

1 Research

My research is in the areas of experimental economics and the economics of gender. It combines observational data and experiments to study how gender differences in preferences and their interplay with market institutions contribute to gender gaps in occupations and earnings. It also asks a more basic question: why are there gender differences in economic preferences such as competitiveness and risk taking? My most recent work gives evidence for a role of culture and social norms in answering this question. Separately, I have ongoing work on prosocial behavior that investigates what motivates individuals to contribute to public goods and how to design mechanisms that promote contributions.

1.1 Gender

The general observation that motivates my work in the economics of gender is the persistent gender differences in occupations, earnings, and career progression. My research asks to what extent these differences can be explained by gender differences in preferences. In **Coffman and Klinowski (2020)**, for example, we use administrative data from the national college admissions test in Chile to show that women answered fewer multiple-choice questions than men when there were penalties for wrong answers. When a test reform removed penalties for wrong answers, the gender gap in questions skipped virtually disappeared, and women's test scores improved. This result is important for the labor market because strong test scores are a prerequisite to many high-paying careers. Removing penalties for wrong answers on admission tests likely increases opportunity for aspiring female professionals and thus helps to reduce occupational gender differences.

Getting feedback on one's performance in educational and work tasks is essential for making informed educational and occupational choices. In **Coffman and Klinowski (2024)**, we test whether women are more averse than men to receiving performance feedback, a conjecture that has been put forward in experimental work on gender but has gone largely unexplored. In a series of experiments that vary the task performed, the level of subjectivity of the feedback, and

whether it is possible for the provider of the feedback to discriminate on the basis of gender, we find that women are never less eager than men to receive performance feedback. Yet, other participants recruited to forecast our results do believe that women demand feedback at lower rates than men. Our results indicate that we cannot accept as evident the conjecture that women are disproportionately feedback averse. Instead, more research is needed to understand under what conditions this conjecture might be true. In a related paper (**Klinowski, 2019**), I study self-improvement contracts, recently proposed in the experimental literature on gender as a mechanism that incentivizes productivity and does not employ tournaments, which are well-documented to discourage female participation. I show that self-improvement contracts can in fact discourage female entry even more than tournaments, particularly when the task involves high earnings volatility.

One labor market with persistent female underrepresentation is academia, as women make up a minority of the faculty and the authors in most scholarly fields. In **Klinowski (2023)**, I ask whether the adversarial nature characteristic of post-publication critiques as currently conducted in scientific journals discourages women from writing this type of papers. I analyze bibliometrics from a set of high-impact journals in the natural and social sciences and show that women are 20-40% less likely to author post-publications critiques and failed replications than they are to author regular papers and successful replications. This result is not explained by gender differences in sorting across fields, seniority, coauthorship propensity, or priorities for authoring impactful work. I argue that preferences for avoiding direct confrontation might play a role. To shed some light on this mechanism, I conduct an experiment designed to test for gender differences in the willingness to criticize someone's work in a setting that removes confounds present in academia. In this experiment, women are less willing than men to point out a mistake in someone's work and to take away credit earned from that mistake, even when they are incentivized to criticize. Jointly, these empirical and experimental results suggest that gender differences in preferences might contribute to women's underrepresentation in comments and failed replications in the scientific literature.

Two of my most recent projects investigate the sources of gender differences in labor market traits and preferences. In **Klinowski and Niederle (2024)**, we analyze the competitiveness of individuals in samples that are nationally representative of 25 million students in 77 countries. We show that the competitiveness of women is highly malleable and highly influenced by culture. For example, we show that the competitiveness of second-generation immigrant women residing

in the same country is highly explained by their country of ancestry. In **Dean, Exley, Klinowski, Niederle, and Sarsons (2024)**, we study the role social norms play in shaping labor market traits and preferences. In an experiment that asks participants for their views of how society responds to men or women who display or fail to display certain traits or behaviors, we find that societal views impose on men a clear but restricted path: men are universally praised if they display traits and behaviors favored in the labor market (e.g., competitiveness, ambition, assertiveness, risk taking, and negotiation skills) and universally criticized if they fail to display those traits or behaviors. Women, on the other hand, face what we call a "mission impossible": women achieve less praise and more criticism than men regardless of whether they display or fail to display those traits and behaviors. To the extent that labor markets reproduce these societal norms, these societal norms might lead to worse labor market outcomes for women and to the persistence of gender differences in traits and preferences.

1.2 Prosocial behavior

My line of work on prosocial behavior examines what motivates contributions to public goods and how to design mechanisms that promote contributions. In **Klinowski (2021)**, I conduct an experiment to study how providing information about others' donations influences subsequent giving to a charity. I show that the same information can either encourage or discourage giving depending on whether the information is provided before or after selection into the giving environment, and that this effect is mediated by the degree to which participants are image concerned. These findings highlight the importance of the *timing* of social information in fundraising, a factor underexplored in the literature.

In **Argo, Klinowski, Krishnamurti, and Smith (2020)**, we use administrative data from charitable crowdfunding platforms in the US and the UK to document that donors make significantly larger and faster donations when their donation reaches the recipient's fundraising goal. This completion effect exists even when the fundraising target is not consequential for provision, which, with other evidence we give, suggests that donors derive value from personally completing a fundraising campaign. Our results suggest that posting a fundraising goal might tap into donor "warm glow" to promote giving.

Finally, **Klinowski (2018)** combines my interests in gender and prosocial behavior. This experiment finds that women give more than men in a dictator game, but are also more likely to

subsequently quietly exit the game in favor of a selfish payoff. This result cautions against interpreting gender differences in giving as stemming from differences in altruism, and points to the need to investigate gender differences in image concerns and their role in explaining differences in giving.

2 Teaching

Since arriving at the University of Pittsburgh's Katz Business School in Fall 2022, I have taught three courses in the area of economics: *Managerial Economics* (BUSECN 1010, undergraduate level), *Economic Analysis for Managerial Decisions* (BECN 2401, MBA level), and *Advanced Topics in Applied Microeconomics* (BECN 3531, Doctorate in Business Administration level). I also developed the course *Applied Behavioral Economics* (BMKT 2036, MBA level), which is offered for the first time in Spring 2025. In these courses, I expose my students to standard and modern economics concepts and tools, and illustrate their applicability to business practice through discussions of cases and media sources. I thoroughly enjoy teaching and interacting with students, and put significant time and effort in preparing organized and thought-provoking lectures and materials. I am highly evaluated by my students, with an overall teaching evaluation of 4.33/5 since arriving at Katz.

References

- Coffman, K. B., and Klinowski, D. (2020). The impact of penalties for wrong answers on the gender gap in test scores. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(16), 8794-8803.
- Coffman, K., and Klinowski, D. (2024). Gender and preferences for performance feedback. *Management Science*.
- Dean, J., Exley, C.L., Klinowski, D., Niederle, M., and Sarsons, H. (2024). Restricted path and mission impossible: Gender views. In progress.
- Klinowski, D. (2018). Gender differences in giving in the Dictator Game: the role of reluctant altruism. *Journal of the Economic Science Association*, 4, 110-122.
- Klinowski, D. (2019). Selection into self-improvement and competition pay: Gender, stereotypes, and earnings volatility. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 158, 128-146.

Argo, N., Klinowski, D., Krishnamurti, T., and Smith, S. (2020). The completion effect in charitable crowdfunding. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 172, 17-32.

Klinowski, D. (2021). Reluctant donors and their reactions to social information. *Experimental Economics*, 24(2), 515-535.

Klinowski, D. (2023). Voicing disagreement in science: Missing women. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 1-40.

Klinowski, D., and Niederle, M. (2024). Gender-equality paradox in competitiveness: Evidence and explanations. Working paper.