

Contents

1	Introduction	1
I	Theory and Methodology	5
2	A Serious Specific Scenario for a Serious Risky Choice Theory	7
3	What Expected Utility Theory Really Is: What Its Notion of Risk Aversion Excludes	11
3.1	Restrictions on How Outcomes Map into Utilities	11
3.2	Ramsey Versus the Friedman-Savage Version of EUT	13
3.3	The Changed Meaning of "Risk Attitude"	13
3.4	Restrictions on the Aggregation of Utilities	14
4	Primary and Secondary Satisfaction	17
4.1	Primary Satisfaction	17
4.2	Secondary Satisfaction	18
4.3	Earlier Terminologies	19
4.4	Emotional Secondary Satisfaction in Insurance	21
4.5	Emotional Secondary Satisfaction in Other Contexts	22

5	The von Neumann-Morgenstern Contradiction When Including Secondary Satisfactions Solved with Stages of Knowledge	25
6	Material Secondary Satisfactions and Planning	35
6.1	The Flawed "Primitive" Re-definition of the EUT Outcomes Space	36
6.2	Temporal EUT	38
6.3	The Missed Connection of Temporal EUT With the von Neumann-Morgenstern Complementarities	40
7	Misconceptions About Secondary Satisfactions	41
7.1	Inappropriate Tests of Secondary Satisfactions	41
7.2	Misleadingly Denigratory Examples of Secondary Satisfactions	42
7.3	Multiple Choice Fallacies	43
7.4	Inconsistent Elaborations of EUT	45
7.5	Violations of the Dominance Principle	46
7.6	Introduction of Contradictions	48
8	Biases in Experimental Set-ups That Ignore Secondary Satisfactions	49
9	SKAT, The Stages of Knowledge Ahead Theory	53
10	Self Reports <i>Versus</i> Scientists' Own Introspection and Related Reliability Issues	59

II Experiments	65
11 Participants and Their Choices	67
11.1 Participants	67
11.2 The Scenario: Potential Monetary Payoffs	68
11.3 Choices Made	70
11.4 Experiences of Terrorism and Preoccupations With Violence	71
11.5 The Ordering of the Risks	73
12 Willingness to Pay Compared with Choices in a Dictated Choice Set	77
12.1 Choice Set Effects	79
12.2 EUT's Technique for Deducing Utility Shapes	82
12.3 EUT's Modal Double Twist "Utility Function" Deduction	84
12.4 EUT Implied Utility Shapes Classification and Summary .	86
12.5 No Participant With Implied EUT Constant Relative Risk Aversion	90
12.6 Only 5% With Implied EUT Linear Utility	90
12.7 The Typical Multiple Inflection Points in the EUT Implied "Utility" Functions	90
12.8 The Incompatibility of the Weird Implied Shapes with EUT Axioms	91
13 The Role of Secondary Satisfaction	97
13.1 Method: Reported Reasons for Choice	97
13.2 Findings on Motivations	99
13.3 EUT Disobeyed	100

14 Algorithms Versus Global Maximising Procedures	105
14.1 Choice Motivators	105
14.2 The Minority Using Expected Net Value	106
14.3 Non-usage of EUT With a Curved Utility Function	107
14.4 Minimal Role for Rank Dependent Generalisations of EUT	108
14.4.1 Minor Usage of Conservative Atemporal Aggregation Weights	109
14.4.2 Minor Usage of Aspiring Atemporal Aggregation Weights	110
14.5 Non-Numerical Treatment of Conflicting Motivations . . .	110
14.6 Framing, Context and Choice Set Impacts on Heuristics .	111
15 Insurance Provision by Governments and Firms	119
16 Summary and Directions for Further Research	125
A Experimental Results in Detail	127
B Utility Shapes	153
C Questionnaire	199
D Glossary / Acronyms	201
References	205
Author Index	219
Subject Index	223



<http://www.springer.com/978-3-540-38472-4>

The Knowledge Ahead Approach to Risk
Theory and Experimental Evidence
Pope, R.; Leitner, J.; Leopold-Wildburger, U.
2007, XVI, 232 p. 51 illus., Softcover
ISBN: 978-3-540-38472-4