



The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

Papers downloaded from AgEcon Search may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.

Does aversion to the sucker's payoff matter in public goods games?

Douadia BOUGHERARA, Sandrine COSTA, Gilles GROLLEAU, Lisette IBANEZ

Working Paper SMART – LEREKO N°09-08

March 2009

Does aversion to the sucker's payoff matter in public goods games?

Douadia BOUGHERARA

INRA, UMR1302 SMART, F-35000 Rennes, France

Agrocampus Ouest, UMR1302 SMART, F-35000 Rennes, France

Sandrine COSTA

AgroParisTech, Engref, Laboratoire d'Economie Forestière, F-54000 Nancy, France

INRA, UMR 356 Economie Forestière, F-54000 Nancy, France

Gilles GROLLEAU

Montpellier SupAgro, UMR1135 LAMETA, F-34000 Montpellier, France

Lisette IBANEZ

INRA, UMR 356 Economie Forestière, F-54000 Nancy, France

AgroParisTech, Engref, Laboratoire d'Economie Forestière, F-54000 Nancy, France

Auteur pour la correspondance / Corresponding author

Douadia BOUGHERARA

INRA, UMR SMART

4 allée Adolphe Bobierre, CS 61103

35011 Rennes cedex, France

Email: Douadia.Bougherara@rennes.inra.fr

Téléphone / Phone: +33 (0)2 23 48 56 03

Fax: +33 (0)2 23 48 53 80

Does aversion to the sucker's payoff matter in public goods games?

Abstract

A usual explanation to low levels of contribution to public goods is the fear of getting the sucker's payoff (cooperation by the participant and defection by the other players). In order to disentangle the effect of this fear from other motives, we design a public good game where people have an assurance against getting the sucker's payoff. We show that contributions to the public good under this 'protective' design are significantly higher and interact with expectations on other individuals' contribution to the public good. Some research extensions are suggested.

Keywords: experiments, public good, sucker's payoff, assurance

JEL classifications: C72, C91, H41

Mise en évidence du problème d'assurance dans les contributions volontaires aux biens publics

Résumé

Une des raisons à la faible contribution volontaire aux biens publics est l'aversion au sucker's payoff (coopération individuelle quand les autres font défection). Afin de distinguer l'effet de cette aversion d'autres causes, nous réalisons une expérience de contribution à un bien public dans laquelle les joueurs ont une assurance contre le risque de sucker's payoff. Les résultats montrent que l'assurance augmente les contributions de manière directe mais également de manière indirecte à travers les anticipations des individus sur les contributions des autres.

Mots-clefs : économie expérimentale, bien public, sucker's payoff, assurance

Classifications JEL : C72, C91, H41

Does aversion to the sucker's payoff really matter in public goods games?

1. Introduction and motivation

A frequent explanation of low levels of contributions in public good games is the individual fear of getting the so-called sucker's payoff or outcome, that occurs when the individual contributes while the other player defects. The aversion to the sucker's payoff has been notably introduced in the analysis of public goods with threshold effects. In this case, the agent does not contribute for the production of a public good because he fears that the good will not be produced because too many other players will defect. Given that the production of the public good requires a minimum level of contributions, if the contributions are insufficient, the good will not be produced and the individual's contribution will feel he squandered his contribution (Sen, 1967; Runge, 1984; Schmidtz, 1991; Wiener and Doescher, 1991).

Even if the outcomes seem similar between free riding and sucker's payoff aversion –that is reduced contributions to public goods– the drivers are different. Indeed, free riding behavior is an opportunistic behavior where the individual seeks to consume more than his fair share of a public resource while the sucker's payoff behavior is *a priori* non-opportunistic and results from concerns regarding others' behaviors. While this aversion is exacerbated in the case of public goods with threshold effects, we contend that it remains an impediment to higher contributions, even when there is no threshold effect. In a survey, Rapoport and Chammah (1965) showed that cooperation rates in prisoner's dilemmas increase when the 'sucker' payoff decreases. The 'strong [emphasis added] desire to avoid being a sucker' is supported by an empirical regularity that 'when a manipulation (...) has the effect of increasing the likelihood that the group's goal will be achieved, subjects are more likely to cooperate' (Wiener and Doescher, 1991; see also Taschian et al., 1984). Using experimental games, Fehr and Gächter (2000) demonstrate that people are willing to punish free-riding –even if it is costly for them– in order to avoid getting the sucker's outcome.

Rather than advocating for assurance schemes or contracts from a theoretical viewpoint (e.g., Schmidtz, 1991), we question their effectiveness to improve the funding of public goods. In order to disentangle the effect of the sucker's payoff aversion from other factors on the level of contributions, we design a public good game where participants are partially insured against defection by other players. The contribution level to public goods when a partial

assurance mechanism is implemented has not been investigated in the literature. In other words, our paper answers to the following question: does the provision of an assurance mechanism lead to higher levels of contribution to public goods and to what extent? We report two main results. First, we corroborate that aversion to the sucker's payoff matters in overall contribution to public goods and the implementation of an assurance mechanism has a positive impact on the individual's contribution. Second, the assurance mechanism also affects the individual's expectations regarding the contributions of other participants. As all other agents also benefit from the same assurance mechanism, their incentive to defect is equally reduced. This effect simultaneously (i) reinforces the positive effect of the assurance mechanism at the individual's level as the probability to end up with the sucker's payoff is reduced, *ceteris paribus* but (ii) also decreases the overall individual's contribution because he expects that given that other players will contribute more, he can contribute less. Ultimately, the overall effect of implementing an assurance mechanism on the individual's contribution remains positive.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the experiment and stipulates the theoretical predictions. Section 3 presents and discusses the results. Section 4 concludes and provides some research extensions.

2. Experimental design and implementation

In this section we present the experimental design and the theoretical predictions given our treatments and our choice of parameters for the experiment.

2.1 Basic design

We use two treatments namely the *Reference* treatment that corresponds to a standard public good game and the *Assurance* treatment where we provide subjects with an insurance against the risk of getting the sucker's payoff. In the *Reference* treatment, subjects are endowed with 20 tokens they allocate between a private investment which earns one euro per token and a public investment which earns 0.4 euros per token as in any standard public good experiment. Given other players' contribution c_{-i} , player i chooses the level of contribution c_i that maximizes the following payoff function:

$$u(c_i, c_{-i}) = 20 - c_i + 0.4 \sum_{k=1}^n c_k = 20 - 0.6c_i + 0.4c_{-i}$$

In the *Reference* treatment, the Nash equilibrium is to contribute nothing and the social optimum to contribute all the endowment. The reason for low contributions may lie in free riding behavior but also in the aversion to the sucker payoff. To distinguish these effects, we design a second treatment.

In the *Assurance* treatment, subjects have the same payoff function as in the *Reference* treatment except that another payoff function (alternative payoff) substitutes to the standard payoff if the contribution of the other players in the group is too low. Given other players' contribution c_{-i} , player i chooses the level of contribution c_i that maximizes the following payoff function:


$$v(c_i, c_{-i}) = \text{Max} [(20 - 0.6c_i + 0.4c_{-i}); (20 - 0.3c_i)]$$

The Nash equilibrium of this game is still to contribute nothing and the social optimum to contribute all. However, the worst payoff for player i that is to be the only one to contribute ("sucker's payoff") is now relatively better, $v(c_i, 0) = 20 - 0.3c_i$. In the *Reference* treatment, this worst payoff is $u(c_i, 0) = 20 - 0.6c_i$.

2.2. Predictions

Figure 1 displays (i) in plain lines, player i 's payoff as a function of his own contribution and depending on the contribution of the three other players and (ii) in dotted lines, the player i 's alternative payoff as a function of his own contribution.

Figure 1: Player i 's payoff as a function of his own contribution in the *Reference* treatment (with increasing levels of contribution of the three other players – plain lines) and in the alternative payment scheme (dotted line)



First, notice that all the payoffs functions in the *Reference* treatment have the same slope (-0.6) and are upward shifted with an increase of the other players' contributions. Second, notice that the alternative payoff scheme has a negative lower slope of -0.3 and is independent of the other players' contribution. In other words, it constitutes a partial and imperfect assurance mechanism against non or too weak contributions by other players. Third, in the *Reference* treatment, we clearly see the Nash equilibrium for player i : whatever the contribution of the other players, payoff is maximized for a zero individual contribution.

Several cases appear revealing player i 's strategy in the *Assurance* treatment as compared to the *Reference* treatment:

(i) When $c_{-i} = 0$, the alternative payoff is always higher than the *Reference* payoff. If player i has an aversion to the sucker payoff, then contributions should be higher in the *Assurance* treatment as compared to the *Reference* treatment.

(ii) When $c_{-i} \geq 15$, the payoff of player i in the *Reference* treatment is always higher than the alternative payoff. Thus, whatever the contribution of the other players, player i should display the same type of strategy in the *Assurance* and *Reference* treatments.

(iii) When $0 < c_{-i} < 15$, the lines representing the *Reference* payoff and the alternative payoff cross each other. If player i is a relatively big contributor to the public good ($c_i > 4/3c_{-i}$), then the *Assurance* treatment provides higher payoffs than the *Reference* treatment. However, if player i is a relatively small contributor ($c_i \leq 4/3c_{-i}$), the *Assurance* treatment is equivalent to the *Reference* treatment. In a pure ‘homo economicus’ model, the *Assurance* mechanism should play no role even when $0 < c_{-i} < 15$. Non contribution remains the dominant strategy. However, with other models of behavior where human beings are not ‘pure egoists’ (e.g., Croson, 2007), the *Assurance* mechanism will play a role. What behavior can we expect? By providing an assurance against the sucker payoff to all participants, the *Assurance* mechanism leads the individual to anticipate that others will contribute more. This anticipation can exert an influence in two opposite ways. On the one hand, if the individual exhibits reciprocal preferences, he will contribute more to match the higher contributions of other participants. On the other hand, if the individual exhibits altruistic preference that can be crowded out by expectations that other participants will contribute at higher levels, he will decrease his own contribution. In sum, in addition to the direct effect of the *Assurance* mechanism on the individual i , there is also an indeterminate indirect effect through the individual’ expectations on the contribution levels of other participants.

3. Experimental results

We first present the sample and the sessions, then some summary statistics and finally the econometric results.

3.1. Sample and sessions


The experiment has been performed at the ENGREF (Nancy, France) and gathered a sample of 64 students. Subjects were randomly distributed among groups of four players. In each session, there were 4 groups. There were two sessions per treatment (Table 1).

Table 1: Organized sessions

Session	Treatment	Number of groups	Number of participants
1	Reference	4	16
2	Reference	4	16
3	Assurance	4	16
4	Assurance	4	16

3.2. Sample statistics

The average group contribution is 22.625 tokens (standard deviation: 18.226) for the *Reference* treatment and 27.863 (standard deviation: 15.532) for the *Assurance* treatment. Figure 2 gives a box plot representation of the average group contribution over the periods and reveals a higher median for the groups in the *Assurance* treatment. A two-sample Wilcoxon rank-sum test is performed to test for a difference of distribution of group contributions between the two treatments. The results suggests group contributions were higher in the *Assurance* treatment at a 1% significance level ($z = -6.258$).

Figure 2: Box plot of average group contribution as a function of the treatment

The statistical analysis does not take into account the panel structure of the data. We take it into account in the econometric analysis.

3.3. Econometric results

Our data displays a panel structure and we are interested in time-invariant variables such as the treatment. The use of a random effect model that includes dummy variables for groups shows there is no individual specific effect. Thus, we use an ordinary least square model.

$$c_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Assurance + \alpha_2 E(c_{-i}) + \alpha_3 Period + \sum_{k \neq 1} \alpha_{4k} Group_k + e_i$$

The dependent variable is an individual i 's contribution to the public good (c_i). Independent variables are the treatment dummy variable (*Assurance*) equal to one if the treatment is the *Assurance* treatment, an individual i 's expectations on what the other three individuals in his group will contribute in the same period t ($E(c_{-i})$), the period number (*Period*), and an indicator variable for each group minus one (*Group*).

Individual i 's expectations on others' behavior is unobservable. Thus, we used three proxies for the variable $E(c_{-i})$ (as in Cason and Gangadarhan, 2002 or in Croson, 2007). We consider that player i updates his beliefs on others' behavior on a period by period basis. In the actual computation method, we simply use the actual contribution of other players in the group as a proxy for individual i 's expectations. In the myopic computation method, player i takes account only of the last period without considering the preceding periods. In the non-myopic computation method, player i updates his beliefs in period (N+1) by a weighted mean where the behavior of others in period (N-1) is projected on periods 1 to (N-2). The three computation methods yield the same results. In the article, we display only the actual computation method. Table 2 presents summary statistics for the dependent and independent variables.

Table 2: Description and statistics of variables used in the regression analysis

Variable	Description	#Obs.	Mean (SD)
c_i	Individual i 's contribution to the public good	1280	6.311 (6.732)
<i>Assurance</i>	Dummy (=1 if <i>Assurance</i> treatment and 0 otherwise)	1280	0.500 (0.500)
$E(c_{-i})$	Individual i 's expectations on what the other three individuals in his group will contribute	1280	18.933 (13.856)

The econometric results for all individuals are presented in Table 3. In line with the predictions in section 2.2., we have introduced an interaction effect between the treatment and the expectations.

Table 3: OLS regression of individual i 's contribution to the public good for all individuals

	Coefficient	SD	P> t
<i>Assurance</i>	2.160	0.949	0.023
<i>Expectations</i>	-0.136	0.028	0.000
<i>Assurance X Expectations</i>	0.068	0.032	0.034
<i>Period</i>	-0.401	0.033	0.000
<i>Constant</i>	6.905	0.776	0.000
<i>(Dummies for group not reported here)</i>			
<i>Nb obs.</i>	1280		
<i>Adj-R2</i>	0.2701		

From Table 3, we see that the *Period* has always a negative effect on individual contributions. It is a common result in experimental data. The data analysis shows a positive effect of the principal effect of *Assurance* treatment. The alternative payoff provides participants with an assurance against the risk of getting the sucker's payoff. Individuals are averse to the sucker's payoff. The principal effect of expectations is negative, although small. According to the analysis performed by Croson (2007), this negative correlation associated with positive levels of contributions reveals altruism on the part of participants. There is a crowding out effect. When participants expect high contributions from others in the group, they will decrease their contribution to the public good. Given such behavioral patterns, we predicted an increased negative effect of expectations in the *Assurance* treatment. However, the interaction effect between the *Assurance* treatment and the expectations is positive, although small. When the treatment has an assurance device against the sucker payoff, higher expectations will lead to higher contributions.

4. Conclusion

We examined the effect of the aversion to the sucker's payoff on contribution to public goods, using experimental games. Our results confirm that the aversion to the sucker's payoff plays a significant role in explaining contribution to public goods. Implementing an assurance mechanism plays a direct positive role on the individual's contribution and a positive indirect role through the individual's expectations on other's contribution. When the expected cooperation rate is relatively high, the assurance scheme reinforces the positive role of expectations.

Our study has limitations that give room for several extensions. For example, our assurance mechanism was partial and we do not investigate how different levels of assurance (from no assurance to full assurance) can impact on overall contribution to public goods with respect to the anticipated cooperation rate. An additional extension relates to the effect of heterogeneous agents (e.g. big and small contributors to public goods) on the functioning of assurance schemes. Moreover, in real life, assurance mechanisms can correspond to various devices that are likely to impact differently on contributions. We contend that people may, regardless from the end-outcome, extract 'procedural' utility from the way the assurance scheme is functioning. For instance, the common knowledge of the presence of a sufficient portion of individuals willing to contribute to the public goods, regardless of others' contributions in the population can provide a natural 'assurance mechanism' preventing to some extent the aversion to the sucker's payoff in a different way when compared to a formal contract reimbursing people in case of insufficient overall contributions.

References

Cason, T., Gangadharan, L. (2002). Environmental labeling and incomplete consumer information in laboratory markets. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 43(1): 113-134.

Croson, R. (2007). Theories of commitment, altruism and reciprocity: evidence from linear public goods games. *Economic Inquiry*, 45(2): 199-216.

Fehr, E., Gachter, S. (2000). Cooperation and punishment in public goods experiments. *American Economic Review*, 90(4): 980-994.

Rapoport, A., Chammah, A.M. (1965). *Prisoner's Dilemma: A Study in Conflict and Cooperation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Runge, C.F. (1984). Institutions and the free rider: the assurance problem in collective action. *The Journal of Politics*, 46: 154-181.

Schmidtz, D. (1991). *The Limits of Government, An Essay on the Public Goods Argument*. Westview Press.

Sen, A.K. (1967). Isolation, assurance and the social rate of discount. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 81: 112-124.

Taschian, A., Slama, M., Taschian, R. (1984). Measuring attitudes toward energy conservation: cynicism, belief in material growth, and faith in technology. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 3: 134-148.

Wiener, J.L., Doescher, T.A. (1991). A framework for promoting cooperation. *Journal of Marketing*, 55(2): 38-47.

Les Working Papers SMART – LEREKO sont produits par l'UMR SMART et l'UR LEREKO

• **UMR SMART**

L'Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR 1302) *Structures et Marchés Agricoles, Ressources et Territoires* comprend l'unité de recherche d'Economie et Sociologie Rurales de l'INRA de Rennes et le département d'Economie Rurale et Gestion d'Agrocampus Ouest.

Adresse :

UMR SMART - INRA, 4 allée Bobierre, CS 61103, 35011 Rennes cedex
UMR SMART - Agrocampus, 65 rue de Saint Brieuc, CS 84215, 35042 Rennes cedex
<http://www.rennes.inra.fr/smart>

• **LEREKO**

Unité de Recherche *Laboratoire d'Etudes et de Recherches en Economie*

Adresse :

LEREKO, INRA, Rue de la Géraudière, BP 71627 44316 Nantes Cedex 03
http://www.nantes.inra.fr/le_centre_inra_angers_nantes/inra_angers_nantes_le_site_de_nantes/etudes_et_recherches_economiques_lereko

Liste complète des Working Papers SMART – LEREKO :

http://www.rennes.inra.fr/smart/publications/working_papers

The Working Papers SMART – LEREKO are produced by UMR SMART and UR LEREKO

• **UMR SMART**

The « Mixed Unit of Research » (UMR1302) *Structures and Markets in Agriculture, Resources and Territories*, is composed of the research unit of Rural Economics and Sociology of INRA Rennes and of the Department of Rural Economics and Management of Agrocampus Ouest.

Address:

UMR SMART - INRA, 4 allée Bobierre, CS 61103, 35011 Rennes cedex, France
UMR SMART - Agrocampus, 65 rue de Saint Brieuc, CS 84215, 35042 Rennes cedex, France
http://www.rennes.inra.fr/smart_eng/

• **LEREKO**

Research Unit *Economic Studies and Research Lab*

Address:

LEREKO, INRA, Rue de la Géraudière, BP 71627 44316 Nantes Cedex 03, France
http://www.nantes.inra.fr/nantes_eng/le_centre_inra_angers_nantes/inra_angers_nantes_le_site_de_nantes/es_unites/etudes_et_recherches_economiques_lereko

Full list of the Working Papers SMART – LEREKO:

http://www.rennes.inra.fr/smart_eng/publications/working_papers

Contact

Working Papers SMART – LEREKO

INRA, UMR SMART

4 allée Adolphe Bobierre, CS 61103

35011 Rennes cedex, France

Email : smart_lereko_wp@rennes.inra.fr

2009

Working Papers SMART – LEREKO

UMR INRA-Agocampus Ouest **SMART** (Structures et Marchés Agricoles, Ressources et Territoires)

UR INRA **LEREKO** (Laboratoires d'Etudes et de Recherches Economiques)

Rennes, France