International Journal of Innovative Research in Computer Science & Technology (IJIRCST)
ISSN: 2347-5552, Volume-10, Special Issue-9, September-2022
Innovative Projects 2022
Organized by Presidency University, Bangalore, India

Some Good News on Compliance and Cooperation

Mathew Sinu Simon
Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id-mathew.simon@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Recent studies on international regulatory regimes' compliance have argued that compliance is generally quite good, this high level of compliance has been attained with little attention to enforcement, those compliance issues that do exist are best addressed as management issues rather than enforcement issues, and the management approach rather than the enforcement approach holds the key to the evolution of future regulatory cooperation in the international arena. The descriptive results are essentially accurate, but endogeneity and selection issues seriously taint the policy implications. States creating treaties that ask them to do nothing more than they would do in the absence of a treaty often lead to high rates of compliance. Self-interest and enforcement both play important roles in situations when disobedience does occur and the consequences of selection are diminished.

KEYWORDS:

Agreement, Compliance, Cooperation, International, States, Treaty.

I. INTRODUCTION

Many social scientists who are interested in collaboration have recently focused on the issue of compliance in global regulatory frameworks. A team made up mostly of qualitative political scientists and academics interested in international law has done a large portion of the empirical research in this field. Its main points are that (1) compliance is generally quite good, (2) this high level of compliance has been attained with little focus on enforcement, (3) those compliance issues that do exist are best addressed as management issues rather than enforcement issues, and (4) the management approach rather than the enforcement approach holds the key to the development of future regulatory cooperation in the international system. According to Oran Young, "A new understanding of the bases of compliance is making itself felt among students of international relations. One that treats compliance as a management problem rather than an enforcement problem and that has profound practical as well as theoretical implications." In conclusion, not only are the pessimistic predictions based on issues like relative gains worries, collective action issues, anarchy, and fears of self-interested exploitation false, but it also appears that the enforcement restrictions that have long seemed to severely restrict the contributions of international law and many international institutions have been exaggerated. We shall argue in this article that while the empirical results of this group, which we designate as the "managerial school," are intriguing and significant, their policy conclusions are gravely tainted by selection issues [1], [2].

Evidence suggests that the high level of compliance and the marginality of enforcement result from the fact that most treaties only call for states to make minor deviations from what they would have done in the absence of an agreement. This is especially true if we focus only on regulatory treaties that call for reductions in a collectively dysfunctional behavior (such as tariffs, increases in arms), as opposed to other types of agreements. As a result, governments often get little gains for even unpunished defections; as a result, the level of enforcement required to sustain cooperation is low. Although there is nothing inherently wrong with this circumstance, it is unlikely to serve as the managerialists' claimed paradigm for the future. Even if we assume that the benefits brought about by this modest amount of regulation are relatively large in absolute terms, furthering international regulatory cooperation will almost certainly necessitate the development of agreements that offer much greater disincentives to adhere to them than those in place at the moment (e.g., stricter environmental regulations, fewer nontariff barriers, and steeper arms reductions). We have very little evidence that such advancement is possible without improved enforcement [3], [4].

We first explain the issues that endogeneity and selection face before presenting the theoretical justification for the relationship between enforcement level and what we refer to as "depth of cooperation" and assessing the degree to which deep cooperation has been accomplished without enforcement. Then, we provide many notable exceptions to the management school's unqualified generalizations about the reasons for noncompliance and how to address them. Finally, we go through how the growth of more cooperative regimes has affected strategy.

The managerial thesis

The management school is founded on the observation that state adherence to international agreements is typically pretty excellent and that enforcement has played little to no role in establishing and maintaining that record. According to Abram and Antonia Chayes, it is not the threat of punishment that ensures compliance, but rather "a plastic process of interaction among the parties concerned in which the effort is to reestablish, in the microcontext of the particular dispute, the balance of advantage that brought the agreement into existence. "Noncompliance is not necessarily, perhaps not even usually, the result of deliberate defiance of the legal standard," according to followers of the managerial school. When compliance issues do arise, they should be treated as isolated administrative failures rather than as infractions or self-serving efforts at exploitation. The reasons for noncompliance may be traced to three factors: (1) the vagueness and ambiguity of treaties; (2) governmental capacity constraints; and (3) unpredictable social or economic developments [5], [6].

It should come as no surprise that the management school has negative opinions about formal and even unofficial enforcement methods. Given the lack of any exploitation-related motive, punishment is not only inappropriate, but it is also expensive, political, and coercive. Retaliatory non-compliance, as noted by Ronald Mitchell, "often proves unlikely because the costs of any individual violation may not warrant a response and it cannot be specifically targeted, imposing costs on those who have consistently complied without hurting the targeted violator enough to change its behavior." Thus, in international society, "arrangements featuring enforcement as a means of eliciting compliance are not of much use," according to Young. As Chayes and Chayes note, sanctions' validity as a tool for treaty enforcement is "deeply suspect" since they are often more effective against economically disadvantaged and politically weak nations, and because "unilateral sanctions can be imposed only by the major powers."

Rather than being transgressions that need to be penalized, instances of seeming noncompliance are issues that need to be addressed. "As in other managerial situations, the dominant atmosphere is that of actors engaged in a cooperative venture, in which performance that seems to be unsatisfactory for some reason represents a problem to be solved by mutual consultation and analysis, rather than an offense to be punished," claim Chayes and Chayes. The main drivers of this process are argument and persuasion. The following tactics must be used to encourage compliance and preserve cooperation: (1) enhancing conflict resolution processes, (2) providing technical and financial support, and (3) raising transparency. The following sentence is particularly crucial: "For a party intentionally contemplating violation, the high probability of discovery reduces the expected benefits rather than increases the costs and would thus deter violation regardless of the possibility of sanctions."

The endogeneity and selection problems

It is simple to see why the management school's conclusions imply that international institutions and even international law have a far brighter future than most experts in international relations have thought over the previous fifty years. They also go opposed to the assertions of cooperation scholars in the rational-choice tradition, severely defying the negative assumptions of many realists and neorealist about the impossibility of cooperation and self-regulation to exist in anarchic worlds. These academics stress the importance of enforcement issues in regulatory contexts and categorize them as mixed-motive games rather than coordination games, where the risk of self-interested exploitation is less of a worry. The common hypothesis that the rational-choice tradition's fondness for the recurring prisoners' dilemma has caused it to overemphasize enforcement and underemphasize the possibility of voluntary compliance and non-coercive conflict settlement gains support from these results [7], [8].

II. DISCUSSION

We need to control for the basis of state selection, i.e., those features of international agreements that play the same role for states as musical difficulty does for school orchestras, to even begin to overcome the challenges that endogeneity poses for understanding the role of enforcement in regulatory compliance. What we have dubbed the depth of collaboration is a potential contender. International political economists measure an agreement's depth by how much behind-the-border integration is required in order to comply with social and environmental norms and lower trade barriers. However, in this case, the term "depth of an agreement" refers to

the amount to which it fully realizes the advantages of perfect collaboration in a single area of policy. It is most helpful to conceive of a treaty's depth of cooperation as the amount to which it forces nations to deviate from what they would have done in its absence, given the challenges involved in determining the cooperative potential of an ideal treaty. The theoretical depth of cooperation of a treaty would refer to the reduction it required relative to a counterfactual estimate of the tariff or pollution level that would exist in the absence of a treaty if we are looking at the critical subset of regulatory treaties that require states to reduce some collectively dysfunctional behavior like tariffs or pollution. Of fact, this number may not accurately reflect the level of collaboration that a pact really accomplished. Since that number serves as the foundation for determining the amount of compliance, we utilize it to gauge the depth of cooperation in this instance. It might be based on the situation at the time an agreement was signed or on a forecast generated from the year-to-year change rate previous to that time if there is no reliable theoretical estimate of this counterfactual [9], [10].

It is evident that any assessment of cooperation's depth is quite unrefined. Undoubtedly, there are certain policy areas where the possibility for collaboration is significantly lower than in others, for a variety of reasons. In these scenarios, our depth measurement will give the impression that cooperation in these regions is shallower than it really is. This depth of cooperation measure, however, gives a general idea of what states have accomplished if one is willing to concede that there are significant cooperative benefits that are as of yet unrealized in the areas of arms control, trade, and environmental regulation, as both managerialists and more traditional institutionalists argue. It may then be used by us to analyze compliance data and determine the effectiveness of enforcement. The link between the depth of cooperation represented by a specific treaty, the nature of the game that underpins it, and the level of enforcement required to preserve it is not expected to be biased in any manner, despite the fact that this measure of depth is far from perfect. Through domestic legislation, such as the European Union and environmental treaties, through unilateral acts, such as the U.S. enforcement of fishery and wildlife accords under the Pelly and Packwood-Magnuson amendments, or through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) Dispute Settlement Procedure. We suspect, along with the majority of managerialists, that the most effective enforcement schemes may well be decentralized and not involve perfectly coordinated action by every signatory of a multilateral agreement given the weakness of current international institutions and the relative difficulty in mobilizing formal sanctions. This does not, however, disprove the relationship between the level of cooperation and the severity of the penalty required to preserve compliance in mixedmotive games.

This means that measuring the relevance of enforcement by looking at how high compliance is when it is low or absent could be deceptive. The degree of cooperation represented by a specific treaty and the quantity of enforcement required in mixed-motive games are logically connected. We need to be concerned that states may be avoiding close cooperation and the benefits it holds whenever a prisoners' dilemma situation exists because they are unwilling or unable to bear the costs of enforcement, which could explain both the high rate of compliance and the relative lack of enforcement threats. If this were the case, ordering governments to disregard enforcement in favor of other compliance measures would be analogous to directing school orchestras not to waste their time practicing. Similar to how the latter would limit orchestras to a collection of straightforward works, the management school's recommendations would limit governments to signing agreements that serve as answers to coordination games and simple prisoner dilemmas.

Given the situation, it would seem prudent to avoid making any effort to describe the fundamental game's characteristics or to weigh the pros and cons of the competing hypotheses. We look at two. In order to reduce behaviors that states have determined are collectively unproductive, we will first evaluate the extent of cooperation and the degree of enforcement in connection with well-known regulatory agreements that do not include many enforcement measures. Although it would be ideal to investigate the relationship between enforcement and degree of collaboration, as we have already said, we concur with the management school that heavily enforced regulatory agreements are not common. If the management school is right, the level of collaboration shouldn't be affected by the lack of strict enforcement laws or the implicit threat of enforcement. There should be many instances of states deciding to drastically change the course they were on when a treaty was signed while giving enforcement little thought. Any tendency of states to refrain from committing themselves to punishing noncompliance is likely to be associated with either a world in which there are relatively few deeply cooperative agreements or in which violations are rampant, if the game theorists are correct that the majority of significant regulatory agreements are mixed-motive games of some variety. We anticipate that the former is accurate since we both agree that while regulatory infractions do occur, they are not common.

Second, we'll look at the managerial school's contention that treaty violations are primarily caused by a confluence of treaty ambiguity, state capacity constraints, and uncontrollable social and economic change rather than by the obvious self-interest that frequently underlies treaty violations. This claim is contested by us since the collection of violations ought to be less biased by selection than the collection of treaties. This is true because,

ceteris paribus, we anticipate that the rate of violation of mixed-motive game treaties will be much greater than the rate of violation of coordination game treaties in the absence of perfect knowledge and proper enforcement. Therefore, even if there were fewer of these treaties, they would still be overrepresented in any sample of breaches compared to treaties based on coordination games.

The Rarity of Deep Cooperation

Do we have a good reason to believe that selection will taint conclusions regarding how important enforcement is? Does evidence support the idea that there isn't much need for enforcement since there isn't any substantial cooperation? Let's start by looking at the collection of armaments deals the US has signed since 1945 (appendix B). We point out right away that, despite their value, some treaties, like the "Hot Line" pact and the United States-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Ballistic Missile Launch Notification Agreements, do not directly regulate an arms output, such as the number and/or location of a weapons system. Among those that do, a sizeable portion include agreements to preserve the current trajectory rather than dramatically modify it, including the Antarctic Treaty, the Seabed Arms Control Treaty, and the Outer Space Treaty. In these locations, neither the Soviet Union nor the United States had cost-effective plans for significant weapons systems or a strategic objective that called for such a system at the time the accords were signed. The reason Chayes & Chayes can state that "there has been no repotted deviation from the requirements of these treaties over a period of forty years" is because this scenario has essentially persisted. It's possible that there was greater enforcement in this situation than is expressly stated in these agreements.

The Soviet Union and the United States undoubtedly both understood that if one violated an agreement dramatically, the other would probably respond in like. Even if these expectations were implicitly formed, they are just as genuine as those that are expressly stated in the treaty. It is difficult to argue that these treaties demonstrate the close cooperation that would have occurred if the superpowers had each agreed to halt significant modernization programs or drastically cut their defense budgets, even though we do not dispute the value of obtaining concrete assurance of a rival's intentions through a treaty. The Anti-Ballistic Missiles (ABM) Treaty is subject to a similar defense. Although neither state had the resources or the technology to deploy a major system when the treaty was signed in 1972, it may have served as a significant benchmark that helped prevent both states from taking advantage of technological advancements made since the treaty was signed.

Soviet ABM efforts were restricted to a spare system around Moscow in 1967, when President Johnson and Premier Kosygin first started to move toward dialogue, and the United States announced that it would start deploying a "thin" system to ward off Chinese attack and potential accident launches. The original agreement's depth in terms of the current "counterfactual" (i.e., the ABM system that the United States would build today if there were no agreement) (i.e., the defense against a terrorist state) has likely increased as the technology of these antiballistic systems gradually improved and attention has shifted away from defense against a terrorist state) has decreased. The game theorist would anticipate that the agreement would come under growing pressure in the form of breaches on the side of the most powerful state given a constant or falling degree of enforcement due to the weakness of the former Soviet Union and expanding depth. This seems to have happened.

Both SALT II and the first Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) Interim Agreement lacked substantial substance. The interim agreement allowed for increases in the number of submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) on both sides while freezing the number of intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) launchers at the status quo level (the United States had none under construction at the time and the Soviet Union was allowed to finish those it was building). It also failed to significantly restrict qualitative improvements in launchers, missiles, or a host of systems that allowe The number of active launchers or bombers for each side had to be significantly reduced under SALT II, although the number of ICBMs fitted with multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles (MIRVed ICBMs) was allowed to rise by 40% between the time of the agreement and 1985. The overall number of nuclear bombs was authorized to expand by 50–70% when this number is added to the number of cruise missiles allowed per aircraft. There is a "remarkable compatibility" between the Treaty's restrictions and both sides' anticipated strategic nuclear weapons development, according to Jozef Goldblat. There are, of course, deeper agreements on intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF), conventional forces in Europe (CFE), and the strategic arms reduction talks (START). In the first, intermediate- and shorter-range missiles must be eliminated from Europe; in the second, conventional forces must be drastically reduced; and in the third, strategic nuclear delivery system arsenals must be reduced by around 30% and warheads by 40%. The reductions are considerable in comparison to both the situation at the time of signing and the trajectory of each state, even if one might argue that the number of responsible weapons under START is lower than the actual number of weapons. Do this imply that a significant role for deep agreements with no enforcement measures in weapons control?

There is no simple solution. On the one hand, we have a tendency to lump these agreements together with the collection of comprehensive regulatory agreements that seem to need minimal enforcement. We just assert that many significant potential agreements require enforcement. Such agreements obviously exist. However, it is unclear if these agreements are as substantial as they seem to be. After all, the counterfactual reflects the actions of a political system that is no longer in place, whether it is calculated using the status quo or the trajectory of year-to-year variations in armaments production. Nobody would evaluate the level of cooperation that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) represents by contrasting German actions during and after the war. Managerialists may react to this argument by claiming that there are solid grounds for thinking that the relationship between enforcement and degree of cooperation in the fields of international commerce and the environment is distinct from that relationship in the security sector. Security traditionally has been governed by the realist logic that managerialists find so insufficient, despite the fact that many of the players are manifestly different. We do not reject this reasoning outright. It is possible that the dynamics of cooperation change over time and between different policy areas, as well as within a single policy area. However, the sectors are not as unlike as one would think or as some may expect, at least in terms of the relationship between enforcement and degree of cooperation.

Examining the history of a particular policy area where laws have been stricter over time may be a good way to gauge the link between the level of cooperation and enforcement. According to the game theorist, as regulatory requirements get more stringent, the severity of the penalty required to discourage defection will also need to grow. Even if the system reaches a certain dynamic equilibrium, there need to be some obvious indication of this in the presence of incomplete information. The finest instances of continuously deepening collaboration may be found in the fields of commerce and European integration, if we disregard the events that took place in armaments control following the demise of the Soviet empire. Each time, the enforcement function has grown in line with the situation. For instance, Thomas Bayard and Kimberly Elliott state that the Uruguay Round has "significantly lowered many of the most egregious trade barriers throughout the globe," but they also highlight the globe Trade Organization's (WTO) improved capacity to address and penalize trade infractions. The processes used by the WTO to deal with infractions are now more automated and less subject to manipulation by particular parties. The inevitable delays under GATT have been eliminated by setting the panel establishment time restrictions to nine months, with panels to be completed in eighteen months. Previously, both sides to a disagreement had an automatic veto on panel recommendations and retribution. Now, the consensus voting concept is used to accept panel findings. Unless it is unanimously rejected, the new system mandates automatic implementation of panel recommendations, including permission for retribution. Sanctions have previously only been applied once in GATT history. Retaliation will now be automatically permitted in the absence of a change in the unlawful practice or payment to the defendant. We think that the WTO's negotiation record shows that the Uruguay Round's decreased risk of self-interested exploitation by member states made it feasible to reach the more rigorous levels of cooperation that it did.

The Causes and Cures of Noncompliance

Designing more efficient techniques for resolving compliance issues in regulatory regimes is the main objective of the management school's examination of compliance. Thus, it is beneficial to focus on the causes of compliance issues that do exist rather than on the probability of selection and the connection between the depth of cooperation and enforcement. The GATT, which served as the cornerstone of a sometimes troublesome postwar trade system, offers scholars a lot of information regarding the causes of noncompliance and the capacity of its members to address them. Common instances of GATT breaches include EC payments and subsidies to oilseed growers, quantitative sugar import limitations imposed by the United States, beef and citrus import restrictions imposed by Japan, and export restrictions imposed by Canada on raw salmon and herring. This is merely a small example of the extensive list of often utilized discriminatory strategies that nations have adopted to appease protectionist political forces in violation of the GATT's rules and norms.

Some of these issues are a result of ambiguity on what constitutes noncompliance, but nobody disputes the existence of a significant number of violations. The GATT's creators took pains to avoid limiting its enforcement or dispute resolution processes to conduct that were expressly forbidden. Instead, they focused their enforcement clauses on the cancellation or reduction of potential advantages for nations. In fact, Article 23 authorizes the start of settlement processes: If any party to this agreement feels that any benefit that would otherwise accrue to them directly or indirectly under this agreement is being nullified or impaired, or that the achievement of any goal set forth in this agreement is being hindered as a result of (a) another party's breach of this agreement's obligations, or (b) another party's application of any measure, whether or not it is in conflict with the terms of this Agreement,

Few parties, including the states at fault, have argued that the EC's subsidies of wheat flour or pasta or the Multifiber Agreement, which blatantly violated the most-favored nation (MFN) principle, were motivated by a misunderstanding of the expectations of other trading partners, despite the existence of undoubtedly varying expectations. Rarely are capacity restrictions and unavoidable social and economic changes mentioned as key contributing factors to noncompliance. This isn't so much because they are never there as it is because the most obvious reason for GATT noncompliance—the demands of domestic interest groups and the enormous political advantages sometimes associated with protection—far outweigh their impact. Although GATT advocates would argue that any negative consequences have been outweighed by the GATT's successful reduction of tariffs, the need for protection is still there.

Are the managerialists right about the actions that seem to have decreased the amount of breaches even if they are incorrect about the cause of the GATT's issues? Compared to the Washington Treaty, the GATT offers a superior testing ground for assessing managerialist assertions about how compliance might be best improved. This is because, unlike the latter, the GATT has developed. There is little question that GATT panels for dispute settlement have had some impact, but not a significant one. The panels used to move slowly and were prone to frustration, particularly from big states, until lately. The multilateral rounds of discussions that have been used to reduce the frequency of specific kinds of conflicts and broaden the scope of the regime have been far more effective.

However, enforcement has also contributed significantly to the functioning and development of the GATT, despite some controversy. In 50% of the GATT disputes it brought between 1974 and 1994, the United States applied sanctions or openly threatened reprisal. Even in five situations that Bayard and Elliott feel would have come within GATT jurisdiction, it did so independently of any GATT action. The progress of GATT legal change, according to observers like Robert Hudec, was aided by increasing enforcement and such "justified disobedience" of the GATT's dispute settlement procedure. Others, such Alan Sykes, attribute the WTO's improved dispute resolution mechanisms to Section 301 and Super 301 unilateralism, which is odd considering the management school's arguments. The USTR [U.S. trading Representative] typically handled the Section 301 crowbar effectively and productively, utilizing a strong unilateral approach to elicit support overseas for enhancing the multilateral trading system, as Bayard and Elliott write in their recent research.

Enforcement has a bigger part in triumphs than one is led to think, and its lack is obvious in several major failures, even in the case of environmental regimes, the basis of many managerialist instances. For instance, up until very recently, it was exceedingly difficult to comply with the poorly enforced agreements made under the auspices of eleven international fisheries commissions. Not a significant portion of these compliance issues were caused by agreement ambiguity or societal or economic developments. Since monitoring catches is expensive, state capacity was more important, although experts agree that developed governments, who were often the main offenders, could have dealt with the monitoring problem if they thought it was in their best interest to do so. The paradox of collective action, which nations felt no incentive to compel its fishermen to follow since other states were likely to break the regulations, was at the heart of the issue. The establishment of the 200-mile exclusive economic zones marked a significant advancement in enforcement. As a result, enforcement has a rising role. For instance, a long-running disagreement between Canada, the European Community, and the United States over fishing rights in the North Atlantic was settled in April 1995 by a deal that, according to the New York Times, "could serve as a model for preserving endangered fish stocks throughout the world." According to the article, "enforcement" is crucial to the agreement. The agreement calls for comprehensive verification procedures and "imposes stiff fines and other penalties for violations." The complex verification procedures attest to the value of openness, but it would be foolish to think that they would be successful in the absence of punishment.

The advantages of lying are too enormous to be countered by simple openness. The Mediterranean Plan, which is widely regarded as an illustration of how epistemic communities have been able to play a significant role in enacting international cooperation, serves as a good example of the cost of ignoring the relationship between enforcement and compliance when there is a significant incentive to defect. By removing any major dumping limits and without providing any means of enforcement for the meager aims and restrictions that were agreed upon, the Mediterranean Plan was able to win support. It has thus been a humiliating failure. Although the European Union has banned drift nets longer than 2.5 kilometers, pollution has worsened, dolphin killing has continued, and the laws are often broken. The Mediterranean ecology has collapsed as a consequence.

CONCLUSION

The significance and advantages of compliance and collaboration in all spheres of life are emphasized in this research. According to the results, good things may happen when people or groups actively practice conformity and collaboration. In the world of law, following the rules and laws guarantees a fair and lawful society. Cooperation among workers fosters collaboration, creativity, and productivity in corporate settings. Additionally, compliance and collaboration support social harmony, problem-solving, and group advancement in larger societal settings. Given their importance, it is essential to promote these behaviors and provide support systems in order to promote compliance and collaboration. Individuals and groups may benefit from increased effectiveness, positive transformation, and general well-being by building a culture that values and fosters these behaviors.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Ali, N. Li, and W. Zhang, "Restrictions on managers' outside employment opportunities and asymmetric disclosure of bad versus good news," Account. Rev., 2019, doi: 10.2308/accr-52314.

[2] A. Coutts, "Good news and bad news are still news: experimental evidence on belief updating," Exp. Econ., 2019, doi: 10.1007/s10683-018-9572-5.

[3] G. Wibisono, "Media Baru dan Nasionalisme Anak Muda: Pengaruh Penggunaan Media Sosial 'Good News From Indonesia' Terhadap Perilaku Nasionalisme," J. Stud. Pemuda, 2019, doi: 10.22146/studipemudaugm.39264.

[4] M. Schroda, "Good news for nuclear transgene expression in Chlamydomonas," Cells. 2019. doi: 10.3390/cells8121534.

[5] X. Wang and X. Gu, "Political incentives in firms' financial reporting: evidence from the crackdown on corrupt municipal officials," Econ. Gov., 2019, doi: 10.1007/s10101-019-00225-3.

[6] S. R. C. Howie and D. R. Murdoch, "Global childhood pneumonia: the good news, the bad news, and the way ahead," The Lancet Global Health. 2019. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30446-7.

[7] Y. Wang, M. S. Delgado, N. Khanna, and V. L. Bogan, "Good news for environmental self-regulation? Finding the right link," J. Environ. Econ. Manage., 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jeem.2019.01.009.

[8] C. Barbui and E. Albanese, "Global mental health: good news, bad news and responsibilities for the future," Epidemiol. Psychiatr. Sci., 2019, doi: 10.1017/S2045796019000738.

[9] A. KAPPES and T. SHAROT, "The automatic nature of motivated belief updating," Behav. Public Policy, 2019, doi: 10.1017/bpp.2017.11.

[10] B. B. Maddox and V. L. Gaus, "Community Mental Health Services for Autistic Adults: Good News and Bad News," Autism in Adulthood, 2019, doi: 10.1089/aut.2018.0006.