

Title: No Gender Difference in Willingness to Compete When Competing against Self

Authors:

Coren L Apicella

Affiliation: University of Pennsylvania

Mailing address: 3720 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

Email address: capicella@psych.upenn.edu

Elif Demiral

Affiliation: Interdisciplinary Center for Economics Science, George Mason University

Mailing address: 4400 University Dr, 22030 Fairfax, VA, USA

Email address: edemiral@gmu.edu

Johanna Mollerstrom (corresponding author)

Affiliations: Humboldt University, German Institute for Economic Research (DIW), Research Institute for Industrial Economics (IFN).

Mailing address: DIW, Mohrenstrasse 58, Berlin, Germany

Email address: jmollerstrom@diw.de

Session: “Understanding Gender Differences in Labor Market Outcomes - Experimental Evidence”. Chair: Ragan Petrie. Discussant: Christine Exley

Abstract

We report on two experiments investigating whether there is a gender difference in the willingness to compete against oneself (self-competition), similar to what is found when competing against others (other-competition). In one laboratory and one online market experiment, involving 1,200 participants, we replicate the gender-gap in willingness to other-compete but find no evidence of a gender difference in the willingness to self-compete. We explore the roles of risk and confidence and suggest that these factors could account for the different findings. Finally, we document that self- and other-competition boost performance equally well, suggesting effectiveness as a policy.

In *The Descent of Man*, Darwin described men as “rivals of other men” and as the sex that “delight[s] in competition” (Darwin, 1888). Nearly 150 years later, economists have substantiated this narrative: men are more likely to enter competitive fields, pursue competitive promotions and select into competitive payment schemes over piece rate schemes (for review, Niederle and Vesterlund, 2011). The gender difference in willingness to compete has been documented in diverse societies, including isolated hunter-gatherers (Apicella and Dreber, 2015) suggesting that differences in competitiveness between men and women is a relatively robust characteristic of humanity. Additionally, it has been suggested that this difference in the willingness to compete may help to explain the pernicious and persistent labor and economic disparities that exist between the sexes, such as the gender gap in earnings. Indeed, the predictive power of laboratory measures of competitiveness on career choices and labor market outcomes has been shown to be substantial (e.g. Buser et al. 2014, Reuben et al, 2015).

Following the work of Niederle and Vesterlund (2007), economists have shifted their level of analysis from the descriptive to explanatory: Why is there a gender difference in willingness to compete and how can it be eliminated? For instance, whereas earlier work claimed that there is a specific “preference for competitions” that is distinct from risk preferences and overconfidence, more recent work suggests that gender differences these factors may explain all or most of the competitiveness gap (e.g. Gillen et al, 2015, van Veldhuizen, 2016). Other work has focused on implementing institutional changes to increase the number of women entering competitive environments. Such changes include: providing feedback about individual performance, instituting affirmative action policies and assembling gender-specific competitions (for review, Niederle and Vesterlund, 2011). Many of these policies however, are unfeasible and impractical from a firm’s perspective. Moreover, restructuring firms to be “competition-free” is

suboptimal, as competition often enhances performance and productivity (e.g. Gneezy et al., 2003).

To our knowledge, research on gender differences in willingness to compete has exclusively focused on competitions against others (*other-competition*). Here, we consider a different type of competition: competition against one's own previous performance. This type of competition embodies notions of self-improvement, progress and mastery. The idea of such *self-competition* has previously been discussed in relation to sports performance and business related goal-setting (e.g. Locke, 1968; Howe, 2008; Brown et al, 1998). We ask whether there is a gender difference in the willingness to compete against oneself, similar to the gender difference found when competing against others.

I The Experiments

We conducted two experiments: one in the laboratory following the original Niederle and Vesterlund (2007) design closely, and one online.¹

A Laboratory Experiment

The laboratory experiment had two treatments: *Other* and *Self*. In the *Other* treatment, subjects performed a series of simple arithmetic problems in three rounds (each round lasting five minutes, with no feedback given between rounds and the incentives for each round outlined just before the start of that particular round). In the first round, subjects were paid a fixed amount for every correctly solved problem (piece rate). In the second round, subjects were anonymously matched in pairs and the subject with the highest score in the pair was paid double the piece rate

¹ Further details about the experiments, including all instructions and questionnaires, are available in the Online Appendix.

for every correctly solved problem, whereas the other subject received nothing (tournament rate). Subjects were then given a choice about which payment scheme to apply in round three. If a subject chose the piece rate, she was paid the fixed amount for every problem she correctly solved in the third round. If she chose the tournament rate, her third round performance was compared to the second round performance of the matched participant, such that if she performed better than they did in the second round, she would earn double the piece rate for every correctly solved problem; otherwise she earned nothing. The *Self* treatment was identical with the following exceptions: 1) the subjects were not matched to another player; instead their scores in the second round tournament were compared to their own scores in the first round, 2) when subjects chose whether to apply the piece rate or the tournament rate in the third round, a choice of tournament meant that their score in the third round would be compared to their own score in round two.

After the three rounds, all subjects filled out a questionnaire. Basic demographics, and self-reported risk aversion using a ten-point likert scale, were collected. Subjects were also incentivized to correctly rank their own performance across the rounds and to guess whether they outperformed their opponent in round two. These questions provided measures of confidence. Subjects were paid in private for a randomly selected round before leaving the laboratory.

The experiment was programmed in Z-Tree (Fischbacher, 2007) and conducted at the ICES laboratory at George Mason University in October 2016. The 204 subjects (50.5% female) earned an average of \$17.42 for their participation. Sessions lasted approximately 40 minutes.

B Online Experiment

We used the labor market Amazon Mturk to ensure that the results from the laboratory replicate. The online experiment also entailed additional treatments to further investigate the mechanisms underlying the findings. Specifically, we implemented two additional versions of the *Other* treatment. In *Other, Same Gender* we matched participants of the same gender in the competition, and in *Other, Same Ability* participants who did the same number of tasks correctly in the first round were matched. Ahead of the second round, subjects were informed about these aspects of the matching. We use these treatments in order to mirror certain features of self-competition (i.e. the fact that the person knows their own gender and also has additional information about her own ability to perform in the task) and to investigate whether these alone cause the gender difference in competitiveness to diminish. The online experimental design also differed from the laboratory design in two other ways: 1) math tasks were replaced with a Captcha-style counting task to prevent cheating and 2) the rounds were shortened to 90s.

994 subjects (49.9% female) took part in the online experiment conducted in November 2016. On average, participants earned \$1.20 for an approximately twelve-minute-long session.

II Results²

A. Laboratory Results: No Gender Difference in the Willingness to Self-Compete

Panel A of Table 1 reports the percentage of subjects choosing the tournament rate by gender and treatment. We replicate the oft-documented finding that women are less willing than men to other-compete: In the *Other* treatment 57.7 percent of men chose to compete in the third round, compared to merely 37.5 percent of women. This results in a gender gap of 20 percentage points

² Summary statistics for both experiments as well as additional analysis and robustness checks are available in the Online Appendix.

($p=0.044^3$). When the competition is against the participant's own previous score the size of the gender gap is reduced by a third and is no longer statistically significant ($p=0.176$). The difference in difference is, however, not significant ($p=0.612$) in the laboratory data alone.⁴

Panel A of Table 2 outlines the regression analysis for the laboratory experiment. A comparison of (1) and (2) in Panel A indicates that risk preferences and confidence are mediators of the gender difference in the willingness to other-compete. Risk preferences are related also to the willingness to self-compete, but here the coefficient on Female is not significant (see specification (3) and (4)).

B. Online Results: Replication and Investigating Mechanisms

Panel B of Table 1 shows that the gender gap in the willingness to compete is 12 percentage points in the *Other*-treatment in the online experiment ($p=0.044$). In the *Self*-treatment the sign of the gap reverses and it is no longer significant ($p=0.448$). Further, a difference-in-difference estimation reveals that the gender gaps in the two treatments differ significantly from each other ($p=0.050$). The analysis of the *Self* and *Other* treatments in the online experiment (specifications 5-8 in Table 2, Panel B) also give similar results to the regression analysis for the laboratory experiment.

Considering the two additional versions of the *Other*-treatment, we note that there is still a gender difference in competitiveness in the *Other, Same Gender* but not in the *Other, Same Ability* treatment (Panel B of Table 1 and Panel C of Table 2). The latter result indicates that

³ All tests, unless otherwise noted, are two-sided t-tests of proportions. Our results are robust to using the non-parametric Fisher Exact test instead, see Online Appendix.

⁴ In addition to the analysis of the online data below, we also perform the analysis on the pooled data in the Online Appendix. Here the difference in difference is significant.

receiving a signal that the matched opponent has an ability akin to one's own (similar to what happens in self-competition), is enough to eliminate the gender difference.

That women are more risk averse (e.g. Croson and Gneezy, 2009) and less overconfident (Niederle and Vesterlund, 2007) than men has been documented previously. We largely replicated these findings (see Online Appendix). As these factors have been shown to be important mechanisms underlying the gender difference in competitiveness when competing against others, it was hypothesized that one reason that we find no gender gap in the willingness to self-compete is that the roles of risk and confidence are different. We confirm this by regressing a dummy indicating the choice to compete in the third round on either risk or confidence, a dummy that takes the value 1 if the treatment is *Other* and 0 if it is *Self*, and the interaction between the two (controlling for ability with round 1 score as in all regressions). The results, which are outlined in more detail in the Online Appendix, indicate that both risk aversion ($p=0.095$) and overconfidence ($p=0.014$) have a larger impact on the choice of whether or not to compete in the *Other*-treatment than in the *Self*-treatment.⁵

C Self- Competition is No Worse than Other-Competition for Performance Boosting

Previous literature (e.g. Gneezy et al., 2003) has documented that competitions can boost performance. In our laboratory experiment we document an average score improvement of 23.9 percent in the *Other*-treatment and 18.2 percent in the *Self*-treatment, ($p=0.444$ for t-test of difference). In the online experiment the improvement between the first and the second round is 18.0 in the *Self*-treatment and 22.2 in the three *Other*-treatments ($p=0.464$ for t-test of dif-

⁵ Using the laboratory data the same analysis yields $p=0.068$ for confidence and $p=0.469$ for risk. See Online Appendix.

ference). Hence, in both experiments there is no significant difference in the performance boosting properties of other- and self-competition.⁶

Table 1 Percentage Choosing Tournament Rate, by Treatment and Gender

Panel A: Laboratory Experiment				Panel B: Online Experiment			
Treatment:	Women	Men	Total	Treatment:	Women	Men	Total
Other	37.5 (7.1)	57.7 (6.9)	48.0 (5.0)	Other	27.8 (4.2)	40.0 (4.3)	34.3 (3.0)
Self	41.8 (6.7)	55.1 (7.2)	48.1 (4.9)	Other, Same Gender	21.9 (3.7)	34.1 (4.2)	28.0 (2.8)
Total	39.8 (4.8)	56.4 (5.0)	48.0 (3.5)	Other, Same Ability	30.6 (4.2)	33.3 (4.3)	32.0 (3.0)
				Self	35.7 (4.2)	31.1 (4.3)	33.5 (3.0)
				Total	29.0 (2.0)	34.7 (2.1)	31.9 (1.5)

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses

Table 2 Regression Analysis

Panel A: Lab Experiment

	(1) (Other)	(2) (Other)	(3) (Self)	(4) (Self)
Female	-0.195** (0.10)	-0.114 (0.10)	-0.132 (0.10)	-0.029 (0.10)
Confidence		0.246** (0.11)		-0.013 (0.10)
Risk		0.039* (0.02)		0.091*** (0.02)
Constant	0.177 (0.14)	-0.212 (0.22)	0.503*** (0.16)	-0.008 (0.20)
N	100	100	104	104
R-square	0.116	0.180	0.019	0.140

Panel B: Online Experiment

	(5) (Other)	(6) (Other)	(7) (Self)	(8) (Self)
Female	-0.126** (0.06)	-0.090 (0.06)	0.052 (0.06)	0.083 (0.06)
Confidence		0.246*** (0.06)		0.128** (0.06)
Risk		0.045*** (0.01)		0.032** (0.01)
Constant	0.297*** (0.07)	-0.114 (0.10)	0.371*** (0.08)	0.120 (0.12)
N	245	245	248	248
R-square	0.028	0.172	0.006	0.042

⁶ Note that we can only compare the improvement between the treatments and do not disentangle what part of that improvement is due to learning versus competition-related boosting.

Panel C: Online Experiment, ctd

	(9) (Other, Same Gender)	(10) (Other, Same Gender)	(11) (Other, Same Ability)	(12) (Other, Same Ability)
Female	-0.122** (0.06)	-0.094* (0.05)	-0.028 (0.06)	0.030 (0.06)
Confidence		0.269*** (0.06)		0.287*** (0.05)
Risk		0.027** (0.01)		0.042*** (0.01)
Constant	0.349*** (0.07)	0.063 (0.09)	0.307*** (0.07)	-0.117 (0.11)
N	257	257	244	244
R-square	0.019	0.158	0.002	0.158

*Notes: Dependent variable is a dummy indicating choice of competition in the third round. Robust standard errors in parentheses. All regressions control for task ability measured as the score in task 1. Risk is a 1-10 self-assessed index of willingness to take risk with 1="Not at all willing to take risks" and 10="Very willing to take risk". Confidence is a dummy that takes on the value 1 for subjects who believed that they improved their performance between the second and the third round ("Self"-treatment) or that they performed better than the person they were matched to in the second round (the three "Other"-treatments). Significance: *** $p < 0.01$ ** $p < 0.05$ * $p < 0.1$*

III Conclusions

While women are less willing than equally able men to compete against other people, we find no gender difference in the willingness to compete against one's own, previous score. For those worried about the inequalities resulting from women shying away from competitive settings, our results provide an alternative to simply removing competitive features from the environment – features which institutions employ to boost performance. Instead, we suggest that a restructuring of institutions, such that competitive pressure primarily concerning comparisons with oneself is enhanced, could be tried to reduce gender disparities in economic and labor market outcomes. This will be especially appropriate when ratchet-effects are not a concern, and when the competition is mainly used for motivation and remuneration rather than for selection. The fact that self-competition leads to a boost in performance similar to other-competition, suggests that

firms would not have to sacrifice these properties of the competitive environment. Whereas self-competition is not always an a

References

- Apicella, Coren L., and Anna Dreber.** 2015. "Sex Differences in Competitiveness: Hunter-Gatherer Women and Girls Compete Less in Gender-Neutral and Male-Centric Tasks." *Adaptive Human Behavior and Physiology* 1 (3): 247-269.
- Brown, Steven P., William L. Cron, and John W. Slocum Jr.** 1998. "Effects of Trait Competitiveness and Perceived Intraorganizational Competition on Salesperson Goal Setting and Performance." *The Journal of Marketing* 62 (4): 88-98.
- Buser, Thomas, Muriel Niederle, and Hessel Oosterbeek.** 2014. "Gender, Competitiveness and Career Choices." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129 (3): 1409-1447.
- Croson, Rachel, and Uri Gneezy.** 2009. "Gender Differences in Preferences." *Journal of Economic Literature* 47 (2): 448-474.
- Darwin, Charles.** 1888. *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*. London: Murray.
- Fischbacher, Urs.** 2007. "z-Tree: Zurich Toolbox for Ready-Made Economic Experiments." *Experimental Economics*, 10 (2): 171-78.
- Gillen, Ben, Erik Snowberg, and Leeat Yariv.** 2015. "Experimenting with Measurement Error: Techniques with Applications to the Caltech Cohort Study." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 21517.
- Gneezy, Uri, Muriel Niederle, and Aldo Rustichini.** 2003. "Performance in Competitive Environments: Gender differences." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118 (3): 1049-1074.

Howe, Leslie A. 2008. "On Competing Against Oneself, Or 'I need to get a different voice in my head'." *Sports Ethics and Philosophy* 2 (3): 353-366.

Locke, Edwin A. 1968. "Toward a Theory of Task Motivation and Incentives." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 3 (2): 157-189.

Niederle, Muriel. 2016. "Gender." In *Handbook of Experimental Economics, Volume 2*, edited by John Kagel and Alvin E. Roth. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Niederle, Muriel and Lise Vesterlund. 2007. "Do Women Shy Away From Competition? Do Men Compete Too Much?" *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 122 (3): 1067-1101.

Niederle, Muriel and Lise Vesterlund. 2011. "Gender and Competition." *Annual Review of Economics* 3 (1): 601-630.

Reuben, Ernesto, Paola Sapienza, and Luigi Zingales. 2015. "Taste for Competition and the Gender Gap Among Young Business Professionals." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 21695.

van Veldhuizen, Roel. 2016. "Gender Differences in Tournament Choices: Risk Preferences, Overconfidence or Competitiveness?" WZB Berlin Social Science Center Discussion Paper SP II 2016-207.

We gratefully acknowledge excellent comments on an earlier draft from Pio Baake, Thomas Buser, Katie B. Coffman, Christine Exley, Roel van Veldhuizen and participants in the session "Understanding Gender Differences in Labor Market Outcomes - Experimental Evidence" at the 2017 ASSA meetings.