

Opponent's Report on Dissertation Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University
Opletalova 26, 110 00 Praha 1, Czech Republic
Phone: +420 222 112 330, Fax: +420 222 112 304

Author:	Jindřich Matoušek
Advisor:	Prof. PhDr. Tomáš Havránek Ph.D. (IES)
Title of the Thesis:	Essays in Behavioural and Experimental Economics
Type of Defense:	DEFENSE
Date of Pre-Defense	April 6, 2022
Opponent:	Heiko Rachinger Ph.D. (University of the Balearic Islands)

Address the following questions in your report, please:

(Note: The report should be at least 2 pages long.)

I have checked the revised version of the PhD thesis and can conclude that Jindřich has taken very well care of all my (and as far as I can judge, also the other opponents') comments. In the following, I first answer to the six questions and afterwards give few further remarks. I focus on the third paper as the only paper that is not published yet.

a) Can you recognize an original contribution of the author?

Yes! As commented in my first report, the question posed in the experimental paper and the two questions posed in the meta-analyses are highly relevant questions in the behavioral and experimental literature. Since then Jindřich has further improved the motivation of the unpublished paper. In particular, he has further improved the motivation of the focus only on the economics literature and restricting the analysis to the 30 top journals. It is also nice seeing that the novel method of Elliot et al (2022) is incorporated.

b) Is the thesis based on relevant references?

Yes. As mentioned in my previous report, the thesis uses the relevant references in both fields – theory and applications in meta-analysis and the behavioral literature.

c) Is the thesis defensible at your home institution or another respected institution where you gave lectures?

Yes. As I mentioned in my previous report, I am convinced that it would be defensible at both universities at which I have worked: University of Vienna and University of Balearic Islands.

d) Do the results of the thesis allow their publication in a respected economic journal?

Yes. Since the last version the third paper has been quite improved and I am very confident that it should publish well. In particular, focus and motivation are improved and it reads better.

e) Are there any additional major comments on what should be improved?

At this point, I cannot think of any additional major comment. Some more issues could be at least discussed in the conclusions (see below) and the paper would benefit from a further proof-reading.

f) What is your overall assessment of the thesis? (a) I recommend the thesis for defense without substantial changes, (b) the thesis can be defended after revision indicated in my comments, (c) not-defendable in this form.

(a) I recommend the thesis for defense without substantial changes. Naturally, before submitting some more polishing and revising might be recommendable.

As for my comment about the choice of only economics papers, the additional discussion is very helpful. I also think that decreasing the importance of economics-psychological and increasing the importance of new methods in the contribution is a good idea.

It is totally fine, restricting the analysis to papers published in top journals. Still I think a very short discussion of the implications on publication bias, at least mentioning the possibility of some effect, might be a good idea. In fact, whether published and unpublished papers are similarly affected by publication bias depends on in which stage of the publication process it is most relevant.

What I meant with the direction depending on the underlying theory was your discussion of positive effects of incentives in the economics literature and negative effects due to the crowding out of intrinsic motivation. In the former we would expect a positive correlation between standard errors and effect sizes and in the latter a negative correlation. Regressing then effect size on the standard error might mix both up. Of course, if it is difficult to judge to which of the two literatures a concrete paper belongs, there is no straightforward solution. Maybe again, it could be a good idea very briefly discussing it.

To conclude let me again congratulate both Jindřich and his supervisor Tomáš for this excellent thesis.

Date:	30/08/2022
Opponent's Signature:	
Opponent's Affiliation:	Heiko Rachinger Ph.D. (University of the Balearic Islands)