

MKTG 951-302: Judgment and Decision Making Perspectives on Consumer Behavior-Advanced (PhD Seminar)

Deborah A. Small - Fall 2015, Q2

Instructor: Deborah Small deborahs@wharton.upenn.edu

Schedule: Fridays 9:00-12:00pm, 10/19/2015-12/8/2015 (JMHH 741; Marketing conference room)

Course website: Canvas

Course Overview:

The main objective of this 7-week course is to provide a deep, focused study on a special topic within the area of Judgment and Decision Making Perspectives on Consumer Behavior. The special topic this term will be moral and prosocial decision making. The weekly readings are intended to provide PhD level coverage of classic and current research on this topic.

For each topic we will cover, articles have been chosen (although this list might be revised), and we will discuss those in detail. Our goals with these readings will be to gain exposure to the latest ideas, to determine the main ideas and research questions driving current work in each topic area, and to develop novel related research questions. In particular, our goal each week is to generate in class the design/idea for at least one new study in the focal topic area. In addition, my goal is to help you develop the skill of reading and critiquing an academic paper. We will therefore have student lead discussions of papers and required summaries (see below).

The readings (available on Canvas) should be **read carefully** by everyone attending the class (whether enrolled or sitting in; if you are unprepared, do not show up). In addition, in each class one or two students (depending on class size) will be responsible for leading the discussion on one of the papers. This responsibility entails two things: (1) guiding discussion on a specific paper, and (2) bringing a one-page summary of that paper to class – make copies for the whole class (and post on Canvas). For the article for which you are responsible, make sure to examine the stated objective and positioning of the research, the conceptual framework and hypotheses, the methodology, the results, the actual contribution and opportunities for further research.

The target audience for this course is Consumer Behavior students and other students interested in pursuing research in this special topic.

Each student will be expected to prepare the following:

- (1) **Each Week:** Prior to class (*no later than Thursday, 8:00 pm*), you are required to submit on Canvas a short “idea” based on the current set of readings. In this very brief response (a short paragraph, or a few bullet points), you could respond to a criticism you have about one of the papers, extend the original paper theoretically (maybe through developing boundary conditions), or suggest a more appropriate research approach (methods or analysis). Some of your ideas will be discussed in class each week.

*Note although what you submit should be very brief that does not mean I expect little attention/time paid to thinking about this. To the contrary, this should be the most important/challenging action on your part—to come up with a thoughtful criticism/idea and to succinctly describe it.

- (2) One goal of this seminar is to help you develop the skills to read academic papers and be able to communicate the key ideas, methods, findings, conclusions, and yes, weaknesses. To this end, every week students will help lead a discussion of a paper and will circulate a **1-page summary of that paper** [hardcopies in class, posted on Canvas, and also by email to me the evening before (*no later than Thursday at 5:00 pm*)]. Each student will do this once or twice during the semester, depending on class size.

- (3) **Research Proposal.** This includes two (2) components:

- a. Presentation of your research ideas on the final meeting. This (brief) presentation should include all of the aspects of the research proposal described below.
- b. Research Proposal (3-4 pages double spaced) due on December 11. The proposal must include the following: clear presentation and motivation of the problem and contribution, a concise mention of key findings from them literature, well developed hypotheses, and most importantly, a plan to test your hypotheses (e.g., experiment).
* Note that the proposed research idea must (generally) relate to the topics we focus on during the seminar.

Grading Components:

- 50% Class contribution (including weekly ‘idea’ and assigned papers).
- 50% Research paper
 - 5%: Paper idea outline
 - 5%: In-class presentation
 - 40%: Final proposal

Course Schedule
-- subject to change --

Revised: June 24, 2015

Date	Topic	Deadlines
1. October 23	Introduction	
2. October 30	Charitable Giving	
3. November 6	Moral signaling and crowding out	
4. November 13	Moral Conflict	
5. November 20	Ethical issues in consumption	
6. December 4		Student research presentation

Detailed Course Schedule and Reading List

-- subject to change --

Session 1: Introduction

Falk, A. and Nora Szech (2013). Morals and Markets. *Science*, 340, 707-11.

McGraw, A.P., & Tetlock, P.E. (2005). Taboo trade-offs, relational framing and the acceptability of exchanges. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 15, 2-15.

Small and Cryder book chapter (to be distributed)

Session 2: Charitable Giving

Small, Deborah A., George Loewenstein, and Paul Slovic (2007), "Sympathy and callousness: The impact of deliberative thought on donations to identifiable and statistical victims," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 102(2), 143-53.

Small, Deborah A. and Uri Simonsohn (2008), "Friends of victims: Personal experience and prosocial behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35 (June), 532-42.

Hsee, Christopher, K., Jiao Zhang, Zoe Y. Lu, & Fei Xu (2013). "Unit asking: A method to boost donations and beyond," *Psychological Science*, 24(9), 1801-08.

Gneezy, Uri, Elizabeth A. Keenan, & Ayelet Gneezy (2014). "Avoiding overhead aversion in charity," *Science*, 346, 632-35.

Session 3: Moral signaling and Crowding Out

Gneezy, Ayelet, Uri Gneezy, Gerhard Riener, and Leif D. Nelson (2012) "Pay-what-you-want, identity, and self-signaling in markets," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109, 7236-40.

Barasch, Alixandra, Jonathan Z. Berman, & Deborah A. Small (working paper) "When payment undermines the pitch: On the persuasiveness of pure motives in fundraising."

Lacetera, Nicola, Mario Macis, & Robert Slonim (2013). "Economic Rewards to Motivate Blood Donations." *Science* 340, 927-28.

Ariely, Dan, Anat Bracha and Stephan Meier (2009). "Doing good or doing well? Image motivation and monetary incentives in behaving prosocially." *American Economic Review*, 99(1), 544-55.

Olivola, Christopher Y. and Eldar Shafir (2013). "The martyrdom effect: When pain and effort increases prosocial contributions." *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 26, 91-105.

Session 4: Moral conflict

McGraw, A.P. and Philip E. Tetlock (2005). Taboo Trade-offs, Relational Framing, and the Acceptability of Exchanges." *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 15(1), 2-15.

Dana, J., Daylian M. Cain, and Robyn M. Dawes. (2006). What you don't know won't hurt me: Costly (but quiet) exit in dictator games. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 100, 193-201.

Berman, Jonathan Z. and Deborah A. Small (2012), "Self-interest without selfishness: The hedonic benefit of imposed self-interest," *Psychological Science*, 10, 1193-99.

Kristofferson, K., Katherine White, and John Peloza (2014). "The nature of slactivism: How the social observability of an initial act of token support affects subsequent prosocial action," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40 (1149-1166).

5. Ethical products

Griskevicius, Vladas, Joshua M. Tybur, and Bram Van den Bergh (2010). "Going green to be seen: Status, Reputation, and Conspicuous Conservation." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(3), 392-404.

Luchs, Michael G., Rebecca W. Naylor, Julie R. Irwin, and Rajagopal Raghunathan (2010). "The sustainability liability: Potential negative effects of ethicality on product preference." *Journal of Marketing*, 74, 18-31.

Scott, Sydney, Yoel Inbar, and Paul Rozin (2015). Evidence for Absolute Moral Opposition to Genetically Modified Food in the United States

Samper, Adriana and Janet Schwartz (2013). "Price inferences for sacred versus secular goods: Changing the price of medicine influences perceived health risk" *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39 (6), 1343-58.