

Risk preferences of children and adolescents in relation to gender, cognitive skills, soft skills, and executive functions

Andreoni, J.; Di Girolamo, Amalia; List, John A.; Mackevicius, Claire; Samek, Anya

DOI:

[10.1016/j.jebo.2019.05.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2019.05.002)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Andreoni, J, Di Girolamo, A, List, JA, Mackevicius, C & Samek, A 2019, 'Risk preferences of children and adolescents in relation to gender, cognitive skills, soft skills, and executive functions', *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2019.05.002>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Checked for eligibility: 06/11/2019

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Risk Preferences of Children and Adolescents in Relation to Gender, Cognitive Skills, Soft Skills, and Executive Functions

James Andreoni, Amalia Di Girolamo, John List,
Claire Mackevicius and Anya Samek*

May 2019

Abstract

We conduct experiments eliciting risk preferences with over 1,400 children and adolescents aged 3-15 years old. We complement our data with an assessment of cognitive and executive function skills. First, we find that adolescent girls display significantly greater risk aversion than adolescent boys. This pattern is not observed among young children, suggesting that the gender gap in risk preferences emerges in early adolescence. Second, we find that at all ages in our study, cognitive skills (specifically math ability) are positively associated with risk taking. Executive functions among children, and soft skills among adolescents, are negatively associated with risk taking. Third, we find that greater risk-tolerance is associated with higher likelihood of disciplinary referrals, which provides evidence that our task is equipped to measure a relevant behavioral outcome. For academics, our research provides a deeper understanding of the developmental origins of risk preferences and highlights the important role of cognitive and executive function skills to better understand the association between risk preferences and cognitive abilities over the studied age range.

JEL Classifications: C72, C91

Keywords: children, field experiment, risk preferences, cognitive ability, executive functions

*Corresponding author: Anya Samek, anyasamek@gmail.com. We thank the Kenneth and Anne Griffin Foundation, the Hymen Milgrom Family Foundation and the National Institutes of Health grant #DK114238 for funding this research. Andreoni also acknowledges financial support from the National Science Foundation, Grant SES-165895. We thank Illinois School District 170, Harvey District 152, Crete Monee CUSD 201U, and Matteson District 159 for accommodating our research project. For excellent research assistance, we thank Edie Dobrez, Kristin Troutman, Rui Chen, Kevin Sokal, Katie Auger, Clark Halliday, Joe Seidel, Tarush Gupta and research assistants at the Becker Friedman Institute at the University of Chicago and the Behavioral and Experimental Economics (BEE) research group at the University of Southern California.

1
2
3
4 **1. Introduction**
5

6
7 A large literature in experimental economics has focused on the role of risk preferences in
8 explaining life outcomes.¹ For example, some research shows that women are less risk averse than
9 men, which could partly explain the gender gap in competitiveness and in labor market earnings
10 (Niederle and Vesterlund, 2011; Azmat and Petrongolo, 2014). It is important to document when
11 differences in risk preferences begin to emerge and when these differences start to make a
12 difference in the behaviors or skills of boys and girls. Such knowledge may inform policies to
13 address differences in educational performance that may, perhaps lead to a wage gap later in life.
14 Despite the great potential value of such understanding, surprisingly little is known about
15 differences in risk preferences at an early age or how these may interact with cognitive skills and
16 executive functions and thereby alter the life paths of students.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 To explore this question, we conduct experiments using a risk preference elicitation task
32 that we developed with over 1,400 children and adolescents ages 3-15. We find that by age 13-15
33 years old, adolescent girls display significantly greater risk aversion than adolescent boys. We do
34 not find the same gender gap among children ages 3-12, suggesting that the gap in risk taking
35 emerges in adolescence. We complement our data on risk preference with an assessment of
36 cognitive and executive function skills. The cognitive skills we refer to in this study are reading,
37 writing and math ability. Executive functions refer to planning skills, maintaining focus and
38 attention, following instructions, resisting distraction and temptation, and coordinating multiple
39 tasks. The executive functions that we measure are working memory, inhibitory control, attention
40 shifting, grit, self-control, conscientiousness and openness to experience. We find that cognitive
41 skills and executive functions are significantly related to risk preferences. Children and adolescents
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 ¹ Examples include Bertrand, 2011; Dohmen et al., 2011; Insler et al., 2016; Khwaja et al., 2006; and Sutter et al.,
60 2013.
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 with higher cognitive skills (specifically math skills) are more willing to take risks. Children with
5
6 higher executive functions, and adolescents with more grit, self-control or soft skills, tend to be
7
8 less willing to take risks. These results are robust to the inclusion of socio-economic and
9
10 demographic controls.
11
12

13
14 Our first contribution is to evaluate the gender gap in risk preferences. Documenting gender
15
16 disparities in risk preferences is important since this disparity can lead to many differential life
17
18 outcomes.² A handful of papers find that adult women are more risk averse than adult men
19
20 (Borghans et al., 2009; Charness and Gneezy, 2012; Croson and Gneezy, 2009; Dohmen et al.,
21
22 2011; Eckel and Grossman, 2002; 2008).³ A few studies (discussed in Section 2) have considered
23
24 the emergence of a gender gap in risk preferences in children and adolescents, but they have either
25
26 had relatively small sample sizes or have not included cognitive controls.
27
28
29
30

31 Our second contribution is to establish a connection between risk aversion and both
32
33 cognitive skills and executive functions across childhood and adolescence. It is important to
34
35 include controls for these two skills when assessing the developmental origins of risk preferences,
36
37 since there is a rapid change in these as children mature. While some related work on risk
38
39 preferences has included cognitive controls, the related work focuses on adolescents or adults and
40
41 excludes children (e.g., Eckel et al., 2012; Benjamin et al., 2013; Burks et al., 2009; Dohmen et
42
43 al., 2010; Frederick, 2005; Insler et al., 2016). Moreover, no related work that we know of also
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 ² We also propose that measures with children can be considered a ‘purer’ measure of time preference than most of
52 the literature presents with their subject pools. This contribution can be thought of in terms of measuring risk posture.
53 Conventional expected utility theory recognizes the important effects of background risk on risk attitudes measured
54 on the current choice. Harrison et al. (2007) show that background risk is important empirically. Specifically, they
55 find their subjects are substantially more risk averse when background risk is introduced. These results suggest the
56 importance of understanding the complete portfolio of risk the agent holds when making choices. As far as we are
57 aware however, the literature has not provided estimates of how background temporal profiles affect current choices.

58 ³ Note that surveys of the literature conclude that the gender gap in risk aversion is not apparent in all contexts (Filippin
59 and Crosetto, 2016). Moreover, the gender gap in risk preferences is not as robust as the observed gender gap in
60 competitiveness (Byrnes et al., 1999; Niederle and Vesterlund, 2011).
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 explores the associations of executive functions with risk preferences, despite its obvious
5
6 relevance.
7

8
9 In what follows, Section 2 summarizes the related literature. Section 3 describes our
10 experimental design. Section 4 summarizes our results. Section 5 provides a discussion and
11 concludes.
12
13
14

15 16 17 18 19 **2. Related Literature**

20 21 **2.1 Gender Gap in Risk Preferences of Children and Adolescents**

22
23 Harbaugh et al. (2002) were the first to explore risk preferences of young children using
24 an incentivized risk elicitation task. Potentially due to relatively small sample sizes⁴, the authors
25 did not find a gender gap in risk preferences in their child, adolescent, or adult subjects.
26
27
28

29
30 Sutter et al. (2019) provide a summary of economic preference experiments conducted with
31 children and adolescents since the original Harbaugh et al. (2002) paper. Their survey concludes
32 that the majority of studies find that girls are more risk averse (less risk tolerant) than boys (studies
33 include Levin and Hart, 2003; Borghans et al., 2009; Moreira et al., 2010; Booth and Nolen, 2012;
34 Cárdenas et al., 2012; Eckel et al., 2012; Sutter et al., 2013; Alan et al., 2017; Deckers et al., 2016;
35 Glätzle-Rützler et al., 2015; Khachatryan et al., 2015; Castillo, 2017). However, some studies do
36 not find the gender effect (for example, Angerer et al., 2015 do not report on a gender effect;
37 Tymula et al., 2012; Munro and Tanaka, 2014; Deckers et al., 2017; Castillo et al., 2018 do not
38 find a gender effect). Since many of the above studies span short age ranges and risk elicitation
39 tasks vary widely across studies, it is also difficult to know at what age the gender gap emerges.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 The evidence on risk preference development across age is quite mixed, but there is some
56

57
58
59 ⁴ 64 subjects ages 5-8 years old, 65 subjects ages 9-13 years old, 58 subjects ages 14-20 years old, and 47 subjects
60 ages 21-64.
61

1
2
3
4 evidence that the gender gap emerges during adolescence. Säve-Söderbergh and Lindquist (2017)
5
6 found that while adults on the TV show Jeopardy display gender gaps in risk taking, children ages
7
8 10-11 years old do not do so. Khachatryan et al. (2015) studied children ages 7-16 in Armenia and
9
10 found an emergence of gender-disparate risk preferences for children in grade 7 or higher as
11
12 compared to younger children. One suggested reason for the emergence of the gap around
13
14 adolescence is the hormonal change that occurs during puberty (Smith et al., 2013).
15
16
17
18

19 Related studies suggest that social environment influences a person's tendency to take
20
21 risks. Gardner and Steinberg (2005) found that being surrounded by peers influenced subjects to
22
23 make riskier decisions. Booth and Nolen (2012) found that girls who attend mixed-gender schools
24
25 may be more risk averse than girls who attend all-girls schools. Cárdenas et al. (2012) found that
26
27 the gender gap in risk-taking varies across Columbia and Sweden. Andersen et al. (2013) found
28
29 the emergence of gender-disparate competitiveness in puberty in patriarchal but not matriarchal
30
31 societies. Brown and van der Pol (2015) used survey questions measuring risk preferences and
32
33 found that adolescents' risk preferences are associated with parental risk preferences.
34
35
36
37

38 An improvement our study over related work is that we control for other age-related
39
40 changes (i.e. cognitive skills and executive functions). A second important improvement is that we
41
42 use the same task to study children and adolescents, which allows us to understand risk preferences
43
44 in both groups. A third improvement is that we study risk preferences at a younger age than most
45
46 studies (for example, in the summary by Sutter et al. (2019), the youngest children studied are 4
47
48 years old in Moreira et al. (2010) and 5 years old in Harbaugh et al. (2002), Levin and Hart (2003),
49
50 and Castillo (2017).)
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **2.2 Relationship of Risk Preferences with Cognitive Skills, Executive Functions and Soft**

59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Skills**
5

6
7 Related work also documents relationships between risk taking, cognitive skills, executive
8
9 functions and soft skills. We might expect a relationship of cognitive skills (specifically math
10
11 skills) with risk aversion since these skills may affect the processing of information related to
12
13 probability. We might also expect a relationship of executive functions with risk aversion since
14
15 inhibitory control or self-control might affect ability to regulate the prepotent response. That is, if
16
17 a child's prepotent response is to take many pencils (i.e., take a higher risk), self-control ability
18
19 may allow him or her to inhibit this response and take fewer pencils. Further, the literature from
20
21 developmental science described later in this section provides theories about links between
22
23 working memory and risk taking behavior.
24
25
26
27

28
29 Among adults, some work has found that greater cognitive skills are associated with lower
30
31 risk aversion (Burks et al., 2009; Dohmen et al., 2010; Frederick, 2005; Insler et al., 2016). Among
32
33 adolescents, risk taking and cognitive skills were assessed in Eckel et al. (2012) and Benjamin et
34
35 al. (2013). Eckel et al. (2012) did not find an association of risk preferences with cognitive skills,
36
37 as proxied by math ability. However, Benjamin et al. (2013) did find an association of risk
38
39 preferences with cognitive skills, whereby higher cognitive ability – especially in math – was
40
41 predictive of lower levels of risk aversion. To the best of our knowledge, researchers have not
42
43 assessed risk preferences and cognitive skills of children. If children are similar to adults and
44
45 adolescents, we might expect that children with higher levels of cognitive ability would also
46
47 display lower levels of risk aversion. On the other hand, if the link between risk preferences and
48
49 cognitive ability develops later in life, we may find no such association.
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 Some limited related work in economics has also evaluated the association of executive
57
58 functions and soft skills with risk preferences. Eckel et al. (2012) found that high planning ability
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 was negatively associated with risk taking, but only among 9th grade students. Becker et al. (2012)
5
6 reviewed the role that personality has on economic preferences. The authors found a low
7
8 association between personality and economic preferences, but concluded that the two are
9
10 complementary in predicting life outcomes and behavior.
11
12

13
14 Developmental psychologists have also been interested in exploring associations of
15
16 executive functions with risk-taking (see Boyer, 2006, for a review). This literature has focused
17
18 on adolescents, which is an age group that is known for taking higher amounts of risk generally
19
20 (e.g., reckless driving, smoking) (Steinberg, 2008). Boyer (2006) emphasized that emotional
21
22 instability and impulsivity may be the main explanation of adolescent risk-loving preferences.
23
24 Additional related work includes Rosenbaum et al. (2017), who found some evidence that training
25
26 adolescents in working memory decreased their risk taking behavior in a hypothetical gambling
27
28 task. A potential explanation for the link between working memory and risk taking is that improved
29
30 working memory accelerates executive function development and therefore reduces risk taking.
31
32 Finally, Romer et al. (2011) found association of risk taking (as measured by surveys) with
33
34 executive functions and the tendency to act without thinking.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 A limitation of the related work is that it does not include young children, since it focuses
42
43 mostly on adolescents and adults. Our study is the first to document associations of risk preferences
44
45 with cognitive skills at an early age. Another limitation is that related work does not include
46
47 measures of executive functions and related skills together with cognitive skills as we do.
48
49 Importantly, we find that cognitive skills and executive functions matter for risk taking at all age
50
51 ranges in our study, including for children as young as age 3.
52
53
54
55
56

57 **3. Experimental Design**

58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

3.1 The Pencil Task

The risk preference task we use is a simplification of a task developed by Andreoni and Harbaugh (2009, 2018). We here provide a simple model that illustrates the point that risk neutrality predicts always choosing the midpoint on the budget, no matter the price. In their task, adult subjects choose both a probability p , $0 \leq p \leq 1$, of winning a prize x if they win, where p and x lie on a budget constraint, such as $rp+x = 100$. In this problem, r is a price that can be any positive number. For instance, if $r=100$, and an individual is risk neutral, the person will solve:

$$\text{Max}_{p,x} px \quad \text{s.t. } 100p + x = 100$$

that is, the subject will maximize expected value, choosing $p=0.5$ and $x=50$. Risk averse subjects will prefer a higher p and lower x relative to this, while a risk loving person would prefer a lower p . Thus, the degree of risk aversion can be measured simply by distance of the chosen p from the expected-value-maximizing p . In this example, values of p increasingly above $\frac{1}{2}$ indicate greater risk aversion, and values of p increasingly below $\frac{1}{2}$ indicate greater risk loving.

The modification we employ in this study relies on the same principles, but is greatly simplified. Participants were shown a fixed number of pencils in a jar (five pencils for children, ten pencils for adolescents).⁵ One pencil had a red mark on the bottom. Participants were told that they could choose to take as many pencils as they wanted from the jar. They could keep any pencils they took out of the jar, as long as none of the pencils that they took had a red mark on the bottom. But if any pencil had a red mark on the bottom, they had to give up all the pencils. Children made the decision only once and then proceeded to take out the number of pencils they specified (i.e., the choice of pencils was not sequential). At the end of the experiment, children kept all the pencils

⁵ Simplifying tasks slightly for younger children is common in related work. For example, in Alan et al. (2017), children had fewer than half as many balls as their mothers in a risk elicitation task.

1
2
3
4 taken out, while adolescents could trade their pencils for U.S. dollars at the rate of 1 pencil = 25
5
6 cents.⁶ The analogy to the Andreoni-Harbaugh mechanism is clear. The number of pencils taken
7
8 out is the prize x , while the proportion of pencils still left in the jar indicates the probability of
9
10 winning, p percent. Since the price is 1, risk neutrality occurs at half of the pencils. Taking fewer
11
12 than half of the pencils indicates risk aversion and taking more than half indicates risk loving.
13
14

15
16 Our task is similar to Edwards and Slovic (1965). In their task, children were seated in
17
18 front of 10 switches and chose how many switches to pull, whereby nine switches were “safe” and
19
20 one switch was the “disaster switch.” The more “safe” switches the child pulled, the more candies
21
22 he/she received. However, pulling of a “disaster” switch resulted in loss of all candies. Our task
23
24 differs from Edwards and Slovic (1965) in that children first decide how many pencils to take out
25
26 of the box, whereas in Edwards and Slovic (1965) children are continuing to pull switches until
27
28 they stop *or* pull the “disaster switch.”
29
30
31

32
33 Other tasks that are related to ours include the Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART)
34
35 (Lejuez et al., 2003) and the Bomb Risk Elicitation Task (BRET) (Crosetto and Filippin, 2013).
36
37 In the BART, children choose continuously whether to keep pumping a balloon that has an
38
39 unknown probability of popping. More pumping is associated with increasing rewards, and
40
41 popping the balloon is associated with no reward. In the BRET, subjects decide how many boxes
42
43 to collect out of 100, one of which contains a bomb. More boxes collected is associated with
44
45 linearly increasing rewards, but collecting a box with a bomb results in loss of all rewards. The
46
47 BRET task and Edwards-Slovic task are formally equivalent.
48
49
50
51

52
53 Our pencil task has several improvements over the BART and BRET that may be helpful
54
55

56
57 ⁶ We have successfully used similar non-monetary prizes for young children in related work (e.g., Andreoni et al.,
58
59 2019; Samak, 2013). The pencils were chosen to have patterns that appeal to this age group. Adolescents are motivated
60
61 by relatively small monetary payments. For comparison, a school lunch or breakfast costs between \$2.00 and \$3.00
62
63 and students can buy other snacks at their school for under \$1.00.
64
65

1
2
3
4 for economists conducting risk elicitation experiments in the field with children. It is simple, easily
5
6 understood by children, and can be conducted without a computer.
7
8 A limitation of the pencil task is that different from a multiple price list (e.g., Holt and Laury,
9
10 2002), we are not able to study inconsistency of choices. This is because children make only one
11
12 choice, and not many choices. Inconsistency of choices has been documented among both adults
13
14 and children, which can cast doubt on the reliability of risk preference measures (Loomes et al.,
15
16 1991; Brocas et al., 2018). Solutions for the inconsistency problem include simply dropping
17
18 individuals who are inconsistent (Harbaugh et al., 2002) or constructing structural estimates to
19
20 correct for measurement errors and improve estimation (Castillo et al., 2018). Brocas et al. (2018)
21
22 suggest that inconsistency among children may be due to several factors, including task difficulty,
23
24 lack of ability to focus or irrational behavior. Our pencil task addresses the first two factors since
25
26 it is simple and short.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **3.2 Experimental Setting**

37

38 Children were recruited from the Chicago Heights Early Childhood Center (CHECC)
39
40 program. CHECC is a large-scale intervention study on the role of different early education
41
42 programs on schooling outcomes conducted in 2010-14 (Fryer et al., 2015). Adolescents were
43
44 recruited from the UProgram, a separate ongoing intervention study on the role of cognitive skills
45
46 and non-cognitive skills interventions on schooling outcomes of 7th and 8th graders.
47
48
49

50 Table 1 (column 1) provides a summary of the background characteristics of the CHECC
51
52 sample. The CHECC sample is drawn from Chicago Heights, IL and the surrounding area. This is
53
54 a predominantly low-income and high minority area. The UProgram sample is drawn from
55
56 similarly low-income and high-minority suburbs in Illinois - Harvey, Matteson and University
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Park. Table 1 (column 2) provides a description of the UProgram sample. The CHECC and
5
6 UProgram samples were similar along the dimensions of gender and census block variables.⁷ They
7
8 differed by race, with relatively more Hispanic students in the CHECC sample and relatively more
9
10 Black students in the UProgram sample.
11
12
13
14

15 **3.3 Child Experiment**

16
17 Children participated about a month after the programs started, which is likely before any
18
19 potential impact of the programs on risk preference could be observed.⁸ Participating children
20
21 (ages 3-5) and their older siblings (ages 6-12) completed the experiment in 2010-2011. Younger
22
23 children participated one-on-one with a trained experimenter, while older children participated in
24
25 a group with several trained experimenters who walked around to assist. The experimenter read
26
27 the instructions out loud to the child (see Appendix I). The risk preference elicitation was part of
28
29 a larger set of assessments, including time preferences, which we report on in a separate paper
30
31 (Andreoni et al., 2019).⁹
32
33
34
35
36

37 All CHECC children also participated in a comprehensive assessment of cognitive skills
38
39 and executive functions (See Appendix II).¹⁰ These were conducted one-on-one with an assessor
40
41 trained in these tasks. The cognitive skills tests were nationally normed sub-tests of the Woodcock-
42
43 Johnson III Test of Achievement (Woodcock-Johnson III, 2007), including measuring literacy
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 ⁷ We match census block variables on address to include these controls: fraction of residents aged 25+ with HS
51 diploma only, 25+ with college degree only, and 25+ with more than college, and fraction of households below
52 twice the poverty line.

53 ⁸ Including controls for treatment assignment does not result in significant coefficients and does not affect our main
54 results.

55 ⁹ A related series of papers have reported on other characteristics of the CHECC sample which are different from
56 what is reported here, most notably social preferences (Cappelen et al., 2016; Ben-Ner et al., 2017; List and Samak,
57 2013; List et al., 2018) and competitiveness (Samak, 2013). This work also includes studies of the associations of
58 economic preferences, cognitive abilities and executive functions at an early age with disciplinary referrals later in
59 life (Castillo et al., 2018) and the development of Theory of Mind (Cowell et al., 2015; Charness et al., 2019).

60 ¹⁰ Note: We do not have cognitive skills and executive function scores for CHECC siblings (n = 54).
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 (letter-word and spelling) and math ability (applied problems and quantitative concepts). These
5
6 were supplemented with the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (measuring receptive vocabulary).
7
8

9 The executive function tests were taken from Blair and Willoughby (2006a; 2006b; 2006c),
10 and include tests of working memory, inhibitory control and attention shifting. They were
11 supplemented with the Preschool Self-Regulation Assessment, a survey that assessors completed
12 after the assessment about the child’s regulation skills during the assessment (Smith-Donald et al.,
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 2007).
20

21 For children, we create a “cognitive skills index” by averaging standardized scores in the
22 cognitive skills sub-tests, and an “executive functions index” by averaging the scores in the
23 executive function tasks.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **3.4 Adolescent Experiment**

32
33 The adolescent experiment was conducted in a group, whereby the experimenter read the
34 instructions out loud while the students followed along (see Appendix I). Adolescents were seated
35 such that they were each doing their own work and could not copy from each other. Three
36 experimenters walked around to assure that children were on task and not discussing any of the
37 questions together. The risk elicitation task was conducted 4-6 weeks after the one-quarter program
38 started and was part of a larger assessment of risk, time and social preferences.¹¹
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 All adolescents also participated in comprehensive assessments of cognitive skills and
49 executive functions (See Appendix II). The cognitive skill scores are taken from the Measures of
50 Academic Progress (MAP) test that is administered annually by the school, and are split into math
51 and reading scores.¹² The executive function scores are taken from the National Institutes of Health
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 ¹¹ Including controls for UProgram treatment assignment does not affect our main results.

60 ¹² <https://www.nwea.org/map-growth/>

1
2
3
4 (NIH) Toolbox application that we administered, including four sub-test instruments: Dimensional
5
6 Card Sort Test, Flanker Inhibitory Control and Attention Test, List Sorting Working Memory Test,
7
8 and Picture Sequence Memory Test.¹³ We also collected survey data from adolescents on grit, self-
9
10 control and two components of the Big Five personality index: conscientiousness and openness to
11
12 experience.
13
14

15
16 For adolescents, we create a “cognitive skills index” by averaging standardized math and
17
18 reading scores from the MAP and an “executive function index” by averaging the scores in the
19
20 executive function tasks (NIH Toolbox). This most closely aligns the executive functions
21
22 measured for adolescents with those measured for children. We complement this data with an
23
24 aggregate measure from the adolescent survey for “soft skills” (grit, self-control, conscientiousness
25
26 and openness to experience).
27
28
29

30
31 Note that although both children and adolescents participated in comprehensive tests of
32
33 cognitive and executive function ability, none of the tests conducted with children are the same as
34
35 the tests conducted with adolescents. Therefore, it is not possible to directly compare the
36
37 performance of children and adolescents on the tests.
38
39
40

41 42 **4. Results**

43 44 **4.1 Summary of Results**

45
46 Figures 1 and 2 provide histograms of the number of pencils taken out of the jar, by gender,
47
48 for the child and adolescent experiments. It is apparent that some children and adolescents make
49
50 mistakes by choosing zero pencils or choosing the maximum number of pencils, and therefore
51
52 having no chance at a reward. None of the 231 children chose zero pencils and 5 (7.8%) chose 5
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

60 ¹³ <http://www.healthmeasures.net/explore-measurement-systems/nih-toolbox>
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 pencils. Two of 1295 adolescents (0.15%) chose zero pencils, and 5 (0.39%) chose 10 pencils.¹⁴
5
6
7 Dropping children and adolescents from the regressions who made these mistakes does not affect
8
9 our main results (see Appendix III, Tables A1 and A2).
10

11 Table 2 provides a calculation of the expected payoff for participants picking each possible
12 number of pencils from the jar. Expected payoff is calculated by multiplying the number of pencils
13 taken by the probability that none of the pencils is the one with the mark, which would lead to a
14 zero payoff. For example, a child who picks 3 pencils has an expected payoff of $6/5 = (3)(2/5) +$
15 $(0)(3/5)$. An adolescent who picks 7 pencils has an expected payoff of $21/10 = (7)(3/10) +$
16 $(0)(7/10)$. From this table, it can be seen that choosing more pencils in the pencil task is related to
17 greater risk-seeking behavior.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **4.2 Gender Gap in Risk Preferences**

29 We now turn to understanding the gender gap in risk preferences. Patterns in Figures 1 and
30
31 2 indicate higher degrees of risk taking in adolescent boys versus adolescent girls, with no apparent
32 differences in younger girls and boys. Table 3 provides summary statistics for children and
33 adolescents, including a *p*-value for the t-test comparing results by gender. While we do not
34 observe a gender gap in risk taking among children (ages 3-12) (The Wilcoxon Rank Sum test of
35 equality of distribution between male and female is not statistically significant, $p = 0.48$), we do
36 observe a gender gap in risk taking among adolescents (ages 13-15) (The Wilcoxon Rank Sum test
37 of equality of distributions between male and female is statistically significant, $p < 0.01$). As shown
38 in Table 3, on average adolescent girls take 4.91 pencils (s.e.=0.08) while adolescent boys take
39 5.71 pencils (s.e.=0.08).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 ¹⁴ In total, only 0.54% of observations were lost in the Andreoni-Harbaugh elicitation because of end-point choices.
59 By comparison, the popular Holt and Laury (2002) multiple price list task often loses 10% of observations because
60 of multiple switching. See a discussion and broader comparison in Andreoni and Kuhn (2019).
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The gender result is further confirmed in Tables 4 and 5, which provide Ordinary Least
5
6 Squares (OLS) regressions with number of pencils taken as the dependent variable and gender as
7
8 the independent variable for children and adolescents, respectively. Child regressions cluster at the
9
10 family level. Adolescent regressions include school-level controls (the program was run in three
11
12 middle schools) and cluster on the unit of randomization at UProgram (quarter-school-class).
13
14 Column 2 adds controls for demographic and socioeconomic status (including the variables
15
16 summarized in Table 1) , and column 3 adds controls for cognitive skills and executive functions.
17
18 Including all controls, Table 5 (column 3) shows the coefficient on *Female* for adolescents is -0.81
19
20 (p-value < 0.01). We do not observe a statistically significant coefficient of *Female* in the child
21
22 sample, as shown in Table 4 (column 3) where the coefficient on *Female* is -0.12 and is
23
24 insignificant (p-value 0.62).
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Multiple hypothesis testing (MHT) is a concern in any experiment that attempts to compare
32
33 sub-groups (List et al., 2016). Using Holm’s adjustment for multiple hypothesis testing (with 7
34
35 hypotheses: comparing by gender for each age group, cognitive and executive functioning for each
36
37 age group, and soft skills for adolescents) our results for the gender gap among adolescents remain
38
39 significant at the 5% level.
40
41
42
43
44

45 **4.3 Association with Cognitive Skills and Executive Functions**

46
47
48 The regressions in Tables 4 and 5 illuminate another interesting finding: cognitive skills
49
50 are significantly positively associated with risk preferences, even when controlling for gender, age,
51
52 socio-economic, and other demographic characteristics. In Table 4, which provides the results
53
54 from the child experiment, the coefficient on the standardized cognitive ability index is positive
55
56 (0.33) and statistically significant (p-value < 0.01). In Table 5, which provides the results from the
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 adolescent experiment, the coefficient on standardized cognitive ability index is again positive
5
6 (0.24) and also statistically significant (p -value < 0.01). Using Holm's adjustment for MHT, these
7
8 results remain significant at the 5% level.
9

10
11 Among adolescents, the impact of cognitive ability seems to be driven by math ability. In
12
13 Tables 6 and 7, we separate out the different components of the indices for children and
14
15 adolescents, respectively. As shown in Table 7, for adolescents the coefficient on standardized
16
17 math scores is positive (0.39) and statistically significant (p -value < 0.01). These results are
18
19 remarkable in light of the fact that in our sample of adolescents, girls have higher cognitive test
20
21 scores than boys (see Table 3) — that is, cognitive ability is not the primary driver of our main
22
23 result of a gender gap in risk preferences in adolescents. This result is in line with the previous
24
25 studies where higher cognitive skills are associated with a preference for risk taking (Burks et al.,
26
27 2009; Benjamin et al., 2013; Dohmen et al., 2010; Frederick, 2005).
28
29
30
31
32

33 The relationship between executive function and risk taking is also interesting. Among
34
35 children, risk taking is associated with statistically significantly lower executive functions (see
36
37 Table 4 (column 3), coefficient = -0.31, p -value = 0.01). For adolescents, we split non-cognitive
38
39 skills into executive functions (the executive functions index includes the average standardized
40
41 components of the NIH Toolbox) and soft skills (soft skills include the average measures of
42
43 personality traits, grit and self-control measured by a survey). Among adolescents, risk taking is
44
45 associated with somewhat higher executive functions, but the result is statistically significant only
46
47 at the 10% level and not robust to Holm's adjustment for multiple hypotheses. Soft skills are
48
49 statistically significantly negatively associated with risk taking among adolescents (coefficient = -
50
51 0.24, p -value= 0.02). As displayed in Table 7, this seems driven in large part by self-reported self-
52
53 control (coefficient = -0.15, p -value <0.05). Using Holm's adjustment for multiple hypotheses, the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 result for soft skills remains significant at the 10% level.
5
6

7 As a robustness check for our econometric analysis, and the way we have grouped variables
8 between cognitive skills and executive functions, we conduct an exploratory factor analysis. We
9 then re-run the OLS regressions reported in Tables 4 and 5 using the indices constructed by factor
10 analysis (see Appendix III, Tables A3 and A4. The results we find are similar to those we get using
11 the indexes constructed by standardized averages.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **4.4 Further Analysis** 22

23 We also have access to disciplinary referral data for the adolescent sample. Disciplinary
24 referrals are an important outcome variable in young-adult samples because disciplinary referrals
25 are a predictor of school drop-out rates, which influence educational attainment and labor market
26 outcomes. We use this data to verify the usefulness of our new simple risk measure at capturing a
27 field-relevant behavior.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Tables 8 and 9 provide OLS regressions that use number of disciplinary referrals as the
37 outcome variable. In Table 8, we evaluate the binary outcome variable – any disciplinary referral
38 versus no disciplinary referral. We find a small and statistically insignificant coefficient on our
39 risk measure (coefficient = 0.01, p-value = 0.105 (see column 2)). In Table 9, we evaluate the
40 number of disciplinary referrals conditional on having at least one disciplinary referral. We find
41 that among adolescents with at least one disciplinary referral, higher risk-taking is associated with
42 statistically significant increases in the number of disciplinary referrals, (coefficient = 0.21, p-
43 value = 0.02 (see column 2). This association holds even when controlling for cognitive skills and
44 executive functions (see Table 9, column 2), suggesting that risk preferences play a role beyond
45 that which is captured in standard measures of cognitive skills. In Tables 8 and 9 we also see that
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 as expected, cognitive skills, executive functions and soft skills are statistically significantly
5
6 negatively associated with disciplinary referrals.
7
8

9 Related work has shown that time preferences are associated with disciplinary referrals,
10 with more impatient adolescents exhibiting more disciplinary referrals (Castillo et al., 2018). Our
11 work complements this finding by showing that risk preferences can be similarly predictive of
12 field behavior. Castillo et al. (2018) also use a risk preference elicitation (consisting of choosing
13 between 5 lotteries) in their study, but do not find an association with disciplinary referrals. We
14 propose that this could be because of the smaller sample in their study or because their task is more
15 difficult for younger populations to understand than our task.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 Finally, we need to take into account two differences between the child and adolescent
27 experiments. First, the adolescent sample is much larger than the child sample, which could explain
28 why we find a statistically significant gender gap among adolescents but not among children. To
29 address this concern, in Appendix III, Table A5 we conduct a bootstrap analysis on the adolescent
30 sample, limiting the sample size to 231. We continue to observe a statistically significant gender
31 gap. Second, the adolescent sample includes choices of pencils from 0-10, while the child sample
32 includes choices of pencils from 0-5. To address this concern, in Appendix III, Tables A6-A9 we
33 rescale the adolescent sample by setting all choices of pencils 5-10 to 5 or setting all choices of
34 pencils 0-5 to 5, with and without bootstrapping. The results are unchanged qualitatively, and we
35 continue to observe a statistically significant gender gap in all tables.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **5. Discussion and Conclusion**

54
55 Our findings inform our understanding of the development of risk preferences as children
56 grow up and have implications for policy and practice. First, we find that a gender gap emerges
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 around adolescence, with girls displaying more risk averse behavior than boys. This gender gap
5
6 could be explained by nature, that underlying differences between male and female individuals
7
8 emerge during puberty. It could also be explained by nurture, that environment plays a role in risky
9
10 behavior—from upbringing in a single sex school to presence of peers. This result is in line with
11
12 related work.
13
14

15
16 Our second main finding is that cognitive skills and executive functions are associated with
17
18 risk taking at all ages in our sample. This points to the importance for future work to control for
19
20 these skills when measuring changes in risk preferences over time or across sub-groups. Cognitive
21
22 skills are positively associated with risk taking in both children and adolescents. Executive
23
24 functions are negatively associated with risk taking in children, and somewhat positively
25
26 associated with risk taking in adolescents. Soft skills in adolescents are negatively associated with
27
28 risk taking.
29
30
31

32
33 Our research finds that while there is no gender gap among young children, a gender gap
34
35 in risk taking does emerge during adolescence. Since risk taking is associated with
36
37 competitiveness, our results could have policy implications for decreasing the gender gap in
38
39 competitiveness Potential policy interventions could focus on increasing willingness for women
40
41 to take risks prior to adulthood, when preferences may already be ingrained. Adolescents make
42
43 many choices—for example, choice of coursework—that affect their educational and labor market
44
45 outcomes. Related work shows that women tend to avoid more competitive fields (Buser et al.,
46
47 2014). We find that cognitive ability is associated with increased risk taking, yet girls in our sample
48
49 already display higher cognitive ability than boys, so it is unclear whether interventions that
50
51 improve math skills could lead to reductions in the gender gap. Finally, we find that extreme risk
52
53 taking preferences are associated with poorer outcomes, such as increased disciplinary referrals.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Therefore, caution should be taken when prescribing policies to increase risk taking.
5
6

7 More generally, we provide a description and evaluation of a simple task that allows us to
8
9 measure risk preferences quickly and easily of a wide age range of children. The task can be used
10
11 for children as young as age 3, does not require a computer, and is associated with an expected
12
13 behavioral outcome (disciplinary referrals). We hope future researchers use this task when
14
15 evaluating preferences of young or low-literacy populations, or when time to administer the task
16
17
18 is limited.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

5. References

- Alan, Sule, Nazli Baydar, Teodora Boneva, Seda Ertac, and Thomas F. Crossley. "Transmission of risk preferences from mothers to daughters." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 134 (2017): 60-77.
- Andersen, Steffen, Seda Ertac, Uri Gneezy, John A. List, and Sandra Maximiano. "Gender, competitiveness, and socialization at a young age: Evidence from a matrilineal and a patriarchal society." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 95, no. 4 (2013): 1438-1443.
- Andreoni, James, and Michael Kuhn. "Is it safe to measure risk preferences? A comparison of four methods." Manuscript (2019).
- Andreoni, James, and William Harbaugh. "When the model of Expected Utility Fails and when it Does Not: A Positive Analysis." (2018).
- Andreoni, James, and William Harbaugh. "Unexpected utility: Experimental tests of five key questions about preferences over risk." (2009).
- Andreoni, James, Michael Kuhn, John A. List, Anya Samek, Kevin Sokal, and Charles Sprenger. *Toward an understanding of the development of time preferences: Evidence from field experiments*. No. w25590. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2019.
- Angerer, Silvia, Daniela Glätzle-Rützler, Philipp Lergetporer, and Matthias Sutter. "Donations, risk attitudes and time preferences: A study on altruism in primary school children." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 115 (2015): 67-74.
- Azmat, Ghazala and Barbara Petrangolo. "Gender and the labor market: What have we learned from field and lab experiments?" *Labour Economics* 30, (2014): 32-40.
- Becker, Anke, Thomas Deckers, Thomas Dohmen, Armin Falk and Fabian Kosse. "The Relationship Between Economic Preferences and Psychological Personality Measures" *Annual Review of Economics* 4, no.1 (2012): 453-478.
- Ben-Ner, A., List, J. A., Putterman, L., & Samek, A. (2017). Learned generosity? An artefactual field experiment with parents and their children. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 143, 28-44.
- Benjamin, Daniel J., Sebastian A. Brown, and Jesse M. Shapiro. "Who is 'behavioral'? Cognitive ability and anomalous preferences." *Journal of the European Economic Association* 11, no. 6 (2013): 1231-1255.

- 1
2
3
4 Bertrand, Marianne. "New perspectives on gender." *Handbook of Labor Economics* 4 (2011):
5 1543-1590.
6
7
8 Blair, C.B. and Willoughby, M.T. (2006a). *Measuring Executive Function in Young Children:*
9 *Operation Span*. Chapel Hill, NC: The Pennsylvania State University and The University
10 of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
11
12
13 Blair, C.B. and Willoughby, M.T. (2006b). *Measuring Executive Function in Young Children:*
14 *Spacial Conflict II: Arrows*. Chapel Hill, NC: The Pennsylvania State University and The
15 University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
16
17
18 Blair, C.B. and Willoughby, M.T. (2006c). *Measuring Executive Function in Young Children:*
19 *Item Selection*. Chapel Hill, NC: The Pennsylvania State University and The University
20 of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
21
22
23
24 Booth, Alison L., and Patrick Nolen. "Gender differences in risk behaviour: Does nurture
25 matter?" *The Economic Journal* 122, no. 558 (2012).
26
27
28 Borghans, Lex, James J. Heckman, Bart HH Golsteyn, and Huub Meijers. "Gender differences in
29 risk aversion and ambiguity aversion." *Journal of the European Economic Association* 7,
30 no. 2-3 (2009): 649-658.
31
32
33 Boyer, Ty W. "The development of risk-taking: A multi-perspective review." *Developmental*
34 *Review* 26 (2006): 291–345.
35
36
37 Brocas, Isabelle, Juan D. Carillo, T. Dalton Combs, Niree Kodaverian. "The development of
38 consistent decision-making across economic domains. *Mimeo* (2018).
39
40
41 Brown, Heather and Marjon van der Pol, "Intergenerational transfer of time and risk preferences."
42 *Journal of Economic Psychology* 49, (2015): 187-204.
43
44
45 Burks, Stephen V., Jeffrey P. Carpenter, Lorenz Goette, and Aldo Rustichini. "Cognitive Skills
46 Affect Economic Preferences, Strategic Behavior." *PNAS* 106(19), (2009): 7745–50
47
48 Buser, Thomas, Muriel Niederle, and Hessel Oosterbeek. "Gender, competitiveness, and career
49 choices." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129, no. 3 (2014): 1409-1447.
50
51
52 Byrnes, James P., David C. Miller, and William D. Schafer. "Gender differences in risk taking:
53 A meta-analysis." (1999): 367.
54
55
56 Cappelen, A. W., List, J. A., Samek, A., & Tungodden, B. (2016). *The effect of early education*
57 *on social preferences*(No. w22898). National Bureau of Economic Research.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 in competitiveness and risk taking: Comparing children in Colombia and
5 Sweden." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 83, no. 1 (2012): 11-23.
- 6
7
8 Castillo, M., List, J.A., Petrie, R. & Samek, A. (2019). Detecting drivers of behavior at an early
9 age: Evidence from a longitudinal field experiment. Working paper.
- 10
11 Castillo, Marco, Jeffrey L. Jordan, and Ragan Petrie. "Children's rationality, risk attitudes and
12 field behavior." *European Economic Review* 102 (2018): 62-81.
- 13
14
15 Castillo, Marco. "Negative childhood experiences and risk aversion: evidence from children
16 exposed to domestic violence." In Technical Report. ICES, 2017.
- 17
18
19 Charness, Gary and Uri Gneezy. "Strong Evidence for Gender Differences in Risk Taking."
20 *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 83, no. 1 (2012): 50-58.
- 21
22
23 Charness, Gary, John List, Aldo Rustichini, Anya Samek and Jeroen Van de Ven. (2019). Theory
24 of mind among disadvantaged children: Evidence from a field experiment. Working paper.
- 25
26
27 Cowell, J. M., Samek, A., List, J., & Decety, J. (2015). The curious relation between theory of
28 mind and sharing in preschool age children. *PLoS One*, 10(2), e0117947.
- 29
30
31 Crosetto, Paolo, and Antonio Filippin. "A theoretical and experimental appraisal of four risk
32 elicitation methods." *Experimental Economics* 19, no. 3 (2016): 613-641.
- 33
34
35 Crosetto, Paolo, and Antonio Filippin. "The "bomb" risk elicitation task." *Journal of Risk and
36 Uncertainty* 47, no. 1 (2013): 31-65.
- 37
38
39 Croson, Rachel and Uri Gneezy. "Gender Differences in Preferences." *Journal of Economic
40 Literature* 47, no. 2 (2009): 448-474.
- 41
42
43 Deckers, Thomas, Armin Falk, Fabian Kosse, and Hannah Schildberg-Hörisch. "How does socio-
44 economic status shape a child's personality?" Human Capital and Economic Opportunity
45 Global Working Group Working Paper Series 2016-002, February 2016.
- 46
47
48 Deckers, Thomas, Armin Falk, Fabian Kosse, Pia Pinger, and Hannah Schildberg-Hörisch. "Socio-
49 economic status and inequalities in children's IQ and economic preferences." *IZA
50 Discussion Paper* 11158, (2017).
- 51
52
53 Dohmen, Thomas, Armin Falk, David Huffman, and Uwe Sunde. "Are risk aversion and
54 impatience related to cognitive ability?" *American Economic Review* 100, no. 3 (2010):
55 1238-60.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Dohmen, Thomas, Armin Falk, David Huffman, Uwe Sunde, Jürgen Schupp, and Gert G.
5
6 Wagner. "Individual risk attitudes: Measurement, determinants, and behavioral
7
8 consequences." *Journal of the European Economic Association* 9, no. 3 (2011): 522-550.
9
- 10 Duckworth, Angela Lee, and Patrick D. Quinn. "Development and validation of the Short Grit
11
12 Scale (GRIT-S)." *Journal of Personality Assessment* 91, no. 2 (2009): 166-174.
- 13 Eckel, Catherine C. and Philip J. Grossman. "Sex differences and statistical stereotyping in
14
15 attitudes toward financial risk." *Evolution and Human Behavior* 23, no. 4 (2002): 281-295.
- 16
17 Eckel, Catherine C., and Philip J. Grossman. "Forecasting risk attitudes: An experimental study
18
19 using actual and forecast gamble choices." *Journal of Economic Behavior &*
20
21 *Organization* 68, no. 1 (2008): 1-17.
- 22
23 Eckel, Catherine C., Philip J. Grossman, Cathleen A. Johnson, Angela CM de Oliveira, Christian
24
25 Rojas, and Rick K. Wilson. "School environment and risk preferences: Experimental
26
27 evidence." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 45, no. 3 (2012): 265-292.
- 28
29 Edwards, Ward and Paul Slovic. "Seeking information to reduce the risk of decisions." *The*
30
31 *American Journal of Psychology* 72, no. 2 (1965): 188-197.
- 32
33 Filippin, Antonio and Paolo Crosetto. "A reconsideration of gender differences in risk
34
35 attitudes." *Management Science* 62, no. 11 (2016): 3138-3160.
- 36
37 Frederick, Shane. "Cognitive skills reflection and decision making." *The Journal of Economic*
38
39 *Perspectives* 19, no. 4 (2005): 25-42.
- 40
41 Fryer Jr., Roland G., Steven D. Levitt, and John A. List. *Parental incentives and early childhood*
42
43 *achievement: a field experiment in Chicago heights*. No. w21477. National Bureau of
44
45 Economic Research, 2015.
- 46
47 Gardner, Margo, and Laurence Steinberg. "Peer influence on risk taking, risk preference, and
48
49 risky decision making in adolescence and adulthood: An experimental
50
51 study." *Developmental Psychology* 41, no. 4 (2005): 625.
- 52
53 Glätzle-Rützler, Daniela, Matthias Sutter, and Achim Zeileis. "No myopic loss aversion in
54
55 adolescents? – An experimental note." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 111,
56
57 (2015): 169-176.
- 58
59 Harbaugh, William T., Kate Krause, and Lise Vesterlund. "Risk attitudes of children and adults:
60
61 Choices over small and large probability gains and losses." *Experimental Economics* 5,
62
63 no. 1 (2002): 53-84.
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Harrison, Glenn W., John A. List, and Charles Towe. "Naturally occurring preferences and
5
6 exogenous laboratory experiments: A case study of risk aversion." *Econometrica* 75, no. 2
7
8 (2007): 433-458.
9
- 10 Holt, Charles A. and Susan K. Laury. "Risk aversion and incentive effects." *American Economic*
11
12 *Review* 92, no. 5 (2002): 1644-1655.
13
- 14 Insler, Michael, James Compton, and Pamela Schmitt. "The investment decisions of young
15
16 adults under relaxed borrowing constraints." *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental*
17
18 *Economics* 64 (2016): 106-121.
19
- 20 John, Oliver P., Eileen M. Donahue, and Robert L. Kentle. "The big five inventory—versions 4a
21
22 and 54." (1991).
23
- 24 John, Oliver P., Laura P. Naumann, and Christopher J. Soto. "Paradigm shift to the integrative
25
26 big five trait taxonomy." *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* 3 (2008): 114
27
28 158.
29
- 30 Khachatryan, Karen, Anna Dreber, Emma Von Essen, and Eva Ranehill. "Gender and
31
32 preferences at a young age: Evidence from Armenia." *Journal of Economic Behavior &*
33
34 *Organization* 118 (2015): 318-332.
35
- 36 Khwaja, Ahmed, Frank Sloan, and Martin Salm. "Evidence on preferences and subjective beliefs
37
38 of risk takers: The case of smokers." *International Journal of Industrial Organization* 24,
39
40 no. 4 (2006): 667-682.
41
- 42 Lejuez, Carl W., Will M. Aklin, Michael J. Zvolensky, and Christina M. Pedulla. "Evaluation of
43
44 the Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART) as a predictor of adolescent real-world risk
45
46 taking behaviours." *Journal of Adolescence* 26, no. 4 (2003): 475-479.
47
- 48 Levin, Irwin P. and Stephanie S. Hart. "Risk preferences in young children: early evidence on
49
50 individual differences in reaction to potential gains and losses." *Journal of Behavioral*
51
52 *Decision Making* 16, no. 5 (2003): 397-413.
53
- 54 List, A. J., List, J. A., & Samek, A. (2017). Discrimination among pre-school children: Field
55
56 experimental evidence. *Economics Letters*, 157, 159-162.
57
- 58 List, J. A., & Samak, A. C. (2013). Exploring the origins of charitable acts: Evidence from an
59
60 artefactual field experiment with young children. *Economics Letters*, 118(3), 431-434.
61
- 62 List, John A., Azeem M. Shaikh, and Yang Xu. "Multiple hypothesis testing in experimental
63
64 economics." *Experimental Economics* (2019).
65

- 1
2
3
4 Loomes, Graham, Chris Starmer, and Robert Sudgen. "Observing violations of transitivity by
5 experimental methods." *Econometrica* 59, no. 2 (1991): 425-439.
6
7
8 Moreira, Bruno, Raul Matsushita, and Sergio Da Silva. "Risk seeking behavior of preschool
9 children in a gambling task." *Journal of Economic Psychology* 31, no. 5 (2010): 794-801.
10
11 Munro, Alistair and Yuki Tanaka. "Risky rotten kids: An experiment on risk attitudes amongst
12 adolescents in rural Uganda." GRIPS Discussion Paper 14-01, April 2014.
13
14
15 Niederle, Muriel, and Lise Vesterlund. "Gender and competition." *Annual Review of Economics* 3,
16 no. 1 (2011): 601-630.
17
18
19 Normative, Woodcock-Johnson III. "Woodcock-Johnson® III." (2007).
20
21 Romer, Daniel, Laura M. Betancourt, Nancy L. Brodsky, Joan M. Giannetta, Wei Yang, and
22 Hallam Hurt. "Does adolescent risk taking imply weak executive function? A prospective
23 study of relations between working memory performance, impulsivity, and risk taking in
24 early adolescence." *Developmental Science* 14, no. 5 (2011): 1119-1133.
25
26
27 Rosenbaum, Gail M., Morgan A. Botdorf, Jamie L. Patrianakos, Laurence Steinberg, and Jason
28 M. Chein. "Working memory training in adolescents decreases laboratory risk taking in the
29 presence of peers." *Journal of Cognitive Enhancement* 1, no. 4 (2017): 513-525.
30
31
32 Samak, A. C. (2013). Is there a gender gap in preschoolers' competitiveness? An experiment in
33 the US. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 92, 22-31.
34
35
36 Samak, Anya C. "Is there a gender gap in preschoolers' competitiveness? An experiment in the
37 US." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 92 (2013): 22-31.
38
39
40 Sävle-Söderbergh, Jenny, and Gabriella Sjögren Lindquist. "Children do not behave like adults:
41 Gender gaps in performance and risk taking in a random social context in the high stakes
42 game shows Jeopardy and Junior Jeopardy." *The Economic Journal* 127, no. 603 (2017):
43 1665-1692.
44
45
46
47 Smith-Donald, Radiah, C. Cybele Raver, Tiffany Hayes, and Breeze Richardson. "Preliminary
48 construct and concurrent validity of the Preschool Self-Regulation Assessment (PSRA)
49 for field-based research." *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 22, no. 2 (2007): 173-187.
50
51
52 Smith, Ashley R., Jason Chein, and Laurence Steinberg. "Impact of socio-emotional context,
53 brain development, and pubertal maturation on adolescent risk-taking." *Hormones and*
54 *Behavior* 64, no. 2 (2013): 323-332.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Steinberg, Laurence. "A social neuroscience perspective on adolescent risk-taking."
5

6 *Developmental Review* 28, no. 1 (2008): 78-106.
7

8 Sutter, Matthias, Claudia Zoller, and Daniela Glätzle-Rützler. "Economic behavior of children and
9 adolescents – A first survey of experimental economics results." *European Economic*
10 *Review* 111 (2019): 98-121.
11
12

13 Sutter, Matthias, Martin G. Kocher, Daniela Glätzle-Rützler, and Stefan T. Trautmann.
14 "Impatience and uncertainty: Experimental decisions predict adolescents' field
15 behavior." *The American Economic Review* 103, no. 1 (2013): 510-531.
16
17
18

19 Tsukayama, Eli, Angela Lee Duckworth, and Betty Kim. "Domain-specific impulsivity in school-
20 age children." *Developmental Science* 16, no. 6 (2013): 879-893.
21
22

23 Tymula, Agnieszka, Lior A. Rosenberg Belmaker, Amy K. Roy, Lital Ruderman, Kirk Manson,
24 Paul W. Glimcher, and Ifat Levy. "Adolescents' risk-taking behavior is driven by tolerance
25 to ambiguity." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109, no. 42 (2012):
26 17135-17140.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figures




Figure 1: Histogram of Child Risk Preferences




Figure 2: Histogram of Adolescent Risk Preferences

Tables

Table 1: Sample Summary Characteristics

	Children	Adolescents
Female	0.47	0.47
Age at risk assessment	5.60	13.56
Black	0.33	0.71
Hispanic	0.54	0.19
White	0.13	0.14
Other race	0.00	0.21
25+ HS diploma only	0.28	0.25
25+ college only	0.09	0.15
25+ more than college	0.06	0.10
Below twice pov. line	0.47	0.34
All demographics available	181	922
All SES available	213	1174
<i>N</i>	231	1295

This table shows the average value for several demographic variables. Of 2,208 total children in CHECC, 177 children and 54 siblings participated in this task. Compared to the total CHECC population, our sub-sample has fewer black participants (main study = 0.46) and more Hispanic participants (main study = 0.42). Of 1,481 total adolescents in UProgram, 1,295 participated in this task. Compared to the total population of UProgram, our population is very similar.

Table 2: Expected Values

	Children	Adolescents
EV(1)	4/5	9/10
EV(2)	6/5	16/10
EV(3)	6/5	21/10
EV(4)	4/5	24/10
EV(5)	0	25/10
EV(6)	-	24/10
EV(7)	-	21/10
EV(8)	-	16/10
EV(9)	-	9/10
EV(10)	-	0

This table shows the expected value payoff from each possible number of pencils a participant could draw from the jar. Children could pick 1-5 pencils, while adolescents could pick 1-10 pencils. For example, an adolescent who picks 4 pencils has an expected value of $(6/10) * (4) + (4/10) * (0) = 24/10$.

Table 3: Summary Across Age and Gender

	Children			Adolescents		
	Male	Female	p-value	Male	Female	p-value
Pencils Taken	2.30 (0.12)	2.19 (0.12)	0.52	5.71 (0.08)	4.91 (0.08)	0.00
Cognitive Index	-0.20 (0.09)	-0.18 (0.09)	0.80	0.05 (0.03)	0.20 (0.03)	0.00
Executive Functioning Index	0.41 (0.09)	0.35 (0.09)	0.54	0.08 (0.02)	0.10 (0.00)	0.54
Self Control, Grit and Personality				-0.02 (0.02)	0.02 (0.00)	0.23
<i>N</i>	121	110		682	613	

This table shows a summary of indices for each age group by gender. Reported p-value is for a t-test of equality by gender. Standard errors in parentheses. The number of pencils taken for children ranges from 1-5. The Cognitive Index for children is composed of standardized scores on Peabody Picture Vocab, Woodcock Johnson Applied Problems, Woodcock Johnson Letter-Word Problems, Woodcock Johnson Spelling Problems, and Woodcock Johnson Quantitative Concepts. The Executive Functioning Index for children is composed of standardized scores of Operation Span Task, Preschool Self-Regulation Assessment, and Spatial Conflict Task. The number of pencils taken for adolescents ranges from 1-10. The Cognitive Index for adolescents is composed of standardized scores on MAP math and reading. The Executive Functioning Index for adolescents is composed of standardized scores on NIH Toolbox Dimensional Change Card Sort Test, Flanker Inhibitory Control and Attention Test, List Sorting Working Memory Test, and Picture Sequence Memory Test. Self Control, Grit and Personality Index for adolescents is composed of self-report Grit, Self-Control, Openness (Big Five), and Conscientiousness (Big Five).

Table 4: Children

	1	2	3
Female	-0.11 (0.16)	-0.07 (0.16)	-0.12 (0.18)
Cognitive Index			0.33*** (0.12)
Executive Functioning Index			-0.31** (0.13)
Constant	2.25*** (0.22)	2.73*** (0.43)	-0.51 (0.93)
Demo & SES		✓	✓
Observations	231	231	177
R^2	0.00	0.10	0.19
Adjusted R^2	-0.01	0.05	0.12

This table shows coefficients from OLS regressions where the dependent variable is the number of pencils taken. Standard errors are in parentheses (clustered at the family level).

* $p < .1$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$

Table 5: Adolescents

	1	2	3
Female	-0.80*** (0.12)	-0.77*** (0.12)	-0.81*** (0.12)
Cognitive Index			0.24*** (0.08)
Executive Functioning Index			0.22* (0.12)
Self Control, Grit and Personality			-0.24** (0.10)
Constant	5.71*** (0.09)	7.35*** (0.87)	7.42*** (0.87)
Demo & SES		✓	✓
Observations	1295	1295	1295
R^2	0.04	0.06	0.07
Adjusted R^2	0.04	0.04	0.06

This table shows coefficients from OLS regressions where the dependent variable is the number of pencils taken. Standard errors are in parentheses (clustered at the quarter-school-class level). * $p < .1$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$

Table 6: Children, Individual Components

	1
Female	-0.24 (0.20)
WJ Applied Problems	0.55 (0.58)
WJ Quantitative Concepts	-0.15 (0.59)
WJ Letter-Word	0.07 (0.43)
WJ Spelling	0.90* (0.49)
PPVT Receptive Vocabulary	0.31 (0.57)
Working Memory (Operation Span)	-0.38 (0.39)
Inhibitory Control (Spatial Conflict)	-0.64 (0.61)
Self Regulation Survey	-1.10* (0.62)
Constant	2.77 (1.71)
Demo & SES	✓
Observations	177
R^2	0.23
Adjusted R^2	0.10

This table shows coefficients from OLS regressions where the dependent variable is the number of pencils taken. Standard errors are in parentheses (clustered at the family level).

* $p < .1$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$

Table 7: Adolescents, Individual Components

	1
Female	-0.80*** (0.13)
Math cog comp.	0.39*** (0.11)
Reading cog comp.	-0.14 (0.11)
NIH Card Sort	0.04 (0.07)
NIH Flanker	0.04 (0.09)
NIH List Sort	-0.00 (0.08)
NIH Picture Sequence	0.04 (0.07)
Openness	-0.05 (0.08)
Conscientiousness	0.04 (0.07)
Grit	-0.02 (0.07)
Self Control	-0.15** (0.07)
Constant	6.80*** (1.32)
Demo & SES	✓
Observations	1295
R^2	0.09
Adjusted R^2	0.07

This table shows coefficients from OLS regressions where the dependent variable is the number of pencils taken. Standard errors are in parentheses (clustered at the quarter-school-class level). * $p < .1$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$

Table 8: Adolescents, Discipline Binary

	1	2
Pencils Taken	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
Female		-0.09*** (0.02)
Cognitive Index		-0.08*** (0.02)
Executive Functioning Index		-0.05** (0.02)
Self Control, Grit and Personality		-0.10*** (0.02)
Constant	0.30*** (0.04)	0.14 (0.30)
Demo & SES		✓
Observations	1295	1295
R^2	0.00	0.18
Adjusted R^2	0.00	0.16

This table shows coefficients from OLS regressions where the dependent variable is an indicator of any vs. no disciplinary referrals. Standard errors are in parentheses (clustered at the quarter-school-class level). * $p < .1$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$

Table 9: Adolescents, Discipline Count (conditional)

	1	2
Pencils Taken	0.14*	0.21**
	(0.08)	(0.09)
Female		-0.04
		(0.38)
Cognitive Index		-1.13***
		(0.29)
Executive Functioning Index		-0.41
		(0.40)
Self Control, Grit and Personality		-0.00
		(0.34)
Constant	2.54***	-6.41***
	(0.44)	(1.82)
Demo & SES		✓
Observations	469	469
R^2	0.01	0.14
Adjusted R^2	0.00	0.10

This table shows coefficients from OLS regressions where the dependent variable is a count of disciplinary referrals (conditional on having at least one disciplinary referral). Standard errors are in parentheses (clustered at the quarter-school-class level). * $p < .1$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$

Supplementary Material

[Click here to download Supplementary Material: Appendix.pdf](#)