

# Ex4

1. Main finding in 2-3 sentences.

The paper explores how manager bias affects minority workers' performance in French grocery stores. They found that minority cashiers perform worse when scheduled with biased managers

2. Comment on the research design of the paper. Which of the tools described in the Mastering Econometrics videos did they use? How did they use them?

It takes advantage of the random scheduling (random assignment) of cashiers to different managers (the workers did not have choice on when and who to work with).

3. Comment on any possible remaining threats to inference that may result from measurement or implementation problems likely encountered by the researchers.

- Measurement Errors

If the AIT score does not perfectly represent manager's bias

- Implementation Problems

It is highly possible that there were interactions between workers and If the behavior or performance of cashiers is influenced by their colleagues, there could be spillover effects that are not accounted for.

4. Think about patent examiners now. If you were to try to establish why examiners leave the USPTO, what could be **one causal** hypothesis to test? (Hint: Think

about many of the reasons certain workers may leave and pick one that you would like to test.)

- Let us hypothesize there is a quota for patent reviewed per examiner in a time period. Missing the quota may decrease the job satisfaction or cause issues that make them want to leave the organization

5. (extra-hard and optional): Outline a research design that would use one of the tools described in the course to test the hypothesized causal link. Be as specific as possible about your implementation (but no need to do any programming or data manipulation, unless you feel compelled).

I think we can use RDD in this case. Apply RDD by identifying a specific quota threshold. For instance, if the quota is reviewing 100 patents per year, you would compare the attrition rates of examiners who reviewed just below 100 patents (e.g., 98 or 99 patents) and those who reviewed just above 100 patents (e.g., 101 or 102 patents). The assumption here is that examiners on either side of this quota are similar in all aspects except for their achievement relative to the quota.