JETIR.ORG ISSN: 2349-5162 | ESTD Year : 2014 | Monthly Issue
JOURNAL OF EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND INNOVATIVE RESEARCH (JETIR)
An International Scholarly Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

THE EVOLUTION OF UTILITY THEORY POST-2000: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

RAKESH KUMAR

Assistant Professor (Temporary),

Department of Business Economics, Faculty of Commerce, The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, Vadodara, India

Abstract

Utility theory, a foundational pillar of microeconomics, has undergone substantial evolution since 2000. Traditional models such as Expected Utility Theory (EUT) assumed rational agents with stable preferences, yet a surge of empirical anomalies and interdisciplinary insights have catalyzed a rethinking of these assumptions. This paper reviews the major post-2000 developments in utility theory, focusing on behavioral and neuroeconomic extensions, ambiguity preferences, reference-dependent models, and social considerations in utility formulation. Emphasizing both theoretical and empirical contributions, this study highlights the increased psychological and contextual realism in modeling human decision-making. Implications for policy design, economic modeling, and future research directions are discussed.

Keywords: Utility theory, behavioral economics, prospect theory, reference dependence, ambiguity aversion, neuroeconomics, social preferences, decision-making

1. Introduction

Utility theory has long been a foundational concept in economics, serving as the cornerstone of consumer behavior analysis and decision-making models. At its core, utility theory seeks to explain how individuals make choices to maximize their satisfaction or well-being when faced with scarce resources. The classical utility framework—grounded in rational choice theory—assumes that individuals have stable, complete, and transitive preferences, enabling them to make consistent and optimal decisions. Over the 20th century, this theory evolved into more formal models such as Expected Utility Theory (EUT), which became the dominant paradigm for decision-making under risk.

However, the beginning of the 21st century marked a turning point in the understanding of human behavior. Empirical observations and experimental data increasingly revealed that actual human choices often deviate from the predictions of traditional utility models. These deviations highlighted systematic biases, inconsistencies, and context-dependent preferences that could not be fully explained by existing theories. This led to an intellectual shift, as economists began to incorporate insights from psychology, neuroscience, and sociology into utility modeling.

Post-2000 developments in utility theory have thus moved beyond the narrow confines of rational choice, embracing more nuanced and realistic assumptions about human cognition and behavior. The rise of behavioral economics, the introduction of reference-dependent preferences, the study of ambiguity aversion, and the emergence of neuroeconomics have fundamentally transformed how economists conceptualize utility. This paper examines these post-2000 evolutions in detail, tracing the theoretical innovations and empirical advancements that have reshaped utility theory into a more flexible and interdisciplinary framework for understanding decision-making.

2. Classical Foundations and the Motivation for Evolution

Utility theory finds its philosophical foundations in classical utilitarianism, especially the works of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. Bentham's principle of utility—"the greatest happiness of the greatest number"—suggested that individual choices could be understood and guided by their consequences on well-being or happiness. This philosophical idea laid the groundwork for economic interpretations of utility as a measurable and comparable quantity representing individual satisfaction or preference.

The formalization of utility theory in economics came with the development of **Expected Utility Theory (EUT)** by von Neumann and Morgenstern in their seminal 1944 work *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. EUT posits that rational individuals make choices under uncertainty by assigning utilities to outcomes and selecting the option with the highest expected utility. This model provided a coherent framework for decision-making and dominated economic thinking for much of the 20th century. It rested on a set of axioms such as completeness, transitivity, independence, and continuity—assumptions that defined rational behavior in uncertain environments.

However, by the mid-20th century, numerous empirical observations began to challenge the predictive validity of EUT. The **Allais paradox** (Allais, 1953) revealed that individuals' choices systematically violated the independence axiom, preferring certainty in some cases even when it was inconsistent with EUT predictions. Similarly, the **Ellsberg paradox** (Ellsberg, 1961) highlighted people's aversion to ambiguous probabilities, contradicting the notion that agents evaluate options solely based on expected utility.

These paradoxes stimulated a critical re-evaluation of the EUT framework. Scholars like **Starmer (2000)** argued that EUT's failure to account for actual human behavior rendered it descriptively inadequate. He surveyed the growing empirical evidence and theoretical responses, urging a shift toward more psychologically realistic models. This motivation catalyzed the evolution of utility theory into a more nuanced domain, incorporating behavioral insights and alternative formulations that more accurately reflect human decision-making under uncertainty.

3. Prospect Theory and Its Expansions

Prospect Theory (PT), introduced by Kahneman and Tversky (1979), marked a revolutionary departure from the traditional Expected Utility Theory by incorporating psychological realism into economic decision-making. Unlike EUT, which assumes agents evaluate final outcomes and act rationally under risk, PT asserts that individuals evaluate outcomes relative to a reference point—often the status quo or expectations—and exhibit **loss aversion**, whereby losses loom larger than equivalent gains. For instance, losing ₹100 is felt more intensely than the pleasure of gaining ₹100.

This theory better explains observed behaviors such as the **disposition effect** in stock trading (where investors hold losing stocks too long and sell winners too early), and **framing effects**, where the way choices are presented influences decisions.

In the 21st century, PT has been significantly refined. Tversky and Kahneman's (1992) **Cumulative Prospect Theory (CPT)** improved the original by incorporating **probability weighting**, where people tend to overweight small probabilities and underweight large ones. This explains why people buy both lottery tickets and insurance—two behaviors difficult to reconcile using EUT.

Empirical support for CPT is robust. Wakker (2010) provided a rigorous axiomatic basis for CPT, reinforcing its theoretical soundness. The model has been applied in diverse domains such as health economics (e.g., understanding patient risk preferences), behavioral finance (e.g., modeling investor sentiment), and public economics (e.g., predicting taxpayer behavior).

Additionally, experimental and field studies since 2000 have validated the central tenets of CPT in varied cultural and economic contexts, demonstrating its robustness across populations.

However, one challenge remains: while PT and CPT are descriptively accurate, they are **not always easily integrated into welfare analysis**, since they depend on reference points which are often unobservable and may shift over time. Despite this, they represent a critical advance in capturing real-world decision-making under uncertainty.

4. Reference-Dependent Preferences and Expectations-Based Utility

A major evolution in utility theory post-2000 is the formalization of **reference-dependent preferences**, wherein individuals derive utility not from absolute outcomes but from how those outcomes compare to a psychological reference point. This shift addresses the limitation of traditional utility models that assume stable, context-independent preferences.

Koszegi and Rabin (2006, 2007) developed a rigorous theoretical framework incorporating expectations as reference points. According to their **Expectations-Based Reference-Dependent Utility (ERDU)** model, individuals form expectations about future outcomes, and utility is partially derived from gains or losses relative to these expectations. Gains produce positive utility, while losses—even of equal magnitude—result in a greater negative impact due to *loss aversion*. This model aligns with and extends the insights of Prospect Theory by specifying how reference points are formed endogenously.

A key contribution of this model is its predictive power across various economic contexts. For instance, it explains why consumers experience regret when discounts occur after a purchase or why workers resist nominal wage cuts even during deflationary periods. In labor economics, Abeler et al. (2011) empirically validated ERDU by showing that effort levels fall sharply when wages dip below expected benchmarks, underscoring the motivational role of expectations.

Moreover, the model has implications in contract design, insurance behavior, and behavioral finance. Firms use price framing, limited-time offers, and bonus structures that manipulate expectations to influence consumer and employee behavior. For example, "pay-what-you-want" pricing or endowment effects in asset valuation can be understood through reference-dependent utility.

While the ERDU model improves psychological realism, it introduces complexity—especially in dynamically changing environments where expectations shift frequently. Nonetheless, it marks a critical advancement in making utility theory more descriptive of real-world behavior and bridges the gap between psychology and economics.

5. Ambiguity Aversion and Decision Making under Uncertainty

Traditional utility theory, especially under the Expected Utility Theory (EUT) framework, assumes that individuals can assign precise probabilities to all possible outcomes. However, real-world decision-making often occurs under *ambiguity*—situations where probabilities are unknown or ill-defined. Post-2000 research has paid increasing attention to this distinction between *risk* (known probabilities) and *ambiguity* (unknown probabilities), giving rise to models that account for ambiguity aversion.

The foundation for this shift lies in the **Ellsberg Paradox** (1961), which demonstrated that individuals systematically prefer known risks over ambiguous alternatives, violating the predictions of EUT. Responding to this, theorists have proposed models that explicitly incorporate ambiguity preferences. Among the most influential is the **Smooth Ambiguity Model** by Klibanoff, Marinacci, and Mukerji (2005), which separates attitudes toward risk from attitudes toward ambiguity by introducing a second-order utility function. This framework allows for more nuanced predictions and has improved analytical tractability in empirical applications.

Other important contributions include the **Maxmin Expected Utility** model (Gilboa & Schmeidler, 1989), which assumes decision-makers evaluate actions based on the worst-case scenario among a set of plausible probability distributions, and the **α-Maxmin** model (Ghirardato, Maccheroni, & Marinacci, 2004), which interpolates between extreme pessimism and optimism.

Empirical validation of ambiguity aversion has been observed in financial behavior (e.g., the equity home bias), medical decisions, and insurance uptake. Ambiguity-averse individuals often demand higher premiums for uncertain outcomes or avoid ambiguous options altogether, even when they may offer better expected returns.

Post-2000 developments have thus enriched utility theory by recognizing that people respond differently to unknown risks. These models enhance predictive accuracy in uncertain environments and inform practical domains such as finance, environmental policy, and behavioral contract design, where ambiguity is intrinsic and unavoidable.

6. Social Preferences: Beyond the Isolated Rational Agent

Traditional utility theory assumes that individuals are self-interested agents who derive satisfaction solely from their own consumption or outcomes. However, a growing body of experimental and theoretical research since 2000 has challenged this assumption by emphasizing the role of *social preferences*—concerns about fairness, equity, reciprocity, and the welfare of others—in economic decision-making.

The seminal work by **Fehr and Schmidt (1999)** introduced a model of *inequity aversion*, proposing that individuals experience disutility when outcomes are perceived as unfair—either because they receive less (envy) or more (guilt) than others. This framework successfully explained behavior observed in classic experimental settings such as the ultimatum and dictator games, where participants often reject or avoid unequal distributions, even at a personal cost.

Further refinement came from **Charness and Rabin (2002)**, who expanded the utility function to include not only inequality aversion but also *reciprocal preferences* and a concern for the total welfare of others. Their model helps explain altruistic actions and cooperative behavior in public goods games and team-based decision contexts.

Empirical support for social preference models is robust. Field and lab experiments consistently reveal that a significant proportion of individuals are motivated by fairness norms, are willing to punish defectors in social dilemmas, and may even exhibit "warm-glow" giving—altruism that generates personal satisfaction.

These insights have profound implications for real-world economic and policy outcomes. In labor economics, incorporating fairness into wage-setting explains why firms may pay above-market wages. In tax compliance, social norms and perceived justice influence voluntary compliance rates. In behavioral public finance, understanding that individuals care about the well-being of others leads to better-designed redistribution policies and social welfare programs.

Thus, post-2000 utility theory recognizes that humans are not isolated calculators but socially embedded agents whose utility is deeply interwoven with the outcomes and perceptions of others.

7. Neuroeconomics and the Biological Basis of Utility

The emergence of **neuroeconomics** in the early 21st century marks a significant interdisciplinary advancement in the evolution of utility theory. Combining neuroscience, psychology, and economics, neuroeconomics investigates how the brain processes information and makes decisions, especially under conditions of risk, reward, and uncertainty. The central objective is to understand the biological underpinnings of utility maximization and preference formation—concepts traditionally treated as abstract in classical economic theory.

One of the key findings in neuroeconomics relates to the **dopaminergic system**, particularly the role of **dopamine neurons** in encoding *prediction errors*—the difference between expected and actual outcomes. Schultz, Dayan, and Montague (1997) demonstrated through primate studies that these neurons fire when an unexpected reward is received, and their firing diminishes when expected rewards are withheld. This mechanism closely mirrors the concept of utility maximization through learning and adaptation. It implies that the brain updates its valuation of choices based on past outcomes, thus dynamically recalibrating its "utility function."

Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) studies have further expanded our understanding by identifying specific brain regions involved in valuation and decision-making. The **ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC)** is consistently associated with the computation of subjective value, integrating both tangible and intangible aspects of utility. The **nucleus accumbens**, part of the brain's reward circuitry, plays a crucial role in anticipating rewards, while the **amygdala** is linked to emotional responses that often influence decisions involving risk or moral judgment.

Neuroeconomic research also provides insights into *bounded rationality* and *time-inconsistent preferences*. For instance, McClure et al. (2004) found that the **limbic system** is more active when individuals make impulsive choices involving immediate gratification, whereas **prefrontal areas** are more engaged in long-term, patient decision-making. This neural duality supports behavioral models such as hyperbolic discounting and the β-δ framework, challenging the classical assumption of exponential time discounting.

Moreover, neuroeconomics helps explain phenomena such as **addiction, altruism, loss aversion**, and **regret**—concepts previously considered anomalies in utility theory. For example, activation of pain centers in the brain during loss scenarios correlates with heightened loss aversion observed in behavioral experiments.

While still an evolving field, neuroeconomics has enriched utility theory by providing empirical evidence that links brain processes to choice behavior. By grounding theoretical models in neurobiological reality, it offers a more comprehensive and predictive framework for understanding economic decision-making.

8. Intertemporal Choice and Time-Inconsistent Preferences

Intertemporal choice involves decisions where the consequences unfold over time—such as saving for retirement, dieting, or investing in education. Traditional utility theory models such decisions using **exponential discounting**, assuming that individuals discount future utility at a constant rate. This implies **time-consistent preferences**—that is, preferences remain stable over time and today's plan for tomorrow will still be preferred when tomorrow arrives.

However, substantial empirical evidence suggests that people often exhibit **present bias**—overvaluing immediate rewards at the expense of future benefits. This has led to the adoption of **quasi-hyperbolic** or **β-δ discounting** models, where individuals disproportionately discount the immediate future (via parameter $\beta < 1$), while maintaining exponential discounting for more distant time periods (via parameter δ). This framework was formalized by Laibson (1997) and further developed by O'Donoghue and Rabin (1999), who introduced the concepts of **naïve** and **sophisticated agents**. Naïve agents fail to predict their future self-control problems, whereas sophisticated agents anticipate them and may seek **commitment devices**—tools or rules to limit future options (e.g., automatic savings plans, deadlines).

These models have profound implications. For instance, time-inconsistent preferences explain why individuals procrastinate, undersave, or overconsume addictive goods—behaviors often viewed as irrational under standard utility theory. In public policy, this has motivated the design of **"soft paternalism"** tools such as nudges, default enrollment in savings plans, and sin taxes on harmful consumption.

Furthermore, experimental studies (e.g., Augenblick, Niederle, & Sprenger, 2015) have validated these theories using real-effort tasks, showing that participants often delay painful activities even when aware of future regret. By integrating psychological realism into intertemporal utility modeling, modern theories provide a more nuanced and empirically grounded understanding of how individuals make choices over time.

9. Empirical Modeling and Structural Estimation

Since the early 2000s, utility theory has increasingly emphasized empirical validation through advanced econometric techniques, leading to the widespread adoption of structural modeling and estimation methods. Structural estimation involves specifying a behavioral model grounded in economic theory, incorporating utility functions that capture preferences and constraints, and then statistically estimating the model parameters using observed data. This approach allows researchers to rigorously test the assumptions of utility theory and quantify behavioral parameters such as risk aversion, time preference, loss aversion, and social preferences.

One key advancement has been the integration of behavioral models into structural frameworks, bridging the gap between descriptive anomalies and predictive economic models. For example, models incorporating reference dependence or prospect theory preferences have been structurally estimated using individual choice data to assess the magnitude of loss aversion or probability weighting in various contexts, such as labor supply decisions, consumer choice, or investment behavior. These empirical estimations often employ maximum likelihood or Bayesian methods, allowing for flexible modeling of heterogeneous agents.

Dynamic discrete choice models, initially developed by Rust (1987), have been extended to account for bounded rationality and behavioral biases. These models enable analysis of decision-making over time, such as retirement timing, educational attainment, or health investments, incorporating utility functions that reflect behavioral nuances. The computational power available post-2000 has greatly facilitated the estimation of complex models, previously deemed intractable.

Furthermore, structural models have practical policy applications. By estimating utility parameters accurately, policymakers can simulate the effects of interventions—such as tax changes, subsidies, or nudges—on behavior and welfare. For instance, understanding time-inconsistent preferences via structural models has informed the design of commitment devices in savings programs.

Despite their power, structural estimation methods face challenges, including identification issues and the need for rich data. Nonetheless, this empirical turn has strengthened utility theory's relevance, making it not only descriptively accurate but also quantitatively robust and policy-relevant.

10. Implications for Policy and Welfare Analysis

The evolution of utility theory post-2000 has profoundly influenced economic policy and welfare analysis, shifting the focus from purely rational, utility-maximizing agents to more nuanced, behaviorally-informed decision-makers. Traditional welfare economics, rooted in expected utility theory, assumes consistent preferences, full information, and rational choices. However, empirical anomalies and behavioral insights have exposed the limitations of such assumptions, necessitating a more flexible framework for policy design.

Behavioral utility models, such as those incorporating loss aversion, present bias, and social preferences, have reshaped how policymakers assess interventions. One prominent example is the concept of "internalities," where individuals make choices that harm their future selves—such as under-saving for retirement or overeating—due to time-inconsistent preferences. In response, governments have adopted "soft" paternalistic tools like **nudges**, a concept popularized by Thaler and Sunstein (2008). These include automatic enrollment in pension plans, default options in organ donation, and simplified tax filing processes, all designed to align individual behavior with long-term welfare without restricting freedom of choice.

Moreover, models incorporating **reference-dependent utility** and **inequality aversion** have prompted a reevaluation of taxation and redistribution policies. For example, individuals may perceive a loss from increased taxes more acutely than a gain from equivalent public benefits, influencing political support for welfare programs. Social utility models also justify redistributive policies beyond purely utilitarian arguments, emphasizing fairness, reciprocity, and dignity.

In the realm of environmental, health, and education policy, behavioral models provide tools for improving outcomes through better framing, incentives, and information design. They also inform **cost-benefit analysis**, which now increasingly includes psychological and behavioral parameters to estimate the true impact of policies.

In sum, the post-2000 developments in utility theory have expanded the analytical toolkit for policymakers, enabling more effective and empathetic interventions that reflect how people actually think, decide, and behave in real-world contexts.

11. Limitations and Critiques

Despite significant theoretical and empirical advancements in utility theory since 2000, several limitations continue to challenge the field. These critiques raise important concerns about the coherence, empirical testability, and practical applicability of modern utility models.

1. Fragmentation of Theoretical Frameworks

One of the foremost critiques is the **lack of a unified theory**. As Bernheim (2009) observes, the post-2000 landscape of utility theory is marked by fragmentation, with numerous overlapping models addressing different anomalies or behavioral patterns. For example, Prospect Theory, Hyperbolic Discounting, Dual-Self Models, and Regret Theory each attempt to explain specific deviations from rational choice, but no single model has emerged as a comprehensive framework. This proliferation creates a **"toolbox approach"** rather than a consistent explanatory theory. While such diversity fosters innovation, it also limits the **cumulative progress** of utility theory as a unified discipline.

2. Empirical Complexity and Falsifiability

A second critique concerns the **empirical complexity** of modern utility models. Behavioral models often incorporate multiple parameters to account for various psychological effects (e.g., loss aversion, reference dependence, or time inconsistency). While this increases the **flexibility and descriptive accuracy** of the models, it comes at the cost of **falsifiability**—a core requirement of scientific theory (Popper, 1959). When a model can be tuned post hoc to fit almost any dataset, its **predictive credibility** weakens. Moreover, such parameter-rich models are often difficult to calibrate in practice and may lack robustness across contexts and populations.

3. Overemphasis on Description over Prediction

A third line of critique targets the **descriptive orientation** of many contemporary models. Some behavioral models appear to function more as **catalogs of cognitive biases** than as theories that generate testable predictions. This has led critics to argue that while these models explain *why* people deviate from rationality, they often fail to predict *how* such deviations will manifest in new contexts. As a result, their contribution to policy modeling, market design, or welfare analysis may be limited unless grounded in generalizable patterns or principles.

Toward a Balanced Utility Framework

Nonetheless, despite these limitations, **recent trends indicate convergence** toward models that balance **realism with analytical tractability**. Scholars are increasingly focused on creating **hybrid frameworks** that integrate psychological realism with the formal precision of traditional economic models. For instance:

- **Model simplification efforts**, like the use of one-parameter versions of Prospect Theory (e.g., cumulative prospect theory with fixed loss aversion coefficients), aim to retain behavioral richness without overfitting.
- **Structural behavioral models** are being developed, which blend classical rationality with empirically-grounded deviations, allowing for both predictive accuracy and policy relevance.
- **Advances in computational modeling** and machine learning are helping to test and refine models across large and varied datasets, thereby enhancing generalizability and falsifiability.

In sum, while the field continues to grapple with fragmentation and empirical complexity, there is a discernible shift toward **parsimonious yet powerful models** that provide both **behavioral depth** and **analytical clarity**. This direction holds promise for the development of a more unified and practically relevant utility theory in the coming decades.

12. Future Directions

The evolution of utility theory post-2000 has opened new pathways for research that aim to bridge theoretical sophistication with empirical applicability. A key future direction involves **unifying diverse behavioral models**—such as those incorporating reference dependence, time inconsistency, and social preferences—into a comprehensive framework that can account for the multifaceted nature of human decision-making. This would enhance predictive accuracy and policy relevance. Another promising area is **cross-cultural validation** of utility models. Much of the existing behavioral research is based on Western populations; future studies must test these models across varied cultural and socio-economic contexts to ensure their generalizability. Additionally, **AI and machine learning techniques** are beginning to inform utility modeling by uncovering latent preference structures from large datasets, enabling more personalized and adaptive economic predictions. **Neuroeconomic insights** will also play a growing role in grounding utility in biological processes, potentially offering objective utility measures that can complement or even replace self-reported data. Lastly, as digital platforms increasingly mediate decision-making, future models must address **technology-induced preference shifts** and cognitive biases shaped by online environments. Together, these directions will shape a more holistic, interdisciplinary, and practically grounded understanding of utility in the 21st century.

13. Conclusion

The evolution of utility theory post-2000 reflects a significant paradigmatic shift in economics, moving beyond the rigid assumptions of classical rationality toward models that better capture the complexity of real human behavior. By incorporating insights from psychology, neuroscience, and sociology, contemporary utility models offer a more nuanced understanding of decision-making under risk, uncertainty, and social contexts. The development of frameworks such as cumulative prospect theory, reference-dependent preferences, and models of ambiguity aversion has enhanced the predictive and explanatory power of economics. These innovations have also led to the emergence of applied fields such as behavioral public policy and neuroeconomics. Despite concerns regarding model complexity and fragmentation, the interdisciplinary approach enriches utility theory and makes it more applicable to diverse policy and market settings. As we look ahead, unifying these diverse strands into comprehensive, empirically validated frameworks will be crucial for both theoretical coherence and effective real-world application.

References

- Abeler, J., Falk, A., Goette, L., & Huffman, D. (2011). Reference points and effort provision. *American Economic Review*, 101(2), 470–492.
- Allais, M. (1953). Le comportement de l'homme rationnel devant le risque. *Econometrica*, 21(4), 503–546.
- Augenblick, N., Niederle, M., & Sprenger, C. (2015). Working over time: Dynamic inconsistency in real effort tasks. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(3), 1067–1115.
- Barberis, N. (2013). Thirty years of prospect theory in economics: A review and assessment. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27(1), 173–196.
- Bernheim, B. D. (2009). Behavioral welfare economics. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 7(2–3), 267–319.
- Charness, G., & Rabin, M. (2002). Understanding social preferences with simple tests. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(3), 817–869.
- DellaVigna, S. (2009). Psychology and economics: Evidence from the field. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 47(2), 315–372.
- Ellsberg, D. (1961). Risk, ambiguity, and the Savage axioms. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 75(4), 643–669.
- Fehr, E., & Schmidt, K. M. (1999). A theory of fairness, competition, and cooperation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114(3), 817–868.
- Ghirardato, P., Maccheroni, F., & Marinacci, M. (2004). Differentiating ambiguity and ambiguity attitude. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 118(2), 133–173.
- Glimcher, P. (2003). *Decisions, uncertainty, and the brain: The science of neuroeconomics*. MIT Press.
- Gilboa, I., & Schmeidler, D. (1989). Maxmin expected utility with non-unique prior. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 18(2), 141–153.

- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–291.
- Klibanoff, P., Marinacci, M., & Mukerji, S. (2005). A smooth model of decision making under ambiguity. *Econometrica*, 73(6), 1849–1892.
- Koszegi, B., & Rabin, M. (2006). A model of reference-dependent preferences. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121(4), 1133–1165.
- Koszegi, B., & Rabin, M. (2007). Reference-dependent risk attitudes. *American Economic Review*, 97(4), 1047–1073.
- Laibson, D. (1997). Golden eggs and hyperbolic discounting. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(2), 443–478.
- Mas-Colell, A., Whinston, M. D., & Green, J. R. (1995). *Microeconomic theory*. Oxford University Press.
- O'Donoghue, T., & Rabin, M. (1999). Doing it now or later. *American Economic Review*, 89(1), 103–124.
- Robson, A. J., & Samuelson, L. (2007). The evolution of time preference with aggregate uncertainty. *American Economic Review*, 97(2), 496–500.
- Rust, J. (1987). Optimal replacement of GMC bus engines: An empirical model of Harold Zurcher. *Econometrica*, 55(5), 999–1033.
- Schultz, W., Dayan, P., & Montague, P. R. (1997). A neural substrate of prediction and reward. *Science*, 275(5306), 1593–1599.
- Starmer, C. (2000). Developments in non-expected utility theory: The hunt for a descriptive theory of choice under risk. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 38(2), 332–382.
- Sugden, R. (2004). The opportunity criterion: Consumer sovereignty without the assumption of coherent preferences. *American Economic Review*, 94(4), 1014–1033.
- Sydnor, J. (2010). (Over) insuring modest risks. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2(4), 177–199.
- Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. Yale University Press.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1992). Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 5(4), 297–323.
- Wakker, P. P. (2010). *Prospect theory: For risk and ambiguity*. Cambridge University Press.