

# David M. Munguia Gomez

<https://davidmunguiagomez.com>  
[dmunguiagomez@chicagobooth.edu](mailto:dmunguiagomez@chicagobooth.edu)

## EDUCATION AND WORK EXPERIENCE

---

<b>Booth School of Business, University of Chicago</b> Ph.D., Behavioral Science (Support Area: Psychology) Advisor and Dissertation Committee Chair: Emma E. Levine Dissertation Committee: L. Taylor Phillips, Jane Risen, Christopher Hsee Dissertation: Selection Decisions about Advantaged and Disadvantaged Applicants	2017 - present
<b>Associate</b> , ideas42, New York, NY	2014 - 2017
<b>Princeton University</b> B.A., Psychology; Minor, Spanish and Portuguese Language and Culture	2010 - 2014

## RESEARCH INTERESTS

---

Merit, Dis/Advantage, Selection and Allocation Decisions, Ethics, Attribution, Inequality

## PUBLICATIONS

---

Munguia Gomez, D. M. & Levine, E. E. (2022). The policy-people gap: Decision makers choose policies that favor different applicants than they select when making individual decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 65(3): 842-869.

Dungan, J. A., Munguia Gomez, D.M., & Epley, N. (2022). Too reluctant to reach out: Receiving social support is more positive than expressers expect. *Psychological Science*, 33(8), 1300-1312.

Levine, E. & Munguia Gomez, D.M. (2021). "I'm just being honest." When and why honesty enables help versus harm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 120(1), 33-56.

Moore, A. K., Munguia Gomez, D. M., & Levine, E. E. (2019). Everyday dilemmas: New directions on the judgment and resolution of benevolence–integrity dilemmas. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 13(7), e12472.

## SELECTED RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

---

Munguia Gomez, D.M. Levine, E.E., & Phillips, L.T. How information about college applicants' socioeconomic context shapes their evaluation. *In preparation for Science*.

Munguia Gomez, D.M. & Levine, E.E. Opportunity luck. *Data collection*.

Shah, A.M., Munguia Gomez, D.M., Hershfield, H., & Fishbane, A. Testing the effectiveness of mental time travel for increasing retirement savings: Evidence from a field experiment in Mexico. *Under review (JEP:Applied)*.

## AWARDS AND HONORS

---

Chicago Booth PhD Program Office Grant (\$2,250)	2021
Chicago Booth Thaler-Tversky Independent Research Grant (\$3,000)	2021
Diversity Graduate Registration Award, Society for Personality and Social Psychology Conference	2020
Graduate Student Travel Award, Society for Personality and Social Psychology Conference	2019
International Association for Conflict Management, Best Conference Paper (Student as First Author)	2019
For: Preference reversals in equivalent choices between individuals and policies that affect individuals	
Academy of Management, Conflict Management Division, Best Paper Award	2019
For: Preference reversals in equivalent choices between individuals and policies that affect individuals	

## CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS AND INVITED TALKS

---

### Opportunity luck

- *Academy of Management Conference*, online (Aug. 2021)
- *The Illusion of Merit Interdisciplinary Workshop (HEIRS)*, online (April 2021)

### Symposium: How communicating past and present inequality promotes equitable decision-making

- *Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) Conference*, San Francisco, CA (Feb. 2022)

### Why people adjust their impression of an applicant more based on disadvantage than advantage

- *Emerging Scholars of Psychological Science*, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ (Mar. 2022)
- *Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) Conference*, San Francisco, CA (Feb. 2022)
- *Justice and Morality Preconference at SPSP*, San Francisco, CA (Feb. 2022)
- *Academy of Management Conference*, online (Aug. 2021)
- *International Association for Conflict Management Conference*, online (July 2021)
- *Society for Personality and Social Psychology Conference*, online (Feb. 2021)
- *Society for Judgment and Decision Making Conference*, online (Dec. 2020)
- *Academy of Management Conference*, online (Aug. 2020)

### The policy-people gap: Decision makers choose policies that would select different applicants than they select when making individual decisions

- *University of Chicago Booth School, Behavioral Science Brownbag*, Chicago, IL. (Oct. 2019)
- *Academy of Management Conference*, Boston, MA. (Aug. 2019)
- *International Association for Conflict Management Conference*, Dublin, Ireland. (July 2019)
- *Society for Personality and Social Psychology Conference*, Portland, OR. (Feb. 2019)
- *Society for Judgment and Decision Making Conference*, New Orleans, LA. (Nov. 2018)
- *University of Chicago Booth School, Behavioral Science Brownbag*, Chicago, IL. (Oct. 2018)
- *Kellogg-Booth Symposium*, Chicago, IL. (April 2018)

## PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

---

### Professional Service

- *Academy of Management Annual Conference*
- *International Association for Conflict Management Conference*

### Professional Development

- *Academy of Management OB Doctoral Conference* (Aug. 2020)
- *Economic Inequality Preconference at SJDM*, Montreal, Canada. (Nov. 2019)
- *B.I.G. Ideas Doctoral Workshop*, Harvard Business School Cambridge, MA. (Aug. 2019)

## TEACHING INTERESTS

---

Diversity and Inclusion, Ethics, Managerial Decision Making, Power and Influence

## TEACHING ASSISTANTSHIPS

---

- 2022, '21, '20    Diversity in Organizations (Professor: Jane Risen)
- 2022             Designing a Good Life (Professor: Nicholas Epley)
- 2021             Power and Influence in Organizations - Executive MBA (Professor: Tanya Menon)  
*Average evaluation: 4.8/5*
- 2021             Consumer Behavior (Professor: Dan Bartels)
- 2022             Managerial Decision Making (Professor: Anuj Shah)

## REFERENCES

---

### **Dr. Emma Levine**

Associate Professor of Behavioral Science &  
Charles E. Merrill Faculty Scholar  
University of Chicago  
Booth School of Business  
[Emma.Levine@chicagobooth.edu](mailto:Emma.Levine@chicagobooth.edu)

### **Dr. Jane Risen**

H.G.B. Alexander Professor of Behavioral  
Science & John E. Jeuck Faculty Fellow  
University of Chicago  
Booth School of Business  
[Jane.Risen@chicagobooth.edu](mailto:Jane.Risen@chicagobooth.edu)

### **Dr. L. Taylor Phillips**

Assistant Professor of Management &  
Organizations  
New York University  
Stern School of Business  
[tphillip@stern.nyu.edu](mailto:tphillip@stern.nyu.edu)

### **Dr. Christopher Hsee**

Theodore O. Yntema Professor of Behavioral  
Science and Marketing  
University of Chicago  
Booth School of Business  
[Chris.Hsee@chicagobooth.edu](mailto:Chris.Hsee@chicagobooth.edu)

## **APPENDIX: ABSTRACTS FROM PUBLISHED ARTICLES AND SELECT MANUSCRIPTS**

---

**Munguia Gomez, D. M. & Levine, E. E. (2022).** The policy-people gap: Decision makers choose policies that favor different applicants than they select when making individual decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 65(3): 842-869. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2020.1740>

This work documents a contemporary organizational problem—a gap between selection policies and individual selection decisions—and suggests one intervention to address it. In college admissions and workplace hiring contexts, we find that decision-makers are more likely to favor disadvantaged applicants over applicants with objectively higher achievements when choosing between selection policies than choosing between individual applicants. We document this policy-people gap among admissions officers, working professionals, and lay people using both within-subject and between-subject designs and across a range of stimuli. We find that the gap is driven in part by shifting standards of fairness across the two types of decisions. When choosing between individuals, compared to choosing between policies, decision-makers are more likely to prioritize what is fair to individuals (a microjustice standard of fairness) over what is fair in the aggregate (a macrojustice standard of fairness). As a result, an intervention that has decision-makers prioritize the same standard of fairness across the decisions mitigates the policy-people gap. This research helps us understand why decision-makers' choices so frequently violate espoused organizational policies and suggests one way to increase the representation of disadvantaged groups in organizations.

**Munguia Gomez, D.M. Levine, E.E., & Phillips, L.T.** How information about college applicants' socioeconomic context shapes their evaluation. *In preparation for Science*.

How are applicants evaluated based on their socioeconomic circumstances and why? We answer this question across 12 experiments with lay people, in surveys of college admissions professionals, and through qualitative analyses. We examine how people adjust their evaluations of a college applicant after learning they are socioeconomically (dis)advantaged. Admissions officers and lay people adjust asymmetrically – they positively adjust their evaluations of disadvantaged applicants more than they negatively adjust their evaluations of advantaged applicants. This asymmetry reflects the beliefs people hold about how advantage affects applicants and manipulating the beliefs changes how people adjust their evaluations. When people believe that advantage makes achievement easier without requiring effort, then they adjust negatively, but when they believe that advantage requires effort to translate to achievement, then they do not adjust. This research suggests asymmetric evaluations as another factor explaining the lack of socioeconomic diversity in higher education and organizations.

**Munguia Gomez, D.M. & Levine, E.E.** Opportunity luck: Luck that builds ability. *Data collection*.

A common way in which luck affects people's outcomes in life is by giving the opportunity to develop ability. For example, the luck of being born to a wealthy family can give students access to educational opportunities that build college readiness, which makes them more likely to attend college. I refer to these kinds of situations, where luck gives people the opportunity to build ability, as "opportunity luck." When faced with achievements—such as musical performances and SAT scores—stemming from opportunity luck, how do people reward them? Despite the prevalence of opportunity luck, we do not yet know the answer to this question. This research seeks to answer this question through an experimental game in which Judges reward Players who have benefitted from opportunity luck.

Levine, E. & **Munguia Gomez, D.M.** (2021). “I’m just being honest.” When and why honesty enables help versus harm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 120(1), 33-56. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000242>

Although honesty is typically conceptualized as a virtue, it often conflicts with other equally important moral values, such as avoiding interpersonal harm. In the present research, we explore when and why honesty enables helpful versus harmful behavior. Across 5 incentive-compatible experiments in the context of advice-giving and economic games, we document four central results. First, honesty enables selfish harm: people are more likely to engage in and justify selfish behavior when selfishness is associated with honesty than when it is not. Second, people are selectively honest: people are more likely to be honest when honesty is associated with selfishness than when honesty is associated with altruism. Third, these effects are more consistent with genuine, rather than motivated, preferences for honesty. Fourth, even when individuals have no selfish incentive to be honest, honesty can lead to interpersonal harm because people avoid information about how their honest behavior affects others. This research unearths new insights on the mechanisms underlying moral choice, and consequently, the contexts in which moral principles are a force of good versus a force of evil.

Dungan, J. A., **Munguia Gomez, D.M.**, & Epley, N. (2022). Too reluctant to reach out: Receiving social support is more positive than expressers expect. *Psychological Science*, 33(8), 1300-1312. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09567976221082942>

Receiving social support is critical for well-being, but concerns about a recipient’s reaction could make people reluctant to express such support. Our studies indicate that people’s expectations about how their support will be received predict their likelihood of expressing it (Study 1,  $N = 100$  online adults), but these expectations are systematically miscalibrated. Participants who sent messages of support to others they knew (Study 2,  $N = 120$  students) or who expressed support to a new acquaintance in person (Study 3,  $N = 50$  adult pairs) consistently underestimated how positively their recipients would respond. A systematic perspective gap between expressers and recipients may explain miscalibrated expectations: Expressers may focus on how competent their support seems, whereas recipients may focus on the warmth it conveys (Study 4,  $N = 300$  adults). Miscalibrated concerns about how to express support most competently may make people overly reluctant to reach out to someone in need.