, Neil Rue. 2015. Option-Writing Strategies in a Low-Volatility Framework. *The Journal of Investing* 24:3, 116-128. [Crossref]
- 425. Okuyama Tadahiro, Hayashiyama Yasuhisa. 2015. A model for evaluating recreation benefits with reference dependent preference. *Journal of Economics and International Finance* 7:8, 167-182. [Crossref]
- 426. Ivan Poon. Incorporation of rebound effect into energy efficient measures cost-benefit analysis model 90-94. [Crossref]
- 427. Alexander Koch, Julia Nafziger, Helena Skyt Nielsen. 2015. Behavioral economics of education. Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization 115, 3-17. [Crossref]
- 428. Mei Wang, Helen X.H. Bao, Pin-te Lin. 2015. Behavioural insights into housing relocation decisions: The effects of the Beijing Olympics. *Habitat International* **47**, 20-28. [Crossref]
- 429. Carey K. Morewedge, Colleen E. Giblin. 2015. Explanations of the endowment effect: an integrative review. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 19:6, 339-348. [Crossref]
- 430. Gar W. Lipow. 2015. Shutting Down the Fog Machine. *Review of Radical Political Economics* 47:2, 231-242. [Crossref]
- 431. Kelvin Balcombe, Iain Fraser. 2015. Parametric preference functionals under risk in the gain domain: A Bayesian analysis. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* **50**:2, 161-187. [Crossref]
- 432. Jess H. Chua, James J. Chrisman, Alfredo De Massis. 2015. A Closer Look at Socioemotional Wealth: Its Flows, Stocks, and Prospects for Moving Forward. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 39:2, 173-182. [Crossref]
- 433. Ferdinand M. Vieider, Thorsten Chmura, Tyler Fisher, Takao Kusakawa, Peter Martinsson, Frauke Mattison Thompson, Adewara Sunday. 2015. Within- versus between-country differences in risk attitudes: implications for cultural comparisons. *Theory and Decision* **78**:2, 209-218. [Crossref]
- 434. Amir Heiman, David R. Just, Bruce P. McWilliams, David Zilberman. 2015. A prospect theory approach to assessing changes in parameters of insurance contracts with an application to money-back guarantees. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* **54**, 105-117. [Crossref]
- 435. Assia Liberatore. Decision Making under Uncertainty: A Methodological Note 399-406. [Crossref]
- 436. Ashish R. Hota, Shreyas Sundaram. Interdependent Security Games Under Behavioral Probability Weighting 150-169. [Crossref]
- 437. Jean-Pierre Danthine, John B Donaldson. Making Choices in Risky Situations 55-86. [Crossref]
- 438. Ronald W. McLeod. Operationalizing some System 1 biases 195-207. [Crossref]
- 439. Huan Li, Xianjin Huang, Mei-Po Kwan, Helen X.H. Bao, Steven Jefferson. 2015. Changes in farmers' welfare from land requisition in the process of rapid urbanization. Land Use Policy 42, 635-641. [Crossref]
- 440. Zane L. Swanson. 2015. How Robust Is the Performance of Growth Options of R&D and Capital Expenditures?. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 441. Jared DeLisle, Dean Diavatopoulos, Andy Fodor, Kevin Krieger. 2015. Prospect Theory, Mental Accounting, and Option Prices. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 442. Doron Sonsino, Mosi Rosenboim, Tal Shavit. 2015. The Valuation of Composite Investment Instruments. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 443. Matthew Frank. 2015. Reckoning: A Tractable Alternative to Expected Utility, Explaining Risk Aversion Via Background Risks. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 444. Angie Andrikogiannopoulou, Filippos Papakonstantinou. 2015. State-Dependent Risk Preferences: Evidence from Individual Choices and Applications in Investment Behavior. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]

- 445. Ralph Sttmmer. 2015. Microeconomics and Prospect Theory: Effects of Risk Behavior Onto Quality of Products Traded. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 446. Qiqi Cheng, Guibing HE. 2015. Deciding for Future Self Reduces Loss Aversion. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 447. Thomas Randolph Beard, James A. Leitzel. 2015. Compensated Live Kidney Donations. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 448. Michael C. I. Nwogugu. 2015. The Case of 'ESOARS' and 'Auction-Rate Securities' ('ARS'). SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 449. Daniel F. Stone, Jeremy Arkes. 2015. Reference Points, Prospect Theory and Momentum on the PGA Tour. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 450. Berber Kramer. 2015. When Expectations Become Aspirations: Reference-Dependent Preferences and Liquidity Constraints. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 451. Janne Artell, Anni Huhtala. 2015. What are the Benefits of the Water Framework Directive? Lessons Learned for Policy Design from Preference Revelation. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 452. Michael C. I. Nwogugu. 2015. Stock-Indices and Strategic Alliances as Evidence of the Invalidity of Third-Generation Prospect Theory, Related Approaches and Intertemporal Asset Pricing Theory: Three New Decision Models. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 453. Anni Huhtala, Piia Remes. 2015. Quantifying the Social Costs of Nuclear Energy: Perceived Risk of Accident at Nuclear Power Plant. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 454. Daniel Monroy. 2015. Las Preferencias Dependen Del Punto De Referencia!: Un desaffo al Annlisis Econnmico y coaseanoo del Derecho (Preferences Depend on Reference Points!: A Challenge to Law & Economics And Coasean Theory - In Spanish). SSRN Electronic Journal 27. . [Crossref]
- 455. A. Rashad Abdel-khalik. 2014. Prospect Theory predictions in the field: Risk seekers in settings of weak accounting controls. *Journal of Accounting Literature* 33:1-2, 58-84. [Crossref]
- 456. Lei Feng, Helen X.H. Bao, Yan Jiang. 2014. Land reallocation reform in rural China: A behavioral economics perspective. *Land Use Policy* **41**, 246-259. [Crossref]
- 457. Yang-Yu Liu, Jose C. Nacher, Tomoshiro Ochiai, Mauro Martino, Yaniv Altshuler. 2014. Prospect Theory for Online Financial Trading. *PLoS ONE* **9**:10, e109458. [Crossref]
- 458. Thomas Hutzschenreuter, Ingo Kleindienst, Florian Groene, Alain Verbeke. 2014. Corporate strategic responses to foreign entry: insights from prospect theory. *The Multinational Business Review* 22:3, 294-323. [Crossref]
- Keith M Marzilli Ericson, Andreas Fuster. 2014. The Endowment Effect. Annual Review of Economics 6:1, 555-579. [Crossref]
- 460. Dorian Jullien, Nicolas Vallois. 2014. A probabilistic ghost in the experimental machine. *Journal of Economic Methodology* **21**:3, 232-250. [Crossref]
- 461. Ryota Nakamura, Marc Suhrcke, Daniel John Zizzo. 2014. A Triple Test for Behavioral Economics Models and Public Health Policy. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 462. Lei Feng, Helen X. Bao, Yan Jiang. 2014. Land Reallocation Reform in Rural China: A Behavioral Economics Perspectivee. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 463. Amedeo Piolatto, Matthew D. Rablen. 2014. Prospect Theory and Tax Evasion: A Reconsideration of the Yitzhaki Puzzle. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
- 464. Adriaan R. Soetevent, Liting Zhou. 2014. Loss Modification Incentives for Insurers under Expected Utility and Loss Aversion. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 465. Bhavani Shanker Uppari, Sameer Hasija. 2014. On the Consistency between Prospect Theory and the Newsvendor Pull-to-Center Effect. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]

- 466. Arun Muralidhar. 2014. Modern Prospect Theory: The Missing Link Between Modern Portfolio Theory and Prospect Theory. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 467. Murray Carlson, Ali Lazrak. 2014. Household Wealth and Portfolio Choice When Tail Events Are Salient. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 468. JannEmmanuel De Neve, George W. Ward, Femke De Keulenaer, Bert Van Landeghem, Georgios Kavetsos, Michael I. Norton. 2014. Individual Experience of Positive and Negative Growth is Asymmetric: Global Evidence from Subjective Well-Being Data. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]
- 469. Leilei Shi. 2014. Prospect Theory and Measurement on Crowdds Subjective Behaviors in Trading. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 470. Leilei Shi. 2014. A Unified Theory: Prospect Theory and Market Dynamics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
- 471. Leilei Shi, Yiwen Wang. 2014. Reference Price Updating, Adaptation, and Trading Volume. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 472. Anni Huhtala, Piia Remes. 2014. Dimming Hopes for Nuclear Power: Quantifying the Social Costs of Perceptions of Risks. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 473. Alex Markle, George Wu, Rebecca J. White, Aaron M. Sackett. 2014. Goals as Reference Points in Marathon Running: A Novel Test of Reference Dependence. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 474. Lieven Baele, Joost Driessen, Juan M. Londono, Oliver G. Spalt. 2014. Cumulative Prospect Theory and the Variance Premium. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 475. Stijn Claessens. 2014. An Overview of Macroprudential Policy Tools. *IMF Working Papers* 14:214, 1. [Crossref]
- 476. Candice H. Huynh, Wenting Pan. Utility Functions and Risk Attitudes in Decision Analysis 2616-2629. [Crossref]
- 477. Robert B. Ekelund, Robert D. Tollison. 2013. On "Translating" History: A Rejoinder to Ramsay MacMullen. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 44:2, 245-248. [Crossref]
- 478. Nicholas Barberis. 2013. The Psychology of Tail Events: Progress and Challenges. *American Economic Review* 103:3, 611-616. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]
- 479. Pedro Bordalo,, Nicola Gennaioli,, Andrei Shleifer. 2013. Salience and Asset Prices. *American Economic Review* 103:3, 623-628. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]
- 480. Moshe A. Milevsky, Tom S. Salisbury. 2013. Optimal Retirement Tontines for the 21st Century: With Reference to Mortality Derivatives in 1693. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 481. Hubert Dichtl, Wolfgang Drobetz, Lawrence Kryzanowski. 2013. Stock Market Timing: A Utility-Based Analysis. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 482. Alex Rees-Jones. 2013. Loss Aversion Motivates Tax Sheltering: Evidence from U.S. Tax Returns. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 483. Larry R. Frank, John B. Mitchell, Wade D. Pfau. 2013. Lifetime Expected Income Breakeven Comparison between SPIAs and Managed Portfolios (A Descriptive Work for Data that is in SSRN Abstract http://ssrn.com/abstract=2317857). *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 484. Daniel Osberghaus. 2013. Prospect Theory, Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 485. John B. Davis. 2013. Neuroeconomics and Identity. SSRN Electronic Journal . [Crossref]
- 486. Steve H. Thomas, Andrew D. Clare, Peter N. Smith, James Seaton. 2012. The Trend is Our Friend: Global Asset Allocation Using Trend Following. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]
- 487. Thomas F. Epper, Helga Fehr-Duda. 2012. The Missing Link: Unifying Risk Taking and Time Discounting. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Crossref]

488. Korok Ray, Venky Nagar, Madhav V. Rajan. 2011. An Evolutionary Risk Basis for Differential Treatment of Gains and Losses. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Crossref]