

PRACTICE A

Set Up, Then *Understand the Paper*

20 minutes, hands on — a working setup and a verified overview.

Jiaqi Shao · NUS Business School



Paper used in class: an unpublished manuscript — classroom use only.

■ The Next 20 Minutes

You just met the agent — now put it to work on a real paper.

- Goal: a working Claude Code setup, and a *verified* one-paragraph overview of the paper.
- Paper: a field RCT — “Careful What You Say to AI Ears.”
- You keep: the habit from the lecture — *read and verify*, never trust a number without a table.



■ 0 Get the Setup Kit (5 min)

A small academic setup — a fork of Sant'Anna's Claude Code workflow.

From the paper's folder, install the kit so Claude loads it automatically:

```
mkdir -p .claude && cp claude-setup/CLAUDE.md ./CLAUDE.md  
cp -r claude-setup/{rules,skills,agents} .claude/
```

It brings:

- a CLAUDE.md (reading order, outputs)
- a *faithfulness* rule — cite every number
- a paper-to-slides skill + referee agent

Check it loaded:

```
claude  
> /memory  
> /agents
```

■ 1 Orient Yourself in the Paper (8 min)

Don't read 40 pages — ask the agent to map it first. Type these one at a time; read each answer before the next (@ points Claude at a file):

Give me an overview of @RCT_paper.md --- the question, the design, and the main result, in one paragraph.

Draw the experiment design (control vs. treatments) as a simple diagram.

It should surface: same 4 questions to every firm; only the questioner's *perceived identity* is randomised.

■ 2 Verify One Number (6 min)

The lecture's survival skill: never accept a headline number on faith. Pick the headline finding and make the agent source it:

The abstract says managers are ``13% less likely to answer.''
Which table is that, and what is the exact number?

- The faithfulness rule forces a real citation — expect Table 6A, −13.2 pp.
- Then spot-check one more: “Are answers longer or shorter when they *do* respond, and which table?”

■ Checkpoint

Compare your overview against the instructor's — same facts, same sources?

■ What good looks like

A one-paragraph summary that names the design (T0/T1/T2, content held fixed), the headline (**Table 6A**, –13.2 pp), and the interpretation (the evidence *favours disciplinary over alien-audience*) — with a table behind every number.

Red flag: any number with no table, or a citation you can't find in the paper — ask “which section?”



■ If It Drifts, Steer

Most first answers are drafts — correct course in one line.

Symptom

- summarises only the abstract
- gives a number with no table
- states a mechanism as proven

Say

- “Read Section 3 before answering.”
- “Cite the table, or mark it not reported.”
- “Is that shown, or the authors’ claim?”

■ Stretch, Then Hand Off

If you finish early, teach the setup something.

- Stretch: persist a rule to memory —

Never quote this paper's numbers without naming the table.

- Stretch: ask for a 5-bullet “what a skeptic would doubt” list — you’ll use it in Practice B.
 - *Next — Practice B: turn this understanding into a talk and a referee report.*