ExpEcon Methods: Vernon's Precepts

ECON 8877 P.J. Healy

Updated 21. September 2023

Vernon Smith



Vernon Smith 2002 Nobel Prize

Other early pioneers: Plott, Kagel, Battalio, Williams... many

Why Vernon?

The 2002 Nobel Prize

- Vernon Smith & Charlie Plott: pioneered market experiments
 - \rightarrow "experimental economics"
- Kahneman & Tversky: Prospect Theory
 - \rightarrow "behavioral economics"
 - Tversky passed away in 1996
- · Smith elucidated the theory of incentivized experiments
 - "Experimental Economics: Induced Value Theory" (1976)
 - "Microeconomic Systems as an Experimental Science" (1982)

Induced Value Theory (1976)

Experiments are important because

- 1. They are a pretest of economic theory
 - · Prior to the use of field data
 - Using field data to modify models won't work since it's in-sample.
 "Any test of significance now becomes hopelessly confused"
 - · Can't this be solved by cross-validation?
 - Model o expm'nt o new model o expm'nt o new model o ...
- 2. (Presumed) parallelism between lab and field
 - Physics: "As far as we can tell, the same physical laws prevail everywhere."
 - My more nuanced view: experimental results are simply provocative examples. Worth worrying about, at least.

- 1. "Non-satiation" (monotonically increasing utility)
 - Monetary reward: M(a) for action a
 - Utility for money: u(M), u' > 0
 - $arg \max_a u(M(a)) = arg \max_a M(a)$
 - · MRS is the same:

$$\frac{\partial u(M(x,y))/\partial x}{\partial u(M(x,y))/\partial y} = \frac{u'\partial M/\partial x}{u'\partial M/\partial y} = \frac{\partial M/\partial x}{\partial M/\partial y}$$

- 2. "Saliency" (actions map to rewards)
 - Action profiles a map into rewards M(a)
 - This mapping is known and understood
 - Example: If you win an auction, you earn v_i
 - Example: Show-up fee is not salient

- 3. "Dominance" (sufficiently large rewards)
 - The reward structure dominates any subjective costs or values
 - · Example: Cognitive costs, effort
 - Example: Paying a commission for each transaction
 - Other-regarding preferences??

- 4. "Privacy" (only know your own payoff)
 - · Subjects can only see their own payoffs
 - · Goal: own-reward maximizers
 - · Removes social preferences
 - But what if we want to study social preferences??

- 5. "Parallelism" (aka "external validity")
 - · Lab results apply to non-lab settings
 - Not required if only testing theories in the abstract
 - "the same physical laws prevail everywhere" (Harlow Shapley 1964)
 - How to test parallelism? Comparison studies
 - · Who has the burden of proof?
 - · My view (following Roth):
 - · Experiments provide provocative examples
 - We can't guarantee parallelism, but our results are at least worth considering in the field

What else this paper does:

- Experiments as game forms \Rightarrow mechanism design
 - Mount-Reiter diagram (Fig. 1)
- Classifications of experiments
 - · Vary environment vs. vary institution
 - · Methodological:
 - 1. Establishing laws of behavior
 - 2. Heuristic/exploratory experiments
 - 3. Boundary/extreme experiments
- List of "stylized facts" (robust results)