This is a record of what I have heard from the audience during my presentation. Since it has been about 3 weeks since I gave it, I may not recall every single detail. Below, I would put down as much content as I can remember.

On page 4 of my slides, when I said there was no dominant strategy in the Volunteer’s dilemma, the professor interrupted me and told me there was actually a dominant strategy (contradictory to what Wikipedia told me). The dominant strategy is that a player can wait for others to make sacrifices and then reap off the benefit.

On page 10, before I went on talking about the experiment in the paper, I threw a question to the audience: among all the persuasion forms that were mentioned in the paper, which one did the audience find most effective in real life? To my surprise, the answer was the text persuasion form. The paper introduced the text form as the most conventional and least powerful. Some of my classmates told me they preferred text because it is usually succinct and accessible, while videos and comics could be time consuming.

On page 17, the professor helped me a great deal when he explained the formula in the paper to the audience. The Bayesian formation used by the paper to examine the effectiveness of persuasion forms was not easy to read, and I unfortunately did not have the best understanding of it. He told us the general purpose of the formula, why it was applied in this case, and what the important factors in the formula stood for, such as the degree of freedom or the scale parameter under certain conditions.

On page 23, during the result analysis part, the professor stepped in again to help explain what those histogram graphs meant. The normal distribution was where most of the donation increases fell. If the green bar fell outside the normal distribution, then the effect that one form of persuasion made (compared to another form) would be seen as significant.

On page 29, my classmates had some interesting discussions about the results and conclusions. Many people were surprised that social proofs, a form that was introduced and tested in one of the previous papers, did not show significant effect in this paper. Some speculated it was because the social proof in this paper did not come from people whom the test subjects personally knew. The researchers told each person “87% of other people in this experiment have donated. Will you do the same?”, which might not be as powerful as “your brother has done this. Will you follow his footsteps?” However, I pointed out that in the previous paper, the social proof message was centered around other guests who stayed in the hotel room, and the test subjects did not personally know them either. There was no correct answer for this topic, but the discussion process was meaningful and joyful.