Welcome to this fourth edition of Contests: Theory and Evidence. This workshop series brings together researchers interested in contests, broadly defined, from theoretical, applied, and experimental perspectives. In addition to contributions to game theory, previous editions of this workshop have featured applications to voting, political economy, research and development, sports, and attitudes towards interpersonal and integroup comparisons. The series has brought together leading researchers from over 50 different institutions around the world here in Norwich. As the organisers we are pleased to have another excellent line-up of talks over the two days of the workshop, and look forward to discussions during the breaks and dinners as stimulating as in the first three years.

Contests: Theory and Evidence is generously supported by the School of Economics and the Centre for Behavioural and Experimental Social Science.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Monday 25 June</th>
<th>Tuesday 26 June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 - 09:20</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Parallel Sessions: 7 and 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:20 - 09:30</td>
<td>Inauguration</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30 - 11:30</td>
<td>Parallel Sessions: 1 and 2</td>
<td>Parallel Sessions: 9 and 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 - 12:00</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 13:00</td>
<td>Keynote Speech</td>
<td>Parallel Sessions: 11 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 - 14:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 - 15:30</td>
<td>Parallel Sessions: 3 and 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30 - 16:00</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 - 17:30</td>
<td>Parallel Sessions: 5 and 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00 - 20:30</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MONDAY 25 JUNE

### 09:00 - 09:30
**REGISTRATION & INAUGURATION**

### 09:30 - 11:30
**SESSION 1 - ARTS 2.01**  
**THEORY EXTENSIONS**  
**Chair:** Scott Gilpatric (Tennessee)

**Dave Rietzke** (Lancaster): Robust Comparative Statics in Contests

**Tamay Besiroglu** (Warwick): Aggregate Effort in Contests

**Scott Gil patric** (Tennessee): Optimal Contest Design when Policing Misconduct

### 11:30 - 12:00
**COFFEE BREAK - ARTS 2.06**

### 12:00 - 13:00
**LUNCH - ARTS 2.06**

### 13:00 - 14:00
**KEYNOTE PRESENTATION - ARTS 2.01**  
**MY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE THEORY OF CONTESTS**  
**Kyung Hwan Baik** (Sungkyunhwan University, Seoul)  
**Chair:** Dan Kovenock (Chapman University)

### 14:00 - 15:30
**SESSION 3 - ARTS 2.01**  
**REPEATED PLAY**  
**Chair:** Lionel Page (Queensland)

**Jörg Franke** (Bath): Repeated Contest with Draws

**Lorenzo Cerboni Baiardi** (Milano-Bicocca): Imitative and best response behaviors in a repeated Tullock contest

**Scott Gilpatric** (Tennessee): Optimal Contest Design when Policing Misconduct

### 15:30 - 16:00
**COFFEE BREAK - ARTS 2.06**

### 16:00 - 17:30
**SESSION 5 - ARTS 2.01**  
**UNCERTAINTY IN CONTESTS**  
**Chair:** Lambert Schoonbeek (Groningen)

**Michael Kramm** (TU Dortmund): Information Design in Multi-Task Contests - Whom to Inform When the Importance of Tasks Is Uncertain

**Lambert Schoonbeek** (Groningen): A rent-seeking contest with uncertain discriminatory power

### 19:00
Dinner at **Ali Tandoori**, 9-11 Magdalen St, Norwich NR3 1LE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 - 11:00</td>
<td><strong>SESSION 7 - ARTS 2.01</strong></td>
<td>Disclosure Policy in Contests</td>
<td>Christian Ewerhart (Zurich)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philip Brookins (MPI, Bonn): An experimental study of information disclosure in contests with endogenous entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qiang Fu (NUS): Feedback and Favoritism in Sequential Elimination Contests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christian Ewerhart (Zurich): Voluntary Disclosure in Unfair Contests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - 11:30</td>
<td><strong>COFFEE BREAK - ARTS 2.06</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 - 13:00</td>
<td><strong>SESSION 9 - ARTS 2.01</strong></td>
<td>Experiments (Theory Testing)</td>
<td>Jingfeng Lu (NUS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Bruner (Appalachian): Voluntary Provision of Property Rights Under Inequity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lorenzo Spadoni (Tuscany): The Effect of Competition on Risk Taking - An Experimental Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jingfeng Lu (NUS): Enhancing Effort Supply with Prize-Augmenting Entry Fees: Theory and Experiments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 - 14:00</td>
<td><strong>SESSION 10 - ARTS 2.03</strong></td>
<td>Membership Choice</td>
<td>Dongryul Lee (Sunghsin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friederike Blönnigen (TU Dortmund): Club Good Provision and Nested Contests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henrik Zaunbrecher (Maastricht): Conflict and Migration: Mobility in Group Contests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 - 16:00</td>
<td><strong>SESSION 11 - ARTS 2.01</strong></td>
<td>Biased Contests</td>
<td>Tore Nilssen (Oslo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subhasish M Chowdhury (Bath): Affirmative Action Policies and Sabotage Behavior in Promotional Tournaments: An Experiment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marco Serena (MPI, Munich): On the suboptimality of perfectly levelling the playing field in dynamic contests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Stephenson (Chapman): Multi-Battle Rent Seeking Contests over Complementary Battlefields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zenan Wu (Peking): On the Optimal Design of Lottery Contests</td>
<td>Sebastian Cortes-Corales (Leicester): Testing Networks of Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td><strong>Dinner</strong></td>
<td>Dinner at The Georgian Townhouse, 30-34 Unthank Rd, Norwich NR2 2RB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SESSION 1 - ARTS 2.01

THEORY EXTENSIONS

Chair: Scott Gilpatrick (Tennessee)

Presentation 1: Robust Comparative Statics in Contests
Dave Rietzke (Lancaster University)

In this paper, we invoke tools from lattice theory to derive several comparative statics in a contest under minimal restrictions on the primitives. Some of our findings extend existing results while others clarify the relevance of structure commonly imposed in the literature. We also comment on equilibrium existence and uniqueness.

Presentation 2: Aggregate Effort in Contests
Tamay Besiroglu (University of Warwick)

Extending an existing model of Logit-contests due to Gama and Rietzke (2017), we provide a comprehensive framework for analysing aggregate effort in contests with asymmetric players with different valuations and cost functions and arbitrary impact functions. Fair Logit contests are found to be supermodular games for Nash-winners and submodular for Nash-losers due to the dependency of the curvature of success functions on opponents’ effort.

Presentation 3: The Tullock paradox and imperfect competition for rents
Samuli Leppälä (Cardiff University)

I study a contest for partially exclusive rents with a stochastic number of winners. Partial exclusivity can explain the Tullock paradox since it decreases rent dissipation but it also increases equilibrium effort. An effort-maximising organiser has a simple rule to follow by awarding at most half of the potential rents.

Presentation 4: Optimal Contest Design when Policing Misconduct
Scott Gilpatrick (University of Tennessee)

We assume enforcement actions can measure contestants’ misconduct behavior but with error. The contest organizer sets a limit on the tolerated misconduct level as a part of the optimal contest design. We model previously unstudied trade-offs between elicited effort, enforcement costs and damaging misconduct in equilibrium.

SESSION 2 - ARTS 2.03

GROUP CONTESTS

Chair: Stefano Barbieri (Tulane)

Presentation 1: Poisoned Chalice - Optimal Bias in Two-Stage Collective Contest
Wing Fung Cheng (The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology)

We consider a two-stage contest in which the second stage contest favors or handicaps the individual winner of the first stage contest. We find that a favorable bias may be a poisoned chalice. The optimal bias may be favoring or handicapping the early winner. Our study provides a new channel to explain the variation of bias in different contests.

Presentation 2: Group Size- Collective Action and Complementarities in Efforts
Romain Fayat (Cee-M)

We model a contest game between two groups of different sizes competing for a prize exhibiting a varying degree of rivalry and where group effort is given by a CES function. We show that with a sufficiently high degree of complementarity the larger group can be more successful than the smaller one.

Presentation 3: Private Information Group Contests with Complementarities
Iryna Topolyan (University of Cincinnati)

We model competing groups when players’ values for winning are private information, individual efforts within a group can be more or less complementary, and the group with the best performance wins the contest. We analyze the effects of increasing the number of competing teams, team members, and complementarity of efforts.

Presentation 4: Group Contests with Private Information and the “Weakest Link
Stefano Barbieri (Tulane University)

We study group competition with weakest-link technology and private information. Various degrees of coordination are possible in equilibrium but more coordination need not be welfare-enhancing. When information sharing among teammates is possible a single group sharing information does better. But if all groups share information all gains are lost to increased competition.
Presentation 1: Repeated Contest with Draws
Jörg Franke (University of Bath)

We consider a simple contest game with draws where sometimes none of the contestants is selected as winner. If such a draw occurs- then the contest is repeated in the next period unless either one of the contestants wins the prize- or until a final last period is reached. This structure of repeated contests with draws introduces a dynamic element into the model. We are interested in the strategic implications of these dynamics with respect to intertemporal effort decisions by the contestants as well as total rent dissipation.

Presentation 2: Imitative and best response behaviors in a repeated Tullock contest
Lorenzo Cerboni Baiardi (University Milano-Bicocca)

We consider a model of repeated Tullock contest where boundedly rational - players set their efforts following- alternatively- proportional imitation and rational-like - rules. We aim at deepening the dynamic consequences of the presence of heterogeneous behaviors - in a nonlinear environment and we discuss them at the light of experimental outcomes.

Presentation 3: How Success Breeds Success
Lionel Page (Queensland University of Technology)

We study whether and how success increases the chance of subsequent success using a real-effort laboratory experiment. We identify the causal effect of winning in a simple dynamic (best-of-three) contest using the random component of a stochastic contest success function that determines the winner of each round. We find a positive effect of an initial success on subsequent performance. We then disentangle the two competing explanations of the positive effect: strategic thinking and psychological effect of winning. To do so- we replace either the first round or the last round of the contest with a die selecting the winner at random- therefore turning on and off each explanation.
Presentation 1: Information Design in Multi-Task Contests - - Whom to Inform When the Importance of Tasks Is Uncertain
Michael Kramm (Technical University of Dortmund)
In multi-task contests it is often unclear to contestants how success depends on the mixture of effort investments in different tasks. We show that- if the contest designer can transmit information on this mixture- she cannot benefit by using public messages. However- asymmetrically disclosing information (e.g. “informational favoritism”) increases efforts.

Presentation 2: Creative Contests
Feng Zhu (Pennsylvania State University)
This paper introduces “creative contests”- in which the criterion for ranking contestants is not fully specified in advance. Examples include architectural contests and logo design contests. Both pure strategy and mixed strategy equilibria can emerge- and are characterized by solutions to a system of non-linear and differential equations.

Presentation 3: A rent-seeking contest with uncertain discriminatory power
Lambert Schoonbeek (University of Groningen)
We investigate the equilibria of a two-player Tullock contest with uncertain discriminatory power in the contest success function. We examine the cases where both players are either informed or uninformed about the size of the discriminatory power parameter- as well as the case where only one player has private information about it.

Presentation 1: How to Motivate Students to Reduce Dormitory Electricity Use: A Field Experiment
Josie Chen (National Taipei University)
This study investigates whether students reduce electricity usage more when they are in a contest and whether providing feedback to students on their own intergroup or intragroup ranking is an effective tool. To answer these questions- we ran a field experiment in college dormitory rooms

Presentation 2: The Supply Side Determinants of Territory and Conflict
Jordan Adamson (Chapman University)
We microfound Boulding’s “Loss of Strength Gradient” to predict the extensive and intensive margins of conflict at multiple locations. The geographic distribution of peace and war depends on scale-economies in the production of violence and costs of projecting power at a distance. Our experimental results match the theory.

Presentation 3: Leadership in head-to-head contests with complex strategy spaces
Theodore Turocy (University of East Anglia)
We study experimentally the role of leadership in competitive head-to-head contests between two teams facing a complex strategy space. Teams of three members face an instance of a team orienteering problem, in which the members jointly devise then separately implement a plan to visit a set of locations on a map. Some teams have one member designated as a “leader,” although this role does not confer any distinct responsibility or capability in the game. We compare the performance of teams with elected leaders, appointed leaders, and no leaders. We find that teams with elected leaders perform significantly better in their initial game, but the effect disappears entirely in a team’s second and subsequent games. The results suggest that nominating a leader in an environment with an otherwise flat team structure does not have a significant effect on team performance in competitive settings.
Presentation 1: An experimental study of information disclosure in contests with endogenous entry
Philip Brookins (Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods)
We experimentally explore behavior in contests with endogenous entry by varying the disclosure rule - whether the number of entrants is disclosed - and the size of the outside option? - high or low. As predicted, entry is invariant to disclosure; however, investments increase in disclosure for high?

Presentation 2: Feedback and Favoritism in Sequential Elimination Contests
Qiang Fu (National University of Singapore)
This paper studies the optimal design of sequential-elimination contests. Only a portion of contestants survive a preliminary stage and proceed to the finale. We explore the optimal feedback policy for the contest- i.e.- whether the contest designer should publicize contestants’ interim ranking prior to the finale. We show that the optimum depends on the objective function for contest design.

Presentation 3: Contest architecture by public disclosures
Toomas Hinnosaar (Collegio Carlo Alberto)
The paper studies optimal sequential contests with different objectives of the contest designer who chooses a disclosure rule which specifies at which points of time to publicly disclose the efforts of the previous contestants. I show that many but not all objectives are maximized by fully sequential or simultaneous contests.

Presentation 4: Voluntary Disclosure in Unfair Contests
Christian Ewerhart (University of Zurich)
We study incentives for the interim voluntary disclosure of verifiable information in probabilistic contests. Under a general condition on the primitives of the model (unfairness)- full revelation is shown to be the unique perfect Bayesian equilibrium outcome of the contest with pre-play communication. The proofs employ lattice-theoretic methods.

Presentation 1: Optimism and Pessimism in Bargaining and Contests
Erya Yang (University of California- Irvine)
The choices between litigation and settlement- as well as effort choices in each option- when agents have risk attitudes that result in optimism or pessimism (in the rank dependent expected utility framework of Quiggin (1982))- are examined. Contest success function is used to relate effort choices to litigation success.

Presentation 2: The use of conflict as a bargaining tool
Anil Yildizparlak (Durham University)
In this paper we explore the role of conflict as an informational device by - means of a simple bargaining model with one-sided incomplete information: - Limited conflicts reveal information about the outcome of the all-out conflict - (that ends the game) because the outcomes of both types of confrontations - are driven by the relative strength of the parties.

Presentation 3: Contests and Bargaining with Up-front Investments
Zach Schaller (University of California- Irvine)
We present a conflict and bargaining game with two distinct contribution stages- the first prior to bargaining and thought of as an up-front investment- and the second in the event of failed settlement. Agents may arrive at a complete information conflict equilibrium where optimal preparations are actually less than those under settlement.

Presentation 4: The Presumption of Validity in Patent Litigation
Tapas Kundu (Oslo Business School)
The presumption of validity is a fundamental aspect of patent litigation. While the validity presumption protects a patentee from frivolous litigation threats- it enhances her leverage and litigation incentive. We study an application of persuasion game in patent litigation to identify effects of the presumption criteria on litigation incentive.
SESSION 9 - ARTS 2.01

EXPERIMENTS (THEORY TESTING)

Chair: Jingfeng Lu (NUS)

Presentation 1: Voluntary Provision of Property Rights Under Inequity
Dave Bruner (Appalachian State University)

This paper derives the subgame-perfect Nash equilibrium to a two-stage game of production with rent-seeking that allows voluntary contributions to property rights in the first stage. Results of a laboratory experiment testing theoretical predictions are reported. Most notably, subjects with larger endowments contribute more to the security of production—yet inequity increases.

Presentation 2: The Effect of Competition on Risk Taking - An Experimental Study
Lorenzo Spadoni (Universities of Tuscany)

We investigate, theoretically and experimentally, the effects of competition in a contest in which players' probability of winning depends on the risk they take. We vary the level of competition in two ways: by increasing the number of players and by increasing the sensitivity of the contest to differences in performance.

Presentation 3: Enhancing Effort Supply with Prize-Augmenting Entry Fees: Theory and Experiments
Jingfeng Lu (National University of Singapore)

Entry fees are widely observed in contests. We study the effect of a prize-augmenting entry fee on expected total effort in an all-pay auction setting where the contestants' abilities are private information. While an entry fee reduces equilibrium entry—it can enhance the entrants' effort supply. Our theoretical model demonstrates that the optimal entry fee is strictly positive and finite. We design a laboratory experiment to empirically test the effect of entry fees on effort supply. Our results provide strong support for the notion that a principal can elicit higher effort using an appropriately set entry fee to augment the prize purse.

SESSION 10 - ARTS 2.03

MEMBERSHIP CHOICE

Chair: Dongryul Lee (Sungshin)

Presentation 1: Club Good Provision and Nested Contests
Friederike Blönnigen (TU Dortmund)

We analyze a framework of two clubs where relative aggregate club activity serves as a head start in a following contest. In stage one, club members maximize the sum of utility from club membership and expected utility from contest participation. Every player enters one of several different contests in stage two.

Presentation 2: Conflict and Migration: Mobility in Group Contests
Henrik Zaunbrecher (Maastricht University)

We introduce intergroup mobility to a group contest and test how this affects contest contributions in a lab experiment. We find that endogenous (voluntary) migration increases contest contributions whereas exogenous migration (displacement) has a negative but insignificant effect relative to a baseline treatment without intergroup mobility.

Presentation 3: The Formation of Groups and Competition
Dongryul Lee (Sungshin University)

We study the endogenous group formation in a contest where individual players may form groups under open membership and exclusive membership before exerting effort to win the prize having the nature of public goods within the winning group. We find the equilibrium group structure under which neither every single player nor every group of players has an incentive to deviate from the group structure.
Presentation 1: Affirmative Action Policies and Behavior in Promotional Tournaments: An Experiment
Subhasish M Chowdhury (University of Bath)

It is argued that incorporating Affirmative action (AA) policies results in more egalitarian outcomes and higher efforts. However, the effectiveness of different AAs, effects of introduction/removal, and interaction with sabotage are open questions. We run a real-effort experiment with head-start and handicap. We find that ability-based AAs result in egalitarian outcomes and high effort of underdogs. Head-start has ambiguous effects on effort but increases the underdog's winning chances. Handicap is useful for increasing effort and decreasing sabotage. If applied randomly, AA reduces efforts of the negatively affected agents. The effects of introduction/removal of different AAs are heterogeneous.

Presentation 2: On the suboptimality of perfectly leveling the playing field in dynamic contests.
Marco Serena (Max Planck Institute for Tax Law and Public Finance)

We consider best-of-three Tullock contests and all-pay auctions between two ex-ante identical players. An effort-maximizing contest designer commits ex-ante to a vector of three (dis)advantages to give to each player during the (at most) three matches of the contest.

Presentation 3: On the Optimal Design of Lottery Contests
Zenan Wu (Peking University)

We develop a novel technique that allows us to obtain optimal multiplicative biases for asymmetric Tullock contests -- i.e. the weights placed on contestants’ effort entries in the contest success function. Our approach is not limited to total effort maximization and applies to contest design problems with noncanonical objective functions.

Presentation 4: Beating the Matthew Effect: Head Starts and Catching Up in a Dynamic All-Pay Auction
Tore Nilssen (University of Oslo)

A principal aiming at maximising total expected effort distributes a prize over two consecutive all-pay auctions. Contestants are heterogeneous in both ex-ante head start and advantage gained from winning contest one. With a large head start the principal runs a single contest. Otherwise he does better by running two contests.
USEFUL INFORMATION

LOCAL HOSTS
- Subhasish M. Chowdhury (S.M.Chowdhury@bath.ac.uk)
- Paul M. Gorny (P.Gorny@uea.ac.uk)
- Anwesha Mukherjee (A.Mukherjee@uea.ac.uk)
- Ted Turocy (T.Turocy@uea.ac.uk)

CONFERENCE VENUE
- The conference will be held at The University of East Anglia, Norwich.
- The conference will be run in the Arts Building on the second floor, rooms 2.01, 2.03 and 2.06. This is point 9, The Teaching Wall, on the campus map.
- Presentations will take place in rooms 2.01 and 2.03.
- Refreshments and meals will be served in 2.06.

TRANSPORT
- Norwich is well connected by train and bus with London, and by flight with Amsterdam.
- The University of East Anglia is on the 25/26 bus route, which departs from the train station and stops at Castle Meadow.
- It is advisable to book taxis early on, and over the phone.

CONFERENCE DINNERS
- The Dinner on Monday 25 will be at Ali Tandoori (http://www.alitandoori.co.uk/about.html)
- The Dinner on Tuesday 26 will be at The Georgian Townhouse. (http://www.thethegeorjiantownhousenorwich.com/)

MISC
- There are shops and ATMs on campus, 17 on the campus map.
- Norwich, in general, is a pretty safe city. In case of any concern, simply ask a local host!

TAXIS
ABC Taxis - 01603 666333 | Courtesy Taxis - 01603 446644 | Green Frog - 01603 744747

GETTING TO UEA

The University and the city of Norwich are well served by road, train, and air connections from all regions of the UK. Regular links with the continent by sea and air are also available.

Distances from Norwich:
- London ........................................... 115 miles
- Birmingham ................................... 175 miles
- Harwich ......................................... 60 miles
- Glasgow ........................................... 383 miles
- Leicester ....................................... 116 miles
- Manchester ..................................... 185 miles
- Newcastle ..................................... 257 miles
- Stratford ....................................... 65 miles

BY CAR
- From London take the M11/A11; just outside Norwich take the A47 (Southern Bypass) in the direction of Swaffham; the University is signposted off at the next exit. If you are driving from the North or the Midlands, you can use the A47 via King’s Lynn, or the A14 as far as Peterborough and then take the A11 to Norwich. UEA is situated on the outskirts of Norwich, around two miles west of the city centre, just off the Eastham Road (B1106) which is one of the main roads out of the city.

By air
- Norwich International Airport has regular flights to and from Aberdeen, Edinburgh, and Manchester, and international connections to 200 cities worldwide through regular direct flights to and from Schipol Airport in Amsterdam. The easiest way to reach UEA from the airport is by taxi.
- Flight enquiries: (+44) (0) 1603 428800

By train
- Norwich is less than two hours from London by train and there is an InterCity link with the Midlands, the north of England and Scotland via Peterborough. Trains run from London Liverpool Street approximately every half hour. You can reach UEA from the station by taxi, which takes approximately 15 minutes. There are regular buses direct to the University from the station (bus route number 25).
- Rail enquiries: (+44) (0) 8457 484950

GETTING TO UEA
UEA CAMPUS

The Workshop will be held in the ARTS Building, on Campus at UEA in rooms; 2.01, 2.03, 2.06. This is point 9, The Teaching Wall, on the campus map.

A range of amenities are available on Campus including cash points, cafes and shops (17).

WIFI

UEA has two wireless networks available, Eduroam and The Cloud. If you are coming from an institution which is part of eduroam, you should connect to the network automatically. However it is possible that you may need to manually enter your login information.

If you do have any issues using Eduroam, or are not from an institution which uses it, then you will be able to connect your devices to The Cloud. Simply select _The Cloud_ from the list of available wireless networks, then open your browser. This will take you to a registration page where you will need to enter your details, including your choice of username and password.

The Cloud is free to use and is also available in areas of central Norwich.

NORWICH

Norwich is a friendly and diverse city, both vibrant and attractive. A hotbed for the arts, culture and tourism, it is a city full of stunning architecture. Norwich has a Norman Cathedral and a 12th Century Castle, as well as an open-air market, a range of independent shops in the Norwich Lanes, and restaurants, cinemas, galleries, theatres, cafes and pubs.

The City’s medieval centre of cobbled streets remains largely intact, but there is still space for modern buildings such as the Forum, a stunning piece of contemporary architecture. Its glass front overlooks the colourful six-day market and reflects the city in all its diversity.

For further information about Norwich;

http://www.visitnorwich.co.uk/

http://www.visitnorfolk.co.uk/explore/Norwich.aspx