## STUDIES IN RATIONALITY AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Editors: Jon Elster and Michael S. McPherson

Editorial Board:
Fredrik Barth
Amartya Sen
Arthur Stinchcombe
Amos Tversky
Bernard Williams

JON ELSTER Explaining technical change
JON ELSTER & AANUND HYLLAND (EDS.) Foundations of social
choice theory
JON ELSTER (ED.) The multiple self
JON ELSTER The cement of society
JON ELSTER & JON ROEMER (EDS.) Interpersonal comparisons of
well-being
JON ELSTER & RUNE SLAGSTAD (EDS.) Constitutionalism and
democracy
JAMES S. COLEMAN Individual interests and collective action
ARTHUR STINCHCOMBE Stratification and organization
DIEGO GAMBETTA Were they pushed or did they jump?
MICHAEL TAYLOR The possibility of cooperation
KAARE STROM Minority government, majority rule
ADAM PRZEWORSKI Democracy and the market

## PICOECONOMICS

The Strategic Interaction of Successive Motivational States within the Person



Published by the Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP 40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA 10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Victoria 3166, Australia

© Cambridge University Press 1992

First published 1992

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Ainslie, George, 1944-

Picoeconomics: the strategic interaction of successive motivational states within the person / George Ainslie.

p. cm. - (Studies in rationality and social change)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-521-26093-0

1. Motivation (Psychology) 2. Choice (Psychology) 3. Reward (Psychology)

I. Title. II. Series.

BF503.A46 199

153.8 – dc20

91-24450

CIP

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 0-521-26093-0 hardback

## Contents

Biomel) 135 503 A296 1992

| PR | EFACE |   | page xi |
|----|-------|---|---------|
| 1  | The   | paradox of addiction                                    | 1       |
|    | 1.1   | Addictions provide a model for participatory disease    | . 3     |
|    | 1.2   | Behavioral science has not dealt with our most          |         |
|    |       | significant decisions                                   | 7       |
|    |       | 1.2.1 Utilitarian concepts of higher motives are        |         |
|    |       | primitive   | 8       |
|    |       | 1.2.2 Anomalies contradict current utility theory       | 12      |
|    | 1.3   | Utility theory fails to account for several major areas |         |
|    |       | of behavior   | 14      |
|    |       | 1.3.1 Ambivalence                                       | 14      |
|    |       | 1.3.2 Participation in aversion                         | 17      |
|    |       | 1.3.3 Dependence of rewards on taste                    | 19      |
|    |       | 1.3.4 Need for emotional objects                        | 21      |
| 2  | In se | arch of the two minds                                   | 24      |
|    | 2.1   | Conflict with other people does not imply ambivalence   | 25      |
|    | 2.2   | Multiple centers of choice must compete on a            |         |
|    |       | common basis  | 28      |
|    | 2.3   | Separate principles of decision making must             |         |
|    |       | also compete  | 32      |
|    |       | 2.3.1 Motivated lower principles                        | 33      |
|    |       | 2.3.2 Unmotivated lower principles                      | 39      |
|    | 2.4   | Misinformation cannot cause ambivalence                 | 48      |
|    |       | 2.4.1 Superstition                                      | 48      |
|    |       | 2.4.2 Hidden costs                                      | 49      |
|    |       | 2.4.3 Misinterpretation                                 | 50      |
|    |       | 2.4.4 Nonspecific errors of learning                    | 51      |