

Behavioral and Experimental Economics Turin 2023

Exam rules

Paolo Crosetto

February 29, 2024

1 In short

1. The exam is a 4-pages take-home *paper report*.
2. Papers come from the reading list that we will discuss on May 10th
3. Due on June 16th, 2024.
4. Worth 30% of the final overall mark (Anna's part is worth 70%)

2 Deadlines

Article reports should arrive to paolo.crosetto@gmail.com **by 23.59, June 16th, 2024**.

This deadline is **strict**: I will *not* even look at things that arrived after that date and time.

3 What to do?

1. Choose **one** article out of the ones on github and read it;
2. Prepare a 4-pages report based on the rules below, and send it by the deadline.
3. Done.

4 Article report rules

The goal of this report is to show that you understood the article, that you understood how experimental designs are made, and to test your skills in proposing a novel experimental design on the same research question proposed by the paper, and your ideas on which data to collect and how to analyze them.

The article is composed of four parts: summary of the paper, critique of the experimental design, proposition of a novel design, data analysis plan. The article will account for 30% of the final mark on this course (Anna's part accounts for 70%)

4.1 Summary

I expect ~1 page; discuss the topic of the article; the main research question; the method used (data, lab, field experiment); method and main design choices (lab/field, between/within, what is randomized, the degree of control); main results.

4.2 Critique of the experimental design

I expect ~1 page; experimental critique: write down what you think are the strong and weak points of the experiment.

- is it an experiment? does it provide causal evidence or just correlation?
- high/low internal validity? external validity?
- Sample size good enough? representative?

- Possible confounds and how they are dealt with.
- How much confidence do you give to results?

4.3 Proposition of an alternative design and data analysis plan

I expect ~2 page; propose another design to answer the same question. If you are reading of a *mechanism* experiment, propose a *counterfactual* experiment; if of a counterfactual, propose a mechanism. Suppose you have no budget and time constraint whatsoever. Keep in mind the following points:

- Is there a possible natural experiment to be exploited?
- Would a field/lab enhance internal validity? external?
- What sample would you select?
- What design choices would you make? within? between? which time frame? which interventions?
- What are the possible confounds of your design and how would you go about solving them?
- Be **precise**, as if we *really* had to run the experiment

Add a section on which data you will collect, and how do you plan to use it to answer your research question.

4.4 Formats

Article reports have to be submitted in *English*. They can be submitted either as a .doc (.docx, .odt, .rtf) file or as a .pdf file (latter preferred). I expect them to be about 4 pages long – not too long, not too short, and *very* carefully done. Quality >> quantity.

5 Papers

Papers are to be found on github, in the Exam folder. To choose one, please go to this google spreadsheet and mark your name beside one of the papers. First come, first served, and you manage eventual conflicts among yourselves. Just one rule: *no duplicates*. Once a paper has been assigned, it's over and you have to choose another.

ID	Paper	Domain
1	Andor et al EU label.pdf	Electricity
2	Noussair et al fishing.pdf	Common Pool Resources
3	Noussair et al GMO.pdf	Food
4	Andor et al Social Norms DE.pdf	Energy
5	Momsen intention action.pdf	Energy
6	Vlaemink eco-friendly.pdf	Food
7	Andor et al CRT.pdf	Energy
8	De Haan nudge lullaby	Nudge and choice
9	Brandon List crowd out social nudges	Electricity
10	DellaVigna Malmendier paying not to go to the gym	Fitness and payment schemes
11	Kormos social norm car use	Transportation
12	Bonander et al Vaccination pre-booking sweden	Health
13	Kahneman Loss aversion and Endowment effect	Mechanism: endowment effect
14	Huber Payne Puto asymmetric dominance	Mechanism: attraction effect
15	Beshears default and saving for retirement	Pensions
16	Kristal Willhans failed nudges in transport	Transportation
17	Gneezy Rustichini pay enough or do not pay	Incentives and productivity
18	Ross et al false consensus effect	Mechanism: false consensus
19	Charness Gneezy gender difference risk taking	Mechanism: gender difference risk
20	Fischbacher lies in disguise	Mechanism: lying
21	Fischbacher gaechter fehr conditional cooperation	Mechanism: conditional cooperation
22	Robertson Nutri Score	Food
23	Timmons Lunn nudge boost savings	Banking and savings

6 ChatGPT and other LLMs

We live in a time the task I ask you to perform could be easily done for you by LLMs (Large Language Models). I am not telling you not to use them – in any case I couldn't prove that you did. But *if* you decide to use them, do this intelligently. Use them to help you clarify questions; to come up with better ways of conveying the same point; to structure the report; to find other references; etc. If you use them quite simply to write the report for you, 1. I will notice: GPTs might be good at mimicking humans, but they produce mostly boilerplate text, too long, too vague, too innocuous and without any bite; and 2. the report will most likely be bad, as it will be too general, without a clear bite.

So, please don't. For your own sake. GPTs are really good at *helping* people that know what they are doing, at least in general. They are pretty bad at taking your place entirely. You will get a very low mark, not because "hey you copied" – since I cannot prove that – but because the end result is usually crap; and you will not have learned in the process. Be smart.

7 Deadlines - repetition always helps

Article reports should arrive to paolo.crosetto@gmail.com by **23.59, June 16th, 2024**.