Microfinance Games*

Xavier Giné
The World Bank

Pamela Jakiela
Washington University in St. Louis

Dean Karlan
Yale University

Jonathan Morduch
New York University

May 1, 2009

Abstract

Group-based lending contracts offer potential solutions to credit market imperfections in populations too poor to provide collateral. Group-based mechanisms drive the global microfinance movement, but, by providing borrowers with implicit insurance against investment losses, the contracts are also vulnerable to free-riding and collusion. We created an experimental economics laboratory in a large urban market in Lima, Peru, and over seven months conducted eleven different experimental economic games that allow us to unpack microfinance mechanisms in a systematic way. We find that risk-taking broadly conforms to theoretical predictions, with dynamic incentives strongly reducing risk-taking even without group-based mechanisms. Group lending increases risk-taking by pushing risk-averse borrowers to take greater risks than they otherwise would. The effect is moderated, however, when borrowers have the opportunity to form groups on their own, and we show sorting by risk-aversion. The results clarify costs and benefits of group-based contracts. Group contracts raise loan repayment rates by creating an implicit insurance mechanism, allowing borrowers to remain in good standing with lenders despite investment losses. Thus, group-lending can facilitate profitable risk-taking while maintaining high rates of loan repayment. However, the costs are borne by fellow borrowers and fall most heavily on the most risk averse participants. The work provides an example of how to use framed field experiments as a methodological bridge between laboratory and field experiments.

*We thank Shachar Kariv, Edward Miguel, Owen Ozier, Chris Udry, and participants in the University of Groningen 2005 conference on microfinance, NEUDC 2005, Pacific Development Conference 2007, and seminars at Yale and UC Berkeley. Antoni Codinas, Gissele Gajate, Jacob Goldston, Marcos Gonzales, and Karen Lyons provided excellent research assistance. We thank the World Bank, the Social Science Research Council Program in Applied Economics, the UC Berkeley Institute for Business and Economic Research, and Princeton University for funding.

1 Introduction

Banking in low-income communities is a notoriously difficult business. Banks typically have limited information about their customers and often find it costly or impossible to enforce loan contracts. Customers, for their part, frequently lack adequate collateral or credit histories with commercial banks. Moral hazard and adverse selection, coupled with small transaction sizes, limit the possibilities for banks to lend profitably. Despite these obstacles, over the past three decades microfinance practitioners have defied predictions by finding workable mechanisms through which to make small, uncollateralized loans to poor customers. Repayment rates on their unsecured loans often exceed 95 percent, and by 2007 — the year after Muhammad Yunus and Grameen Bank won the Nobel Peace Prize — microfinance institutions were serving about 150 million customers around the world. This achievement has been exciting to many, and advocates describe microfinance as a revolutionary way to reduce poverty (Yunus 1999). From a theoretical perspective, though, the success has puzzling elements. Many microfinance mechanisms rely on groups of borrowers to jointly monitor and enforce contracts themselves. However, group-based mechanisms tend to be vulnerable to free-riding and collusion; in the absence of "dynamic incentives" which raise the costs of default by denying borrowers in arrears access to future loans, it is not obvious that group-lending mechanisms should out-perform individual liability alternatives.

In this paper, we explore the impact of a variety of individual and group lending mechanisms on investment decisions within a controlled laboratory environment, conducting a series of experimental "microfinance games" which allow us to unpack microfinance mechanisms in a systematic way. We set up an experimental economics laboratory in a large, urban market in Lima, Peru, where we conduct a framed field experiment with micro-enterprise owners and employees.[1] Within the lab setting, we examine the ways that

[1] Harrison and List (2004) coin the term "framed field experiment" to refer to experiments which use

contracts affect default rates by enabling partners to insure one another and by creating social costs to individual default. The idea that "joint liability" contracts can mitigate moral hazard in project choice by creating social costs to default is central to the idea of group lending in microfinance (e.g. Stiglitz 1990, Besley and Coate 1995). Our experimental setting is inspired by Stiglitz's (1990) model of *ex ante* moral hazard in project choice in microfinance; we extend the model to consider the impact of introducing opportunities for monitoring, coordination, and enforcement. The closest work to this in terms of methodology is Fischer (2008), who creates a laboratory experiment in Chennai, India, to test similar questions about how joint liability influences risk taking and informal insurance. He finds that joint liability facilitates informal insurance among borrowers, allowing them to make profitable but risky investments.[2]

The simulated microfinance transactions involved players receiving loans, choosing between risky and safe investments, and managing the risk of default. Over seven months of experimental sessions, we played each of eleven variants of the microfinance game an average of 29 times. Subjects were small-scale entrepreneurs in an urban Peruvian market, and thus had demographic and economic profiles similar to those of microfinance customers. By working in Lima and designing the games to replicate actual microfinance scenarios, our aim was to explore behavioral responses to common components of micro-loan contracts in a population of individuals likely to participate in an actual microfinance program. Furthermore, by playing a sequence of games with the same individuals, we are able to control for innate risk preferences and isolate the impact of each lending mechanism on risk-taking and loan repayment.

We find that adding dynamic incentives to any loan contract decreases the rate of

non-standard subject pools and add a "field context" familiar to the subjects to the commodity or task in the experiment. Early examples in other settings include List (2004) and Barr and Kinsey (2002).

[2]In a related paper, Cassar, Crowley, and Wydick (2007) conduct a series of repeated public goods games, framed as a decision to repay a loan, in South Africa and Armenia in order to relate contributions to likely behavior in a microfinance setting.

risky project choice and default. In contrast to many of the predictions from theoretical work on microfinance, we find that joint liability increases rates of risky investment choice when borrowers are able to communicate freely, and has little effect on behavior in the absence of communication. Much of the behavioral change we observe occurs among the most risk averse borrowers, who are significantly more likely to choose risky investments when matched with more risk-loving liability partners. However, in spite of these effects on project choice, joint liability increases the loan repayment rate by forcing borrowers to insure each other — passing the cost of limited liability back to the microfinance clients. These costs fall most heavily on the most risk averse, as they are the most likely to have to subsidize their partners' risk-taking. Consistent with this pattern, we find evidence of assortative matching when borrowing groups form endogenously; the most risk averse borrowers, in particular, tend to form homogeneously conservative liability groups (as in Ghatak 1999).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the theoretical underpinnings of the microfinance game and derives testable predictions under the different loan contracts explored in the experimental sessions; Section 3 describes our experimental design, protocol, and subject pool; Section 4 discusses our findings; Section 5 concludes.

2 Theoretical Framework

Consider an extended version of the Stiglitz (1990) model of moral hazard in which agents make repeated project choice decisions. In every period that a borrower is active, she receives a loan of $L > 0$ which she can invest in one of two projects: a safe, low return project which generates profit $Y_s > 0$ with certainty or a profitable but risky venture which succeeds with probability p, yielding profit Y_r; with probability $1-p$, the risky project fails and generates no income.

In Stiglitz's model, as in much of the theoretical work on microfinance, safer projects are assumed to have higher expected returns than riskier projects, and, consequently, the bank's optimum coincides with the social optimum.[3] In that context, an optimal contract induces safe project choice. We relax this assumption for several reasons. First, the assumption that risky projects have higher expected returns than safe projects is more realistic (de Meza and Webb 1990). One objective in expanding financial access is to enable borrowers to make risky but profitable investments — and the structure highlights this possibility. Second, it is reasonable to assume that micro-entrepreneurs must be compensated for bearing investment risk (Fischer 2008). Our pilot games suggested that when expected returns from both projects were equal, almost all subjects chose the safe one. We decided to calibrate the payoff to the risky project so that roughly equal numbers of participants would choose the safe and the risky project in the benchmark games.

Assumption 1. *The risky project is assumed to be socially optimal:* $pY_r > Y_s$.

There are three types of borrowers in the population, indexed by their degree of risk aversion. There is proportion λ_i of borrowers with risk aversion θ_i, where $\theta_1 > \theta_2 > \theta_3$. Proportions λ_i are common knowledge. Borrowers maximize their streams of expected utilities, discounting the future at rate $\delta < 1$. Individual preferences over payoffs in each period are represented by the utility function $u_i(y_i)$, where $u_i'(y_i) > 0$, $u_i''(y_i) < 0$, and $u_i(0) = 0$ for all i. Borrower i thus maximizes discounted utility: $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^{t-1} E[u_i(y_i)]$.

We focus on individual project choice and abstract from ex-post moral hazard and strategic default considerations: the success probability p is fixed, and the loan amount L is automatically deducted from the profits of successful projects. However, borrowers have no collateral, so the lender is not repaid if the project fails. Thus, while socially optimal, the bank may suffer a loss if the risky project is chosen.

[3] See also Banerjee, Besley, and Guinnane (1994) and Madajewicz (2004).

Because the bank is uninformed about borrower types (as in Ghatak 1999, Ghatak 2000), borrower project choices (as in Stiglitz 1990), and actual profits obtained (as in Rai and Sjöström 2004), it cannot offer state and type contingent contracts which would be optimal under full information. In that case, banks would encourage borrowers to choose the risky project, regardless of type, and would provide insurance in case of default.[4] Even in the private information world we consider, the bank could simply set the interest rate high enough to make the safe project unattractive; all borrowers would then be induced to choose the risky project and would repay whenever their projects were successful. However, the bank cannot raise interest rates when faced with competition, since other lenders would undercut the interest rate until it coincided with the cost of funds, which we assume to be zero. Moreover, if potential borrowers had an alternative to borrowing, an increase in the interest rate could make borrowing unattractive for the most risk averse agents, who are likely to be the poorest and most marginalized.

The bank may, however, offer loan contracts with a joint liability clause; the loan contract may also include a "dynamic incentive" clause which excludes defaulting borrowers from future borrowing.[5] In what follows, we examine the impact of dynamic incentives on project choice and bank repayment, first under individual liability and then in the joint liability setting under different information structures.

2.1 Individual Liability Borrowing

We first consider the case of individual liability, wherein the borrower is only liable for the loan she takes. In the absence of the dynamic incentive clause, a borrower will invest in

[4]We thank an anonymous referee for pointing this out.

[5]Morduch (1999) and Tedeschi (2006) discuss the use of dynamic incentives in microfinance.

the risky project in a given period whenever

$$u_i\left(Y_s - L\right) \leq p u_i\left(Y_r - L\right). \tag{1}$$

Similarly, a borrower will always invest in the risky project when the loan contract includes a dynamic incentive whenever

$$\left(\frac{1-p\delta}{1-\delta}\right) u_i\left(Y_s - L\right) \leq p u_i\left(Y_r - L\right) \tag{2}$$

since a borrower who always chooses the risky project is still a client of the lender in period t with probability p^{t-1}.

Equation (2) implies Equation (1), so if borrower i chooses to invest in the safe project in the absence of dynamic incentives, she will also do so when they are imposed. Similarly, if borrower i chooses to invest in the risky project under dynamic incentives, she will also do so when they are absent. Players that are particularly risk averse always invest in the safe project under individual liability. We refer to these individuals as θ_1-borrowers, and define them as borrowers for whom Equation (1), and therefore Equation (2), does not hold. We define θ_2-borrowers as those for whom Equation (1) holds but (2) does not. Lastly, we define θ_3-borrowers as the least risk averse group: for them, both equations hold. θ_3-borrowers never invest in the safe project under individual liability, while θ_2-borrowers do so only when defaulters are excluded from future loans.

The first row of Table 1 reports the expected rates of risky project choice and loan repayment for the individual liability contract. When dynamic incentives are imposed, we distinguish between *unconditional* rates, calculated with respect to the initial population (thus including participants who have defaulted and are excluded from the remainder of the game), and *conditional* rates among active borrowers, who have not defaulted. Dynamic incentives increase the proportion of individuals who choose the safe project, and therefore

the repayment rate, but the increase is not without cost. Half of the lender's active θ_3-borrowers are excluded from future borrowing in every period because of default. Moreover, θ_2-borrowers experience lower expected profits and utility because they switch to the safe but low return investment to avoid exclusion from future loans.

2.2 Joint Liability Borrowing

In the benchmark joint liability treatment, each borrower is randomly matched with another. When one of the two borrowers has an unsuccessful project, the successful one must repay both loans. A default only occurs when both members of a borrowing group have unsuccessful projects. We assume that the return on the safe project exactly covers both loans. More formally,

Assumption 2. *Profits from the safe project satisfy:* $Y_s - 2L = 0$.

Under joint liability, the borrower's expected utility depends on both her own actions and those of her partner. Figure 1 shows the single period choice-contingent expected payoffs of a θ_i-type borrower matched with a θ_j-type partner.

	Safe	Risky
Safe	EU_i^{SS}, EU_j^{SS}	EU_i^{SR}, EU_j^{RS}
Risky	EU_i^{RS}, EU_j^{SR}	EU_i^{RR}, EU_j^{RR}

Figure 1: Per period joint liability game payoff matrix

The different payoffs are defined as follows: $EU_i^{SS} = u_i(Y_s - L)$, $EU_i^{RS} = pu_i(Y_r - L)$, $EU_i^{SR} = pu_i(Y_s - L)$ and $EU_i^{RR} = p^2 u_i(Y_r - L) + p(1-p)u_i(Y_r - 2L)$. Throughout the analysis, we use the notation EU_i^{AB} to denote the period payoff to a θ_i-type borrower that chooses project A when her partner chooses project B. Notice that $EU_i^{SS} > EU_i^{SR}$ and $EU_i^{RS} > EU_i^{RR}$ for all i.

In order to sharpen the predictions from the model, we make two additional assumptions about the types and the payoff structure:

Assumption 3. *$Y_R > 3L$,*

and

Assumption 4. *$\nexists\ \alpha \in [0,1]$ such that $\alpha EU_i^{SR} + (1-\alpha)\, EU_i^{SS} > EU_i^{RR}$ for $i = 1$ and $\alpha EU_i^{RS} + (1-\alpha)\, EU_i^{SS} > EU_i^{RR}$ for $i \in \{2,3\}$.*

We are now ready to characterize the Nash equilibrium of any joint liability borrowing game with or without dynamic incentives. We focus on equilibria which are symmetric in the sense that borrowers of the same risk aversion type employ the same strategy.

2.2.1 Joint Liability without Dynamic Incentives

Assumption 3 above guarantees that investing in the risky project is the unique best response to a partner who invests in the risky project with certainty. Consequently, risky choice by all borrowers constitutes a Nash equilibrium of any joint liability borrowing game without dynamic incentives, but one that is undesirable from the perspective of risk averse θ_1-borrowers. We refer to this outcome as the "all-risky" equilibrium. θ_1-borrowers strictly prefer an "all-safe" outcome to any other and are not tempted to "defect" on their partners since $EU_1^{SS} > EU_1^{RS}$.[6] Assumption 4 guarantees that type θ_2- and θ_3-borrowers, on the other hand, invest in the risky project with probability one in any Nash equilibrium of any game without dynamic incentives.

Proposition 1. *Given Assumption 4, a θ_2- or θ_3-borrower invests in the risky project in all rounds in any subgame perfect equilibrium of a joint liability game without dynamic incentives.*

[6] This expression is analogous to Equation (1).

PROOF: See Appendix A.

Anticipating the experimental treatments described in the next section, we consider three distinct informational structures in the joint liability borrowing game. Much of the literature on joint liability argues that borrowers have a comparative advantage in monitoring one another, relative to the lender; costless and full information between borrowers facilitates punishment of risky project choice (Banerjee, Besley, and Guinnane 1994, Besley and Coate 1995) and coordination of actions within liability groups (Stiglitz 1990). We first consider the joint liability borrowing game with **communication**, in which members of a liability group are allowed to communicate and thus observe each others' types and investment decisions *ex ante*. This information structure is motivated by Stiglitz (1990), in which borrowers play a cooperative game. We then consider a **monitoring** game, motivated by Banerjee, Besley, and Guinnane (1994), Besley and Coate (1995) and Ghatak and Guinnane (1999), where borrowers cannot communicate *ex ante* but can observe each others' actions *ex post*. We contrast these two informational structures with the more restrictive **imperfect information** benchmark, where a borrower only learns that her partner chose the risky project when it fails and the partner defaults. This framework allows us to separate the direct impacts of the joint liability contract from the informational structure often assumed to accompany group lending. Finally, motivated by the literature on adverse selection (Ghatak 1999, Ghatak 2000, Sadoulet 2000, Sadoulet and Carpenter 2001), we consider a **partner choice** game where borrowing groups form endogenously, as opposed to being randomly assigned. We assume full communication when borrowers play the partner choice game.

Communication:

In the **communication** game, the partner's type and project choice are known *ex ante*. This allows θ_1-borrowers to coordinate on the all-safe outcome, and to avoid choosing the safe project when matched with θ_2- or θ_3-borrowers. Thus, there exists a subgame perfect

Nash equilibrium where θ_1-borrowers choose the safe project in every round if and only if they are matched with another θ_1-borrower, and all other borrowers choose the risky project in every round.[7] The expected repayment rate (reported in Table 1) highlights the fact that the probability of default when both borrowers in a group choose the risky project is only $(1-p)^2$ because the probability of failure is uncorrelated across projects, and the joint liability clause requires borrowers to insure each other.

Monitoring:

Next, we consider the **monitoring** treatment, in which borrowers cannot communicate with each other but can observe one another's past actions. Since partners are randomly assigned, a borrower does not know her partner's type *ex ante*. For sufficiently high discount factors, a Nash equilibrium exists in which each θ_1-borrower plays the following "grim" trigger strategy: invest in the safe project until one's partner chooses the risky project, then switch to the risky project forever. If all θ_1-borrowers play this grim strategy, it will be optimal for them as long as the expected gain to choosing safe, and signalling a willingness to coordinate away from the all-risky equilibrium, is greater than the expected cost if one's partner is not type θ_1; this is true whenever the following expression holds:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right) EU_1^{SS} + (1-\lambda_1)\left[EU_1^{SR} + \left(\frac{\delta}{1-\delta}\right) EU_1^{RR}\right] \geq \\ \lambda_1 \left[EU_1^{RS} + \left(\frac{\delta}{1-\delta}\right) EU_1^{RR}\right] + (1-\lambda_1)\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right) EU_1^{RR}.\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Assumptions 3 and 4, together with a high enough discount factor δ, guarantee that Equation (3) holds even when θ_2- and θ_3-borrowers never invest in the safe project. Since a positive fraction of subjects chose the safe project in all monitoring treatments in our experimental sessions, we infer that the discount factor δ is such that Equation (3) holds.[8]

[7] Though other equilibria exist (such as the all-risky equilibrium, for example) a joint liability group of two θ_1-borrowers strictly prefers the all-safe equilibrium to the all-risky one; we therefore predict that they will coordinate on the safe investment.

[8] If this were not the case, no borrower would find it optimal to invest in the safe project in the initial

Imperfect Information:

Next we consider the **imperfect information** treatment where one's partner's type and actions are unobservable. In this case, a borrower only learns that her partner has chosen the risky project when it fails and she has to repay the partner's loan (provided she has the funds to do so). When the following expression holds, a subgame perfect equilibrium exists wherein every θ_1-borrower chooses the safe project until her partner defaults:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right) EU_1^{SS} + (1-\lambda_1)\left(\frac{1}{1-p\delta}\right)\left[EU_1^{SR} + (1-p)\left(\frac{\delta}{1-\delta}\right) EU_1^{RR}\right] \geq \\ \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{1-p\delta}\right)\left[EU_1^{RS} + (1-p)\left(\frac{\delta}{1-\delta}\right) EU_1^{RR}\right] + (1-\lambda_1)\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right) EU_1^{RR}.\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Intuitively, after every period without a default, a θ_1-borrower revises up her belief that her partner is also a θ_1-borrower. Thus, if it was optimal to choose safe in the first period, it will also be optimal in subsequent periods until a default is observed.

For a given discount factor δ, Equation (4) is more likely to bind than Equation (3). If Equation (3) held but Equation (4) did not, one would only observe risky project choices in the imperfect information game. Since safe project choices were observed in all of our experimental sessions, we assume that Equation (4) also holds. The predicted rate of risky project choice and repayment in this equilibrium are reported in Table 1.

Partner Choice:

When borrowers are allowed to choose their joint liability partners, θ_1-borrowers will choose other θ_1-borrowers, because these individuals strictly prefer the all-safe equilibrium to any other. Consequently, as Table 1 shows, the predicted rate of risky project choice in a **partner choice** game after the first period is the lowest among all joint liability games without dynamic incentives considered.

period and, because beliefs would never be updated, it would remain sub-optimal in subsequent periods.

2.2.2 Dynamic Incentives

The cost of default increases under dynamic incentives, rendering the all-risky equilibrium less attractive. Simple symmetric strategies that constitute a Nash equilibrium exist for the communication game and the partner choice game, but they are harder to implement for the monitoring and imperfect information games.

Communication:

Communication allows borrowers to coordinate actions *ex ante*, so individual borrowers can coordinate so as to invest in the risky project in specific periods without risking a group default. For a homogenous pair of θ_1-borrowers, this does not matter because the safe project is the preferred choice and one supported by a subgame perfect Nash equilibrium for any discount factor, as it is in the absence of dynamic incentives. For a pair of θ_2- or θ_3-borrowers with sufficiently high discount factors, however, a wide range of subgame perfect equilibria may exist under dynamic incentives which are not supported when dynamic incentives are absent. Two examples are the all-safe equilibrium and the "alternating equilibrium" in which borrowers take turns investing in the risky project. Type θ_2- and θ_3-borrowers prefer the alternating to the all-risky equilibrium whenever:

$$\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta^2}\right)\left(EU_i^{SR}+\delta EU_i^{RS}\right) \geq \left(\frac{1}{1-\delta\left(2p-p^2\right)}\right) EU_i^{RR}, \quad \text{for} \quad i=2,3. \tag{5}$$

This equation also characterizes the one deviation property that needs to be satisfied whenever θ_2- and θ_3-borrowers are paired with each other, because the only profitable deviation involves choosing the risky investment when it is one's partner's turn to do so. Because $EU_1^{SS} > EU_1^{RS}$, the alternating equilibrium is not subgame perfect in heterogeneous pairs (θ_1-borrowers matched with either θ_2- or θ_3-borrowers): a θ_1-borrower's best response to an alternating partner is to invest in the safe project in every period. If θ_1-borrowers can still credibly commit to revert to the all-risky equilibrium, then an equilibrium may exist

in which each θ_1-borrower matched with a θ_2 or θ_3 partner invests in the safe project in every period while the partner alternates between the safe and risky projects.[9]

Given the multiplicity of equilibria, it is impossible to precisely characterize the expected rate of risky project choice or default in the communication game with dynamic incentives. However, the existence of *any* subgame perfect equilibrium other than the all-risky one implies a (weakly) lower level of risky project choice. Moreover, since these alternative equilibria are supportable only because they reduce the probability of default and exclusion from future periods of borrowing, their existence clearly implies weakly higher expected repayment rates. All pairings of borrowers which chose the safe project in the absence of dynamic incentives continue to do so, but other borrowers that would chose the risky project when dynamic incentives were absent may now choose the safe project.

Monitoring & Imperfect Information:

When borrowers cannot coordinate their project choices *ex ante*, the alternating equilibrium, and other potential equilibria involving coordinated timing of risky project choices, may be difficult to achieve. It is reasonable to assume that θ_1-borrowers continue to employ grim trigger strategies (if they are credible), although perhaps with higher thresholds for defection to risky project choice, that is, allowing θ_2- or θ_3-borrowers to choose the risky project in some rounds, but not too many consecutively. If Equation (3) and Equation (4) both hold when dynamic incentives are absent, they must also hold when they are imposed, because dynamic incentives reduce EU_1^{RR} without affecting the other expected payoffs. This suggests that rates of risky project choice (and repayment) should again be weakly lower (higher) than in the absence of dynamic incentives. However, there is no clear prediction for the behavior of θ_2- or θ_3-borrowers: risk aversion might lead to safe project choice when the probability that one's partner chooses the risky investment is unknown,

[9] If θ_1-borrowers cannot credibly commit to reverting to the all-risky equilibrium, then the unique subgame perfect equilibrium involves safe choices by the θ_1-borrower in all periods and risky choices by the partner.

but the inability to coordinate might cause borrowers to revert to the all risky equilibrium.

To explore coordination further, we also consider a **punishment** variation of the monitoring game with dynamic incentives described above. Several models suggest that joint liability increases repayment because borrowers can punish default with social sanctions (e.g. Besley and Coate 1995). Since social sanctions are not feasible in a laboratory environment, we introduce an opportunity for monetary punishment. In punishment games, participants learned at the beginning of the game that at the end of the game, they would be given the opportunity to pay a cost, $c > 0$, to reduce their partners' total winnings by γc. Since, punishments occur after all project choice decisions, the use of the punishment mechanism should not be observed in equilibrium, and, should consequently not impact behavior within the experiment. However, previous studies have found that participants in experiments are often willing to pay to punish uncooperative behavior in the lab, despite the fact that such punishment is not part of any subgame perfect equilibrium (Fehr and Gächter 2000). Hence, borrowers may change their behavior if, for example, they expect risky project choice to be punished.

Partner Choice:

When borrowers can choose their partners, θ_1-borrowers will still prefer a partner of the same type and thus homogeneous groups will be formed. As discussed above, however, pairs of θ_2 or θ_3-borrowers may choose an equilibrium other than the all-risky one.

2.2.3 Summary of Predictions

We now summarize the predictions across liability and information structures using Table 1. When dynamic incentives are imposed, the rate of risky project choice is predicted to be weakly lower, and the repayment rate weakly higher.

A more nuanced set of predictions arises in the various joint liability treatments without dynamic incentives. Under the communication treatment, participants know the investment

strategies of their partners from the start of the game. In the monitoring and imperfect information treatments, there is no direct communication during the game and learning takes place over time. Thus, the theory predicts that in the first period of a given joint liability game, risky project choice is higher under the communication treatment than under the monitoring or imperfect information and partner choice treatments; the first period choices under the latter games should all coincide with choices under individual liability. The reason is that under communication, θ_1-borrowers will never choose the safe project if their partner's *type* is θ_2 or θ_3, but under monitoring and imperfect information, all θ_1-borrowers choose the safe project in the first period even if matched with a θ_2 or θ_3-borrower. After the first period, the rate of risky project choice under communication and monitoring coincide since θ_1-borrowers switch to risky choice if matched with a θ_2- or θ_3-borrower. Under imperfect information, the rate of risky project choice will increase steadily over time and will converge to choices under the communication or monitoring treatments, as θ_1-borrowers matched with a θ_2- or θ_3-borrower eventually switch to the risky choice if they infer that their partner is choosing risky. Finally, our model predicts that under partner choice, θ_1-borrowers will pair with other θ_1-borrowers, since these individuals have higher expected utility in homogeneous matchings, when they are able to coordinate on the all-safe equilibrium.

3 Experimental Design and Procedures

3.1 The Microfinance Game

To test the predictions of the model, we designed the "microfinance game," an economic experiment which mimics the essential features of the theoretical framework described

above. Games consisted of multiple rounds of borrowing and repayment.[10] In each round, experimental subjects were given a "loan" of 100 points which they invested it in one of two projects: a safe project, which yielded a return of 200 points with certainty, or a riskier project, which paid 600 points with probability one half and zero otherwise.[11] A borrower whose project succeeded had to repay her loan; the loan amount was automatically deducted from project earnings. A borrower whose project failed could not repay her loan, as wealth from prior rounds could not be used to pay off the current round's loan. Thus, limited liability introduces the possibility that risk averse borrowers might choose the risky project to reduce their individual repayment cost. In each round, the safe project had an expected (and certain) net return of 100 points after repaying the principal; the risky project had an expected net return of 250 points, but a fifty percent probability of default. Points accumulated over the course of all of the rounds determined individual game payouts.

We conducted eleven experimental treatments, summarized in Figure 2, which mimic the contract and information structures described in Section 2. Treatments differ both in terms of the "loan contract" characterized by the rules of the experimental session — individual or joint liability, with or without dynamic incentives — and the extent to which borrowers within joint liability groups were allowed to communicate or observe each others' actions. In games without dynamic incentives, subjects were allowed to continue playing whether or not they repaid their loans in all previous rounds. In games including a dynamic incentive, subjects who defaulted in any round were forced to sit out the remaining rounds of the game.[12]

As Figure 2 indicates, we conducted two individual liability treatments: one with and

[10] Players were informed that games would consist of at least two and no more than ten rounds, and that the probability of a game ending after any round depended on chance.

[11] At no time during the games did we refer to the choices as "safe" and "risky" — within the experiment, the projects were referred to as "project square" and "project triangle," respectively.

[12] Defaulters were asked to indicate the fact that they had defaulted on their experimental decision sheets, just as other players indicated their project choices. Hence, whether a subject had defaulted was not publicly observable.

one without dynamic incentives. Payoffs in the individual liability treatments depended only on player choices and chance. We also conducted nine joint liability treatments, reflecting the range of information structures considered in Section 2. In each joint liability treatment, subjects were randomly matched with anonymous borrowing partners;[13] players were then made liable for the loans of their defaulting partners. The structure of payouts within these treatments is described in Figure 3. For each of the main information structures described in Section 2 — imperfect information, monitoring, communication, and partner choice — we conducted two experimental treatments, one with and one without dynamic incentives. The distinct treatments allow us to "unpack" the relative impact of the distinct components of the information structure in joint liability settings with and without dynamic incentives.

In the imperfect information and monitoring treatments, subjects were not allowed to communicate during the game. In the imperfect information treatments, players learned the outcome of their chosen project and their net earnings at the end of each round. They were consequently able to infer that their partner had chosen the risky project and defaulted when 200 points (rather than 100) were deducted from their earnings. In monitoring treatments, each player was informed which project her partner had chosen at the end of each round — this information was reported with an individual's project outcome and net earnings. The punishment treatments were identical to the monitoring treatments except that it was announced that after the completion of the game, each participant would have an opportunity to pay 50 points and deduct 500 points from the final point total of her partner. In the communication treatments, players were assigned to seats so as to be situated next to their partners; they were then allowed to talk (quietly) during the experiment and could observe partners' decision sheets. Finally, in the partner choice treatments, players were instructed to form joint liability pairs before the game began. They were given time to

[13]Except in communication and partner choice treatments (discussed below), subjects did not learn the identities of their partners during or after the experiment.

circulate the room while the matching process took place, so that they could exchange information with potential partners.

3.2 Experimental Procedures

We conducted the microfinance games as a framed field experiment which we played with owners and employees of micro-enterprises in Lima, Peru. We set up an experimental lab in an isolated room in a large consumer market, Polvos Azules, located in the center of the city. Each experimental session consisted of two or three game treatments played in random order followed by a social networks survey. At the beginning of each treatment, subjects were given decision sheets marked with spaces for each of the rounds. The rules for each game were explained to all the participants simultaneously. Instructions were presented orally, in Spanish, with the aid of posterboards highlighting the key points specific to the particular experimental treatment. In each round, subjects indicated their project choices on their game sheets. Game sheets were then collected by members of the research team, who entered project choices into a computer, which then calculated payouts for the round. Game sheets were returned to players at the end of the round. Payouts were made at the end of each experimental session, after all the games were completed. Subjects were paid a show-up fee plus their total earnings from all of the days experimental treatments.[14]

In all treatments, game decision sheets indicate whether a subject's project in the previous round was successful, and report net earnings for the round. In individual liability and (joint liability) imperfect information treatments, this is the only information that players receive. In contrast, in monitoring treatments, each participant also receives complete information about her partners project choice and outcome at the end of each round — these are also included on each player's game sheet. Hence, *ex post* monitoring is costless and

[14]The show-up fee was ten Peruvian nuevos soles, worth approximately $2.98 in July 2004. Observed earnings ranged from 10 to 20 soles.

automatic. As in the other joint liability treatments with imperfect information, partner identities are never revealed during or after the game. In communication treatments, participants still have no choice in group formation because partners are randomly assigned, but partners sit together and are allowed to talk during the course of the game. Joint liability groups are announced at the beginning of the game, and seats are rearranged accordingly. Each participant knows both the identity of her partner and the action that her partner takes in every round. Finally, in partner choice treatments, players are instructed to form borrowing groups of two prior to the start of the game, after the instructions are explained.

We played eleven different game treatments an average of 29 times each over the course of seven months (from July of 2004 to February of 2005). Our sample includes data from 321 games played over the course of 81 days. 493 participants played an average of eleven games each. Table 2 describes the allocation of players across games. 238 participants attended only one game session, while 23 participants attended more than ten sessions.

3.3 Lab Setting & Subject Pool

All of our experimental subjects either owned or were employed by a micro-enterprise in Polvos Azules. The market has approximately 1,800 stalls where vendors sell clothes, shoes, personal items, jewelry, and consumer electronics. We used two methods to recruit participants. First, we hired delegates from the local association of micro-entrepreneurs to invite vendors to specific game sessions. We also allowed participants to return for subsequent experimental sessions, and to invite their friends and neighbors from the market to accompany them.

We also conducted a census of micro-entrepreneurs working in Polvos Azules. The market census serves several purposes. First, it allows us to control for demographic and socioeconomic characteristics in our analysis, and to test for heterogeneity in the "treat-

ment effects" of microfinance contract structures across groups. We also use the census data to learn about the matching process in the partner choice treatments. Finally, the census allows us to examine sample selection to determine whether the individuals who participate in our experiments are truly representative of the broader population of micro-entrepreneurs in Polvos Azules. Specifically, we are able to test whether the nature of the games specifically attracts risk-seeking individuals.[15]

Demographic summary statistics of our subject pool are provided in Table 3.[16] Approximately half of our subjects own a micro-enterprise in Polvos Azules; the rest are micro-enterprise employees. Only six percent have experience with group lending, but 65 percent have participated in an informal rotating and saving and credit association (ROSCA). Overall, the data suggest that our participants are not a representative sample of micro-entrepreneurs in the market: they are older, more likely to be business owners, poorer (measured by asset ownership and the probability of using kerosene to cook), and more experienced with borrowing. However, there is no evidence that they are more risk-loving than average: both answers to a hypothetical lottery choice question designed to calibrate risk aversion and the probability of gambling or playing the lottery in the past month are similar across the two groups. Relative to the broader population of Polvos Azules, participants score somewhat higher on questions designed to elicit a sense of trust, fairness, and altruism.[17]

[15]Levitt and List (2007) discuss the possibility that non-random selection into lab experimental subject pools introduces bias. Lazear, Malmendier, and Weber (2006) also consider selection into lab experiments as a possible source of bias.

[16]Because many market stalls are often closed, we were only able to survey active market stall owners and employees. The survey includes data on 323 of our 493 participants.

[17]The General Social Survey (GSS) contains three questions on "trust," "fairness" and "helping" which purport to measure social capital. The exact wording is as follows: the trust question, "Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?", the fairness question, "Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair?", and the helpful question, "Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly just looking out for themselves?" In cross-country regressions, several studies find that these GSS questions correlate with outcomes of interest. Knack and Keefer (1997) find correlations with growth; Kennedy, Kawachi, Prothrow-Stith, Lochner, and Gupta (1998) and Lederman,

Since our experiment randomizes contract structure within the games, non-random selection will not affect the internal validity of our results. However, selection into our experimental laboratory may alter the external validity of this exercise. To check this, we ran between-effects regressions of individual risky project choice on the set of socioeconomic characteristics and found that, with the exception of the propensity to hold a savings account, the variables do not systematically predict risky play.[18] To further address selection on non-random characteristics, we also run all main specifications with individual-level fixed effects, sweeping out the roles of fixed demographic variables, and find that results are robust. The census data also allow us to interact joint liability contract structure with demographic characteristics, and again we find little evidence that sample selection within pool of individuals working at Polvos Azules alters our results.

4 Results

In this section, we first examine the rate of risky project choice and repayment to the bank across experimental treatments. We then look at whether project choice is affected by individual characteristics, such as gender, age, etc. Next, we turn to the model predictions regarding joint liability games, that players choice of projects will depend on their type and that of their partners. We then look at the ability to coordinate joint outcomes within liability groups, and at the impact of introducing the ability to punish the partner. Finally, we look at the determinants of partner choice.

Loayza, and Menéndez (2002) with crime; Brehm and Rahn (1997) with civic involvement; and Fisman and Khanna (1999) with communication infrastructure. In experimental economics, Karlan (2005) finds that positive answers to the GSS questions predict the repayment of loans one year after the survey, and that positive answers to the GSS questions predict trustworthy behavior in a Trust game (conducted shortly after the GSS questions). Throughout the analysis, the dummy variable "2 positive GSS answers" equals one if an individual answered positively to at least two of the three questions.

[18] Individuals with savings accounts are more likely to choose the risky project in the dynamic games, but, as noted in the text, fixed effects specifications should control for this effect (results not shown).

4.1 Project Choices & Repayment Rates

We begin by comparing the proportion of borrowers investing in the risky project across the experimental treatments. Summary statistics on rates of risky project choice and loan repayment in the first six rounds of each game are reported in Table 4. As predicted, adding dynamic incentives reduces investment in the risky project in the individual liability treatments (from 61 percent of choices to 34 percent). As discussed in Section 2, rates of risky project choice in the individual liability games characterize the proportions of different risk aversion types in the population.[19]

Repayment rates in the individual liability treatments are also consistent with the theoretical predictions: the repayment rate under dynamic incentives (0.82) is significantly higher than the repayment rate without dynamic incentives (0.68, p-value < 0.001). Thus, the simple dynamic incentive has considerable power, dramatically increasing the proportion of loans recouped by the bank.

Next, we consider the joint liability treatments without dynamic incentives. Taking averages over the first six rounds, the mean rates of risky project choice in the joint liability treatments without communication — the imperfect information and monitoring treatments — are 0.63 and 0.61, respectively (Rows 2, 3). The model predicts that the rates of risky project choice in these games will be equal to the rate in the individual liability game in the first round, but higher than in the individual liability game in subsequent rounds. Our findings are consistent with this pattern, though not statistically significant. The rate of risky project choice in the first round of these two joint liability games (0.60)

[19]The estimated value of λ_1, the proportion of borrowers who choose the safe project even in the absence of dynamic incentives, is 0.39 (i.e. 1 minus 0.61); the estimated value of λ_2, the proportion if borrowers induced to choose the safe project by the dynamic incentive clause, is 0.27 (i.e., 0.61 minus 0.34). Our model predicts that each borrower should choose the same project in all rounds of either individual liability treatment. In practice, individual choices are quite noisy: the median subjects invests in the risky project in 60 percent of rounds in the individual liability treatment without dynamic incentives, and 40 percent of the time when dynamic incentives are imposed. For simplicity, we use the overall frequency with which the risky project is chosen in the absence of dynamic incentives to estimate λ_1.

is not statistically different from the rate in the individual liability game (0.62, p-value = 0.71); the rate of risky project choice is higher in the two joint liability games than in the individual liability game in every round after the first one, though the difference is not significant (results not shown).

In games with communication, the model predicts a higher rate of risky project choice, since players learn their partners' types *ex ante* (Row 4). This is precisely what we find: the rate of risky project choice in the communication treatment is 0.68, significantly higher than the rate in either the individual liability treatment or the two joint liability treatments without communication (p-values both < 0.001).

Lastly, consider the partner choice games in which joint liability groups form endogenously. Though the model predicts a rate of risky project choice equal to that observed in the individual liability game, that is not what we find. Instead, the rate of risky project choice (0.69) is approximately equal to the rate observed in the communication treatment, and significantly higher than the rate in the individual liability treatment (p-value < 0.001). The model also does an imperfect job of predicting repayment rates. The model predicts lower repayment in the monitoring and communication games than in other joint liability treatments. In fact, rates are almost exactly equal across the four joint liability treatments.

Next, we turn to the joint liability treatments with dynamic incentives. The model predicts weakly lower rates of risky project choice under dynamic incentives, and that is exactly what we find when comparing the first column to the second: the proportion of borrower-rounds in which the risky project was selected is at least ten percentage points lower in each dynamic incentive treatment than in the analogous treatment without dynamic incentives.

We now examine the predictions of the model in a regression framework. Following the focus on risk-taking and default in the literature on microfinance contracts, our main dependent variables are individual risky project choice and repayment in a round of play,

conditional on being an active borrower.[20] Regressions are estimated using a linear probability model; results with and without individual-level and round-level fixed effects are reported.[21] The fixed effects control for time-invariant participant characteristics and for learning. The sample includes only the first six rounds to limit possible survivor bias, and the qualitative results are robust to restricting estimation to shorter panels.

Results are consistent with the summary statistics reported above. The indicator for games including dynamic incentives is consistently significant, indicating that adding dynamic incentives to any loan mechanism reduces the rates of risky project choice by 21.5 percent (Table 5, Column 2) and increases the repayment rate by 12.3 percent (Table 6, Column 2). Among joint liability treatments without dynamic incentives, only the indicator for communication games is statistically significant; the point estimate suggests that *ex ante* type revelation increases the rate of risky project choice by 6.1 percentage points (Table 6). Again, in contrast to the theoretical prediction, allowing borrowers to choose their partners does not lead to a reduction in risky project choice in the absence of dynamic incentives. However, joint liability does have a significant impact on the repayment rate, even in the absence of changes in rates of risky project choice: the coefficient estimate suggests that including a joint liability clause increases loan repayment by 20.2 percent via the insurance effect (Table 5). There is also evidence that allowing borrowers to communicate decreases repayment rates, while allowing either partner choice or monitoring without communication increases the repayment rate. However, these effects are small in magnitude relative to the overall joint liability effect.

Coefficient estimates on the interaction between the indicators for dynamic incentives and joint liability indicate that joint liability increases the rate of risky project choice relative to the individual liability contract with dynamic incentives, since forcing borrowers to

[20] Bond and Rai (2008) highlight the importance of the repayment rate as a summary measure of a microfinance lender's expected longevity which, in turn, impacts borrower incentives to repay future loans.

[21] Qualitative results are unchanged when an additional control for the number of previous days played is included.

insure each other lowers the expected cost of an individual default (Table 6). The effectiveness of dynamic incentives, however, means that the combination of dynamic incentives and joint liability decreases risky project choice relative to the joint liability contract without dynamic incentives. Turning to the repayment rate, repayments rise due to the insurance effect: adding both joint liability and dynamic incentives generates levels of loan repayment that are significantly higher than those observed under either joint liability or dynamic incentives alone (Table 5). Among the joint liability games with dynamic incentives, adding communication leads to a significant increase in risky project choice; more surprisingly, it leads to a significant decrease in the repayment rate, suggesting that borrowers are not using the opportunity to communicate as a way to coordinate the timing of risky project choices while insuring each other.

Overall, the findings are broadly consistent with the theoretical predictions. Joint liability increases risk-taking under dynamic incentives while simultaneously increasing the repayment rate. In the absence of dynamic incentives, joint liability increases loan repayment without changing individual behavior. Communication among borrowers increases the rate of risky project choice and default; surprisingly, this is even true under dynamic incentives.[22]

Much is written on how credit contracts may or should differ for different demographic groups. Microfinance has tended to focus on females. Women are viewed as more reliable customers, and they do, in fact, tend to repay their loans more frequently than men do (Armendáriz and Morduch 2005). By the same token, they tend to be less prone to moral hazard (Karlan and Zinman 2009). We examine our primary set of results for different demographic groups in order to identify systematic differences in the responses to differ-

[22]Regressions do not control for attrition in dynamic games, as risk-taking players are gradually eliminated from the pool of active borrowers. We focus on the conditional rates of repayment and risky project choice as these are the experimental analogs of the "low default rates" discussed in much of the literature on microfinance. Our qualitative results are robust including interactions between the set of round dummies and the indicators for game with dynamic incentives and joint liability games with dynamic incentives.

ent mechanisms. Table 7 breaks down the analysis of Table 5 by demographic categories. Despite some variation in significance across the specifications, we find that the sign patterns are broadly consistent across the demographic subsets we consider. Strikingly, we find no gender differences, and only minor differences between the old and the young. The patterns are also similar among better educated individuals, more trusting individuals (as measured by the GSS social survey questions), and individuals who have a savings account in a commercial bank. Thus, the results suggest that individual play within the game is not driven predominantly by demographic characteristics.

4.2 Heterogeneous Effects

Though the lender is primarily concerned with average rates of repayment, our model predicts that the effects of the joint liability treatment on risky choice depend on both individual risk attitudes and partner characteristics. One consequence of joint liability is that relatively safe players matched with relatively risky partners should unambiguously move toward the risky project in the joint liability settings, particularly in the absence of dynamic incentives. In Table 8, we test our predictions about the impact of joint liability contract structure on different types of players, exploiting the fact that we observe the same individuals making choices under different contracts. Our model predicts that θ_1-borrowers, the most risk averse, will change their behavior when matched with a riskier partner under joint liability. Following the model, we characterize θ_1-borrowers as those most likely to choose the safe project in the individual liability setting without dynamic incentives. Specifically, we classify an individual as a θ_1-borrower if her rate of risky project choice in the individual games without dynamic incentives is below the 25th percentile (0.40). We define the variable "Safer Player w/ Riskier Partner #1" as an indicator for a θ_1-borrower matched with a partner of another risk aversion type; the variable "Riskier Player w/ Safer Partner #1" is defined analogously. In Column (2), we include these variables in a

regression of individual risky project choice within the joint liability games on the set of treatment dummies and fixed effects. θ_1-borrowers are significantly more likely to choose the risky project when matched with less risk averse partners: the coefficient estimates suggests that their rate of risky project choice increases by 4.9 percentage points. As predicted by the theory, riskier borrowers matched with safer partners do not change their behavior. In Column (3), we consider an alternative definition of a "safer player" which is not explicitly motivated by our theoretical model — being below the 25th percentile in terms of risky project choice in either of the individual liability games. The point estimate is similar, and the significance level increases.

Finally, in Columns (4) through (6), we examine behavior in the joint liability games, splitting the sample into those classified by our model as θ_1-, θ_2-, and θ_3-borrowers.[23] Dynamic incentives decrease the rate of risky project choice, but the effect is not significant among θ_3-borrowers. However, as predicted, communication has the largest impact on the most risk averse participants, increasing the rate of risky project choice by an estimated 19 percentage points. Allowing partner choice significantly reduces the rate of risky project choice among θ_1-borrowers. Among θ_2-borrowers, partner choice increases the rate of risky project choice in the absence of dynamic incentives, and decreases it when dynamic incentives are imposed. Again, the results of our analysis fit the theory closely.

4.3 Coordination

Our theoretical model characterizes not only individual choices, but also equilibrium outcomes within joint liability groups. Specifically, the model predicts that increasing information flows within games without dynamic incentives will lead to higher rates of coordination

[23]Following the strategy used to define θ_1-borrowers, we define θ_3-borrowers as those whose rates of risky project choice in the individual liability game are above the 75th percentile. θ_2-borrowers are those who do not fall into either of the other two categories. Given our process for assigning individual types, it is theoretically possible that a single borrower could be classified as both a θ_1-borrower and a θ_3-borrower. We do not observe any such borrowers.

on the risky investment, while communication within the treatments including dynamic incentives may increase the likelihood that partners choose different projects.

We examine joint outcomes using a multinomial logit specification with three possible values for the dependent variable: both played risky, played opposite, and both played safe (the omitted category). Allowing communication in games without dynamic incentives increases the probability of both playing risky, though the effect is only marginally significant (Table 9). Among games including dynamic incentives, adding communication leads to a substantial increase in the probability of the all-risky outcome and of discordant project choice. Allowing endogenous partner choice sharply decreases the frequency of the all-risky outcome without any increase in the likelihood of choosing opposite projects — indicating a strong increase in coordination on safe project choice.

Next, we disaggregate the analysis into "safer pairs" of two θ_1-borrowers, "mixed pairs" including only one θ_1-borrower, and "riskier pairs" which do not include a θ_1-borrower (Columns 3 through 8). Consistent with our theoretical model, many of the main effects are driven by project choices in mixed pairs: communication within mixed pairs substantially increases the probability of the all-risky outcome, particularly in games including dynamic incentives. In games with dynamic incentives, communication also increases substantially the probability of partners choosing different projects in mixed pairs. Among riskier pairs of borrowers, monitoring increases the probability of choosing opposite projects, providing the first evidence that borrowers coordinate to avoid default under dynamic incentives. We find no evidence that adding partner choice improves the ability to coordinate on either the all-safe or the alternating equilibrium.

4.4 Punishment

Next we consider punishment treatments, in which we introduced an opportunity for *ex post* retaliation in monitoring games with dynamic incentives. In total, 125 players participated

in punishment treatments, and 44 of these players punished a partner at least once. Since punishment is never a credible threat, it should not be observed in equilibrium; hence, the observed frequency is unexpectedly high. If anything, the mere threat of punishment might drive behavioral changes, and we should not actually observe punishment. On the other hand, if one expected all safe players to punish risky choices by their partners, the punishment rate is low.

Adding punishment leads to a slight increase in risk-taking — to 53 percent from 47 percent in the monitoring treatments with dynamic incentives — and no change in the average repayment rate. This evidence is reinforced by regression analysis. OLS estimates suggest that adding the possibility of punishment increases the rate of risky project choice by five percentage points (Table 10). A multinomial logit of joint outcomes indicates that punishment significantly increases the probability of coordinating on the all-risky outcome. Thus, we find no evidence that expanding opportunities for borrowers to punish risky behavior by partners deters risky project choice.

4.5 Partner Choice

As discussed above, allowing borrowing groups to form endogenously has a strong, negative effect on risk-taking under dynamic incentives. We also find that the proportion of pairs comprising two θ_1-borrowers is significantly higher in partner choice games than in other joint liability treatments (5.6 percent of pairs versus 3.6 percent, p-value= 0.007). This is all consistent with assortative matching on risk preferences. We now examine more formally the determinants of matching among players using data from the market census and the social networks survey conducted at the end of each experimental session. For each communication game, we create all possible dyads, or pairs, of players; for example, if a game has twenty players, there are 190 possible combinations of two players. However, only ten of those pairs are matches, either randomly assigned by the computer in the communication

treatments or elected by the players themselves in the partner choice treatments. The goal is to determine which variables were used by players in choosing their partners. We use information on where players were sitting during the games, whether they had attended any games as the guest of another player, and the census and social networks surveys.[24]

We report results for the pooled sample of partner choice games, and also disaggregated into games with and without dynamic incentives. For comparison purposes, we also report the results of the network regression using the randomly-assigned matches from the other communication treatments (without endogenous partner choice) as the dependent variable. The coefficient on "sitting next to each other" is negative and significant when partners are randomly assigned, reflecting the fact that the random assignment process avoided pairing individuals who were in adjacent seats. In contrast, the coefficient on sitting in adjacent seats is positive and weakly significant in the partner choice games. Variables measuring the social links between players are jointly significant in all specifications, including — surprisingly — the communication games without endogenous partner choice. Sharing the same religion is also positively associated with the probability of matching in the partner choice games.

Measures of risk aversion drawn from the hypothetical lottery choice questions in the census survey have limited predictive power; specifically, we find no evidence of assortative matching among those deemed the "most risk averse" by the hypothetical question. However, we find strong evidence of assortative matching in games including dynamic incentives when we use estimates of individual risk aversion type based on behavior in the individual liability treatments: those classified as θ_1-borrowers are more likely to form liability groups with similarly risk averse individuals, though the effect is only significant in games including dynamic incentives. Thus, our data are consistent with Ghatak's (1999) hypothesis

[24] As discussed above, we allowed participants to attend multiple experimental sessions and encouraged them to invite other micro-entrepreneurs from the market to attend the sessions as their guests.

that joint liability will lead to assortative matching.[25]

5 Conclusion

Microfinance is transforming thinking about banking in low-income communities. The techniques that are employed to ensure loan repayment contain numerous overlapping mechanisms, and we have taken them apart in order to examine how important components function in isolation and how they interact with one another. The results draw from a series of experimental "microfinance games" conducted over seven months in Lima, Peru. The experimental approach allows us to pose clear but narrow questions and generate precise hypotheses about several loan features at once. By locating the games in a market setting in a developing country, we were able to attract participants who are similar to typical microfinance customers, including some who were in fact customers of local microfinance institutions.

We find that cutting off defaulting borrowers from access to future loans powerfully reduces risky project choice, even when lenders use individual liability contracts. These results on the power of dynamic incentives are consistent with recent shifts by micro-lenders from group-based mechanisms toward individual loans. The Grameen Bank of Bangladesh and Bolivia's BancoSol, for example, are the two best-known pioneers of group lending, but they have both shifted toward individual lending as their customers have matured and sought larger loans (Armendáriz and Morduch 2005). Grameen has dropped joint liability entirely, and just one percent of BancoSol's loan portfolio remained under group contracts in 2005. In two experiments in the Philippines, Giné and Karlan (2006) and Giné and Karlan (2009) found that group liability held no advantage over individual liability for

[25] Ghatak (1999) assumes risk neutral borrowers that differ in the probability that the project will succeed. He finds that safe borrowers will pair with other safe borrowers. We assume that players differ in their risk aversion and choose among two different projects with a different (but fixed) probability of success. The finding confirms that risk averse, and hence safe, borrowers will pair with other risk averse borrowers.

either screening of clients or monitoring and enforcing contracts. Hence, joint liability does not always appear necessary to maintain high repayment rates. Given large enough incentives to avoid default, borrowers will choose safe projects and repay their loans.

The trade-off when relying on dynamic incentives alone is that borrowers may take too *little* risk, relative to what is socially optimal. In contrast to the outcomes under individual liability, we find that group-based mechanisms can support high repayment rates while facilitating risky (but profitable) project choice. Holding project choices constant, joint liability reduces default since group members must bail each other out when luck is bad.

The results clarify costs and benefits of group-based contracts. The implicit insurance against borrowers' investment losses helps risk-taking borrowers to maintain their good standing with lenders. Against that, the costs are borne by fellow borrowers and fall most heavily on the most risk averse participants (who are the ones most likely to have to bail out their partners). We find that, as a consequence, when risk-averse borrowers have the chance to sort into groups of their own making, they seek other risk-averse borrowers. Moreover, when risk-averse borrowers are forced into groups with riskier investors, the risk averse borrowers respond to the moral hazard problem by making riskier choices than they would otherwise.

From a methodological vantage, the "framed" field experiments developed here act as a bridge from laboratory experiments to field experiments. Similar bridge work has been done with respect to auctions and charitable fundraising, but as Levitt and List (2007) discuss, much remains to be known about how the laboratory itself alters the behavior of individuals and thus the interpretation of results. By working with the same type of individuals that are of interest to those who study credit markets for the poor, we show how laboratory experimental tools can be used to begin crisper discussions of the relative merits of different lending mechanisms. With further links from these "framed" field experiments to "natural" field experiments (e.g. Giné and Karlan 2006), such approaches

can be integrated in a research and development process that is helpful both to applied theorists interested in testing mechanisms and to practitioners interested in observing actual behavior under different incentive schemes.

References

Armendáriz, B., and J. Morduch (2005): *The Economics of Microfinance*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Banerjee, A. V., T. Besley, and T. W. Guinnane (1994): "The Neighbor's Keeper: The Design of a Credit Cooperative with Theory and a Test," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109(2), 491–515.

Barr, A., and B. Kinsey (2002): "Do men really have no shame?," CSAE Working Paper No. 164.

Besley, T., and S. Coate (1995): "Group Lending, Repayment Incentives and Social Collateral," *Journal of Development Economics*, 46(1), 1–18.

Bond, P., and A. S. Rai (2008): "Borrower Runs," working paper.

Brehm, J., and W. Rahn (1997): "Individual-Level Evidence for the Causes and Consequences of Social Capital," *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(3), 999–1023.

Cassar, A., L. Crowley, and B. Wydick (2007): "The Effect of Social Capital on Group Loan Repayment: Evidence from Field Experiments," *Economic Journal*, 117(517), F85–F106.

de Meza, D., and D. Webb (1990): "Risk, Adverse Selection and Capital Market Failure," *Economic Journal*, 100(399), 206–214.

Fehr, E., and S. Gächter (2000): "Cooperation and Punishment in Public Goods Experiments," *American Economic Review*, 90(4), 980–994.

Fischer, G. (2008): "Contract Structure, Risk Sharing, and Investment Choice," working paper.

Fisman, R., and T. Khanna (1999): "Is Trust a Historical Residue? Information Flows and Trust Levels," *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 38(1), 79–92.

Ghatak, M. (1999): "Group Lending, Local Information and Peer Selection," *Journal of Development Economics*, 60(1), 27–50.

——— (2000): "Screening by the Company You Keep: Joint Liability Lending and the Peer Selection Effect," *Economic Journal*, 110(465), 601–631.

Ghatak, M., and T. W. Guinnane (1999): "The Economics of Lending with Joint Liability: Theory and Practice," *Journal of Development Economics*, 46(1), 1–18.

Giné, X., and D. Karlan (2006): "Group versus Individual Liability: A Field Experiment in the Philippines," working paper.

——— (2009): "roup versus Individual Liability: Long Term Evidence from Philippine Microcredit Lending Groups," working paper.

Harrison, G. W., and J. A. List (2004): "Field Experiments," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 42(4), 1013–1059.

Karlan, D. S. (2005): "Using Experimental Economics to Measure Social Capital and Predict Financial Decisions," *American Economic Review*, 95(5), 1688–1699.

Karlan, D. S., and J. Zinman (2009): "Observing Unobservables: Identifying Information Asymmetries with a Consumer Credit Field Experiment," *Econometrica*, p. forthcoming.

Kennedy, B. P., I. Kawachi, D. Prothrow-Stith, K. Lochner, and V. Gupta (1998): "Social Capital, Income Inequality, and Firearm Violent Crime," *Social Science and Medicine*, 47(1), 7–17.

Knack, S., and P. Keefer (1997): "Does Social Capital Have an Economic Payoff? A Cross-Country Investigation," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(4), 1251–1288.

Lazear, E. P., U. Malmendier, and R. Weber (2006): "Sorting in Experiments with Application to Social Preferences," NBER Working Paper No. 12041.

Lederman, D., N. Loayza, and A. M. Menéndez (2002): "Violent Crime: Does Social Capital Matter?," *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 50(3), 509539.

Levitt, S. D., and J. A. List (2007): "What Do Laboratory Experiments Measuring Social Preferences Tell Us About the Real World?," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21(2), 153–174.

List, J. A. (2004): "Neoclassical Theory Versus Prospect Theory: Evidence from the Marketplace," *Econometrica*, 72(2), 615–625.

Madajewicz, M. (2004): "Joint Liability Versus Individual Liability in Credit Contracts," working paper.

Morduch, J. (1999): "The Microfinance Promise," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 37(4), 1569–1614.

Rai, A., and T. Sjöström (2004): "Is Grameen Lending Efficient? Repayment Incentives and Insurance in Village Economies," *Review of Economic Studies*, 71(1), 217–234.

Sadoulet, L. (2000): "The Role of Mutual Insurance in Group Lending," Ecares/free university of brussels working paper.

Sadoulet, L., and S. B. Carpenter (2001): "Endogenous Matching and Risk Heterogeneity: Evidence on Microcredit Group Formation in Guatemala," working paper.

Stiglitz, J. (1990): "Peer Monitoring in Credit Markets," *World Bank Economic Review*, 4(3), 351–366.

Tedeschi, G. A. (2006): "Here Today, Gone Tomorrow: Can Dynamic Incentives Make Microfinance More Flexible?," *Journal of Development Economics*, 80(1), 84–105.

Yunus, M. (1999): *Banker to the Poor*. Worth Publishers, New York, NY.

Table 1: Theoretical Predictions

		w/o Dynamic Incentives	w/ Dynamic Incentives	
Conditional/Unconditional?		Both	Unconditional	Conditional
Panel A: Expected Rate of Risky Project Choice				
Individual Liability	$t \geq 1$	$1-\lambda_1$	$p^{t-1}(1-\lambda_1-\lambda_2)$	$\frac{p^{t-1}(1-\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}{p^{t-1}+\left(1-p^{t-1}\right)(\lambda_1+\lambda_2)}$
Joint Liability (JL)	$t=1$	$1-\lambda_1$		
JL	$t>1$	$(1-\lambda_1)\left[1+\lambda_1\left(1-p^{t-1}\right)\right]$		
JL + M	$t=1$	$1-\lambda_1$	.	.
JL + M	$t>1$	$1-\lambda_1^2$	.	.
JL + M + C	$t \geq 1$	$1-\lambda_1^2$	.	.
JL + M + C + PC	$t \geq 1$	$1-\lambda_1$	.	.
Panel B: Expected Repayment Rate				
IL	$t \geq 1$	$\lambda_1+p(1-\lambda_1)$	$p^t+(1-p^t)(\lambda_1+\lambda_2)$	$\frac{p^t+\left(1-p^t\right)(\lambda_1+\lambda_2)}{p^{t-1}+\left(1-p^{t-1}\right)(\lambda_1+\lambda_2)}$
JL	$t=1$	$1-(1-\lambda_1)^2(1-p)^2$	.	.
JL	$t>1$	$1-\left[(1-\lambda_1)^2+2\lambda_1(1-\lambda_1)\left(1-p^{t-1}\right)\right](1-p)^2$	.	.
JL + M	$t=1$	$1-(1-\lambda_1)^2(1-p)^2$	.	.
JL + M	$t>1$	$1-(1-\lambda_1^2)(1-p)^2$	.	.
JL + M + C	$t \geq 1$	$1-\left(1-\lambda_1^2\right)(1-p)^2$	.	.
JL + M + C + PC	$t \geq 1$	$1-(1-\lambda_1)^2(1-p)^2$	.	.

Rates of risky project choice and repayment in joint liability games with dynamic incentives are predicted to be weakly lower and higher, respectively, than in analogous games without dynamic incentives.

Table 2: Summary Statistics — Experimental Sessions

	Games Played		Average Players/Game	
Dynamic Incentives?	No	Yes	No	Yes
Individual Liability	34	36	17.00	18.47
			(6.633)	(6.134)
Joint Liability (JL)	31	33	18.65	17.49
			(6.46)	(6.54)
JL + Monitoring (M)	32	28	16.38	17.36
			(6.86)	(5.99)
JL + M + Communication (C)	22	25	17.73	17.20
			(6.66)	(7.42)
JL + M + C + Partner Choice (PC)	25	23	18.24	15.74
			(6.51)	(6.42)
JL + M + Punishment	.	32	.	11.88
				(3.90)

Standard errors in parentheses.

Table 3: Summary Statistics — Subject Characteristics

	Non-Subjects		Subjects		
Variable	Mean	Stan.Err.	Mean	Stan.Err.	P-Value
Female	0.58	(0.01)	0.57	(0.01)	0.68
Age	28.54	(0.29)	34.40	(0.36)	0.00
Married	0.36	(0.01)	0.49	(0.02)	0.00
Years of education	5.55	(0.03)	5.57	(0.03)	0.76
Spanish is second language	0.08	(0.01)	0.11	(0.01)	0.11
Born in Lima	0.53	(0.02)	0.50	(0.02)	0.36
Household size	4.99	(0.07)	4.88	(0.06)	0.43
Assets, appliances owned	3.13	(0.05)	2.86	(0.05)	0.01
Cooks with kerosene	0.06	(0.01)	0.11	(0.01)	0.01
Played lotto, casino past month	0.19	(0.01)	0.18	(0.01)	0.75
At least 2 positive GSS answers	0.05	(0.01)	0.07	(0.01)	0.07
Work experience	7.28	(0.22)	11.37	(0.28)	0.00
Owns microenterprise	0.30	(0.01)	0.50	(0.02)	0.00
Hours worked per week	66.47	(0.43)	63.28	(0.59)	0.01
Number of workers in business	1.74	(0.02)	2.25	(0.03)	0.00
Has government business license	0.76	(0.01)	0.62	(0.01)	0.00
Saves in a commercial bank	0.09	(0.01)	0.07	(0.01)	0.37
Has been involved in a ROSCA	0.60	(0.01)	0.65	(0.01)	0.12
Has had a joint liability loan	0.02	(0.00)	0.06	(0.01)	0.00
Received a loan in past year	0.25	(0.01)	0.39	(0.01)	0.00
Most risk averse (census)	0.38	(0.01)	0.36	(0.01)	0.49
Most least risk averse (census)	0.30	(0.01)	0.33	(0.01)	0.28
Observations	1104		323		

Standard errors in parentheses.

Table 4: Summary Statistics — Game Outcomes

	w/o Dynamic Incentives	w/ Dynamic Incentives	
Conditional/Unconditional?	Both	Conditional	Unconditional
Panel A: Rate of Risky Project Choice			
(1) Individual Liability Games	0.61	0.34	0.24
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
(2) Joint Liability (JL) Games	0.63	0.49	0.44
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
(3) JL + Monitoring (M) Games	0.61	0.47	0.42
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
(4) JL + M + Communication (C) Games	0.68	0.58	0.50
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
(5) JL + M + C + Partner Choice (PC) Games	0.69	0.53	0.46
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
(6) Punishment Game	.	0.53	0.46
		(0.01)	(0.01)
Panel B: Repayment Rate			
(7) Individual Liability Games	0.68	0.82	0.58
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
(8) Joint Liability (JL) Games	0.88	0.94	0.84
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.01)
(9) JL + Monitoring (M) Games	0.90	0.95	0.85
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.01)
(10) JL + M + Communication (C) Games	0.87	0.91	0.78
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
(11) JL + M + C + Partner Choice (PC) Games	0.89	0.94	0.82
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
(12) Punishment Game	.	0.94	0.80
		(0.01)	(0.01)

Standard errors in parentheses. The first column reports the mean rate of risky project choice and repayment in the games without dynamic incentives. The second reports average outcomes among currently active borrowers in games with dynamic incentives, while the third column reports the mean outcome rates among all participants. Data are drawn from the first six rounds within each game.

Table 5: OLS Regressions of Individual Risky Project Choice

Dependent Variable: Indicator for Risky Project Choice

			Dynamic Incentives? (Y/N)			
Sample:	All Games		No		Yes	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Dynamic Incentives (D)	-0.263***	-0.215***	.	.	.	.
	(0.019)	(0.02)				
Joint Liability (JL) Game	0.02	0.015	0.02	0.022	0.151***	0.074***
	(0.017)	(0.015)	(0.017)	(0.015)	(0.017)	(0.018)
JL + Monitoring (M)	-0.015	-0.021	-0.015	-0.023	-0.026	-0.008
	(0.019)	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.016)	(0.02)	(0.018)
JL + M + Communication (C)	0.073***	0.061***	0.073***	0.06***	0.113***	0.073***
	(0.019)	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.017)	(0.021)	(0.02)
JL + M + C + Partner Choice (PC)	0.005	0.009	0.005	0.007	-0.055***	-0.033*
	(0.018)	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.017)
D × JL	0.131***	0.07***	.	.	.	.
	(0.024)	(0.024)				
D × (JL + M)	-0.011	0.024	.	.	.	.
	(0.027)	(0.022)				
D × (JL + M + C)	0.04	0.002	.	.	.	.
	(0.028)	(0.023)				
D × (JL + M + C + PC)	-0.06**	-0.037*	.	.	.	.
	(0.025)	(0.022)				
Constant	0.606***	0.601***	0.606***	0.615***	0.343***	0.374***
	(0.017)	(0.012)	(0.017)	(0.013)	(0.016)	(0.017)
Individual FEs	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Round FEs	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Observations	24840	24840	13541	13541	11299	11299
Number of Unique IDs	493	493	474	474	449	449
R^2	0.04	0.044	0.005	0.006	0.024	0.036

Robust standard errors, clustered at the player level, in parentheses. *** indicates significantly different from zero at 1 percent level; ** indicates significant at 5 percent level; * indicates significantly at 10 percent level. Data are drawn from the first six rounds within each game.

Table 6: OLS Regressions of Loan Repayment

Dependent Variable: Indicator for Loan Repayment

			Dynamic Incentives? (Y/N)			
Sample:	All Games		No		Yes	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Dynamic Incentives (D)	0.139***	0.123***	.	.	.	.
	(0.012)	(0.012)				
Joint Liability (JL) Game	0.2***	0.202***	0.2***	0.201***	0.117***	0.144***
	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.01)	(0.011)
JL + Monitoring (M)	0.021**	0.023**	0.021**	0.019**	0.013**	0.006
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.006)	(0.007)
JL + M + Communication (C)	-0.033***	-0.03***	-0.033***	-0.026**	-0.036***	-0.022**
	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.008)	(0.01)
JL + M + C + Partner Choice (PC)	0.021**	0.02*	0.021**	0.021*	0.024***	0.016*
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.011)	(0.008)	(0.009)
D × JL	-0.083***	-0.067***	.	.	.	.
	(0.014)	(0.014)				
D × (JL + M)	-0.008	-0.019	.	.	.	.
	(0.011)	(0.012)				
D × (JL + M + C)	-0.003	0.012	.	.	.	.
	(0.014)	(0.016)				
D × (JL + M + C + PC)	0.003	-0.003	.	.	.	.
	(0.013)	(0.013)				
Constant	0.682***	0.678***	0.682***	0.668***	0.82***	0.809***
	(0.01)	(0.009)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Individual FEs	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Round FEs	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Observations	24840	24840	13541	13541	11299	11299
Number of Unique IDs	493	493	474	474	449	449
R^2	0.057	0.058	0.055	0.052	0.029	0.041

Robust standard errors, clustered at the player level, in parentheses. *** indicates significantly different from zero at 1 percent level; ** indicates significant at 5 percent level; * indicates significantly at 10 percent level. Data are drawn from the first six rounds within each game.

Table 7: OLS Regressions of Risky Project Choice by Demographic Category

Dependent Variable: Indicator for Risky Project Choice

Sample:	All Subjects	Female	Younger	Older	Secondary	GSS Answers	Saves
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Dynamic Incentives (D)	-0.215***	-0.22***	-0.329***	-0.179***	-0.233***	-0.243***	-0.269**
	(0.02)	(0.026)	(0.058)	(0.037)	(0.025)	(0.087)	(0.116)
Joint Liability (JL) Game	0.015	0.006	0.049	-0.004	0.005	0.069	-0.04
	(0.015)	(0.019)	(0.042)	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.094)	(0.069)
JL + Monitoring (M)	-0.021	-0.014	-0.028	-0.052*	-0.014	-0.103**	-0.063
	(0.016)	(0.02)	(0.034)	(0.027)	(0.02)	(0.051)	(0.054)
JL + M + Communication (C)	0.061***	0.063***	0.028	0.093***	0.046***	0.067	0.059
	(0.017)	(0.024)	(0.028)	(0.025)	(0.018)	(0.062)	(0.055)
JL + M + C + Partner Choice (PC)	0.009	-0.005	0.038	0.026	0.024	-0.018	-0.111
	(0.016)	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.017)	(0.046)	(0.08)
D × JL	0.07***	0.091***	0.088	0.081**	0.077***	0.052	0.108
	(0.024)	(0.029)	(0.063)	(0.038)	(0.027)	(0.087)	(0.119)
D × (JL + M)	0.024	0.012	0.053	0.031	0.033	0.127	0.053
	(0.022)	(0.027)	(0.037)	(0.035)	(0.025)	(0.085)	(0.077)
D × (JL + M + C)	0.002	-0.009	0.013	-0.018	0.014	-0.05	0.072
	(0.023)	(0.031)	(0.05)	(0.034)	(0.027)	(0.063)	(0.137)
D × (JL + M + C + PC)	-0.037*	-0.018	-0.083*	-0.049	-0.074***	0.036	-0.083
	(0.022)	(0.027)	(0.049)	(0.03)	(0.025)	(0.081)	(0.134)
Constant	0.601***	0.609***	0.719***	0.589***	0.637***	0.549***	0.7***
	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.027)	(0.02)	(0.014)	(0.063)	(0.059)
Individual FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Round FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	24840	14245	4020	10269	17407	1779	835
Number of Unique IDs	493	253	61	131	271	24	24
R^2	0.044	0.046	0.094	0.033	0.05	0.052	0.05

Robust standard errors, clustered at the player level, in parentheses. *** indicates significantly different from zero at 1 percent level; ** indicates significant at 5 percent level; * indicates significantly at 10 percent level. Data are drawn from the first six rounds within each game. Younger subjects are aged 22 or below, Older subjects 35 or above. Secondary indicates that a subject has completed secondary school. GSS Answers equals one if a subject game positive responses to at least two of the three GSS questions described in footnote 14. Saves indicates subjects who have a savings account in a bank.

Table 8: OLS Regressions of Risky Project Choice by Risk Aversion Level

Dependent Variable: Indicator for Risky Project Choice

				Risk Aversion Type:		
Sample:	All Players			θ_1	θ_2	θ_3
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Dynamic Incentives (D)	-0.143***	-0.14***	-0.143***	-0.135***	-0.156***	-0.065
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.045)	(0.022)	(0.041)
JL + Monitoring (M)	-0.022	-0.017	-0.023	-0.049	-0.021	-0.004
	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.041)	(0.022)	(0.044)
JL + M + Communication (C)	0.06***	0.06***	0.059***	0.19***	0.037*	0.063**
	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.044)	(0.022)	(0.031)
JL + M + C + Partner Choice (PC)	0.007	0.013	0.009	-0.099**	0.049**	-0.033
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.045)	(0.02)	(0.031)
D × (JL + M)	0.023	0.033	0.054***	0.038	0.029	0.043
	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.021)	(0.064)	(0.03)	(0.052)
D × (JL + M + C)	0.003	-0.01	-0.026	-0.076	0.015	-0.073
	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.021)	(0.056)	(0.03)	(0.05)
D × (JL + M + C + PC)	-0.04*	-0.052**	-0.044*	0.077	-0.098***	-0.027
	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.055)	(0.03)	(0.035)
Safer Player w/ Riskier Partner #1	.	0.049*	.	.	.	.
		(0.026)				
Riskier Player w/ Safer Partner #1	.	0.005	.	.	.	.
		(0.013)				
Safer Player w/ Riskier Partner #2	.	.	0.051***	.	.	.
			(0.019)			
Riskier Player w/ Safer Partner #2	.	.	0.0002	.	.	.
			(0.01)			
Constant	0.621***	0.616***	0.609***	0.432***	0.667***	0.712***
	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.035)	(0.015)	(0.035)
Individual FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Round FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	19550	17754	21039	3464	9843	3682
Number of Unique IDs	491	424	472	99	126	89
R^2	0.036	0.037	0.035	0.039	0.048	0.018

Robust standard errors, clustered at the player level, in parentheses. *** indicates significantly different from zero at 1 percent level; ** indicates significant at 5 percent level; * indicates significantly at 10 percent level. Data are drawn from the first six rounds within each game. Risk Aversion Type based on choices in individual liability games. Subjects are classified as θ_1-borrowers if their rate of risky project choice in individual games without dynamic incentives is at or below the 25th percentile; subjects are classified as θ_3-borrowers if their rate of risky project choice in individual games with dynamic incentives is at or above the 75th percentile.

Table 9: Multinomial Logit Regressions of Joint Outcomes

Omitted Outcome: Both Chose Safe Project

Sample:	All Pairs		Safer Pairs		Mixed Pairs		Riskier Pairs	
Games w/ Dynamic Incentives?	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Outcome #1: Both Chose Risky Project								
Monitoring (M)	-0.034	-0.197	0.099	0.287	-0.253	-0.539	0.023	0.107
	(0.175)	(0.188)	(0.936)	(1.188)	(0.314)	(0.382)	(0.234)	(0.24)
M + Communication (C)	0.334*	0.872***	0.283	0.626	0.632*	1.507***	0.174	0.394
	(0.194)	(0.208)	(1.331)	(1.190)	(0.331)	(0.414)	(0.276)	(0.26)
M + C + Partner Choice (PC)	0.129	-0.477**	-0.235	-0.605	-0.143	-0.301	0.439	-0.51*
	(0.202)	(0.223)	(1.251)	(1.213)	(0.345)	(0.462)	(0.287)	(0.266)
Constant	0.639***	-0.852***	-1.640*	-4.628***	0.424	-1.314***	1.235***	-0.536***
	(0.157)	(0.156)	(0.942)	(1.014)	(0.291)	(0.317)	(0.215)	(0.202)
Outcome #2: Alternation / Opposite Projects								
M	0.046	0.026	-0.599	0.532	-0.12	-0.224	0.228	0.313*
	(0.156)	(0.136)	(0.594)	(0.796)	(0.259)	(0.236)	(0.207)	(0.179)
M + C	0.024	0.502***	0.549	0.968	-0.444	0.743**	-0.004	0.16
	(0.181)	(0.169)	(0.924)	(0.837)	(0.297)	(0.31)	(0.259)	(0.216)
M + C + PC	0.136	-0.194	0.693	-0.758	0.382	-0.126	0.227	-0.189
	(0.194)	(0.201)	(0.907)	(0.832)	(0.328)	(0.379)	(0.282)	(0.254)
Constant	0.802***	0.397***	-0.565	-1.115*	1.116***	0.521***	1.015***	0.47***
	(0.153)	(0.114)	(0.613)	(0.657)	(0.272)	(0.196)	(0.211)	(0.152)
Observations	10554	8416	364	357	2720	2269	5920	4848

Robust standard errors, clustered at the level of the joint liability pair, in parentheses. *** indicates significantly different from zero at 1 percent level; ** indicates significant at 5 percent level; * indicates significantly at 10 percent level. Data are drawn from the first six rounds within each game. Safer Pairs are those comprising two θ_1-borrowers. Mixed Pairs include exactly one θ_1-borrower. Riskier Pairs do not include a θ_1-borrower.

Table 10: Game Outcomes in Punishment Treatments

Specification:	OLS	OLS	Multinomial Logit	
Dependent Variable:	Risky	Repay	Both Risky	Alternate
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Punishment Game	0.050**	0.005	0.314**	-0.036
	(0.024)	(0.011)	(0.152)	(0.137)
Constant	0.475***	0.946***	0.699***	0.345***
	(0.011)	(0.005)	(0.158)	(0.126)
Observations	4268	4268	4862	4862
Round FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Robust standard errors, clustered at the level of the joint liability pair, in parentheses. *** indicates significantly different from zero at 1 percent level; ** indicates significant at 5 percent level; * indicates significantly at 10 percent level. Data are drawn from the first six rounds within each game.

Table 11: OLS Regressions of Determinants of Group Formation in Partner Choice Games

Dependent Variable: Dyad Formed a Liability Group (Indicator)

Partner Choice:	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dynamic Incentives? (Y/N/B)	Both	Both	No	Yes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Sitting next to each other	-0.07***	0.028*	0.034	0.016
	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.021)	(0.026)
Bought or sold from partner's store	-0.014	0.006	0.003	0.004
	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.023)
Partners are related	0.012	0.209***	0.208***	0.22***
	(0.041)	(0.038)	(0.056)	(0.055)
Partners meet socially	-0.014	0.037***	0.026	0.042*
	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.024)
Know store locations	0.032**	0.024*	0.026	0.027
	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.023)
Have watched over stores	0.043***	0.074***	0.054***	0.106***
	(0.015)	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.023)
Has been host, guest of partner	-0.044	0.395***	0.544***	0.226***
	(0.047)	(0.039)	(0.051)	(0.063)
Both are popular	-0.0007	-0.028**	-0.027	-0.038
	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.027)
Both are trusted	-0.005	-0.015	-0.022	0.004
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.016)	(0.024)
Both most risk averse (census)	-0.025	-0.012	-0.022	0.003
	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.028)	(0.037)
Both most risk loving (census)	-0.004	0.05***	0.048*	0.052
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.025)	(0.032)
Both most risk averse (IL games)	0.002	0.084***	0.044	0.15***
	(0.033)	(0.027)	(0.033)	(0.046)
Both least risk averse (IL games)	0.004	-0.0003	0.015	-0.024
	(0.032)	(0.028)	(0.037)	(0.047)
Same marital status	0.007	-0.007	0.001	-0.02
	(0.011)	(0.01)	(0.013)	(0.016)
Same religion	0.001	0.04***	0.039**	0.048**
	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.023)
Wealth difference	0.018**	-0.01	-0.013	-0.008
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.009)	(0.012)
Both Polvos Azules founders	0.028	0.04**	0.053**	0.037
	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.024)	(0.029)
Both own stores	-0.022	-0.017	0.009	-0.056*
	(0.021)	(0.02)	(0.026)	(0.033)
Constant	0.562	-0.192	-0.216	-0.492
	(0.415)	(0.529)	(0.509)	(0.367)
Individual FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Individual Game FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	2690	2473	1377	1096
R^2	0.059	0.164	0.204	0.182

Robust standard errors, clustered at the pair level, in parentheses. *** indicates significantly different from zero at 1 percent level; ** indicates significant at 5 percent level; * indicates significantly at 10 percent level. Column 1 (Columns 2–4) includes all joint liability treatments with communication but without (with) partner choice.

Figure 2: Experimental Treatments of the Microfinance Game

	Games without Dynamic Incentives	Games with Dynamic Incentives (D)	
Individual Liability (IL)	IL Game	Dynamic × IL Game	
Joint Liability (JL)	JL Game	Dynamic × JL Game	
+ Monitoring (M)	JL + M Game	Dynamic × (JL + M) Game	Punishment Game
+ Communication (C)	JL + M + C Game	Dynamic × (JL + M + C) Game	
+ Partner Choice (PC)	JL + M + C + PC Game	Dynamic × (JL + M + C + PC) Game	

Figure 3: Payouts, Outcomes in Joint Liability Treatments

Project Choices (Safe/Risky)		Project Outcomes (Success/Failure)				
Borrower's	Partner's	Borrower's	Partner's	Probability	Borrower's Net Payout	Default? (Y/N)
Safe	Safe	Success	Success	1	100	N
	Risky	Success	Success	0.50	100	N
			Failure	0.50	0	N
Risky	Safe	Success	Success	0.50	500	N
		Failure		0.50	0	N
	Risky	Success	Success	0.25	500	N
			Failure	0.25	400	N
		Failure	Success	0.25	0	N
			Failure	0.25	0	Y

Appendix A

Proof of Proposition 1

We begin by showing that a θ_2- or θ_3-borrower matched with a partner of a similar type will choose the risky project in all rounds in any subgame perfect equilibrium. First, note that Assumption 4 guarantees that $EU_i^{RR} > EU_i^{SS}$ for $i \in \{2,3\}$. To see this, observe that for $i = 1$, $EU_i^{SS} > EU_i^{RR}$, so it must be the case that

$$\alpha EU_i^{SR} + (1-\alpha)\, EU_i^{SS} > EU_i^{RR} \tag{6}$$

for some $\alpha \in [0,1]$ — specifically, α close enough to zero. Since $EU_i^{RS} > EU_i^{RR}$ for all i, if $EU_i^{SS} \geq EU_i^{RR}$ for $i \in \{2,3\}$, then the following would hold for all $\alpha \in [0,1]$:

$$\alpha EU_i^{RS} + (1-\alpha)\, EU_i^{SS} > EU_i^{RR}. \tag{7}$$

Thus, Assumption 4 can only hold if $EU_i^{SS} < EU_i^{RR}$ for $i \in \{2,3\}$. Because this is true, a pair of θ_2- or θ_3-borrowers would never coordinate on the safe project in any round of a subgame perfect equilibrium, as it forces both below their minmax expected payout, EU_i^{RR} and both have a profitable deviation.

Next, we prove by contradiction that any alternating sequence — in which Borrower i chooses the risky project in periods $\tau \in Z_R$ and the safe project in all other periods while Borrower i's partner, Borrower j, chooses the safe project in periods $\tau \in Z_R$ and the risky project in all other periods — cannot constitute a subgame perfect equilibrium between to θ_2- or θ_3-borrowers. consider any such sequence. Borrower i receives expected utility stream

$$\left[\alpha EU_i^{RS} + (1-\alpha)\, EU_i^{SR}\right]\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right) \tag{8}$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{\sum_{\tau \in Z_R} \delta^\tau}{\sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty} \delta^\tau};$$

Borrower j receives expected utility stream

$$\left[\alpha EU_j^{SR} + (1-\alpha)\, EU_j^{RS}\right]\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right). \tag{9}$$

If there exists a set Z_R such that expected payoffs for both borrowers exceed the minmax level, then the following inequalities must hold:

$$\left[\alpha EU_i^{RS} + (1-\alpha)\, EU_i^{SR}\right]\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right) \geq EU_i^{RR}\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right) \tag{10}$$

and

$$\left[\alpha EU_j^{SR} + (1-\alpha)\, EU_j^{RS}\right]\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right). \geq EU_j^{RR}\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right). \tag{11}$$

Since $Y_R > 3L$ (by Assumption 3),

$$u_i\left(Y_R - 2L\right) > u_i\left(Y_R - L\right) - u_i\left(Y_R - 2L\right) \tag{12}$$

by the concavity of $u_i(\cdot)$. This implies

$$(1-p)\left[u_i(Y_R-L)-u_i(Y_R-2L)\right]+u_i(Y_S-L)<pu_i(Y_R-L)+(1-p)u_i(Y_R-2L) \quad (13)$$

since $EU_i^{SS}<EU_i^{RS}$.[26] Rearranging the above and multiplying by $p/2$ yields

$$\frac{1}{2}pu_i(Y_R-L)+\frac{1}{2}pu_i(Y_S-L)<p^2u_i(Y_R-L)+p(1-p)u_i(Y_R-2L). \quad (14)$$

Consequently, for Equation (10) to hold, α must be greater than one half.[27] However, by a similar argument, for Equation (11), α must be less than one half. This creates a contradiction. Finally, by an argument directly parallel to the one above, Assumption 4 guarantees that a subgame perfect equilibrium cannot exist wherein a θ_1-borrower plays safe in all rounds while her partner, a θ_2 or θ_3, invests in the risky project in some but not all rounds.

■

[26] Recall $EU_i^{SS}=u_i(Y_S-L)$ and $EU_i^{RS}=pu_i(Y_R-L)$.

[27] Since $EU_i^{RR}=p^2u_i(Y_R-L)+p(1-p)u_i(Y_R-2L)$ and $EU_i^{SR}=pu_i(Y_S-L)$.

Appendix B

Game Administration & Experimental Instructions

All games were administered by a team of three to five researchers. Players were randomly assigned to numbered seats at the beginning of each game session, and were identified using their seat numbers throughout the day. In each game, each player received a packet of ten game worksheets. Sample worksheets are included in Appendix B. In each round, participants would circle their desired projects before returning their game packets to the researchers. Choices were then entered into a computer which randomized outcomes for players investing in the risky project and then reported individual earnings for that round (after automatically deducting the loan repayment). A member of the research team then highlighted final outcomes on participant game sheets before returning them to players. After players examined their results for the round, the game either continued into the next round or ended.

Read at the beginning of all games:

Good morning everyone. We are a group of college students carrying out research about how micro-entrepreneurs from Polvos Azules make business decisions. We would like you to participate in our study. If you choose to participate, we will ask you to play several types of games with us. Just for showing up and staying for two hours, you will receive ten soles. You may earn up to ten soles. How much you earn will depend on how many points you accumulate during the course of the games. The more points you accumulate during the games, the more money you will receive at the end of the session.

Packets of game worksheets are passed out at this point.

You are not allowed to talk to each other during the course of the games. In addition, you are not allowed to look at the worksheets of people sitting near you.

Each game consists of multiple rounds. At the beginning of each round, you will receive a bank loan for 100 points. You must invest this loan in one of two projects: "Project Square" or "Project Triangle." Project Square pays 200 points with certainty. If you choose Project Triangle, your project may be successful or it may fail. Each time you choose Project Triangle, it is like the computer flips an imaginary coin. If the coin lands on heads, you will receive 600 points. However, if the coin lands on tails, you won't receive anything.

Note that project outcomes are independent, so if two players chose Project Triangle in the same round, one can be successful while the other fails because the computer tosses a different imaginary coin for each player.

Before receiving the points from your project, you have to repay the loan from the bank. This is done automatically by the computer, so no one has the right to decide whether or not to repay the loan. You can only use the points you earned in each round to repay the bank. In any round, if you choose Project Triangle and your project is not successful, you cannot repay the bank.

To begin the game everybody is assigned 500 points.

The only thing you have to do is circle one of the two projects for each round. After that you will hand us the game sheets and we will fill in the rest of the information after entering your choice into the computer. Do not forget to write your ID number in the upper right corner of each sheet.

We will be playing many rounds, but we are not sure how many. It will be as if we were rolling an imaginary dice, and with some probability the game stops and we will start another game.

There are going to be several types of games that we will explain as we play them. In some of them you will play alone, in others you will have a partner.

Read before specific game specifications:

Individual Games without Dynamic Incentives: In this game you will be playing alone, meaning you will be solely responsible for your loan from the bank. You will receive the loan from the bank and you will have to circle the project (Square or Triangle) that you want to invest in. In this game, you will always receive a new loan at the beginning of each round even when you were not able to repay your loan in the previous round. In this case, the bank will allow you to borrow again even if your project does not succeed and you do not repay the loan.

Individual Games with Dynamic Incentives: In this game you will be playing alone, meaning you will be solely responsible for your loan from the bank. You will receive the loan from the bank and you will have to circle the project (Square or Triangle) that you want to invest in. In this game, the bank will not loan to you again if your project does not succeed and thus are unable to repay the loan. This will happen if you choose Project Triangle and your project fails. In that case you will have to remain in your seat and wait for the other participants to finish playing.

Joint Liability Games without Dynamic Incentives: In this game you will be borrowing jointly from the bank with a partner in the room. You will not know who the partner is, nor will you be shown what project the partner chooses. As before, you will choose a project by circling either Square or Triangle. You and your partner are responsible for each other's loans. If your project succeeds and your partner's does not, you will have to repay your partner's loan. On the other hand, if your partner's project succeeds and yours does not, your partner will repay your loan. In this game, you will always receive a new loan at the beginning of each round even when neither of you are able to repay the loan in the previous round.

Joint Liability Games without Dynamic Incentives: In this game you will be borrowing jointly from the bank with a partner in the room. You will not know who the partner is, nor will you be shown what project the partner chooses. As before, you will choose a project by circling either Square or Triangle. You and your partner are responsible for each other's loans. If your project succeeds and your partner's does not, you will have to repay your partner's loan. On the other hand, if your partner's project succeeds and yours does not, your partner will repay your loan. In this game, the bank will not loan to you or your partner again if your projects do not succeed and you are unable to repay your loans. This will happen if both partners choose Triangle and both projects fail.

Monitoring Games without Dynamic Incentives: In this game you will be borrowing jointly from the bank with a partner in the room. You will not know who the partner is. However, at

the start of each round, we will show you what your partner chose (square or triangle) in the prior round. As before, you will choose a project by circling either Square or Triangle. You and your partner are responsible for each other's loans. If your project succeeds and your partner's does not, you will have to repay your partner's loan. On the other hand, if your partner's project succeeds and yours does not, your partner will repay your loan. In this game, you will always receive a new loan at the beginning of each round even when neither of you are able to repay the loan in the previous round.

Monitoring Games with Dynamic Incentives: In this game you will be borrowing jointly from the bank with a partner in the room. You will not know who the partner is. However, at the start of each round, we will show you what your partner chose (square or triangle) in the prior round. As before, you will choose a project by circling either Square or Triangle. You and your partner are responsible for each other's loans. If your project succeeds and your partner's does not, you will have to repay your partner's loan. On the other hand, if your partner's project succeeds and yours does not, your partner will repay your loan. In this game, the bank will not loan to you or your partner again if your projects do not succeed and you are unable to repay your loans. This will happen if both partners choose Triangle and both projects fail.

Communication Games without Dynamic Incentives: In this game you will be borrowing jointly from the bank with a partner in the room. Before the game begins, the computer will assign each of you a partner and we will ask you to move to a seat next to your partner. You and your partner will sit next to each other, and you will be allowed to talk to your partner throughout the game. In addition, in each round we will show you what your partner chose (square or triangle) in the prior round. As before, you will choose a project by circling either Square or Triangle. You and your partner are responsible for each other's loans. If your project succeeds and your partner's does not, you will have to repay your partner's loan. On the other hand, if your partner's project succeeds and yours does not, your partner will repay your loan. In this game, you will always receive a new loan at the beginning of each round even when neither of you are able to repay the loan in the previous round.

Communication Games with Dynamic Incentives: In this game you will be borrowing jointly from the bank with a partner in the room. Before the game begins, the computer will assign each of you a partner and we will ask you to move to a seat next to your partner. You and your partner will sit next to each other, and you will be allowed to talk to your partner throughout the game. In addition, in each round we will show you what your partner chose (square or triangle) in the prior round. As before, you will choose a project by circling either Square or Triangle. You and your partner are responsible for each other's loans. If your project succeeds and your partner's does not, you will have to repay your partner's loan. On the other hand, if your partner's project succeeds and yours does not, your partner will repay your loan. In this game, the bank will not loan to you or your partner again if your projects do not succeed and you are unable to repay your loans. This will happen if both partners choose Triangle and both projects fail.

Partner Choice Games without Dynamic Incentives: In this game you will be borrowing jointly from the bank with a partner in the room. Before the game begins, we will ask you to stand up and find a partner that you would like to play with. You and your partner will sit next

to each other, and you will be allowed to talk to your partner throughout the game. In addition, in each round we will show you what your partner chose (square or triangle) in the prior round. As before, you will choose a project by circling either Square or Triangle. You and your partner are responsible for each other's loans. If your project succeeds and your partner's does not, you will have to repay your partner's loan. On the other hand, if your partner's project succeeds and yours does not, your partner will repay your loan. In this game, you will always receive a new loan at the beginning of each round even when neither of you are able to repay the loan in the previous round.

Partner Choice Games with Dynamic Incentives: In this game you will be borrowing jointly from the bank with a partner in the room. Before the game begins, we will ask you to stand up and find a partner that you would like to play with. You and your partner will sit next to each other, and you will be allowed to talk to your partner throughout the game. In addition, in each round we will show you what your partner chose (square or triangle) in the prior round. As before, you will choose a project by circling either Square or Triangle. You and your partner are responsible for each other's loans. If your project succeeds and your partner's does not, you will have to repay your partner's loan. On the other hand, if your partner's project succeeds and yours does not, your partner will repay your loan. In this game, the bank will not loan to you or your partner again if your projects do not succeed and you are unable to repay your loans. This will happen if both partners choose Triangle and both projects fail.

Punishment Games with Dynamic Incentives: In this game you will be borrowing jointly from the bank with a partner in the room. You will not know who the partner is. However, at the start of each round, we will show you what your partner chose (square or triangle) in the prior round. As before, you will choose a project by circling either Square or Triangle. You and your partner are responsible for each other's loans. If your project succeeds and your partner's does not, you will have to repay your partner's loan. On the other hand, if your partner's project succeeds and yours does not, your partner will repay your loan. In this game, the bank will not loan to you or your partner again if your projects do not succeed and you are unable to repay your loans. This will happen if both partners choose Triangle and both projects fail. At the end of the game, you will be given the opportunity to punish your partner. If for any reason you feel the person that has been your partner did something you do not approve or that you want to send them a message about your satisfaction in relation to their choices, you can punish them. If you choose to punish your partner, we will deduct 500 points from their total earnings in this game. Punishing is costly: we will also deduct 50 points from your earnings. Keep in mind that as well as you can punish your partner, your partner can punish you if he/she feels they ought to. Also remember that your winnings are determined by how many points you accumulate, and are not affected by how many points everyone else accumulates. In order to be able to punish you are receiving an additional sheet. At the end of the game, you will able to choose between option 1 (No punishment 0 Cost of punishment) or option 2 (500 points of punishment 50 points as cost of punishment). After you hand in your sheets with your punishment choice we will return them to you and you will be able to see if someone punished you. You will never know the identity of your partner, even if they punish you.