# (4) Rationality Myth How \& Why People Make Weird Choices 



## Rational animal

„Man is a rational animal - so at least I have been told. Throughout a long life I have been looking diligently for evidence in favour of this statement, but so far I have not had the good fortune to come across it."

B. Russell

- What does "RATIONAL" mean?
- Reasonable \& logical
- Unbiased by emotions
- Optimal, relative to the information available


## Rational choice

- Expected Utility Theory:

Expectancy $\times V_{\text {alue }}$


## Example 1: Crockery story



## Example 1: Crockery story



# Example 1: Crockery story 

Hsee, C. K. (1998). Less is better: When low-value options are valued more highly than high-value options. Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 11, 107-121.

## Set $A$ :

24 pieces

- Dinner plates 8, all in good condition
- Soup/salad bowls 8, all in good condition
- Dessert plates 8, all in good condition


## Set B:

31 pieces

- Dinner plates 8 , all in good condition
- Soup/salad bowls 8, all in good condition
- Dessert plates 8, all in good condition
- Cups 8, 2 of them broken
- Saucers 8,7 of them broken


# Example 1: Crockery story 

Hsee, C. K. (1998). Less is better: When low-value options are valued more highly than high-value options. Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 11, 107-121.

## Three groups:

|  | Offered price <br> Set A(24pcs) | Offered price <br> Set B (31pcs) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Group 1 - <br> simultaneous <br> evaluation | $\$ 30$ | $\$ 32$ |
| Group 2 - Set A <br> only | $\$ 33$ | - |
| Group B - Set B <br> only | - | $\$ 23$ |

## Example 2: Dictionary story

Hsee, C. K. (1996). The evaluability hypothesis: An explanation for preference reversals between joint and separate evaluations of alternatives. Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 67(3), 247-257.

## Dictionary A:

- Published 1993
- 10,000 entries
- Like new


## Dictionary B:

- Published 1993
- 20,000 entries
- Cover torn, otherwise like new


## Example 2: Dictionary story

Hsee, C. K. (1998). Less is better: When low-value options are valued more highly than high-value options. Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 11, 107-121.

## Three groups:

|  | Offered price <br> Dictionary A | Offered price <br> Dictionary B |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Group 1- <br> simultaneous <br> evaluation | $\$ 19$ | $\$ 27$ |
| Group 2 - <br> Dictionary A only | $\$ 24$ | - |
| Group B - <br> Dictionary B only | - | $\$ 20$ |

## Conclusions

## ■ Preference reversal

In certain conditions, our preferences and/or evaluations may change even though the attributes of the objects remain the same.

Rational prioritization (transitive):
A is more than B is more than C

Irrational prioritization (intransitive):
$A$ is more than $B$ is more than $C$ is more than $A$ amount
amount
amount
defect

## Conclusions

## - Preference reversal

## ■ Evaluability effect

Our evaluation of options is only based on the information immediately available.
We do not consider relative value of possible alternatives if they are not available.

## How we think our mind works...



Rational thinking / decision making

## Irrational thinking / decision making



## How our mind actually works...

## HEURISTICS

## Conclusions

■ Preference reversal

- Evaluability effect
- Loss aversion

We invest more into avoiding losses than into achieving gains (of the same value).
When negative information is available, we tend to give it special attention and prioritize it.

## Loss aversion

Daniel Kahneman


Behavioural economics

Amos Tversky


## Risk aversion

## People avoid uncertainty.

## (Daniel Bernoulli)

## Loss v. risk aversion

Kahneman \& Tversky

## Situation A:

You have been given $\$ 1,000$. You are now asked to choose one of these options: 50\% chance to win $\$ 1,000$ OR get $\$ 500$ for sure
$50 \%$ chance of $\$ 1,000$ or $\$ 2,000$ OR
$100 \%$ chance of \$1,500

## Situation B:

You have been given $\$ 2,000$. You are now asked to choose one of these options: 50\% chance to lose $\$ 1,000$ OR lose $\$ 500$ for sure
$50 \%$ chance of $\$ 1,000$ or $\$ 2,000$ OR
$100 \%$ chance of $\$ 1,500$

## Loss V. risk aversion

Kahneman \& Tversky


## Loss v. risk aversion

|  | Certain $\$ 1,500$ <br> gain | Uncertain $\$ 1,000$ <br> or $\$ 2,000$ gain |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Situation A: <br> $\$ 1,000$ given <br> $50 \%$ chance to win <br> additional $\$ 1,000$ OR <br> get $\$ 500$ for sure | YES!!! | No, thanks. |
| Situation B: <br> $\$ 2,000$ given <br> $50 \%$ chance to lose <br> $\$ 1,000$ OR lose $\$ 500$ <br> for sure | Not if I can avoid <br> it. | THANKS FOR |

## Loss v. risk aversion

|  | Certain \$500 gain | Uncertain \$1,000 or $\$ 0$ gain |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Situation A: $\$ 1,000$ given 50\% chance to win additional \$1,000 OR get $\$ 500$ for sure | YES!!! | No, thanks. |
| Situation B: \$ 2,000 given $50 \%$ chance to lose \$1,000 OR lose \$500 for sure | Not if I can avoid it. | THANKS FOR THE CHANCE!!! |

## Loss v. risk aversion

|  | Certain \$500 loss | Uncertain \$1,000 or \$0 loss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Situation A: $\$ 1,000$ given 50\% chance to win additional \$1,000 OR get $\$ 500$ for sure | YES!!! | No, thanks. |
| Situation B: \$ 2,000 given $50 \%$ chance to lose \$1,000 OR lose \$500 for sure | Not if I can avoid it. | THANKS FOR THE CHANCE!!! |

## Loss aversion

## A matter of FRAMING.

"Let's go for a hike! Adam and Susan said thnymunld also be going!"
"Let's go for a hike! Adam and Susan said they would also be going, but, unfortunately, Steve cannot make it..."


# Loss aversion, preference reversal \& any choice 

A matter of FRAMING.

Influenced by CONTEXT.

## Dictionary story revisited

Hsee, C. K. (1998). Less is better: When low-value options are valued more highly than high-value options. Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 11, 107-121.

## Three groups:

|  | Offered price <br> Dictionary A <br> (10,000 entries, like <br> new) | Offered price <br> Dictionary B <br> (20,000 entries, <br> cover torn) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Group 1- <br> simultaneous <br> evaluation | $\$ 19$ | $\$ 27$ |
| Grup 2- <br> Dictionary A only | $\$ 24$ | - |
| Group B - <br> Dictionary B only | - | $\$ 20$ |

## Additional materials

- Before attempting the first quiz, watch the two videos available in the interactive syllabus in the IS:
Dan Ariely's TED talk on decision making
Daniel Kahneman's TED talk on past, present and future selves
- Recommended good reading on behavioural economics:
Kahneman, Daniel. Thinking, Fast and Slow.
Ariely, Dan. Predictably Irrational.
Ariely, Dan. The Upside of Irrationality.


## Rationality Myth <br> To be continued...



## Thank you!

