

# M.Sc. Seminar: Decision and Game Theory

Prof.Dr. Carlos Alós-Ferrer

## Contact

- Use this and only this email address: `office.alos-ferrer@wiso.uni-koeln.de`
- This is not the only course we teach. Always write in your email which course it is about, in this case “Seminar Decision and Game Theory”.

## Topic

The topic this year is **Economic Theory and Psychology: Multiple Selves**. The seminar examines *decision- and game-theoretical models* incorporating ideas from psychology.

Evidence from psychology and neuroscience (“dual-process theories”) shows that human decisions are the result of the interaction of impulsive/affective processes (automatic) and more deliberative ones (controlled). This view has influenced different models in economics in the recent decades, starting with those examining intertemporal decisions (procrastination, intertemporal inconsistencies) and culminating in more recent “multiple-selves models”, which view decisions as the result of intrapersonal games between long-run and short-run selves, and self-control problems as one aspect of the possible conflict between processes.

For a very short introduction to the topic, you can check this paper:

- ALÓS-FERRER, C., STRACK, F., 2014. From Dual Processes to Multiple Selves: Implications for Economic Behavior. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 41, 1-11.

## Schedule for WS 15/16

Group Meetings take place on certain **Wednesdays, 14:00 - 15:30, Philosophikum - Room S 69**. A good part of the course is based on your own work and face-to-face meetings to discuss it. The course has three phases.

### Phase 1: Introduction

In this phase we will briefly introduce the seminar topic, and discuss what should be in the presentation and in the written report. The date for this is:

- **October 21st, 2015**: General information on the seminar

### Phase 2: Preparing Your Presentation

In this phase you have to choose your topic (paper) from the list of **References** at the end of this document, get a date for your presentation, and prepare your slides and your written report. *There are no group meetings in this phase*. Important notes:

- The deadline for choosing a topic and a preferred date for your presentation (see below) is **November 4th**. Write an email before that date. Please note that we operate on a “first-come, first-served” basis, so if you are late you might not get your topic or your preferred slot. Also please note that some papers need to be presented before other ones, so this might condition the slot you get.
- If you encounter difficulties preparing your presentation / report, make an appointment with Prof. Alós-Ferrer. Please note that office hour slots go fast! You need to make an appointment with several weeks in advance. Ask for an appointment at the email address above.

- Even if you do not make an appointment, it is recommended that you send a preliminary version of your slides (PDF only!!!) to the email address above. To get feedback on the slides, you need to send them at least two weeks before your scheduled talk.

### Phase 3: Student Presentations

We will have student presentations in the dates below. You need to get a slot for one of these dates.

- January 13th, 2016
- January 20th, 2016
- January 27th, 2016
- February 3rd, 2016

You are required to give a presentation to pass. We have chosen as many dates as needed given the number of registered students. If students drop out, we might reallocate some talks.

*Is attendance required?* Except for your presentation, NO. But it is highly recommended. Please check “Seminar Attendance and the New University Law” in the Brain Gain blog. There are other entries on seminars and studies in that blog that you might want to have a look at.

In addition to your presentation, you need to deliver a written report.

**The deadline for the written report is February 10th, 2016, 24:00.**

### General Observations

1. **The language is English.** English has established itself as the language of Economic Theory. The literature you will work with will be in English, and it is expected that you write your slides and your written report in English.
2. **The format is PDF.** It is *recommended* to write in  $\text{\LaTeX}$ , but you are free to use whatever software you are familiar with to produce your presentation slides and your written report. However, **YOU MUST GENERATE (searchable) PDF FILES** which work across platforms (our group is Windows-free). No other format is accepted. In particular, do *not* come to your presentation with a “PowerPoint” file.
3. **Plan in advance.** You can make an appointment to discuss your presentation and report. However, you need to make the appointment several weeks in advance. Do not count on getting an appointment if you ask just a week in advance—slots go fast! You can also send a preliminary version of your slides before your presentation. You will get feedback, but only if you send them at least two weeks before your presentation.

### The Presentation

4. You should prepare a slides-based presentation based on the research paper you have been assigned.
5. Your talk should take no more than 25 minutes, and no less than 20. Practice privately in advance. Several times. As a rule of thumb, this means 10 to 15 slides.
6. Slides have to be easily readable. Use a large type font (if you use  $\text{\LaTeX}$  simply use a slide style as *Beamer* or *PowerDot*). Do not pack too much in your slides.
7. What belongs in the slides?
  - Introduction: what the paper is about, previous literature.

- For theoretical papers: Detailed set-up of the model and equilibrium concept (if applicable).
- Detailed presentation of the results. Include intuition on them.
- Graphical illustrations. It is fine to copy-paste pictures from the paper (this is a closed-door presentation), but indicate it clearly in the slide.
- Discussion, including literature appeared *after* the paper.

8. What should *not* be in the slides?

- Detailed proofs (but intuition and/or examples are welcome).
- Unsubstantiated opinions.

9. These things *could* be in the slides (but need not be).

- Short (1 slide) discussions of related papers.
- Short presentations of examples or other original contributions on your part (see below).
- Self-generated pictures illustrating aspects of the paper.

## The Written Report

11. The written report is due at the end of the semester, and can contain elements which appeared in the discussion of your presentation.

12. The written report should be 12 to 16 A4 pages written single-spaced with reasonable margins (not too large, not too small) and a 12pt type font. The bibliography at the end does *not* count towards page count.

13. **Content.** The written report is made out of the following parts.

- *Introduction.* Where you explain what is the topic and why it is interesting for economists.
- *Related Literature Review.* Where you briefly explain which other articles are relevant for the issue(s) at hand, and put the paper in a broader context.
- *Model,* where the setup of the paper is presented.
- *Results,* where the results of the paper are presented and discussed. As in the presentation, avoid repeating proofs (we can read those in the original paper), but make sure you understand them and give intuitions, illustrations, or summaries of the main arguments instead.
- *A Small but Original Contribution,* related to the paper but not taken from it. What is feasible of course depends on the paper, but examples of original contributions are:
  - A worked-out **numerical example** where you can illustrate the results of the paper, ideally giving rise to a graphical illustration.
  - A **computer simulation** which illustrates aspects of the model in the paper which have not been or can not be showed analytically.
  - A worked-out **small variant** or **simplification** of the paper's model in the literature review (e.g. take a model which has been analyzed with linear costs and solve it with quadratic costs; find additional equilibria after one assumption has been dropped/weakened; recompute the results of a duopoly model for three firms; etc).
  - A **comparison** of the results in the paper to later, related papers (of course, this does not count as contribution if the comparison is made in those later papers).
- *Related Work.* Where you briefly summarize related papers which appeared after the one you have been assigned. Conduct an inverse search (through academic databases or at least Google Scholar) to see who has quoted the papers you are working on and why. Find out what has been done on the topic after the papers you review were written.
- *Conclusion.* Where you summarize the report and its message (1 page; not more, not less).

## Mistakes

The following are examples of severe mistakes leading to bad grades. They are all taken from actual student behavior in past seminars. Learn from their mistakes!

- *Mistake: using the wrong version of your paper.* Do not “google” for your paper. Go to the journal’s webpage through the Library’s database and download the published version. There might be preliminary versions on the internet, which might differ from the published version or even contain mistakes. As a student at the University of Cologne, you have access to the journals. Use it!
- *Mistake: looking only at your paper.* There are several “general papers” which you should read. You should also read the papers which are going to be presented by other participants. You might be asked to discuss the relations among them. Be prepared!
- *Mistake: misquoting.* If a paper is by Smith, Jones, and Gordon (1985), you *cannot* quote it as Smith (1985). How would you feel if you worked hard on a paper and it was attributed to somebody else? Learn how to quote properly, and make sure you do not mix up the authors’ names. Misquoting will automatically reduce your grade.
- *Mistake: textbook literature.* This is not the place to review textbook knowledge from your basic courses. Don’t review what is a utility function or a subgame perfect Nash equilibrium. Don’t write the  $n$ -th summary on the basics of Principal-Agent models. Don’t reproduce a detailed definition of repeated games.
- *Mistake: nonacademic sources.* Wikipedia is not a peer-reviewed, academic source. It’s fine to use it to find the real sources, but do not mistake it with an academic document. Likewise, not everything you find on Google is an acceptable reference (hint: use the academic databases available within the UoC net, e.g. EconLit, or at least start your searches with Google Scholar).
- *Mistake: coming to your presentation without a working PDF file.* If you show up with a file in the wrong format (e.g. Powerpoint slides), you will not be able to present. This means you will fail the course.
- *Mistake: reading from your notes while presenting.* Your presentation should be hands-free. Do not prepare a text to read. That shows that you are unfamiliar with the paper and are trying to cover up lack of preparation. Look at the slides and at the audience, and explain the paper. It’s fine to have a couple of notes handy “just in case”, but reading out loud from them is not.
- *Very Bad Mistake: plagiarism.* Plagiarizing is worse than a mistake. It is dishonest behavior. As a first step, it will immediately lead to a “fail” grade. Additionally, we will report it to the administration and that might lead to expulsion from University. We’re not kidding. By the way, there is automatic web-searching software to check for plagiarism. So we’ll find out. And yes, copying from other students’ written reports is also plagiarism.

## References

- ALONSO, R., I. BROCAS, AND J. D. CARRILLO (2014): “Resource Allocation in the Brain,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 81(2), 501–534.
- BÉNABOU, R., AND J. TIROLE (2004): “Willpower and Personal Rules,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 112(4), 848–887.
- BENHABIB, J., AND A. BISIN (2005): “Modeling Internal Commitment Mechanisms and Self-Control: A Neuroeconomics Approach to Consumption-Saving Decisions,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, 52(2), 460–492.
- BERNHEIM, B. D., AND A. RANGEL (2004): “Addiction and Cue-Triggered Decision Processes,” *American Economic Review*, 94(5), 1558–1590.
- BROCAS, I., AND J. D. CARRILLO (2008): “The Brain as a Hierarchical Organization,” *American Economic Review*, 98(4), 1312–1346.
- (2012): “From Perception To Action: An Economic Model of Brain Processes,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, 75(1), 81–103.
- FUDENBERG, D., AND D. K. LEVINE (2006): “A Dual-Self Model of Impulse Control,” *American Economic Review*, 96(5), 1449–1476.
- (2012): “Timing and Self-Control,” *Econometrica*, 80(1), 1–42.
- FUDENBERG, D., D. K. LEVINE, AND Z. MANIADIS (2012): “An Approximate Dual-Self Model and Paradoxes of Choice Under Risk,” *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 41, 55–67.
- O’DONOGHUE, T., AND M. RABIN (1999): “Doing It Now or Later,” *American Economic Review*, 89(1), 103–124.
- (2001): “Choice and Procrastination,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116(1), 121–160.
- OZDENOREN, E., S. SALANT, AND D. SILVERMAN (2012): “Willpower and the Optimal Control of Visceral Urges,” *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 10(2), 342–368.