Politicians' Social Welfare Criteria

An Experiment With German Legislators[*]

Sandro Ambuehl

Sebastian Blesse

Philipp Doerrenberg

Christoph Feldhaus

Axel Ockenfels

June 9, 2023

Abstract

Much economic analysis derives policy recommendations based on social welfare criteria intended to model policymakers' preferences. Yet, little is known about policymakers' normative views suitable to this use. Our behavioral experiment elicits German legislators' welfare criteria. When resolving preference conflicts *across* individuals, they place substantially more importance on least-favored alternatives than on most-favored alternatives, contrasting with common aggregation mechanisms and the equal weighting inherent in utilitarianism. When resolving preference conflicts *within* individuals, politicians choose inconsistently with behavioral economists' most common approach to welfare analysis with time-inconsistent preferences. In distribution, politicians largely support the same welfare criteria as the public.

JEL codes: C9, D6

Keywords: Positive welfare economics, politicians, preference aggregation, paternalism

1   Introduction

Much economic analysis derives policy recommendations based on assumed social welfare criteria that are typically left to policy makers to judge. Yet, little is known about what criteria policy makers actually support (Gul and Pesendorfer, 2007). Empirical evidence that infers policy makers' preferences from actual policies, from policy makers' voting behavior, from party election proposals, or from survey responses (Heathcote et al., 2020; Butler et al., 2011; Jacobs et al., 2017; Heinemann and Janeba, 2011, resp.) is arguably confounded by political economy considerations, strategic motives, and social signaling concerns. Nonetheless, politicians' personal inclinations can substantially affect their policy making in democracies (Washington, 2008; Besley et al., 2011; Lee et al., 2021; Amsalem and Sheffer, 2023).[1] To study what social welfare criteria politicians support, we conduct an anonymized behavioral experiment in which German federal and state legislators make choices with real consequences. The experiment allows us to characterize the social welfare criteria they support, free from political economy constraints. Critically, our work does *not* seek to improve predictions of politician's real-world behavior, which may be shaped by political economy and signaling constraints. Rather, we seek to identify the social welfare criteria politicians *genuinely* consider normatively appealing. The aim is to reduce the potential mismatch between the social welfare criteria economists' policy recommendations typically rely on and those that policy makers support.

When economists derive optimal policy recommendations, they must often take a stance not only on how to resolve preference conflicts *across* individuals (social aggregation), but also on how to adjudicate conflicts between mutually inconsistent preferences *within* the same individual—especially when time-inconsistent preferences affect optimal sin taxes (Gruber and Kőszegi, 2001; O'Donoghue and Rabin, 2006; Allcott et al., 2019a), optimal social security systems (Bisin et al., 2015), or optimal energy policy (Allcott and Taubinsky, 2015).[2] The criteria that economists typically assume might deviate from those that politicians support in both of these domains. We thus measure how politicians resolve preference conflicts both across and within individuals.

To resolve preference conflicts across individuals, economists often assign equal weight to those who most prefer the chosen policy and to those who least prefer it. This is the case, for instance, when policy recommendations derive from the maximization of a utilitarian social welfare function, or when policies are ranked according to the Kaldor-Hicks criterion (Hausman et al., 2016). Our experiment lets us characterize how politicians impartially aggregate both when only ordinal information is available (as in the framework of Arrow, 1950), and when cardinal preferences play a role (as in utilitarian aggregation). We design the experiment in a way that lets us infer ordinal aggregation preferences because cardinal information is often difficult to obtain, either because no meaningful cardinal measures may exist (for instance in the case of setting priorities) or because it may not be feasible to measure them. We focus

---

[1] For instance, the number of daughters affects US congresspersons' voting on reproductive rights issues (Washington, 2008), the personality traits Openness to Experience and Extraversion predict stated policy preferences of elected representatives in democracies (Amsalem and Sheffer, 2023), and more highly educated leaders cause higher economic growth in democracies Besley et al. (2011). Lee et al. (2021) even shows that voters merely decide who is elected into office, but cannot change any given candidates' voting behavior, due to the candidates' lack of commitment power.

[2] See Bernheim and Taubinsky (2018) for a comprehensive review.

on the relative weights politicians implicitly assign to citizens as a function of the preference rank of the alternative they obtain, or of the cardinal utility associated with that alternative.

In the domain of preference conflicts within individuals, the case of time-inconsistency has received particular attention (see Ericson and Laibson, 2019, for a review). To derive policy recommendations, economists commonly take the stance that choices involving immediate rewards are mistaken (due to the lure of immediacy), but choices only involving future rewards reveal 'true' preferences (e.g. O'Donoghue and Rabin, 1999, 2006; Gruber and Kőszegi, 2001, 2004; DellaVigna and Malmendier, 2004; Allcott et al., 2019b). This stance is known as the *long-run criterion*. We test whether politicians' preferences are consistent with it. In this context, we also study how politicians resolve the tradeoff between respecting the autonomy of a voting-age German citizen, and ensuring that he receives an outcome the politician regards as good. We regard this decision, too, as the resolution of a conflict of preferences within an individual—those that the citizen reveals in his choices, and those which, in the mind of the politician, he would have if he understood what is truly good for himself.

To study how politicians resolve preference conflicts across individuals, we use the method developed in Ambuehl and Bernheim (2021). Each respondent learns that she is matched, with some chance, to a group of five German voting-age citizens. Each of them has ranked three given political foundations in the order in which he would like them to receive a donation of €30 that cannot be split. The respondent observes this preference profile, along with five other profiles. To ensure that respondents reveal their aggregation preferences rather than their own political leanings, we anonymize the foundations. For each profile, the respondent decides which of the anonymized foundations will receive the donation. The respondent knows that one of these preference profiles is real and that her decision on that profile will be carried out. Because we do not reveal the identify of the real profile, the respondent has an incentive to make a serious choice on each profile (as long as she is not completely indifferent to the group of citizens). We then elicit the respondents' beliefs about citizens' willingness to pay to trigger or prevent the donation to whichever foundation they ranked first, second, and last. These cardinal beliefs let us compare respondents' aggregation decisions to a utilitarian benchmark.

To study how politicians resolve preference conflicts within individuals, we rely on the method used in Ambuehl et al. (2021). Respondents make choices concerning the conflict between respecting other individuals' autonomy and ensuring they receive outcomes considered good. Each respondent is matched, with some chance, with a German voting-age citizen who can choose how to receive payment for his study participation. Each choice option consists of two payments, one disbursed six months before the other. Impatience is costly: larger earlier payments are associated with smaller total payments. The respondent's task is to construct the choice set from which the citizen will choose. Our interest centers on the number and type of options the respondent includes in that set. To identify implicit support for the long-run criterion, the respondent constructs one choice set from options that involve immediate payments, and another one from options in which even the early payment occurs one month after the study.

We invited all 2,588 members of German state and federal parliaments to participate in our study, and obtained 423 responses (16.3%) from across the political spectrum. We weight all responses in our analysis by age, education and political affiliation to address any remaining selection issues. Because the ultimate

sovereign of a democracy is its citizens, we conduct parallel experiments with a general population sample of well over a thousand members of the German voting-age general public. The comparison between this sample and politicians allows us to check the alignment of lawmakers' social welfare criteria with those of the general public.

We obtain three main findings. First, when politicians resolve preference conflicts across individuals, they deviate from economists' typical practice of weighing them equally. Instead, they place, on average, substantially more weight on minimizing the number of individuals who receive their least-favored alternative than on maximizing the number of citizens who obtain their most-favored alternative. This behavior also contrasts with aggregation mechanisms commonly used in practice, such as the plurality vote, that place exclusive emphasis on first-ranked alternatives. The weight on least-preferred alternatives varies with a politician's party's position. It is strongest for representatives of center parties and weakest for representatives of the left- and rightmost parties. In this sense, more centrist politicians focus on the losers of collective decision making to a greater extent. When we use politicians' beliefs about citizens' willingness to pay (WTP) associated with their most, second, and least preferred foundation, we find that utilitarian aggregation based on these beliefs would produce far more majoritarian choices than we actually observe. Politician's choices are better rationalized by a welfare function that applies a concave transformation to WTP beliefs, consistent with a motive to reduce inequality in utility.

Second, when politicians resolve potentially conflicting preferences within individuals, they deviate from the long-run criterion commonly used in economics in two ways. First, the choice sets they construct are largely independent of the availability of immediate rewards, in contrast to what one would expect if the lure of immediacy were of particular concern. Second, even when all rewards are delayed, more than half of all politicians remove impatient alternatives. This behavior conflicts with the long-run criterion's prescription to defer to the agent's preferences when no immediate rewards are available. Moreover, representatives of parties further to the political right intervene more often in otherwise autonomous choices.

Third, the social welfare criteria of elected politicians align well with those of the general public. Even though we have substantial statistical power, we find no significant difference in the distribution of aggregation decisions between the two samples. In the domain of interpersonal preference conflicts, the general public shows as little support for the long-run criterion as politicians, though its members intervene slightly more often to prevent impatient (and in some cases patient) choice. In spite of the similarities in the public's and politicians' welfare criteria, and in spite of monetary incentives for accuracy, the public's beliefs about others' choices are systematically biased. They underestimate both politicians' and the public's preference for compromise and they substantially overestimate politicians' interventionism. The latter bias is so severe that subjects believe politicians' intervene more often than the general public, even though the opposite is true.[3]

There are three advantages from obtaining these results through an experiment aside avoiding political economy confounds. First, we can present our experimental decisions in a largely context-free way. Thus,

---

[3]When asked whether to delegate decisions to either politicians or to other members of the general public, respondents display such a strong aversion to delegating to politicians that beliefs about the two subject pools' choices have no explanatory power.

we obtain plausibly context-independent results that generalize to various policy domains about which economists make recommendations based on specific social welfare criteria. Second, the stylized nature of our tasks makes it difficult to infer what choice would be socially desirable, which diminishes the types of experimenter demand effects that plague other research with elected representatives. Third, while diverging assessments of real-world policies might reflect heterogeneous beliefs about likely consequences just as much as differences in value judgments, we can cleanly control beliefs.[4] Hence, we can uniquely trace disagreements to underlying welfare judgments.

Our results provide guidance to research in economics that derives policy advice based on social welfare criteria. It is important to aligning the welfare criteria that underlies such research with those that policy makers support. Policy recommendations based on value judgments that decision makers reject will less likely be followed (Sapienza and Zingales, 2013).

Our results also inform the literature on *positive welfare economics* which empirically studies how individuals resolve normative questions (Konow, 2003; Almas et al., 2020; Cappelen et al., 2019; Andreoni et al., 2020; Ackfeld and Ockenfels, 2021; Bartling et al., 2021; Chen and Schøyen, 2022). That literature largely relies on laboratory and general population samples.[5] Our finding that politicians' welfare criteria largely align with those of the general public suggests that such alignment is plausible in other domains of positive welfare economics.[6]

Finally, this paper contributes to a literature that studies the preferences, traits, and biases of elected representatives (Fatas et al., 2007; Heß et al., 2013; Sheffer and Loewen, 2019; Linde and Vis, 2017; Sheffer et al., 2018; Hanania, 2017; Janezic and Gallego, 2020).[7] Despite a recent rise in survey and experimental work with political elites, behavioral experiments with real-world policy makers remain scarce (Kertzer and Renshon, 2022). Extant research has not measured the social welfare criteria of politicians. Our finding that the social welfare criteria of politicians and of the general public align closely, but that the general public believes in substantial differences resonates with a recent meta-analysis that finds that elite-public gaps in decision-making are often smaller than commonly believed (Kertzer, 2020).

The remainder of this paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 presents our experimental design. Section 3 provides institutional context and explains our samples and weighting strategies. Section 4 contains our

---

[4]This point is of particular concern when comparing politicians' inferred value judgments to those of the general public given that politicians are often demonstrably better informed than citizens (Lee et al., 2021).

[5]As an exception, Fisman et al. (2015) consider the distributional preferences of a likely future elite. A complementary literature shows that general population subjects' decisions in laboratory-type tasks predict real-world political choices (e.g. Fisman et al., 2017; Epper et al., 2020).

[6]More broadly, an emerging set of studies, scattered across fields, compares the decisions of laypeople with those of experts within the latter's field of expertise (see, e.g., Morgan et al. (2021) for medical doctors, Linnainmaa et al. (2021) for financial advisers, Schwitzgebel and Cushman (2012) for academic philosophers, or Rachlinski and Wistrich (2017) for judges). Like the present paper, this literature typically finds that the decisions of domain experts are affected by the same tendencies and biases as those of general population respondents.

[7]Other papers, for instance, study whether politicians know the preferences of their electorate (Broockman and Skovron, 2018), discard voter opinion selectively or discriminate against voters (e.g. Butler and Dynes, 2016; Butler and Broockman, 2011), represent their voters interests (e.g. Bailer et al., 2021), violate rational choice theory (Fatas et al., 2007) or are factually more knowledgeable (Lee, 2021). A recent meta–study of Kertzer (2020) shows that differences in political attitudes between politicians and the broader public may actually be overstated and that these differences may be rather due to demographic differences rather than genuine differences between these groups. A more distantly related literature, reviewed in Gulzar (2021), studies selection into political office depending on factors such as competence and socio-economic background (e.g. Dal Bó et al., 2017; Jokela et al., 2022), earning levels in politics (e.g. Fisman et al., 2015), institutional incentives (e.g. Galasso and Nannicini, 2017), outside options and intrinsic motivation (Besley, 2005) as well as social motivators (e.g. Gulzar and Khan, 2017).

main results about politicians' social welfare criteria. Section 5 compares them to the welfare criteria of the general public. Section 6 analyzes respondents' beliefs about the decisions that politicians and other general population respondents have made. Finally, Section 7 concludes.

2   Design

Our main experiment has two parts. They allow us to answer, respectively, how politicians aggregate preferences (conflicting preferences *across* individuals), and how politicians resolve the tradeoff between respecting individual liberty and ensuring that individuals obtain outcomes the politician regards as desirable (conflicting preferences *within* individuals, i.e. paternalism). A fraction of the general-population respondents complete two additional parts. We explain each part in turn.

2.1   Conflicting preferences *across* individuals

In this part of the experiment, the politician's task is to aggregate the preferences of five voting-age German citizens that we call stakeholders.

Stakeholders have preferences over three social alternatives, A, B, and C. The politician observes the preference profile of the five stakeholders over the three alternatives as in Panel A of Figure 1 and then chooses one of the social alternatives to be carried out.[8] Politicians make one such decision for each of six preference profiles. The politician knows that with a 10% chance one of these profiles represents the preferences of a real group of five stakeholders and that her decision on that profile will be carried out, but she does not know which profile that is. Consequently, as long as she is not entirely indifferent towards all stakeholders, she has an incentive to reveal her aggregation preferences truthfully for every preference profile she encounters.

Each social alternative is a non-divisible donation of €30 to one of three political foundations (*Hans Böckler Stiftung*, *Bund der Steuerzahler Deutschland*, and *Ludwig Erhard Stiftung*).[9] To ensure that politicians reveal their aggregation preferences rather than their political leanings, we anonymize the foundations, representing them with individually randomized letter labels A, B, and C.

In a preliminary online survey, stakeholders ranked the three foundations according to their preference. We incentivized stakeholders to answer truthfully. They knew that with a 1 in 40 chance, the ranking they provided would determine the recipient of the $30 (the first- and second-ranked foundations would receive it with a 2/3 and 1/3 chance, respectively). Stakeholders did not learn how the recipient of the $30 would be determined otherwise. Hence they could not strategically misrepresent their preferences. We enroll stakeholders solely to incentivize politicians who make aggregation choices.

---

[8]The figure displays preference profile 1 of Table 1.

[9]On their websites, the foundations describe themselves as follows. The *Hans Böckler* foundation deals with co-determination, research linked to the world of work and the support of students on behalf of the confederation of German trade unions. The *Bund der Steuerzahler Deutschland* is devoted to combat wasteful spending of tax-payer money and tax revenues, and advocates the rights of tax-payers. The *Ludwig Erhard* foundation aims to promote the principles of liberty in politics and economy, to foster freedom and responsibility, and to strengthen the development of the social-market economy.

After making these aggregation decisions, politicians indicate their beliefs about stakeholder's willingness to pay to trigger the donation to their first, second, and least preferred foundation. We ask politicians to enter a negative amount if they believe stakeholders would pay to prevent rather than trigger the donation.

Figure 1: Main decisions

A. Preference Aggregation (to resolve conflicting preferences *across* individuals)

	Best	Middle	Worst	Choice	Equally good
Foundation A	👤👤	👤	👤👤	⭘	☐
Foundation B	👤	👤👤👤👤		⭘	☐
Foundation C	👤👤		👤👤👤	⭘	☐

B. Choice set construction (to resolve conflicting preferences *within* individuals)

Options	Available		Unavailable	Advise against this option
	Please make ONE cross each row			
0 € immediately and **24 € in 6 months**	⭘	or	⭘	☐
3 € immediately and **15 € in 6 months**	⭘	or	⭘	☐
6 € immediately and **3 € in 6 months**	⭘	or	⭘	☐

Identification. Following Ambuehl and Bernheim (2021), we use a revealed preference approach to infer how politicians aggregate ordinal preferences. Specifically, we ask what theoretical ordinal preference aggregation function best matches the sequence of choices a politician makes across the six preference profiles. The literature emphasizes two classes of such aggregation functions, *scoring rules* and *Condorcet extensions* (see e.g. Gaertner, 2009).

Scoring rules assign values 1, s, and 0 to each stakeholder's most, middle, and least-preferred alternatives, respectively. They then select the alternative for which the sum of scores across the stakeholders is highest. The case $s = 1/2$ is the Borda rule, and the case $s = 0$ is the plurality rule (one person, one vote, and the alternative with the largest number of votes wins). Scoring rules encompass a judgment on how important it is that many stakeholders get their most-preferred rather than the second-most-preferred option relative to how many get their least-preferred rather than their second-least-preferred option. The Borda rule weighs both considerations equally. The plurality rule only places weight on the first consideration, and hence is *majoritarian*. Its polar opposite, the antiplurality-rule ($s = 1$) only places weight on the second consideration.[10] We interpret the parameter s as a preference for compromise—the higher s, the more willing is a politician to prevent a stakeholder from obtaining his least preferred alternative by

[10]The antiplurality rule can be implemented through negative voting: each stakeholder receives one vote he can use against his least preferred alternative. The alternative with the fewest votes against it wins.

selecting an alternative for which most other stakeholders only have a middling preference. Rules in the class of *Condorcet extensions* select the social alternative that wins a pairwise majority vote against every other alternative (the *Condorcet winner*) if such an alternative exists. They differ according to the selections they make when no Condorcet-winner exists.

We select our six preference profiles so we can identify the scoring parameter s for individuals whose choices are consistent with a scoring rule. In conjunction with the others, one profile helps separate the use of the Condorcet rule from scoring rules. Table 1 lists the preference profiles. Each profile is associated with a value $\bar{s}$ such that scoring rules with $s \leqslant \bar{s}$ select alternative A (the *majority winner*) and scoring rules with $s \geqslant \bar{s}$ select alternative B (the *compromise option*). Scoring rules never strictly prefer alternative C in any of the profiles, though C ties for majority with A in profile 1 and will be selected along with A if $s = 0$. In order to ensure that one of the six profiles corresponds to the real stakeholder preferences, we form groups of five stakeholders each such that each group matches one of the six preselected profiles. Appendix B presents details.

Table 1: Preference profiles.

Index	Preference profile					$\bar{s}$	$0 \leqslant s < \bar{s}$	$s = \bar{s}$	$\bar{s} < s \leqslant 1$	Condorcet
								Scoring rules		
1	B	C	C	A	A	1/3	A[a)]	{A,B}	B	B
	A	B	B	B	B					
	C	A	A	C	C					
2	B	B	A	A	A	1/3	A	{A,B}	B	A
	C	C	B	B	B					
	A	A	C	C	C					
3	A	A	A	B	B	1/2	A	{A,B}	B	A
	C	B	B	C	C					
	B	C	C	A	A					
4	C	C	A	A	A	3/5	A	{A,B}	B	A
	B	B	B	B	B					
	A	A	C	C	C					
5	C	A	A	A	B	2/3	A	{A,B}	B	A
	B	B	B	B	A					
	A	C	C	C	C					
6	C	A	A	A	A	4/5	A	{A,B}	B	A
	B	B	B	B	B					
	A	C	C	C	C					

[a)] If $s = 0$, then the set of selected options is $\{A, C\}$.

Notes: Each profile is displayed as a 3×5-matrix. Columns correspond to stakeholders, rows correspond to preference ranks. A stakeholder's first, second, and third-ranked alternative are listed in the first, second, and third rows, respectively.

Table 2: Menus from which respondents construct choice sets

	Menu 1A		Menu 1B	
	Early	Late	Early	Late
Most patient	0 €	16 €	0 €	24 €
Middle	2 €	10 €	3 €	15 €
Least patient	4 €	2 €	6 €	3 €

	Menu 2A		Menu 2B	
	Early	Late	Early	Late
Most patient	0 €	18 €	0 €	24 €
Middle	3 €	12 €	4 €	16 €
Least patient	6 €	3 €	8 €	4 €

2.2 Conflicting preferences *within* individuals

In this part of the experiment, politicians learn that they may be paired with a German voting-age citizen who will participate in a follow-up study and who will choose how to receive his study payment from a choice set. We refer to that citizen as *Chooser*. The politician's task is to construct the choice set that will be available to the citizen from a menu, using a decision screen as in Panel B of Figure 1. The sole restriction is that at least one alternative must be available. Each option in that menu is a pair of payments, one received half a year before the other. In each menu, impatience is costly: the citizen can only increase his early payment by reducing his overall payment. In a follow-up session, the citizen selects one of the options the politician made available, without learning how the choice set was determined.

To measure implicit support for the long-run criterion, politicians construct choice sets from two different menus. In one of them, the citizen receives the early payment immediately, and the late payment with a half-year delay. In the other, the early payment is paid one month after the citizen's participation, and the late payment is paid 7 months after. In addition to this variation in the availability of immediate payments, we vary the menus within individual to prevent artificially consistent choices. Table 2 displays the menus from which politicians construct choice sets. Politicians are assigned to construct choice sets either from menus 1A and 1B or from menus 2A and 2B. The menus in a pair are rescalings of each other. The amounts in 1A are $\frac{2}{3}$ of the amounts in 1B, and the amounts in menu 2A are $\frac{3}{4}$ the amounts of menu 1B.

After constructing choice sets, politicians report their beliefs about the choices previous citizens made from each of two unrestricted choice sets. For each of the three options in each of two menus, they predict how many out of ten randomly chosen people chose that option. These beliefs allow us to measure the probability with which politicians believe they impose binding restrictions by excluding options from choice sets.

2.3 Delegation

Respondents from the general public make the same decisions as politicians. Some of them additionally decide to which of three groups of individuals to delegate their preference aggregation and choice set construction decisions, after making these choices themselves. They make two such delegation decisions, either in the context of aggregation decisions or in the context of choice set construction, depending on the survey version. Respondents can delegate the decision to either of three groups: (i) federal and state legislators, (ii) the general public, and (iii) a sample of the general public selected to match the demographic characteristics of federal and state legislators.[11] We inform respondents that the members of these groups have previously participated in the same survey and that they have made their decisions already. Respondents further learn that we have randomly chosen one member of each group and that the decision of this selected member is implemented if the respondent decides to delegate to the corresponding group.

2.4 Beliefs about other participants' aggregation and intervention decisions

From a part of the general population respondents, we elicit beliefs about how politicians, other members of the general public, and a sample of the general public that matches the politicians' demographic characteristics decided when aggregating preferences. They indicate, for each respondent group, how many out of 10 respondents from that group chose option A, B, and C when aggregating the preferences in profile 2 of Table 1. We elicit the same beliefs corresponding to preference profile 5. Other respondents from the general public report beliefs about what choice sets each of the three respondent groups constructed. They indicate how many out of 10 respondents decided for each of the following choice sets: $\{A\}, \{A, B\}, \{A, B, C\}$, and 'other.' They provide one set of such beliefs for each of the two menus from which they have previously constructed choice sets themselves.

2.5 Additional elicitations

We complement politicians' responses with background information using publicly available data. Since such data is not available for general population respondents, we survey relevant background characteristics for the general public. Respondents from the general public report their gender, year of birth, German citizenship status, federal state of residence, highest educational attainment, marital status, monthly household income, and own monthly net income. They further indicate which political party they most identify with, whether they are a member of a political party, the extent to which they are politically active, and their own political attitude on a left / right scale.

In addition, both politicians and respondents from the general public answer the three questions about risk, time, and social preferences from Falk et al. (2018), and they indicate their support for additional compulsory retirement savings. For politicians, we interpret these responses with caution, since they may wish to signal certain personality types they believe are generally perceived as attractive (altruistic, patient,

---

[11]In case of group (iii), we inform respondents about the average demographic characteristics (gender, age, university education and marital status) of the general population subjects to whom a delegation is possible.

not timid).[12] We do not have such concerns regarding our main elicitations of preference aggregation and choice set construction, since there are no choices in these domains that are obviously more socially desirable than others.

2.6 Implementation

Survey versions. We run four versions of the survey, summarized in Table 3.[13] The first two versions (*Politicians 1* and *Public 1*) include the preference aggregation and intervention parts (Subsections 2.1 and 2.2) as well as the questions listed in Subsection 2.5. All politicians complete this version, as does a sample of the general public that matches the universe of federal and state legislators on observables (details below). These two versions differ only in that general population respondents answer additional demographic and attitudinal questions. We administer the remaining two versions to the general public. Version *Public 2* only contains decisions and questions regarding preference aggregation. Version *Public 3* only includes decisions and questions regarding interventions. Both of these versions include the delegation stage (Subsection 2.3) and the prediction stage (Subsection 2.4) for the corresponding domain (aggregation or intervention). They also include the questions of Subsection 2.5.

Within each survey version, we randomize the order of decisions and the parameters displayed. We use block-randomization to limit the number of non-identical surveys. This limit arises from the fact that politicians receive a paper version of the survey, sent through postal mail (along with a link through which they can participate online). Each respondent who makes aggregation decisions is randomly assigned to one of the following four orders in which the preference profiles are presented: $(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)$, $(6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1)$, $(1, 6, 2, 5, 3, 4)$, $(4, 3, 5, 2, 6, 1)$. Independently, the display of preference profiles randomizes the table rows that correspond to the social alternatives into one of the following orders: (A, B, C), (C, B, A), (B, A, C), (C, A, B). Each respondent who constructs choice sets does so by selecting options either from menus 1A and 1B or from menus 2A and 2B. The respondent reveals beliefs about Choosers's unrestricted choices regarding the corresponding left-out menus. We include immediate payments either menus 1A and 2A, or in menus 1B and 2B. Finally, a respondent either first sees the menus with immediate payouts, both in the decision and belief elicitation stage, or she first sees the menus without immediate payouts in each of these stages.

Overall, there are thus 16 variations of the preference aggregation part and 8 versions of the intervention part. In order to limit the total number of survey variations to 16, we deterministically pair each variation in the aggregation part with a variation in the intervention part. See Appendix Table A.1 for details.

The versions for general population respondents include comprehension tests.[14] The comprehension test on aggregation decisions serves to ensure that respondents understand the display of the preference profile. They view a preference profile and indicate (i) how many stakeholders rank alternative A in

---

[12] We defer the analysis of these responses to Appendix Sections E.3 and E.4.

[13] See Appendix G for English translations of each survey version. The surveys were custom-coded by the ZEW — Leibniz Centre for European Economic Research.

[14] We did not include such tests for politicians both to keep the survey brief, and to avoid the risk of appearing patronizing.

the middle, and (ii) which alternative is preferred most by three people. The comprehension test on interventions serves to ensure that respondents understand the menu of options from which they construct choice sets. For a given menu in which the least patient option is marked as unavailable, subjects indicate (i) the maximal amount that the Chooser can obtain immediately from that choice set, and (ii) the amount of money the Chooser receives with a six months delay if he chooses to receive €3 immediately. The comprehension checks precede decision making for each domain. Subjects who make decisions only in one domain (*Public 2* and *Public 3*) only complete one of these checks. Subjects have three attempts to answer correctly, otherwise the survey terminates. We provide an email address to which subjects can send questions if they feel they have understood the instructions but still cannot continue.

Incentives. All politicians and general population respondents learn that a random 10% of them are paired with either a group of five real stakeholders or with a real voting-age German citizen choosing from a choice set they construct, and that one decision from the study affecting these subjects will be selected at random and carried out. Because respondents do not know whether they are among these 10%, and because they do not know which decision will be carried out, they have an incentive to reveal their preferences truthfully, as long as they are not completely indifferent towards all other study participants (see Appendix B for the implementation of these decisions). While decisions affecting others have real consequences, they do not affect the respondent's own study payout.

All respondents indicate beliefs about stakeholders. We refrain from incentivizing these elicitations for politicians because sending money to elected representatives would raise bribery concerns. To permit a clean comparison to the general public, we also refrain from incentivizing the corresponding questions for the latter respondents. We do, however, incentivize the elicitation of beliefs about participants' aggregation and intervention decisions. In each of these prediction problems, the respondent assigns ten identical hypothetical individuals to three or four categories to predict the probability distribution across these categories. If the respondent's prediction matches the true distribution, she receives €5 in the form of our survey provider's panel currency. Otherwise, the respondent loses €0.50 for each of the hypothetical individuals we need to assign to a different category until the elicited and observed distributions coincide. We pay these incentives for a random 10% of respondents, for one randomly selected prediction problem. Respondents are aware of this scheme.

3 Samples and context

Our study enrolls German politicians and the German general public. Germany is a federation with 16 constituent states that each have their own state parliament and legislature. The federation and all states are multiparty representative democracies. The federal level features a bicameral system. The 736 members of the federal parliament (*Bundestag*) represent (approximately proportionally) the votes of the German population. The *Bundesrat* consists of 69 seats, three to six for each federal states. The Bundestag is roughly comparable to the US House of Representatives whereas the Bundesrat is roughly comparable to the US Senate. Since 2017, the Bundestag has consisted of members of six major parties,

Table 3: Survey versions

Version	Politicians	Public 1	Public 2	Public 3
Participants				
Politicians	✓			
General population		✓	✓	✓
Main decisions				
Preference aggregation	✓	✓	✓	
Choice set construction	✓	✓		✓
Beliefs about other participants				
Preference aggregation			✓	
Choice set construction				✓
Delegation				
Preference aggregation			✓	
Choice set construction				✓

Notes: Main decisions also include the elicitation of beliefs about stakeholders' willingness to pay to trigger or prevent the donation and about the choices unrestricted Choosers would have made.

along with a handful of organizations with a single representative each, as well as a small number of representatives without party affiliation.[15] Each of the 16 federal states has a single-chamber system with a parliament (*Landtage*) whose members are full-time politicians. The six major parties of the Bundestag are also the dominant parties in the state parliaments. The federal states have far-reaching political power and autonomy in many important policy fields. For example, they have full legislative autonomy in the fields of education, culture, police system, penal system, social housing and regulative law, and they independently govern taxes on the transfer of land and real estate. An additional source of political power is through the representation of the federal states' governments in the Bundesrat, which needs to approve many federal-level legislative proposals and which can veto any proposed changes to the federal constitution.[16]

Politician sample. We fielded the politician survey between late May and mid September 2021. We invited politicians through the ZEW Mannheim (Leibniz Centre for European Economic Research) which had conducted surveys with politicians for many years on a regular basis (e.g. Heinemann et al., 2016). Politicians thus recognized and trusted the organization and its surveys. We invited all 709 members of parliament (MPs) in the federal parliament (Bundestag) and all 1879 MPs in each of the 16 state parliaments both by email and by postal mail and asked politicians to respond personally. Politicians could answer the online survey on a mobile or desktop device. Alternatively, they could submit their responses to the printed version through postal mail, fax, or email. The invitation letter and emails promised strict confidentiality, as did the survey itself. In order to increase response rates, we repeatedly contacted MPs both by email and by phone if they had neither participated nor explicitly declined to so. We did not re-

---

[15]These six parties are the centre-right conservative union of Christ-Democrats and their Bavarian sister party, the Christ-Social Union, which we treat together as CDU/CSU, the centre-left Socio-Democrats (SPD), the Greens (Grüne), the center-right Liberals (FDP), the left-wing party Die Linke as well as the right-wing party Alternative für Deutschland (AFD).

[16]A very brief overview of the German political system is, for example, provided online HERE.

Table 4: Politician responses

	Answers	Total	Share
Party			
AFD	56	336	16.67%
CDU /CSU	117	815	14.36%
FDP	47	196	23.98%
Gruene	67	346	19.36%
SPD	82	619	13.25%
Linke	43	214	20.09%
Fraktionslos	11	62	17.74%
Total	423	2588	16.34%

Notes: A legislator is *fraktionslos* if they are not associated with a government party. Appendix C.2 splits this table by parliament type.

quire politicians to answer every question, but the online interface displayed a message in case of skipped questions or invalid answers.

We obtained responses from 423 legislators of whom 342 are members of state parliaments and 81 are members of the federal parliament.[17] These numbers correspond to a response rate of 16.3% across parliaments. Table 4 displays the party composition of our sample and compares it to the composition of the parliaments. We obtained good coverage across the political spectrum; for each of the six government parties, we have responses from at least 43 representatives. Response rates vary from 13.25% to 23.98% across the political parties. The differences in response rates do not obviously relate to party position. Detailed non-response analysis shows that participation rates are higher among those over 60 years of age, those who were elected directly rather than through party lists, those who have completed tertiary education, those in state parliaments rather than the federal parliament, and those with fewer years of experience in the federal parliament or in a state parliament. Appendix C.2 presents details.

General population surveys. The commercial provider Norstat fielded our survey with the voting-age German general public between May and September 2021. This period coincides with our fielding of the politicians' survey. All respondents completed the survey online. For all survey versions we defined quotas and tracked respondent characteristics during sample collection. In response, Norstat adjusted the targeting of invitation emails to meet the quotas. For survey *Public 1*, we recruited 619 individuals with demographic characteristics that match those of the universe of federal and state politicians as follows. We required a high net household income (€4000 or more per month[18]) and a tertiary degree. We further matched the sample to politicians on age, gender, political attitude (left or right, self-stated in the case of the general public), and all interactions between these variables. For surveys *Public 2* and *Public 3* we recruited 735 and 548 respondents, respectively. We sought representativeness to the German general pop-

---

[17]Response modes are the following: 56 postal mail, 354 online on a desktop device, and 13 online on a mobile device. The median response time among politicians responding online for the total survey is just under 12 minutes (707 seconds). Their response time for the six aggregation decisions is 103, 153, and 271 seconds at the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentile. The corresponding response times for the two intervention decisions are 40, 61, and 87 seconds, respectively.

[18]The mean household net income in Germany was €3612 per month in 2020 (Federal Statistical Office, 2021).

ulation along the attributes age, gender, political attitudes (left or right), all interactions of the foregoing three attributes, state of residence, education level, and net household income. For each survey version, we ensured that each federal state is represented proportionally. Appendix C.1 presents summary statistics.[19]

Survey weighting.   In order to obtain estimates that are representative of our baseline populations along observables, we will use weighted regression throughout. To determine the population distribution among politicians, we hand-collected all state and federal legislators' age (categories 18 to 40, 40 to 59, 60 or over), gender, education level (no college, college, doctorate), and political party affiliation. We weight our politician sample on all these attributes both in levels and in interactions.[20] We weight our general population sample along the same dimensions, both in levels and in interactions. We obtain the baseline distribution from the 2018 wave of the German Socioeconomic Panel (SOEP, Goebel et al., 2019) which includes the party the respondent reports to have voted for in the 2017 federal election. Appendix C.1 displays summary statistics.

4   Politicians' social welfare criteria

We begin by examining how politicians resolve preference conflicts across individuals (Subsection 4.1). Subsection 4.2 considers politicians' intervention choices (preference conflicts within individuals). We compare politicians' decisions to those of the general public in Section 5. Section 6 then studies the alignment between respondents' beliefs about politicians and their actual choices.

4.1   Aggregation: Preference conflicts across individuals

How do politicians aggregate ordinal preferences when acting as an impartial social planner? What do they genuinely consider good for a heterogeneous group of stakeholders when no strategic or reputational concerns shade decisions?

We study these questions by first examining whether politicians follow the majority preference and select alternative A, or whether they choose the compromise option B and thus defy the majority preference. Figure 2 shows the distribution of politicians' choices across all preference profiles, using data from the 407 politicians who made a choice on each of the six profiles. In profile 1, nearly 80% of politicians favor the compromise option B over the tied majority winners A and C. In profile 2, where three stakeholders rank alternative A first, around three quarters of politicians opt for the compromise option B. Even on profile 6, in which four out of five stakeholders most-prefer the majority winner A, a quarter of politicians still opt for the compromise option. Overall, politicians place more weight on preventing stakeholders from having to live with a last-ranked option than on making sure stakeholders receive their first-ranked option. There is substantial support for compromise.

---

[19]Response times amongst general population respondents for the aggregation decisions are 80, 115, and 170 seconds at the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentile, respectively. The corresponding response times for the intervention decisions are 56, 86, and 135 seconds, respectively.

[20]To ensure sufficient bin size for all interactions, we combine the SPD and Left parties into a single category.

The Condorcet rule selects the majority winner throughout. This is inconsistent with a preference for preventing stakeholders from having to live with their last-ranked option. In fact, for profile 2, where A is the Condorcet winner, only one in five politicians select that option (and a part of that fraction might represent plurality rather than Condorcet decision making).[21] We conclude that politicians strongly favor scoring rules over Condorcet extensions.

Figure 2 also shows that politicians respond sensitively to the rank distributions of the three alternatives. As we consider preference profiles with higher indexes, the rank-distribution of the majority-preferred alternative improves, and the rank-distribution of the compromise option worsens. Politicians respond to this variation by selecting the majority winner A more frequently, at the expense of the compromise option B. This pattern is what one would expect if politicians choose consistently with scoring rules but are heterogeneous in their preference for compromise (the scoring parameter s). Appendix D.1 corroborates this analysis by assigning each politician to one of 22 theoretical aggregation rules that best describes her behavior. In that analysis 73% of politicians are assigned to a scoring rule, and of these, 82% place more weight on preventing last-ranked choices than on realizing first-ranked choices (scoring parameter $s > 0.5$).

The way in which politicians resolve interpersonal preference conflicts might depend on their position on the political spectrum—some politicians might be more centrist precisely because they have a stronger preference for compromise than members of more extreme parties. To test this hypothesis, we assign each politician the scoring parameter that best describes her sequence of choices, using the procedure of Ambuehl and Bernheim (2021).[22] We allow for the possibility that a politician may aim to harm rather than help the group of stakeholders assigned to her. For politicians classified as benevolent, we relate the estimated scoring parameter to the position of her party on the left/right spectrum as measured on a 1 to 10 scale by Bakker et al. (2020).[23]

Our procedure classifies 360 of our 407 respondents as benevolent. Of these, 11 are not affiliated with a party. For the remaining 349 politicians, Panel B of Figure 2 plots the relation between her preference for compromise (measured by the best-fitting scoring parameter) and the position of her party.[24] The figure

---

[21]In profiles 2 to 6, the Condorcet winner coincides with the plurality winner and can be determined easily. In profile 1, the Condorcet winner can be determined as follows. Three people rank C last, so B wins a pairwise majority vote against C. Hence, if there is a Condorcet winner, it must be B. B also wins a pairwise majority vote against A. The reason is that any stakeholder who ranks A last must rank it below B. But the one stakeholder who ranks A second must also rank it below B, because no stakeholder ranks B last. Hence, B wins a pairwise majority vote against both A and C, making it the Condorcet winner.

[22]Specifically, we use a Bayesian classifier. That classifier addresses the issue that less resolute rules (rules that create more ties) can mechanically better match any given choice sequence; it appropriately penalizes such rules. It rests on four assumptions. First, the prior probability over rules is uniform. Second, for each of the six profiles, the respondent follows her assigned rule with probability $1 - \epsilon$. She uniformly randomizes across all options with probability ϵ. Third, decision errors are independent across outcomes. Fourth, when a rule creates ties, the respondent uniformly randomizes over the prescribed choices. The classifier calculates the posterior probability for each rule and a noise parameter ϵ conditional on the respondent's choice sequence. It assigns each respondent the rule and noise parameter for which this posterior is highest. The procedure is robust to any variation in choice of prior that does not alter the mode of the posterior distribution.

[23]The party alliance of the CDU and the CSU acts as a union. We elicited membership and party preference for the union, but not separately for the constituent parties. Bakker et al. (2020) list the left / right position separately for the member parties. We average these positions to the position of the alliance as follows. The CSU represents the union in the state of Bavaria whereas the CDU represents the union in all states outside of Bavaria. Hence, we calculate the position of the union on the political spectrum as the weighted average of the CSU and the CDU's position, with the weight of the CSU equal to the relative population share of Bavaria compared to the German population. The population of Bavaria is 13.08 million compares to a total German population of 83.02 million, which yields a weight 0.1576 for the CSU.

[24]In our experiment, scoring parameters are interval-identified. We use midpoints for analysis.

Figure 2: Politicians' preference aggregation choices

A. Distribution of politicians' choices

B. Preference for compromise, by political party

Notes: Panel A: Distribution of preference aggregation decisions. Profiles are numbered as in Table 1. In each profile, politicians using a scoring rule with $s < \bar{s}$ will choose option A, and politicians with $s > \bar{s}$ will choose option B (except that rule $s = 0$ generates a tie between A and C on profile 1). The threshold value $\bar{s}$ increases from left to right and is given by $1/3, 1/3, 1/2, 3/5, 2/3$, and $4/5$, respectively. Panel B: Best-fitting scoring parameters, by party position. Whiskers denote 95% confidence intervals, with standard errors clustered by subject. Position on political spectrum from Bakker et al. (2020).

Table 5: Rank distributions of stakeholder preferences over the foundations

Charity	Ranked 1st	Ranked 2nd	Ranked 3rd
Ludwig Erhard Stiftung	0.27	0.32	0.40
Hans Böckler Stiftung	0.27	0.39	0.33
Bund der Steuerzahler	0.45	0.28	0.26

Notes: Numbers show the fraction of subjects in the stakeholder sample that place a given foundation in the indicated rank position.

shows that politicians affiliated with more centrist parties have a stronger preference for compromise than those affiliated with more extreme parties. Nonetheless, for each party, the mean best-fitting scoring parameter is higher or statistically indistinguishable from $\frac{1}{2}$ (the Borda rule). The members of each party place at least as much weight on preventing last-ranked outcomes as on realizing first-ranked outcomes, on average. Members of centrist parties place significantly more weight on the latter motive.

The relation between aggregation preferences and party affiliation raises the question of whether politicians may have tried to use the preference profiles we presented to infer the identity of the foundations. If so, our results might reflect their preferences over the specific foundations rather than their social welfare criteria. This interpretation is implausible because such inference would be extremely weak, for three reasons. First, politicians know that five of the six preference profiles they see are hypothetical, and they do not know which profile is real. This factor greatly dilutes inference.[25] Second, each politician observes the preference rankings of only five stakeholders. Such a small sample leads to highly uncertain inference. Third, real stakeholder preferences are diverse. Table 5 displays the rank distribution of each foundation. These distributions are close to uniform, except that the Ludwig Erhard Stiftung is ranked last slightly more often than one-third, and the Bund der Steuerzahler is ranked first slightly more often.Because these distributions are close to uniform, ordinal preferences provide little information about the identity of the foundations.

To document our results more formally, we regress politicians' scoring parameters on the political position of their party and on its square. Column 1 in Table 6 shows the result. The negative coefficient on the square term is highly statistically significant. It highlights the concave relationship between party position and preference for compromise. Column 2 adds demographic control variables (age, gender, education), an indicator for whether the respondent is a federal or state politician, and fixed effects for each state parliament. It also controls for the respondent's political experience in state and federal parliaments in years. These controls slightly decrease the estimated parameter values, causing the coefficient on the square of the political position to become statistically insignificant (p = 0.106). We highlight the Null effect of political experience. It suggests that politician's aggregation preferences do not change as a function of the duration a politician has spent in parliament (or they change in a way that is exactly offset by selection out of parliament). All other control variables are far from statistically significant, too.[26]

---

[25]Because we needed to make the survey available in pen-and-paper format, all six preference profiles were pre-determined. To implement respondents' decisions, we matched stakeholder preferences to one of the six profiles ex-post. Therefore, unbeknownst to respondents, no inference can in fact be drawn from the six preference profiles.

[26]We have also collected politicians' self-reported time, risk, and social preferences. These are not associated with aggregation preferences, possibly due to social desirability bias in politicians' responses; see Appendix E.3.

Table 6: Politicians' aggregation preferences

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Preference for compromise (scoring parameter s scaled from 0 to 100)		Assigned to benevolent rule	
Political party position				
Linear	1.800***	1.390**	-0.014	-0.013
	(0.609)	(0.556)	(0.009)	(0.010)
Square	-0.590**	-0.412	-0.002	-0.002
	(0.239)	(0.254)	(0.004)	(0.003)
Federal parliamentarian		3.863		0.002
		(14.174)		(0.072)
Political experience (years)		0.257		0.002
		(0.230)		(0.004)
Female		1.058		0.020
		(2.797)		(0.039)
Age		0.202		-0.001
		(0.131)		(0.002)
Observations	350	350	396	396

Notes: Columns 1 and 2 only use politicians assigned to a benevolent rule. Regressions do not include respondents not associated with a government party ("fraktionslos"). Political experience measures total years of experience in federal and state parliaments. Columns 2 and 4 include fixed effects for the 16 state parliaments. Party position represents overall ideological stance on the left / right spectrum from Bakker et al. (2020), measured on a scale from 1 to 10, de-meaned. $^{*}p < 0.1,^{**} p < 0.05,^{***} p < 0.01$.

Columns 3 and 4 show that our results are not an artifact of focusing on respondents classified as benevolent. We regress an indicator for whether a politician is assigned to a benevolent rule on the same predictor variables as in columns 1 and 2, respectively. All coefficient estimates are close to zero and statistically insignificant.[27]

Table 7: Beliefs about willingness to pay and implied utilitarian choice

	(1) WTP in €		(2) Implied utilitarian choice	(3) Actual choice
Preference rank		Choice Option		
Best	17.849	A (majority winner)	0.637	0.407
	(1.141)		(0.022)	(0.028)
Middle	6.362	B (compromise option)	0.301	0.562
	(0.723)		(0.021)	(0.028)
Worst	-0.711	C	0.062	0.031
	(0.862)		(0.012)	(0.008)

Notes: WTP is the believed amount in € a politician believes a stakeholder would be willing to pay to trigger or prevent (negative WTP) a donation to the foundation in his first, second, and third preference rank, respectively. Implied utilitarian choice is the choice a politician would make if she selected alternatives by maximizing the sum of believed WTP. Actual choice is the actual choice the politician made. Standard errors in parentheses, clustered by subject. Table based on data from politicians who provided WTP beliefs about each preference rank.

Our data also let us interpret politicians choices in the framework of cardinal welfare maximization. 238 politicians provided complete beliefs about stakeholder's willingness to pay (WTP) to trigger the donation of €30 to their first, second, and last-ranked foundation, or to prevent it (indicated by negative numbers). If politicians chose social alternatives by maximizing the sum of these willingnesses-to-pay, what choice distribution would we observe? Column 1 of Table 7 lists mean WTP beliefs by preference rank.[28] The difference in WTP between obtaining one's first-ranked rather than second-ranked alternative is more than one-and-a-half times as high as that between obtaining one's second-ranked rather than third-ranked alternative. Accordingly, if politicians aggregated preferences according to a utilitarian welfare function, they would frequently prefer the majority option over the compromise option. As column 2 shows, utilitarian maximization selects options A, B, and C in 64%, 30%, and 6% of the cases, respectively. These values differ substantially from the actual choice frequencies for this subsample, listed in column 3. The majority-preferred option A is chosen 23 %-points less often than predicted by the utilitarian benchmark, whereas the compromise option B is chosen 26%-points more often. Hence, on the assumption that politicians aggregate preferences based on their beliefs about cardinal utilities, they place substantially more weight on equity than utilitarians.[29]

---

[27]Moreover, Appendix D.2 shows that we obtain similar, though less pronounced results if we assign every politician to their best-fitting benevolent scoring rule.

[28]Believed WTP ranges between −€30 and €30.

[29]Appendix section D.4 estimates the parameter of a constant-elasticity cardinal welfare function in which cardinal utility u enters welfare through the concave transformation $f(u) = \frac{1}{\alpha}u^{\alpha}$. We obtain a parameter estimate of 0.74. Due to the limited sample size and possibly noisy elicited beliefs, the estimate is imprecise, with a standard error of 0.34.

Overall, this analysis shows that politicians' social welfare criteria in the domain of preference aggregation substantially deviate from those commonly employed in economics research. They demonstrate a strong preference for compromise, especially among members of moderate parties. They place significantly more weight on stakeholders who end up with their least-preferred alternative than the utilitarian or Condorcet-type aggregation often employed in economics.

4.2 Intervention: Preference conflicts within individuals

We now turn to politicians' intervention decisions. How do politicians trade off the objective of making sure citizens make choices they consider good on the one hand, and the objective to respect others' autonomy on the other hand? A subset of politicians provided valid responses in this second part of our survey (191 and 193 for the case without and with front-end delay, respectively, with 185 politicians providing valid responses in both cases).[30] We account for this smaller sample size by recalculating our regression weights.

Politicians' resolution of the tradeoff becomes apparent in Panel A of Figure 3. Two features stand out. First, politicians intervene frequently. They exclude the least patient option from the choice set over half the time. Second, politicians intervene to impose patient choice. The choice sets they construct exclude less patient options much more often than more patient options. Most politicians' decision whether to intervene is consistent across the two rounds. Only 6.1% of our respondents intervene in only one of the two rounds, whereas 61.2% intervene in both decisions, and 32.7% in neither.

Are politicians' decisions consistent with the long-run criterion, according to which citizens' intertemporal choices should be respected unless the lure of immediacy might bias them? The answer is No, for two reasons. First, as the figure shows, politicians do not remove alternatives substantially more often when immediate payments are available than when all payments are delayed. The lure of immediacy plays practically no role in politician's intervention decisions. Second, politicians' choices are inconsistent with the view that citizens' intertemporal choices should be respected if potential bias caused by the availability of immediate payments is not an option. Even when all payments are delayed by at least one month, politicians still exclude the least patient alternative more than half the time.[31]

Politicians do not simply remove options they believe no citizen would have chosen. Rather, their decisions reflect a genuine tradeoff between respecting citizen autonomy and enforcing patient decisions. Recall that each politician indicated the probability with which she believes an unrestricted citizen would have chosen a given option, for each option in the menu. This data shows that politicians assign 22.4% probability mass to options they excluded. Hence, politicians who remove options believe their decisions will change the choice of nearly one quarter of citizens.[32]

---

[30]Six observations from five politicians who answered the pen-and-paper version of the survey are invalid because the choice sets they constructed in these cases are empty.

[31]The availability of immediate payments neither affects politicians' beliefs about unrestricted citizens' choices, nor does it affect the actual choices of these subjects (see Appendix B.2). Even so, politicians violate the long-run criterion by intervening when no immediate rewards are available.

[32]As described in Section 3, to prevent artificially consistent choices, we elicit beliefs about slightly different menus than those from which the respondent has previously constructed choice sets. Strictly speaking, beliefs and intervention choices are thus not directly comparable. We estimate a model of how beliefs respond to the six specific payment amounts that characterize a menu. We estimate a two-equation system that expresses the elicited beliefs that an unrestricted citizen would choose options A and B, respectively, on

Figure 3: Politicians' intervention decisions

A. Interventions by front-end delay

B. Interventions by political party

Notes: Panel A displays the fraction of cases for which politicians exclude options from the choice set they construct, categorized by relative patience. The solid (dashed) line corresponds to choice sets constructed from menus that include (exclude) immediate rewards. Panel B displays the average number of excluded options by party position, measured as ideological stance on the left / right spectrum by Bakker et al. (2020). Whiskers denote 95% confidence intervals, standard errors clustered by subject.

Next, we study whether politicians' interventions depend on their position on the political spectrum. On the one hand, politicians near the center of the political spectrum might more often respect citizen autonomy because they tend to display a greater preference for compromise (and thus respect for minority preferences) than those at the extremes, as Section 4.1 shows. This hypothesis predicts an inverted U-shape between interventions and political spectrum. On the other hand, politicians of parties more supportive of traditional values and norms (which typically view patience as a virtue) might be more willing to intervene to enforce compliance with these norms. If so, we should observe more interventions on the political right.

As Panel B of Figure 3, politicians towards the right (but not the left) of the spectrum tend to exclude a larger number of options from the choice sets they construct, consistent with the second hypothesis above. To document this effect econometrically, Column 1 of Table 8 regresses the number of excluded options on party position measured on a scale from 1 to 10 by Bakker et al. (2020). We find that a politician on the very right of the political spectrum excludes an additional 0.53 alternatives per menu than a politician on the very left (p < 0.1). This effect increases to 0.79 and becomes statistically significant at p < 0.01 as we include demographic control variables (age, gender, education, state), an indicator for whether the respondent is a federal or state politician, and the respondent's political experience in state and federal parliaments in years. As in the case of preference aggregation, we find no effect of political experience or of being a federal parliamentarian. There are substantial effect of age and gender, however, as column 2 shows. Female politicians remove 0.26 additional options (p < 0.05), and each additional year of age is associated with excluding an additional 0.02 options (p < 0.01).

Are politicians further to the right knowingly more restrictive? An alternative hypothesis is that these politicians simply remove of options they believe nobody would choose, but greater apparent restrictiveness arises from the possibility that they have different beliefs about the choices unrestricted citizens would make. To distinguish between these mechanisms, we calculate the probability with which a politician beliefs her intervention changes the citizen's choice. As column 3 shows, this *believed restrictiveness* increases with political party position. While the corresponding estimate is not statistically significant, it increases in magnitude and becomes significant at p < 0.05 once we control for demographic and political background variables (column 4). A politician on the very right believes it is 18 percentage points more likely that her intervention forces a citizen to change his choice than a politician on the very left believes about her respective intervention. Hence, politicians further to the right intervene more than politicians on the left, and they do so knowing that they will change the choice of a larger number of citizens.[33] The tendency of female and older politicians to exclude more options, however, does not appear to reflect a desire to change the Chooser's choice more often. Older and female politicians simply believe that citizens are more patient than younger and male politicians believe, so that they do not realize that their interventions, though in fact more restrictive, are binding with a higher probability.

all payment amounts and on the relative prices of gaining one additional present Euro in terms of future Euro from selection option A rather than B, as well as the respondent's intervention choices. We obtain estimates of the beliefs about unrestricted citizens that are corrected for the difference in payment amounts as the predicted values of this regression. This correction raises the believed effectiveness of the chosen interventions from 22.4% to 23.1%.

[33] This result would obtain mechanically if beliefs-data were pure noise. Contrary to this interpretation, our beliefs data are highly predictive, as Appendix E.1 shows.

Table 8: Politicians' intervention decisions

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Number of options removed		Believed restrictiveness	
Mean of the dependent variable	0.837	0.837	0.150	0.150
	0.080	0.080	0.017	0.017
Political party position	0.053*	0.077**	0.012	0.018**
	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.007)	(0.008)
Federal parliamentarian		-0.026		0.038
		(0.467)		(0.077)
Political experience (years)		-0.013		-0.001
		(0.009)		(0.002)
Female		0.262**		0.042
		(0.122)		(0.030)
Age		0.017***		-0.001
		(0.006)		(0.001)
Front-end delay	-0.025	-0.043	-0.006	-0.010
	(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.012)	(0.013)
Fixed effects				
Education		✓		✓
State of parliament		✓		✓
Subjects	195	195	180	180
Observations	369	369	339	339

Notes: Weighted regressions. Regressions do not include respondents not associated with a government party ("fraktionslos"). Political experience measures total years of experience in federal and state parliaments. Columns 2 and 4 include fixed effects for the 16 state parliaments. Columns 3 and 4 include a smaller number of observations due to non-responses on beliefs. Party position represents overall ideological stance on the left / right spectrum from Bakker et al. (2020), measured on a scale from 1 to 10, de-meaned. Standard errors in parentheses, clustered by subject. $^*p < 0.1,^{**} p < 0.05,^{***} p < 0.01$.

Overall, these results show that many politicians across the spectrum—but especially on the right—readily intervene to enforce choices they regard as good, even if that comes at a cost in terms of citizen autonomy. Yet, their decisions show no sign of support for the long-run criterion that is frequently used in economics research.

# 5   Welfare criteria of the general public

Representative democracy is based on the idea that politicians' value judgments represent those of the general public. Moreover, much research in positive welfare economics studies normative views of the general public (Almas et al., 2020; Bartling et al., 2021; Ambuehl et al., 2021; Ambuehl and Bernheim, 2021), even though actual policy making largely falls to elected representatives, which raises a question of external validity. Therefore, we now examine the extent of alignment between politicians' social welfare criteria and those of the general public. Throughout, we pool the data in survey versions *Public 2* and *Public 3* with the corresponding parts of version *Public 1*.

5.1 Aggregation: Preference conflicts across individuals

The distribution of aggregation choices among the general public is strikingly similar to that of politicians, as Panel A of Figure 4 shows. Averaged across preference profiles, the general public selects alternatives A, B, and C in 42.7%, 53.1%, and 4.2% of cases, compared to politicians' 40.8%, 54.8%, and 4.4%. Statistically, there are no significant differences between these distributions, and none emerge for separate comparisons for each preference profile. As a group, when deciding as an impartial social planner, politicians resolve preference conflicts across individuals in the same way as the general public.

We also do not find a difference in the distribution of best-fitting choice rules between politicians and the general public, as Appendix D.1 shows. Moreover, the distribution of best-fitting rules in our samples is highly similar to the distribution that Ambuehl and Bernheim (2021) find with Swedish and US general population samples in a case where stakeholders have preferences about which international charity will receive a fixed donation amount, and with Swiss student samples in which stakeholders have preferences about which Swiss party will receive a donation of Fr. 30 that cannot be split. This similarity suggests that our results are robust to variations in the domain of stakeholder preferences.

Figure 4: Social welfare criteria of the general public

Notes: Whiskers denote 95% confidence intervals, standard errors clustered by subject.

Yet, in contrast to politicians, the political position of the preferred party of members of the general public does not relate to their aggregation decisions, as Panel A of Figure 5 shows. The difference in party-dependence between politicians and the general public may have multiple causes, including the possibility that a politician's party affiliation is more strongly tied to her identity than a general population member's party preference is to his.[34] Yet, it does mean that some parties' electorate endorses systematically different social welfare criteria than those of the politicians representing the parties in parliament. Specifically, we

---

[34]We do not condition on whether general population respondents are registered party members. The reason is that only a small minority of Germans are members of a political party. In the year 2019, the six government parties had a total of 1.2 million active members (Niedermayer, 2020), which is 1.4% of the 83 million German population, or 2% of the 60 million Germans entitled to vote (Der Bundeswahlleiter, 2021). In our sample 95 respondents making aggregation decisions and 80 respondents making intervention decisions report that they are a member of a political party. While these respondents represent 6.6% and 6.0% of our respective

find that voters of the left-wing party Die Linke have a significantly higher preference for compromise than their representatives and that voters of the center-conservative CDU/CSU have a significantly weaker preference for compromise than their representatives (p < 0.01 in both cases). Once we control for age, gender, education, and state, the difference remains statistically significant only for Die Linke.

To document the difference in party-dependence across politicians and the general public econometrically, column 1 of Table 9 regresses best-fitting scoring parameters on an indicator for the general public, the position of a respondents' preferred political party and its quadratic, as well as on the interaction between the general public indicator and the party position variables. We find that the difference in party dependence across the two populations is highly statistically significant. Column 2 shows that this conclusion is unchanged once we control for age, gender, education, and state.

When we consider the general publics' beliefs about stakeholders' WTP to trigger or prevent a donation to their first, second, and third-ranked foundation, respectively, our results again parallel those of the politician sample. In particular, implied utilitarian aggregation based on these beliefs yield a choice distribution that places dramatically more weight on the majority winner than the general publics' actual choices. See Appendix D.3 for details.

Figure 5: Social welfare criteria of the general public by party position

Notes: Whiskers denote 95% confidence intervals, with standard errors clustered by subject. Party position represents overall ideological stance on the left / right spectrum from Bakker et al. (2020).

5.2   Interventions: Preference conflicts within individuals

As is the case for politicians, the general public's choices are inconsistent with the long-run criterion. Panel B of Figure 4 plots the intervention rates of the general public by front-end delay. It shows that the availability of immediate rewards has no effect on the frequency with which members of the general public exclude any alternative. Moreover, even absent immediate rewards, members of the general public

samples, they are still too few to permit statistical inference. Appendix E.2 shows that our conclusions pertaining to the general public remain unchanged once we account for political involvement measured as voting regularly in elections.

Table 9: General population vs. politicians

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Preference for compromise (scoring parameter s scaled from 0 to 100)		Number of options removed	
Political party position	1.800***	1.388***	0.053*	0.057*
	(0.607)	(0.532)	(0.031)	(0.030)
(Political party position)^2	-0.590**	-0.496**		
	(0.239)	(0.232)		
General public				
$\times$ 1	-3.495	-2.781	0.286***	0.254***
	(2.223)	(2.345)	(0.081)	(0.088)
$\times$ political party position	-1.868**	-1.292*	-0.052	-0.060*
	(0.738)	(0.671)	(0.033)	(0.031)
$\times$ (political party position)^2	0.643**	0.558*		
	(0.299)	(0.288)		
Female		0.722		0.055
		(1.963)		(0.047)
Age		0.125*		0.010***
		(0.074)		(0.002)
Fixed effects				
Education		✓		✓
State		✓		✓
p-values				
Significance of party position for general public				
linear term	0.873	0.825	0.894	0.768
square term	0.770	0.738		
Observations	1,661	1,661	3,025	3,025
Subjects	1,661	1,661	1523	1523

Notes: Weighted regressions. Regressions exclude politicians not associated with a government party ("fraktionslos"). Party position represents overall ideological stance on the left / right spectrum from Bakker et al. (2020), measured on a scale from 1 to 10, demeaned. Standard errors in parentheses, clustered by subject. *p < 0.1,** p < 0.05,*** p < 0.01.

intervene to remove the least patient alternative more than half the time, in contrast to the criterion's prescription to defer to citizens' preferences in that case.

There are, however, some differences between politicians' and general population respondents' interventions. First, general population respondents intervene more often than politicians. While politicians exclude 0.89 choice options on average from the choice sets they construct, general population respondents exclude 1.13 (p < 0.01). Second, unlike politicians, general population respondents remove the most patient alternative slightly more often than the middle alternative.[35] The difference in removal rates between the most patient and middle options, however, is an order of magnitude smaller than that between

---

[35]This pattern is not driven by spite towards other subjects. To check this possibility, respondents decided whether to costlessly increase the Chooser's payment by €0.50, to leave it unchanged, or to decrease it by €0.50. 91% chose to increase the recipient's payment, only 3% chose to decrease it. The extent of non-monotonicity in intervention decisions remains nearly unchanged once we exclude spiteful respondents.

the middle and least patient option. Hence, for both samples, enforcing patient choice is the dominant concern.

Panel B of Figure 5 shows that there is no relation between interventions and political party preference among the general public, just as in the case of preference aggregation, and possibly for the same reasons. To document the effect of party position econometrically, we regress the number of excluded options on an indicator for general population respondents, the position of the preferred political party, and the interaction between the two. Column 3 of Table 9 displays the result. The negative coefficient on the interaction term almost exactly offsets the effect of party position for politicians, leading to a p-value of 0.89 for a dependence on political position among the general public. These results remain largely unchanged once we control for gender, age, education, and state fixed effects.

Just as in the case of preference aggregation, the fact that politicians' but not the general public's intervention decisions depend on their political position implies that the politicians of some parties more closely represent the social welfare criteria of the parties' supporters. We find statistically significant differences for left-wing party Die Linke ($p = 0.05$) and for the moderate-left SPD ($p < 0.01$). In both cases, politicians of the respective party intervene less than its supporters. Controlling for gender, age, education, and state fixed effects renders the effect for Die Linke statistically insignificant.

6   Beliefs about politicians' decisions

Having shown that the social welfare criteria of politicians and those of the general public largely mirror each other, we now examine whether respondents are aware of this fact.

For the preference aggregation domain, panel A of Figure 6 compares general population respondents' beliefs about other decision makers to their actual choices (focusing on the two profiles for which we elicited beliefs). Beliefs about politicians and about the general public resemble each other closely. Yet, they diverge from the actual choice probabilities. Most notably, while both politicians and the general public chose the compromise option substantially more often than the majority winner, respondents believe the opposite would be the case ($p < 0.001$ both for beliefs about politicians and beliefs about the general public). Hence, general population respondents underestimate others' preference for compromise, both in politicians and in other general population respondents.[36]

In the domain of intervention decisions, beliefs are systematically distorted, too, as Panel B of Figure 6 shows. For easier visibility, we center the actual choice frequencies at zero and show the deviations from that benchmark. Subjects systematically overestimate how often politicians enforce patient choice. They overestimate the fraction of politicians who remove all but the most patient alternative A by more than 15 %-points, they underestimate the fraction of politicians who exclude only the least patient option by roughly 5 %-points, and they more strongly underestimate the fraction of politicians who include all alternatives by more than 10 %-points. In contrast, beliefs about the general public deviate from the truth

---

[36]Subjects also overestimate the frequency with which the rank-dominated option C would be chosen, possibly indicating their beliefs about how (in)attentively others would choose. Our results are unlikely a consequence of inattention to the belief elicitation itself, however. As Appendix F.2 shows, elicited beliefs vary sensitively with the particular preference profile for which we elicit these beliefs.

non-monotonically. Respondents overestimate both the extent to which general population respondents remove all but the most patient alternative, and the extent to which they include all options. Overall, while beliefs about general population subjects are inconclusive, respondents greatly overestimate politicians' interventionism, both compared to their actual choices and compared to the general population. Appendix F.1 documents these effects econometrically.

Figure 6: Beliefs about politicians' and other general population respondents' choices

Notes: Panel A aggregates across preference profiles 2 and 5, for which we elicited beliefs. Panel B aggregates across menus.

7 Conclusion

Economic analysis often derives policy recommendations based on assumed social welfare criteria. The appropriateness of these criteria is typically left to the policy maker to judge. Little is known, however, about policy makers' normative views in a way that is amenable to this use. Our study begins to fill this gap. We conduct a behavioral experiment with German federal and state politicians that avoids confounds from political economy considerations. We complement it with parallel experiments with the German voting-age general public.

We document three main findings. First, when resolving preference conflicts across individuals, politicians assign substantially more importance to individuals who obtain their least-favored alternative than to receive their most-favored alternative, in contrast to both common aggregation mechanisms and the equal weighting inherent in utilitarianism and the Kaldor-Hicks criterion. Second, when resolving preference conflicts within individuals, specifically that between respecting citizen autonomy and ensuring outcomes that politicians believe to be good for the citizen, politicians place substantial weight on the latter motive. Their choices are inconsistent with the long-run criterion that is frequently used in behavioral public economics as a foundation for policy recommendations. Not only has the availability of immediate rewards virtually no effect on politicians' choices, but politicians still intervene frequently to enforce patient choice when we rule out the possibility that the lure of immediacy might bias citizens' choices. Third,

the welfare criteria of politicians and those of the general public largely align—though general population respondents (wrongly) believe that politicians are less willing to compromise and more willing to limit others' autonomy both compared to general population respondents and compared to politicians' actual choices.

Our results provide guidance to researchers who derive policy recommendations based on social welfare criteria they wish reflect those of policy makers and of the general public. Additionally, our result that politicians' and the general public's welfare criteria align closely is encouraging for the field of positive welfare economics, which typically relies on general population samples. It increases our confidence that its results will generalize to elected policy makers both in Germany and in other representative democracies.

References

Ackfeld, V. and A. Ockenfels (2021). Do people intervene to make others behave prosocially? *Games and Economic Behavior* (128), 58–72.

Allcott, H., B. B. Lockwood, and D. Taubinsky (2019a). Regressive sin taxes, with an application to the optimal soda tax. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics 134*(3), 1557–1626.

Allcott, H., B. B. Lockwood, and D. Taubinsky (2019b). Regressive sin taxes, with an application to the optimal soda tax. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics 134*(3), 1557–1626.

Allcott, H. and D. Taubinsky (2015). Evaluating behaviorally motivated policy: Experimental evidence from the lightbulb market. *American Economic Review 105*(8), 2501–38.

Almas, I., A. W. Cappelen, and B. Tungodden (2020). Cutthroat capitalism versus cuddly socialism: Are americans more meritocratic and efficiency-seeking than scandinavians? *Journal of Political Economy 128*(5), 1753–1788.

Ambuehl, S. and B. D. Bernheim (2021). Interpreting the will of the people: A positive analysis of ordinal preference aggregation. *Unpublished Manuscript*.

Ambuehl, S., B. D. Bernheim, and A. Ockenfels (2021). What motivates paternalism? An experimental study. *American Economic Review 111*(3).

Amsalem, E. and L. Sheffer (2023). Personality and the policy positions of politicians. *Political Psychology 44*(1), 119–138.

Andreoni, J., D. Aydin, B. Barton, B. D. Bernheim, and J. Naecker (2020). When fair isn't fair: Understanding choice reversals involving social preferences. *Journal of Political Economy 128*(5).

Arrow, K. J. (1950). A difficulty in the concept of social welfare. *Journal of Political Economy 58*(4), 328–346.

Bailer, S., C. Breunig, N. Giger, and A. M. Wüst (2021). The diminishing value of representing the disadvantaged: Between group representation and individual career paths. *British Journal of Political Science*, 1–18.

Bakker, R., L. Hooghe, S. Jolly, G. Marks, J. Polk, J. Rovny, M. Steenbergen, and M. A. Vachudova (2020). 2019 Chapel Hill expert survey. https://www.chesdata.eu/2019-chapel-hill-expert-survey.

Bartling, B., A. Cappelen, H. Hermes, M. Skivenes, and B. Tungodden (2021). Free to fail? Paternalistic preferences in the U.S. *Unpublished Manuscript*.

Bernheim, B. D. and D. Taubinsky (2018). Behavioral public economics. In *Handbook of Behavioral Economics: Applications and Foundations 1*, Volume 1, pp. 381–516. Elsevier.

Besley, T. (2005). Political selection. *Journal of Economic Perspectives 19*(3), 43–60.

Besley, T., J. G. Montalvo, and M. Reynal-Querol (2011). Do educated leaders matter? *The Economic Journal 121*(554), F205–227.

Bisin, A., A. Lizzeri, and L. Yariv (2015). Government policy with time inconsistent voters. *American Economic Review 105*(6), 1711–1737.

Broockman, D. E. and C. Skovron (2018). Bias in perceptions of public opinion among political elites. *American Political Science Review 112*(3), 542–563.

Butler, D. M. and D. E. Broockman (2011). Do politicians racially discriminate against constituents? a field experiment on state legislators. *American Journal of Political Science 55*(3), 463–477.

Butler, D. M. and A. M. Dynes (2016). How politicians discount the opinions of constituents with whom they disagree. *American Journal of Political Science 60*(4), 975–989.

Butler, D. M., D. W. Nickerson, et al. (2011). Can learning constituency opinion affect how legislators vote? results from a field experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science 6*(1), 55–83.

Cappelen, A. W., J. Mollerstrom, B.-A. Reme, and B. Tungodden (2019). A meritocratic origin of egalitarian behavior.

Chen, X. and Ø. Schøyen (2022). Rejecting non-paternalist motivation: An experimental test. *Journal of Experimental Political Science 9*(3), 339–345.

Dal Bó, E., F. Finan, O. Folke, T. Persson, and J. Rickne (2017). Who becomes a politician? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics 132*(4), 1877–1914.

DellaVigna, S. and U. Malmendier (2004). Contract design and self-control: Theory and evidence. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics 119*(2), 353–402.

Der Bundeswahlleiter (2021, February). Bundestagswahl 2021: 60.4 Millionen Wahlberechtigte. https://www.bundeswahlleiter.de/en/info/presse/mitteilungen/bundestagswahl-2021/01_21_wahlberechtigte-geschaetzt.html.

Epper, T., E. Fehr, and J. Senn (2020). Other-regarding preferences and redistributive politics. *University of Zurich, Department of Economics, Working Paper* (339).

Ericson, K. M. and D. Laibson (2019). Intertemporal choice. In *Handbook of Behavioral Economics: Applications and Foundations 1*, Volume 2, pp. 1–67. Elsevier.

Falk, A., A. Becker, T. Dohmen, B. Enke, D. Huffman, and U. Sunde (2018). Global evidence on economic preferences. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics 133*(4), 1645–1692.

Fatas, E., T. Neugebauer, and P. Tamborero (2007). How politicians make decisions: A political choice experiment. *Journal of Economics 92*(2), 167–196.

Federal Statistical Office (2021). Wirtschaftsrechnungen. Laufende Wirtschaftsrechnungen Einkommen, Einnahmen und Ausgaben privater Haushalte 2020. Publication of Federal Statistical Office of Germany (Destatis), Fachserie 15 Reihe 1. Table 1.

Fisman, R., N. A. Harmon, E. Kamenica, and I. Munk (2015). Labor supply of politicians. *Journal of the European Economic Association 13*(5), 871–905.

Fisman, R., P. Jakiela, and S. Kariv (2017). Distributional preferences and political behavior. *Journal of Public Economics 155*, 1–10.

Fisman, R., P. Jakiela, S. Kariv, and D. Markovits (2015). The distributional preferences of an elite. *Science 349*(6254).

Gaertner, W. (2009). *A primer in social choice theory: Revised edition*. Oxford University Press.

Galasso, V. and T. Nannicini (2017). Political selection under alternative electoral rules. *Public Choice 171*(3), 257–281.

Goebel, J., M. M. Grabka, S. Liebig, M. Kroh, D. Richter, C. Schröder, and J. Schupp (2019). The german socio-economic panel (soep). *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik 239*(2), 345–360.

Gruber, J. and B. Kőszegi (2001). Is addiction "rational"? theory and evidence. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics 116*(4), 1261–1303.

Gruber, J. and B. Kőszegi (2004). Tax incidence when individuals are time-inconsistent: the case of cigarette excise taxes. *Journal of Public Economics 88*(9-10), 1959–1987.

Gul, F. and W. Pesendorfer (2007). Welfare without happiness. *American Economic Review 97*(2), 471–476.

Gulzar, S. (2021). Who enters politics and why? *Annual Review of Political Science 24*, 253–275.

Gulzar, S. and M. Y. Khan (2017). Why do citizens become politicians? experimental evidence on the social dimensions of candidacy. Technical report.

Hanania, R. (2017). The personalities of politicians: A big five survey of american legislators. *Personality and Individual Differences 108*, 164–167.

Hausman, D., M. McPherson, and D. Satz (2016). *Economic analysis, moral philosophy, and public policy*. Cambridge University Press.

Heathcote, J., K. Storesletten, G. L. Violante, et al. (2020). How should tax progressivity respond to rising income inequality? *NBER Working Paper*.

Heinemann, F. and E. Janeba (2011). Viewing tax policy through party-colored glasses: What german politicians believe. *German Economic Review 12*(3), 286–311.

Heinemann, F., E. Janeba, C. Schröder, and F. Streif (2016). Fiscal rules and compliance expectations – evidence for the german debt brake. *Journal of Public Economics 142*, 11–23.

Heß, M., C. v. Scheve, J. Schupp, and G. G. Wagner (2013). Members of german federal parliament more risk-loving than general population. *SOEP papers*.

Jacobs, B., E. L. Jongen, and F. T. Zoutman (2017). Revealed social preferences of dutch political parties. *Journal of Public Economics 156*, 81–100.

Janezic, K. A. and A. Gallego (2020). Eliciting preferences for truth-telling in a survey of politicians. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 117*(36), 22002–22008.

Jokela, M., J. Meriläinen, J. Tukiainen, and A. van Schoultz (2022). Personality traits and cognitive ability in political selection. Aboa Centre for Economics Discussion paper No. 152.

Kertzer, J. D. (2020). Re-assessing elite-public gaps in political behavior. *American Journal of Political Science*.

Kertzer, J. D. and J. Renshon (2022). Experiments and surveys on political elites. *Annual Review of Political Science 25*, 529–550.

Konow, J. (2003). Which is the fairest one of all? a positive analysis of justice theories. *Journal of Economic Literature 41*(4), 1188–1239.

Lee, N. (2021). Do policy makers listen to experts? evidence from a national survey of local and state policy makers. *American Political Science Review*, 1–12.

Lee, N., B. Nyhan, J. Reifler, and D. Flynn (2021). More accurate, but no less polarized: Comparing the factual beliefs of government officials and the public. *British Journal of Political Science 51*(3), 1315–1322.

Linde, J. and B. Vis (2017). Do politicians take risks like the rest of us? an experimental test of prospect theory under mps. *Political Psychology 38*(1), 101–117.

Linnainmaa, J. T., B. T. Melzer, and A. Previtero (2021). The misguided beliefs of financial advisors. *The Journal of Finance 76*(2), 587–621.

Morgan, D. J., L. Pineles, J. Owczarzak, L. Magder, L. Scherer, J. P. Brown, C. Pfeiffer, C. Terndrup, L. Leykum, D. Feldstein, et al. (2021). Accuracy of practitioner estimates of probability of diagnosis before and after testing. *JAMA Internal Medicine 181*(6), 747–755.

Niedermayer, O. (2020). Parteimitglieder in deutschland: Version 2020. *Arbeitshefte aus dem Otto-Stammer-Zentrum 31*.

O'Donoghue, T. and M. Rabin (1999). Doing it now or later. *American Economic Review 89*(1), 103–24.

O'Donoghue, T. and M. Rabin (2006). Optimal sin taxes. *Journal of Public Economics 90*(10-11), 1825–1849.

Rachlinski, J. J. and A. J. Wistrich (2017). Judging the judiciary by the numbers: Empirical research on judges. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science 13*, 203–229.

Sapienza, P. and L. Zingales (2013). Economic experts versus average americans. *American Economic Review Papers & Proceedings 103*(3), 636–42.

Schwitzgebel, E. and F. Cushman (2012). Expertise in moral reasoning? order effects on moral judgment in professional philosophers and non-philosophers. *Mind & Language 27*(2), 135–153.

Sheffer, L. and P. J. Loewen (2019). Accountability, framing effects, and risk-seeking by elected representatives: An experimental study with american local politicians. *Political Research Quarterly 72*(1), 49–62.

Sheffer, L., P. J. Loewen, S. Soroka, S. Walgrave, and T. Sheafer (2018). Nonrepresentative representatives: An experimental study of the decision making of elected politicians. *American Political Science Review 112*(2), 302–321.

Washington, E. L. (2008). Female socialization: How daughters affect their legislator fathers' voting on women's issues. *American Economic Review 98*(1), 311–332.

ONLINE APPENDIX

Politicians' Social Welfare Criteria

Sandro Ambuehl   Sebastian Blesse   Philipp Doerrenberg
Christoph Feldhaus   Axel Ockenfels

Table of Contents

A Design details

Table A.1: Survey variants

| | Aggregation | | Intervention | | | | | | | |
| | | | Decision 1 | | Decision 2 | | Beliefs 1 | | Beliefs 2 | |
Survey Variant	Order pref. profiles	Permutation soc. alternatives	Menu	Immediate rewards	Menu	Immediate rewards	Menu	Immediate rewards	Menu	Immediate rewards
1	123456	ABC	1A		1B	✓	2A		2B	✓
2	123456	CBA	1A		1B	✓	2A		2B	✓
3	123456	BAC	1A	✓	1B		2A	✓	2B	
4	123456	CAB	1A	✓	1B		2A	✓	2B	
5	654321	ABC	1B		1A	✓	2B		2A	✓
6	654321	CBA	1B		1A	✓	2B		2A	✓
7	654321	BAC	1B	✓	1A		2B	✓	2A	
8	654321	CAB	1B	✓	1A		2B	✓	2A	
9	615243	ABC	2A		2B	✓	1A		1B	✓
10	615243	CBA	2A		2B	✓	1A		1B	✓
11	615243	BAC	2A	✓	2B		1A	✓	1B	
12	615243	CAB	2A	✓	2B		1A	✓	1B	
13	342516	ABC	2B		2A	✓	1B		1A	✓
14	342516	CBA	2B		2A	✓	1B		1A	✓
15	342516	BAC	2B	✓	2A		1B	✓	1A	
16	342516	CAB	2B	✓	2A		1B	✓	1A	

Notes: Table 2 lists the options in menus 1A, 1B, 2A, and 2B.

B Stakeholder preference elicitation and outcome implementation

To implement the decisions, we randomly chose 10 % of the respondents of each of the four survey versions (Politicians, Public 1, Public 2, Public 3). For each of the four versions separately, we then selected one of the choices which we implemented for all participants in that survey version (either preference aggregation, choice set construction, or delegation).

B.1 Preference aggregation

We recruited stakeholders for the preference aggregation part from survey company *Pollfish*, using voting-age German citizens. Stakeholders ranked the three political foundations from the most to the least preferred. Stakeholders had incentives to truthfully reveal their preferences over the foundations. Specifically, they learned that with a 1 in 40 chance, their choice would determine which of the three foundations received the donation. They learned that in this case, we would randomly select two of the three foundations, and send the donation to the foundation the respondent ranked higher amongst the two. Stakeholders further learned that with the remaining chance, their decision 'contributes to determining'

which of the three foundations would receive the donation, together that of five other participants. As we left the corresponding process unspecified, stakeholders could not have reported preferences strategically.

We used the elicited stakeholder preferences to construct groups of five German voting-age citizens to match one of the six preference profiles. The corresponding politicians' or general population respondents' aggregation decision was then implemented and determined which of the three foundations received the donation.

Table 5 in the main text summarizes the stakeholder preferences.

B.2 Interventions

For each respondent for whom a decision is implemented, a Chooser decision was collected in the Cologne Laboratory for Economic Research after finalizing the survey data collection process. We made sure that all Choosers are German citizens. In the sessions, Choosers made eight decisions, one for each menu in Table 2, one with and once without front-end delay. Each subject went through the rounds in an individually random order. In each round, the subject ranked all three alternative according to her preference, not knowing whether any alternative might be unavailable, if any. Subjects did see any advice previous participants had decided to disburse, for the decision problem for which the advice had been given. Subjects were paid according to the round about which the previous participant had decided. Subjects received the most preferred alternative from those that participant had made available. Subjects only knew that one round would be chosen for payment, but did not know which one.

A total of 79 subjects finished these decisions on February 9, 2023. Table B.2 shows these subjects' preferences. For each alternative it lists the fraction of subjects who prefer that alternative most (Panel A), middle (panel B), or lowest (panel C), separately by whether immediate rewards are available or not. We find only a weak preference for less patient alternatives when immediate rewards are available compared to when they are unavailable, which is not statistically significantly different from zero ($p = 0.35$).

C   Summary statistics and non-responses

C.1   Summary statistics

Table C.4 presents summary statistics for our four samples and population statistics.

Table B.2: German subjects' preferences over payment bundles

	Alternative		
Immediate rewards available	Most patient	Middle	Least patient
	A. Highest preference		
Yes	0.905	0.057	0.038
No	0.927	0.041	0.032
	B. Middle preference		
Yes	0.063	0.902	0.035
No	0.044	0.921	0.035
	C. Lowest preference		
Yes	0.063	0.902	0.035
No	0.044	0.921	0.035

Table C.4: Sample characteristics

Survey	Politicians	Public 1	Public 2	Public 3	SOEP benchmark
Political party					
Linke	0.1	0.05	0.12	0.14	0.08
Gruene	0.16	0.24	0.21	0.23	0.24
SPD	0.19	0.14	0.17	0.15	0.19
FDP	0.11	0.17	0.15	0.14	0.06
CDU/CSU	0.28	0.33	0.21	0.24	0.34
AfD	0.13	0.06	0.13	0.1	0.07
Other	0.03				0.02
Political activity					
Inactive			0.3	0.31	
Vote sometimes			0.07	0.07	
Vote regularly			0.72	0.73	
Actively involved (e.g. collecting votes)			0.11	0.09	
Politician (communal level)			0.01	0.01	
Male	0.67	0.68	0.53	0.53	0.49
Age					
18-29	0.03	0	0.1	0.23	0.17
30-39	0.12	0.15	0.2	0.12	0.16
40-49	0.19	0.31	0.2	0.24	0.19
50-59	0.3	0.37	0.23	0.18	0.21
60-69	0.32	0.15	0.2	0.17	0.14
70+	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.07	0.13
Bundesland					
BB	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.04
BE	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.04
BW	0.1	0.11	0.11	0.13	0.11
BY	0.11	0.14	0.15	0.16	0.15
HB	0.03	0	0.02	0.02	0.01
HE	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.07
HH	0.07	0.06	0.03	0.02	0.02
MV	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.02
NI	0.04	0.11	0.09	0.1	0.1
NW	0.08	0.19	0.19	0.21	0.21
RP	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.06	0.05
SH	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04
SL	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01
SN	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.06
ST	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03
TH	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03
Monthly household income					
1500 or less			0.2	0.21	0.15
1500 - 3000			0.39	0.34	0.33
3000 - 4500			0.25	0.28	0.27
4500 - 6000			0.12	0.11	0.13
6000 - 7500			0.02	0.03	0.06
7500 or more			0.03	0.04	0.06
Highest education completed					
Hauptschule or Mittlere Reife	–	–	0.39	0.38	0.36
Abitur or equivalent	0.19	0.26	0.3	0.35	0.38
Hochschule	0.77	0.67	0.3	0.26	0.27
Promotion	0.04	0.08	0.01	0.01	
Marital status					
Married or engaged			0.91	0.58	0.6	0.59
Single			0.05	0.26	0.28	0.25
" Divorced, separated, widowed"			0.04	0.16	0.12	0.15
N	423	619	735	548	

Notes: Omitted cells were not asked, or were not available as answer options to subjects. Population statistics are based on weigthed data from the 2019 German Socioeconomic Panel (SOEP). In the SOEP, the education category *Promotion* (PhD or professional doctorate) is not elicited separately, the corresponding individuals are included in the category *Hochschule*. $^*p < 0.1$,$^{**}p < 0.05$,$^{***}p < 0.01$.

C.2 Non-response analysis for politician sample

Table C.3: Selection into participation for politician sample

	Non-participants		Participants		Difference
	mean	sd	mean	sd	Δ
Male	0.692	0.462	0.667	0.472	0.026
Age <= 39	0.142	0.349	0.147	0.354	-0.004
Age >= 40 & <= 59	0.603	0.489	0.489	0.500	0.113***
Age >= 60	0.255	0.436	0.364	0.482	-0.109***
Non-tertiary education	0.238	0.426	0.194	0.396	0.044**
Tertiary education	0.645	0.479	0.681	0.467	-0.036
Doctorate	0.116	0.321	0.125	0.331	-0.009
AFD	0.129	0.336	0.132	0.339	-0.003
CDU/CSU	0.322	0.468	0.277	0.448	0.046*
FDP	0.069	0.253	0.111	0.315	-0.042***
Grüne	0.129	0.335	0.158	0.366	-0.030
Linke	0.079	0.270	0.102	0.303	-0.023
SPD	0.248	0.432	0.194	0.396	0.054**
Fraktionslos	0.024	0.152	0.026	0.159	-0.002
Bundestag	0.290	0.454	0.191	0.394	0.099***
Landtag	0.710	0.454	0.809	0.394	-0.099***
Directly elected	0.523	0.500	0.593	0.492	-0.071***
Years in Parliament	9.029	7.176	7.544	6.714	1.485***
Observations	2165		423		2588

Notes: This table compares differences in observable characteristics between the non-participants (N=2165) and participants (N=423) among all German legislators in our experiment (N=2588). The first two columns in each comparison report the mean values and standard deviations for either 'Non-participants' or 'Participants' politicians, respectively. The last column reports the difference of a means test of equivalence (Wald–test). All characteristics on politicians were hand–collected by the authors from web–resources. Non-tertiary education, completed tertiary education as well as having a doctorate refers to International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) category codes 4, 5 and 6, respectively. A legislator is 'fraktionslos' if they are not associated with a government party. One legislator's age is not publicly available. $^*p < 0.1,$ $^{**} p < 0.05,$ $^{***} p < 0.01$.

Table C.5 shows response rates separately for federal and state parliamentarians.

D Additional analysis: Preference aggregation

D.1 Comprehensive classification

To obtain a more granular understanding of politicians' preference aggregation, we next assign each politician to one of a set of theoretical preference aggregation rules that best describe that politician's choice sequence, following the methods developed in Ambuehl and Bernheim (2021). We make no claim that politicians aggregated preferences following any specific *procedure*, just as economists do not usually believe that individuals make decisions under risk by explicitly calculating the expectation of their utility function. We merely use the aggregation rules as a succinct description of the collection of choices made by politicians, in the sense of revealed preference. Given our selection of preference profiles, we can

Table C.5: Politician responses by parliament type

	State Parliaments			Federal parliament		
	Answers	Total	Share	Answers	Total	Share
Party						
AFD	42	244	17.21%	14	92	15.22%
CDU /CSU	97	569	17.05%	20	246	8.13%
FDP	30	116	25.86%	17	80	21.25%
Gruene	62	279	22.22%	5	67	7.46%
SPD	73	466	15.67%	9	153	5.88%
Linke	27	145	18.62%	16	69	23.19%
Fraktionslos	11	60	18.33%	0	2	0%
Total	342	1879	18.20%	81	709	11.42%

Notes: A legislator is *fraktionslos* if they are not associated with a government party.

distinguish between the Condorcet pairwise majority rule, and five scoring rules characterized by the five intervals $(0, 1/3), (1/2, 3/5), (3/5, 2/3), (2/3, 4/5)$, and $(4/5, 1)$ into which s may fall. In addition, we can identify use of the antiplurality runoff rule,[1] the 80% supermajority rule, and the unanimity rule. In order to address the issue that less resolute rules can mechanically better match any given choice sequence, we use a Bayesian classifier which appropriately penalizes less resolute rules (Ambuehl and Bernheim, 2021).[2]

Panel B of Figure D.1 displays the resulting classification. Three features stand out. First, there is no notable difference between politicians and the general public. Second, more than three quarters of respondents make choices consistent with a scoring rule. Only slightly over 10% are best-described as following the Condorcet rule. Third, respondents assigned to a scoring rule are overwhelmingly characterized by a scoring parameter $s > 1/2$. We also find that just under 10% of respondents are assigned to a malevolent rule. Given the relatively small number of preference profiles we use to classify respondents, we conjecture that assignments to malevolent rules might reflect noise (though note that in a simulated dataset of uniformly random aggregation choices, 56% of artificial subjects are assigned to a malevolent rule).

Could our results be driven by attempts to save cognitive effort? Arguably, the plurality rule is a candidate for the least effortful rule, as it allows the respondent to ignore most of the information contained in a preference profile and focus exclusively on first ranks. The fact that we find only a small minority whose choices align with the plurality rule provides evidence against this hypothesis. Moreover, response times do not predict the aggregation rule to which a respondent is assigned in our data. A related concern is the possibility that our particular way of displaying preference profiles to respondents might bias our findings towards certain kinds of rules. While the limited sample size prevented us from experimenting with display formats, Ambuehl and Bernheim (2021) comprehensively investigate the effect of display formats. Their results are largely independent of the display format.

---

[1]The winner is calculated as follows. First, calculate the score of each option using scoring parameter $s = 1$. Second, remove the option with the lowest score from consideration. Third, select the option with the highest score amongst the remaining options. In case two options tie for the worst score in the first step, drop both of them, and use the remaining option as the winner.

[2]Footnote 22 in Section 4.1 lists details.

Figure D.1: Best-fitting aggregation rules, politicians and general public

D.2 Classification to benevolent scoring rules

Figure D.2 replicates Panel B of Figure 2 with the alteration that we restrict the Bayes classifier to assign politicians to *benevolent* scoring rules.

## D.3 Willingness to pay beliefs and implied utilitarian choice of the general public

Table D.6 replicates Table 7 for the general public. Utilitarian aggregation places slightly more weight on the compromise option than in the case of politicians, but the implied utilitarian choice distribution still differs dramatically from the actual distribution of choices.

Table D.6: Willingness to pay beliefs and implied utilitarian choice of the general public

Preference rank	(1) WTP	Choice Option	(2) Implied utilitarian choice	(3) Actual choice
Best	17.183 (0.450)	A (majority winner)	0.585 (0.011)	0.427 (0.011)
Middle	7.975 (0.335)	B (compromise option)	0.386 (0.012)	0.531 (0.011)
Worst	-0.549 (0.281)	C	0.079 (0.007)	0.042 (0.005)

Notes: WTP is the believed amount in € a politician believes a stakeholder would be willing to pay to trigger or prevent (negative WTP) a donation to the foundation in his first, second, and third preference rank, respectively. Implied utilitarian choice is the choice a politician would make if she selected alternatives by maximizing the sum of believed WTP. Actual choice is the actual choice the politician made. Standard errors in parentheses, clustered by subject.

Figure D.2: Preference for compromise, by political party, benevolent scoring rules only

Notes: Best-fitting scoring parameters, by party affiliation. Whiskers denote 95% confidence intervals, with standard errors clustered by subject. Position on political spectrum from Bakker et al. (2020).

D.4 Estimation of a cardinal social welfare function

We posit that politicians make social choices by maximizing a cardinal welfare function defined on beliefs about stakeholders' willingness to pay to trigger or prevent (if negative) a donation to their first, second, and third ranked foundation, respectively. We ask what form of that function best describes their choices between social alternatives. Letting u_1, u_2, and u_3 denote a politician's beliefs about stakeholders' WTP coresponding to their first, second, and third-ranked foundation, we consider the function

$$W_\alpha(X) = \sum_{i=1}^{5} f_\alpha(u_{r_i(X)} + \underline{u})$$

where $r_i(X)$ is the preference rank that stakeholder i assigns to alternative X and $\underline{u}$ is a location parameter. We assume a constant-elasticity form $f_\alpha(x) = \frac{x^\alpha - 1}{\alpha}$. Our interest centers on the parameter α which captures how politicians resolve equity-efficiency tradeoffs, where lower values of α indicating a greater weight on equity. Because the constant-elasticity function is only defined on positive values, we set $\underline{u} = 30$.

We estimate this function focusing on the binary choice between the majority-preferred option A and the compromise option B, using the 93.01% of cases in which a politician selected either of these alternatives. We assume that the politician selects alternative A over B with probability

$$(1 + \exp(-\sigma[W_\alpha(A) - W_\alpha(B)]))^{-1} \tag{1}$$

We estimate α and σ using nonlinear least squares. Because of the reduced sample size due to non-responses on the questions about WTP beliefs, we have limited statistical power.

We obtain estimates $\hat{\alpha} = 0.74$ (s.e. 0.34) and $\hat{\sigma} = 0.03$ (s.e. 0.03). While the estimate of α is substantially below the utilitarian benchmark of 1, the diminished sample size and the resulting imprecise estimates means that we cannot reject the hypothesis that $\hat{\alpha}$ equals 1 at conventional levels of significance. When we let α depend on a politicians' party's position and its square, we similarly find statistically insignificant results that are directionally consistent with the party-dependence of ordinal aggregation documented in Panel B of Figure 2.

E   Additional analysis: Interventions

E.1   Predictive power of elicited beliefs

Do our elicited beliefs contain information or are they mostly noise? To answer this question, we calculate the maximum amount the Chooser can receive early according to the choice set the politician or general population respondent has constructed for him.[3] We also use the respondents' beliefs about the Chooser's unrestricted choice to calculate the amount the respondent expects the Chooser would select early absent restrictions. We then regress the former variable on the latter, controlling for gender, age, and state and education fixed effects.

Table E.7 displays the results. Pooling across samples, we find a highly statistically significant coefficient of 0.57. If interventions moved one-for-one with beliefs, the coefficient would be 1; if beliefs were pure noise, the coefficient would be zero. Columns 2 and 3 run the same regression on the sample of politicians and on the sample of general population subjects, respectively. In the case of politicians, the relation is highly statistically significant 0.45, indicating a large amount of information in elicited beliefs data. On the general population sample, the relation is (0.57) and highly statistically significant, indicating substantial information in beliefs.

E.2   Effect of political involvement among general population subjects

Here we check whether the absence of an effect of political party preferences among the general population respondents on aggregation and intervention decisions might be caused by a weaker identification of these subjects with their preferred party relative to the case of elected representatives. To this end, we repeat the analysis of Table 9 including only citizens who are politically active, defined as voting regularly or being more politically involved than that. Amongst general population respondents who completed the aggregation decisions, 75.3% report being involved in politics of at least voting regularly. Amongst those who completed the intervention decisions, the corresponding number is 76.3%. Notably, all but a handful of respondents achieve this level of involvement exclusively by voting regularly (i.e. they are not more actively involved than as regular voters).

Table E.8 displays the result. In the case of preference aggregation, we continue to observe a coefficient on the square of the political party position that largely offsets that of politicians, though the linear term

---

[3]For better comparability across decisions, we normalize the payoff amounts. Specifically, we multiply the amounts of Menu 1B by $\frac{2}{3}$ to make them equal to those in Menu 1A, and we multiply the amounts of Menu 2B my $\frac{3}{4}$ to make them equal to Menu 2A.

Table E.7: Relation between beliefs and interventions

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Maximal amount allowed to be received early		
Politicians	✓	✓	
General public	✓		✓
Believed amount chosen early	0.569***	0.446**	0.572***
	(0.043)	(0.178)	(0.044)
Age	-0.018***	-0.026*	-0.018***
	(0.004)	(0.015)	(0.004)
Male	0.159	0.379	0.133
	(0.123)	(0.327)	(0.123)
Observations	2,839	287	2,552
Subjects	1433	152	1281

Notes: Weighted regressions. Pooled across observations with and without front-end delay. Politicians who did not provide beliefs data are excluded from this analysis. Standard errors in parentheses, clustered by subject. $^{*}p < 0.1$, $^{**}p < 0.05$, $^{***}p < 0.01$.

for the general public is now statistically significant as the corresponding p-value near the bottom of the table indicates. In the case of interventions, there remains no statistically significant effect of party position for the general public.

E.3 Self-reported risk, time, and social preferences

Are there differences between politicians and the general public in terms of the standard economic time, risk, and social preferences? To answer this question, we turn to respondents' self-assessments based on the questions of Falk et al. (2018). 291 politicians provided answers to these three questions, as did all general population respondents. Because of this limited sample, we reweight the sample of politicians.

Odd-numbered columns in Table E.9 regress each of the preference self-reports on an indicator for whether the respondent is a politician. Even numbered columns add controls for being a federal parliamentarian, political experience in years, gender, age, as well as education and state fixed effects. We find that politicians rate themselves as more altruistic, less risk averse, and more patient than the general public ($p < 0.01$) in each case, with parameter estimates that are quite robust to the inclusion of statistical controls. We caution that these differences might reflect differing signaling incentives across politicians and the general population. As column 2 shows, the 53 federal parliamentarians who answered these questions rate themselves as significantly less altruistic than other politicians ($p < 0.01$). Column 6 shows that they also rate themselves as less patient ($p < 0.05$). We find some, but not all of demographic effects on preferences that typically appear with preference measures. Specifically, males rate themselves as significantly less altruistic ($p < 0.01$), but we do not find the classical effect of gender on risk aversion.

Figure E.3 further shows how self-reported preferences depend on the political position of the party a respondent supports. Individuals on the political right rate themselves as less altruistic, both among

Table E.8: Politically active citizens vs. politicians

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Preference for compromise (scoring parameter s)		Number of options removed	
Political party position	1.800***	1.356**	0.053*	0.066**
	(0.608)	(0.538)	(0.031)	(0.029)
(Political party position)^2	-0.590**	-0.491**		
	(0.239)	(0.236)		
General public				
$\times$ 1	-1.182	-0.417	0.284***	0.245**
	(2.527)	(2.819)	(0.085)	(0.096)
$\times$ political party position	-0.626	-0.158	-0.054	-0.072**
	(0.803)	(0.756)	(0.035)	(0.032)
$\times$ (political party position)^2	0.502	0.471		
	(0.317)	(0.313)		
Female		0.450		0.063
		(2.326)		(0.063)
Age		0.153*		0.011***
		(0.088)		(0.002)
Fixed effects				
Education		✓		✓
State		✓		✓
p-values				
Significance of party position				
for general public				
linear term	0.025	0.031	0.970	0.675
square term	0.672	0.928		
Observations	904	904	1,449	1,449
Subjects	904	904	735	735

Notes: Weighted regressions. Regressions exclude politicians not associated with a government party ("fraktionslos"). Party position represents overall ideological stance on the left / right spectrum from Bakker et al. (2020), measured on a scale from 1 to 10, de-meaned. Standard errors in parentheses, clustered by subject. *p $< 0.1,^{**}$ p $< 0.05,^{***}$ p < 0.01.

politicians and among the general public. Individuals on the right also rate themselves as less risk averse; an effect that is particularly pronounced for politicians. Self-reported patience, by contrast, does not vary substantially across the political spectrum in either population.

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Altruism		Risk aversion		Patience	
Mean of the dependent variable	5.493		3.907		5.575	
	(0.097)		(0.099)		(0.119)	
Politician	0.545***	0.553***	-0.581***	-0.509***	0.442***	0.499***
	(0.111)	(0.156)	(0.121)	(0.186)	(0.134)	(0.191)
Federal parliamentarian		-1.376***		-0.343		-0.546**
		(0.515)		(0.599)		(0.255)
Political experience (years)		0.024*		-0.003		-0.004
		(0.014)		(0.014)		(0.016)
Male		-0.404***		-0.248		0.218
		(0.156)		(0.175)		(0.173)
Age		-0.007		-0.008		0.003
		(0.007)		(0.009)		(0.008)
Fixed effects						
Education		✓		✓		✓
State		✓		✓		✓
Observations	1,704	1,704	1,704	1,704	1,704	1,704

Notes: Weighted regressions. Standard errors in parentheses. $^*p < 0.1$, $^{**}p < 0.05$, $^{***}p < 0.01$.

E.4 Support for retirement savings mandate

We check whether experimental behavior correlates with attitudes to real-world policy issues. All politicians and all respondents to *Public 1* and *Public 3* indicated their agreement with the following statement: *'All employees in Germany should be obligated to save a certain portion of their labor income as part of a private pension plan to achieve a pension level that exceeds the pension entitlement from the statutory pension insurance.'* Upon completion of data collection, we noticed several shortcomings of this question. Attitudes towards it may differ for many reasons other than variation in intervention preferences, such as the respondent's opinion about the specific implementation, different interpretations of the vague term 'a certain portion,' heterogeneity in knowledge about the level of the 'pension entitlement from the statutory pension insurance,' and differences in whether one would like to be affected by such a policy rather than whether one would like to supply it to others. Hence we refrain from further analysis of this question, except by noting that individuals who never withhold alternatives in the experiment are less likely to express agreement with the statement.

E.5 Whose beliefs are more accurate?

Who has more accurate beliefs about politicians' and the general public's choices? We use the Euclidian distance between a person's beliefs and the true choice distribution as measure of belief accuracy. We regress it on an indicator for whether beliefs concern politicians, an indicator for preference profile 5 (the

Figure E.3: Self-reported preferences by political party

A. Altruism

B. Risk aversion

C. Patience

Notes: Whiskers denote 95% confidence intervals, with standard errors clustered by subject. Party position represents overall ideological stance on the left / right spectrum from Bakker et al. (2020).

other belief decision concerns profile 2), gender, age, political party position, an indicator for political inactivity, and education and state fixed effects. Column 1 of Table E.10 displays the result. Subjects have slightly less accurate beliefs about politicians' choices, though this difference is minor. Accuracy decreases with age ($p < 0.05$) and with political inactivity ($p < 0.1$). Column 2 considers the difference in the belief accuracy measure by whether beliefs concern politicians or the general public. The difference in belief accuracy decreases for subjects further to the political right ($p < 0.05$).

Column 3 replicates column 1 in the domain of intervention decisions. Here, respondents have significantly more accurate beliefs about politicians' choices than about those of the general public ($p < 0.01$), though accuracy decreases further to the right of the political spectrum ($p < 0.05$). Column 4 replicates column 2 without finding any significant effects.

Table E.10: Divergence between beliefs and truth by respondent characteristics

VARIABLES	(1) Belief divergence	(2) Difference belief divergence politicians vs. general public	(3) Belief divergence	(4) Difference belief divergence politicians vs. general public
	Preference aggregation		Interventions	
Beliefs concern politicians	0.024***		-3.077***	
	(0.009)		(0.923)	
Preference profile 5	-0.052***	-0.043***		
	(0.010)	(0.015)		
Front-end delay			0.378	0.640
			(0.867)	(1.411)
Male	-0.022	-0.002	-3.045	0.307
	(0.015)	(0.017)	(1.973)	(1.744)
Age	0.001**	-0.001	0.117	-0.053
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.075)	(0.059)
Political party position	-0.003	-0.011**	1.097**	-0.300
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.461)	(0.413)
Politically inactive	0.036*	0.011	0.160	0.125
	(0.021)	(0.022)	(2.889)	(1.983)
Fixed effects				
Education	✓	✓	✓	✓
State	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	3,240	1,620	2,832	1,416
Subjects	810	810	708	708

Notes: Weighted regressions. Standard errors in parentheses, clustered by subject. *$p < 0.1$,** $p < 0.05$,*** $p < 0.01$.

F Additional analysis: Beliefs and Delegation

F.1 Beliefs

To document these effects econometrically, Table F.11 lists the data of Figure 6 numerically, along with hypothesis tests. Columns 3 and 6 of panel A show that the difference between believed and actual choice frequencies is statistically significant at $p < 0.01$ in all but one case in the preference aggregation domain, as is also the case in the intervention domain (panel B). Column 5 further shows that there are no statistically significant differences in beliefs about politicians and the general population in the domain of preference aggregation. By contrast, differences in beliefs about the frequency with which politicians construct choice sets $\{A\}$ and $\{A, B, C\}$ compared to how often the general public does so are highly statistically significant.

Finally, we check whether the accuracy of beliefs about politicians' and other general population respondents' choices is related to demographic characteristics. We do not find any robust effects in either domain (see Appendix E.5 for details). We also examine whether beliefs explain subjects' preferences to delegate choices to politicians or general population members. We find little variation in delegation preference; more than half of all respondents most prefer delegating to a general population member and least prefer delegating to a politician, with delegation to a member of the subgroup of general population respondents with the same demographics as politicians ranking in the middle.[4] Due to these strong preferences, we do not find any relation between beliefs and delegation choices (see Appendix F.2 for details).

F.2 Delegation

Respondents in the general population samples ranked three groups of individuals to whom they prefer to delegate the preference aggregation (*Public 2*) or intervention decisions (*Public 3*): (i) elected representatives, (ii) general population subjects, (iii) general population subjects with a distribution of demographic characteristics like elected representatives. Figure F.4 displays respondents' delegation preferences. Panel A focuses on preference aggregation. In this domain, nearly 70% of subjects most prefer delegating to a general population individual, and just over 10% most prefer delegating to an elected representative. Conversely, nearly 70% of subjects least prefer delegating to an elected representative, and just over 10% least prefer delegating to a general population member. Indeed, 51.54% of subjects most prefer delegating to a general population member, least prefer delegating to an elected representative, and have a middling preference for delegating to a general population member with demographic characteristics of elected representatives. Panel B shows that these results are qualitatively and quantitatively highly similar in the intervention domain. We obtain highly similar results when we disaggregate these graphs by the specific preference profile to be aggregated or by the menu from which to construct choice sets (not shown). This similarity across domains and parametrizations suggests that respondent's delegation decisions reflect

---

[4]This result might reflect general distrust in politicians. An alternative hypothesis is that subjects attempt to equalize decision power across populations and thus delegate to individuals who do not usually have that power.

Table F.11: Beliefs about politicians' and other general population respondents' choices

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| | | Politicians | | | General population | | Difference in beliefs |
	True	Believed	p-value	True	Believed	p-value	p-value
			A. Aggregation				
Choice option							
A (majority winner)	0.408	0.433	0.001	0.427	0.438	0.154	0.521
B (compromise option)	0.548	0.359	0.000	0.531	0.354	0.000	0.567
C	0.044	0.207	0.000	0.042	0.207	0.000	0.982
			B. Interventions				
Choice set							
{A}	0.166	0.331	0.000	0.112	0.193	0.000	0.000
{A, B}	0.324	0.280	0.000	0.420	0.276	0.000	0.700
{A, B, C}	0.346	0.222	0.000	0.137	0.369	0.000	0.000
Other	0.165	0.166	0.165	0.331	0.161	0.000	0.714

Notes: Columns 1, 2, 4, and 5 each display a probability distribution over the choice options or choice sets sets listed on the left. Panel A aggregates across preference profiles. Panel B aggregates across menus. Columns 3 and 6 display the p-values for tests that the mean of the beliefs equal the point estimate of the true distribution. Column 7 displays the p-values for tests that the mean beliefs of politicians and the general public coincide. *p < 0.1,** p < 0.05,*** p < 0.01.

generalized confidence in the delegates rather than domain- or task-specific beliefs. In fact, we obtain this result in spite of the fact that beliefs about preference aggregation choices depend sensitively on the profile of preferences to be aggregated, as panel A of Figure F.5 shows.

Figure F.4: Delegation preferences

Figure F.5: Beliefs about delegates' choices

A. Aggregation

B. Interventions

Beliefs about delegates' choices. Panel A of Figure F.5 shows subjects' beliefs about the option that members of each groups of delegates would choose when aggregating preferences. Beliefs are strikingly similar across groups. In fact, 60% of subjects predict exactly the same choice for all three groups. Because of this lack of variation across delegation groups, beliefs are not systematically related with delegation preferences. This result does not simply reflect inattention. In fact, subjects' beliefs vary substantially with the preference profile. Moreover, subjects' beliefs vary substantially with their own scoring parameter. Rather, we conjecture the pronounced unwillingness to delegate to politicians thus appears to reflect a general distrust rather than a factor specific to preference aggregation.

Panel B shows what choice sets respondents believe delegates would construct. As highlighted in Section 6, respondents believe politicians (and members of a sample of the general public with demographic characteristics that match politicians) would construct substantially different choice sets. Beliefs do not systematically differ, however, depending on whether or not the subjects' choices involve a front-end delay. Again, this effect is unlikely due to limited attention because beliefs vary substantially with the group of delegates.

G Survey

Full Original Survey

In the following, we display an English translation of the survey originally administered in German. Grey text in italics are comments to the reader and were not displayed to subjects. Politicians can leave questions unanswered unless otherwise noted. General population participants must answer all questions.

For the first survey version (main decisions on preference aggregation and choice set construction; see Table 3), we display in the following the version that politicians received. The corresponding survey received by the general population was identical, but additionally included two comprehension checks (which are not displayed).

We have two further survey versions that only went to general population respondents (beliefs about other participants and delegation decision in the context of preference aggregation and choice set construction, respectively; see Table 3). Respondents who received these survey versions were first asked to make the same decisions decisions as in the first survey version, but only for either preference aggregation or choice set construction (depending on survey version). These survey versions then subsequently include the delegation stage and the prediction stage. These two additional stages are displayed below as well.

General population respondents in all survey versions further received questions about their demographics and political views which politicians did not receive (see "extra screens 1 and 2" below).

WELCOME, AND THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

This is a survey by the Centre for European Economic Research (ZEW) in Mannheim and the universities in Cologne, Mannheim, Münster and Zurich. It will only take you a few minutes to participate, and you will be supporting research on decision-making processes in politics.

In this survey, you will make eight decisions and answer seven questions. After the survey, 10% of all participants will be randomly selected. One of the eight decisions of each selected participant will be randomly designated and put into action exactly as described below (all of the people mentioned actually exist and all of the payments will be made as described).

There are no right or wrong answers in this survey. Please always decide based on your own personal views. Your answers will remain strictly confidential.

Survey Version 1:

<u>Screen 1</u>:

The following is about a donation of €30 that one of these three foundations is to receive:

Politically left	Politically center	Politically conservative
Hans Böckler Foundation	***Bund der Steuerzahler Deutschland e.V.***	***Ludwig Erhard Foundation***

Five German citizens participated in a prior survey. Each of these five individuals specified in the prior survey which of the three foundations they considered to be the best, middle-ranked and worst.

We are now interested in how you would combine the five individual preferences into a group decision on which foundation the €30 should go to. For example, do you prefer more of a compromise or more of a majority solution? Your own opinion about the foundations is not intended to play a role. That is why the foundations are listed anonymously in the following as foundations A, B and C.

You will make a total of six decisions on how to summarize the group's preferences. One of the six decisions represents the true preferences of the group members from the preliminary survey, and could therefore be randomly selected and actually put into action. Since you do not know which decision represents the true preferences, please assume in every case that the respective decision actually will be implemented.

To decide which foundation the money should go to, **please place one X in the "Choice" column** for the corresponding foundation. If you feel that a second or third alternative is just as good, place an X in the "Equally good" column.

Decision 1.

Which foundation should receive the €30 in the following configuration of preferences?
(Please place an X in the "Choice" column and, if applicable, one or more additional Xs in the "Equally good" column)

Explanation: In Decision 1, foundation A is given the rating of best by four people and worst by one other person. Foundation B is given the rating of middle rank by five people, and so on.

	Best	Middle	Worst	Choice	Equally good
Foundation A	👤👤👤👤		👤	◯	☐
Foundation B		👤👤👤👤👤		◯	☐
Foundation C	👤		👤👤👤👤	◯	☐

Decision 2.
Which foundation should receive the €30 in the following configuration of preferences?
(Please place an X in the "Choice" column and, if applicable, one or more additional Xs in the "Equally good" column)

	Best	Middle	Worst	Choice	Equally good
Foundation A	👤👤	👤	👤👤	◯	☐
Foundation B	👤👤		👤👤👤	◯	☐
Foundation C	👤	👤👤👤👤		◯	☐

Decision 3.
Which foundation should receive the €30 in the following configuration of preferences?
(Please place an X in the "Choice" column and, if applicable, one or more additional Xs in the "Equally good" column)

	Best	Middle	Worst	Choice	Equally good
Foundation A	👤		👤👤👤👤	◯	☐
Foundation B	👤	👤👤👤👤		◯	☐
Foundation C	👤👤👤	👤	👤	◯	☐

Comment: If the subject completes the questions partially, an alert box asks the subject whether they really want to continue or whether they want to complete their decisions.

Decision 4.
Which foundation should receive the €30 in the following configuration of preferences?
(Please place an X in the "Choice" column and, if applicable, one or more additional Xs in the "Equally good" column)

	Best	Middle	Worst	Choice	Equally good
Foundation A	👤👤👤		👤👤	○	☐
Foundation B		👤👤👤👤👤		○	☐
Foundation C	👤👤		👤👤👤	○	☐

Decision 5.
Which foundation should receive the €30 in the following configuration of preferences?
(Please place an X in the "Choice" column and, if applicable, one or more additional Xs in the "Equally good" column)

	Best	Middle	Worst	Choice	Equally good
Foundation A		👤👤👤	👤👤	○	☐
Foundation B	👤👤	👤👤	👤	○	☐
Foundation C	👤👤👤		👤👤	○	☐

Decision 6.
Which foundation should receive the €30 in the following configuration of preferences?
(Please place an X in the "Choice" column and, if applicable, one or more additional Xs in the "Equally good" column)

	Best	Middle	Worst	Choice	Equally good
Foundation A		👤👤	👤👤👤	○	☐
Foundation B	👤👤	👤👤👤		○	☐
Foundation C	👤👤👤		👤👤	○	☐

Comment: If the subject completes the questions partially, an alert box asks the subject whether they really want to continue or whether they want to complete their decisions.

5

Question 1.
Please make an estimate: What is the maximum amount a randomly selected person from our prior survey would be willing to pay so that a donation of €30 is transferred to the foundation this person considers to be best/middle-ranked/worst? *(If you think the person would pay for the foundation not to receive the €30, please place a minus sign in front of the respective amount)*

Best Foundation	☐ €	Middle Foundation	☐ €	Worst Foundation	☐ €

Comment: If a subject provides estimates that are inconsistent with the ranking of the foundations as worst, middle, and best, an alert box informs subjects of this fact. If desired, subjects may continue with inconsistent estimates.

Now we come to the second part of our survey. In this section, you will be making decisions for a German citizen who is allocated to you and who will participate in a future survey. This person will decide in the survey how they will be paid for their participation in the survey. The more willing this person is to wait for their money, the more money they will be paid overall.

We now ask you to decide how patiently or how impatiently the person can choose. For each of the three options, specify whether the respective option should be available to the person or not. If you make multiple options available, the person will be able to choose from these options. At least one option must be "Available".

Details: The options you mark as unavailable will not be shown to the person as options to choose from. For options you mark as available, you can additionally check "Advise against this option". If you do this, the person will receive the message, "A previous participant in this survey advises you not to choose this option."

Decision 7.
Which options should (not) be available to the person, if the options are as follows?

Options	Available	Unavailable	Advise against this option
	Please place ONE cross per row		
0 € immediately and **24 €** in **6 months**	◯	or ◯	☐
3 € immediately and **15 €** in **6 months**	◯	or ◯	☐
6 € immediately and **3 €** in **6 months**	◯	or ◯	☐

Decision 8.
Which options should (not) be available to the person, if the options are as follows?
(Please note: Both the timing of the payment and the amounts are different from those in the previous decision)

Options	Available	Unavailable	Advise against this option
	Please place ONE cross per row		
0 € in **1 month** and **16 €** in **7 months**	◯	or ◯	☐
2 € in **1 month** and **10 €** in **7 months**	◯	or ◯	☐
4 € in **1 month** and **2 €** in **7 months**	◯	or ◯	☐

Comment: To move to the next page, it is not required to submit the answers.

Question 2.

Please make an estimate: How many members of a group of 10 randomly selected people participating in such a survey will choose each of the following options A, B, and C, if they each have to choose exactly one of the three options?
(The sum of your answers must be 10)

Option A	Option B	Option C
0 € immediately and **24 €** in **6 months**	**4 € immediately** and **16 €** in **6 months**	**8 € immediately** and **4 €** in **6 months**
☐ out of 10 select option A	☐ out of 10 select option B	☐ out of 10 select option C

Question 3.

And what is your estimate for the following three options?
Please note that the times and amounts are different than in Question 2

Option A	Option B	Option C
0 € in 1 month and **18 €** in **7 months**	**3 € in 1 month** and **12 €** in **7 months**	**6 €** in **1 month** and **3 €** in **7 months**
☐ out of 10 select option A	☐ out of 10 select option B	☐ out of 10 select option C

Comment: If the entries do not add up to 10, the subject receives a notification asking if they want to proceed nonetheless.

Question 4.
How much do you agree with the following statement: "*All employed individuals in Germany should be obligated to save a specific part of their earned income as part of a private retirement plan so that they can accrue a level of retirement income that is higher than their pension claim under the compulsory pension system.*"

Totally disagree						Totally agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

In conclusion, we would like to ask you to answer three questions about yourself:

Question 5.
Compared to others, are you generally willing to give up something today so that you can benefit from it in the future, or are you unwilling to do this compared to others?

Not willing at all   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○   Very willing

Question 6.
How do you personally view yourself? Are you generally a risk-taker or do you try to avoid risks?

Not risk-taking at all   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○   Very risk-taking

Question 7.
How do you evaluate your willingness to share with others without expecting anything in return?

Not willing at all   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○   Very willing

Extra Screen 1 (General Population only)

Question 8.
Please indicate your gender:

      Man ◯   Woman ◯   Diverse ◯

Question 9.
Please enter your year of birth: [   ]

Question 10.
Do you have a German citizenship?

            Yes ◯   No ◯

Question 11.
What German state is your main residence located in?

Baden-Württemberg	◯	Bavaria	◯
Berlin	◯	Brandenburg	◯
Bremen	◯	Hamburg	◯
Hesse	◯	Mecklenburg Western Pomerania	◯
Lower Saxony	◯	Northrhine-Westphalia	◯
Rhineland Palatinate	◯	Saarland	◯
Saxony	◯	Saxony-Anhalt	◯
Schleswig Holstein	◯	Thuringia	◯

Question 12.
What is the highest level of education you achieved?

No degree	◯	Secondary school level certificate *(Hauptschule)*	◯
Certificate of Secondary Education *(Mittlere Reife)*	◯	University entrance qualification *(Abitur)*	◯
Degree from a university or college of higher education (Bachelor, Master, Diploma)	◯	Doctoral degree	◯

Question 13.

Are you a member of a political party?

Yes ○   No ○

Question 14.

Which political party that is represented in the German *Bundestag* do you identify most closely with?

FDP	○
SPD	○
AfD	○
Bündnis 90/Die Grünen	○
Die Linke	○
CDU/CSU	○

Question 15.

How politically active are you (if at all)?

☐	I am not politically active
☐	I vote sometimes
☐	I vote regularly
☐	I am actively involved in political issues (e.g., gathering signature / voting on petitions)
☐	I am a member of a parliament or executive body at the local level
☐	I am a member of a parliament or executive body at the state level
☐	I am a member of a parliament or an executive body at the federal level

Comment: Multiple selections allowed.

Question 16.

Are you a politician?

Yes, on a voluntary basis	○
Yes, career wise	○
No	○

Question 17.
What is your marital status?

Married and living with spouse	◯	Married and living separately	◯
Widowed	◯	Divorced	◯
Partnership but not married	◯	Single	◯

Question 18.
What is the total monthly net income of your household? This refers to the sum of all wages, salary, income from self-employment, pension or retirement benefits, all after deduction of taxes and social security contributions. Please also include any income from public assistance, income from rentals, leasing, housing allowance, child allowance and any other income.

Up to 1,500 euros	◯	1,500 to 3,000 euros	◯
3,000 to 4,500 euros	◯	4,500 to 6,000 euros	◯
6,000 to 7,500 euros	◯	More than 7,500 euros	◯

Question 19.
How high is your *own* monthly net incon[   ]

Determined the same as in the previous question: sum of wages, salary... deduction of taxes, social security contributions …

Question 20.
In politics, people often talk about "left" and "right". If you use this scale here, where do you put yourself? Please indicate the number that applies to you personally.

Left   Right
◯   ◯   ◯   ◯   ◯   ◯   ◯   ◯   ◯   ◯   ◯

End.

Your entries have been saved.

Thank you for completing this survey!

Survey Version 2:

Part 1:

Delegation screen 1:

Part 2:

You previously decided how to combine the preferences of five people into a group decision. By doing this, you determined which political foundation will receive a donation of €30.

In the following, you will decide who you would like to delegate this decision to instead of making the decision yourself. The person you select has also seen the preference configuration of five German citizens from the preliminary survey and based on this, decided which foundation should receive the €30.

Delegation screen 2:

You can delegate the decision to a randomly selected person from one of the following three groups:

- A group of German citizens who are *not politicians*, but who have the same demographic characteristics as the politicians. In other words, this group consists of, for example, 70% men, 3% of the members are under the age of 30, 87% of the members have a university degree and 17% are single (group Δ).

- A representative group of German politicians from the state and federal parliaments (group □).

- A representative group of German citizens (group O).

Explanation: We asked members of these three groups the same questions we asked you in the last part. The members of the three groups have also seen preference configurations of participants from the preliminary survey and decided which organization should receive the money given the preference configuration. We randomly selected one member from each of these three groups for you. If this part of the survey is put into action, the decision of the people randomly selected for you from your chosen group will determine which foundation will receive the €30.

<u>Delegation screen 3:</u>

Who would you like to delegate the decision to if the preferences of the five people are given as follows?

If the preferences of the five people are given as above:

Who should decide whether foundation A, B or C receives the €30?

☐ A German citizen from the group with the same demographic characteristics as the politicians (group Δ)

☐ A German politician from state or federal parliament (group □)

☐ A representative German citizen (group O).

Who should not decide whether foundation A, B or C receives the €30?

☐ A German citizen from the group with the same demographic characteristics as the politicians (group Δ)

☐ A German politician from state or federal parliament (group □)

☐ A representative German citizen (group O).

Explanation*: If this part is implemented and thereby determines which foundation will receive €30, two of the three groups will be randomly selected to actually determine which foundation receives the money. The third group will definitely not make the decision. Of the two groups that can make the decision, the one that you think is better based on your answers to the last two questions will make the decision.*

<u>Delegation screen 4:</u>

As Delegation screen 3, but for a different constellation of preferences

Part 3:

In this part of the survey, you will answer six questions. After the survey, 10% of all participants will be randomly selected. Each participant selected will receive a bonus payment of up to 50 Norstat Coins (value: €5) depending on the accuracy of their answers.

This part is once again about the three groups from the last part:

- A group of German citizens who are *not politicians*, but who have the same demographic characteristics as the politicians. In other words, this group consists of, for example, 70% men, 3% of the members are under the age of 30, 87% of the members have a university degree and 17% are single (group Δ).

- A representative group of German politicians from the state and federal parliaments (group □).

- A representative group of German citizens (group O).

We ask you to estimate which foundation was chosen by 10 randomly selected members of these groups as the recipient of the €30 when they saw specific preference configurations from the preliminary survey.

If you are selected for the bonus payment, we will randomly select one of the following six questions and compare your estimate in this question with the real decisions of the group members in the respective preference configuration. The more accurate your estimate, the higher your bonus payment will be. So please think about your answers very carefully!

Explanation: If you give an answer that is 100% correct in the selected question, you will receive 50 Norstat coins. For each person you are over or under in your estimates, you lose 2.5 Norstat coins. For example, if all 10 group members chose foundation C, but you indicate that 5 group members choose foundation B, and another 5 choose foundation C, then you under-reported five group members for foundation C, and over-reported five for foundation B. Accordingly, your bonus is reduced to 50 - 2.5 x 5 - 2.5 x 5 = 25 Norstat Coins.

Belief about others Screen 2:

First, make your estimate for the following preference configuration of the five individuals:

PREFERENCE CONSTELLATION DISPLAYED AS IN SURVEY VERSION 1

If the preferences of the five people are given as above:

How do you think the 10 randomly selected German citizens from group Δ (German citizens with the same demographic characteristics as the politicians) decided?

- ☐ out of 10 chose foundation A
- ☐ out of 10 chose foundation B
- ☐ out of 10 chose foundation C

The sum of your answers must be 10.

How do you think the 10 randomly selected German politicians from group □ (German politicians from state and federal parliaments) decided?

- ☐ out of 10 chose foundation A
- ☐ out of 10 chose foundation B
- ☐ out of 10 chose foundation C

The sum of your answers must be 10.

How do you think the 10 randomly selected German citizens from group O decided (representative German citizens)?

- ☐ out of 10 chose foundation A
- ☐ out of 10 chose foundation B
- ☐ out of 10 chose foundation C

The sum of your answers must be 10.

Belief about others Screen 3:

As Belief about others Screen 2, but for a different constellation of preferences

Survey Version 3:

Survey version 3 is very similar to survey version 2, with the difference being that version 3 is about choice set construction instead of preference aggregation.

Survey version 3 consists of three parts (just as version 2):

1. Part 1 is identical to the choice set construction part in the first survey version.
2. Part 2 contains a delegation decision that is very similar to the delegation decision in version 2, but in the context of choice construction.
3. Part 3 elicits beliefs about others in a very similar way as in version 2, but in the context of choice construction.

Because of the similarity with survey version 2, we do not display the full survey here for reasons of brevity.

References