

USING CLASSROOM EXPERIMENTS TO TEACH MARKET DESIGN AND MATCHING THEORY*

Melati Nungsari[†] & Sam Flanders[‡]

Asia School of Business in Collaboration with MIT Sloan School of Management

June 10, 2017

Abstract

Market design studies alternative mechanisms to allocate resources when standard markets fail. One application of market design is the study of two-sided matching markets such as the marriage and dating market. Introductory market design is often taught as an upper-level undergraduate class that requires a significant amount of mathematical preparation. In this paper, we outline two classroom experiments conducted in a matching theory class. We found the experiments to be very effective at simplifying abstract concepts to students with limited mathematical and economics background. The first experiment studies market thickness and market segmentation. The second experiment explores the idea that positive assortative mating in income and education has led to an increase in income inequality in the U.S. in recent history.

JEL classification: A22, C78

Keywords: experiment, matching, inequality, economic education

*We would like to thank the Department of Economics at Davidson College for providing the opportunity to develop and teach the course outlined in this paper. We would also like to thank our home institution, the Asia School of Business in collaboration with MIT Sloan, for their support. All mistakes are our own.

[†]Assistant Professor of Economics and MIT International Faculty Fellow; Asia School of Business in collaboration with MIT Sloan; Sasana Kijang, 2 Jalan Dato' Onn, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia 50480; Telephone: +1-309-299-1279; Email: melati.nungsari@asb.edu.my.

[‡]Assistant Professor of Economics and MIT International Faculty Fellow; Asia School of Business in collaboration with MIT Sloan; Sasana Kijang, 2 Jalan Dato' Onn, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia 50480; Telephone: +1-919-636-9852; Email: samuel.flanders@asb.edu.my.

Introduction

The field of market design came into the spotlight when Al Roth and Lloyd Shapley won the Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences in 2012 for “the theory of stable allocations and the practice of market design.”¹ Market design is the study of market structures and characteristics with the goal of identifying specific problems so that economists can make them more efficient. The 2012 Nobel Prize catapulted the popularity of the study of two-sided matching markets amongst academics, but the subfield itself started 50 years earlier with the elegant paper by David Gale and Lloyd Shapley titled “College Admissions and the Stability of Marriage” (1962), in which they define the notion of a *stable matching*² and develop an algorithm to pair individuals together in a matching market depending on their preferences over potential mates. Very recently, Al Roth brought matching markets to the attention of the nonacademic audience with the release of his very accessible book on this topic called “Who Gets What – and Why: The New Economics of Matchmaking and Market Design” (2015).

What makes a matching market different than a “normal” market? What makes the dating market different than the market for Wisconsin cheddar cheese? In a matching markets, there are different *sides* to the market and each side has preferences over individuals on the other sides of the market. For example, in a heterosexual dating or marriage market, there are typically two sides (men and women) and every man and woman has preferences over characteristics of their potential partners. In contrast, markets for consumption goods do not have two-sided preferences – you may prefer Wisconsin cheddar over English cheddar, but the cheese certainly does not care about who ends up buying and consuming it. It is also important to note that prices do not play a strong role in some matching markets but that there are many important matching markets in which prices are a powerful allocation mechanism. For example, wages play a key role in the allocation of doctors to hospitals, whereby economists have studied how price competition works in the labor market for medical residents (Bulow and Levin 2006).

Even though the basic ideas from the field of matching theory are quite intuitive, the level of mathematical maturity needed to study these questions in detail is quite high. This being the case, matching theory and more broadly, market design, is generally not taught to lower-level undergraduate economics majors, and not at all to non-majors. A standard market design class typically requires at least intermediate microeconomics and familiarity with basic set theory and calculus, which is not the norm amongst most

¹http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economic-sciences/laureates/2012/

²A stable matching exists in a two-sided matching market when there are no two individuals who are married to other people and who would rather be married to each other.

sophomore-level college students and below. This is unfortunate because unlike most economics classes that utilize a lot of math, the conclusions derived from the study of market design are extremely useful for real-world applications.

In the spring of 2016, we were given the opportunity by Davidson College, an elite liberal arts college in North Carolina, to design a course on market design that is targeted to undergraduate students who have *only* had introductory economics (micro and macro). In developing this course, we decided to incorporate many experiments as a way to keep the students interested in the material to provide a tangible way of illustrating abstract concepts, and to provide a break for the students so that they can walk around the classroom, not fall asleep, and do something other than listening to lectures on mathematical models.

The literature on economic education has documented many instances in which experiments have added significant value to student learning in the classroom (Holt 1999). The paper that is closest to ours is titled “Choosing Partners: A Classroom Experiment,” and was published in the *Journal of Economic Education* (Bergstrom et al. 2013). It provides a case study of a classroom experiment that was used by the authors to teach students about the concept of two-sided markets, stable matching assignments, and the Gale-Shapley deferred-acceptance algorithm outlined in their 1962 paper. Another study found that “students who took part in (a) classroom experiment, as well as those who just watched it, were more successful in answering a multiple-choice test than control groups from the same courses.” (Frank 1997). Some authors have also found that unlike grade incentives, experiments have the ability to increase learning in introductory microeconomics courses (Dickie 2006). Finally, in an article published in 2007, Durham et al. found that the learning benefits that students experience from classroom experiments greatly offset its high implementation costs.

Our paper has two goals:

1. To add to the growing body of literature in economic education dedicated to documenting experiments in the classroom.
2. To provide a way to lessen the overuse of mathematics in teaching mathematically intensive undergraduate courses in microeconomics.

Our paper will focus on the two most successful experiments that we conducted in this market design course that have since been repeated in other classes that we have taught. The first is on the idea of thick markets and the usefulness of market segmentation and the second addresses the rise in income inequality in the US and assortative mating.

Course Description

In this section, we will provide a general overview of the course so that the reader may situate the experiments within the context of topics covered. There were 34 students in the class, which is quite large for Davidson College, where the average class size is 15. Students were mostly sophomores, and most, but not all, were economics majors. The course was designated as a 200-level elective, which means that the only prerequisite for the class was introductory economics.³ Davidson College is a premier liberal arts college that has consistently ranked within top 10 liberal arts colleges in the U.S. It has an acceptance rate of about 20%, with 85% of the Class of 2020 reporting that they were in the top 10% of their class.⁴ We found the students to be remarkably engaged and talented but most had not yet taken intermediate microeconomics. Classes were held every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday for 50 minutes. Since the students did not all come equipped with intermediate micro and the mathematical sophistication needed to study market design at a higher level, our focus for the class was not to teach them how to do quantitative research in matching theory, but to expose them to the useful results that the field has derived that may be used in other aspects of their life and other classes.

The course was divided into two parts. The first part of the course was devoted to learning the basics of market design and matching markets (1.5 weeks), an introduction to rational decision theory and a brief introduction to game theory (1 week), and a more in-depth look at two-sided matching theory, the notion of stability, and a variety of algorithms for finding stable matchings (2 weeks). After I was confident that the students had a sufficiently rigorous foundation in matching theory, we proceeded to look at a variety of applications for matching markets. These included the following markets, each covered for about a week:

1. The National Residency Matching Program
2. Kidney Exchanges and Repugnant Goods
3. School Choice in Major US Cities
4. Job Search
5. Marriage and Dating Markets

Finally, at the end of the semester, we also discussed other issues related to market design such unraveling, platforms and firm pricing, signaling, and exploding offers.

³At Davidson, ECO 101 (Introductory Economics) covers both micro and macroeconomics.

⁴<https://www.davidson.edu/admission-and-financial-aid/class-of-2020-profile>

The students were graded on the following components – two midterm exams (20% of the final grade each), 2 major problem sets (5% each), participation (10%), reading responses to academic and news articles (15%), and a final paper (5% for a written proposal, 5% for final class presentation on the paper, and another 15% for the final paper itself). The method of delivery for the class was mainly lectures with the integration of classroom discussions, debates, and experiments. For example, when we covered kidney exchanges, we read an academic paper that summarized the government-operated market for organs in Iran (Fatemi, 2012). This system is, of course, in contrast to the U.S., where it is illegal for money to be exchanged for a human organ. We then watched the HBO documentary “Tales from the Organ Trade” when we discussed the idea of *repugnant markets* (i.e. markets that do not exist because of prevailing social norms), and debated the existence of organ markets in groups. Some questions that were raised during this debate were: Is it ethical to pay somebody for an organ? Do you see the organ market as the beginning of the commoditization of other goods and services such as sex and children? Should somebody from a developing country be paid less than somebody from a developed country for essentially the same organ?

The first experiment described below was conducted at the start of the semester as a classroom activity in the foundations section of the course. We first assigned as required reading for the day the chapter from Al Roth’s book that loosely discusses the concept of thick markets and the usefulness of market segmentation. Students came to class prepared and then we played the game. The second experiment was conducted at the end of the course during the topics section of marriage and dating markets. For that experiment, students were assigned an article from The Economist titled “Sex, brains and inequality: How sexual equality increases the gap between rich and poor households”, to read before class.

Experiment 1 - Thick Markets and Market Segmentation

In market design, a “thick market” is a market that is sufficiently saturated with participants such that each participant does not have trouble finding somebody else to transact with. This experiment was a fun way to both expose students to this concept and to explore the costs and benefits of having a thick market.

In this experiment, we simulated a two-sided matching market with horizontal preferences. Horizontal preferences are preferences for similarity. In the context of a marriage market, these preferences can be used to model the phenomena where fans of jazz music find it attractive to marry each other or the fact that most individuals marry within their racial group. This is in contrast to vertical preferences, which

are preferences over characteristics ranked according to an order that most or all individuals agree on. For example, individuals tend to view income as a vertical trait – the higher a person’s income, the more desirable they are seen by their potential mates.

Description of the Experiment

Types: Each student is randomly assigned a “type” – A, B, C or D. If possible, assign an equal number of students to each type.

Preferences: Everybody wants to marry their own type.

Number of Iterations: Three, each with different setups.

Time Limit: 90 seconds for each iteration. Time is clearly projected at the front of the room.

Setup for Each Iteration:

- Iteration 1 – The instructor randomly partitions the class into four groups. You may only search and match with individuals in your own group.
- Iteration 2 – Students are free to match to anybody in the class.
- Iteration 3 – The instructor partitions the class into four groups according to their types. You may only search and match with individuals in your group.

Rules and Restrictions

- For each iteration, students search for a match by approaching another student by stating their name, providing one interesting fact about themselves (e.g., “My name is John and I grew up in Germany”), and shaking the other student’s hand. After listening to the other person’s introduction, both students reveal their types to each other. If they both happen to be of the same type, they get married and move to the back of the classroom. If they are not of the same type, they must continue the search process with another individual.
- Students are not allowed to shout their type out loud. They must proceed through the search process as outlined above.
- Students are assigned different types for each iteration of the experiment.

Deliverables: On the same day that the experiment was conducted, students participated in an all-class discussion of the experiment, their experiences, their takeaways, and also the reading assigned from the

previous class. Students also had to turn in a 1-page writeup on the experiment and outcomes.

Outcomes and Takeaways

The first iteration of the experiment (depicted in Figure 1), is meant to illustrate the concept of an anti-thick market, i.e. a *thin market*. A thin market is one in which participants may have trouble finding somebody to match or transact with due to the fact that they have run out of people of their type. In a buyer-seller market, this can be imagined as a difficult situation where you'd like to purchase a specific product but cannot find a seller who can sell that product to you. The cost of a thin market is that some people could end up unmatched, which makes them unhappy. Economists have often studied how market segmentation can improve market efficiency. In the case of the first iteration, we tried to show students that market segmentation, if not done correctly, can actually thin out the market and cause participants to be worse off.




Figure 1: Iteration 1 – Classroom is randomly partitioned into 4 groups. Students may only search within their own group.

So the question then becomes – can we make markets work better than those in Iteration 1? The second iteration of the experiment (depicted in Figure 2) was meant to show how thick markets increase the chances of successful transactions by providing a wider pool of individuals to pair up and match with. At the end of the 90 seconds, however, students run into the commonly studied problem of *congestion in a thick market*; that is, the problem where there are simply too many people to search through and hence, many individuals

end up unmatched. In a buyer-seller market, this would be a situation where there are too many buyers in line to buy something from a seller and the seller runs out of the good before all of the buyers in line get to buy it.




Figure 2: Iteration 2 – Classroom is not partitioned. Students are free to search amongst the entire classroom.

The question after Iteration 2, in which many individuals still were not able to find a match despite the thickness of the market, is whether or not we can make the market even better. In Iteration 3 (depicted in Figure 3), we have the most ideal situation where every group only has individuals of the same type. In this iteration, the market is thick, there is no congestion because each person matches with the first person they meet, and so the overall payoff in the market is maximized. There may still be individuals who are unmatched if the number of individuals in a group is an odd number, but this market configuration works better in maximizing the amount of matches given the time constraint.

To reiterate a point from earlier, the most important thing that both the instructor and students should take note of is the importance of segmenting the market *in the appropriate way*. As we observed from the results of the experiment, a market designer can vastly improve efficiency by partitioning markets according to types instead of randomly.




Figure 3: Iteration 3 – Classroom is partitioned into 4 groups according to types. Students may only search within their own group.

Possible Modifications

This experiment requires a reasonable amount of physical space in the classroom and an appropriately sized class. Our class had only 34 students in a classroom that could fit 40 students and the experiment worked out very well. Due to the network externalities that are captured in this experiment, we do not believe that this would work well in a class that is smaller than 30 students. The tradeoff with very large classes is that the network externalities, and hence the results of the experiment, are better, but the logistics with the space needed become trickier. If you would like to run this experiment in a very large class, we suggest increasing the number of types possible from four to more and correspondingly increase the number of groups as a result of class partitioning. We would also like to point out that in order for the dynamics of a real market to be accurately captured in this experiment, all participants must strictly adhere to the time constraints. Since the experiment includes a search process, it is crucial that the instructor be strict with the amount of time allocated per iteration. As the reader will see, Iteration 2 will not produce “good” outcomes that reflect the theoretical results if students are given too much time.

Experiment 2 - Assortative Mating and Inequality

In this experiment, we tried to expose to the students the issue of *assortative mating* and how it could potentially relate to income equality. Assortative mating is simply a term that economists use to describe the phenomenon of “likes marrying likes.” Positive assortative mating on income, for example, is when high-income individuals prefer to marry high-income individuals whereas negative assortative mating would be when high-income individuals prefer to marry low-income individuals. An empirical paper recently published in the American Economic Review used U.S. Census Bureau data to conclude that “if matching in 2005 between husbands and wives had been random, instead of the pattern observed in the data, then the Gini coefficient would have fallen from the observed 0.43 to 0.34, so that income inequality would be smaller.” (Greenwood et al. 2014) This was a very interesting result that was widely covered in popular press, so we made our students read a news article on this finding before they conducted the experiment in class. Our main goal for this exercise was to convey to the students the complexity of the relationship between matching behavior and the economy, and do so in a realistic way by incorporating income shocks and a search process to find partners. The experiment is described below.

Description of the Experiment

Types: Income, ranging from 0-100. Assigned randomly.

Preferences: Vertical – that is, everybody wants to marry high-income individuals.

Number of Iterations: Two rounds with 3 iterations per round.

Time Limit: 30 seconds for each iteration in Round 1 and 2 minutes for each iteration in Round 2.

Rules and Restrictions

- Without knowing why they are doing so, each student writes down a random 6-digit number on the top of Handout 1 (displayed in the appendix on this paper), where each digit ranges from 0 to 9.
- For each round, the instructor randomly assigns a number between 0 and 100 to each student, which is their income. In each iteration, students must search for a partner to marry, given their preferences. Students search for a match by approaching another student, stating their name, providing one interesting fact about themselves (e.g., “My name is John and I grew up in Germany”), and shaking the other student’s hand. After listening to the other person’s introduction, both students reveal their incomes to each other.

- Students then face a choice – should they marry the person they were just introduced to or can they do better by continuing their search? If they find somebody who they consider “sufficiently rich,” and hence sufficiently attractive to marry, they marry and move to the back of the room. If not, they must continue searching.
- If they are successful in their search, they must write what their match’s income is on Handout 1. The two individuals’ incomes then produce a new income, which is

$$\text{New Income} = \frac{\text{Your match's income} + \text{Your income}}{2} + \epsilon$$

where ϵ is a matching shock, and given that you are in the i th iteration of the two rounds (there are 6 iterations, 3 for each round), $\epsilon = 10$ if the i th digit in your number on the top of Handout 1 is an even number, and $\epsilon = -10$ if the number is odd. If you do not find anybody to marry, or equivalently if nobody wants to marry you, your new income for the next iteration will simply be your old income since there was no marriage and hence, no sharing of income.

- Students are not allowed to marry the any of the individuals that they married in a previous iteration. They may marry somebody they met and were introduced to but did not end up marrying.
- As in Experiment 1, students are not allowed to shout their type out loud.

Deliverables: On the same day that the experiment was conducted, students participated in an all-class discussion of the experiment, their experiences, their takeaways, and also the reading assigned from the previous class. Students also had to turn in a 1-page writeup on the experiment and outcomes.

Outcomes and Takeaways

When we conducted this experiment, we made sure to assign different incomes to each student in both rounds. In other words, if a student was rich in one round, we made sure that they were poor in another. This was done so that students would understand both sides of the coin in terms of the inequality debate.

There were a couple of concepts in real-life searching that we tried to simulate in this experiment. The first was the rather involved search process of getting to know somebody and balancing tradeoff between marrying somebody who maybe isn’t the richest person in the classroom now, and continuing the search for a richer person. The distribution of incomes was common knowledge, so every student understood where




Figure 4: Results from Experiment 2 – Standard Deviation In Income Across Generations

each person they met stood in terms of the ranking in income. The second was the structure of how income and socioeconomic standing is generally passed down through a family – in each subsequent iteration, a couple gives birth to a child (in this situation, you are your own child), where the child inherits the average of the parents’ income plus a random component. The random component is a proxy for the randomness in life – the child of rich parents could have made terrible investment decisions and lost income, or they could have won the lottery and gained more income as a result. Each round had three generations, we deemed a sufficient number of generations to produce the inequality effects, as displayed later in the paper. The second round was much longer than the first round, with 2 minutes for each iteration instead of 30 seconds. This was intended to capture the essence of operating within a time constraint, and also to allow for repetition so that the students could iron out confusions they had regarding the rules of the game in the first round and act more strategically in the second round.

We had a short class discussion right after we did the experiment about the realizations that the students had. The main complaint voiced by the students during this experiment was how unfair it was if you were born very poor. Many “poor” students noted that they were either not able to marry anybody in any iteration or that the only individuals who wanted to marry them were also poor. The students also brought up the issue of “settling,” whereby since they knew that they had a time limit, many settled and married

somebody who was significantly poorer than them, and in particular, somebody who they would not have married had they been able to search for a longer period.

For the next class period, we showed them the results of the experiment using the data that we obtained. In particular, we showed them three graphs. The first was Figure 4, which depicts the standard deviation in incomes across generations in both rounds (note that “short search” was the first round with 30 seconds and “long search” was the second round with 2 minutes). In Figure 4, note that the long search graph is relatively flat while the short search graph is more downward-sloping, indicating that the standard deviation in the income distribution fell across generations for the short search round but remained fairly constant for the long search round. A smaller standard deviation corresponds to a tighter income distribution; that is, less inequality. The data suggest that when individuals can search for a longer time, they try harder to marry their ideal type (i.e. a richer person), but when they are given a significantly shorter time period to search, they “settle” and marry somebody who is “middle-class.”

Figure 4 of course says nothing about the initial distribution of income and how it compared to the final distribution of income for both rounds. To see this, we also showed the students Figures 5 and 6. As the reader can see from Figure 5, the initial income distributions for both rounds appears to be similar. However, when we look at Figure 6, which shows the income distribution for the final generation, we see the following outcomes:

1. There is clustering about the mean (income of 50) for the short search. This is consistent with the class discussions on individuals settling and marrying somebody who is middle-class when given a very strict time constraint rather than keep on searching for a higher-income individual.
2. There is clustering around low incomes (20) and high incomes (90-100) for the long search, with a relatively constant distribution in the middle, consistent with the findings from Greenwood et al. 2014.

Overall, the students found Experiment 2 very interesting in understanding the dynamics of individual choice and how it may affect the aggregate economy. Through the course evaluations, we found that many students appreciated the opportunity to stand up and physically move around the room and felt like the experiment supplemented the matching theory they learned while at the same time introducing them to the real-life frictions simulated in the experiments.




Figure 5: Income Distribution Across the First Generation for Both Rounds




Figure 6: Income Distribution Across the Final Generation for Both Rounds

Possible Modifications

As the reader may have already noted, the results of this experiment depend on how the utility functions are specified. We chose our particular utility specification because we wanted to incorporate a notion of income-sharing and shocks. One could also imagine a setup where instead of an averaging of incomes, the couple inherits the maximum income between themselves instead. This experiment easily accommodates a variety of utility specifications but we caution against the use of overly complicated setups as to not confuse the students. An interesting consequence of using our income-sharing utility specification was that quite a number of our students, all of whom were in the 90-100 income level, decided not to get married because marriage would lessen the amount of income they would inherit for the next generation. This is similar to a finding in urban economics that in cities with higher male inequality than female, “increasing inequality explains about 25% of the marriage rate decline over the last few decades.” (Gould and Passerman 2003)

This experiment also only uses a one-dimensional matching framework — that is, a world in which individuals only care about income. This can be modified to represent a world of multi-dimensional preferences where individuals care about a variety of characteristics in their potential partner such as income, looks, race, education level, etc. If the reader is interested in running an experiment with multi-dimensional preferences, we would caution against using too many dimensions and to limit the number of dimensions to two (perhaps income and a horizontally-distributed characteristic such as physical location in the classroom). In this situation, in order to study inequality as a result of assortative mating in income, the instructor should set income to be the trait that is “dominant” (i.e. the trait that is seen as most important in order to secure a good match) and clearly explain to the student that they could settle for a lower-income individual if they are a very good match in terms of geographical location.

Conclusion

This paper provides two examples of experiments that can be conducted in any economics class to help illustrate some of the main results from market design and matching theory. This paper also adds to the burgeoning literature on the effectiveness of using experiments in the classroom to increase student participation and interest. There is a growing literature that is devoted to the teaching of millennials – students who were born in or after the year 1992 (McGlynn 2005). In particular, many authors have noted that the majority of current-day college students have, by and large, lived the “digital lifestyle” for their

entire lives and are very familiar, and in fact crave, the use of non-lecture methods in the classroom. These include, but are not limited to, the use of media, technology, experiments, games, concrete real-life case studies, and structured debates (Considine et al. 2009; McMahon and Pospisil 2005). This trend is largely inconsistent with how economists teach economics at any level of instruction (Becker et al. 1996, 2001, 2006; Watts & Becker 2008). Thus, we hope that this paper adds to the body of academic papers that document the use and need for experiments to present classroom material to students.

References

- Becker, William E., and Michael Watts. "Chalk and talk: A national survey on teaching undergraduate economics." *The American Economic Review* 86, no. 2 (1996): 448-453.
- Becker, William E., and Michael Watts. "Teaching economics at the start of the 21st century: Still chalk-and-talk." *The American Economic Review* 91, no. 2 (2001): 446-451.
- Becker, William E., Suzanne R. Becker, and Michael W. Watts, eds. *Teaching economics: More alternatives to chalk and talk*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2006.
- Bergstrom, Carl T., Theodore C. Bergstrom, and Rodney J. Garratt. "Choosing Partners: A Classroom Experiment." *The Journal of Economic Education* 44, no. 1 (2013): 47-57.
- Bulow, Jeremy, and Jonathan Levin. "Matching and price competition." *The American Economic Review* 96, no. 3 (2006): 652-668.
- Considine, David, Julie Horton, and Gary Moorman. "Teaching and reaching the millennial generation through media literacy." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 52, no. 6 (2009): 471-481.
- Dickie, Mark. "Do classroom experiments increase learning in introductory microeconomics?." *The Journal of Economic Education* 37, no. 3 (2006): 267-288.
- Durham, Yvonne, Thomas McKinnon, and Craig Schulman. "Classroom experiments: Not just fun and games." *Economic Inquiry* 45, no. 1 (2007): 162-178.
- Fatemi, Farshad. "The regulated market for kidneys in Iran." In *International Conference on Auctions, Market Mechanisms and Their Applications*, pp. 62-75. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011.

- Frank, Björn. “The impact of classroom experiments on the learning of economics: An empirical investigation.” *Economic Inquiry* 35, no. 4 (1997): 763-769.
- Gale, David, and Lloyd S. Shapley. “College admissions and the stability of marriage.” *The American Mathematical Monthly* 69, no. 1 (1962): 9-15.
- Gould, Eric D., and M. Daniele Paserman. “Waiting for Mr. Right: rising inequality and declining marriage rates.” *Journal of Urban Economics* 53, no. 2 (2003): 257-281.
- Holt, Charles A. “Teaching economics with classroom experiments: A symposium.” *Southern Economic Journal* (1999): 603-610.
- McGlynn, Angela Provitera. “Teaching millennials, our newest cultural cohort.” *Education Digest* 71, no. 4 (2005): 12.
- McMahon, Mark, and Romana Pospisil. “Laptops for a digital lifestyle: Millennial students and wireless mobile technologies.” *Proceedings of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education* (2005): 421-431.
- Roth, Alvin E. *Who Gets What—and Why: The New Economics of Matchmaking and Market Design*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2015.
- Watts, Michael, and William E. Becker. “A little more than chalk and talk: Results from a third national survey of teaching methods in undergraduate economics courses.” *The Journal of Economic Education* 39, no. 3 (2008): 273-286.

Appendix

Handout 1: Assortative Mating Experiment

Your random 6-digit number:

Round 1 - 30 seconds for each iteration. YOUR INITIAL ASSIGNED INCOME IS _____

1. Iteration 1

- Your match's income:
- Your new income for Iteration 2:

2. Iteration 2

- Your match's income:
- Your new income for Iteration 3:

3. Iteration 3

- Your match's income:
- The average income in your household:

Round 2 - 2 minutes for each iteration. YOUR INITIAL ASSIGNED INCOME IS _____

1. Iteration 1

- Your match's income:
- Your new income for Iteration 2:

2. Iteration 2

- Your match's income:
- Your new income for Iteration 3:

3. Iteration 3

- Your match's income:
- The average income in your household: