

Bosch-Domènech, Antoni; Silvestre, Joaquim

Working Paper

Measuring risk aversion with lists: A new bias

Working Paper, No. 12-10

Provided in Cooperation with:

University of California Davis, Department of Economics

Suggested Citation: Bosch-Domènech, Antoni; Silvestre, Joaquim (2012) : Measuring risk aversion with lists: A new bias, Working Paper, No. 12-10, University of California, Department of Economics, Davis, CA

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/58375>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

UC DAVIS

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

Working Paper Series

Measuring risk aversion with lists: A new bias

Antoni Bosch-Domènech
Universitat Pompeu Fabra
Joaquim Silvestre

May 20, 2012

Paper # 12-10

Various experimental procedures aimed at measuring individual risk aversion involve a list of pairs of alternative prospects. We first study the widely used method by Holt and Laury (2002), for which we find that the removal of some items from the lists yields a systematic decrease in risk aversion. This bias is quite distinct from other confounds that have been previously observed in the use of the Holt and Laury method. It may be related to empirical phenomena and theoretical developments where better prospects increase risk aversion. Nevertheless, we have also found that the more recent elicitation method due to Abdellaoui et al. (2011), also based on lists, does not display any statistically significant bias when the corresponding items of the list are removed. Our results suggest that methods other than the popular Holt and Laury one may be preferable for the measurement of risk aversion.

Department of Economics
One Shields Avenue
Davis, CA 95616
(530)752-0741

http://www.econ.ucdavis.edu/working_search.cfm

Measuring risk aversion with lists: A new bias
by Antoni Bosch-Domènech, *Universitat Pompeu Fabra*
and Joaquim Silvestre, University of California, Davis

ABSTRACT

Various experimental procedures aimed at measuring individual risk aversion involve a list of pairs of alternative prospects. We first study the widely used method by Holt and Laury (2002), for which we find that the removal of some items from the lists yields a systematic decrease in risk aversion. This bias is quite distinct from other confounds that have been previously observed in the use of the Holt and Laury method. It may be related to empirical phenomena and theoretical developments where better prospects increase risk aversion. Nevertheless, we have also found that the more recent elicitation method due to Abdellaoui et al. (2011), also based on lists, does not display any statistically significant bias when the corresponding items of the list are removed. Our results suggest that methods other than the popular Holt and Laury one may be preferable for the measurement of risk aversion.

KEY WORDS: Risk aversion, risk attitudes, experiments, lists, elicitation method, Holt, Laury, Abdellaoui, Driouchi, l'Haridon, independence axiom.

JEL Classification Number: C 91

A new bias in the use of lists to measure risk aversion

by Antoni Bosch-Domènech, *Universitat Pompeu Fabra*
and Joaquim Silvestre, University of California, Davis

1. Introduction

Various experimental procedures aimed at eliciting information on risk attitudes involve a list of pairs of alternative prospects. The present paper investigates the robustness of such procedures with respect to the removal of some pairs from the list.

We first study the widely used method by Holt and Laury (2002) [HL in what follows] and enquire whether the removal of some pairs from their list affects the choices made by experimental subjects. We find that it does so in a systematic way: the removal of better, end-of-list pairs induces subjects to display less risk aversion than when facing the whole list. This invalidates the numerical estimation of the degree of risk aversion of an individual.¹

This systematic bias, together with other findings in the literature with the same flavor, may suggest a more general idea that the inclusion of better prospects in a list of choices favors risk aversion. But it cannot be a universal principle: we conduct similar robustness checks on the elicitation method of Mohammed Abdellaoui *et al.* (2011) [ADH in what follows], also based on lists of pairs of prospects, and find no evidence of such a bias: the frequency of risk averse choices for a given pair of the list is statistically invariant with respect to the deletion of other items.²

2. The Holt & Laury method

2.1. Purpose

HL state (p. 1645) that they “present subjects with a menu of choices that permits measurement of the degree of risk aversion, and also estimation of its functional form.” In order to measure the degree of risk aversion, they first match (Table 3, p. 1649) the subjects’ choices to risk aversion intervals based on the CRRA von Neumann Morgenstern (vNM) utility function $x^{1-r} / (1-r)$ (the variable x is the *ex post* amount of money, and the parameter r is the coefficient of relative risk

¹ With respect to the HL procedure, it has already been noted that the order in which the tasks are implemented may confound the results (Glenn Harrison *et al.* 2005; see also Holt and Laury, 2005). In other experiments, Chetan Dave *et al.* (2010) consider the effect of differing degrees of difficulty. Framing effects are reported in Mark Isaac and Duncan James (2000) and Louis Lévy-Garboua *et al.* (2012). Our robustness test yields a different type of confound.

² Also, our own method (Bosch-Domènech and Silvestre, 1999, 2006a, b, c, 2010) for eliciting risk attitudes based on lists of a different kind does not evidence a statistically significant effect of deletions.

aversion). The last pages of the paper report maximum-likelihood estimates of the parameters r and α of the vNM function $(1 - \exp(-\alpha x^{1-r})) / \alpha$, first proposed by Atanu Saha (1993).

2.2. Description of the Holt and Laury method

Subjects in HL face a list of *ten* pairs of binary lotteries, which we can number from one to ten as in Table 1 below, each pair involving a “safe” lottery (S) and a “risky” one (R). The terms “safe” and “risky,” used by HL, must be understood in a loose sense and relative to each other: in a given pair, lottery R gives a larger good payoff, but a lower bad payoff, than S .³

All S lotteries offer the same payoffs, namely \$2 and \$1.60, but with varying probabilities. An S lottery with a high lottery-pair number first-order stochastically dominates any S lottery with a lower number, since it gives the larger payoff (\$2) with higher probability. The list of R lotteries displays exactly the same feature. Hence, a lottery pair with a higher number offers an unambiguously better prospect than one with a lower number.

Of course, first-order stochastic dominance implies higher expected value. The last three columns in Table 1 (not shown to the experimental subjects) indicate the expected dollar values of the safe lottery in the pair (denoted EV^S) and that of the risky lottery (denoted EV^R), as well as the difference between the two. A risk-neutral individual would choose the pattern $SSSS/RRRRR$. Thus, a subject who chooses $SSSS/RRRRR$ displays risk aversion.

2.3. Our experimental design: Changing list length in Holt and Laury

We designed five treatments, numbered 1 to 5, and carried them out in six sessions, labeled A to F . Our Treatment 1 is the control treatment, where subjects face the complete list of Table 1, with euro payoffs obtained by multiplying by three the dollar amounts of Table 1. These payoffs were maintained in all treatments.

In treatments 2 to 5 we ran the experiment with lists of *seven* (lottery) pairs where some of the better pairs and/or some of the worse pairs of Table 1 (three in total) have been eliminated.

Specifically, in Treatment 2, each subject faced the seven-pair list obtained by deleting the first three rows of Table 1. In Treatment 3, each subject faced the seven-pair list obtained by

³ The two lotteries entail the same probabilities for the good and bad payoffs, and their expected values are different, i. e., R is not a mean-preserving spread of S . In lottery pair 10 the good outcome is certain in both R and S : hence, R is not risky at all.

deleting rows 1, 2 and 10 of Table 1. In Treatment 4, each subject faced the seven-pair list obtained by deleting rows 1, 9 and 10 of Table 1. Finally, in Treatment 5 each subject faced the seven-pair list described in Table 2 and obtained by deleting the last three rows from Table 1. We were particularly interested in the decisions for pairs 4 to 7, which are present in all five treatments.

Lottery Pair #	Safe Lottery (<i>S</i>)				Risky Lottery (<i>R</i>)				EV^S	EV^R	Difference
	Prob.	Payoff	Prob.	Payoff	Prob.	Payoff	Prob.	Payoff			
1	0.1	\$2	0.9	\$1.60	0.1	\$3.85	0.9	\$0.10	\$1.64	\$0.48	\$1.17
2	0.2	\$2	0.8	\$1.60	0.2	\$3.85	0.8	\$0.10	\$1.68	\$0.85	\$0.83
3	0.3	\$2	0.7	\$1.60	0.3	\$3.85	0.7	\$0.10	\$1.72	\$1.23	\$0.49
4	0.4	\$2	0.6	\$1.60	0.4	\$3.85	0.6	\$0.10	\$1.76	\$1.60	\$0.16
5	0.5	\$2	0.5	\$1.60	0.5	\$3.85	0.5	\$0.10	\$1.80	\$1.98	-\$0.17
6	0.6	\$2	0.4	\$1.60	0.6	\$3.85	0.4	\$0.10	\$1.84	\$2.35	-\$0.51
7	0.7	\$2	0.3	\$1.60	0.7	\$3.85	0.3	\$0.10	\$1.88	\$2.73	-\$0.84
8	0.8	\$2	0.2	\$1.60	0.8	\$3.85	0.2	\$0.10	\$1.92	\$3.10	-\$1.18
9	0.9	\$2	0.1	\$1.60	0.9	\$3.85	0.1	\$0.10	\$1.96	\$3.48	-\$1.52
10	1	\$2	0	\$1.60	1	\$3.85	0	\$0.10	\$2.00	\$3.85	-\$1.85

Table 1. Design of the Holt and Laury experiments (adapted from Harrison *et al.*, 2005).

Lottery Pair #	Safe Lottery (<i>S</i>)				Risky Lottery (<i>R</i>)				EV^S	EV^R	Difference
	Prob.	Payoff	Prob.	Payoff	Prob.	Payoff	Prob.	Payoff			
1	0.1	\$2	0.9	\$1.60	0.1	\$3.85	0.9	\$0.10	\$1.64	\$0.48	\$1.17
2	0.2	\$2	0.8	\$1.60	0.2	\$3.85	0.8	\$0.10	\$1.68	\$0.85	\$0.83
3	0.3	\$2	0.7	\$1.60	0.3	\$3.85	0.7	\$0.10	\$1.72	\$1.23	\$0.49
4	0.4	\$2	0.6	\$1.60	0.4	\$3.85	0.6	\$0.10	\$1.76	\$1.60	\$0.16
5	0.5	\$2	0.5	\$1.60	0.5	\$3.85	0.5	\$0.10	\$1.80	\$1.98	-\$0.17
6	0.6	\$2	0.4	\$1.60	0.6	\$3.85	0.4	\$0.10	\$1.84	\$2.35	-\$0.51
7	0.7	\$2	0.3	\$1.60	0.7	\$3.85	0.3	\$0.10	\$1.88	\$2.73	-\$0.84
8	0.8	\$2	0.2	\$1.60	0.8	\$3.85	0.2	\$0.10	\$1.92	\$3.10	-\$1.18
9	0.9	\$2	0.1	\$1.60	0.9	\$3.85	0.1	\$0.10	\$1.96	\$3.48	-\$1.52
10	1	\$2	0	\$1.60	1	\$3.85	0	\$0.10	\$2.00	\$3.85	-\$1.85

Table 2. The deletion of the last three rows of Table 1.

Subjects in the experiment were students from the *Universitat Pompeu Fabra* who volunteered. Because of concern for order effects, we scrambled the order of our treatments and repeated one of them as a “return to baseline.” For instance, Treatment 1 preceded Treatment 5 three times while followed it four times. In each session, we ran four different treatments in the following orders.

Session *A*, with 28 subjects, implemented treatments 5, 3, 2, 1, 5.

Session *B*, with 24 subjects, treatments 2, 4, 5, 1, 2.

Session *C* with 21 subjects, treatments 1, 5, 3, 2, 1.

Session *D*, with 24 subjects, treatments 3, 5, 2, 1, 3.

Session *E*, with 22 subjects, treatments 4, 1, 2, 3, 4.

And Session *F*, with 26 subjects, treatments 1, 4, 2, 5, 4.

2.4. Including better (end-of-list) pairs favors risk aversion

Tables A1 to A6 in the Appendix present the raw experimental data for sessions *A* to *F*. We can visualize the overall outcomes in Table 3, which displays the rate of safe choices per pair and treatment aggregated over Sessions *A* to *F*.

Formally, and ignoring for the moment the last two columns, the entry in Table 3 for Pair j ($j = 1, \dots, 10$) and Treatment i ($i = 1, \dots, 5$) is the quotient:

$$\frac{\text{Number of } S \text{ choices in Pair } j \text{ and Treatment } i \text{ aggregated over Sessions } A-F}{\text{Number of choices (} S \text{ and } R \text{) in Pair } j \text{ and Treatment } i \text{ aggregated over Sessions } A-F}$$

We have marked in boldface the pairs common to all five treatments, namely pairs 4 to 7. Figure 1 plots the frequency of safe choices for treatments 1, 2 and 5. Recall that Treatment 1, our control, covers the ten pairs of Table 1 and Treatment 2 deletes the first three pairs, whereas Treatment 5 deletes the last three, as shown in Table 2.

By comparing the first two columns of Table 3 (Treatment 2 vs. control), we observe that the deletion of the first three (worse) pairs slightly increases the rate of safe choices. Treatment 5, which deletes the three last (best) pairs, shows a marked decrease in the rate of safe choices. See Figure 1, where the gap between the graphs for treatments 1 and 2 is dwarfed by the one between treatments 1 and 5. It appears that, as good pairs (bottom of list) are replaced by bad ones (top of list), risk aversion becomes less frequent.

Next, we focus on the individual decisions by each participant as he or she confronts two different treatments in the same session, and ask whether each participant made or not the same choice in the two treatments, testing whether any observed asymmetries could be due to chance. To that effect, we use the McNemar test and obtain significant p -values (0.007 for pair 6, and 0.001 for pair 7) when comparing treatments 1 and 5, even after applying the Bonferroni correction. On the other hand, the p -values were not significant when comparing treatments 1 and 2. In summary, within-subjects analysis confirms the observation that when participants decide on a particular pair, a higher frequency of risk-averse behavior is observed when that pair is embedded in a set that includes good (end of list) pairs.

In addition, Section 4.1 below presents the results of Fischer's exact tests, showing that the observed differences for pairs 6 and 7 between our control Treatment 1 and Treatment 5, as well as the differences between control and Treatment 4 for pair 7, are statistically significant. Note that treatments 4 and 5 delete the largest numbers of good (end of list) pairs.

As we repeatedly noted, good pairs appear at the end of the list. Is the observed effect of deleting good pairs due to their goodness or to their position at the end of the list? We address the issue in the following section.

	Treatment 1 (Control)	Treatment 2	Treatment 3	Treatment 4	Treatment 5	Average Treat's 2-5	Max Rate Diff. Treat's 2-5
Pair 1	0.99	-	-	-	0.99	-	-
Pair 2	0.99	-	-	0.99	0.98	-	-
Pair 3	0.99	-	0.96	1.00	0.98	-	-
Pair 4	0.97	0.99	0.94	0.99	0.97	0.97	0.05
Pair 5	0.89	0.91	0.86	0.87	0.80	0.86	0.14
Pair 6	0.71	0.76	0.69	0.63	0.58	0.66	0.28
Pair 7	0.34	0.36	0.30	0.19	0.18	0.26	1.00
Pair 8	0.11	0.11	0.05	0.06	-	-	-
Pair 9	0.03	0.01	0.01	-	-	-	-
Pair 10	0.00	0.01	-	-	-	-	-
Number of observations	144	120	94	72	122		

Table 3. Rate of safe choices per pair and treatment, Holt and Laury method (in bold the pairs common to all treatments).




Figure 1. The rate of safe choices in treatments 1, 2 and 5 for pairs 1 to 7, Holt and Laury method.

2.5. The irrelevance of the position in the list: Inverting the order of the pairs

The tendency, in some of the shorter lists, to switch earlier from the safe to the risky option brings to mind the phenomenon discussed in Steffen Andersen *et al.* (2006) that, in multiple-price lists, subjects may be inclined to pick a response in the middle of the list, independent of true valuations. An inspection of the results in Table 3 shows that such an attraction for the middle does not appear in our experiment: the middle pair in a list of seven is the fourth one, and the fraction of subjects who choose the safe lottery there goes from 0.36 in Treatment 2 to 0.97 in Treatment 5.

But, as indicated above, the increase in risk aversion as good pairs are removed could conceivably be due to an “end-of-list” effect, since the good pairs are located at the end. One simple way of exploring the issue consists in running the experiment with the order of the pairs inverted, i. e., giving the subjects a list that begins with the *better* pairs and ends with the *worse* pairs. If, in the inverted treatments, we observe again that risk aversion is less frequent when removing the better pairs, now located at the beginning of the list, then we will be more confident that it is not the distance to the end of the list that drives the effect.

Accordingly, we have run sessions *A* to *F* with the inverted order of pairs. The aggregate results are shown in Table 4. One observation is clear from the table, namely that the previously observed effect survives the inversion of the order of lotteries. Moreover, as before, it is more noticeable in pairs 6 and 7. Therefore, we must conclude that the position of the pairs in the list is not what drives the observed bias.

	Treatment 1i (Control)	Treatment 2i	Treatment 3i	Treatment 4i	Treatment 5i	Average Treat's 2i to 5i	Max Rate Diff. Treat's 2i to 5i
Pair 1	0.99	-	-	-	0.99		-
Pair 2	0.98	-	-	0.98	0.99		-
Pair 3	0.98	-	0.97	0.98	0.99		-
Pair 4	0.98	0.96	0.97	0.98	0.93	0.96	0.05
Pair 5	0.85	0.87	0.83	0.86	0.78	0.83	0.12
Pair 6	0.67	0.72	0.67	0.58	0.49	0.61	0.47
Pair 7	0.31	0.36	0.34	0.23	0.16	0.27	1.25
Pair 8	0.12	0.10	0.05	0.07	-	-	-
Pair 9	0.01	0.02	0.01	-	-	-	-
Pair 10	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	-	-
Number of Observations		171	165	124	108	124	

Table 4. Inverted treatments: Rate of safe choices per pair and treatment in the Holt and Laury method (in bold the pairs common to all treatments). To facilitate the comparison with Table 3, we keep the same ordering of the pairs in both tables. However, one should keep in mind that, in the inverted treatments of Table 4, the order of the lotteries was inverted, so that subjects faced listings of pairs beginning with Pair 10, and ending with Pair 1.

3. The Abdellaoui *et al.* method

3.1. Our experimental design: Changing list length in Abdellaoui *et al.*

We adapt the ADH method by adding one row to their Table 3 in order to facilitate the comparison with the HL procedure. The adapted list appears as our Table 5.⁴ In both the HL and ADH procedures, subjects face a list of “safe” and “risky” pairs, but in ADH the safe alternative is a sure payoff that increases along the list, while the risky one is a 50-50 fixed lottery, that we implement by a coin toss.

⁴ Here too the column displaying the expected values was not shown to the experimental subjects.

Pair	Option A (Safe)	Option B (Risky)	Expected payoff diff.
1	€5.00	€15 if heads, €5 if tails	-5.00
2	€6.10	€15 if heads, €5 if tails	-3.90
3	€7.20	€15 if heads, €5 if tails	-2.80
4	€8.30	€15 if heads, €5 if tails	-1.70
5	€9.45	€15 if heads, €5 if tails	-0.55
6	€10.55	€15 if heads, €5 if tails	0.55
7	€11.70	€15 if heads, €5 if tails	1.70
8	€12.80	€15 if heads, €5 if tails	2.80
9	€13.90	€15 if heads, €5 if tails	3.90
10	€15.00	€15 if heads, €5 if tails	5.00

Table 5. Our adaptation of the Abdellaoui *et al.* design; payoffs in euros.

We designed five treatments, numbered 1 to 5, and carried them out in five sessions, labeled *A* to *E*. As in our experiment on the HL method, our Treatment 1 is the control treatment, where subjects face the complete list of Table 5.

In treatments 2 to 5 we ran the experiment with lists of seven pairs where some of the better pairs and/or some of the worse pairs of Table 5 (three in total) have been eliminated.

In Treatment 2, each subject faced the seven-pair list obtained by deleting the first three rows of Table 5. In Treatment 3, each subject faced the seven-pair list obtained by deleting rows 1, 2 and 10 of Table 5. In Treatment 4, each subject faced the seven-pair list obtained by deleting rows 1, 9 and 10 of Table 5. Finally, in Treatment 5 each subject faced the seven-pair list obtained by deleting the last three rows from Table 1. We were particularly interested in the decisions for pairs 4 to 7, which are present in all five treatments.

Once more, subjects were students from the *Universitat Pompeu Fabra*. Because of concern for order effects, we scrambled the order of our treatments and repeated one of them as a “return to baseline.” In each session, we ran four different treatments in the following orders.

Session *A*, with 21 subjects, implemented treatments 1, 5, 3, 4, 1.

Session *B*, with 21 subjects, treatments 2, 1, 4, 5, 2.

Session *C* with 20 subjects, treatments 3, 2, 5, 1, 3.

Session *D*, with 21 subjects, treatments 4, 3, 1, 2, 4.

And Session *E*, with 21 subjects, treatments 5, 4, 2, 3, 5.

3.2. Results

Tables A13 to A17 in the Appendix present the raw experimental data for sessions *A* to *E*. We can visualize the overall outcomes in Table 6, which displays the rate of safe choices per pair and treatment aggregated over sessions *A* to *E*: the format is that of tables 3 and 4 above.

	Treatment 1 (Control)	Treatment 2	Treatment 3	Treatment 4	Treatment 5	Average Treat's 2-5	Max Rate Diff. Treat's 2-5
Pair 1	0.00	-	-	-	0.00	-	-
Pair 2	0.00	-	-	0.00	0.00	-	-
Pair 3	0.08	-	0.07	0.06	0.09	-	-
Pair 4	0.29	0.24	0.23	0.29	0.37	0.28	0.51
Pair 5	0.73	0.66	0.71	0.75	0.72	0.71	0.14
Pair 6	0.93	0.91	0.94	0.94	0.96	0.94	0.05
Pair 7	1.00	0.98	0.98	0.97	0.97	0.98	0.03
Pair 8	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	-	-	-
Pair 9	1.00	1.00	1.00	-	-	-	-
Pair 10	1.00	1.00	-	-	-	-	-
Number of observations	83	83	83	84	83		

Table 6. Rate of safe choices per pair and treatment for the Abdellaoui *et al.* method (in bold, the pairs common to all treatments)

The inspection of Table 6 shows that the pairs more affected by the deletions are pairs 4 and 5. By comparing the first two columns of Table 6 (Treatment 2 vs. control), we observe that the deletion of the first three (worse) pairs slightly *decreases* the rate of safe choices. Treatment 5, which deletes the three last (best) pairs, shows no consistent pattern of differences from control. In any event, as we will see in Section 4.1 below, Fischer's exact test indicates that the differences are not statistically significant.

4. Discussion

4.1. Comparing Holt and Laury with Abdellaoui *et al.*

The main lesson of our experiments is that the HL and ADH methods respond quite differently to the deletions of pairs. We have performed Fischer's exact test for both methods, focusing on pairs 6 and 7 in HL, and pairs 4 and 5 in ADH, the pairs that show larger responses to the deletions. The results are displayed in Table 7.

	Holt and Laury method		Abdellaoui <i>et al.</i> method	
	Pair 6	Pair 7	Pair 4	Pair 5
Treatment 1 vs. Treatment 2	0.40	0.79	0.43	0.36
Treatment 1 vs. Treatment 3	0.88	0.57	0.27	0.76
Treatment 1 vs. Treatment 4	0.28	0.039	1.00	0.75
Treatment 1 vs. Treatment 5	0.039	0.0035	0.30	1.00

Table 7. Double-tail Fischer's exact test p -values. Significant results in bold.

We observe that the differences between treatments and control are not significant for the ADH method. But in the case of the HL method, and confirming our observations in Section 2.4 above, we obtain significant differences for Treatment 4 and Pair 7, and for Treatment 5 and pairs 6 and 7. Recall that in Treatment 4 (resp. 5) we delete the two (resp. three) best pairs.

The inspection of the last two columns of tables 3, 4 and 6 provides an informal confirmation of the asymmetry. Averaging over The treatments 2 to 5 yields numbers that are relatively close to control in ADH, whereas they are markedly different for pairs 6 and 7 in HL. And the maximal-rate differences for treatments 2 to 5 are typically larger in HL than in ADH, indicating more dispersion.

While our results evidence a clear asymmetry between the two methods, the reasons for this asymmetry are not clear to us.

4.2. Increasing risk aversion and violations of the independence axiom

Our result that, in HL, the deletion of better pairs favors an earlier switch to the riskier option shows that the choice in a given pair is not independent from the list where it is placed. Hence, a subject displaying such behavior cannot be maximizing preferences that satisfy the independence axiom and, therefore, the expected utility hypothesis (see, e. g., Andreu Mas-Colell *et al.*, 1995). Therefore, any formalization of this behavior must discard the independence axiom. It follows from our experimental results that HL repeated reliance on vNM utility functions is not well grounded, despite the awareness previously evidenced by Holt (1986).

Mark Machina (1982, 1983) tackled the more common observed violations of the independence axiom by proposing a *generalized expected utility model* characterized by the smoothness of the utility function U defined on the space of probability distributions, so that a *local vNM-type utility function* can be defined at each probability distribution. He showed that the most common violations of the independence axiom (the effects named common consequence, common ratio, oversensitivity to changes in small probability outlying events, and utility evaluation) were implied by an elegant condition, which he called Hypothesis II, by which the local vNM-type utility function of a “better” probability distribution is more concave (implying more risk aversion) than the one corresponding to a worse probability distribution.⁵ Hence, under Hypothesis II the decision maker displays a higher degree of risk aversion in the neighborhood of a better probability distribution than in the neighborhood of a worse one.

The result that the deletion of better pairs in the HL method favors risk taking is in line with Machina’s analysis: each lottery (S or R) in pairs that appear in Treatment 1 but not in Treatment 5 (namely 8, 9 and 10) first-order statistically dominates the corresponding lottery (S or R) in all pairs in Treatment 5: in this sense, Treatment 1 offers better pairs than Treatment 5. The fact that the subjects in our test of the HL method display more risk aversion in Treatment 1 than in Treatment 5 parallels Machina’s observation.

4.3. The effects of the inclusion of better options on choice

Our result on the HL method that the inclusion of better pairs favors an later switch to the riskier lottery displays an interesting similarity with a finding by Ian Bateman, Brett Day, Graham

⁵ Machina (1982, 1983) uses “better” in the precise sense of first order stochastic dominance. Geometrically, Hypothesis II implies that the indifference curves “fan out” in the Marschak-Machina triangle.

Loomes and Robert Sugden (2007) in the process of analyzing the preference reversal phenomenon. They observe that the certainty equivalent of a given lottery (say, Lottery I or Lottery J in their Table 1) is lower when included in a list of better lotteries (Set 1 *ibid.*) than when included in a set of worse lotteries (Set 2 *ibid.*). Because a higher certainty equivalent corresponds to a lower degree of risk aversion, their observation implicitly points towards the phenomenon that including better choices in a list favors risk aversion.⁶

4.4. Does risk taking increase when removing pairs where the risky option is more popular?

As noted, the ADH method does not show a statistically significant dependence of the frequency of safe choices on the deletions. Yet some deviations from control do occur, particularly in Treatment 2, in which the rate of safe choices is smaller than in control. Now, in Treatment 2, it is the *worse* choice pairs that have been deleted: this goes in the opposite direction to the bias displayed by HL, where it is the deletion of the *better* prospects that decreases risk aversion.

Notice, however, that in HL most subjects, when confronted with the *better* pairs, choose the risky option, whereas in ADH most subjects choose the risky alternative in the *worse* pairs. Perhaps, then, what drives the changes in risk aversion is the deletion of pairs where most subjects choose the risky alternative, rather than the deletion of better or worse pairs.

Table 8 offers a comparative summary of the features associated with decreased risk aversion in the HL and ADH methods.

⁶ The literature offers instances of the more general dependence of the value, or category, assigned to a particular item on the set of items in which it is embedded. In the medical literature, Angela Robinson, Michael Jones-Lee and Graham Loomes (2001) observe how respondents' rankings of descriptions of road injuries depend on the set of descriptions in which there are included. In psychology, Allen Parducci and Douglas Weddell (1986) define a "range-frequency effect" where the category assigned to the size of a square (e. g., large, or small) depends both on the number of allowable categories and on the support and the frequency of the distribution of sizes in the list presented to the subject. Neil Stewart, Gordon Brown and Nick Chater (2005) ascertain the importance of the intensity difference between a stimulus and the previous one in the sequence. In marketing research, Joel Huber, John Payne and Christopher Puto (1982) study consumers' choices when confronted with a set of products each of which is favored in a different dimension (size, quality, color, price), and observe that introducing a new product that is dominated in all dimensions by one of the existing products results in the latter product being hugely favored by consumers. This is an instance of how asymmetric dominance may affect choices, as analyzed by Wilfred Amaldoss *et al.* (2008).

Holt and Laury Method	Removal of good pairs = Removal of pairs where most subjects choose the risky option	→ fewer safe choices = less risk aversion (statistically significant)
Abdellaoui <i>et al.</i> Method	Removal of bad pairs = Removal of pairs where most subjects choose the risky option	→ fewer safe choices = less risk aversion (not statistically significant)

Table 8. Comparison of the features associated with decreased risk aversion

We have pondered three explanations for the phenomenon of decreased risk aversion clearly observed in the HL method, namely the deletion of (a) better pairs, (b) end of list pairs, and (c) pairs where the risky option is more popular. Our analysis in Section 2.4 above definitely rules (b) out. If we attached any importance to the statistically not significant changes observed in our test of the ADH method, then we would have to rule (a) out, leaving only (c). But at this point, in the absence of further research, it would be reckless to bet on this explanation.

5. Conclusions

The paper tests the robustness of experimental procedures, aimed at measuring risk aversion, where subjects face a list of pairs of alternative prospects. More specifically, we examine whether the removal of some items of the list affects the outcomes, focusing on the widely used Holt and Laury (2002) method and on the more recent one by Abdellaoui *et al.* (2011). Either method uses a list of pairs: we conduct experiments where some pairs are removed from the list. We ask: are decisions on a particular pair influenced by the presence or absence of other pairs in the list?

We experimentally discover a systematic bias in the Holt and Laury method: as some specific pairs are removed, risk aversion becomes less frequent. No statistically significant bias appears, on the contrary, in our test of the Abdellaoui *et al.* method.

The pairs whose deletion induces the reduction of risk aversion in the Holt and Laury method are the better pairs, and also the last ones in the list. By repeating our experiment with the order of pairs inverted, we find that the position of the pairs in the list is irrelevant.

But it would be premature to explain the phenomenon in terms of the removal of *good* pairs: even though the results for our test of Abdellaoui *et al.* are not statistically significant, they point away from this explanation.

In conclusion, our experimental results provide a new call for caution when using the Holt and Laury method to estimate individual risk aversion, and suggest that better alternatives can be found.

APPENDIX

Treatment 5	Treatment 3	Treatment 2	Treatment 1	Treatment 5
SSSSSS/R000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSS/RR000
SSSSSSS000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS000
SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/R000
SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/R000
SSSSSSS000	00SSSSSS/R0	000SSSSSS/R	SSSSSSSSS/R	SSS/RR/SS000
SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/R000
SSSSSSS000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSS/RR000
SSSSS/RR000	00SSS/RRRR0	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR	SSSS/RRR000
SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSSSS/RR	SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/R000
SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSSSS/RR	SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/R000
SSSSSSS000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSSS/RR	SSSS/RRRRRR	S/RRRRRR000
SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000
SSSSSS/R000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSSS/RR	SSSSSSS000
SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000S/R/SS/RRR	SSSSSSSS/RR	SSSSS/RR000
SSSS/RRR000	00SS/RRRRR0	000S/RRRRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR	SSSS/RRR000
SSSS/RRR000	00SS/RRRRR0	000S/RRRRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RR000
SSSSS/R/S000	00S/RR/SS/RR0	000SSS/RRR/S	SSSSSS/R/S/RR	S/RR/SSSS000
SSSSSS/R000	00SSSSSS/R0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSS/RR000
SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000
SSSSSS/R000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSSS/RR	SSSSSSS000
SSSS/RRR000	00SS/RRRRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR	SSSS/RRR000
SSSSSS/R000	00SSS/RRRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR	SSSSSS/R000
SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSSS000
SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RR000
SSSSS/RR000	00SSS/RRRR0	000SS/RRRRR	SSSS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RR000
SSSS/RRR000	00SS/RRRRR0	000S/RRRRRR	SSSS/RRRRR	SSSSSSS000
SSS/RRRR000	00SSS/RRRR0	000S/RRRRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR	SSSSSSS000
SSSSS/RR000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000

Table A1. Choices of subjects (28) in Session A for the Holt and Laury method (here and in the following tables zeroes mark the deletion of pairs).

Treatment 2	Treatment 4	Treatment 5	Treatment 1	Treatment 2
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RR000	SSSS/RRRRRR	000SS/RRRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RR000	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RR000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSSSS/RR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSSSS/RR
000SS/RRRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	SSS/RRRR000	SSSS/RRRRRR	000S/RRRRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000S/RRRRRR	0SSS/RRRR00	SSSS/RRR000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000S/RRRRRR
000SS/RRRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RR000	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SS/RRRRR
000SS/RRRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RR000	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SS/R/S/RRR	0SSSS/RRR00	SS/R/S/RRR000	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSS/RRR/S	0SSS/RRR/S00	SSS/RRR/S000	SSSSSSSSSS	000RRR/SSSS
000SSSS/RRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSSS/RRR
000SSSS/RRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSSS000	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSSS/RRR
000S/RRRRRR	0SSS/RR/S/R00	SS/R/S/RRR000	SSS/RRR/S/RRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSSS/RRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSSS/RRR
000SS/RRRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SS/RRRRR
000SS/RRRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RR000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SS/RRRRR

Table A2. Choices of subjects (24) in Session *B* for the Holt and Laury method.

Treatment 1	Treatment 5	Treatment 3	Treatment 2	Treatment 1
SSSSSS/RRR	SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS000	00SSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/RRR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSSS000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSS/RRRR0	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSSSS/RR	SSSSSSSS/RR
SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR
SSSSSSSS/RR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR
SSSSS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR
SS/R/SS/RRRRR	SSSS/RRR000	00SSS/RRRR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSS/RRR000	00SSS/RRRR0	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSSS/RRR
SSSS/RRRRRR	SSSSSSS000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR

Table A3. Choices of subjects (21) in Session C for the Holt and Laury method.

Treatment 3	Treatment 5	Treatment 2	Treatment 1	Treatment 3
00SSS/RRRR0	SSSS/RRR000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR	00SSS/RRRR0
00SSS/RRRR0	SSSS/RRR000	000SS/RRRRR	SSSS/RRRRRR	00SS/RRRRR0
00SSS/RRRR0	SSSSS/RR000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSSS/RRR0
00SSSSS/RR0	SSSSSSS000	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0
00SS/RRRRR0	SSS/RRRR000	000RRRRRRR	SSS/R/S/RRRRR	00SS/RRRRR0
00SSS/RRRR0	SSSSS/RR000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSS/RRRRRR	00SSS/RRRR0
00SSSSS/RRR0	SSSSS/RR000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSSS/RRR0
00SSS/RRRR0	SSSS/RRR000	000S/RRRRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSSS/RRR0
00SSS/RRRR0	SSSS/RRR000	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR	00SSS/RRRR0
00SS/RRRRR0	SSSS/RRR000	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR	00SS/RRRRR0
00SSSSS/RR0	SSSSSSS/R000	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0
00SSSSS/RR0	SSSSSSS/R000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSSS/RRR0
00SSSSS/RR0	RR/S/R/SSS000	000RR/S/R/SSS	RR/S/R/SSSS/RR	00RR/S/R/SSS0
00SS/R/S/RRR0	SSSSSSS000	000SSSSS/RR	SSSSSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0
00SSSSS/RR0	SSSSSSS/R000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0
00SSSSS/RR0	SSSSSSS000	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0
00SS/RRRRR0	SSS/RRRR000	000RRRRRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR	00SSS/RRRR0
00SSSSS/RR0	SSSSSSS/R000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSSS/RRR0
00SSSSS/R/S/R0	SSSSS/RR000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSSSS/RR	00SSSSS/RR0
00RRRRRRR0	SSSSSSS/R000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSSS/RRR0
00RRRRRRR0	SSSS/RRR000	000RRRRRRR	SSSS/RRRRRR	00SS/RRRRR0
00SSSSS/RR0	SSSS/RRR000	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0
00SS/RRRRR0	SSSS/RRR000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSS/RRRRRR	00SSS/RRRR0
00SSSSSSS0	SSSSSSS000	000SSSSSS/R	SSSSSSSSS/R	00SSSSSSS0

Table A4. Choices of subjects (24) in Session *D* for the Holt and Laury method.

Treatment 4	Treatment 1	Treatment 2	Treatment 3	Treatment 4
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSSS/RSR00	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SS/RRRRR00	SSS/RRRRRRR	000RRRRRRR	00S/RRRRRR0	0SS/RRRRR00
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSS/RSRR00	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SSSSS/RR	00SSSSS/RR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSSSSS/R00	SSSSSSSS/RR	000SSSSS/RR	00SSSSSS/R0	0SSSSSS/R00
0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSSS/RRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSS/RRR00
0SSSS/RRR00	SSSS/RRRRRR	000SS/RRRRR	00SSS/RRRR0	0SSSS/RRR00
0SSS/RRRR00	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSS/RRRR0	0SSSS/RRR00
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSS/RRR00
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSS/RRRR00	SSSS/RSRRRR	000S/RRRRRR	00RRRRRRR0	0SSS/RRRR00
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0RSRRRRR00	SSRSRRSRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSS/RRRR00	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSSSS/RR0	0SSSSSS/R00
0SSS/RRRR00	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SS/RRRRR	00SSSSS/RR0	0SSSS/RRR00
0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SS/RRRRR	00SSS/RRRR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSSSS/RS00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSSSS/R00
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSSSS/RR0	0SSSSSS/R00
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SS/RRRRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSSS/RR00

Table A5. Choices of subjects (22) in Session *E* for the Holt and Laury method.

Treatment 1	Treatment 4	Treatment 2	Treatment 5	Treatment 4
SSSSSSS/RR	0SSSSS/R00	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS000	0SSSSS/R00
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SSS/RRRR00	000SSS/RRRR	SSSS/RRR000	0SSS/RRRR00
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SSSSSS/R00	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS000	0SSSSS/R00
SSSSSSS/RRR	0SSSSS/RR00	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSS/RRRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSSSS/RRR	0SSSSSS/R00	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/R00
SSSSS/RRRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RR000	0SSSS/RRR00
SSS/RRRRRR	0SSS/RRRR00	000S/RRRRRR	SSSS/RRR000	0SSS/RRRR00
SSSSSSS/RRR	0SSSSSS/R00	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSSSS/RRR	0SSSSSS/R00	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSSSS/RRR	0SSSSS/RR00	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSSSSS/RR	0SSSSSS/R00	000SSSSS/RR	SSSSSSS000	0SSSSSSS00
SSSSS/RRRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RR000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RR000	0SSSS/RRR00
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSRSSRRR	0SSSSSS/R00	000SSSSS/RR	SSSSSSS000	0SSSSSSS00
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSSSSSS/R	0SSSSSSS00	000SSSSSS/R	SSSSSSS000	0SSSSSSS00
SSSSSSSS/RR	0SSSSSS/R00	000SSSSS/RR	SSSSSSS000	0SSSSSSS00
SSSSSSSS/RR	0SSSSSS/R00	000SSSSS/RR	SSSSSSS000	0SSSSSSS00
SSSSS/RRRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/R00

Table A6. Choices of subjects (26) in Session *F* for the Holt and Laury method.

Treatment 5	Treatment 3	Treatment 2	Treatment 1	Treatment 5
SSSRSSR000	00SSRRRS0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSRSRRRS	SSRSRSR000
SSS/RRRR000	00S/RRRRRR0	000RRRRRRR	SSS/RRRRRRR	SSS/RRRR000
SSRSRRR000	00RRRSRSS0	000SRRSRS	RRRSSSSRRR	SSSS/RRR000
SSSSS/RR000	00SSS/RRRR0	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSSRRRRR	SSSSS/RR000
SRSSRSS000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSSRRR	SSSSSSS000
SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSSRRR	SSSSSSS000
SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSSRRRR	SSSSSS/R000
SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSSRRRR	SSSSSS/R000
SSSS/RRR000	00SS/RRRRR0	000S/RRRRRR	SSSSRRRRRR	SSSS/RRR000
SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSSRRRR	SSSSSR000
SSSS/RRR000	00SSS/RRRR0	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSSRRRRR	SSSSS/RR000
SSSSSS/R000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSSS/RR	SSSSSSSRR	SSSSSSS000
SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000S/RRRRRR	SSSSSRRRRR	SSSSSS/000

Table A7.

Choices of subjects (13) in Session A_i (= *A* with order inverted) for the Holt and Laury method.

Treatment 2	Treatment 4	Treatment 5	Treatment 1	Treatment 2
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSS/RRR000	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSSSS/RR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSSSS/RR
000RSRSSSR	0RRSRSSS00	RRRSRSS000	RRRRRSSSSS	000RSSSSSSS
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RR000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SRRSRRR	0SSS/RRRR00	SSSS/RRR000	SSSS/RRRRRR	000S/RRRRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSS/RRR00	SSS/RRRR000	SSSS/RRRRRR	000S/RRRRRR
000SS/RRRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RR000	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SS/RRRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSS/RR000	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SS/RRRRR
000SSSS/RRR	0SSSSSS/R00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSSSS/RR
000RRRRRRR	0SSRRRS00	SSS/RRR000	SSRRRRRSRS	000RRRRRSR
000SSSS/RRR	0SSSSSSS00	SSSSSSS000	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSSS/RRR
000SSSS/RRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSS/RRR000	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSSS/RRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSRSRRRR	000SSSS/RRR
000SSSSS/RR	0SSSSSSS00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSSSSS/R	000SSSSSS/R
000SSSSS/RR	0SSSSSS/R00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SS/RRRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RR000	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SS/RRRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSSSSS/R	0SSSSSSS00	SSSSSSS000	SSSSSSSSS/R	000SSSSSS/R
000SRRRRRR	0SSS/RRRR00	SSS/RRR000	SSRRRRRSRS	000SSRRRSR
000SSSS/RRR	0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RR000	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SS/RRRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RR000	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SS/RRRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSSS/RRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSSS/RRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSS/RR000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR
000SSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/R000	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR

Table A8.

Choices of subjects (26) in Session Bi ($= B$ with order inverted) for the Holt and Laury method.

Treatment 1	Treatment 5	Treatment 3	Treatment 2	Treatment 1
S/RRRRRRRR	SSSS/RRR000	00SSS/RRRR0	000S/RRRRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR
SSSSS/RRRRR	SSSS/RRR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSS/RRR000	00SSS/RRRR0	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR
SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSSSS/RR	SSSSSSS000	00SSSSSS/R0	000SSSSS/RR	SSSSSSSS/RR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSSSS/RR	SSSSSSS000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSSS/RR	SSSSSSSS/RR
SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSS/RR000	00SSS/RRRR0	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSSSS/RRR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR
SSSSSSSS/RR	SSSSSSS000	00SSSSSS/R0	000SSSSS/RR	SSSSSSSS/RR
RRRRRRRRRR	SSSSS/RR000	00SSS/RRRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR
SSSSS/RRRRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SS/R/S/RRRRRR	SSSSS/RR000	00SSS/RRRR0	000RRRRRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR
SSSSS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSSS/RRR
SSSS/RRRRRR	SSSS/RRR000	00SS/RRRRR0	000S/RRRRRR	SSSS/RRRRRR
SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSSSS/RR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSSSS/RR	SSSSSSS000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSSS/RR
SSSSSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSSSS/R0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSS/RRRR/S	SSSS/RRR000	00SS/RRRRR0	000S/RRRRRR	SSSS/RRRRRR
SSSSSSSS/RR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSSS/RR
SSSS/RRRRRR	SSSS/RRR000	00SS/RRRRR0	000S/RRRRRR	SSSS/RRRRRR
SSSS/RRRRRR	SSSSS/RR000	00SSSS/RRR0	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR
SSSSSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR
SSSS/RRRRRR	SSSS/RRR000	00SS/RRRRR0	000S/RRRRRR	SSSS/RRRRRR
SSSSS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RR000	00SSS/RRRR0	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR
SSSSSSSS/RR	SSSSSS/RR000	00SSSSSSS0	000SSSSS/RR	SSSSSSSS/RR
SSSSS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RR000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR
SSSSS/RRRRR	SSSSSS/R000	00SSSSS/RR0	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR

Table A9.

Choices of subjects (35) in Session C_i ($= C$ with order inverted) for the Holt and Laury method.

Treatment 3	Treatment 5	Treatment 2	Treatment 1	Treatment 3
00SSSS/RRR0	SSSS/RRR000	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR	00SSS/RRRR0
00SSS/RRRR0	SSSSS/RR000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSS/RRRRR	00SSS/RRRR0
00SSSS/RRR0	SSSS/R/S/R000	000SS/RRRRR	SSS/RRRRRRR	00 SSS/RRRR0
00SSS/R/SS/R0	SSSSSS/R000	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0
00SSS/RRRR0	SSSSS/RR000	000SS/RRRRR	SSSS/RRRRRR	00SS/RRRRR0
00SS/R/S/RRR0	SSSS/R/S/R000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0
00SSSS/RRR0	SSSSS/RR000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0
00SSSS/RRR0	SSSSSS/R000	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR	00SSSS/RRR0
00RRRRRRR0	SSSSSSS000	000SS/RRRRR	SSSS/RRRRRRR	00SS/RRRRR0
00SSSS/RRR0	SSSSSS/R000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0
00SSSSS/RR0	SSSSSS/R000	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0
00SSSS/RRR0	SSSSS/RR000	000 SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0
00RRRRRRR0	SSSS/RRR000	000S/RRRRRR	SSSS/RRRRRRR	00SS/RRRRR0
00SSSS/RRR0	SSSSSS/R000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0
00SSSS/RRR0	SSSSSS/R000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0
00SS/RRRRR0	SSSS/RRR000	000S/RRRRRR	SSSS/RRRRRRR	00SS/RRRRR0
00SSSS/RRR0	SSSSS/RR000	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0
00SSS/RRRR0	SSS/R/S/RR000	000S/RRRRRR	SSSS/RRRRRRR	00SS/RRRRR0
00SSSSS/RR0	SSSSSSS000	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0
00SSSSS/RR0	SSSSSS/R000	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSSS/RR0
00SSSS/RRR0	SSSSSS/R000	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSSS/RR0
00SSSSS/RR0	R/SSS/RR/S000	000SS/R/S/RR/S	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSSS/RR0
00SSSSS/RR0	SSS/RRRR000	000S/RRRRRR	SSSS/RRRRRRR	00SS/RRRRR0
00SSSS/RRR0	SSSSS/RR000	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SS/RRRRR

Table A10.

Choices of subjects (24) in Session Di ($= D$ with order inverted) for the Holt and Laury method.

Treatment 4	Treatment 1	Treatment 2	Treatment 3	Treatment 4
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR	00SSSS/RR0	0SSSSS/R00
0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSSSSS/RR	00SSSSS/RR	00SSSSSS/R0	0SSSSSSS00
0SSSSSSS00	SSSSSSSS/RR	00SSSSS/RR	00SSSSSS/R0	0SSSSSS/R00
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RRRRR	00SSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSS/RRRR00	SSSSS/RRRRR	000S/RRRRR	00SSS/RRR00	0SSSS/RRR00
0SS/RR/SS/R00	R/S/R/SSS/R/S/RR	000R/SS/R/SS/R	00S/R/S/R/S/RR0	0S/R/S/R/S/R/S00
0SSSSSS/R00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0	0SSSSS/R00
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SS/RRRRR	00SSS/RRR00	0SSSS/RRR00
0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SS/RRRRR0	0SSSS/RRR00
0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0	0SSSSSS/R00
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0	0SSSSS/RR00
0SSSSSSS/R00	SSSSSSS/RRR	000SSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0	0SSSSSS/R00
0SSS/RRRR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSS/RRR00	0SSSS/RRR00
0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RRRRR	000RRRRRRR	00SSS/RRR00	0SSS/RRRR00
0RRRRRRR00	RRRRRRRRR	000RRRRRRR	00RRRRRRR0	0RRRRRRR00
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SS/RRRRR	00SSS/RRR00	0SSSS/RRR00
0SSSS/RRR00	SSSSS/RRRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SS/RRRRR0	0SSS/RRRR00
0S/R/A/RRR/A00	SSSS/R/S/RR/S/R	000SSS/R/S/RR	00SS/RRR/SS0	0SS/RR/S/RR00
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000R/SS/RRRR	00SS/RRRRR0	0SSSS/RRR00
0SSSSSSS00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0	0SSSSSS/R00
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSSS/RRR	00SSSSS/RR0	0SSSSSS/R00
0SSSSS/RR00	SSSSSS/RRRR	000SSS/RRRR	00SSSS/RRR0	0SSSSS/RR00

Table A11.

Choices of subjects (28) in Session Ei ($= E$ with order inverted) for the Holt and Laury method.

Treatment 1	Treatment 4	Treatment 2	Treatment 5	Treatment 4
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS000	0SSSSS/R00
SSSSS/RRRRR	0SSS/RRRR00	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSS/RR000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSS/RRRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	000SSS/RRRR	SSSS/RRR000	0SSSS/RRR00
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SSSSS/RR00	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RR000	0SSSS/RRR000
SSSS/RRRRRR	0SSS/RRRR00	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSS/RRR00
SSSSSSS/RRR	0SSSSSS/R00	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS000	0SSSSSS/R00
SSSSSSS/RRR	0SSSSSS/R00	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSSS000	0SSSSSS/R00
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSS/RR000	0SSSS/RRR00
SSSSSSSS/RR	0SSSSS/RR00	000SSSS/RRR	SSSSSS/R000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SSSS/RRR00	000SSS/RRRR	SSSS/RRR000	0SSSS/RRR00
SSSS/RRRRRR	0SSS/RRRR00	000SSS/RRRR	SSSSS/RR000	0SSSSS/RR00
SSSSSS/RRRR	0SS/RR/SSS00	000SS/RRRRR	SSSSSSS000	0SSSSS/RR00

Table A12.

Choices of subjects (13) in Session Fi ($= F$ with order inverted) for the Holt and Laury method.

Treatment 1	Treatment 5	Treatment 3	Treatment 4	Treatment 1
RR/S/RR/SSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	00RRR/SSSS0	0RR/SSSSS00	RRR/SSSSSSS
RRRR/SSSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	00RR/SSSSS0	0RRR/SSSS00	RRRR/SSSSSS
RRR/SSSSSSS	RRR/SSSS000	00R/SSSSSS0	0RR/SSSSS00	RRR/SSSSSSS
RRR/SSSSSSS	RRR/SSSS000	00RR/SSSSS0	0RR/SSSSS00	RRR/SSSSSSS
S/RRRR/SSSSS	RRRRR/SS000	00RRR/SSSS0	0RRRR/SSS00	RRRRR/SSSSS
RRR/SSSSSSS	RRR/SSSS000	00RR/SSSSS0	0RR/SSSSS00	RRRR/SSSSSS
RRRR/SSSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	00RR/SSSSS0	0RRR/SSSS00	RRRR/SSSSSS
RRRRR/SSSSS	RRRRR/SS000	00RR/SSSSS0	0RRRR/SSS00	RRRRR/SSSSS
RR/SSSSSSSS	RR/SSSSS000	00SSSSSSS0	0R/SSSSSSS00	RR/SSSSSSSS
RRRR/SSSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	00RR/SSSSS0	0RRR/SSSS00	RRRR/SSSSSS
RRRR/SSSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	00RR/SSSSS0	0RRR/SSSS00	RRRR/SSSSSS
RRRR/SSSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	00RR/SSSSS0	0RRR/SSSS00	RRRR/SSSSSS
RRRR/SSSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	00RR/SSSSS0	0RRR/SSSS00	RRRR/SSSSSS
RRRRR/SSSSS	RRRRR/SS000	00RRR/SSSS0	0RRRR/SSS00	RRRRR/SSSSS
RRRR/SSSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	00RR/SSSSS0	0RRR/SSSS00	RRRR/SSSSSS
RRRRR/SSSSS	RRRRR/SS000	00RRR/SSSS0	0RRRR/SSS00	RRRRR/SSSSS
RRRRRR/SSSS	RRRRRR/S000	00RRRRR/SS0	0RRRRRR/S00	RRRRRR/SSSS
RRR/SSSSSSS	RRR/SSSS000	00RR/SSSSS0	0RR/SSSSS00	RRR/SSSSSSS
RRR/SSSSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	00RR/SSSSS0	0RR/SSSSS00	RRR/SSSSSSS
RRRRR/SSSSS	RRRRR/SS000	00RRR/SSSS0	0RRRR/SSS00	RRRRR/SSSSS
RRRR/SSSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	00RRR/SSSS0	0RRRR/SSS00	RRRRR/SSSSS

Table A13.

Choices of subjects (21) in Session A for the Abdellaoui *et al.* method.

Treatment 2	Treatment 1	Treatment 4	Treatment 5	Treatment 2
000SSSSSS	RR/SSSSSS	0RR/SSSS00	RRR/SSSS000	000SSSSSS
000RR/SSSS	RRRRR/SSSS	0RRRR/SS00	RRRRR/SS000	000RR/SSSS
000RR/SSSS	RRRR/SSSS	0RRR/SS00	RRRR/SS000	000R/SSSS
000RR/SSSS	RRRRR/SSSS	0RRRR/SS00	RRRRR/SS000	000RR/SSSS
000RR/SSSS	RRRRRR/SSSS	0RRRRR/S00	RRRRRR/000	000RRRR/SSS
000RR/SSSS	RRRR/SSSS	0RRR/SS00	RRRR/SS000	000R/SSSS
000R/SSSS	RRRR/SSSS	0RRR/SS00	RRR/SS000	000R/SSSS
000R/SSSS	RRRR/SSSS	0RRR/SS00	RRR/SS000	000SSSSSS
000SSSSSS	RR/SSSSSS	0R/SSSS00	RR/SSSS000	000SSSSSS
000RR/SSSS	RRRRR/SSSS	0RRRR/SS00	RRRRR/SS000	000RR/SSSS
000RR/SSSS	RRRRR/SSSS	0RRR/SS00	RRRRR/SS000	000RR/SSSS
000RR/SSSS	RRRR/SSSS	0RRR/SS00	RRRR/SS000	000R/SSSS
000RR/SSSS	RRRRR/SSSS	0RRRR/SS00	RRRRR/SS000	000RR/SSSS
000R/SSSS	RRRR/SSSS	0RRR/SS00	RRRR/SS000	000R/SSSS
000R/SSSS	RRR/SSSS	0RRR/SS00	RRR/SS000	000R/SSSS
000SSSSSS	RRR/SSSS	0RR/SS00	RRR/SS000	000SSSSSS
000RRR/SSS	RRRRR/SSSS	0RRRR/SS00	RRRRR/SS000	000RR/SSSS
000RRR/SSS	RRRRRR/SSSS	0RRRRR/S00	RRRRRR/000	000RRRR/SSS
000SS/RRRR	SSSS/RRRR	0RRR/SS00	RRRRR/SS000	000R/SSSS
000RR/SSSS	RRR/SSSS	0RR/SS00	RRR/SS000	000SSSSSS
000SSSSSS	RR/SSSSSS	0R/SSSS00	RR/SSSS000	000SSSSSS

Table A14. Choices of subjects (21) in Session *B* for the Abdellaoui *et al.* method.

Treatment 3	Treatment 2	Treatment 5	Treatment 1	Treatment 3
00R/SSSSSS0	000R/SSSSSS	RRR/SSSS000	RRR/SSSSSSS	00RR/SSSSSS0
00RRR/SSSS0	000SSSSSSS	RRRRR/SS000	RRRR/SSSSSS	00RR/SSSSSS0
00RR/SSSSSS0	000R/SSSSSS	RRR/SSSS000	RRR/SSSSSSS	00RR/SSSSSS0
00RR/SSSSSS0	000SSSSSSS	RRR/SSSS000	RRR/SSSSSSS	00R/SSSSSSS0
00R/SSSSSSS0	000R/SSSSSS	RR/SSSSS000	RR/SSSSSSSS	00SSSSSSS0
00RR/SSSSSS0	000RR/SSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	RRRR/SSSSSS	00RR/SSSSSS0
00SSSSSSSS0	000SSSSSSS	RRR/SSSS000	RRR/SSSSSSS	00R/SSSSSSS0
000RRRRRR/S	000RRR/SSSS	RRRRRR000	RRRRRR/SSSS	00RRRR/SSS0
00SSSSSSSS0	000SSSSSSS	RR/SSSSS000	RR/SSSSSSSS	00SSSSSSS0
00RR/SSSSSS0	000R/SSSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	RRRR/SSSSSS	00RR/SSSSSS0
00RRR/SSSS0	000R/SSSSSS	RRR/SSSS000	RRRR/SSSSSS	00R/SSSSSSS0
00RRR/SSSS0	000RR/SSSSS	RRRRR/SS000	RRRRR/SSSSS	00RRR/SSSS0
00RR/SSSSSS0	000R/SSSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	RRRR/SSSSSS	00RR/SSSSSS0
00RRR/SSSS0	000RR/SSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	RRRR/SSSSSS	00RR/SSSSSS0
00RR/SSSSSS0	000SSSSSSS	RRR/SSSS000	RRR/SSSSSSS	00R/SSSSSSS0
00RR/SSSSSS0	000R/SSSSSS	RRR/SSSS000	RRRR/SSSSSS	00RRR/SSSS0
00RRR/SSSS0	000RR/SSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	RRRRR/SSSSS	00RRRR/SSS0
00R/SSSSSSS0	000R/SSSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	RRRR/SSSSSS	00RR/SSSSSS0
00RRR/SSSS0	000R/SSSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	RRRR/SSSSSS	00RR/SSSSSS0
00RR/SSSSSS0	000R/SSSSSS	RRRR/SSS000	RRRR/SSSSSS	00RR/SSSSSS0

Table A15. Choices of subjects (20) in Session C for the Abdellaoui *et al.* method.

Treatment 4	Treatment 3	Treatment 1	Treatment 2	Treatment 4
0RRR/SSSS00	00RR/SSSS0	RRRR/SSSSSS	000R/SSSSSS	0RRR/SSSS00
0RR/SSSS00	00RR/SSSS0	RRRR/SSSSSS	000R/SSSSSS	0RR/SSSS00
0RR/SSSS00	00RR/SSSS0	RRRR/SSSSSS	000SSSSSS	0RRR/SSSS00
0RRR/SSSS00	00RRR/SSSS0	RRRR/SSSSSS	000R/SSSSSS	0RRR/SSSS00
0RRR/SSSS00	00RR/SSSS0	RRRR/SSSSSS	000R/SSSSSS	0RRR/SSSS00
0RR/SSSS00	00R/SSSS0	RR/SSSSSS	000SSSSSS	0R/SSSS00
0RRR/SSSS00	00RR/SSSS0	RRRR/SSSSSS	000SSSSSS	0RRR/SSSS00
0RRRR/SSS00	00RRR/SSSS0	RRRRR/SSSS	000R/SSSSSS	0RRRR/SSS00
0RRR/SSSS00	00RRR/SSSS0	RRRRR/SSSS	000RR/SSSS	0RRRR/SS00
0RR/SSSS00	00RR/SSSS0	RRR/SSSSSS	000R/SSSSSS	0RR/SSSS00
0RRRR/SSS00	00RRRR/SSS0	RRRRR/SSSS	000RRR/SSSS	0RRRR/SSS00
0RR/SSSS00	00RR/SSSS0	RRR/SSSSSS	000R/SSSSSS	0RR/SSSS00
0RRR/SSSS00	00RR/SSSS0	RRRR/SSSSSS	000R/SSSSSS	0RRR/SSSS00
0RRR/SSSS00	00RR/SSSS0	RRRR/SSSSSS	000R/SSSSSS	0RRR/SSSS00
0RRR/SSSS00	00RR/SSSS0	RRRR/SSSSSS	000R/SSSSSS	0RRR/SSSS00
0RRR/SSSS00	00R/SSSS0	RRRR/SSSSSS	000R/SSSSSS	0RRR/SSSS00
0RRR/SSSS00	00RRR/SSSS0	RRR/SSSSSS	000R/SSSSSS	0RRR/SSSS00
0RRR/SSSS00	00RRR/SSSS0	RRRRR/SSSS	000RRR/SSSS	0RRRR/SS00
0RRR/SSSS00	00RR/SSSS0	RRRR/SSSSSS	000R/SSSSSS	0RR/SSSS00
0RRR/SSSS00	00R/SSSS0	RRR/SSSSSS	000SSSSSS	0RR/SSSS00

Table A16. Choices of subjects (21) in Session *D* for the Abdellaoui *et al.* method.

Treatment 5	Treatment 4	Treatment 2	Treatment 3	Treatment 5
RRR/SSSS000	0RR/SSSS00	000SSSSSS	00R/SSSS00	RRR/SSSS000
RRRR/SSS000	0RRR/SSSS00	000R/SSSSSS	00RR/SSSS00	RRRR/SSS000
RRRR/S/R/S000	0R/S/R/SSS/R00	000SS/R/S/R/SS	00S/RRR/SS/R0	RR/SS/R/S/R/000
RRRRR/SS000	0RRRR/SSS00	000RR/SSSSS	00RRR/SSSS0	RRRRR/SS000
RRR/SSSS000	0RRR/SSSS00	000R/SSSSSS	00RR/SSSS00	RRRR/SSS000
RR/SSSSS000	0R/SSSSSS00	000SSSSSSS	00SSSSSSS0	RR/SSSSS000
RRR/SSSS000	0RRR/SSSS00	00R/SSSSSS	00RR/SSSS00	RRRR/SSS000
RRRR/SSS000	0RRR/SSSS00	000SSSSSSS	00R/SSSSSS0	RRRR/SSS000
RRRR/SSS000	0RRRRR/SS00	000RRR/SSSS	00RRRR/SSS0	RRRRR/SS000
RRR/SS/RR000	0RRR/SSSS00	000RRR/SSSS	00RR/SSSS00	RRRRR/SS000
RRR/SSSS000	0RRRR/SSS00	000R/SSSSSS	00RR/SSSS00	RRRRR/SS000
RR/SSSSS000	0RR/SSSSS00	000SSSSSSS	00SSSSSSS0	RRR/SSSS000
RRR/SSSS000	0RR/SSSSS00	000SSSSSSS	00R/SSSSSS0	RRR/SSSS000
RR/SSSSS000	0RR/SSSSS00	000SSSSSSS	00R/SSSSSS0	RRR/SSSS000
RRRRR/SS000	0RRRR/SSS00	000RR/SSSSS	00RRR/SSSS0	RRRRR/SS000
RRRR/SSS000	0RRR/SSSS00	000R/SSSSSS	00RR/SSSS00	RRRR/SSS000
RRR/SSSS000	0RR/SSSSS00	000R/SSSSSS	00R/SSSSSS0	RRR/SSSS000
RRRRR/SS000	0RRRR/SSS00	000RR/SSSSS	00RRR/SSSS0	RRRRR/SS000
RRRRR/SS000	0RRRR/SSS00	000RR/SSSSS	00RRR/SSSS0	RRRRR/SS000
RRRR/SSS000	0RRR/SSSS00	000R/SSSSSS	00RR/SSSS00	RRRR/SSS000
RRRR/SSS000	0RRR/SSSS00	000R/SSSSSS	00RR/SSSS00	RRRR/SSS000

Table A17. Choices of subjects (21) in Session *E* for the Abdellaoui *et al.* method.

REFERENCES

- Abdellaoui, Mohammed, Ahmed Driouchi, Olivier L'Haridon (2011). "Risk aversion elicitation: Reconciling tractability and bias minimization." *Theory and Decision* 71: 63-80.
- Amaldoss, Wilfred, James R. Bettman, and John W. Payne (2008). "Biased but Efficient: An Investigation of Coordination Facilitated by Asymmetric Dominance." *Marketing Science* 27: 903-921.
- Andersen, Steffen, Glenn W. Harrison, Morten Igel Lau and E. Elisabet Rutström (2006). "Elicitation Using Multiple Price List Formats." *Experimental Economics* 9(4): 383-405.
- Bateman, Ian, Brett Day, Graham Loomes, and Robert Sugden (2007). "Can Ranking Techniques Elicit Robust Values?" *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 34: 49-66.
- Bosch-Domènech, Antoni, and Joaquim Silvestre (1999). "Does Risk Aversion or Attraction Depend on Income? An Experiment." *Economics Letters* 65: 265-273.
- Bosch-Domènech, Antoni, and Joaquim Silvestre (2006a). "Do the Wealthy Risk More Money? An Experimental Comparison." In Christian Schultz and Karl Vind, eds., *Institutions, Equilibria and Efficiency: Essays in Honor of Birgit Grodal*: 95-106, Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Bosch-Domènech, Antoni, and Joaquim Silvestre (2006b). "Reflections on Gains and Losses: A 2x2x7 Experiment." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 33(3): 217-235.
- Bosch-Domènech, Antoni, and Joaquim Silvestre (2006c). "The Gain-Loss Asymmetry and Single-Self Preferences." In Shigeo Kusuoka and Akira Yamazaki, eds., *Advances in Mathematical Economics*, Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Bosch-Domènech, Antoni, and Joaquim Silvestre (2010). "Averting Risk in the Face of Large Losses: Bernoulli vs. Tversky and Kahneman." *Economics Letters* 107(2): 180-182.
- Dave, Chetan, Catherine C. Eckel, Cathleen A. Johnson, and Christian Rojas (2010). "Eliciting Risk Preferences: When Is Simple Better?" *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 41: 219-243.
- Harrison, Glenn W., Eric Johnson, Melayne M. McInnes, and E. Elisabet Rutström (2005). "Risk Aversion and Incentive Effects: Comment." *American Economic Review* 95(3): 897-901.
- Holt, Charles A. (1986). "Preference Reversals and the Independence Axiom." *American Economic Review* 76(3): 508-515.
- Holt, Charles A., and Susan K. Laury (2002). "Risk Aversion and Incentive Effects in Lottery Choices." *American Economic Review* 92(5): 1644-1655.
- Holt, Charles A., and Susan K. Laury (2005). "Risk Aversion and Incentive Effects: New Data without Order Effects." *American Economic Review* 95(3): 902-912.
- Huber, Joel, John Payne, and Christopher Puto (1982). "Adding Asymmetrically Dominated Alternatives. Violations of Regularity and the Similarity Hypothesis." *Journal of Consumer Research* 9: 90-98.
- Isaac, Mark, and James Duncan (2000). "Just Who Are You Calling Risk Averse?" *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 20(2): 177-187.
- Lévy-Garboua, Louis, Hela Maafi, David Masclet and Antoine Terracol (2012). "Risk aversion and framing effects." *Experimental Economics* 15: 128-144.
- Machina, Mark J. (1982). "'Expected Utility' Analysis Without the Independence Axiom." *Econometrica* 50(2): 227-323.

Machina, Mark J. (1983). "Generalized Expected Utility Analysis and the Nature of Observed Violations of the Independence Axiom." In B. Stigum and F. Wenstop, eds., *Foundations of Utility and Risk Theory with Applications*, Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

Mas-Colell, Andreu, Michael Whinston, with Jerry Green (1995). *Microeconomic Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Parducci, Allen, and Douglas H. Weddell (1986). "The Category Effect with Rating Scales: Number of Categories, Number of Stimuli and Method of Presentation." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 12(4): 496-516.

Robinson, Angela, Michael W. Jones-Lee, and Graham Loomes (2001). "Visual Analog Scales, Standard Gambles and Relative Risk Aversion." *Medical Decision Making* 21: 17-27.

Saha, Atanu (1993). "Expo-Power Utility: A Flexible Form for Absolute and Relative Risk Aversion." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 75(4): 905-913.

Stewart, Neil, Gordon D. A. Brown, and Nick Carter (2005). "Absolute Identification by Relative Judgment." *Psychological Review* 112(4): 881-911.