GV120 - Politics and Economics Policies

University of Essex - Department of Government

Lorenzo Crippa

Week 2 - 11 October, 2019

Your GTA

Hi! My name is Lorenzo Crippa,

Email: I.crippa@essex.ac.uk

Office: 5B.153 (Department of Government)

Office hour: Wednesday 15:00 to 16:00

Basic housekeeping rules

- Class on Friday, 14:00 to 15:00
- Room 3.105
- A more participated class
- Sharing handouts: send them to me and I forward them to the class?
- Presentations but also Q&A about any topic related to the module

Bottom-up organisation

Let's introduce ourselves to each other!

- Your name
- What do you study?
- Why have you chosen this degree?

Class organisation

- Form groups (best if they are groups of 2)
- Choose a topic and a related reading
- Sign up your names on the table that is circulating

https://www.randomlists.com/team-generator

Rough timetable

| Week number | What are we going to do? |
|-------------|---|
| 2 | organisation and introduction |
| 3 | - 1 group presents |
| 4 | - 2 groups present |
| 5 | - 2 groups present |
| 6 | – discuss take-home assignment |
| | - 1 group presents? |
| 7 | – discuss in-lecture test |
| | - 1 group presents? |
| 8 | EXTRA SLOT: catch up with presentations? |
| 9 | - 2 groups present |
| 10 | - 1 group presents |
| 11 | EXTRA SLOT: catch up with presentations? |

What makes for a good presentation? (I part)

| Criteria | | 0 | | 50 | 60 | 70 | 100 | |
|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|
| Research question or research problem of | | | | | | | | |
| the article clearly emphasized. | | | | | | | | |
| Main theoretical argument is presented. | | | | | | | | |
| Methodology is described (briefly). | | | | | | | | |
| Main findings/conclusions are clear. | | | | | | | | |
| Main contributions are clear. | | | | | | | | |
| Three short takeaways are included. | | | | | | | | |
| Two discussion questions (not part of time | | | | | | | | |
| limit) | | | | | | | | |
| Structure of the presentation | | | | | | | | |
| Speed of the presentation | | | | | | | | |
| Timing of the presentation (10 min) | | | | | | | | |
| Quality of presentation slides | | | | | | | | |
| Quality of questions, critique for discussion | | | | | | | | |
| Quality of handout | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL MARK | 0 | | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | | 100 |
| COMMENTS: | | | | | | | | |

What makes for a good presentation? (II part)

- 1. Understanding the paper
 - 1.1 Research context
 - 1.2 Main research question
 - 1.3 Main argument
 - 1.4 Methodology
 - 1.5 Main findings and contributions
- 2. Beyond the paper
 - 2.1 Critical points (2 questions, issues, comments, critiques)
 - 2.2 Stimulate a discussion with the audience
- 3. Speed and style
 - 3.1 10 minutes per group to present
 - 3.2 A clear and complete presentation

Example of a presentation by me

Kaczmarek, S. and A. L. Newman (2011). "The Long Arm of the Law: Extraterritoriality and the National Implementation of Foreign Bribery Legislation". *International Organization*, 65 (4): 745-770.

(Handout will be sent to the mailing list of the class this afternoon)

1. Research context

- Context: Foreign bribery is nowadays a criminal offence (1997 OECD Anti-Bribery Convention)
- U.S. anti-bribery law applies also to non-American citizens
- Problem: Regulating foreign bribery requires collective action by sovereign states.
- Clash between individual and societal interests

2. Research question and argument

- **Res. Question**: What is the reaction of sovereign states to the extraterritorial application of U.S. anti-bribery law?
- Theory supports competing answers: Spill-over (+) or competition (-)?
- Authors' argument: U.S. behaviour has a positive impact on states' application of their own anti-bribery laws

3. Methodology and findings

- Data: Actual instances of prosecution for foreign bribery
- Methodology: Discrete event-history analysis
 - Dependent variable: first application of anti-bribery law by a country
 - (Main) independent variable: application of U.S. anti-bribery law against a citizen of that country
- Findings: Application of the U.S. anti-bribery law on average stimulate other countries to start applying their laws

4. Critical points and gaps

- Theoretical: By what causal link is this positive effect channelled?
- Methodological: The variable for state compliance with the OECD Convention is ordinal. What happens after the state has first-applied its anti-bribery laws?

Conclusion

Questions? Doubts?

Don't hesitate to ask me or simply drop me an email.

See you next week!