

Name: _____

Score: _____ / _____

Paper analysis practice

Part 1

Before you start the practice assignment, download and read through the paper analysis project prompt (available below).

Once you've done that, you're ready for the practice assignment. You will need three articles for the practice assignment -- download them below. Then, write "OK" in the box below.

Attachments

paperanalysis.pdf

CNN Diplomats whose countries dislike the US.pdf

Fisman and Miguel Corruption, Norms, and Legal Enforcement.pdf

NY Times The Culture of Nations.pdf

Answer Point Value: 0.0 points

Model Short Answer: Just write "OK" in the box to proceed

Feedback: -----

What type of article is the CNN (AP) article?

A. Other

Feedback: -----

B. News article

Feedback: -----

C. Feature/magazine story

Feedback: -----

D. Op-ed

Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: B

Correct Feedback: -----

Incorrect Feedback: -----

What type of article is the NY Times article?

- A. Feature/magazine story Feedback: -----
- B. Op-ed Feedback: -----
- C. News article Feedback: -----
- D. Other Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: B

Correct Feedback: -----

Incorrect Feedback: -----

Where does the academic article come from?

- A. Press release Feedback: -----
- B. Medical/technical journal Feedback: -----
- C. Academic journal Feedback: -----
- D. Book Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: C

Correct Feedback: -----

Incorrect Feedback: -----

How does the original (academic) report describe the goal of the study?

- A. Which countries are most corrupt and why? Feedback: -----
- B. Why do people engage in corruption? Feedback: -----
- C. Does dislike of a country make people more likely to commit crimes there? Feedback: -----
- D. What is the best way to reduce corruption? Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: B

Correct Feedback: -----

Incorrect Feedback: Reread page 1: They are interested in understanding the underlying causes of corruption, and especially in the relative effects of social norms and legal enforcement.

Which option best describes the setting of the study

- A. Diplomats in New York City in the early 2000s Feedback: -----
- B. Diplomats in Washington, D.C. in the early 2000s Feedback: -----
- C. Senators in Washington, D.C. in the early 2000s Feedback: -----
- D. Ambassadors in Geneva in the early 2000s Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: A

Correct Feedback: -----

Incorrect Feedback: -----

What type of study is this?

- A. Meta-analysis Feedback: -----
- B. Natural experiment Feedback: -----
- C. Observational study Feedback: -----
- D. Survey study Feedback: -----
- E. Randomized experiment Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: B,C

Correct Feedback: There is no random assignment here (by experimenters or "nature"), so this is an observational study. The authors claim the 2002 enforcement increase is a "natural experiment," but it affects all the diplomats equally, so there's no assignment by nature into different experimental conditions as we saw in e.g., Snow's cholera study, Card and Krueger's minimum wage study, or Dell's mita study.

Incorrect Feedback: There is no random assignment here (by experimenters or "nature"), so this is an observational study. The authors claim the 2002 enforcement increase is a "natural experiment," but it affects all the diplomats equally, so there's no assignment by nature into different experimental conditions as we saw in e.g., Snow's cholera study, Card and Krueger's minimum wage study, or Dell's mita study.

What population does the article attempt to generalize to?

- A. Diplomats to the U.N. in New York City Feedback: -----
- B. The general population Feedback: -----
- C. All government officials outside the U.S. Feedback: -----
- D. All diplomats (since they have diplomatic immunity) Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: B

Correct Feedback: -----

Incorrect Feedback: They are interested in universal causes of corruption and claim their study yields insights that generalize universally.

Which of these variables are the key explanatory variables in their study? (Focus on the model on p. 1035)

- A. Number of diplomats Feedback: -----
- B. U.S. aid recipient Feedback: -----
- C. Enforcement Feedback: -----
- D. Dislike of the U.S. Feedback: -----
- E. Corruption level Feedback: -----
- F. GDP Feedback: -----
- G. Government wage relative to GDP Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: A,C,E

Correct Feedback: -----

Incorrect Feedback: Some of the other variables enter in some specifications, but Corruption, Enforcement, Number of diplomats are always included (along with GDP per capita and region).

Which of these are the key response variables in the study?

- A. Number of diplomats representing the country at the U.N. Feedback: -----
- B. Corruption level Feedback: -----
- C. Number of parking violations Feedback: -----
- D. Number of unpaid parking violations Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: D

Correct Feedback: -----

Incorrect Feedback: Number of unpaid parking violations is the key outcome. Getting and then paying parking tickets isn't considered corrupt by the authors. Corruption level and number of diplomats are explanatory/predictor variables

About how much data is missing in this study? Focus on the main model. The UN has 193 members, and (assume) all are represented with missions in New York that have at least one car. Hint: You've derived this number on a previous problem set.

- A. 55% Feedback: -----
- B. 25% Feedback: -----
- C. 15% Feedback: -----
- D. 5% Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: B

Correct Feedback: Good! We're assuming that we have complete data for each diplomatic mission in this case, which seems like a fair assumption (why would the State Department only know of some resident diplomats, for instance?).

Incorrect Feedback: See page 1022: "This approach allows us to construct a 'revealed preference' measure of corruption among government officials across 149 countries [...]" $149/193 = 77.2\%$. 22.8% of the data are missing. We're assuming that we have complete data for each diplomatic mission in this case, which seems like a fair assumption (why would the State Department only know of some resident diplomats, for instance?).

Look at figure 1. Notice that the y axis is logarithmic. What do you see?

A. There was a sharp decrease in parking violations after the onset of the great recession Feedback: -----

B. There was a clear negative trend over time Feedback: -----

C. There was a sharp decrease in parking violations after the Bloomberg administration's enforcement measures were introduced Feedback: -----

D. There was a sharp decrease in parking violations after the dot-com bubble burst Feedback: -----

E. There was a sharp decrease in parking violations after 9/11 Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: C,E

Correct Feedback: -----

Incorrect Feedback: There are sharp declines after the Bloomberg administration's intervention and 9/11 but not the other two dates. Apart from these large shifts, the pattern is largely flat.

Table 3 shows the main results of the paper. Look at column 2. Which predictor variables are statistically significant? (They are the ones with multiple asterisks)

A. Diplomats Feedback: -----

B. Log per capita income (1998 US\$) Feedback: -----

C. Country corruption index x postenforcement period Feedback: -----

D. Postenforcement period indicator (post-11/2002) Feedback: -----

E. Country corruption index, 1998 Feedback: -----

F. One or more region indicator variables Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: A,D,E

Correct Feedback: -----

Incorrect Feedback: Column two includes four variables and three are significant (see above).

Which of these statements about the authors' design (i.e., internal validity) do you agree with?

A. Missing data are a major problem with this study

Feedback: -----

B. Ideally, we would want a "natural experiment" that increased enforcement for some countries, but not others

Feedback: -----

C. Figure 1 shows us that violation levels were largely constant aside from the two events the authors highlight, so comparing pre- and post-enforcement without a control group seems pretty reasonable

Feedback: -----

D. The fact that corruption levels isn't randomly assigned is a significant limitation -- the effect we attribute to corruption could be caused by something else highly corrupt countries have in common

Feedback: -----

E. The fact that the authors control for many alternative variables that could be correlated with corruption, such as distaste for the U.S. and U.S. aid receipts, makes us less worried that our corruption coefficient is driven by a lurking/omitted variable

Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: B,C,D,E

Correct Feedback: -----

Incorrect Feedback: The missing countries are all very small, so including them and giving them as much weight as e.g., China would likely do more harm than good.

Which of these points about generalizability (external validity) do you agree with?

A. I'm not sure whether diplomat behavior is representative of how all government employees (e.g., cops, teachers, other bureaucrats) behave

Feedback: -----

B. I think it's more helpful to look at real-world behavior (i.e., unpaid parking violations) than surveys that measure self-reported behaviors (i.e., asking officials whether they ask for bribes or people whether they pay them)

Feedback: -----

C. I'm not sure whether unpaid parking violations are a good example of what we typically think of as corruption (i.e., taking bribes)

Feedback: -----

D. It's helpful to work with a sample that's fairly homogenous (diplomats posted in a single location) on most variables except where they're from (and how corrupt that country is)

Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: A,B,C,D

Correct Feedback: -----

Incorrect Feedback: -----

How would you describe the relationship between the CNN (AP) article and the academic report?

- A. It briefly mentions the paper and then proceeds with largely unrelated conjecture Feedback: -----
- B. It's broadly accurate, but makes one major mistake Feedback: -----
- C. It's accurate, but emphasizes a relatively tangential result Feedback: -----
- D. It's very sensationalist and misrepresents the paper's key findings Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: C

Correct Feedback: -----

Incorrect Feedback: It's a great summary of the paper, but you have to read the article to learn about the key findings (culture vs. enforcement) -- instead, they lead with a result that's less important to the researchers.

How would you describe the relationship between the NY Times article and the academic report?

- A. It's accurate, but emphasizes a relatively tangential result Feedback: -----
- B. It's very sensationalist and misrepresents the paper's key findings Feedback: -----
- C. It's broadly accurate, but makes one major mistake Feedback: -----
- D. It accurately interprets a key finding from the paper and then provides additional context from other practitioners/researchers Feedback: -----
- E. It briefly mentions the paper and then proceeds with largely unrelated conjecture Feedback: -----

Answer Point Value: 1.0 points

Answer Key: D

Correct Feedback: -----

Incorrect Feedback: -----

What are some areas that you felt the author(s) of the study were unclear on? What part of their statistical analysis confused you? What connections between the results and the argument were unclear? What part of the news article write-up of the report was confusing? Write down two or more additional questions you still have after doing a careful analysis of the news article and the academic study.

Answer Point Value: 4.0 points

Model Short Answer: -----

Feedback: -----