

A Comparison of Punishment Rules in Repeated Public Good Games*

— An Experimental Study —

Torsten Decker[†], Andreas Stiehler[‡], Martin Strobel[§]

May 2003

Abstract

In this experimental study we analyze one individual and three collective punishment rules in a public good setting. We present evidence and explanations for differences between the rules concerning punishment intensity, contribution and profit levels, as well as justice. Finally, we investigate influences crucial to participants' support for a collective rule when the individual rule is the status quo. We show that besides profit differences the degree of consent required by the collective rule is essential for the degree of support by the participants.

*We thank Jörg Breitung, Simon Gächter, Werner Güth, Michael Kvasnicka, and two anonymous referees for helpful comments as well as Urs Fischbacher for z-Tree. Financial support by Deutsche Handelsbank Berlin and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (through SFB 373) is gratefully acknowledged.

[†]Institute for Operations Research, Humboldt University Berlin, Spandauer Str. 1, 10178 Berlin, Germany, email: decker@wiwi.hu-berlin.de, phone: +49 (0)30 2093-5626, fax: +49 (0)30 2093-5745.

[‡]Max Planck Institute for Research into Economic Systems, Strategic Interaction Group, Kahlaische Straße 10, D-07745 Jena, Germany, email: stiehler@mpiew-jena.mpg.de, phone: +49 (0)3641 686-633, fax: +49 (0)3641 686-667.

[§]Department of Economics and International Institute of Infonomics, Maastricht University, P.O. Box 616, 6200 MD Maastricht, The Netherlands, email: Martin.Strobel@infonomics.nl, phone: +31 (0)43 38-83646, -83885, fax: +31 (0)43 38-84878; corresponding author.

1 Introduction

A distinctive characteristic of public goods is free access to the common good irrespective of each person's contribution to the provision of the good. This characteristic creates the incentive to free-ride, i.e. enjoy the benefits while staying away from the provision. While free-riding is rational at the individual level, it produces socially undesirable outcomes at the aggregate level. Economists and scholars in other social sciences directed a lot of research to solve this dilemma. One way to do so is by implementing additional institutions that create incentives to participate in the provision, e.g. a sanctioning system. Unfortunately, in a framework of rationality and selfishness, a new dilemma arises: no individual is willing to bear the costs of implementing or supporting the institution. This famous problem is known as the second order dilemma, or second order public good (Oliver 1980, Bates 1988).

From experiments and casual observations in reality, however, we have evidence that punishment systems are indeed effective tools to promote cooperation. As a result of field studies, Elinor Ostrom (1990) worked out seven design principles, which are crucial to the success or failure of a group or society facing a social dilemma. One of them is sanctioning.¹ Fehr and Gächter (2000) showed experimentally that costly punishment opportunities, despite their dilemma characteristics, are utilized by the participants and are able to raise and stabilize cooperation in a public good environment. In their experiment they introduced a sanctioning system in which each participant had to decide individually whether and to what extent she wants to punish another person. The leverage, however, was rather high. The cost for imposing a fine to somebody else was only a third of the fine.

If the costs for punishment are high, though, members of a group probably wish to decide together on the potential punishment of free-riders sharing the associated costs. Ostrom reports cases, where the decision on punishment was found in a joint and organized way, e.g. in a vote. Another example, the so-called Stability Pact contains a sanctioning system in which the EMU members decide together on the punishment of countries endangering the stability of the Euro. A collective sanctioning system may be useful if the very structure of individual punishment bears strong incentives to abstain

¹Though Ostrom's main field of study is common pool resources (CPR), she argues that "given the similarity between many CPR problems and the problems of providing small scale collective goods, the findings of this volume should contribute an understanding of [...] the capabilities of individuals to organize collective action related to providing local public goods." (Ostrom 1990, p. 27).

from punishment (Weesie and Franzen 1998), or is likely to escalate and cause heavy damages.

Two crucial questions may arise when designs of collective rules are considered:

1. Is it feasible that people accept the collective decision with all its implications although they favoured a lower or higher punishment?
2. Given a positive answer to Question 1, why is it not feasible to directly enforce a full contribution at the public good stage?

With respect to the first question, we argue that an institution like a collective punishment rule is set up in order to continually gain benefits from it. Opposing it in one case could put the whole institution at risk. So, once people erected an institution they will probably continue to obey it for their long-term benefit. Moreover, it is conceivable that the enforcement of the institution is backed by an authority, which was erected by the people in advance and is out of control in the current situation. Ostrom (1990) reports on successful cases where people designed sophisticated systems in order to ensure that punishment costs are shared.² Whether people are indeed willing to submit themselves to an institution like a collective punishment rule is one of the questions we seek to answer in this work.

The answer to the second question makes it important to distinguish between the initial public good in the first stage and the public good “punishment” in the second stage. A certain feature of collective punishment regulation is that punishment becomes a central issue and is, therefore, easy to enforce as discussed above. In contrast, the contribution decision remains in private responsibility and cannot be transferred to a central or an outside institution. In some cases the contribution is even not or only ex-post observable. Thus, a participant deciding by herself on her contribution still faces incentives to free-ride. Even a contract among the participants that fixes contributions is no credible commitment and, therefore, likely to be violated.

For the reasons given above we assume in this paper that contributions to the public good in the first stage are not enforceable whereas the decided punishment in the second stage is. Our main goal is to investigate collective punishment rules and confront them with an individual rule which we consider an initial position. The following questions are central to our analysis:

²She reports, for example, on irrigation systems in Spain where guards and so-called “Ditch riders”, were paid for monitoring, reporting violations and bringing charges against farmers (Ostrom 1990, pp.69-78).

- Are collective punishment rules able to bring about stronger cooperation and/or higher profits in a public good setting than an individual rule?
- To what extent do different collective rules perform differently from each other with respect to contribution, efficiency, and justice?
- Will participants agree to submit themselves to a collective rule, even if this means to give up some individual freedom? Which rule is preferred?

In order to find answers to the above questions we designed an experiment in which subjects repeatedly play a public good game. In-between the rounds they had the possibility to punish each other according to different rules. Every subject experienced a collective punishment rule and an individual punishment rule. After that subjects could bid for the right to choose the institution for the last five rounds.

The results of our experiment suggest basically that the more severe an institution is the higher is the contribution to the public good but the lower is the willingness of subjects to accept this institution. In the remainder of the paper we will first describe the experimental design (Section 2). Then we establish some links to the literature, which guided our expectations (Section 3) and report detailed results (Section 4). Eventually we conclude with some general remarks (Section 5).

2 The Experiment

In our experiment subjects played a two stage game for 20 periods in groups of four. The first stage consisted of a standard linear public good game (see Ledyard 1995). Each group member i received an initial endowment of ECU 20.– (Experimental Currency Units) and had to decide about which amount x_i to contribute to a public good (“pot”). The pot was multiplied by 1.6 and then equally distributed among the four group members regardless of their contribution. Thus, ECU 1.– contributed to the pot had a marginal return of ECU 0.40 to each participant, whereas ECU 1.– kept for oneself had a marginal return of ECU 1.– to oneself only. The preliminary payoff of subject i in group G therefore was:

$$\Pi_i^{pre} = 20 - x_i + 0.4 \sum_{j \in G} x_j.$$

In stage two, the punishment stage, every participant got to know the other group members’ actions and could propose punishment amounts for each of the others. They had to be chosen from all even amounts between ECU 0.– (meaning no fine) and ECU

20.–. Thus, every participant faced three punishment proposals (further called triplet) from the other group members against herself. The fine that was actually imposed on her was determined according to specific rules described below. All rules have in common that they imposed punishment costs of exactly the same amount. Hence, the rules basically determine the size of the fine and who is going to bear the costs:

Individual rule (indi): The highest proposal out of the triplet was chosen and put into action. The person who proposed that highest amount had to bear the costs of the punishment. If there happened to be two or three equally high maximal proposals, the person who had to bear the costs for punishing was chosen randomly among them.

We consider this rule to be the fallback possibility which is always feasible without the presence of any institution. Many situations have the characteristic that the action of only one person is sufficient to reach a certain goal, and no additional gain can be made when another person joins the action. Imagine people who are waiting in a queue observe a person jumping the queue. While many may feel upset, it is probably sufficient if one person rises up and scolds the "free-rider". The others with similar intentions may be satisfied then and abstain from further action.

Collective rules (mini, medi, maxi): We distinguish between three collective rules - mini, medi, maxi - depending on which of the three proposals in a triplet was put into action. With all three collective rules we assume that a person is monotone in her wish to punish, i.e. a person who proposes a certain fine will also approve any lower fine.

- In the mini-rule the lowest proposal was chosen. This rule can be considered a unanimity vote.
- In the medi-rule the medium proposal was chosen. This corresponds to a majority vote.
- In the maxi-rule the highest proposal was chosen. This rule can be interpreted as a sort of minority voting.

As with the individual rule, incurred costs were equal to the actual punishment amount. In contrast to the former, costs for punishing were now shared by the three remaining participants. Each of them had to pay one third irrespective of the own proposal.

The final profit Π_i^{final} for a participant i was calculated from her preliminary profit Π_i^{pre} , the sanction s_i she received, and her costs for sanctioning others $c(s_j)$ as follows:

Table 1: Overview of the four different treatments.

Phase	Periods	Treatment 1	Treatment 2	Treatment 3	Treatment 4
1	1 to 10	indi-rule	maxi-rule	medi-rule	mini-rule
2	11 to 15	medi-rule	indi-rule	indi-rule	indi-rule
	before 16	rule selection	rule selection	rule selection	rule selection
3	16 to 20	selected rule	selected rule	selected rule	selected rule

$$\Pi_i^{final} = \Pi_i^{pre} - s_i - \sum_{j \in G, j \neq i} c(s_j).$$

At the end of each period participants were informed about the actual punishment they received themselves, the costs they incurred by punishing others, as well as their final profit. Additionally, they got information on whether and to what extent other persons were punished. They did not get to know the individual punishment proposals. Their final profits were credited to their respective accounts, and a new period began.

Having described the design of one period, we now turn to the structure of the treatments. In order to compare different punishment rules as well as to measure people's willingness to accept them we let subjects experience two different rules (in periods 1 to 15) and then auctioned off the right to determine the rule for a third phase (periods 16 to 20). An overview of the treatments is provided in Table 1.

Any collective rule was followed by the indi-rule, whereas the indi-rule was followed by the medi-rule (majority voting) as a prominent example of the collective rules. Moreover, complementing the indi-rule with a collective rule allows us to check whether the sequence of rules matters for the rule selection.

The selection procedure was designed not only to find out which rule a person favours but also to receive indication of how strongly she prefers this rule. Each participant was asked to announce the rule she favours, and her willingness to pay to be dictator in the selection procedure. Therefore an extra amount of ECU 60.– was credited to each participant's account. The proposal supported by the highest amount was then applied, and the amount was removed from the dictator's account. All other proposals were ignored, and the assigned bids were not subtracted. If there were two or more equally high maximal bids, the dictator was chosen randomly among them. Periods 16 to 20 in which the selected rule was actually applied served as an incentive for thoughtful participation in the selection process.

We converted the experimental design into a computer program using the software z-Tree (Fischbacher 1999). In order to run eight observations of each treatment, we invited 128 students of economics and business administration to the experimental laboratory at Humboldt University. Eight people were invited at a time and randomly assigned to two groups. The participants did not know who of the remaining seven people belonged to their group. Though they were informed that the experiment consisted of three phases, the instructions were not handed out until the beginning of the corresponding phase and the selection procedure, respectively. During the experiment all interaction took place through computers. Each group member was given a number (ID), which was used as an identifier for the other group members. Within a phase the IDs were constant but after each phase they were randomly permuted in order to diminish carryover effects from one to another phase (subjects were informed about it). The decisions in the experiment were materially motivated. Each participant's payoff was converted into German Marks after the experiment and paid in cash. The conversion rate was ECU 30.– = DM 1.– (roughly Euro 0.50). The average earning of a subject was Euro 9.50.

3 Links to the Literature

Before formulating concrete hypotheses about the likely outcomes of the experiment we briefly summarize some theoretical approaches suitable for our purpose.

Assuming rationality and common knowledge of rationality, punishment will not occur in the last period, since it is costly and no additional profit can be gained from it. Therefore, the punishment threat is not credible. This, in turn, leads to zero contribution in the last period. Using backward induction we conclude that neither punishment nor cooperation will occur in any period. For the finite game this is the only Nash-equilibrium which is both subgame-perfect and trembling hand-perfect.³

From both experimental studies and real life we know that the assumption of rational individuals is often violated. Many people are willing to engage in cooperation despite adverse incentives. Dawes and Thaler (1988) for example found non-negligible cooperation levels in one-shot public good decisions. Moreover, participants may become angry about unfair behavior and are ready to punish even if it is costly. Experimental evidence therefore was found not only in public good situations but also in a variety of

³For indi no other subgame-perfect equilibrium exists. However, for mini, medi and maxi, the voting procedure causes numerous subgame-perfect equilibria in weakly dominated strategies. This is due to the fact that individuals do not have a decisive vote in many of these situations.

other settings. Responders in ultimatum games reject unfair offers (Güth and Tietz 1990). In gift exchange games Fehr, Gächter and Kirchsteiger (1996) found behavior displaying patterns of cooperation and reciprocity. Fehr and Gächter (2000) presented evidence for people's willingness to punish unfair behavior, as well as report high cooperation levels in public good settings.

A variety of approaches exist, in which economists try to explain these contradictory results by introducing elements of altruism, fairness, and/or reciprocity into people's considerations, mostly by incorporating additional terms into their preferences.

Rabin (1993) emphasizes reciprocity in a person's behavior. The core of his approach is that "people like to help those who are helping them, and to hurt those who are hurting them" (Rabin 1993, p.1281). Levine (1998) presents a theory of altruism and spitefulness in which people's utilities depend on their own and their fellow players' pay-offs. The degree to which a person takes other people's pay-offs into account is specific to that person and varies among the population. The former two approaches model both altruism and reciprocity in participants' utility functions, whereas Andreoni and Miller (2002) focus on altruism alone.⁴

While cooperation in a public good game is in line with all three approaches, punishment can be explained only if reciprocity or spitefulness is part of the model as is the case in Rabin's and Levine's approach.

Recently two approaches pioneered by Bolton and Ockenfels (2000) on the one hand, and by Fehr and Schmidt (1999) on the other hand have received attention in the public good context and beyond. They have in common the introduction of an inclination to equity of pay-offs into people's motivation. This means that punishment could be used to reduce inequity after the public good stage. The application of inequality aversion is however questionable in the case of the indi-rule. It would only work out if it were the free-riders to engage in punishment, which is not the case (as we will see later).

Pruitt and Kimmel (1977) address the topic from a psychological perspective and emphasize the role of trust. Their goal/expectation theory suggests that most people recognize the need for and share the goal of establishing mutual cooperation. In order to achieve cooperation, the common goal "must be accompanied by an expectation that the other will cooperate [...]" (Pruitt and Kimmel 1977, p.375).

The goal/expectation theory has been extended by Yamagishi (1986) to the structural goal/ expectation theory. He argues that people are conditionally willing to cooperate in the sense of Pruitt and Kimmel. The main obstacle to cooperation is a lack of

⁴Additionally, they allow for non-linear preferences.

mutual trust. However, the opportunity to cooperate in a second order public good, e.g. a sanctioning system, will be utilized to establish trust necessary for durable cooperation. Yamagishi provides experimental evidence that people showing a lack of mutual trust display uncooperative behavior (relative to groups of rather trusting people)⁵ in the absence of a sanctioning system. The same people make relatively heavy use of punishment opportunities and achieve higher cooperation levels than their trusting counterparts when a sanctioning system is provided. Further evidence for conditional cooperation is given by Fischbacher, Gächter and Fehr (2001).

We consider as the essence of all approaches that there is at least a fraction of people conditionally willing to contribute to a common goal despite adverse incentives, and that there are people ready to punish if they feel unfairly treated.

4 Hypotheses and Results

In most of our analysis we concentrate on phase 1 (period 1 to 10) and the selection procedure (choice of the rule). The data from phase 2 is difficult to interpret since it is not clear to which extent there are carryovers from one rule to another. Phase 3 was primarily introduced to give the subjects incentives to take the auction seriously.

Figure 1 gives a general idea of the behavior in the first phase. Obviously, punishment occurred, but we have to be careful with conclusions about the effect of punishment since we did not run a treatment without punishment. The general contribution behavior, however, is hump-shaped — quite similar to that found by Masclet et al. (forthcoming) and Noussair and Tucker (2002) in treatments with punishment. We do not find the typical strong deterioration of cooperation over time as described in the literature (e.g. Fehr and Gächter 2000, Ledyard 1995). We therefore assume that punishment helped to establish and stabilize cooperation.

However, there are still differences between the rules. While in terms of contributions they display visibly different courses with a clearly superior maxi-rule, the evolution of profits paints a rather vague picture. Interestingly, the initial average contribution is similar for all different rules. Apparently, people did not anticipate the rules' different peculiarities but rather react to them in the course of the repeated game.

In the following subsections we analyze the data in more detail. Thereby we use the relation \succ in a generic sense denoting higher and better, respectively. Most regressions

⁵On basis of a pre-experimental questionnaire Yamagishi subdivided participants into groups of so-called high- and low-trustees.




Figure 1: Average contribution (a), average received punishment (b), and average profit (c) over the first ten periods (abscissa).

rely on averages of single groups over the first 10 rounds rather than on individual data, since this allows us to base our tests on independent observations.

4.1 Punishment

4.1.1 Number and extent of punishment proposals

The fact that punishment is able to substantially change people's behavior in public good settings necessitates closer investigation of the motives behind punishment: On one hand, it can be the anger about another person's contribution. In this case we speak of emotional punishment. On the other hand, one might wish to punish in order to induce higher future contributions by the punished person and, as a result, higher cooperation within the group. We refer to this as the strategic punishment.

Hypothesis 1 *Both, strategic and the emotional punishment exist and are non-negligible.*

If the strategic motive existed, punishment activity should weaken towards later periods, as the benefit from establishing future cooperation decreases. To check this we calculated the total amounts of punishment proposals (i.e. the sum over all proposals for a given group and period) and compared the first five periods with the last five periods. Apart from the influence described above, we recognize the contribution's mean and standard deviation as possible determinants for punishment activity. Furthermore, it is reasonable that a particular group is more or less active in punishment throughout all periods. Thus, we performed a fixed-effect regression explaining the total amount of punishment proposals in a period by the mean and standard deviation of contributions of that period, and a dummy variable with values 0 or 1 for the first or the last five periods, respectively. Moreover, the regression was done separately for the indi-rule, the collective rule, and all rules together. Eventually, we chose to report (White's) robust standard deviations to account for possible dependencies within the ten observations from one group. The results are reported in Table 2.

As can be seen, the dummy is only significant for the indi-rule. There is no sign of weakening punishment behavior under the collective rules. One possible explanation is that other (emotional) motives grow as the strategic motive loses strength. We conjecture that in the collective rules increasing emotional punishment neutralizes lower strategic punishment in the last periods whereas emotional punishment is dampened by the second order dilemma in the indi-rule. If one person repeatedly bore the costs for punishment

Table 2: Fixed-effect regression of the total amount of punishment proposals within a group and a period.

	All rules	indi only	Collective rules
Constant	***21.05 (6.88)	5.84 (7.60)	***27.27 (8.29)
Contribution mean	* -0.71 (0.38)	0.01 (0.49)	** -1.06 (0.44)
Contribution std.dev.	*** 4.00 (0.48)	*** 2.76 (0.95)	*** 4.41 (0.54)
Dummy (5 to 10)	-1.78 (1.97)	***-8.45 (3.94)	0.90 (2.01)
Adjusted R^2	0.69	0.56	0.70

Note: Numbers in parentheses are (White’s) robust standard errors. *, **, and *** denote significance levels of 10%, 5%, and 1% respectively.

alone she may feel exploited and understandably abstains from future engagement in punishment. However, this explanation cannot be verified in this study.

The existence of emotional punishment can be checked easily. If we observe punishment activity in the very last period of a phase, we have evidence for emotional punishment since strategic punishment is futile. The data strongly supports emotional punishment. In 24 out of 32 groups (indi: 5/8, maxi: 5/8, medi: 7/8, mini: 7/8) punishment proposals occurred in period 10. One may object that there is still a reason for strategic punishment since people may speculate that they encounter each other in a similar game in the second or third phase of the experiment. Thus, we also looked at the last period of the third phase, from which the subjects knew that it was definitely the last period of the entire experiment. Again we found punishment activity across all rules (indi: 9/12, maxi: 1/2, medi: 9/12, mini: 5/6).

Subjects anticipate, however, punishment to be strategic rather than to be emotional and decrease their contribution at the end of the phase (see Figure 1a). To the contrary, at least some individuals seem to be more emotional than anticipated which can be seen by the punishment curve of the maxi treatment (see Figure 1b).

The punishment curve for the indi-rule resembles best the characteristics of a standard public good dilemma. Carried out punishment starts rather high and decreases towards the end. It carries features of a so-called volunteer’s dilemma.⁶ The positive

⁶Strictly speaking, we assume the existence of an asymmetric volunteer’s timing dilemma for individual punishment. Following Weesie (1993) the person with the strongest need for the provision of the good (punishment) is most likely to go ahead and provide and pay for it while the others who are able to observe

effects of punishment on cooperation can be enjoyed by everyone, whereas the costs are borne by that participant who proposed the highest amount. This dilemma in its various forms has been described and analysed by Diekmann (1993), Weesie (1993, 1994) and Weesie and Franzen (1998). Most relevant is the work by Weesie and Franzen in which they show both theoretically and experimentally that the probability of the public good (here: punishment) being provided increases under the condition of cost sharing. In our setting this translates into more and heavier punishment proposals under the collective rules. One may also take on a simpler view: Punishment is, for an individual, less costly under a collective rule than under the indi-rule; strictly speaking, the costs reduce to one third. Hence, we state:

Hypothesis 2 *Punishment activity (measured by proposals) is weaker under the indi-rule than under the collective rules.*

In order to analyse this, we confront the total extent of punishment proposals in a period averaged over ten periods in indi-rule with the same measure from the collective rules. In order to control for the influence of the contributions' mean and standard deviation, as well averaged over ten periods, we applied a linear regression including a dummy variable with value 0 for observations from indi treatments and value 1 for those from collective treatments. Table 3 (column: punishment proposed) shows that our hypothesis is confirmed, as the significant dummy indicates.

4.1.2 Enforcement of punishment proposals

Concerning the rules, the punishment which was enforced depending on the proposals is straightforward. In both the maxi- and the indi-rule, the most severe proposal is enforced, in the medi-rule the median proposal, and in the mini-rule the least severe proposal is put into action. Given all other things equal, carried-out punishments in the four rules should be related in the following way: indi/maxi \succ medi \succ mini. However, carried-out punishment differs only if there are different proposals against a person. Moreover, the sizes of the punishment relations crucially depend on the characteristics (spread, skewness) of the proposal distribution within a triplet.

From our data, we calculated descriptive measures for this distribution. Taking into account all triplets in which at least one proposal was greater than zero we found that

this will then abstain from provision. Assuming that the person with the highest need for punishment will propose the highest punishment amount, our design of the indi-rule reflects both the selection mechanism and the consequences of a volunteer's timing dilemma.

Table 3: OLS regressions of the averaged total amount of punishment proposals and of carried-out punishment.

	Punishment proposed		Punishment carried out	
Constant	-3.05	(17.11)	1.20	(1.62)
Averaged contribution	-0.23	(0.87)	0.02	(0.08)
Averaged std.dev. of contr.	** 5.66	(1.91)	** 0.56	(0.17)
Dummy for collective rules	**14.82	(5.56)		
Dummy for indi			** -1.56	(0.60)
Dummy for medi			*** -2.00	(0.62)
Dummy for mini			*** -3.24	(0.64)
Adjusted R^2	0.42		0.49	

Note: Numbers in parentheses are standard errors. ** and *** denote significance levels of 5% and 1% respectively.

the average distance between the maximum and the median proposal was 5.80 while the average distance between the median and the minimum proposal was 1.77. Furthermore we calculated the average ratios of the min-med-span to the (whole) max-min-span over all triplets of a 4-person group. The ratios have a mean of .251 and a standard deviation of .125. There was no group with an average ratio greater than .5. Thus, apart from the variation within the triplets we find that the distribution is highly skewed. The medium proposal is much closer to the minimum than to the maximum proposal.

4.1.3 Carried-out punishment

The occurrence of punishment is essentially influenced by the number and extent, as well as the enforcement of punishment proposals. Following Hypothesis 2, the indi-rule generates less punishment activity than the collective rules. Since, under the aspect of enforcement, the indi-rule is equivalent to the maxi-rule, we expect:

Hypothesis 3 *In the maxi-rule punishment occurs more extensively than in the indi-rule.*

Following our reasoning on enforcement, and since we have no reason to expect different punishment behavior across the collective rules, we expect:

Hypothesis 4 *Concerning the extent of punishment carried out, the following relation holds: $maxi \succ medi \succ mini$.*

In a linear regression we explained the carried-out punishment averaged over ten periods. We introduced dummy variables for three of the four rules (indi, medi, and mini) and controlled for the contribution's mean and standard deviation (also averaged over ten periods). The intercept reflects the influence of the maxi-rule whereas the dummies reflect the additional influences of either rule relative to the maxi-rule.

The results are reported in Table 3 (column: punishment carried out). The values for the dummies show that carried-out punishment is significantly higher in the maxi-rule than in the other rules. Applying an F-test, based on the restriction that the mini- and medi-dummies are equal, we also find that the medi-rule generates significantly higher punishment than the mini-rule ($p=.044$, F-test). Thus all relations proposed in Hypotheses 3 and 4 turn out to be statistically significant.

For further considerations, we will refer to a rule that is superior to another rule in terms of the carried-out punishment as the more severe rule.

4.2 Contribution and punishment

In a public good game without punishment opportunities, an important determinant of a participant's contribution decision are the past contributions of the other group members, and her expectation about their future contributions. This is in line not only with Yamagishi's approach (Yamagishi 1986), but has recently been supported also experimentally by Fischbacher, Gächter and Fehr (2001). With our setup, explicit punishment as well as expectations about it come into play and influence the contribution decision additionally.

It is intuitively appealing that relatively small contributions are perceived as unfair, whereas higher contributions are seen as fair. In this context, Fehr and Gächter (2000) found that mainly negative deviations from average contribution levels were punished.⁷ Consequently we expect to find similar behavior in our experiment.

Hypothesis 5 *Lower contributions (relative to the group average) receive heavier punishment proposals than higher contributions.*

The correlation between a person's deviation from the average group contribution and the amount of punishment proposals she received in the same period was calculated

⁷They also found that some low contributors engaged in punishment against high contributors but the extent was small though.

as $-.580$ from all available data, supporting the assumption. The relation is stable across all rules. However, this number is calculated from the total of 1280 observations that are partly dependent. In order to check for statistical significance we calculated a correlation coefficient for each group and applied a t-test on the 31 resulting independent measures.⁸ The correlation coefficients have a mean of $-.660$ with an estimated standard deviation of $.037$. Based on a sample of size 31 one can reject the hypothesis of a non-negative correlation at any reasonable significance level.

In a similar way we consider one's own contribution as a major determinant of how fair or unfair one regards other persons' contributions, i.e. a person with a very high contribution may feel a stronger need to educate a free rider than a person with an average or even lower contribution.

Hypothesis 6 *Participants with above average contributions propose heavier punishment than others.*

As with Hypothesis 5, we calculated the correlation between a person's deviation from the group average and the total amount of punishment she proposed. The Pearson correlation coefficient is $.257$ if all observations are included. If one separates individuals from collective treatments, the coefficients are $.256$ and $.271$, respectively, indicating a stable relationship. The 31 correlation coefficients for each single group have a mean of $.278$, with an estimated standard deviation of $.050$. Again, we can reject the hypothesis of a non-positive correlation by a t-test at any reasonable significance level.

4.3 Contribution

Having an idea of who punishes whom we turn to the effects which punishment causes. A person's natural reaction to a received punishment should be to change her behavior. Following Hypothesis 5, this means above all that she will raise her contribution.⁹ All other contributions unchanged, this would lead to a higher cooperation level in the group. Keeping one's own contribution constant in an environment of rising cooperation, however,

⁸In one out of 32 groups no punishment proposal occurred in the first phase, making it impossible to calculate a correlation coefficient.

⁹Hypothesis 5 contains a link between a person's contribution and the punishment proposals she receives, while for a change in a person's behavior actual punishment was needed. However, more or higher punishment proposals generally lead to higher (at least not smaller) carried-out punishment within any rule.

also means facing a higher risk of being punished. Therefore, observed punishment may induce other group members to raise their contributions as well.

The fear of being punished is not the only motive to raise one's contribution. As explained above, people are willing to contribute more in expectation of higher cooperation by other group members, even in the absence of punishment opportunities. The credible threat of punishment should be sufficient to trigger the same dynamics. In contrast, we expect lower cooperation levels, if punishment fails to be credible.

From Hypotheses 3 and 4 we saw that the occurrence (and thus the credibility) of punishment varies within the rules. Therefore, contribution should relate accordingly.

Hypothesis 7 *Concerning the performance of contributions, the following relation holds: $maxi \succ indi$, and $maxi \succ medi \succ mini$.*

Table 4 shows that the contribution levels averaged over all participants and periods under a certain rule relate as proposed though there are large dispersions within each group. The relations become clearer when only contributions of the last five periods of a treatment are averaged. The results of pairwise comparisons using a Mann-Whitney-U test are reported in Table 5. The relations between maxi and medi as well as maxi and mini are significant at the 5% level. With a 10% level of significance one might also reject that maxi and indi generate equal contribution behavior in the last five periods. The non-significance of the medi-mini comparison may be explained by the high skewness of the distribution of punishment proposals. The punishment amount resulting from a typical triplet would rise only modestly if the medi-rule were applied instead of the mini-rule. It would rise substantially if the maxi rule were applied.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that applying the same test to initial contribution levels under the different rules did not lead to any significant difference. As noted before, this shows that people's anticipation about the rule was limited.

4.4 Efficiency

On one hand punishment seemingly raises contribution on the other hand it reduces income. Obviously the question arises which of the rules performs best in terms of efficiency.¹⁰ Does the benefit from more cooperation outweigh the costs of the punishment needed to establish that additional cooperation? We abstain from generating a hypothesis

¹⁰By efficiency we understand the group's total profit after all sanction costs have been covered, e.g. the final profit as defined in Section 2 summed over all four members.

Table 4: Descriptive measures on contribution and profit levels under different rules.

Rule	Mean		Minimum	Maximum	Range
	prds. 1 to 10	prds. 6 to 10	prds. 1 to 10	prds. 1 to 10	prds. 1 to 10
Contributions					
indi	14.65	15.04	10.98	20.00	9.02
maxi	16.94	18.31	14.13	19.13	5.00
medi	13.73	14.19	10.43	17.75	7.32
mini	13.06	12.74	6.58	20.00	13.42
Profits					
indi	25.65	27.05	20.75	32.00	11.25
maxi	24.35	26.61	16.68	31.02	14.34
medi	25.54	25.74	21.78	28.25	6.47
mini	26.96	26.84	23.45	31.28	7.83

Note: All measures are based on group averages under the specific rule.

to this question since it requires quantitative assumptions on the effects of punishment, which are difficult to make.

Interestingly enough, the relations between the rules in terms of efficiency are opposite to the relations predicted and found for punishment and contributions: maxi \prec indi, and maxi \prec medi \prec mini (see Table 4). However, these relations do not withstand a statistical test ($p > 0.1$, Kruskal-Wallis test), partly due to the high dispersion in profit levels among the observations.

The efficiency relations (see Figure 1c) are not stable throughout the course, because of the striking pattern exhibited by the maxi-rule. While it performs best in some intermediate periods it lies far behind in the beginning and in the last period. Obviously, the heavy use of punishment to establish cooperation was both, successful and expensive. In the intermediate periods cooperation stabilized on a high level accompanied by few punishments, allowing the participants to earn generous profits. However, when the end of the treatment approached contribution levels decayed generally. This effect could not be stopped even though heavy punishment had to be expected. The immense extent of carried-out, emotional punishment in the last period left the participants with relatively poor profits.

The medi- and mini-rule, in contrast, exhibit a rather stable pattern in terms of

Table 5: Test statistics and significance levels (Mann-Whitney-U tests) for contributions on all relevant pairs of rules.

Variable: contributions	Mann-Whitney-U	Significance (1-tailed)
maxi / indi	20.0 (17.5)	.117 (.065)
maxi / medi	11.0 (8.0)	.014 (.005)
medi / mini	28.0 (23.5)	.361 (.191)
maxi / mini	12.5 (11.0)	.019 (.014)

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the respective values using the averages of the last five periods. All tests are based on independent observations (group averages).

efficiency, while the indi-rule's evolution resembles the maxi-rule in the beginning but not in the last periods.

4.5 Justice

Beside efficiency people turn their attention to justice if they judge allocations or have to choose between different alternatives.¹¹ They, therefore, wish to compare the four punishment rules with respect to justice, too. In our view, the highest degree of justice would be reached if the most generous contributors earned the highest profits. Additionally, we would also regard a situation without any dispersion in both, contributions and profits as just.¹²

In a linear public good game without punishment opportunities, different profits can only be attributed to different privately kept amounts. Therefore, the correlation between profits and contributions is perfectly negative. Moreover, the variance in contributions translates completely into the variance of profits. According to our definition, this is a very unfair situation.

¹¹One may reason that justice is of importance for a long-term stabilization of cooperation. Given repeated free-rider attacks, repeated punishment would be needed to stabilize cooperation. If, though, a rule generates permanently and strongly unjust results after punishment, the willingness to punish and to cooperate may decay.

¹²Alternatively, one could simply regard the variance in profits within a group as a measure of justice, i.e. low variance means higher justice than high variance. This definition rests on the fact that in each period every group member starts with the same endowment.

We recognize three channels through which punishment is able to improve justice:

1. Through weakening or even reversing the negative correlation between contributions and profits, and, given a negative correlation rate,
2. by reducing the variance in profits,
3. by reducing variation in contributions themselves.

Let's first turn to channel one and two, which can be considered the direct influences of punishment. Since, following Hypotheses 5 and 6, mainly below average contributions are punished from above average contributors, the relative benefit from free-riding may be reduced or even reversed. This is for the better of justice. The costs of punishment, however, lessen this improvement. Thus, it is of particular importance who bears the costs for punishment in the indi-rule. In most cases, participants who already have relatively small preliminary profits after the public good stage, suffer a further deterioration in payoffs due to punishment costs.

For the collective rules the results of the Hypotheses 3 and 4 suggest that the more severe a rule is the more likely free-riders were punished and thus the greater the improvements in justice will be.

We come to the same conclusion when turning to channel 3, the indirect effect of punishment. The more severe a rule is, the less deviations from a social norm (e.g. the average contribution) are tolerated. And, the less tolerant a rule is, the more it is able to generate homogeneity in contributions.

Taking all three channels into account we arrive at the following proposition:

Hypothesis 8 *In terms of justice, the following relations hold: $maxi \succ indi$ and $maxi \succ medi \succ mini$.*

In order to test our hypothesis, we calculated a measure for each of the justice channels: correlation coefficients between profits and contributions, variances of profits, and variances of contributions. The measures were calculated for each group and each period from 1 to 10 and then averaged over periods.¹³ Eventually, we tested whether the resulting measures differ.

¹³The variances in profits and contributions are disputable in particular if the correlation between profits and contributions is positive. However, since only one out of 31 groups shows a resulting positive measure, we neglect this problem.

Table 6: Significance levels (Mann-Whitney-U tests) of the differences between different rules regarding correlations between profits and contributions as well as the variances of profits and contributions.

Rules	Corr. betw. profits and contr.: 1-tailed sign.	Variance of profits: 1-tailed sign.	Variance of contributions: 1-tailed sign.
maxi / indi	.232 (21.5)	.081 (18.0)	.287 (26.0)
maxi / medi	.065 (17.5)	.065 (17.0)	.221 (24.0)
medi / mini	.053 (16.5)	.053 (16.0)	.164 (22.0)
maxi / mini	.002 (5.5)	.003 (6.0)	.018 (12.5)

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the Mann-Whitney-U statistics. All tests are based on independent observations (group averages).

Regarding the first relation between maxi and indi rule we only find a weakly significant difference for profit variances (see Table 6). The other two measures do not significantly differ. When comparing the 3 collective rules among each other the variances of profits as well as correlations between profits and contributions turn out to be significantly different ($p=.013$ and $p=.011$, Kruskal-Wallis test) whereas the variances in contribution do not differ significantly ($p=.105$, Kruskal-Wallis test). In pairwise comparisons (see Table 6) we find (weakly) significant differences with respect to the correlation of profits and contributions as well as to profit variances. The difference in contribution variances is only significant between maxi and mini. After all, we consider the second part of the hypothesis, i.e. the relations among the collective rules, as supported.

4.6 Institutional Choice

In previous subsections we compared collective rules in terms of normative criteria, e.g. efficiency and justice. Now we turn to the question whether and to what extent people are willing to support a collective rule when their alternative is the individual rule.

Before we turn to identify the determinants of the decisions made by the participants we present some aggregate results. The approval of the collective rules follows the pattern $\text{mini} \succ \text{medi} \succ \text{maxi}$. When the mini-rule was the alternative to indi, 22 out of 32 (68.8%)

chose for it. For medi and maxi the rates of approval were 42/64 (65.6%)¹⁴ and 16/32 (50%).

The bids submitted by the participants to support their votes average ECU 14.18, which is nearly 25% of the amount they received for this purpose. The most frequent bids were ECU 0.–, 1.–, 10.– and 20.–, the maximal amount of ECU 60.– occurred four times. With respect to the decision determinants we expect individuals to weigh their costs and benefits. One variable, which is easily observable and comparable is personal profit. We expect:

Hypothesis 9 *Differences in personal profits are of importance; a person tends to choose the rule under which she can expect higher profits.*

Besides profits we consider personal freedom essential to a person's evaluation of punishment rules. Any collective rule constitutes a restriction to an individual's freedom of action that can be regarded as a cost in a non-pecuniary sense. The restriction occurs in two possible ways:

1. A participant has to bear the costs for a carried-out punishment (one third of the amount) even if she proposed a lower punishment or no punishment at all.
2. A participant has to be satisfied with lower carried-out punishment though she proposed a higher amount.

Crucial to the restriction of a person's freedom by a rule is the degree of consent required by the rule. The mini-rule requires the agreement of all three proposers to fix the punishment amount. Consequently, in the mini-rule the first kind of restriction can be ignored, while the second kind may occur frequently. On the other hand, in the maxi-rule the most severe person decides on the punishment amount. Thus, the second kind of restriction is negligible, whereas the first kind may play an important role. The medi-rule lies between the two extremes.

Hypothesis 10 *Both kinds of restriction weaken the approval of collective rules.*

If the choice is between indi and maxi, a person who is very keen to punish others will prefer the maxi-rule as this rule would enable her to put through a high punishment

¹⁴Since the order in which the rules are applied does not significantly influence the rate of approval (two-sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction, $p=.792$), we pool the data of indi/medi (22/32) and medi/indi (20/32).

while she can share the costs with the other group members. On the other hand, a person who wishes few or no punishment and is not willing to share costs will prefer the indi-rule. A similar reasoning applies when people are up to choosing between the mini-rule and the indi-rule. A person very willing to punish may feel too restrained under this collective rule and vote for the indi-rule.

There are some other possible influences on a person's attitude towards a rule, for example the extent to which a person was target of past punishments, the extent of unduly punishments to one person, and the degree of justice of a rule. However, we consider them of playing a minor role since the first is at least partially included in the profits and the second does rarely happen. Justice is difficult to observe because the participants had to keep track with all the payments of the others.¹⁵

According to the distinction concerning the restriction to a person's freedom, we calculated two measures:¹⁶

1. drag-in: absolute value of the sum of negative differences between a person's proposed punishment and the carried-out punishment, averaged over ten/five periods.
2. curb: sum of positive differences between a person's proposed punishment and the carried-out punishment, averaged over ten/five periods.

In order to measure the degree of approval for a particular collective rule we put a sign to each bid, depending on whether the amount was dedicated to support a vote for the indi-rule (−) or a collective rule (+). On these measures we used a linear regression to estimate the influence of drag-in, curb and profit differences on the approval of a rule. We use aggregated measures in order to base the regression on independent observations. As dependent variable we calculated the total approval for the collective rule in a group as the sum of the signed bids over the four members of the group, i.e. bids for the collective rule were added and bids for the indi-rule were subtracted. As independent variables we used the averaged profit differences, and summed up the variables “curb” and “drag-in” over the four group members. The results confirm our hypotheses (see Table 7). Profit differences as well as “drag-in” contribute most strongly to the explanation of participants' approval for the collective rule, but also curb has an influence. Given our prior assumptions on the sign of these influences a 1-tailed test is appropriate. Based on this, the variables are significant at levels of 5% and 10%, respectively.

¹⁵Subjects received only information about their own accumulated payoff.

¹⁶The measures were, of course, calculated from the first phase. For groups starting with the indi-rule the second phase was accounted.

Table 7: OLS regression of the total approval of the collective rule in a group.

Variable	Coefficient		Significance (t-test, 1-tailed)
Constant	30.89	(13.04)	.013
Profit diff.	2.98	(1.55)	.033
Curb	-0.72	(0.52)	.087
Drag-in	-1.50	(0.86)	.046
Adjusted R^2			0.18

Note: Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

5 Conclusion

Like Elinor Ostrom we are aware that: “[...]whether or not an equilibrium would be an improvement for the individuals involved (or for others who are in turn affected by these individuals) will depend on the particular structures of the institutions. [...] Further, the particular structure of the physical environment involved also will have a mayor impact on the structure of the game and its results. Thus, a set of rules used in one physical environment may have vastly different consequences if used in a different physical environment.” (Ostrom 1990, p.22).

We consider our experimental design as one of many possible structures to be found in practice. Changing certain characteristics of the design, e.g. the number of players, the number of periods, the cost or information structure, or the degree of anonymity in the voting process, may lead to changes of particular results. Therefore, we cannot generalize each particular finding, but we want to make some general remarks about the insights we gained from this study.

Our experiment was designed so as to learn about people’s behavior under different punishment rules and to answer several questions. First we asked: *Are collective punishment rules able to bring about stronger cooperation and/or higher profits in a public good setting than an individual rule, and to what extent do different collective rules perform differently from each other?*

We find that punishment rules differ from each other due to differences in the occurrence of punishment proposals and their enforcement. Collective rules generally induce heavier punishment activity. Supposing that a higher probability of being punished leads to higher contribution, it is no surprise that the maxi-rule performs best in terms of con-

tribution. But when comparing punishment rules it is not enough to consider contribution behavior only. One has to take punishment costs into account as well. Though efficiency does not differ significantly in our setting the relations are reversed. We conclude:

Remark 1 *More punishment, though it is able to enforce more cooperation, does not necessarily generate higher profits.*

Our data verify that emotional punishment exists and that it has a major impact on efficiency. In the maxi-rule, though it performed best in terms of contribution, emotional punishment was not sufficiently suppressed and consequently damaged the gains from cooperation. We conclude:

Remark 2 *When designing punishment rules, the ability to suppress exaggerated emotional punishment is at least as important as providing a sufficient punishment threat.*

Turning to justice, we argued that the extent to which a rule is able to generate and enforce punishment is responsible for the improvement of justice provided that contributions below average are heavier punished than that above. This argument was confirmed by our empirical findings, where the maxi-rule turned out to be superior to all other rules.

Altogether, considering efficiency and justice, collective rules do not perform worse than the individual rule. Moreover, depending on their design, they are able to surpass individual punishment in different aspects. The question remains: *Will participants agree to submit themselves to a collective rule, even if this means to give up some individual freedom?*

We investigated influences on participants' approval or rejection of collective rules and conclude:

Remark 3 *As far as collective rules allow for higher profits, people support them. On the other hand, restrictions to the personal freedom weaken the support for collective rules or even cause support for the individual rule.*

Mainly participants who had to bear the costs of a carried-out punishment higher than the one they have proposed are likely to oppose the collective rule. This finding suggests that the higher the required degree of consent by the collective rule the more likely it is to be supported by the participants. This may explain the high popularity of unanimity voting and veto rights in institutions of the UNO as well as the EU. The other kind of restriction, that participants have to accept a certain punishment even if they proposed a higher amount, turned out to be less influential.

Finally, we turn to the last question: *Is there an optimal punishment rule?*

To design an optimal punishment rule one has to solve several trade-offs. The punishment rule has to provide sufficiently high probability of being punished on one hand, but it should be able to suppress exaggerated emotional punishment on the other hand. What extent of punishment is sufficient or exaggerated can be answered only case by case taking into account the very environment and the characteristics of the individuals involved. A particular result of our experiment is that a rule, which is severe enough to establish cooperation in one group, may fail to provide sufficient punishment in another group. Moreover, a rule providing sufficient but not exaggerated punishment in one group may allow for too excessive punishment in another group. Since both, people and groups differ in their initial inclination to cooperate and to punish, and since environments are special and unique, we arrive at the final remark, that a generally optimal punishment rule may not exist.

References

- Andreoni, J., and J. Miller. 2002. Giving According to GARP: An Experimental Test of the Consistency of Preferences for Altruism. *Econometrica* 70: 737-53.
- Bates, R.H. 1988. Contra Contractarianism: Some Reflections on the New Institutionalism. *Politics and Society* 16: 169-217.
- Bolton, G.E., and A. Ockenfels. 2000. ERC - A Theory of Equity, Reciprocity, and Competition. *American Economic Review* 90: 166-93.
- Dawes R.M., and R. Thaler. 1988. Cooperation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 2: 187-97.
- Diekmann, A. 1993. Cooperation in an Asymmetric Volunteer's Dilemma Game - Theory and Experimental Evidence. *International Journal of Game Theory* 22: 75-85.
- Fehr, E., S. Gächter, and G. Kirchsteiger. 1996. Reciprocity as a Contract Enforcement Device. *Econometrica* 65: 833-60.
- Fehr, E., and S. Gächter. 2000. Cooperation and Punishment in Public Goods Experiments. *American Economic Review* 90: 980-94.
- Fehr, E., and K.M. Schmidt. 1999. A Theory of Fairness, Competition, and Cooperation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 114: 817-68.

- Fischbacher, U., S. Gächter, and E. Fehr. 2001. Are people conditionally cooperative? Evidence from a public goods experiment. *Economics Letters* 71(3): 397-404
- Fischbacher, U. 1999. z-Tree. Zurich Toolbox for Readymade Economic Experiments. Working Paper No. 21. University of Zürich.
- Güth, W., and R. Tietz. 1990. Ultimatum Bargaining Behavior—A Survey and Comparison of Experimental Results. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 11: 417-49.
- Ledyard, J.O. 1995. Public Goods: A Survey of Experimental Research. In : J. Kagel and A. Roth (eds.): *Handbook of Experimental Economics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Levine, D.K. 1998. Modeling Altruism and Spitefulness in Experiments. *Review of Economic Dynamics* 1: 593-622.
- Masclot, D., C. Noussair, S. Tucker, and M.C. Villeval. forthcoming. Monetary and Nonmonetary Punishment in the Voluntary Contributions Mechanism. *American Economic Review*.
- Noussair, C., and S. Tucker. 2003. Combining Monetary and Social Sanctions to Promote Cooperation, Working Paper, Emory University, Atlanta.
- Oliver, P. 1980. Rewards and Punishments as Selective Incentives for Collective Action: Theoretical Investigations. *American Journal of Sociology* 85: 356-75.
- Ostrom, E. 1990. *Governing the Commons—The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pruitt, D.G., and M.J. Kimmel. 1977. Twenty years of experimental gaming: Critique, synthesis, and suggestions for the future. *American Review of Psychology* 28: 362-96.
- Rabin, M. 1993. Incooperating Fairness into Game Theory and Economics. *American Economic Review* 83: 1281-302.
- Weesie, J. 1993. Asymmetry and Timing in the Volunteer's Dilemma. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37: 569-90.
- . 1994. Incomplete Information and Timing in the Volunteer's Dilemma. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 38: 557-85.
- Weesie, J., and A. Franzen. 1998. Cost Sharing in a Volunteer's Dilemma. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42: 600-18.

Yamagishi, T. 1986. The Provision of a Sanctioning System as a Public Good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51: 110-16.

Appendix

[This is a translated version of the instructions for Treatment 4. Instructions for the other treatments were accordingly. For procedural details see Section 2.]

[Page 1 and 2]

Welcome to this experiment.

We ask you to stop any communication from now on. Please, read the instructions very carefully. If any questions remain, please raise your hand, we will help you.

The following experiment consists of three consecutive parts. Your total earnings will be the sum of your earnings from these three parts.

Part 1.

This part consists of ten periods. Each period follows the same procedure:

You interact with three other participants. Each of you receives an endowment of 20 ECU (*Experimental Currency Unit*) per period. From this endowment each of you may contribute a certain amount g to a common pot, the remainder goes to your private account. The sum of all contributions - the pot - grows by 60%, or in other words, is multiplied by the factor 1.6. Afterwards the grown pot is equally distributed among all four participants, irrespective of each participant's contribution. Consequently, you receive one quarter of the grown pot additional to that amount that you have kept for yourself. Your preliminary income Π is calculated as:

$$\Pi = 20 - g + \frac{1.6}{4} * P, \text{ where } P = \text{pot} = \text{sum over all four contributions}$$

After you have chosen your contribution, you will learn from an overview how much you and the other participants of your group have contributed:

	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4
Contribution				
Punishment Proposal				

In the next step you have the opportunity to propose fines in order to punish other participants' behavior.

Punishment

Below the contributions you find an area in which you may indicate the punishment amounts you propose with respect to the other participants. After all participants have decided on their proposals, there are three punishment proposals against each participant. The **smallest** out of the three proposals for a participant is selected and put into action. The amount is subtracted from the participant's preliminary profits. No other person benefits from the loss. However, punishment is costly.

Costs of Punishment

Each ECU of a realized fine raises costs of one ECU. The costs for punishing a particular participant are **shared** by the three remaining participants. That is, the costs are divided by three and subtracted from each of the remaining participants' preliminary profits irrespective the proposed amounts. Again, no other person benefits from the costs of punishment.

Afterwards you receive an overview of the punishment amounts carried-out:

	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4
Contribution				
Resulting Punishment				

This table informs, whether and to what extent you and the other participants were actually punished. Additionally, you receive information about your final period-profit after the subtraction of possibly received punishment and costs for punishing others.

This procedure is repeated for ten periods, profits or losses for each period are credited to your account.

If you have any question yet, please raise your hand. Please do not communicate with other participants, neither now nor during the experiment.

_____ [Page 3 handed out to the participant before phase 2] _____

Now **part 2** of the experiment begins.

This part differs from the first part only in some details. The following changes:

There are **five** periods (formerly: ten).

The **highest** out of the three proposals for a participant is selected and put into action (formerly: the smallest).

The costs of punishment are unchanged, but have to be borne **alone** by the participant who proposed that highest amount. In the case that two or more participants proposed the same highest amount, the participant who has to bear the costs is selected randomly. All other rules remain unchanged.

Note: The identification numbers of the four participants will be changed before part 2 will start.

_____ [Page 4 handed out to the participant before the auction and phase 3] _____

Now **part 3** of the experiment begins.

You have experienced two different punishment mechanisms. In this part you have the opportunity to decide on the mechanism to be applied. With this mechanism another **five** periods are conducted.

Mechanism 1:

The **smallest** out of the three proposals for a participant is selected and put into action. The costs for punishment will be **shared** among the three remaining participants, i.e. each participant carries one third.

Mechanism 2:

The **highest** out of the three proposals for a participant is selected and put into action. The costs have to be borne **alone** by the participant who proposed that highest amount. In the case that two or more participants propose the same highest amount, the one who has to bear the costs is selected randomly.

The selection of the mechanism is as follows:

First, indicate in the decision form the mechanism you prefer.

Which mechanism is applied, is decided by that participant who submits the highest bid for putting through his/her preferred mechanism. For this purpose each participant receives an extra 60 ECU. If you submit the highest bid, your preferred mechanism will be implemented. Your bid is subtracted from the 60 ECU, the remainder is credited to your account. If someone else submits the highest bid, then that participant decides on the mechanism. You are credited the whole amount of 60 ECU. In case that several persons submit the same highest bid, the person who decides and pays is chosen randomly.

The chosen mechanism is announced to all members, and part three starts.

Note: Again, identification numbers of the four participants will be changed before part 3 will start.