

MIT Department of Economics
 77 Massachusetts Avenue, E52-301
 Cambridge, MA 02139
hruebeck@mit.edu

DOCTORAL STUDIES Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)
 PhD, Economics, Expected completion June 2024
 DISSERTATION: “The role of personal, social, and political identities in key decision-making and behavior”

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE AND REFERENCES

Frank Schilbach
 MIT Department of Economics
 77 Massachusetts Avenue, E52-560
 Cambridge, MA 02139
 617-253-9299
fschilb@mit.edu

Esther Duflo
 MIT Department of Economics
 77 Massachusetts Avenue, E52-544
 Cambridge, MA 02139
 617-253-7013
eduflo@mit.edu

Parag Pathak
 MIT Department of Economics
 77 Massachusetts Avenue, E52-426
 Cambridge, MA 02139
 617-253-7458
ppathak@mit.edu

PRIOR EDUCATION Wellesley College 2016
 BA in Economics with Honors
Summa Cum Laude, Phi Beta Kappa Society

CITIZENSHIP USA **GENDER** Female

FIELDS Primary Fields: Behavioral and Labor
 Secondary Fields: Education

TEACHING EXPERIENCE Psychology and Economics (undergraduate, MIT course 14.13) 2023
 Head Teaching Assistant to Professor Frank Schilbach
 Public Finance and Public Policy (undergraduate, MIT course 14.41) 2022
 Teaching Assistant to Professor Jonathan Gruber
 Political Economy and Economic Development (undergraduate and masters, MIT course 14.75/0) 2021
 Teaching Assistant to Professor Benjamin Olken
 Research and Communications in Economics (undergraduate, MIT course 14.33) 2020

MIT Economics

HANNAH RUEBECK

OCTOBER 2023—PAGE 2

	Teaching Assistant to Ro'ee Levy (post-doc)	
	The Challenge of World Poverty (undergraduate, MIT course 14.73)	2020
	Teaching Assistant to Professor Frank Schilbach	
RELEVANT POSITIONS	Research Assistant to Professor Amy Finkelstein	2019
	Pre-Doctoral Research Fellow with Professor Roland Fryer	2016-18
FELLOWSHIPS, HONORS, AND AWARDS	National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Schiff Fellowship for undergraduate thesis in economics, Wellesley College	
	Research Grants: J-PAL King Climate Action Initiative (36K, co-primary PI) J-PAL Social Policy Research Initiative (43K, primary PI) US HHS, ACF Behavioral Intervention Scholars Grant (25K, primary PI) NSF Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grant (25K, primary PI) George and Obie Shultz Fund Grant (23K, primary and co-primary PI) Strengthening American Democracy Program at Beyond Conflict (10K, co-primary PI)	
PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES	Referee: <i>American Economic Review</i> , <i>American Economic Review-Insights</i> Service: MIT Economics Application Assistance and Mentoring Program, MIT Economics Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion committee	
PUBLICATIONS	“Childhood Confidence, Schooling, and the Labor Market: Evidence from the PSID” (with Lucy Page) <i>Journal of Human Resources</i> , <i>Forthcoming (Accepted Jul 2022)</i> . We link over- and under-confidence in math at ages 8-11 to education and employment outcomes 22 years later among the children of PSID households. About twenty percent of children have markedly biased beliefs about their math ability, and beliefs are strongly gendered. Conditional on measured ability, childhood over- and under-confidence predict adolescent test scores, high school and college graduation, majoring or working in STEM, earnings, and unemployment. Across all metrics, higher confidence predicts better outcomes. These biased beliefs persist into adulthood and could continue to affect outcomes as respondents age, since intermediate outcomes do not fully explain these long-run correlations. “Crowd-out in School-based Health Interventions: Evidence from India’s Midday Meals Program” (with Jim Berry, Saurabh Mehta, Priya Mukherjee, and Gauri Kartini Shastry) <i>Journal of Public Economics</i> , 2021 “Implementation and Effects of India’s National School-based Iron Supplementation Program” (with Jim Berry, Saurabh Mehta, Priya Mukherjee, and Gauri Kartini Shastry) <i>Journal of Development Economics</i> , 2020	

RESEARCH PAPERS

“Perceived Discrimination at Work” (Job Market Paper)

Beliefs about experiencing discrimination are widespread but understudied. In an online experiment (N=5000), I randomly assign workers to be evaluated by promotion procedures with varied potential to discriminate and provide information about the procedure. Learning that managers knew workers’ race and gender and previously promoted mostly white men increases perceived discrimination rates from 3-34%, lowers retention by 3-6%, and increases reservation wages by 9%. Reducing perceived discrimination is therefore important for equity and efficiency. However, increasingly-common anti-bias procedures—blinding managers to demographics or using unbiased algorithms—are unlikely to alone eliminate perceived discrimination when minority groups remain under-represented.

“The Narrative of Policy Change: Fiction Builds Political Efficacy and Climate Action,” (with Lucy Page and James Walsh) (*Submitted*)

Can fictional narratives contribute to building political momentum? In an online experiment (N≈6,000), learning about the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) strengthens beliefs about government responsiveness to citizen action by only 0.07sd. Watching a short, fictional story about political climate advocacy as a loose backstory to the IRA yields much larger effects on beliefs (0.5sd). While IRA information alone does not affect climate advocacy, the story increases information-gathering about climate marches by 54 percent and donations to lobbying organizations by 19 percent. We show evidence that beliefs and emotions may drive this effect.

“Reaching Across the Aisle: Does Affective Polarization Hinder Grassroots Climate Mobilization?” (with Lucy Page)

Political action spreads through social networks, so citizens may have power to shape policy both through their own advocacy and by recruiting others to act. Do citizens try to spread grassroots action? If so, do they work to build broad, bipartisan coalitions or to recruit others like them? We focus on the climate movement, where most citizen advocates are Democrats. Mobilizing bipartisan action could more effectively promote climate policy in Congress, but record-high affective polarization—animosity towards counter-partisans—may impede cross-party grassroots cooperation. In online experiments with 25,000 participants, we connect Democrats with other Americans across the political spectrum (all of whom believe climate change is human-caused) to understand whether and how they try to recruit others to push for climate policy. Democrats are motivated to recruit others—they are 10% more likely to email Congress when doing so allows them to invite others to act. Even while Democrats say that a bipartisan climate movement would be more effective, however, they are 27% more likely to invite other liberals than conservatives to email Congress. This gap does not arise from Democrats’ own distaste for engaging with counter-partisans, but rather can be explained by their correct beliefs that their invitation will have

about half as much impact on conservatives' action. Anticipated affective polarization drives these beliefs: Democrats estimate that conservatives would respond three times more to invitations that did not identify them as liberals.