

## Quentin André, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of Marketing  
 Leeds School of Business, University of Colorado Boulder  
 995 Regent Drive, Koelbel Building  
 Boulder, CO 80309-0419  
 Email: [quentin.andre@colorado.edu](mailto:quentin.andre@colorado.edu)  
 Website: <http://quentinandre.net/>

### Employment and Education

---

2020-	<b>Assistant Professor</b> , Leeds School of Business, University of Colorado Boulder
2018-2020	<b>Assistant Professor</b> , Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University
2013-2018	<b>Ph.D. Marketing (cum laude)</b> , INSEAD Europe Campus “Essays in Consumer Financial Decision-Making and Numerical Cognition”
2009-2012	<b>M.Sc. Managerial and Financial Economics</b> , HEC Paris, France Masters’ Thesis: “Are Lotteries a Tax on Low-Income Consumers? An Empirical Investigation.”
2008-2009	<b>B.A. Management</b> , HEC Paris, France (Minor in History of Arts at Sorbonne University)

### Research Interests

---

- Consumer Financial Decision-Making
- Numerical Cognition and Probabilistic Reasoning
- Statistical Methods
- Open Science

### Publications

---

**André, Quentin** and Bart de Langhe (forthcoming), “How (Not) To Test Theory with Data: Illustrations from Walasek, Mullett and Stewart” *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*

*André and de Langhe (2020) pointed out that Walasek and Stewart (2015) estimated loss aversion on different lotteries in different conditions. Because of this flaw in the experimental design, their results should not be taken as evidence that loss aversion can disappear and reverse, or that decision by sampling is the origin of loss aversion. In their response to André and de Langhe (2020), Walasek, Mullett and Stewart (2020) defend the link between decision by sampling and loss aversion. We take their response as an opportunity to emphasize three guiding principles when testing theory with data: 1) Look for data that are uniquely predicted by the theory, 2) Do not ignore data that contradict the theory, and 3) If an experiment is flawed, fix it. In light of these principles, we do not believe that Walasek, Mullett, and Stewart (2020) provide new insights about the origin and stability of loss aversion.*

**André, Quentin** and Bart de Langhe (forthcoming), “No Evidence for Loss Aversion Disappearance and Reversal in Walasek and Stewart (2015)” *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*

*In an influential article published in the Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, Walasek and Stewart (2015) test an implication of decision by sampling theory: Loss aversion can disappear, and even reverse, depending on the distribution of gains and losses people have encountered. In this article, we show that the results reported in Walasek and Stewart (2015) emerge because the estimates of loss aversion is computed on different lotteries in different conditions. After correcting this error, we do not see evidence that loss aversion is shaped by the distribution of gains and losses that people have encountered.*

**André, Quentin**, Pierre Chandon, and Kelly H. Haws (2019), “Healthy Through Presence or Absence, Nature or Science?: A Framework for Understanding Front-of-Package Food Claims”. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*

*Consumers intuitively categorize front-of-packaging claims displayed on food into 4 broad categories: (1) Claims about “removing negatives,” (e.g., “Low Fat”), (2) claims about “adding positives,” (e.g., “High vitamins”), (3) claims about “not*

adding negatives” (e.g., “GMO-free”), and (4) claims about “not removing positives” (e.g., “Unprocessed”). Each type of claim is associated with different beliefs about the healthiness, tastiness, and dieting properties of the food.

**André, Quentin**, Ziv Carmon, Klaus Wertenbroch, Alia Crum, Douglas Frank, William Goldstein, Joel Huber, Leaf van Boven, Bernd Weber and Haiyang Yang (2018), “Consumer Choice and Autonomy in the Age of Artificial Intelligence and Big Data”. *Customer Needs and Solutions*

*Drawing on diverse perspectives from marketing, economics, philosophy, neuroscience, and psychology, we explore how consumers’ sense of autonomy in making choices affects their well-being. We discuss how new technologies may enhance or diminish consumers’ perceptions of being in control of their choices and how feelings of control (or lack thereof) affect consumers’ well-being. We suggest avenues for future research in the domain of choice, well-being, and consumer welfare.*

## Working Papers

---

**André, Quentin**, Nicholas Reinholtz, and Bart de Langhe, “Can Consumers Learn Price Dispersion? Evidence for Dispersion Spillover Across Categories” (preparing for fourth round submission at the Journal of Consumer Research)

*Dispersion knowledge (the perception of the variability of a numerical distribution) is a key antecedent of many judgments and decisions, both mundane (e.g., “should I search for a better price?”) and consequential (e.g., “how much should I have in my emergency fund?”). But how does this knowledge develop from experience? Across seven studies, we document a bias in the formation of this dispersion knowledge: Consumers ascribe more variance to a distribution when it was learned in a high (vs. low) variance environment. We show that this “dispersion spillover” has downstream consequences on judgments of price attractiveness, and on consumers’ decision to search for better options.*

**André, Quentin**, “Outliers Exclusion Procedures Must be Blind to the Researcher’s Hypothesis” (under second round of reviews at the Journal of Experimental Psychology: General)

*When researchers choose to identify and exclude outliers from their data, should they do so across all the data, or within experimental conditions? Both methods are widely used, and common data visualization techniques suggest that outliers should be excluded at the condition-level. However, I highlight that removing outliers by condition runs against the logic of hypothesis testing, and that this practice leads to unacceptable increases in false-positive rates. This conclusion holds true across a variety of statistical tests, exclusion criterion and cutoffs, sample sizes, and data types. I replicate this result in the context of a recent paper excluding outliers per condition (Cao, Kong, and Galinsky, 2020): Excluding outliers at the condition level can bring the likelihood of a false-positive result up to 47%, and the exclusion strategy reported by the authors is associated with a 56% Type I error rate.*

Paolacci, Gabriele and **Quentin André**, “Uncertain Outcomes are Valued Less than Certain Outcomes” (reject and resubmit at Management Science)

*Most theories of decision-making under risk assume that payoffs and probabilities are separable: The subjective value of a prospective outcome (the payoff) is assumed to be independent of the likelihood that the outcome will occur (the probability). In violation of this assumption, we show that people anticipate less utility from uncertain outcomes than from certain outcomes. Our results suggest that this effect does not simply reflect an aversion toward “weird” transactions: Instead, we argue that hypothetical outcomes are perceived as psychologically distant, which leads to muted reactions towards their utility. Finally, we show that our findings cast a new light on the phenomenon of risk aversion, and offer a solution to the paradoxical “uncertainty effect,” whereby a risky prospect is valued less than its worst possible realization.*

**André, Quentin** and Bart de Langhe, “Slop(p)y Learning: When Market Trends Foster a False Sense of Understanding” (three studies collected, first draft in preparation)

*We demonstrate that the outcome bias (people’s tendency to infer the quality of a decision from its outcome) can exacerbate illusory correlations. To do so, I designed and programmed a simulation in which people make repeated investment decisions, and are asked to learn the characteristics that are associated with higher returns. Unbeknownst to them, the payoffs are independent of their choices, and are manipulated to be increasing (vs. decreasing or flat) over time. We show that this manipulation of slope significantly increases people’s confidence in how much they have learnt, and makes them more confident in their ability to predict future outcomes.*

**André, Quentin**, Bart de Langhe, and Philip Fernbach, “The Perils of Personas” (four studies collected, first draft in preparation)

*We show that personas (fictional profiles used to illustrate consumer segments) can lead to distorted perceptions of customers’ preferences. Across four experiments, we show that respondents who were asked to name two consumer segments and write personas about them exacerbate the behavioral differences between the two segments (an effect that we call amplification) and minimize the heterogeneity within each segment (an effect that we call amplification). As a consequence, people’s predictions about what consumers in the different segments prefer become less accurate.*

**André, Quentin**, Nicholas Reinholtz, and John G. Lynch Jr., “Restricted-Use Funds and Budgeting Decisions” (on hold)

*How do consumers budget when a part of their income is denominated in a category-restricted resource (e.g., food stamps)? Building on the mental accounting and categorization literature, we hypothesized that people endowed with a category-restricted resource would be averse to spending their unrestricted money on products of this category. To test this hypothesis, we developed a multi-round, interactive budgeting simulation. We find that people endowed with a food-restricted resource end up budgeting less on food than people who received an equivalent amount in unrestricted money.*

## Libraries and Software

---

### **pypcurve: A library for p-curve analysis in Python**

- A Python implementation of Simonsohn, Simmons and Nelson's 'p-curve'

### **Slop(p)y Investor: An interactive game illustrating how market trends can foster illusory learning**

- Experimental paradigm developed for André and de Langhe (working paper), written in React and Flask
- Used to illustrate learning traps in MBA and EMBA classes at ESADE and RSM

### **distBuilder: A Javascript library to add distribution builders to online and offline experiments**

- Open-source implementation of the distribution builder method described in Goldstein and Rothschild (2014)
- Documentation and source code available at <https://quentinandre.github.io/software/distributionbuilder/> (includes a ready-to-use Qualtrics implementation)

### **pyprocessmacro: A Python 3 library to estimate moderation, mediation, and conditional processes**

- Open-source rewrite of Andrew F. Hayes’ “Process Macro” in Python
- Documentation and source code available at <https://quentinandre.github.io/software/pyprocessmacro/>

### **pysprite: A Python 3 re-implementation of 'Sample Parameter Reconstruction via Iterative TEchniques (SPRITE)' (Heathers et al. 2018)**

- Documentation and source code available at <https://github.com/QuentinAndre/pysprite>

### **affectiveSamplerJS: A Javascript library to record people’s affective reactions to audio/video sequences**

- Documentation and source code available at <https://github.com/QuentinAndre/AffectiveSamplerJS>

### **wordSearchJS: A Javascript library to add word search tasks to online and offline experiments**

- Documentation and source code available at <https://github.com/QuentinAndre/WordSearchJS>

## Conferences and Invited Presentations

---

**Society for Consumer Psychology Conference**, Huntington Beach, California, USA, March 2020

- “Slop(p)y Learning: When Market Trends Foster a False Sense of Understanding” (Session Paper)

**Bocconi University**, Milan, Italy, November 2019

- “Slop(p)y Learning: When Market Trends Foster a False Sense of Understanding” (Invited Presentation)

**Boulder Summer Conference on Consumer Financial Decision Making**, Boulder, Colorado, USA, May 2018

- “Restricted-Use Funds and Budgeting Decisions” (Paper)

**Rotterdam School of Management**, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, February 2018

- “Restricted-Use Funds and Budgeting Decisions” (Invited Presentation)

**ESADE**, Barcelona, Spain, February 2018

- “Restricted-Use Funds and Budgeting Decisions” (Invited Presentation)

**Society for Judgement and Decision-Making Annual Meeting**, Vancouver, Canada, November 2017

- “Can Food Stamps Reduce Food Consumption? The Unintended Consequences of Restricted-Use Funds on Budgeting Decisions” (Paper)
- “Variance Spillover: Consumers Underestimate Differences in Price Dispersion” (Paper)

**Association for Consumer Research Conference**, San Diego, California, USA, October 2017

- “Can Food Stamps Reduce Food Consumption? The Unintended Consequences of Restricted-Use Funds on Budgeting Decisions” (Session Chair)
- “Variance Spillover: Consumers Underestimate Differences in Price Dispersion” (Session Chair)

**Symposium on Meaning and Alienation in Consumption**, Munich, Germany, January 2017

- “The Value of Meaning: How Job Satisfaction Affects Consumers’ Perception and Use of their Earnings” (Invited Presentation)

**Association for Consumer Research Conference**, Berlin, Germany, October 2016

- “The Value of Meaning: How Job Satisfaction Affects Consumers’ Perception and Use of their Earnings” (Session Chair)
- “Removing This (or not), Adding That (or not): A Taxonomy of ‘Healthy’ Food Claims” (Session Paper)

**Choice Symposium**, Lake Louise, Alberta, Canada, May 2016

- “When to Choose” (Discussant)

**European Marketing Academy Conference**, Oslo, Norway, May 2016

- “The Value of Meaning: How Job Satisfaction Affects Consumers’ Perception and Use of their Earnings” (Invited Presentation)

**Society for Consumer Psychology Conference**, St. Pete Beach, Florida, USA, February 2016

- “Removing This (or not), Adding That (or not): A Taxonomy of ‘Healthy’ Food Claims” (Session Paper)

**Open Course Initiative at INSEAD**, Fontainebleau, France, March 2015

- “Happiness in a Consumerist World: What Marketing Research Can Teach Us About Well-Being” (Invited Presentation)

**Transformative Consumer Research Conference (ACR)**, Lille, France, May 2013

- “Low-Income Consumers” (Discussant)

## Seminars Attended

---

- FTEP Early Career Faculty Meeting, Leeds School of Business, CU Boulder
- Leeds Summer Series Teaching Workshops focused on Online Education, Leeds School of Business, CU Boulder
- Principles of Effective Online Teaching, Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University

## Honors and Grants

---

- Fellow, **AMA-Sheth Doctoral Consortium**, Mendoza College of Business, University of Notre Dame, Indiana
- Winner of the **ADL Partner PhD Award** (€ 11,250)
- Full tuition scholarship, **INSEAD**, 2013-2018

## Teaching

---

### Undergraduate and Graduate Level

- Marketing Management (MBA), 2020-
- Brand Development, 2019-2020

### Ph.D. Seminars

- Experimental Methods, 2019-2020

### Teaching Assistant

- Brand Management (MBA Elective), Pierre Chandon, 2015-2017

### Adjunct Lecturer Positions

- Preparation to Business School Interviews, Prepa-Sciences IPECOM Paris, 2008-2013
- History of Economic Theory, Prepa-Sciences IPECOM Paris, 2008-2010

## Academic Service

---

### Reviewer Service

- Management Science
- Journal of Public Policy and Marketing
- Journal of Marketing
- Social Psychology and Personality Science
- Appetite

### Service to the School

- Ph.D. Students Representative for the Marketing Department, INSEAD
- Ph.D. Alumni Reunion Organization Committee, INSEAD

## Other Skills

---

- Python (Web scraping, data-mining, natural language processing, statistical analysis and data visualization)
- Statistics (Python, R)
- Front-end Web Development (React, Redux, TypeScript)
- Back-end Web Development (Flask, SQLAlchemy)
- Git and GitHub (GitHub profile: <https://github.com/QuentinAndre>)