

Empirical Studies on Sources of Inequality

Empirical Studies on Sources of Inequality

Anna Sandberg





Dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Ph.D.,
in Economics
Stockholm School of Economics, 2014

Empirical Studies on Sources of Inequality

© SSE and Anna Sandberg, 2014

ISBN 978-91-7258-917-9 (printed)

ISBN 978-91-7258-918-6 (pdf)

Front cover illustration:

Painting by Karin Lidman Frostenson, 2014

Back cover photo:

Joakim Trolle-Lindgren, 2014

Printed by:

Ineko, Göteborg, 2014

Keywords:

Gender, gender bias, nationalistic bias, discrimination, group identity, negotiation, gender composition, wages, compensation, crime, family background, sibling correlation, fairness, dictator game, omission

*Till
Berit, Sven och Greta*

Foreword

This volume is the result of a research project carried out at the Department of Economics at the Stockholm School of Economics (SSE).

This volume is submitted as a doctor's thesis at SSE. In keeping with the policies of SSE, the author has been entirely free to conduct and present her research in the manner of her choosing as an expression of her own ideas.

SSE is grateful for the financial support provided by the Jan Wallander and Tom Hedelius Foundation which has made it possible to fulfill the project.

Göran Lindqvist

Director of Research
Stockholm School of Economics

Richard Friberg

Professor and Head of the
Department of Economics
Stockholm School of Economics

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank three people who made this thesis possible: my advisors Magnus Johannesson and Anna Dreber Almenberg, and my friend and co-author Karin Hederos Eriksson. I have been fortunate to have two advisors who are not only outstanding researchers but also great people. The support from Magnus and Anna has meant a lot to me. Also, I am forever grateful to Karin for her constant encouragement and insightful contributions to our joint research. Thank you for always being there.

Next, I want to thank the faculty at the Stockholm School of Economics. I especially thank Tore Ellingsen and Erik Lindqvist for always taking the time to give me advice and offer constructive comments. I also want to acknowledge the support of the administrative staff, in particular Carin Blanksvärd, Ritva Kiviharju, Pia Ylinen and Lilian Öberg.

Special thanks also to my co-authors Manja Gärtner, Matthew Lindquist and Randi Hjalmarsson. It has been a pleasure and a privilege to work with you.

I owe many thanks to my fellow Ph.D. students in Stockholm for making these years more memorable. There are too many of you to mention, but I would especially like to thank Carl Magnus Bjuggren, Arna Vardardottir and Simon Wehrmüller. Also, the board members of the Female Economist Network of Stockholm and Uppsala (FENSU) provided many laughs and much needed encouragement.

Further, I am indebted to the Economics Departments at the Gothenburg School of Economics and the Norwegian School of Economics for accepting me as a visiting Ph.D. student. In particular, I thank everyone at the Choice Lab for showing me how much fun research can be. Discussions with Alexander Cappelen, Erik Sørensen and Bertil Tungodden have been both enjoyable and helpful.

Finally, none of this would have been possible without my family and friends. Christian, Helena, Maja and Matias: thank you for standing by me through the ups and downs of the past years. Anders, Emi, Vanja, Joel and Niki: I am truly grateful for having you in my life. Joakim: thank you for your endless patience, love and support. I dedicate this thesis to my parents Berit and Sven, and my grandmother Greta. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to be where I am today.

Stockholm, April 6, 2014

Anna Sandberg

Contents

Introduction	1
1 Competing biases: Effects of gender and nationality in sports judging	5
1.1 Introduction	6
1.2 Data	10
1.3 Estimation strategy	12
1.4 Main results	14
1.5 Variation in biases	15
1.6 Compensating bias	19
1.7 Robustness	22
1.8 Conclusions	27
Appendix 1.A: Additional tables and figures.....	31
2 Gender differences in initiation of negotiation: Does the gender of the negotiation counterpart matter?	37
2.1 Introduction	38
2.2 Experimental design.....	42
2.3 Results	44
2.4 Discussion	53
Appendix 2.A: Word puzzle instructions	59
3 The importance of family background and neighborhood effects as determinants of crime	61
3.1 Introduction	62
3.2 Statistical model and estimation method.....	65
3.3 Data and descriptive statistics	69
3.4 Sibling correlations in criminal convictions and incarcerations.....	74

3.5 Accounting for sibling correlations in criminal convictions and incarcerations.....	80
3.6 Conclusion.....	95
Appendix 3.A: Additional figures.....	97
4 Omission effects in fairness behavior	103
4.1 Introduction.....	104
4.2 Experimental design	108
4.3 Results	112
4.4 Conclusion.....	118
Appendix 4.A: Additional tables and figures.....	123
Appendix 4.B: Structural estimation.....	129
Appendix 4.C: Written instructions	132
References.....	137

Introduction

This thesis consists of four self-contained chapters that empirically explore sources of economic inequality, using data from experiments, sports competitions, and Swedish registers.

The first three chapters assess the importance of gender, nationality and family background as determinants of unequal outcomes. Each chapter addresses this issue from a different perspective. The first chapter looks at discrimination, addressing whether individuals are treated differently based on their gender and nationality. The second chapter investigates gender differences in behavior, while the third chapter looks into how family background affects choices individuals make later on in life.

The fourth and final chapter explores how the design of choice environments can influence whether individuals choose to implement unequal outcomes.

A short summary of each chapter follows.

Competing biases:

Effects of gender and nationality in sports judging

The equestrian sport dressage is the only Olympic sport with subjective performance evaluations in which male and female athletes compete as equals, and international dressage competitions include judges and athletes of both genders and of many nationalities. Thus, these competitions provide a rare opportunity to explore gender bias and nationalistic bias in the same setting, using naturally occurring data on repeated high-stakes decisions of professional decision makers. In this paper, I use a unique data set of 89,124 scores from top-level dressage competitions between 2007 and 2012. For each performance by an individual athlete, the data include the

scores given by each of the five judges on the panel, allowing for clean identification of in-group biases. Overall, I find robust evidence of nationalistic bias but no gender bias. Further analyses suggest that nationalistic bias may crowd out gender bias in international contexts. Moreover, the nationalistic bias is largest in championships and team competitions, indicating that nationalistic bias is positively correlated with the salience of national identity. Finally, I find that judges are influenced by the nationality of the other members of the judging panel. Judges give higher scores to athletes who are of the same nationality as one of the other judges on the panel, thus reinforcing each other's nationalistic biases. Consequently, having at least one judge from the same country as oneself can have a large impact on an athlete's final score, as the scores from all judges on the judging panel are affected. This might indicate that judges engage in vote trading.

Gender differences in initiation of negotiation:

Does the gender of the negotiation counterpart matter?

(with K. Hederos Eriksson)

In this study, we investigate if and how gender differences in the propensity to initiate a negotiation are affected by the gender of the counterpart in the negotiation. We enlist 204 Swedish students to take part in an experiment in which they have to decide whether to initiate a negotiation for higher compensation. In line with previous research, we find that men are more likely than women to initiate a negotiation: 42 percent of the male and 28 percent of the female participants initiate a negotiation. The gender difference, however, is only large and statistically significant when the negotiation counterpart is a woman. With a female negotiation counterpart, women are less likely than men to initiate a negotiation by 24 percentage points, while with a male negotiation counterpart, the gender difference is only 5 percentage points and not statistically significant. This result suggests that the gender of the negotiation counterpart should be taken into consideration when analyzing gender differences in initiation of negotiation.

*The importance of family background and
neighborhood effects as determinants of crime*

(with K. Hederos Eriksson, R. Hjalmarsson and M. Lindquist)

We quantify the importance of family background and neighborhood effects as determinants of criminal convictions and incarceration by estimating sibling and neighborhood correlations. At the extensive margin, factors common to siblings account for 24 percent of the variation in criminal convictions and 39 percent of the variation in incarceration. At the intensive margin, these factors typically account for slightly less than half of the variation in prison sentence length and between one-third and one-half of the variation in criminal convictions, depending on crime type and gender. Neighborhood correlations, on the other hand, are quite small. We, therefore, conclude that these large sibling correlations are most likely generated by family influences and not by neighborhood influences. Further analysis shows that parental criminality and family structure contribute more to sibling similarities in crime than parental income and education or neighborhood characteristics. The lion's share of the sibling crime correlations, however, is unexplained by these factors. Finally, sibling spacing in age also matters – more closely spaced siblings are more similar in their criminal behavior.

Omission effects in fairness behavior

(with M. Gärtner)

We investigate whether individuals are more prone to act selfishly if they can passively allow for a self-serving outcome to be implemented (omission) rather than having to make an active choice (commission). In most settings, active and passive choice alternatives differ in terms of factors such as defaults, costs of taking an action, and awareness. Isolating the distinction between active and passive choices in an experiment, we find no omission effect in fairness behavior. This suggests that increased selfishness through omission, as observed in various economic choice situations, is driven by these other factors rather than a preference for selfish omissions.

References

- Abadie, A., & Gay, S. (2006). The impact of presumed consent legislation on cadaveric organ donation: a cross-country study. *Journal of Health Economics*, 25(4), 599-620.
- Abrevaya, J., & Hamermesh, D. S. (2012). Charity and favoritism in the field: Are female economists nicer (to each other)? *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 94(1), 202-207.
- Akee, R. K. Q., Copeland, W. E., Keeler, G., Angold A., & Costello, E. J. (2010). Parents' incomes and children's outcomes: A quasi-experiment using transfer payments from casino profits. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2(1), 86-115.
- Altonji, J. G., Cattan, S., & Ware, I. (2010). Identifying sibling influence on teenage substance use. NBER Working Paper No. 16508.
- Andreoni, J., & Bernheim, B. D. (2009). Social image and the 50–50 norm: A theoretical and experimental analysis of audience effects. *Econometrica*, 77(5), 1607-1636.
- Andreoni, J., Rao, J.M., & Trachtman, H. (2011). Avoiding the ask: A field experiment on altruism, empathy, and charitable giving. NBER Working Paper No. 17648.
- Anger, S., & Schnitzlein, D. D. (2013). Like brother, like sister? The importance of family background for cognitive and non-cognitive skills. Unpublished manuscript, DIW Berlin.
- Angrist, J. D., & Pischke, J. S. (2009). *Mostly harmless econometrics: An empiricist's companion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton university press.
- Anwar, S., Bayer, P., & Hjalmarsson, R. (2012). The impact of jury race in criminal trials. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(2), 1017-1055.
- Asch, D. A., Baron, J., Hershey, J. C., Kunreuther, H., Meszaros, J., Ritov, I., & Spranca, M. (1994). Omission bias and pertussis vaccination. *Medical Decision Making*, 14(2), 118-123.
- Babcock, L., Gelfand, M., Small, D., & Stayn, H. (2006). Gender differences in the propensity to initiate negotiations. In D. De Cremer, M. Zeelenberg, & J. K. Murnighan (Eds.), *Social psychology and economics* (pp. 239-262). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Babcock, L., Laschever, S., Gelfand, M., & Small, D. (2003). Nice girls don't ask. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(10), 14-16.

- Bagues, M. F., & Esteve-Volart, B. (2010). Can gender parity break the glass ceiling? Evidence from a repeated randomized experiment. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 77(4), 1301-1328.
- Bardsley, N. (2008). Dictator game giving: Altruism or artifact. *Experimental Economics*, 11(2), 122-133.
- Baron, J., & Ritov, I. (1994). Reference points and omission bias. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 59(3), 475-498.
- Bayer, P., Hjalmarsson, R., & Pozen, D. (2009). Building criminal capital behind bars: Peer effects in juvenile corrections. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(1), 105-147.
- Beck, T., Behr, P., & Madestam, A. (2013). Sex and credit: Is there a gender bias in lending?. Unpublished manuscript, Stockholm University.
- Bénabou, R., & Tirole, J. (2006). Incentives and prosocial behavior. *The American Economic Review*, 96(5), 1652-1678.
- Bénabou, R., & Tirole, J. (2011). Identity, morals, and taboos: Beliefs as assets. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 126(2), 805-855.
- Bernhard, H., Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2006). Group affiliation and altruistic norm enforcement. *The American Economic Review*, 96(2), 217-221.
- Bertrand, M., Chugh, D., & Mullainathan, S. (2005). Implicit discrimination. *The American Economic Review*, 95(2), 94-98.
- Björklund, A., Lindahl, L., & Lindquist, M. J. (2010). What more than parental income, education and occupation? An exploration of what Swedish siblings get from their parents. *The BE Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 10(1).
- Björklund, A., & Jäntti, M. (2012). How important is family background for labor-economic outcomes? *Labour Economics*, 19(4), 465-474.
- Blank, R. M. (1991). The effects of double-blind versus single-blind reviewing: Experimental evidence from the American Economic Review. *The American Economic Review*, 81(5), 1041-1067.
- Bohnet, I., & Bowles, H. R. (2008). Special section: Gender in negotiation (introduction). *Negotiation Journal*, 24(4), 389-392.
- Booth, A., & Leigh, A. (2010). Do employers discriminate by gender? A field experiment in female-dominated occupations. *Economics Letters*, 107(2), 236-238.
- Bourhis, R. Y., & Gagnon, A. (2001). Social orientations in the minimal group paradigm. In R. Brown, & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (Vol. 4, pp. 89-111). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bowles, H. R., Babcock, L., & Lai, L. (2007). Social incentives for gender differences in the propensity to initiate negotiations: Sometimes it does hurt to ask. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 103(1), 84-103.
- Bowles, H. R., Babcock, L., & McGinn, K. L. (2005). Constraints and triggers: Situational mechanics of gender in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(6), 951-965.

- Bowles, H. R., & Flynn, F. (2010). Gender and persistence in negotiation: A dyadic perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(4), 769-787.
- Broder, I. E. (1993). Review of NSF economics proposals: Gender and institutional patterns. *The American Economic Review*, 83(4), 964-70.
- Brännström, L. (2004). Poor places, poor prospects? Counterfactual models of neighbourhood effects on social exclusion in Stockholm, Sweden. *Urban Studies*, 41(13), 2515-2537.
- Cáceres-Delpiano, J., & Giolito, E. (2012). The impact of unilateral divorce on crime. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 30(1), 215-248.
- Calvó-Armengol, A., Patacchini, E., & Zenou, Y. (2009). Peer effects and social networks in education. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 76(4), 1239-1267.
- Cárdenas, J. C., Dreber, A., von Essen, E., & Ranehill, E. (2012). Gender differences in competitiveness and risk taking: Comparing children in Colombia and Sweden. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 83(1), 11-23.
- Carroll, G. D., Choi, J. J., Laibson, D., Madrian, B. C., & Metrick, A. (2009). Optimal defaults and active decisions. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(4), 1639-1674.
- Case, A. C., & Katz, L. F. (1991). The company you keep: The effects of family and neighborhood on disadvantaged youths. NBER Working Paper No. 3705.
- Charness, G., & Rabin, M. (2002). Understanding social preferences with simple tests. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(3), 817-869.
- Charness, G., Rigotti, L., & Rustichini, A. (2007). Individual behavior and group membership. *The American Economic Review*, 97(4), 1340-1352.
- Chen, Y., & Li, S. X. (2009). Group identity and social preferences. *The American Economic Review*, 99(1), 431-457.
- Coffman, L. C. (2011). Intermediation reduces punishment (and reward). *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 3(4), 77-106.
- Cohen, B. J., & Pauker, S. G. (1994). How do physicians weigh iatrogenic complications?. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 9(1), 20-23.
- Cox, J., Servátka, M., & Vadovič, R. (2013). Status quo effects in fairness games: Reciprocal responses to acts of commission vs. acts of omission. Department of Economics and Finance, University of Canterbury, Working Paper No. 25/2013.
- Crosan, R., & Gneezy, U. (2009). Gender differences in preferences. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 47(2), 448-474.
- Currie, J., & Tekin, E. (2012). Understanding the cycle childhood maltreatment and future crime. *Journal of Human Resources*, 47(2), 509-549.
- Cushman, F., Murray, D., Gordon-McKeon, S., Wharton, S., & Greene, J. D. (2012). Judgment before principle: Engagement of the frontoparietal control network in condemning harms of omission. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 7(8), 888-895.

- Cushman, F., Young, L., & Hauser, M. (2006). The role of conscious reasoning and intuition in moral judgment: Testing three principles of harm. *Psychological Science*, *17*(12), 1082-1089.
- Damm, A. P., & Dustmann, C. (2013). Does growing up in a high crime neighborhood affect youth criminal behavior? Unpublished manuscript, University College London.
- Dana, J., Cain, D. M., & Dawes, R. M. (2006). What you don't know won't hurt me: Costly (but quiet) exit in dictator games. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *100*(2), 193-201.
- Dana, J., Weber, R. A., & Kuang, J. X. (2007). Exploiting moral wiggle room: Experiments demonstrating an illusory preference for fairness. *Economic Theory*, *33*(1), 67-80.
- Datta Gupta, N., Poulsen, A., & Villeval, M. C. (2005). Male and female competitive behavior: Experimental evidence. IZA Discussion Paper No. 1833.
- DellaVigna, S., List, J. A., & Malmendier, U. (2012). Testing for altruism and social pressure in charitable giving. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *127*(1), 1-56.
- De Paola, M., & Scoppa, V. (2011). Gender discrimination and evaluators' gender: Evidence from the Italian academy. Dipartimento di Economia e Statistica, Università della Calabria, Working Paper No. 06-2011.
- De Scioli, P., Bruening, R., & Kurzban, R. (2011). The omission effect in moral cognition: Toward a functional explanation. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *32*(3), 204-215.
- De Scioli, P., Christner, J., & Kurzban, R. (2011). The omission strategy. *Psychological Science*, *22*(4), 442-446.
- Dhingra, N., Gorn, Z., Kener, A., & Dana, J. (2012). The default pull: An experimental demonstration of subtle default effects on preferences. *Judgment & Decision Making*, *7*(1), 69-76.
- Doyle, J. J. (2008). Child protection and adult crime: Using investigator assignment to estimate causal effects of foster care. *Journal of Political Economy*, *116*(4), 746-770.
- Dreber, A., Ellingsen, T., Johannesson, M., & Rand, D. G. (2013). Do people care about social context? Framing effects in dictator games. *Experimental Economics*, *16*(3), 349-371.
- Dreber, A., von Essen, E., & Ranehill, E. (2011). Outrunning the gender gap – boys and girls compete equally. *Experimental Economics*, *14*(4), 567-582.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*(4), 569-591.
- Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. J. (2005). Managing diversity by creating team identity. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *58*(3), 371-392.

- Eley, T. C., Lichtenstein, P., & Moffitt, T. E. (2003). A longitudinal behavioral genetic analysis of the etiology of aggressive and nonaggressive antisocial behavior. *Development and Psychopathology, 15*(2), 383-402.
- Emerson, J. W., Seltzer, M., & Lin, D. (2009). Assessing judging bias: An example from the 2000 Olympic Games. *The American Statistician, 63*(2), 124-131.
- Fehr, E., & Schmidt, K. M. (1999). A theory of fairness, competition, and cooperation. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 114*(3), 817-868.
- Fischbacher, U. (2007). z-Tree: Zurich toolbox for ready-made economic experiments. *Experimental Economics, 10*(2), 171-178.
- Frisell, T., Lichtenstein, P., & Långström, N. (2011). Violent crime runs in families: A total population study of 12.5 million individuals. *Psychological Medicine, 41*(1), 97-105.
- Gaviria, A., & Raphael, S. (2001). School-based peer effects and juvenile behavior. *Review of Economics and Statistics, 83*(2), 257-268.
- Gill, D., & Prowse, V. (2011). A novel computerized real effort task based on sliders. IZA Discussion Paper No. 5801.
- Glaze, L., & Maruschak, L. (2008). Parents in prison and their minor children. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, NCJ 222984*.
- Gneezy, U., Niederle, M., & Rustichini, A. (2003). Performance in competitive environments: Gender differences. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 118*(3), 1049-1074.
- Gneezy, U., & Rustichini, A. (2004). Gender and competition at a young age. *The American Economic Review, 94*(2), 377-381.
- Goette, L., Huffman, D., & Meier, S. (2012). The impact of social ties on group interactions: Evidence from minimal groups and randomly assigned real groups. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics, 4*(1), 101-115.
- Goldin, C., & Rouse, C. (2000). Orchestrating impartiality: The impact of "blind" auditions on female musicians. *The American Economic Review, 90*(4), 715-741.
- Greig, F. (2008). Propensity to negotiate and career advancement: Evidence from an investment bank that women are on a "Slow Elevator". *Negotiation Journal, 24*(4), 495-508.
- Greiner, B. (2004). An online recruitment system for economic experiments. In K. Kremer & V. Macho (Eds.), *Forschung und Wissenschaftliches Rechnen. GWDG Bericht 63* (pp. 79-93). Göttingen: Gesellschaft für Wissenschaftliche Datenverarbeitung.
- Grossman, Z. (in press). Strategic ignorance and the robustness of social preferences. *Management Science*.
- Hausmann, R., Tyson, L. D., & Zahidi, S. (2010). The global gender gap report 2010. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
- Hayashi, A. T. (2013). Occasionally libertarian: Experimental evidence of self-serving omission bias. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization, 29*(3), 711-733.

- Heap, S. P. H., & Zizzo, D. J. (2009). The value of groups. *The American Economic Review*, 99(1), 295-323.
- Hjalmarsson, R., & Lindquist, M. J. (2010). Driving under the influence of our fathers. *The BE Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 10(1).
- Hjalmarsson, R., & Lindquist, M. J. (2012). Like godfather, like son: Exploring the intergenerational nature of crime. *Journal of Human Resources*, 47(2), 550-582.
- Hjalmarsson, R., & Lindquist, M. J. (2013). The origins of intergenerational associations in crime: Lessons from Swedish adoption data. *Labour Economics*, 20, 68-81.
- Hjalmarsson, R., Holmlund, H., & Lindquist, M. (2011). The effect of education on criminal convictions and incarceration: Causal evidence from micro-data. CEPR Discussion Paper No. 8646.
- Holmlund, H., Lindahl, M., & Plug, E. (2011). The causal effect of parents' schooling on children's schooling: A comparison of estimation methods. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 49(3), 615-651.
- Ishikawa, S. S., & Raine, A. (2002). Behavioral genetics and crime. In J. Glickson (Ed.), *The Neurobiology of Criminal Behavior* (pp. 81-110), Norwell: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Johnson, E. J., & Goldstein, D. (2003). Do Defaults Save Lives?. *Science*, 302, 1338-1339.
- Johnson, E. J., Hershey, J., Meszaros, J., & Kunreuther, H. (1993). Framing, probability distortions, and insurance decisions. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 7(1), 35-51.
- Johnson, R. C. (2007). Intergenerational risks of criminal involvement and incarceration. Unpublished manuscript, Goldman School of Public Policy, University of California, Berkeley.
- Kling, J. R., Ludwig, J., & Katz, L. F. (2005). Neighborhood effects on crime for female and male youth: Evidence from a randomized housing voucher experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120(1), 87-130.
- Kolb, D. M. (2009). Too bad for the women or does it have to be? Gender and negotiation research over the past twenty-five years. *Negotiation Journal*, 25(4), 515-531.
- Kordes-de Vaal, J. H. (1996). Intention and the omission bias: Omissions perceived as nondecisions. *Acta Psychologica*, 93(1), 161-172.
- Kray, L. J., Thompson, L., & Galinsky, A. (2001). Battle of the sexes: Gender stereotype confirmation and reactance in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(6), 942-958.
- Kray, L. J., & Thompson, L. (2004). Gender stereotypes and negotiation performance: An examination of theory and research. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 26, 103-182.
- Krivo, L. J., & Peterson, R. D. (1996). Extremely disadvantaged neighborhoods and urban crime. *Social Forces*, 75(2), 619-648.

- Krupka, E. L., & Weber, R. A. (2013). Identifying social norms using coordination games: Why does dictator game sharing vary?. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 11(3), 495-524.
- Lauritsen, J. L. (1993). Sibling resemblance in juvenile delinquency: Findings from the National Youth Survey. *Criminology*, 31(3), 387-409.
- Lazear, E. P., Malmendier, U., & Weber, R. A. (2012). Sorting in experiments with application to social preferences. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 4(1), 136-163.
- Leider, S., Möbius, M. M., Rosenblat, T., & Do, Q. A. (2009). Directed altruism and enforced reciprocity in social networks. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(4), 1815-1851.
- Levitt, S. D., & List, J. A. (2007). What do laboratory experiments measuring social preferences reveal about the real world?. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21(2) 153-174.
- Li, D. (2011). Gender bias in NIH peer review: Does it exist and does it matter? Unpublished manuscript, Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University.
- Lindahl, L. (2011). Does the childhood environment matter for school performance, education and income? Evidence from a Stockholm cohort. *Journal of Economic Inequality*, 9(2), 207-226.
- Lindquist, M., & Zenou, Y. (2013). Key players in co-offending networks. Unpublished manuscript, Stockholm University.
- List, J. A. (2007). On the interpretation of giving in dictator games. *Journal of Political Economy*, 115(3), 482-493.
- Liu, X., Patacchini, E., Zenou, Y., & Lee, L. F. (2012). Criminal networks: Who is the key player? Unpublished manuscript, Stockholm University.
- Lochner, L., & Moretti, E. (2004). The effect of education on crime: Evidence from prison inmates, arrests, and self-reports. *The American Economic Review*, 94(1), 155-189.
- Ludwig, J., Duncan, G. J., & Hirschfeld, P. (2001). Urban poverty and juvenile crime: Evidence from a randomized housing-mobility experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116(2), 655-679.
- Machin, S., Marie, O., & Vujić, S. (2011). The crime reducing effect of education. *The Economic Journal*, 121(552), 463-484.
- Magee, J. C., Galinsky, A. D., & Gruenfeld, D. H. (2007). Power, propensity to negotiate, and moving first in competitive interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(2), 200-212.
- Mazumder, B. (2008). Sibling similarities and economic inequality in the US. *Journal of Population Economics*, 21(3), 685-701.

- Mazumder, B. (2011). Family and community influences on health and socioeconomic status: Sibling correlations over the life course. *The BE Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 11(3).
- Meghir, C., Palme, M., & Schnabel, M. (2012). The effect of education policy on crime: An intergenerational perspective. NBER Working Paper No. 18145.
- Meszaros, J. R., Asch, D. A., Baron, J., Hershey, J. C., Kunreuther, H., & Schwartz-Buzaglo, J. (1996). Cognitive processes and the decisions of some parents to forego pertussis vaccination for their children. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 49(6), 697-703.
- Moffitt, T. E. (2005). The new look of behavioral genetics in developmental psychopathology: Gene-environment interplay in antisocial behaviors. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(4), 533-554.
- Mullen, B., Brown, R., & Smith, C. (1992). Ingroup bias as a function of salience, relevance, and status: An integration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22(2), 103-122.
- Niederle, M., & Vesterlund, L. (2007). Do women shy away from competition? Do men compete too much?. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(3), 1067-1101.
- Pacifico, D. (2013). lcglogit: A Stata command for fitting latent-class conditional logit models via the expectation-maximization algorithm. *The Stata Journal*, 13(3), 625-639.
- Parsons, C. A., Sulaeman, J., Yates, M. C., & Hamermesh, D. S. (2011). Strike three: Discrimination, incentives, and evaluation. *The American Economic Review*, 101(4), 1410-1435.
- Pezzin, L. E. (2004). Effects of family background on crime participation and criminal earnings: An empirical analysis of siblings. *Estudos Econômicos*, 34(3), 487-514.
- Pichert, D., & Katsikopoulos, K. V. (2008). Green defaults: Information presentation and pro-environmental behaviour. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 28(1), 63-73.
- Price, J., & Wolfers, J. (2010). Racial discrimination among NBA referees. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125(4), 1859-1887.
- Rand, D. G., Greene, J. D., & Nowak, M. A. (2012). Spontaneous giving and calculated greed. *Nature*, 489(7416), 427-430.
- Rand, D. G., Pfeiffer, T., Dreber, A., Sheketoff, R. W., Wernerfelt, N. C., & Benkler, Y. (2009). Dynamic remodeling of in-group bias during the 2008 presidential election. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(15), 6187-6191.
- Ritov, I., & Baron, J. (1990). Reluctance to vaccinate: Omission bias and ambiguity. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 3(4), 263-277.
- Ritov, I., & Baron, J. (1999). Protected values and omission bias. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 79(2), 79-94.
- Rowe, D. C., & Farrington, D. P. (1997). The familial transmission of criminal convictions. *Criminology*, 35(1), 177-202.

- Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(3), 629.
- Sariaslan, A., Långström, N., D'Onofrio, B., Hallqvist, J., Franck, J., & Lichtenstein, P. (2013). The impact of neighbourhood deprivation on adolescent violent criminality and substance misuse: A longitudinal, quasi-experimental study of the total Swedish population. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 42(4), 1057-1066.
- Shayo, M., & Zussman, A. (2011). Judicial ingroup bias in the shadow of terrorism. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 126(3), 1447-1484.
- Skrondal, A., & Rabe-Hesketh, S. (2004). *Generalized latent variable modeling: Multilevel, longitudinal, and structural equation models*. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall/CRC.
- Small, D. A., Gelfand, M., Babcock, L., & Gettman, H. (2007). Who goes to the bargaining table? The influence of gender and framing on the initiation of negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(4), 600-613.
- Solon, G. (1999). Intergenerational mobility in the labor market. *Handbook of Labor Economics*, 3, 1761-1800.
- Solon, G., Page, M. E., & Duncan, G. J. (2000). Correlations between neighboring children in their subsequent educational attainment. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 82(3), 383-392.
- Spranca, M., Minsk, E., & Baron, J. (1991). Omission and commission in judgment and choice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 27(1), 76-105.
- Stuhlmacher, A. F., & Walters, A. E. (1999). Gender differences in negotiation outcome: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(3), 653-677.
- Sutter, M. (2009). Individual behavior and group membership: Comment. *The American Economic Review*, 99(5), 2247-2257.
- Sutter, M., Bosman, R., Kocher, M. G., & van Winden, F. (2009). Gender pairing and bargaining – Beware the same sex!. *Experimental Economics*, 12(3), 318-331.
- Säve-Söderbergh, J. (2007). Are women asking for low wages? Gender differences in competitive bargaining strategies and ensuing bargaining success. Swedish Institute for Social Research, Working Paper 2007:07.
- Tinghög, G., Andersson, D., Bonn, C., Böttiger, H., Josephson, C., Lundgren, G., Västfjäll, D., Kirchler, M., & Johannesson, M. (2013). Intuition and cooperation reconsidered. *Nature*, 498(7452), E1-E2.
- Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1(2), 149-178.
- Walters, A. E., Stuhlmacher, A. F., & Meyer, L. L. (1998). Gender and negotiator competitiveness: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 76(1), 1-29.
- Weichselbaumer, D., & Winter-Ebmer, R. (2005). A meta-analysis of the international gender wage gap. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 19(3), 479-511.

- Wennerås, C., & Wold, A. (1997). Nepotism and sexism in peer review. *Nature*, *387*, 341-343.
- Zinovyeva, N., & Bagues, M. (2011). Does gender matter for academic promotion? Evidence from a randomized natural experiment. IZA Discussion Paper No. 5537.
- Zitzewitz, E. (2006). Nationalism in winter sports judging and its lessons for organizational decision making. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, *15*(1), 67-99.