

Junior Sophister 2017/18
EC3040B
ECONOMICS OF LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Group Assignment (Presentation and Paper)
Academic Paper Review

This assignment accounts for 20 per cent of the final mark for Module B. The assignment is broken down into two equal parts: a group presentation (including attendance) and a group assignment. The class will be randomly divided into 18-20 equal groups of four. Each group will be required to present a review of an academic paper in 16 minute presentations in tutorials and then submit a joint group assignment on the same paper.

Groups will be formed by the instructor and asked to present in a specific tutorial. Please arrive early and upload your presentation before the tutorial begins on the day you are due to present. Each 16-minute presentation will be followed by questions and answers from the class. Two groups will present in each tutorial. Marks (5% of total grade) will be given for the coherence, quality and level of critique of presentations. Students are expected to attend all tutorials and marks will be given for attendance in tutorials (5% of total grade).

Group assignments are due at 5pm on Wednesday April 11th and should be submitted via www.turnitin.com. This will account for 10 per cent of your final grade and should be between 2,000 and 2,500 words in length excluding the bibliography. Marks will be given for the clarity of discussion, the structure, and the depth and breadth of the critique. For both parts grades will be based on how well you summarise, critique and suggest improvements to the paper.

Feel free to structure both your individual referee report and group presentation as you see fit. As a guide however, please see the following suggestion.

<i>Objectives</i>	What does the article set out to do?
<i>Concepts</i>	What are the central concepts? Are they clearly defined?
<i>Argument</i>	What is the central argument? Are there specific hypotheses?
<i>Method</i>	What methods are employed to test these?
<i>Evidence</i>	Is evidence provided? How adequate is it?
<i>Literature</i>	How does the work fit into the wider literature?
<i>Contribution</i>	How well does the work advance our knowledge of the subject?
<i>Critique</i>	What weaknesses does the paper have? What changes would you suggest the author make?
<i>Conclusion</i>	A brief overall assessment.

Please note it is important for your futures to be able to work effectively in teams. If a team member does not participate (does not answer emails, does not product work on time for the group) please let me know and I will assess the situation. If a student does not perform I reserve the right to give differentiate grades to group members.

List of Papers by Group and Week

Week 6

1. Pritchett (1997) Divergence, Big Time, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, No. 3.
2. Hausmann and Rodrik, Economic Development as Self Discovery, Revised April 2003
See: <http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/drodrik/selfdisc.pdf>

Week 8

3. Lindauer and Pritchett, What's the Big Idea?: The Third Generation of Policies for Economic Growth, *Economía*, Volume 3, Number 1, Fall 2002.
4. Rodrik (2006) Goodbye Washington Consensus, Hello Washington Confusion? *Journal of Economic Literature* Vol. XLIV (December 2006), pp. 973–987.

Week 9

5. Rodrik, Subramanian and Trebbi. Institutions Rule: The Primacy of Institutions over Geography and Integration in Economic Development (2002)
<http://www.nber.org/papers/w9305.pdf>
6. Rodrik Where Did All the Growth Go? External Shocks, Social Conflict, and Growth Collapses, *Journal of Economic Growth*, 1999.

Week 10

7. Mehlum, Moene and Torvik. (2006) Institutions and the Resource Curse. *The Economic Journal*, 116 (January), 1–20.
8. Gerring, Bond, Barndt and Moreno. (2005) Democracy and Economic Growth: A Historical Perspective. *World Politics* 57 (April 2005), 323–64

Week 11 (Thurs), Week 12 (Fri)

9. Miguel, Morjaria and Miquel (2014) The Value of Democracy: Evidence from Road Building in Kenya
10. Duflo, Esther, Rema Hanna, and Stephen P. Ryan. 2012. Incentives Work: Getting Teachers to Come to School, *American Economic Review*, 102(4): 1241-78.