Evolution of decision making under risk:

How comparative work on human and non-human primates can shed light on humans' decisions

Workshop on Behavioral Insurance Thursday, April 15, 2021

Francesca De Petrillo, PhD.

Research Fellow, Institute for Advanced Study in Toulouse







Variation in decision-making under risk

Population variation: differences in risk propensity across nations, and small-scale subsistence

societies (Hsee & Weber 1999; Amir et al., 2019)

Individual variation: men tend to be more risk-prone than women and risk propensity change during aging (Charness & Gneezy 2012; Paulsen et al. 2012)

Context variation: specific currency of the reward at stake and the larger social context (Bault et al. 2008; Rosati & Hare 2016)

Internal state variation: emotional states affect individuals' risk preferences: disappointment and regret (Coricelli et al. 2007)

Variation in decision-making under risk

What is the origins of this variation?

Cultural experiences

- Market experience (Amir et al. 2019)
- Cultural norms (Hsee &Weber 1999)
- Socialization practices (Croson & Gneezy 2009)

Biological contributions

- Genetic differences (Cesarini et al. 2009)
- Hormonal status (Apicella et al. 2015)
- Maturation of the neural system recruited in the decision process

(Galvan et al. 2007)

Biological foundations of human decisions

Humans: biological influences (shared) + cultural influences (unique)



Non-human primate can help us understand the biological foundation of human behaviour

- similarities in their cognition and neurobiology
- Similarities in social behaviour, sex differentiation and development
- Luck human-specific form of culture and economic market

(De Petrillo & Rosati, 2021 Phil. Trans.)

Biological foundations of human decisions

Non-human animals make decisions about value in their everyday lives

Food choice

Mate choice

Ally choice

TIME: rewards may be not immediately available

RISK: gains may be variable

Evolutionary rationality

When making decisions, Individuals maximize their fitness (number of offspring)

Food or calories are treated as proxy for fitness (MacArthur & Pianka, 1966; Charnov, 1976; Stephen & Krebs, 1986).

Measuring risk preferences in non-human animals

Series of choices between two different quantities of consumable reward:

«Safe» option (constant food amount) vs. «Risky» option (variable food amount)





Non-human animals risk preferences



Non-human animals are usually risk averse for gains

Risk-sensitivity theory: the individual's energy budget affects risk preference negative energy budget \rightarrow risk proneness, positive energy budget \rightarrow risk aversion

(Kacelnik & Bateson 1996; Kacelnik & El Mouden 2013; Platt & Huettel 2008)

The evolution of risk preferences

Ecological rationality hypothesis: differences in natural history explain differences in decisions

(Gigerenzer et al. 1999; Stevens 2010; De Petrillo et al. 2015; Rosati 2017)



Brown tufted capuchin monkeys

Wild capuchins exploit a wide variety of risky food sources and engage in potentially hazardous activities

(Perry and Rose 1994; Visalberghi and Fragaszy 2013)



The quantity risky choice task

Quantity risky choice task: same procedure used in chimpanzees and bonobos

Safe option

Risky option N = 10 (5 males, 5 females)

The quantity risky choice task

1. Neutral: 50% chance to receive 7 food items

(average payout = 4 food items)

2. Advantageous: 67% chance to receive 7 food items

(average payout = 5.2 food items)

3. Disadvantageous: 33% chance to receive 7 food items

(average payout = 2.8 food items)







(De Petrillo et al., 2015)

Capuchin choice - Example



Capuchins' risk preferences



Flexible choices: Neutral ~ Advantageous > Disadvantageous

(De Petrillo et al. 2015 Animal Cognition)

Comparison across species



Risk proneness: capuchins ~ chimpanzees > bonobos

- No sex differences
- No age differences

Species that rely on more variable resources have evolved higher tolerance for risk

Emotions and decision-making

Emotions affect human risky choices

- People make choices that minimize the chance to feel regret
- Shift from risk seeking to risk aversion after gambling and losing

(Heilman et al. 2010; Coricelli et al., 2005, 2007; Coricelli & Rustichini 2010)

Measuring monkey emotions

- Scratching and stress indicators
- Choice switching



(De Petrillo et al. 2017 Animal Behaviour)

Switching behaviour - example



(De Petrillo et al. 2017 Animal Behaviour)

Emotional responses to the choice outcome



- More negative emotions and switching after gambling and receiving a bad outcome
- No effect of these emotions on capuchins' subsequent choices

Social context and decision-making

People make more risky choices in the presence of others (Hill & Buss 2010: Bault et al. 2008)

Monkey choices with or without conspecific observer



- *Alone* (N = 10)
- *Paired* with dominant *bystander*(low ranking individuals N = 6)
- *Paired* with subordinate *bystander*(high ranking individuals N = 4)

(Zoratto, De Petrillo et al. 2018 Behavioral Brain Research)

Social context and decision-making



Capuchins are more risk-prone when alone

(And more stressed with a partner)

(Zoratto, De Petrillo et al. 2018 Behavioral Brain Research)

The importance of a comparative approach

Like humans, (some) non – human primates:

Are sensitive to variation in their payoff

Different decision strategies depending on the species

Exhibit emotional responses to outcomes



Change decision making strategies depending on the social context

This suggests that some psychological processes driving human decision making strategies might be shared with other primates.

The importance of a comparative approach

levels of variation	shared biological processes	human-unique cultural influences
population variation (species and populations)	adaptation to socioecological niche	acquisition of local cultural norms and institutions
individual variation (personality, sex, development)	little evidence for sex or developmental differences	gender socialization and cohort effects
within-individual variation (context and internal state)	sensitivity to energetic state, emotions, and social context	capacities for cooperation and social exchange

Adapted from (De Petrillo & Rosati, 2021 Phil. Trans.)

Culturally based traits are more malleable and amenable to interventions \rightarrow new clues for promoting optimal economic behaviour in humans

Thank You!

Francesca De Petrillo, PhD. francesca.de-petrillo@iast.fr



Francesca_DePe





