GIVING AN ACADEMIC TALK
Have a Punchline
Have a Punchline
1. Kinds of talks
   • Their format
   • Your goals

2. Preparing the Talk
   • Organization
   • Slides

3. Giving the Talk
   • Presentation
   • Q&A
I. Kinds of talks

- Their format
- Your goals

Invited Talks

- Speaker Series
- Job Talks
- Professional Audiences

Conference Presentations

- 10-15 minutes on a panel
- 45-90 minutes at small conferences

Classroom Lectures
1. Kinds of talks
- Their format
- Your goals

Ask your host

Length
- Often 90 minutes for invited talks
- Leave time for Q&A
- 10 to 15 minutes for conference

Expectations
- Discussant?
- Has everyone read the paper?

Q&A
- How Long?
- How Aggressive? Econ vs. History

Technology
- What will they have?
- Bring your own

Clarifying questions, others at the end
I. Kinds of talks

- Their format
- Your goals

Impress People

- Be smart
- Be collegial
- Be interesting

So interesting, they want to tell others about you.

Communicate Your Research

- Spread your ideas
- Protect your ideas

Get Feedback

- Part of the publication process
- Maybe about your punchline

These are why academic talks are important to the discipline.
1. Kinds of talks
   • Their format
   • Your goals

2. Preparing the Talk
   • Organization
   • Slides

3. Giving the Talk
   • Presentation
   • Q&A
2. Preparing the Talk

- Organization
- Slides

Include the answer right at the beginning

Leave details for Q&A

The meat of the talk

Tie it back to the beginning

An Outline You Can Follow

- Make it transparent
  All built around your punchline

Communicate Your Research

- Motivation or Puzzle
- Theory or Significance
- Methods and Data
- Results
- Implications

Other Formats Can Work

Winnow for a Conference
Even winnow on the fly
2. Preparing the Talk

- Organization
  - Slides

Use Slides

Beamer vs. PowerPoint (etc.)
- Beamer sends a signal
- Use what you know how to use

Make Slides Sparse
- Minimize Text
- No huge tables

Use Visuals
- Minimize clipart.
- Don’t force it.
- Visuals should support your points

- Conceptual tables
- Causal diagrams
- Important actors
- Maps
- Graphs
- Simple tables
- Equations
Examples
Interpreting Nominate scores 

Ideological Votes vs. Partisan Votes

Leveraging outside Information

Seperating Ideology from Party in Roll Call Data: Hans Noel

1.5 Ideological Votes vs. Partisan Votes

Separating Ideology from Party in Roll Call Data:

Similarly ...

(from www.votescore.com)

Separating Ideology from Party in Roll Call Data:

Partisan vs. Ideological coalitions

Using known liberals and conservatives

In the three-party system of Republicans, Southern Democrats and Northern Democrats, it is useful to think of a major-party loyalty dimension as defined by the axes through the space that captures party-line votes. This dimension can be thought of as ranging from strong loyalty to the Democrats to weak loyalty to either party and to strong loyalty to the Republicans. (In other periods, when party cutting lines are vertical, the horizontal dimension can be thought of as both a party-loyalty dimension and an economic dimension.) An axis perpendicular to the party-loyalty dimension would then express a liberal/conservative dimension that is independent of party loyalty. Votes with cutting lines that are on neither the party-loyalty axes nor the independent liberal/conservative axes represent votes in which legislators make a trade-off instead of voting on their liberal/conservative positions, they maintain some loyalty to their parties. Almost all votes reflect, to some degree, this type of tradeoff. (Poole and Rosenthal 1997, pp. 45-46.)

What does this picture mean?

What does ideology mean?

What we call “ideology” might mean:

- Whatever NOMINATE scores measure
- A philosophical worldview
- Something that maps worldviews to policy positions
  - Reich and Margo 1994
  - Noel 2013
- Give us a dimension, but it has meaning
  - Not just any line will do.

What does this picture mean?

Noel 2013: Integrating Pundits

1950's Pundits projected into 1949-1950 Congress

- Cutting line of Speaker Vote
- Bipartisan in Speaker Vote
- Best Line for Pundits

Trade

Idea of all cutting lines, U.S. House, 1940-1980

Angles of “Major” legislation

“Major Legislation” refers to those laws selected by David Mayhew for Chosen Life Grown. They span 1957 to 1983
A different model

Typical Item-Response Model treats vote choice as a function of an n-dimensional space. Interpret the space after.

\[ P(v_i = 1) = F(\theta_i - \gamma) \]

Instead, we could treat vote choice as a function of two specific dimensions, one partisan and one ideological.

\[ P(v_i = 1) = F(\theta_{pi} + \theta_{ii} - \gamma_{pi} - \gamma_{ii}) \]

Identification of the dimensions

Identify the dimensions through known information about who is liberal/moderate/conservative and who is Democrat/Republican.

\[ x_i \sim N(\mu_i, 1) \]

\[ \mu_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if Conservative} \\ 0 & \text{if Moderate} \\ -1 & \text{if Liberal} \end{cases} \]

and

\[ x_{pi} \sim N(\mu_{pi}, 1) \]

\[ \mu_{pi} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if Republican} \\ 0 & \text{if Independent} \\ -1 & \text{if Democrat} \end{cases} \]

Political Ideologies and Political Parties in Congress

- Ideology and Party are independent forces in congressional voting.
- What NOMINATE measures is a mix of both.
- We can disentangle them.
Interpreting Nominates scores: Ideological Votes vs. Partisan Votes

Leveraging outside Information in a Party + Ideology Model

Separating Ideology from Party in Roll Call Data: Hans Noel

Political Ideologies and Political Parties in Congress

- Ideology and Party are independent forces in congressional voting.
- Nominates measure is a mix of both.
- We can disentangle them.

What does this picture mean?

What does ideology mean?

What do these charts show?

Using known liberals and conservatives

- Media and other observers characterize legislators as "liberal," "moderate," and "conservative.
- These are not just synonyms for "Democrat" and "Republican.
  - Probably not "conditional" in their usage (e.g., "he's liberal for a Republican").
- Almanac of American Politics

Partisan vs. Ideological coalitions

Angles of "Major" legislation

Noel 2013: Integrating Pundits

1950's Pundits projected into 1949-1950 Congress

- Cutting line of Speaker Vote
- Distribution of Speaker Vote
- Best Fits for Pundits
In the three-party-system period [of Republicans, Southern Democrats and Northern Democrats], it is useful to think of a major-party loyalty dimension as defined by the axis through the space that captures party-line votes. This dimension can be thought of as ranging from strong loyalty to the Democrats to weak loyalty to other party and to strong loyalty to the Republicans. (In other periods, when party cutting lines are vertical, the horizontal dimension can be thought of as both a party-loyalty dimension and an economic dimension.) An axis perpendicular to the party-loyalty dimension would then express a liberal/conservative dimension that is independent of party loyalty. Votes with cutting lines that are on neither the party-loyalty axis nor the independent liberal/conservative axis represent votes in which legislators make a trade-off instead of voting on their liberal/conservative positions, they maintain some loyalty to their parties. Almost all votes reflect, to some degree, this type of tradeoff." (Poole and Rosenthal 1997, pp. 45-46).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Polls, second half</th>
<th>Endorsements (Weighted Share), second half</th>
<th>Fund raising, second half</th>
<th>Media coverage, second half</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polls</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsements</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Weighted)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Raising</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Coverage</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/Number of Candidates</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-squared</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root MSE</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. EMPIRICAL TESTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Polls,</th>
<th>Endorsements (Weighted Share),</th>
<th>Fund raising,</th>
<th>Media coverage,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second half</td>
<td>second half</td>
<td>second half</td>
<td>second half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polls</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsements</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Raising</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Coverage</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/Number of Candidates</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-squared</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root MSE</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. EMPIRICAL TESTS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Polls, second half</th>
<th>Endorsements (Weighted Share), second half</th>
<th>Fund raising, second half</th>
<th>Media coverage, second half</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polls</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Weighted)</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsements</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td><strong>0.87</strong></td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td><strong>(0.27)</strong></td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td><strong>3.25</strong></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td><strong>0.11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Raising</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Coverage</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/Number of Candidates</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-squared</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root MSE</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. EMPIRICAL TESTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Polls, second half</th>
<th>Endorsements (Weighted Share), second half</th>
<th>Fund raising, second half</th>
<th>Media coverage, second half</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polls</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsements</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Weighted)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Raising</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Coverage</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/Number of Candidates</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-squared</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root MSE</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. EMPIRICAL TESTS
THE TEA PARTY

DON'T TREAD ON ME

SANTELLI
BECK
PALIN
BACHMANN
DeMINT
CARENDER
KOCH
PAUL
1. Kinds of talks
   • Their format
   • Your goals
2. Preparing the Talk
   • Organization
   • Slides
3. Giving the Talk
   • Presentation
   • Q&A
3. Giving the Talk

• Presentation
• Q&A

Practice
• Talk, don’t read
• Give formal and informal practices

Confidence with Humility
• You belong there
• But so do they

Manage interruptions
• Deflect questions
• Use them

Slides augment your talk
• Don’t read them
• Walk people through diagrams

It’s not a “dissertation.”
It’s your research.

Laser pointer, or just your fingers
3. Giving the Talk
- Presentation
- Q&A

Keep your punchline in mind
- How would a critique affect your main point? *If it doesn’t matter, it doesn’t matter*

Confidence with Humility
- Maintain respect
- Everyone’s question is good
- Don’t get defensive

You can admit you don’t know
- Or even that you might be wrong

You are doing scholarship.
- It’s not a game.

Have backup slides
1. Kinds of talks
   • Their format
   • Your goals

2. Preparing the Talk
   • Organization
   • Slides

3. Giving the Talk
   • Presentation
   • Q&A
1. Kinds of talks
   • Their format
   • Your goals

2. Preparing the Talk
   • Organization
   • Slides

3. Giving the Talk
   • Presentation
   • Q&A
1. Kinds of talks
   • Their format
   • Your goals

2. Preparing the Talk
   • Organization
   • Slides

3. Giving the Talk
   • Presentation
   • Q&A