

ROLE OF MAGNITUDE IN LOSS AVERSION UNDER RISK

OUROZ KHAN



DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

July 2025

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2025

ROLE OF MAGNITUDE IN LOSS AVERSION UNDER RISK

By

OUROZ KHAN

Department of Humanities and Social Sciences

Submitted

In fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

July 2025

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis titled “Role of Magnitude in Loss Aversion under Risk”, being submitted by Ms. Ouroz Khan to the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, is a record of original bona fide research carried out by her under my supervision. In my opinion, the thesis has reached the standards fulfilling the requirements for submission relating to the degree.

As far as I am aware, the results contained in the thesis have not been submitted, in part or full, to any other institute or university for award of any degree or diploma.

Dr. Sumitava Mukherjee

Associate Professor

Department of Humanities and Social Sciences

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

New Delhi- 110016, India

Date:

New Delhi, India

DECLARATION BY AUTHOR

I certify that the thesis titled “Role of Magnitude in Loss Aversion under Risk” submitted to the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy is a bonafide record of my research work done under the supervision of Dr. Sumitava Mukherjee, at the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi. The content of this thesis, in full or in parts, has not been submitted to any other institute or University for the award of any degree or diploma.

Ouroz Khan

2018HUZ8623

New Delhi

July, 2025

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Completing this thesis has been a profound journey, both academically and personally. This process has taken me through immense challenges, moments of self-doubt, and tremendous growth, ultimately bringing me to a quiet sense of strength. As I reflect on this long and winding journey, I am deeply aware that I did not walk it alone.

First and foremost, I am eternally grateful to my Lord for His constant guidance and mercy in paving this path for me. I simply moved forward, sometimes dragging myself, sometimes crawling, and at other times, running. Now, looking back, I see that every step, no matter how hard, was part of His plan.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my PhD supervisor, Dr. Sumitva Mukherjee, for helping me complete this journey. Your insightful discussions on research and life went far beyond academic supervision; they shaped my thinking and personality throughout these years. Your patience, belief in the work, and gentle encouragement have been a cornerstone of this thesis. I am grateful to all the faculty members who taught us during our PhD coursework; their insights laid a strong foundation for this journey. I am especially thankful to Dr. Samar Hussain, whose introduction to R programming became central to my analytical work, and who also served as a member of my SRC committee. I also extend my sincere thanks to my other SRC members, Dr. Purnima Singh and Dr. Narayanan Srinivasan, for their valuable feedback and guidance at critical stages of this research. My heartfelt appreciation goes to my M.Sc. supervisor, Dr. Supriya Ray, who first planted the idea that I could pursue research and taught me what it means to be true to science, and his belief in me laid the foundation for everything that followed.

I also wish to acknowledge the contributions of my colleagues and peers, who supported me both intellectually and emotionally throughout this journey. I am grateful to Sneha for always being there for me, and to Shailendra for helping me design experiments, explore new areas, and constantly encouraging us to keep learning. To my dear friends Jyotirmay, Simran, and Nikhil, thank you for being the calm in the academic storm and making daily responsibilities feel less daunting. I also thank Mudafia, Deepti, Akhil, and Avantika for offering unwavering support when it was needed most. To Srishti, thank you for your positive spirit and prayers; they meant more than you know. To my family, I owe everything. To my mother, who envisioned this dream for me and stood firm in support of my education, thank you for giving me the freedom to make my own choices and for trusting me completely. I also thank my siblings, who encouraged me throughout the journey. To my husband Zubair, who joined me at the most difficult stage of this journey, thank you for being my unwavering pillar of strength. Your calm presence, care, and silent sacrifices gave me the balance and support I needed to bring this thesis to completion.

This work is dedicated to all the first-generation girls stepping out of conservative homes, determined to make a mark, and to the torchbearers in their families who dare to choose conviction over conformity. In a family unfamiliar with academia, pursuing a PhD was a bold and uncertain step. Completing it has shown me that even what seems unreachable can be achieved through belief, effort, and grace. To everyone who played a part, directly or quietly in the background, thank you. Your support has been an integral part of this journey, and I carry deep gratitude for it all.

Ouroz Khan

Abstract

Prospect Theory (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979) is arguably one of the most influential descriptive theories of choice, which consists of a value function that predicts the overweighting of losses compared to gains. Building upon the general notion of bad being stronger than good and Prospect Theoretic loss aversion, the statement ‘losses loom larger than gains’ became accepted as a fundamental principle of human behavior. However, Mukherjee et al. (2017) proposed that loss aversion could be magnitude dependent, as some studies reported that loss aversion as measured using affective judgments disappears for small magnitudes, leading one to speculate about the generalizability of loss aversion (Gal & Rucker, 2018) or its empirical evidence at the origin (Yechiam, 2019). This has given rise to three positions in the field: the classic version in favor of loss aversion, the evidence against the existence of loss aversion, and a magnitude-dependent version that suggests loss aversion exists for large magnitudes but not for small magnitudes. However, there has been no systematic study to test the hypothesis for choices under risk. In this thesis, a comprehensive investigation of magnitude in risky choices has been done to test if loss aversion is indeed magnitude dependent for choices. Furthermore, as elicitation modes might impact choices and preferences (Slovic, 1995), three dominant methods have been used to measure loss aversion for risky choices involving equiprobable gambles in studies 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Further, the comprehensive analysis of secondary data is done in Study 4 to investigate the role of magnitudes within existing datasets, as it has often been overlooked or misinterpreted. The focus of the thesis is to underscore that magnitude is not a mere boundary condition but rather central to the concept of loss aversion under risk.

The first study involves testing a magnitude-dependent hypothesis for judgments and choices using equiprobable symmetrical gambles conducted on student population (Experiment 1A; $n = 146$), with a subsequent replication on a job aspirant (Experiment 1B; $n = 114$). The second study (Experiment 2A; $n = 183$ & 2B; $n = 187$) employs the list method, where a fixed gain is presented along with a sequentially increasing list of losses, to test magnitude-dependent loss aversion. In the third study, an experiment was conducted in which participants ($n = 208$) engaged in binary choices by playing a sequence of 200 hypothetical gambles within a sample space consisting of low magnitudes versus high magnitudes. In the fourth study, a detailed analysis of secondary datasets from previously published papers, specifically Zhao et al. (2020) and Sheng et al. (2020), was performed. Both datasets used a similar paradigm to Study 3, involving 200 binary choices across a range of magnitudes conducted in other countries.

The findings across the studies consistently support a magnitude-dependent hypothesis. The results from Study 1 revealed that magnitude levels predicted affective judgments and choices. Study 2 demonstrated a lower value of the loss aversion coefficient in the low-magnitude group compared to the high-magnitude group using the list methods. Study 3 further supported the magnitude-dependent hypothesis by demonstrating significant differences in median loss aversion coefficients between the low and high magnitude groups. In Study 4, the examination of symmetric gambles in the decision space consistently revealed that magnitudes significantly impacted choices, with higher rejection rates observed at larger magnitudes within the sample space. These cumulative results affirm magnitude-dependent loss aversion across diverse populations and experimental paradigms, underscoring the pivotal role of magnitude in shaping our understanding of loss aversion under risk.

Keywords: Loss Aversion, Magnitude-dependent Loss Aversion, Judgment, Choice,
Risky Decision making.

सार

प्रॉस्पेक्ट सिद्धांत (कह्लमैन और टवस्की, 1979) को विकल्पों के चयन से संबंधित सबसे प्रभावशाली वर्णनात्मक सिद्धांतों में से एक माना जाता है। यह सिद्धांत एक मूल्य फलन पर आधारित है, जो यह भविष्यवाणी करता है कि लोग लाभ की तुलना में हानियों को अधिक महत्व देते हैं। इसी सिद्धांत के आधार पर यह व्यापक रूप से स्वीकार कर लिया गया कि "हानियाँ लाभों की तुलना में अधिक प्रभाव छोड़ती हैं", और यह कथन मानव व्यवहार की एक मूल प्रवृत्ति के रूप में स्थापित हो गया।

हालाँकि, मुखर्जी और सहयोगियों (2017) ने यह प्रस्तावित किया कि हानि-विकर्षण परिमाण पर निर्भर हो सकता है। उन्होंने यह दिखाया कि जब हानि-विकर्षण को भावनात्मक मूल्यांकन के आधार पर मापा गया, तो छोटे परिमाणों के संदर्भ में यह प्रभाव गायब हो गया। इससे यह सवाल खड़ा हुआ कि क्या हानि-विकर्षण की धारणा वास्तव में सार्वभौमिक है, जैसा कि गाल और रकर (2018) ने तर्क दिया, या फिर इसका मूल साक्ष्य ही संदिग्ध है, जैसा कि येचियाम (2019) ने इंगित किया। इस बहस ने क्षेत्र में तीन भिन्न दृष्टिकोणों को जन्म दिया — एक पक्ष जो पारंपरिक रूप से हानि-विकर्षण के पक्ष में है; दूसरा, जो इसके अस्तित्व पर ही सवाल उठाता है; और तीसरा, जो यह मानता है कि हानि-विकर्षण केवल बड़े परिमाणों में ही प्रकट होता है, जबकि छोटे परिमाणों में यह प्रभाव मौजूद नहीं होता।

हालाँकि, अब तक जोखिम की स्थिति में इस परिकल्पना की कोई व्यवस्थित और ठोस परीक्षा नहीं की गई थी। प्रस्तुत शोध में इसी कमी को ध्यान में रखते हुए यह जाँचने का प्रयास किया गया है कि क्या जोखिमपूर्ण विकल्पों में हानि-विकर्षण वास्तव में परिमाण पर निर्भर करता है। इसके लिए तीन प्रमुख प्रयोगात्मक विधियों का उपयोग किया गया — हर विधि का उपयोग एक-एक अध्ययन (अध्ययन एक, दो और तीन) में किया गया। ये सभी अध्ययन समान संभावनाओं वाले काल्पनिक जुए पर आधारित थे। इसके अतिरिक्त, एक चौथे अध्ययन में जाओ और सहयोगियों (2020) तथा शेंग और सहयोगियों (2020) द्वारा पूर्व में प्रकाशित आंकड़ों का गहराई से विश्लेषण किया गया, ताकि यह समझा जा सके कि पूर्ववर्ती अध्ययनों में परिमाण की भूमिका को किस तरह समझा या उपेक्षित किया गया।

इस शोध-प्रबंध का मुख्य उद्देश्य यह रेखांकित करना है कि परिमाण केवल एक सीमित परिस्थिति नहीं है, बल्कि जोखिम की स्थितियों में हानि-विकर्षण को समझने का एक केंद्रीय आयाम है। अध्ययन एक में विद्यार्थियों और नौकरी के इच्छुक प्रतिभागियों पर समान-संभावनाओं वाले सममित जुए के माध्यम से यह जाँचा गया कि क्या परिमाण का स्तर उनके निर्णय और भावनात्मक मूल्यांकन को प्रभावित करता है। अध्ययन दो में सूची विधि का प्रयोग करते हुए यह परीक्षण किया गया कि एक निश्चित लाभ के साथ प्रस्तुत की गई बढ़ती हुई हानियों की सूची पर प्रतिभागी कैसे प्रतिक्रिया करते हैं — जिसमें यह पाया गया कि छोटे परिमाणों में हानि-विकर्षण गुणांक अपेक्षाकृत कम था। अध्ययन तीन में प्रतिभागियों ने दो सौ काल्पनिक द्वैध विकल्प खेले, जहाँ छोटे और बड़े परिमाणों के बीच उनके निर्णयों में अंतर देखा गया। अंततः, अध्ययन चार में अंतरराष्ट्रीय आंकड़ों का विश्लेषण करते हुए यह पाया गया कि जैसे-जैसे परिमाण बढ़ा, निर्णयों में अस्वीकृति दर भी अधिक हुई।

इन चारों अध्ययनों के परिणाम एक स्वर में इस बात का समर्थन करते हैं कि हानि-विकर्षण परिमाण पर निर्भर करता है। यह प्रभाव विभिन्न जनसंख्याओं, संदर्भों और प्रयोगात्मक विधियों में समान रूप से पाया गया। इस शोध के निष्कर्ष यह दर्शाते हैं कि जोखिम से जुड़े निर्णयों को समझने में परिमाण की भूमिका सतही नहीं, बल्कि अत्यंत महत्वपूर्ण और निर्णायक है।

कुंजीशब्द: हानि-विकर्षण, परिमाण-निर्भर हानि-विकर्षण, मूल्यांकन, निर्णय, जोखिमपूर्ण निर्णय-निर्माण।

Table of Contents

<i>Certificate</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>iii-iv</i>
<i>Abstract</i>	<i>v-ix</i>
<i>List of figures</i>	<i>xiv-xv</i>
<i>List of tables</i>	<i>xvi-xvii</i>
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	<i>xviii</i>
Chapter 1	1
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2.....	14
Literature Review.....	14
2.1 Trajectory of Loss Aversion	15
2.2 Overview of Loss aversion	16
2.3 Magnitude-dependent Effects in Loss aversion: A Comprehensive Review.....	20
2.4 Magnitude as a Central Aspect of Loss Aversion.....	32
Chapter 3.....	37
Experiment 1A: Testing magnitude-dependent hypothesis for judgment and choices using equiprobable gambles	41
3.1.1 Methods.....	41

3.1.2 Results.....	43
Experiment 1B: Replication of magnitude-dependent hypothesis.....	47
3.2.1 Methods.....	47
3.2.2 Results.....	49
3.3 Discussion.....	54
Chapter 4.....	57
Experiment 2A: Testing loss aversion using the List Method: A between-subject comparison.....	62
4.1.1 Methods.....	62
4.1.2 Results.....	65
<i>Additional analysis</i>	67
Experiment 2B: Testing loss aversion using the revised List Method,Symmetric Distribution of Losses.....	70
4.2.1 Methods.....	70
4. 2. 2 Results.....	73
<i>Additional analysis</i>	74
Experiment 2C: Testing loss aversion using the List Method - A within-subject comparison.....	79
4.3.1 Methods.....	79
4.3.2 Results.....	80

4.4 Discussion	83
Chapter 5	88
Experiment 3A: Testing Loss Aversion using Sequential Sampling Gambling Task	91
5.1.1 Methods.....	91
.....	94
5.1.2 Results.....	95
Additional analysis.....	104
5.2 Discussion	107
Chapter 6	113
6.1 .1 Method.....	118
6.2. Results.....	119
6.3. Discussion	128
Chapter 7.....	132
General Discussion	132
References.....	155
Appendix A.....	163
Appendix B.....	170
Appendix C	175
Curriculum Vitae	181

List of Figures

Figure no.	Title	Page No.
1.	Prospect Theory's (1979) value function	17
2.	Percentage of Participants' Ratings in Study 1, Experiment 1A: Comparing Gain > Loss, Gain = Loss, and Loss > Gain	45
3.	Percentage of Participants Accepting vs. Rejecting Gambles (Study 1, Experiment 1A)	47
4.	Percentage of Participants' Ratings in Study 1, Experiment 1B: Comparing Gain > Loss, Gain = Loss, and Loss > Gain	51
5.	Percentage of Participants Accepting vs. Rejecting Gambles (Study 1, Experiment 1B)	53
6.	Asymmetric Distribution of Losses in Low Magnitude Condition (Study 2, Experiment 2A)	63
7.	Asymmetric Distribution of Losses in High Magnitude Condition (Study 2, Experiment 2A)	64
8.	Percentage of Participants Accepting and Rejecting Gambles in low and magnitude condition (Study 2, Experiment 2A)	69

9.	Symmetric Distribution of Losses in Low Magnitude Condition (Study 2, Experiment 2B)	72
10.	Symmetric Distribution of Losses in Low Magnitude Condition (Study 2, Experiment 2B)	72
11.	Percentage of Participants Accepting and Rejecting Gambles in Low and High Magnitude Condition (Study 2, Experiment 2B)	76
12.	Trial Structure of the Experiment (Study 3, Experiment 3A)	94
13.	Proportion of Acceptance for Various Combinations of Gains and Losses for Low Magnitude Condition (Study 3, Experiment 3A)	102
14.	Proportion of Acceptance for Various Combinations of Gains and Losses for High Magnitude Condition (Study 3, Experiment 3A)	104
15.	Density Plot of Reaction Time (rt_) for Reject and Accept Responses in the Low Magnitude Condition (Study 3, Experiment 3A)	105
16.	Density Plot of Reaction Time (rt_) for Reject and Accept Responses in the High Magnitude Condition (Study 3, Experiment 3A)	106
17.	Proportions of Acceptances for Various Gain and Loss Combinations (1 = Accept; 0 = Reject) for the secondary datasets	127

List of Tables

Table no.	Title	Page no.
1.	Cumulative Link Mixed Model Predicting Affective Judgments(Study 1, Experiment 1A)	44
2.	Logistic Mixed-Effects Regression Predicting Gamble Acceptance (Study 1, Experiment 1A)	46
3.	Cumulative Link Mixed Model Predicting Affective Judgments(Study 1, Experiment 1B)	50
4.	Logistic Mixed-Effects Regression Predicting Gamble Acceptance (Study 1, Experiment 1B)	53
5.	Acceptance Rates for Matched Gambles Across Experiments 2A and 2B	77
6.	Regression Results for the Low-Magnitude Condition Across Ten Magnitude Levels on the Main Diagonal (Experiment 3A)	100
7.	Regression Results for the High-Magnitude Condition Across Ten Magnitude Levels on the Main Diagonal	103
8.	Regression Results Based on Zhao et al. (2020) Across Ten Magnitude	121

	Levels on the Main Diagonal	
9.	Regression Results for the Sheng et al. (2020) Across Ten Magnitude Levels on the Main Diagonal	123
	Levels on the Main Diagonal	
10.	Acceptance Percentages Across Ten Magnitude Levels Along the Main Diagonal, Based on Zhao et al. (2020)	124
11.	Acceptance Percentages Across Ten Magnitude Levels Along the Main Diagonal, Based on Sheng et al. (2020)	125

List of Abbreviations

PT	Prospect Theory
MLE	Maximum Likelihood Estimate
HDDM	Hierarchical Drift Diffusion Model
DbS	Decision by Sampling
hBayes	Hierarchical Bayesian Modeling