

I am an applied microeconomist working on topics in behavioral, labor, and gender economics. My research primarily examines behavioral root causes of the labor market gender gap. I use controlled laboratory experiments based on ex-ante analysis of simulated data and pre-registered analysis plan, which allows me to causally identify the effect of various behavioral biases on outcomes relevant to the labor markets and workplace and obtain credible results.

Research during my PhD: In my postdoc job market paper, “**Should Women Speak Up More? The Cost of Corrections in Group Work,**” I study women’s cost of correcting male colleagues and its effect on group efficiency. Women speak up less often than equally knowledgeable men in a group, which reduces women’s visibility in a group and group efficiency. However, speaking up corrects others who have a different opinion, and women’s corrections may receive backlash. Should women speak up more often to close the labor market gender gap? To answer this question, I design a quasi-laboratory experiment where participants first perform a joint task seven times, each time with a different participant. After performing a joint task, they state whether they would like to be paired again with each of them. Then, they play a final, payoff-relevant, round of the task with one of the participants they have previously selected. After controlling for paired participants’ contribution to the joint task and showing that statistical discrimination against women is unlikely to be present, I find that participants are significantly less likely to select a paired participant who has corrected their action, regardless of the paired participant’s gender. Moreover, male participants react more negatively to a correction that fixes their mistake due to their overconfidence. These findings suggest that corrections do not necessarily increase group efficiency due to behavioral bias, it may not be necessarily optimal for women to speak up more, and that men may be speaking up too much.

In another paper, “**Do Competent Women Receive Unfavorable Treatment?,**” I study whether competent women receive unfavorable treatment than equally competent men. While literature finds that competent women are perceived as less likable, its direct effect on women’s career is not well investigated. I design a laboratory experiment where I exogenously vary participants’ IQ levels (a measure of competence) and compare dictator game allocation to female and male participants with higher and lower IQ levels. I find that neither men nor women treat competent women less favorably; if anything, both men and women treat competent women slightly more favorably than equally competent men. The findings provide a piece of evidence that competent women may not necessarily receive unfavorable treatment, which may shed new light on hiring and promotion practices in labor markets.

Going forward: I am planning to expand my methodological tools so that I can also exploit field settings and secondary data while keeping my expertise in controlled laboratory experiments. I am also planning to expand my research topics to social inequality in general.

In an ongoing project, “**The Effect of Identity on Labor Market Outcomes,**” I am designing a field intervention to improve newly-arrived immigrants’ ethnic and cultural identity where I hold a series of job seminars with a local NGO. I expose immigrants to other already-settled successful immigrants with the same ethnic and cultural origin. I measure their identity improvements by the Implicit Association Test and labor market outcomes by the types of jobs they have applied for and been accepted.

In another ongoing project, “**The Effect of Domestic Violence on Women’s and Children’s Wellbeing,**” I use unique Russian panel data to examine the effect of domestic violence tolerance on women’s and children’s wellbeing. I exploit the domestic violence legalization law passage and variation in the existing cultural norms and use difference-in-differences as an identification strategy.

Finally, yet in another ongoing project, “**The Effect of Cognitive Scarcity on Polarization,**” I test a hypothesis that people’s cognitive scarcity is one reason for the recent rise in supports for anti-immigrant policies using a controlled laboratory experiment and text analysis.