

## ANNA SANDBERG

### CONTACT INFORMATION

Department of Economics, Stockholm School of Economics  
Box 6501, SE-11383, Stockholm, Sweden  
Telephone: +46-8-736-9645  
E-mail: [anna.sandberg@hhs.se](mailto:anna.sandberg@hhs.se)  
Web page: <https://sites.google.com/site/annahsandberg>

### PERSONAL INFORMATION

Date of Birth: November 18, 1983  
Nationality: Swedish

### EDUCATION

- 2009 -                      Ph.D., Economics, Stockholm School of Economics  
                                 Expected Completion: June 2014  
                                 *Main advisor:* Professor Magnus Johannesson  
                                 *Co-advisor:* Assistant Professor Anna Dreber Almenberg
- Fall 2013                      Visiting Ph.D. student, The Choice Lab, Department of Economics, Norwegian  
                                 School of Economics, Bergen
- Fall 2011                      Visiting Ph.D. student, Department of Economics, University of Gothenburg
- 2004 - 2009                      M.Sc., Economics and Business, Stockholm School of Economics

### REFERENCES

#### **Professor Magnus Johannesson**

Department of Economics,  
Stockholm School of Economics  
+46-8-736 9443  
[magnus.johannesson@hhs.se](mailto:magnus.johannesson@hhs.se)

#### **Professor Tore Ellingsen**

Department of Economics,  
Stockholm School of Economics  
+46-8-736 9260  
[tore.ellingsen@hhs.se](mailto:tore.ellingsen@hhs.se)

#### **Assistant Professor Anna Dreber Almenberg**

Department of Economics,  
Stockholm School of Economics  
+46-8-736 9640  
[anna.dreber@hhs.se](mailto:anna.dreber@hhs.se)

#### **Professor Alexander Cappelen**

Department of Economics  
Norwegian School of Economics  
+47-55-959577  
[alexander.cappelen@nhh.no](mailto:alexander.cappelen@nhh.no)

### RESEARCH INTERESTS

Behavioral and Experimental Economics, Applied Microeconomics, Economics of Gender,  
Economics of Crime

### TEACHING EXPERIENCE

- Fall 2012                      Microeconomics (undergraduate), Stockholm School of Economics  
                                 Teaching Assistant for Professor Richard Friberg
- Spring 2011                      Behavioral Economics (master program), Stockholm School of Economics  
                                 Teaching Assistant for Professor Magnus Johannesson

## PRESENTATIONS (INCLUDING SCHEDULED)

- 2014 Seminar, Research Institute of Industrial Economics (IFN), Stockholm  
Seminar, Department of Economics, Stockholm University  
Seminar, Department of Economics, Uppsala University  
Seminar, Institute for International Economic Studies (IIES), Stockholm
- 2013 Seminar, The Choice Lab, Norwegian School of Economics  
8<sup>th</sup> Nordic Conference in Behavioral and Experimental Economics, Stockholm School of Economics  
Seminar, Department of Economics, Stockholm School of Economics  
IAFFE Annual Conference, Stanford University  
PhD Spring School in Behavioral Economics, the Rady School of Management, UC San Diego (poster presentation)  
PhD Workshop in Behavioral and Experimental Economics, The Choice Lab, Norwegian School of Economics
- 2012 7<sup>th</sup> Nordic Conference on Behavioral and Experimental Economics, Norwegian School of Economics  
Swedish National Conference in Economics, Stockholm University (poster presentation)  
IAFFE Annual Conference, Universitat de Barcelona  
ESPE Annual Conference, University of Bern  
7th Annual Stockholm Uppsala Doctoral Students' Workshop in Economics (SUDSWec), Uppsala University  
Seminar, Department of Economics, Stockholm School of Economics
- 2010 Conference on Equal Wages and Decentralized Wage Formation, Lund University

## JOURNAL PUBLICATIONS

**“Gender Differences in Initiation of Negotiation: Does the Gender of the Negotiation Counterpart Matter?” (2012) *Negotiation Journal*, 28(4): 407-428. (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.

## **WORKING PAPERS AND WORK IN PROGRESS**

### **“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.

### **“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.

### **“Omission Effects in Fairness Behavior” (with M. Gärtnner)**

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.

## **ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES**

Referee for: *Management Science, Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, Labour Economics*

## **RESEARCH GRANTS, HONORS, AND SCHOLARSHIPS**

2012	The Gerhard Törnqvist Scholarship for Best Published Paper by a Ph.D. Student at the Stockholm School of Economics
2013 - 2014	Tom Hedelius Research Grant for Studies Abroad
2011 -	Research grant for Ph.D. studies, Jan Wallander and Tom Hedelius Foundation
2009	The Bertil Ohlin Scholarship for Distinguished Master's Thesis in Economics, Stockholm School of Economics
2009	The John Lovén Scholarship for Outstanding Achievements within the Master Program, Stockholm School of Economics
2006	Scholarship for Academic Excellence, Stockholm School of Economics
2005	Scholarship for Academic Excellence, Stockholm School of Economics

## **UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES**

2011 - 2012	Treasurer for the Ph.D. Committee at the Department of Economics, Stockholm School of Economics
2011 - 2012	Co-founder and board member of the Female Economist Network of Stockholm and Uppsala (FENSU)

## **COMPUTER SKILLS**

STATA, z-Tree, Microsoft Office