



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **The desperation threshold: a model to explain decisions in poverty**

Du Buisson de Courson, B.

### **Citation**

Du Buisson de Courson, B. (2026, April 7). *The desperation threshold: a model to explain decisions in poverty*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4301048>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4301048>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

# **The desperation threshold: a model to explain decisions in poverty**

De wanhoopsdrempel: een model om beslissingen in armoede te begrijpen

Proefschrift  
ter verkrijging van  
de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,  
op gezag van rector magnificus prof.dr. S. de Rijcke,  
volgens besluit van  
het college voor promoties  
te verdedigen op  
7 april 2026  
klokke 11:30 uur  
door Benoît du Buisson de Courson  
geboren te 16 juni 1998 in Paris

**Promotor**

Prof.dr.dr. Jean-Louis van Gelder

**Co-promotores**

- Prof.dr. Willem Frankenhuis
- Prof.dr. Daniel Nettle

**Promotiecommissie**

- Prof.dr. Wilco van Dijk
- Prof.dr. Eric van Dijk
- Dr. Loreen Tisdall (Senior Researcher, Basel University)
- Prof.dr. Catherine Eckel (Professor in the department of Economics, Texas A&M University)
- Dr. Daniel Krupp (Associate Professor, Lakehead University)

This work has been funded and supported by the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Crime, Security and Law (Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany) and by the Institut Jean Nicod, Département d'études cognitives, École Normale Supérieure-PSL, EHESS, CNRS (Paris, France).

Cover designed by Poorvi Iyer.

*À ma maman, qui a la classe*  
*À mon papa, qui m'a subtilement transmis sa soif de comprendre des trucs*

# Table of contents

<b>Summary</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Samenvatting</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>I Introduction</b>	<b>11</b>
1.1 Poverty is unpleasant . . . . .	11
1.2 Why model . . . . .	14
1.2.1 “Models do not investigate nature” . . . . .	14
1.2.2 We are all modelers . . . . .	15
1.2.3 Verbal models are vague . . . . .	15
1.2.4 Verbal models are fallible . . . . .	16
1.2.5 Poverty and risk taking need formalisation . . . . .	16
1.3 What is a good model? . . . . .	17
1.3.1 Abductive reasoning . . . . .	17
1.3.2 State-dependent rational choice . . . . .	18
1.3.3 Methodological individualism . . . . .	19
1.3.4 Toy models . . . . .	19
1.3.5 What for? . . . . .	20
1.4 The desperation threshold: an old, simple, but radical idea . . . . .	21
1.4.1 Agricultural economics . . . . .	21
1.4.2 Development economics . . . . .	22
1.4.3 Evolutionary biology and psychology . . . . .	22
1.5 Dissertation outline . . . . .	23
1.5.1 Chapter 2: Why is violence high and persistent in deprived communities? A formal model . . . . .	23
1.5.2 Chapter 3: Why does poverty increase time discounting? Present needs and uncertain future . . . . .	24
1.5.3 Chapter 4: Poverty is associated with both risk avoidance and risk taking: empirical evidence for the desperation threshold model from the UK and France . . . . .	24
1.5.4 Chapter 5: Explaining the paradoxical effects of poverty on decision making: The Desperation Threshold Model . . . . .	24
<b>2 Why is violence high and persistent in deprived communities? A formal model</b>	<b>26</b>
2.1 Abstract . . . . .	27
2.2 Introduction . . . . .	27

2.3	Model . . . . .	29
2.3.1	Structure of the model . . . . .	29
2.3.2	Individual strategies and fitness . . . . .	30
2.3.3	Population simulations . . . . .	31
2.4	Results . . . . .	32
2.4.1	Individual decisions . . . . .	32
2.4.2	Population simulations . . . . .	33
2.4.3	Multiple equilibria and hysteresis . . . . .	34
2.5	Discussion . . . . .	35
2.5.1	Desperation triggers high violence . . . . .	36
2.5.2	Relative poverty or absolute poverty? . . . . .	37
2.5.3	Future directions . . . . .	38
2.5.4	Implications for policy and intervention . . . . .	38
	Funding and acknowledgements . . . . .	39
	Data transparency and reproducibility . . . . .	39
2.6	Appendix . . . . .	39
2.6.1	The model . . . . .	39
2.6.2	Supplementary results . . . . .	43
<b>3</b>	<b>Why does poverty increase time discounting? Present needs and uncertain future</b>	<b>52</b>
3.1	Abstract . . . . .	52
3.2	Introduction . . . . .	52
3.3	Model . . . . .	54
3.4	Results . . . . .	57
3.4.1	Analytical derivation . . . . .	58
3.4.2	The effect of resources . . . . .	58
3.4.3	The effect of future expectatoinis . . . . .	60
3.5	Discussion . . . . .	61
3.6	Appendix . . . . .	64
3.6.1	Mathematical derivations . . . . .	64
3.6.2	Sensitivity analysis . . . . .	70
<b>4</b>	<b>Poverty is associated with both risk avoidance and risk taking: empirical evidence for the desperation threshold model from the UK and France</b>	<b>73</b>
4.1	Abstract . . . . .	74
4.2	Introduction . . . . .	74
4.3	Theory . . . . .	76
4.4	Methods . . . . .	78
4.4.1	Panel . . . . .	78
4.4.2	Measures . . . . .	78
4.4.3	Analysis strategy . . . . .	79
4.5	Results . . . . .	80
4.5.1	Descriptive analysis . . . . .	80

4.5.2	Analysis 1 . . . . .	82
4.5.3	Analysis 2: do individuals with low resources vary more in risk taking? . . . . .	85
4.5.4	Ruling out alternative explanations . . . . .	87
4.6	Discussion . . . . .	87
4.6.1	Summary of results . . . . .	87
4.6.2	Alternative explanations . . . . .	89
4.6.3	Limitations . . . . .	90
4.6.4	Implications . . . . .	90
4.7	Funding and acknowledgements . . . . .	91
4.8	Data transparency and reproducibility . . . . .	92
4.9	Appendix . . . . .	93

**5 Explaining the paradoxical effects of poverty on decision making: The Desperation Threshold Model 99**

5.1	Abstract . . . . .	100
5.2	Poverty and risk taking: A paradoxical relationship . . . . .	100
5.3	The desperation threshold model . . . . .	101
5.3.1	The core of the model . . . . .	101
5.3.2	Grounding the basic assumptions . . . . .	102
5.3.3	The predictions of the DTM . . . . .	103
5.3.4	Antecedents of the DTM . . . . .	106
5.3.5	The DTM and Prospect Theory . . . . .	107
5.4	Empirical evidence to date . . . . .	108
5.4.1	Psychological experiments . . . . .	110
5.4.2	Choice tasks in relation to real-world resources . . . . .	115
5.4.3	Real-world choices in relation to real-world resources . . . . .	118
5.4.4	Natural experiments . . . . .	120
5.5	Population consequences of the DTM . . . . .	121
5.5.1	Explaining associations between inequality and aggregate outcomes . . . . .	121
5.5.2	Impact of welfare states on risky behaviours . . . . .	122
5.5.3	Deterrence of crime . . . . .	123
5.6	Critical issues . . . . .	123
5.6.1	Is the threshold a subjective or objective construct? . . . . .	124
5.6.2	Is the threshold level absolute or relative? . . . . .	124
5.6.3	Is the DTM falsifiable? . . . . .	125
5.7	An agenda for DTM research . . . . .	125
5.7.1	Proximal representations: thresholds in the mind . . . . .	125
5.7.2	The connection to wellbeing and poverty research . . . . .	126
5.7.3	Moral and ethical thought . . . . .	127
5.7.4	Sociopolitical implications . . . . .	128
5.8	Conclusion . . . . .	128

<b>6</b>	<b>General discussion</b>	<b>130</b>
6.1	Summary of the findings . . . . .	130
6.2	Concluding remarks . . . . .	131
6.2.1	Social life and poverty . . . . .	131
6.2.2	The desperation threshold: an obvious, but disturbing idea . . . . .	132
6.2.3	What next? . . . . .	132
	<b>Curriculum Vitae</b>	<b>134</b>
	<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>135</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>137</b>