Attitudes to Risk and Roulette

By

Adi Schnytzer and Sara Westreich[1]

October 28, 2010

(*Research and Discussion*, Volume 3, no. 3, pp. 3-20.)

Introduction

Who plays roulette in a casino? Since the expected return to playing is negative, the obvious answer would appear to be risk lovers. But this is not necessarily the case. Thus, a risk averse consumer may decide to set aside a given sum as a conceptual "entrance fee", enter the casino (where there is no entrance fee) and play with his entrance money either until he loses it all or until he decides to leave with money left over or even a profit, whichever occurs first. It has even been suggested by Mobilia (1993) [2], using a rational addiction framework, that such risk averse gamblers may even be addicted. Since Mobilia's model does not involve any explicit considerations of risk, we do not deal with the addiction issue here. In this paper, we present an empirical framework for determining whether or not customers at the roulette wheel are risk averse or risk loving.

We proceed as follows. In section 1, we present a summary of the Aumann-Serrano risk index (Aumann and Serrano (2007), hereafter [AS]), as generalized to allow for the presence of risk lovers by Schnytzer and Westreich (2010) (hereafter [SW]). We show that, for any gamble, whereas riskiness increases for gambles with positive expected return as the amount placed on a given gamble is increased, the opposite is the case for gambles with negative expected return. Since roulette involves binary gambles, we restrict our attention to such gambles exclusively and derive empirically testable hypotheses in section 2. In particular, we show that, all other things being equal, for gambles with a negative expected return, riskiness decreases as the size of the contingent payout increases. On the other hand, riskiness increases if the gamble has a positive expected return. We also prove that, for positive return gambles, riskiness increases, *ceteris paribus*, in the variance of the gamble while the reverse is true for gambles with negative expected returns. In section 3, we apply these results to the specific gambles involved in American roulette and discuss how we might distinguish between casino visitors who are risk

[1] Departments of Economics and Management, respectively, Bar Ilan University, Israel.

[2] The model is based on Gary Becker and Kevin Murphy (1988). For other applications, see Chaloupka (1988, 1990a, 1990b) and Becker, Grossman, and Murphy (1990).

averse and those who are risk loving as well as those who may suffer from gambling addictions of one form or another.

1 The Generalized Aumann and Serrano Index of Riskiness

Following [AS] and [SW] we outline the notion of a *generalized index of inherent riskiness,* with no a priori assumptions about attitudes toward risk. A *utility function* is a strictly monotonic twice continuously differentiable function u defined over the entire line. We normalize u so that

$$u(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u'(0) = 1$$

If u is concave then an agent with a utility function u is risk averse, while if u is convex, then an agent with a utility function u is risk lover.

The following definition is due to Arrow (1965 and 1971) and Pratt (1964):

Definition 1.1 *The coefficient of absolute risk of an agent i with utility function u_i and wealth w is given by:*

$$\rho_i(w) = \rho_i(w, u_i) = -u_i''(w)/u_i'(w)$$

Note $u_i(x)$ is concave in a neighborhood of w if and only if $\rho_i(w) > 0,$ while if it is convex if and only if $\rho_i(w) < 0.$

Definition 1.2 *Call i at least risk averse or no more risk loving than j (written $i \geq j$) if for all levels w_i and w_j of wealth, j accepts at w_j any gamble that i accepts at w_i. Call i more risk averse or less risk loving than j (written $i \rhd j$) if $i \geq j$ and $j \not\geq i$.*[3]

We have:

Corollary 1.3 *Given agents i and j, then*

$$i \geq j \iff r_i(w_i) \geq r_j(w_j)$$

for all w_i and w_j.

Definition 1.4 *An agent is said to have Constant Absolute Risk (CAR) utility function if his*

[3] Note that in [AS] the above is defined for risk averse agents only, and is denoted by "i is at least as risk averse as j".

normalized utility function $u(x)$ *is given by*

$$u_\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} \alpha^{-1}(1-e^{-\alpha x}), & \alpha \neq 0 \\ x & \alpha = 0 \end{cases}$$

If $\alpha > 0$ then the agent is risk-averse with a CARA utility function, while if $\alpha < 0$ then the agent is risk-loving with a CARL - Constant Absolute Risk-Loving - utility function . If $\alpha = 0$ then the agent is risk neutral. The notion of ``CAR" is justified since for any α, the coefficient of absolute risk ρ defined in Def.1.1, satisfies $\rho(w) = \alpha$ for all w, that is, the Arrow-Pratt coefficient is a constant that does not depend on w.

Proposition 1.5 *An agent* i *has CAR utility function if and only if for any gamble* g *and any two wealth levels,* i *either accepts* g *at both wealth levels, or rejects* g *at both wealth levels.*

The next theorem appears in [SW] extending the original idea of [AS]. It verifies the existence of the general index for the following class of gambles. A gamble g is *gameable* if it results in possible losses and possible gains. If g has a continuous distribution function, then it is gameable if it is bounded from above and below, that is, its distribution function is truncated.

Theorem 1.6 [AS,SW] *Let* g *be a gameable gamble and let* α *be the unique nonzero root of the equation*

$$Ee^{-\alpha g} - 1 = 0$$

Then for any wealth, a person with utility function u_α *is indifferent between taking and not taking* g. *In other words, the CAR utility function* u_α *satisfies for all* x,

$$Eu_\alpha(g + x) = u_\alpha(x).$$

Moreover, α *is positive (negative) if and only if Eg is positive (resp. negative).*

Definition 1.7 *Given a gamble* g, *denote the number* α *obtained in Th.1.6 by the upper limit of taking* g.

The notation upper limit is justified by the following:

Theorem 1.8 *Let* α *be the upper limit of taking a gamble* g. *Then:*

1. If $Eg > 0$ *then all CARL accept* g *and a CARA person with a utility function* u_β *accepts* g *if and only if*

$$0 < \beta < \alpha$$

2. If $Eg < 0$ *then all CARA reject* g *and a CARL person with a utility function* u_β *accepts* g *if and only if*

$$\beta < \alpha < 0$$

3. If $E(g) = 0$ *the all CARA people reject* g *while all CARL people accept* g.

We propose here the following general index of inherent riskiness. Given a gamble g and its upper limit α define its index Q(g) by:

$$Q(g) = e^{-\alpha}$$

Th. 1.8 and the fact that Q is a monotonic decreasing function of α, imply that:

Corollary 1.9 An increase in riskiness corresponds to a decrease in the set of constant risk-attitude agents that will accept the gamble.

Caution: The corollary above does not say that constant risk-attitude agents prefer less risky gambles. It says that they are more likely to accept them.

It is straightforward to check the following properties:

Corollary 1.10 *The generalized index* $Q(g)$ *given in (6) satisfies:*

1. $Q(g) > 0$ for all g.
2. If $Eg > 0$ then $Q(g) < 1$ and if $Eg < 0$ then $Q(g) > 1$. When $Eg = 0$ then $Q(g) = 1$.
3. $Q(Ng) = Q(g)^{1/N}$. In particular

$$Q(-g) = Q(g)^{-1}$$

Remark 1.11 *Unlike the case of the [AS]- index, homogeneity of degree* 1 *does not hold. However, when* $E(g) > 0$ *then it is replaced by (increasing) monotonicity. This follows since in this case* $Q(g) < 1$, *hence if* $t < 1$ *then* $Q(tg) = (Q(q))^{1/t} < Q(g)$, *while if* $t > 1$ *then* $(Q(q))^{1/t} > Q(g)$. *This is no longer true for gambles with negative positive return. If* $E(g) < 0$ *then* $Q(g) > 1$ *and Q is monotonically decreasing with respect to multiplication by t. This follows by the same argument as above, with the reverse inequalities.*

Put simply, the remark says that, for a risk averse person, the greater the stake the riskier the gamble, whereas for a risk lover the more money invested in a particular gamble, the less the risk! Following Cor. 1.9, consider the suggested index of riskiness as the opposite to the number of constant risk attitude gamblers who will accept it. Now, the intuition for the risk averse person is straight-forward: placing more money in situation of risk is undesirable since the marginal utility of money is falling and this kind of individual wants to sleep at night. So, as the amount at stake rises, the riskiness rises and there are fewer constant risk attitude risk averse gamblers who will accept it.

For the risk lover, on the other hand, the marginal utility of money is rising. Thus, the more money he stands to win, *ceteris paribus*, the better of he is. Besides which, the risk lover gets utility from the adrenalin rush that accompanies gambling. Accordingly, as the amount waged on a given gamble increases, there will be more constant risk attitude risk loving gamblers who will accept it. In other words, the gamble is less risky.

2 Binary Gambles

In this section we further turn to a discussion of specific properties of the index of inherent risk as it applies to binary gambles. For this case, we prove that our index is a monotonic function of Var(g), which is increasing for gambles with Eg>0 and decreasing otherwise.

Let g be a gamble that results in a gain of M with probability p and a loss of L with probability $q = 1 - p$. We assume M and L are positive real numbers. Note that:

$$Eg = p(M+L) - L \qquad \sigma^2(g) = p(1-p)(M+L)^2 \tag{1}$$

In order to generate the empirically testable hypotheses discussed in the next section, we summarize partial relations between expected utilities, expectations of gambles, chances to win and riskiness. We start with expected utilities of Constant Absolute Risk *(*CAR) utility functions. Consider $Eu_a(g) = Eu_a(L, M, Eg)$ as a function of the independent variables L, M and Eg.

Proposition 2.*1* *Assume g results in a gain of M with probability p and a loss of L otherwise.*

Let $u_\alpha(x) = \alpha^{-1}(1 - e^{-\alpha x})$, $\alpha \neq 0$, be a CAR utility function. Then:

$\alpha > 0$ *implies* $\frac{\partial Eu_a}{\partial M} < 0$ *and* $\alpha < 0$ *implies* $\frac{\partial Eu_a}{\partial M} > 0.$

Proof. By (1) we have

$$p = \frac{Eg + L}{M + L} \ .$$

Hence

$$Eu_\alpha(g) = \alpha^{-1}(1 - pe^{-\alpha M} - (1-p)e^{\alpha L}) = \alpha^{-1}(1 - \frac{Eg + L}{M + L}(e^{-\alpha M} - e^{\alpha L}) - e^{\alpha L})$$

A straightforward computation gives:

$$\frac{\P Eu_a}{\P M} = \frac{e^{-aM}a^{-1}p}{L+M}\left(1+a(L+M)-e^{a(L+M)}\right)$$

We claim that $f(a) = 1+a(L+M)-e^{a(L+M)}$ is negative for all $\alpha \neq 0$. Indeed,

$$f'(\alpha) = L+M-(L+M)e^{\alpha(L+M)} = (L+M)(1-e^{\alpha(L+M)})$$

If $\alpha > 0$ then $f'(\alpha) < 0$ while if $\alpha < 0$ then $f'(\alpha) > 0$. Since $f(0) = f'(0) = 0$, our claim follows. Since $Eu_\alpha(g) = f(\alpha)$ multiplied by a positive value, the desired result follows. QED

We consider now how Q = Q(g) is related to the other variables . Following Th.1.6 we need to solve $Ee^{-\alpha g} - 1 = 0$. That is:

$$0 = pe^{-\alpha M} + qe^{\alpha L} - 1$$

The following is quite intuitive.

Proposition 2.2 *Let g be a gamble that results in a gain M with probability p and a loss L otherwise. Consider Q(g) as a function of the independent variables L, M and Eg. Then we have:*
If $Eg < 0$ then $\frac{\partial Q(g)}{\partial M} < 0$ and if $Eg > 0$ then $\frac{\partial Q(g)}{\partial M} > 0$. Finally, if $Eg = 0$ then $\frac{\partial Q(g)}{\partial M} = 0$.

Proof. Assume $M_1 < M_2$. Let g_1 be the gamble resulting in M_1 and g_2 resulting in M_2. Let α_1 satisfies $Eu_{\alpha_1}(g_1) = 0$. By Th.1.8, if $Eg < 0$ then $\alpha_1 < 0$ and since $M_1 < M_2$ it follows by Prop. 2.1 that $Eu_{\alpha_1}(g_1) < Eu_{\alpha_1}(g_2)$. Hence an agent with utility function u_{α_1} accepts g_2. This implies by Th.1.8 that $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$, where $\alpha_2 < 0$ is the upper limit of taking g_2. Since Q=$e^{-\alpha}$ we have $Q(g_1) > Q(g_2)$ and we are done. When $Eg > 0$ then by $\alpha_1 > 0$, and by Prop. 2.1, $0 = Eu_{\alpha_1}(g_1) > Eu_{\alpha_1}(g_2)$. Hence α_1 rejects g_2 and thus $\alpha_2 < \alpha_1$ and $Q(g_1) < Q(g_2)$. If $Eg = 0$ then Q(g) = 1 and the result follows. QED

For binary gambles, fixing Eg and increasing M, means increasing Vg=Var(g). Thus Prop.2.2 implies that for a given Eg>0, $\frac{\partial Q(g)}{\partial Vg} > 0$ and for a given Eg<0, $\frac{\partial Q(g)}{\partial Vg} < 0$.

Since $\frac{\partial Eu_\alpha}{\partial Q} = \frac{\partial Eu_\alpha}{\partial M}\frac{\partial M}{\partial Q}$ we have by Proposition 2.1 and 2.2 that:

Corollary 2.3 If Eg > 0 then for a risk lover $\frac{\partial Eu_\alpha}{\partial Q} > 0,$ and for a risk averse $\frac{\partial Eu_\alpha}{\partial Q} < 0.$

If Eg < 0 then for a risk lover $\frac{\partial Eu_\alpha}{\partial Q} < 0.$

3 Roulette

The casino game of roulette is probably the simplest practical example of the inherent risk index. In this case, every possible bet is a binary gamble where the return to a losing bet is always the outlay and both the probability of success and the concomitant payout are known. There is thus no uncertainty here, merely risk. Accordingly, roulette also provides the simplest case for a study of attitudes towards risk of casino gamblers. In the absence of data, we are restricted to proving some potentially interesting empirically testable hypotheses. We hope to be able to test these when/if data are forthcoming.

Table I provides complete details for the different kinds of bets available in the American version of the game[4].

Table I: American Roulette

Bet name	Winning spaces	Payout M	Odds p=1/(odds+1)	Expected value (on a $1 bet) = Eg
0	0	35 to 1	37 to 1	−$0.053
00	00	35 to 1	37 to 1	−$0.053
Straight up	Any single number	35 to 1	37 to 1	−$0.053
Row 00	0, 00	17 to 1	18 to 1	−$0.053
Split	any two adjoining numbers vertical or horizontal	17 to 1	18 to 1	−$0.053

[4] In the European version, the setup of the wheel is slightly different.

Trio	0, 1, 2 or 00, 2, 3	11 to 1	11.667 to 1	−$0.053
Street	any three numbers horizontal	11 to 1	11.667 to 1	−$0.053
Corner	any four adjoining numbers in a block	8 to 1	8.5 to 1	−$0.053
Six Line	any six numbers from two horizontal rows	5 to 1	5.33 to 1	−$0.053
1st Column	1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34	2 to 1	2.167 to 1	−$0.053
2nd Column	2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35	2 to 1	2.167 to 1	−$0.053
3rd Column	3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 24, 27, 30, 33, 36	2 to 1	2.167 to 1	−$0.053
1st Dozen	1 through 12	2 to 1	2.167 to 1	−$0.053
2nd Dozen	13 through 24	2 to 1	2.167 to 1	−$0.053
3rd Dozen	25 through 36	2 to 1	2.167 to 1	−$0.053
Odd	1, 3, 5, ..., 35	1 to 1	1.111 to 1	−$0.053
Even	2, 4, 6, ..., 36	1 to 1	1.111 to 1	−$0.053
Red	1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 30, 32, 34, 36	1 to 1	1.111 to 1	−$0.053
Black	2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 35	1 to 1	1.111 to 1	−$0.053
1 to 18	1, 2, 3, ..., 18	1 to 1	1.111 to 1	−$0.053
19 to 36	19, 20, 21, ..., 36	1 to 1	1.111 to 1	−$0.053
Five Number	0, 00, 1, 2, 3	6 to 1	6.6 to 1	−$0.079

The initial bet is returned in addition to the mentioned payout. Note also that 0 and 00 are neither odd nor even in this game.

The crucial questions are: what kinds of gamblers play roulette and can we determine their attitudes to risk based on the kinds of bets they place? Are they all risk-lovers? Or perhaps some of them are people who pay a certain amount of money for fun, this being the amount they are willing to lose when gambling and which they view as an “entrance fee” or some such and then bet as risk-averse gamblers so that any losing bets provide zero utility while winning bets provide positive utility?

Indeed, according to the rational addiction model of Mobilia (1993), as farfetched as it may seem when simple intuition is applied, there may even be risk averse gamblers who are addicted! Thus, a rational risk averse gambler who obtains utility from the act of gambling (as he might from smoking a cigarette) may be shown to be rationally addicted if the quantity of gambling demanded today is a function of gambling in the future. But this requires the very strange assumption that such a gambler obtains actual (as distinct from positive expected) utility from even losing gambles. Finally, it should be stressed that attitude towards risk nowhere comes into the Mobilia model. On the other hand, her utility function adopted permits a far wider interpretation than our own.

Be all of this as it may, it seems clear that in principle there may be both risk lovers and risk averse gamblers to be seen in a casino (and among them will be those who are addicted and those

who are not)[5]. Now, since our utility functions are static, we can shed no light on addiction but we can generate some testable hypotheses regarding attitudes to risk.

The two different points of view yield different ways of calculating the index of riskiness. We can either assume that each gamble yields a possible loss of 1 and a possible gain of M. In this case only risk lovers bet. We will denote this gamble by g_1 and calculate Q_1 according to these assumptions.

To allow for risk averse players, let's assume that the gambler is ready to pay \$0.5 for the fun (his entrance fee). Let now g_2 be the gamble where one can either lose 0.5\$ or win M+0.5. From table I, it follows that the expected return for g_2 is:

$$E(g_2)=E(g_1+0.5)=0.447.$$

Let Q_2 be the corresponding index of risk. Note that the two indexes are different, and by the previous section, one is a monotonic decreasing function of M and the other is increasing.

We suggest that data on bets can shed light on gambler type. If most gamblers are risk averse who willingly spend some money on gambling for fun, they will choose the smaller M. If they are "big" risk lovers they will choose the greater M, but if they are "small" risk lovers they can choose other gambles.

[5] We are unaware of any formal model explaining gambling addiction for risk lovers, but there seems no reason to rule out such a possibility *a priori*.

Table II: Two possible calculations for the Risk Index (Q)

Bet name	Payout = M	$Q_1(g)$	$Q_2(g)$
0	35 to 1	1.003065	0.959765
00	35 to 1	1.003065	0.959765
Straight up	35 to 1	1.003065	0.959765
Row 00	17 to 1	1.006318	0.919738
Split	17 to 1	1.006318	0.919738
Trio	11 to 1	1.00978	0.880007
Street	11 to 1	1.00978	0.880007
Corner	8 to 1	1.013457	0.840812
Six Line	5 to 1	1.02138	0.805094
1st Column	2 to 1	1.05467	0.76214
2nd Column	2 to 1	1.05467	0.76214
3rd Column	2 to 1	1.05467	0.76214
1st Dozen	2 to 1	1.05467	0.76214
2nd Dozen	2 to 1	1.05467	0.76214
3rd Dozen	2 to 1	1.05467	0.76214
Odd	1 to 1	1.111	0.538585
Even	1 to 1	1.111	0.538585
Red	1 to 1	1.111	0.538585
Black	1 to 1	1.111	0.538585
1 to 18	1 to 1	1.111	0.538585
19 to 36	1 to 1	1.111	0.538585
Five Number	6 to 1	1.027295	0.33569

Comments:

1. We have by Prop. 2.2, that $Eg < 0 \Leftrightarrow \frac{\partial Q(g)}{\partial M} < 0$. This is demonstrated in the table in the column of Q_1. The case when Eg > 0 is demonstrated in Q_2.

2. Based upon these observations, we would predict that if most players are "big" risk-lovers then more roulette players choose to play 35 to 1 gambles and fewest would chooses even money gambles. Unfortunately, we have no data that would permit us to test this hypothesis formally, but we have been told that the following holds in casinos operated by HIT in Slovenia and elsewhere in Southern Europe.[6] First, less than 5 percent of all gamblers play 2 to 1 or even money gambles. Second, in most instances there are multiple bets on one spin of the wheel. Thus, most of the gamblers choose 17 to 1 or 35 to 1 gambles, but most of the customers will cover, with such bets, approximately 12 of the available numbers (out of 37) on one roulette spin. Finally, following

[6] This information was provided by Igor Rus of HIT.

winning bets, gamblers will proceed to cover more numbers in a subsequent bet. There is no observable trend following losing bets.

4 Bibliography

Arrow, K. J. (1965), "Aspects of the Theory of Risk-Bearing", Helsinki: Yrjö Jahnssonin Säätiö

Arrow, K. J. (1971), "Essays in the Theory of Risk Bearing", Chicago: Markham Publishing Company.

Aumann, R. J. and R. Serrano (2007), "An Economic Index of Riskiness", Discussion Paper #446, Centre for the Study of Rationality, Jerusalem.

Becker, G. & Murphy, K. (1988), A theory of rational addiction, *Journal of Political Economy*, 96, 675-700.

Becker, G., Grossman, M. & Murphy, K. (1990), "An empirical analysis of cigarette addiction", National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 3322.

Chaloupka, F.J. (1988), "An economic analysis of addictive behavior: The case of cigarette smoking", Ph.D. dissertation, City University of New York.

Chaloupka, F.J. (1990a), "Men, women, and addiction: The case of cigarette smoking", National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 3267.

Chaloupka, F.J. (1990b), "Rational addictive behavior and cigarette smoking", National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 3268.

Mobilia, P. (1993), "Gambling as a rational addiction", *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 9(2), 121-151.

Pratt, J. (1964), "Risk Aversion in the Small and in the Large," *Econometrica*, 32, 122-136.

Schnytzer, A. and S. Westreich (2010), "False Consciousness in Financial Markets: Or is it in Ivory Towers?", *Journal of Gambling Business and Economics*, forthcoming.

Bar-Ilan University
Department of Economics
WORKING PAPERS

1-01 **The Optimal Size for a Minority**

Hillel Rapoport and Avi Weiss, January 2001.

2-01 **An Application of a Switching Regimes Regression to the Study of Urban Structure**

Gershon Alperovich and Joseph Deutsch, January 2001.

3-01 **The Kuznets Curve and the Impact of Various Income Sources on the Link Between Inequality and Development**

Joseph Deutsch and Jacques Silber, February 2001.

4-01 **International Asset Allocation: A New Perspective**

Abraham Lioui and Patrice Poncet, February 2001.

5-01 **מודל המועדון והקהילה החרדית**

יעקב רוזנברג, פברואר 2001.

6-01 **Multi-Generation Model of Immigrant Earnings: Theory and Application**

Gil S. Epstein and Tikva Lecker, February 2001.

7-01 **Shattered Rails, Ruined Credit: Financial Fragility and Railroad Operations in the Great Depression**

Daniel A. Schiffman, February 2001.

8-01 **Cooperation and Competition in a Duopoly R&D Market**

Damiano Bruno Silipo and Avi Weiss, March 2001.

9-01 **A Theory of Immigration Amnesties**

Gil S. Epstein and Avi Weiss, April 2001.

10-01 **Dynamic Asset Pricing With Non-Redundant Forwards**

Abraham Lioui and Patrice Poncet, May 2001.

11-01 **Macroeconomic and Labor Market Impact of Russian Immigration in Israel**

Sarit Cohen and Chang-Tai Hsieh, May 2001.

Electronic versions of the papers are available at
http://www.biu.ac.il/soc/ec/wp/working_papers.html

12-01 **Network Topology and the Efficiency of Equilibrium**

Igal Milchtaich, June 2001.

13-01 **General Equilibrium Pricing of Trading Strategy Risk**

Abraham Lioui and Patrice Poncet, July 2001.

14-01 **Social Conformity and Child Labor**

Shirit Katav-Herz, July 2001.

15-01 **Determinants of Railroad Capital Structure, 1830–1885**

Daniel A. Schiffman, July 2001.

16-01 **Political-Legal Institutions and the Railroad Financing Mix, 1885–1929**

Daniel A. Schiffman, September 2001.

17-01 **Macroeconomic Instability, Migration, and the Option Value of Education**

Eliakim Katz and Hillel Rapoport, October 2001.

18-01 **Property Rights, Theft, and Efficiency: The Biblical Waiver of Fines in the Case of Confessed Theft**

Eliakim Katz and Jacob Rosenberg, November 2001.

19-01 **Ethnic Discrimination and the Migration of Skilled Labor**

Frédéric Docquier and Hillel Rapoport, December 2001.

1-02 **Can Vocational Education Improve the Wages of Minorities and Disadvantaged Groups? The Case of Israel**

Shoshana Neuman and Adrian Ziderman, February 2002.

2-02 **What Can the Price Gap between Branded and Private Label Products Tell Us about Markups?**

Robert Barsky, Mark Bergen, Shantanu Dutta, and Daniel Levy, March 2002.

3-02 **Holiday Price Rigidity and Cost of Price Adjustment**

Daniel Levy, Georg Müller, Shantanu Dutta, and Mark Bergen, March 2002.

4-02 **Computation of Completely Mixed Equilibrium Payoffs**

Igal Milchtaich, March 2002.

5-02 **Coordination and Critical Mass in a Network Market – An Experimental Evaluation**

Amir Etziony and Avi Weiss, March 2002.

6-02 **Inviting Competition to Achieve Critical Mass**

Amir Etziony and Avi Weiss, April 2002.

7-02 **Credibility, Pre-Production and Inviting Competition in a Network Market**

Amir Etziony and Avi Weiss, April 2002.

8-02 **Brain Drain and LDCs' Growth: Winners and Losers**

Michel Beine, Fréderic Docquier, and Hillel Rapoport, April 2002.

9-02 **Heterogeneity in Price Rigidity: Evidence from a Case Study Using Micro-Level Data**

Daniel Levy, Shantanu Dutta, and Mark Bergen, April 2002.

10-02 **Price Flexibility in Channels of Distribution: Evidence from Scanner Data**

Shantanu Dutta, Mark Bergen, and Daniel Levy, April 2002.

11-02 **Acquired Cooperation in Finite-Horizon Dynamic Games**

Igal Milchtaich and Avi Weiss, April 2002.

12-02 **Cointegration in Frequency Domain**

Daniel Levy, May 2002.

13-02 **Which Voting Rules Elicit Informative Voting?**

Ruth Ben-Yashar and Igal Milchtaich, May 2002.

14-02 **Fertility, Non-Altruism and Economic Growth: Industrialization in the Nineteenth Century**

Elise S. Brezis, October 2002.

15-02 **Changes in the Recruitment and Education of the Power Elitesin Twentieth Century Western Democracies**

Elise S. Brezis and François Crouzet, November 2002.

16-02 **On the Typical Spectral Shape of an Economic Variable**

Daniel Levy and Hashem Dezhbakhsh, December 2002.

17-02 **International Evidence on Output Fluctuation and Shock Persistence**

Daniel Levy and Hashem Dezhbakhsh, December 2002.

1-03 **Topological Conditions for Uniqueness of Equilibrium in Networks**

Igal Milchtaich, March 2003.

2-03 **Is the Feldstein-Horioka Puzzle Really a Puzzle?**

Daniel Levy, June 2003.

3-03 **Growth and Convergence across the US: Evidence from County-Level Data**

Matthew Higgins, Daniel Levy, and Andrew Young, June 2003.

4-03 **Economic Growth and Endogenous Intergenerational Altruism**

Hillel Rapoport and Jean-Pierre Vidal, June 2003.

5-03 **Remittances and Inequality: A Dynamic Migration Model**

Frédéric Docquier and Hillel Rapoport, June 2003.

6-03 **Sigma Convergence Versus Beta Convergence: Evidence from U.S. County-Level Data**

Andrew T. Young, Matthew J. Higgins, and Daniel Levy, September 2003.

7-03 **Managerial and Customer Costs of Price Adjustment: Direct Evidence from Industrial Markets**

Mark J. Zbaracki, Mark Ritson, Daniel Levy, Shantanu Dutta, and Mark Bergen, September 2003.

8-03 **First and Second Best Voting Rules in Committees**

Ruth Ben-Yashar and Igal Milchtaich, October 2003.

9-03 **Shattering the Myth of Costless Price Changes: Emerging Perspectives on Dynamic Pricing**

Mark Bergen, Shantanu Dutta, Daniel Levy, Mark Ritson, and Mark J. Zbaracki, November 2003.

1-04 **Heterogeneity in Convergence Rates and Income Determination across U.S. States: Evidence from County-Level Data**

Andrew T. Young, Matthew J. Higgins, and Daniel Levy, January 2004.

2-04 **"The Real Thing:" Nominal Price Rigidity of the Nickel Coke, 1886-1959**

Daniel Levy and Andrew T. Young, February 2004.

3-04 **Network Effects and the Dynamics of Migration and Inequality: Theory and Evidence from Mexico**

David Mckenzie and Hillel Rapoport, March 2004.

4-04 **Migration Selectivity and the Evolution of Spatial Inequality**

Ravi Kanbur and Hillel Rapoport, March 2004.

5-04 **Many Types of Human Capital and Many Roles in U.S. Growth: Evidence from County-Level Educational Attainment Data**

Andrew T. Young, Daniel Levy and Matthew J. Higgins, March 2004.

6-04 **When Little Things Mean a Lot: On the Inefficiency of Item Pricing Laws**

Mark Bergen, Daniel Levy, Sourav Ray, Paul H. Rubin and Benjamin Zeliger, May 2004.

7-04 **Comparative Statics of Altruism and Spite**

Igal Milchtaich, June 2004.

8-04 **Asymmetric Price Adjustment in the Small: An Implication of Rational Inattention**

Daniel Levy, Haipeng (Allan) Chen, Sourav Ray and Mark Bergen, July 2004.

1-05 **Private Label Price Rigidity during Holiday Periods**

Georg Müller, Mark Bergen, Shantanu Dutta and Daniel Levy, March 2005.

2-05 **Asymmetric Wholesale Pricing: Theory and Evidence**

Sourav Ray, Haipeng (Allan) Chen, Mark Bergen and Daniel Levy, March 2005.

3-05 **Beyond the Cost of Price Adjustment: Investments in Pricing Capital**

Mark Zbaracki, Mark Bergen, Shantanu Dutta, Daniel Levy and Mark Ritson, May 2005.

4-05 **Explicit Evidence on an Implicit Contract**

Andrew T. Young and Daniel Levy, June 2005.

5-05 **Popular Perceptions and Political Economy in the Contrived World of Harry Potter**

Avichai Snir and Daniel Levy, September 2005.

6-05 **Growth and Convergence across the US: Evidence from County-Level Data (revised version)**

Matthew J. Higgins, Daniel Levy, and Andrew T. Young , September 2005.

1-06 **Sigma Convergence Versus Beta Convergence: Evidence from U.S. County-Level Data (revised version)**

Andrew T. Young, Matthew J. Higgins, and Daniel Levy, June 2006.

2-06 **Price Rigidity and Flexibility: Recent Theoretical Developments**

Daniel Levy, September 2006.

3-06 **The Anatomy of a Price Cut: Discovering Organizational Sources of the Costs of Price Adjustment**

Mark J. Zbaracki, Mark Bergen, and Daniel Levy, September 2006.

4-06 **Holiday Non-Price Rigidity and Cost of Adjustment**

Georg Müller, Mark Bergen, Shantanu Dutta, and Daniel Levy. September 2006.

2008-01 **Weighted Congestion Games With Separable Preferences**

Igal Milchtaich, October 2008.

2008-02 **Federal, State, and Local Governments: Evaluating their Separate Roles in US Growth**

Andrew T. Young, Daniel Levy, and Matthew J. Higgins, December 2008.

2008-03 **Political Profit and the Invention of Modern Currency**

Dror Goldberg, December 2008.

2008-04 **Static Stability in Games**

Igal Milchtaich, December 2008.

2008-05 **Comparative Statics of Altruism and Spite**

Igal Milchtaich, December 2008.

2008-06 **Abortion and Human Capital Accumulation: A Contribution to the Understanding of the Gender Gap in Education**

Leonid V. Azarnert, December 2008.

2008-07 **Involuntary Integration in Public Education, Fertility and Human Capital**

Leonid V. Azarnert, December 2008.

2009-01 **Inter-Ethnic Redistribution and Human Capital Investments**

Leonid V. Azarnert, January 2009.

2009-02 **Group Specific Public Goods, Orchestration of Interest Groups and Free Riding**

Gil S. Epstein and Yosef Mealem, January 2009.

2009-03 **Holiday Price Rigidity and Cost of Price Adjustment**

Daniel Levy, Haipeng Chen, Georg Müller, Shantanu Dutta, and Mark Bergen, February 2009.

2009-04 **Legal Tender**

Dror Goldberg, April 2009.

2009-05 **The Tax-Foundation Theory of Fiat Money**

Dror Goldberg, April 2009.

2009-06 **The Inventions and Diffusion of Hyperinflatable Currency**

Dror Goldberg, April 2009.

2009-07 **The Rise and Fall of America's First Bank**

Dror Goldberg, April 2009.

2009-08 **Judicial Independence and the Validity of Controverted Elections**

Raphaël Franck, April 2009.

2009-09 **A General Index of Inherent Risk**

Adi Schnytzer and Sara Westreich, April 2009.

2009-10 **Measuring the Extent of Inside Trading in Horse Betting Markets**

Adi Schnytzer, Martien Lamers and Vasiliki Makropoulou, April 2009.

2009-11 **The Impact of Insider Trading on Forecasting in a Bookmakers' Horse Betting Market**

Adi Schnytzer, Martien Lamers and Vasiliki Makropoulou, April 2009.

2009-12 **Foreign Aid, Fertility and Population Growth: Evidence from Africa**

Leonid V. Azarnert, April 2009.

2009-13 **A Reevaluation of the Role of Family in Immigrants' Labor Market Activity: Evidence from a Comparison of Single and Married Immigrants**

Sarit Cohen-Goldner, Chemi Gotlibovski and Nava Kahana, May 2009.

2009-14 **The Efficient and Fair Approval of "Multiple-Cost–Single-Benefit" Projects Under Unilateral Information**

Nava Kahanaa, Yosef Mealem and Shmuel Nitzan, May 2009.

2009-15 **Après nous le Déluge: Fertility and the Intensity of Struggle against Immigration**

Leonid V. Azarnert, June 2009.

2009-16 **Is Specialization Desirable in Committee Decision Making?**

Ruth Ben-Yashar, Winston T.H. Koh and Shmuel Nitzan, June 2009.

2009-17 **Framing-Based Choice: A Model of Decision-Making Under Risk**

Kobi Kriesler and Shmuel Nitzan, June 2009.

2009-18 **Demystifying the 'Metric Approach to Social Compromise with the Unanimity Criterion'**

Shmuel Nitzan, June 2009.

2009-19 **On the Robustness of Brain Gain Estimates**

Michel Beine, Frédéric Docquier and Hillel Rapoport, July 2009.

2009-20 **Wage Mobility in Israel: The Effect of Sectoral Concentration**

Ana Rute Cardoso, Shoshana Neuman and Adrian Ziderman, July 2009.

2009-21 **Intermittent Employment: Work Histories of Israeli Men and Women, 1983–1995**

Shoshana Neuman and Adrian Ziderman, July 2009.

2009-22 **National Aggregates and Individual Disaffiliation: An International Study**

Pablo Brañas-Garza, Teresa García-Muñoz and Shoshana Neuman, July 2009.

2009-23 **The Big Carrot: High-Stakes Incentives Revisited**

Pablo Brañas-Garza, Teresa García-Muñoz and Shoshana Neuman, July 2009.

2009-24 **The Why, When and How of Immigration Amnesties**

Gil S. Epstein and Avi Weiss, September 2009.

2009-25 **Documenting the Brain Drain of «la Crème de la Crème»: Three Case-Studies on International Migration at the Upper Tail of the Education Distribution**

Frédéric Docquier and Hillel Rapoport, October 2009.

2009-26 **Remittances and the Brain Drain Revisited: The Microdata Show That More Educated Migrants Remit More**

Albert Bollard, David McKenzie, Melanie Morten and Hillel Rapoport, October 2009.

2009-27 **Implementability of Correlated and Communication Equilibrium Outcomes in Incomplete Information Games**

Igal Milchtaich, November 2009.

2010-01 **The Ultimatum Game and Expected Utility Maximization – In View of Attachment Theory**

Shaul Almakias and Avi Weiss, January 2010.

2010-02 **A Model of Fault Allocation in Contract Law – Moving From Dividing Liability to Dividing Costs**

Osnat Jacobi and Avi Weiss, January 2010.

2010-03 **Coordination and Critical Mass in a Network Market: An Experimental Investigation**

Bradley J. Ruffle, Avi Weiss and Amir Etziony, February 2010.

2010-04 **Immigration, fertility and human capital: A model of economic decline of the West**

Leonid V. Azarnert, April 2010.

2010-05 **Is Skilled Immigration Always Good for Growth in the Receiving Economy?**

Leonid V. Azarnert, April 2010.

2010-06 **The Effect of Limited Search Ability on the Quality of Competitive Rent-Seeking Clubs**

Shmuel Nitzan and Kobi Kriesler, April 2010.

2010-07 **Condorcet vs. Borda in Light of a Dual Majoritarian Approach**

Eyal Baharad and Shmuel Nitzan, April 2010.

2010-08 **Prize Sharing in Collective Contests**

Shmuel Nitzan and Kaoru Ueda, April 2010.

2010-09 **Network Topology and Equilibrium Existence in Weighted Network Congestion Games**

Igal Milchtaich, May 2010.

2010-10 **The Evolution of Secularization: Cultural Transmission, Religion and Fertility Theory, Simulations and Evidence**

Ronen Bar-El, Teresa García-Muñoz, Shoshana Neuman and Yossef Tobol, June 2010.

2010-11 **The Economics of Collective Brands**

Arthur Fishman, Israel Finkelstein, Avi Simhon and Nira Yacouel, July 2010.

2010-12 **Interactions Between Local and Migrant Workers at the Workplace**

Gil S. Epstein and Yosef Mealem, August 2010.

2010-13 **A Political Economy of the Immigrant Assimilation: Internal Dynamics**

Gil S. Epstein and Ira N. Gang, August 2010.

2010-14 **Attitudes to Risk and Roulette**

Adi Schnytzer and Sara Westreich, August 2010.

2010-15 **Life Satisfaction and Income Inequality**

Paolo Verme, August 2010.

2010-16 **The Poverty Reduction Capacity of Private and Public Transfers in Transition**

Paolo Verme, August 2010.

2010-17 **Migration and Culture**

Gil S. Epstein and Ira N. Gang, August 2010.

2010-18 **Political Culture and Discrimination in Contests**

Gil S. Epstein, Yosef Mealem and Shmuel Nitzan, October 2010.

2010-19 **Governing Interest Groups and Rent Dissipation**

Gil S. Epstein and Yosef Mealem, November 2010.

2010-20 **Beyond Condorcet: Optimal Aggregation Rules Using Voting Records**

Eyal Baharad, Jacob Goldberger, Moshe Koppel and Shmuel Nitzan, December 2010.

2010-21 **Price Points and Price Rigidity**

Daniel Levy, Dongwon Lee, Haipeng (Allan) Chen, Robert J. Kauffman and Mark Bergen, December 2010.

2010-22 **Price Setting and Price Adjustment in Some European Union Countries: Introduction to the Special Issue**

Daniel Levy and Frank Smets, December 2010.

2011-01 **Business as Usual: A Consumer Search Theory of Sticky Prices and Asymmetric Price Adjustment**

Luís Cabral and Arthur Fishman, January 2011.

2011-02 **Emigration and democracy**

Frédéric Docquier, Elisabetta Lodigiani, Hillel Rapoport and Maurice Schiff, January 2011.

2011-03 **Shrinking Goods and Sticky Prices: Theory and Evidence**

Avichai Snir and Daniel Levy, March 2011.

2011-04 **Search Costs and Risky Investment in Quality**

Arthur Fishman and Nadav Levy, March 2011.

2011-05 **To What Extent do Investors in a Financial Market Anchor Their Judgments? Evidence from the Hong Kong Horserace Betting Market**

Johnnie E.V. Johnson, Shuang Liu and Adi Schnytzer, March 2011.

2011-06 **Attitudes to Risk and Roulette**

Adi Schnytzer and Sara Westreich, March 2011.

2011-07 **False Consciousness in Financial Markets: Or is it in Ivory Towers?**

Adi Schnytzer and Sara Westreich, March 2011.

2011-08 **Herding in Imperfect Betting Markets with Inside Traders**

Adi Schnytzer and Avichai Snir, March 2011.

2011-09 **Painful Regret and Elation at the Track**

Adi Schnytzer and Barbara Luppi, March 2011.

2011-10 **The Regression Tournament: A Novel Approach to Prediction Model Assessment**

Adi Schnytzer and Janez Šušteršič, March 2011.

2011-11 **Shorting the Bear: A test of anecdotal evidence of insider trading in early stages of the sub-prime market crisis**

Les Coleman and Adi Schnytzer, March 2011.

2011-12 **SP Betting as a Self-Enforcing Implicit Cartel**

Adi Schnytzer and Avichai Snir, March 2011.

2011-13 **Testing for Home Team and Favorite Biases in the Australian Rules Football Fixed Odds and Point Spread Betting Markets**

Adi Schnytzer and Guy Weinberg, March 2011.

2011-14 **The Impact of Insider Trading on Forecasting in a Bookmakers' Horse Betting Market**

Adi Schnytzer, Martien Lamers and Vasiliki Makropoulou, March 2011.

2011-15 **The Prediction Market for the Australian Football League**

Adi Schnytzer, March 2011.

2011-16 **Information and Attitudes to Risk at the Track**

Adi Schnytzer and Sara Westreich, March 2011.

2011-17 **Explicit Evidence on an Implicit Contract**

Andrew T. Young and Daniel Levy, March 2011.

2011-18 **Globalization, Brain Drain and Development**

Frédéric Docquier and Hillel Rapoport, March 2011.