

CGS 3516F
Economies of Development
Matthew McBurney

Office: Benson 2

e-mail address: mmcburn2@uwo.ca

Scheduled class times: Tuesdays 8:30am-11:30am HUC W6

Office Hours: Tuesday 11:30am – 12:30pm or by appointment

Prerequisites: 0.5 Centre for Global Studies course at the 1000-1099 level, or permission of the Centre for Global Studies.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course critically examines tools for assessing development, such as development indicators and indices (GNP/GDP, Human Development/Poverty Indices, Physical Quality of Life Index, Gender Empowerment Measure), community-based indicators, and explanations of economic development in micro and macro contexts. A critical perspective will be used to analyze the validity and usefulness of these tools.

COURSE LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Learning Outcomes

On completing this course it is envisaged that students will have:

- Demonstrate analytical knowledge of various economic strains of thought and the evolution of these thoughts in relation to development.
- Critically assess and engage with organizational policy literature on global development.
- Demonstrate familiarity with existing tools and measures for assessing development.
- An ability to present and evaluate some of the key debates over development strategy and practices.
- Demonstrate and convey these competencies in a clear, critical and reflexive communication style.

DESCRIPTION OF CLASS METHODS

Classes will consist of a combination of lecture and participatory learning methods, such as circle workshops and discussion groups. However, each class will require high levels of participation from students. It is expected that each student will arrive at each class having read all of the week's readings, and students are required to engage with the readings and with each other during the weekly seminar.

During lectures and classroom learning methods, students are expected to be respectful and to not distract fellow students or the instructor. If you would like to send text messages, browse irrelevant websites, or talk without contributing to class discussion, please do so elsewhere.

REQUIRED RESOURCES

Taylor, J. Edward and Lybbert, Travis J. 2015. *Essentials of Development Economics*. 2nd Edition. University of California Press.

EVALUATION

Class Participation 15%

Considering the fact that this is an upper year course, emphasis will be placed on student participation and interaction. Students are required to come to class having read the material and ready to participate in discussions and group work. Participation is not graded on the number of times a student speaks, but also the quality of each interjection and discussion created by the student. Various group learning and participatory methods will be used throughout the course which require active participation on the part of each student.

Policy Brief Analysis Project 20% Presentation 10%

This assignment is designed to be done in a group (maximum 3 students). For this assignment, students will be asked to analyze a current policy brief from an international development organization or government. The group will then be asked to provide an alternative policy brief to the one analyzed. The policy brief analysis will be a document (1500 words) which outlines the rationale for choosing a particular policy alternative or course of action in a current policy debate. The policy must be related to the topics covered in the course about global development economics. The purpose of the policy brief is to convince the target audience of the urgency of the current problem and the need to adopt the preferred alternative or course of action outlined by the student(s). Students will be graded on their ability to analyze critically the suggested policy and to put forth viable alternatives. Each group will present their policy brief analysis in class. **Project Due October 2, Presentations Week 5 (October 16)**

Millennium Development Goals Project Proposal 10%

The proposal will be a maximum 2 page proposal for the MDG project. The proposal must include a description of and justification for the chosen MDG, a thesis statement, a brief outline of the final essay, and an annotated bibliography with a minimum of 5 scholarly sources. **Due October 20**

Millennium Development Goals Project 30%

Students will be asked to elaborate a critical analysis of one of the MDGs as it relates to a specific country and/or region. This analysis must take into account readings discussed during the course and show the ability to engage critically with development policies and the tools used to measure them, such as the MDGs. Students must analyze the achievement (or failure to achieve) one of the MDGs as it relates to the chosen country/region. Students must also show how the country/region is attempted to achieve the chosen MDG through development policies and projects and provide a critical analysis of these projects and policies. Students will be required to discuss both the positive and negative aspects of his/her chosen MDG and suggest alternatives, if possible. The assignment must be between 2,000-2,500 words and must use a minimum of 10 scholarly sources. The format of the project is an essay and will be graded using the following grading scheme: **Due November 20**

MDG Project Presentation 15%

Students will present the findings of their SDG analysis and the suggestions and alternatives laid forth. Students will be graded on the quality of their presentations and ability to assess critically the suggestions in the brief and to put forth their own viable alternatives. Students will have 15 minutes to present their analysis. **Last Day of Class (December 4)**

Grade	Research	Argument (Intro/Conclusion)	Analysis (Body of Paper)	Clarity	Format
A	<p>a significant amount of independent, scholarly research was undertaken</p> <p>the majority of sources are from peer-reviewed publications, those that aren't are used as primary research only.</p> <p>research is solidly within the parameters of the analysis and thesis argument</p>	<p>an innovative and provocative thesis is clearly stated at the beginning of the paper</p> <p>the method of proving that thesis is established early on and justified on scholarly terms</p> <p>the thesis provides the backbone of analysis and reaches a satisfying conclusion based on what was proposed at the beginning</p>	<p>based on excellent research and an original thesis, the analysis is strong, and clearly follows established research questions</p> <p>the research is artfully woven throughout the analysis, shoring up and thoughtfully supporting the argument</p> <p>new information is well contextualized and serves to propel the argument towards a satisfying conclusion</p>	<p>the paper is easy to read, analysis flows expertly</p> <p>language is sophisticated without using jargon</p> <p>terms of analysis and argumentation are clearly laid out and well-defined</p>	<p>TimesRoman 12pt, double spaced, 1-inch margins, page numbers</p> <p>a cover page provides pertinent information</p> <p>the bibliography follows a recognized scholarly style</p> <p>citations are thorough and well documented throughout the paper</p>
B	<p>a reasonable amount of independent, scholarly research was undertaken</p> <p>sources are mainly from peer-reviewed publications</p> <p>research is sound but predictable</p>	<p>an interesting but predictable thesis is clearly stated at the beginning of the paper</p> <p>the thesis tends toward more description than argument, leading to a weak conclusion</p> <p>the methodology is there but isn't clearly laid out, or is laid out but not followed</p>	<p>the analysis is good but there are some significant weaknesses or lapses</p> <p>the paper occasionally drifts off-topic or into territory that isn't adequately supported by the research</p> <p>the research questions are interesting but potentially unrealistic in terms of the</p>	<p>the paper is well written but suffers from some significant grammatical inconsistencies or spelling errors</p> <p>language is clear but lacks scholarly depth</p> <p>there are some lapses in definition and explication of terms</p> <p>segue between points in</p>	<p>the paper basically follows the technical requirements, with a few minor exceptions</p> <p>citations are solid but not thorough, with some noticeable omissions</p>

		through on an expert level	type and/or level of research undertaken	the analysis are weak	
C	the minimum amount of independent, scholarly research was undertaken sources also rely on non-scholarly publications research is weak and unoriginal	the thesis is fundamentally descriptive or dependent on a value judgment (good/bad, right/wrong) the method is vague or poorly laid out the argument fails to reach a satisfying conclusion, with the paper simply petering out	analysis is uninteresting or uninspired, tending toward description research questions are poorly laid out and inadequately explored the research does not adequately support the analysis	there are significant but not quite major problems in grammar and spelling language is unclear and/or shallow terms are not well defined and analysis leaps erratically from point to point	there are some significant problems with the technical requirements of the paper that affect the strength of its analysis citations are weak and/or the bibliography is incomplete
D	less than the minimum amount of independent, scholarly research was undertaken sources depend heavily on non-scholarly publications research is weak and unoriginal, but also fails to adequately support the argument	there is no easily identifiable thesis and/or little in the way of method there is no conclusion because no argument was established early on	research questions are not identified at the outset there is little interaction between research and analysis what is supposed to pass as analysis is little more than description	major problems with grammar and spelling language is murky, confused and difficult to follow there is a paucity of definitions or context for analysis	there are major problems with the technical requirements of the paper that affect the strength of the analysis there are next to no citations and/or no bibliography or it does not follow a scholarly style
F	little to no research undertaken, scholarly or not little evidence of scholarly research in the paper	there is no thesis and/or no method the conclusion is deeply flawed or outright non-existent	analysis is nearly non-existent, weak, minimal and unsupported by research	language is sub-par for university, riddled with grammatical and spelling errors analysis is difficult to follow and lacks any sense of flow	the paper does not follow a scholarly format

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

It is the expectation that students enrolled in CGS 3516F will submit electronic copies of assignments via Owl. Make sure to keep an electronic copy of your assignment until it has been graded and returned to you.

Extensions on assignments can only be requested in-person, and more than 48 hours prior to the assigned deadline. Extensions being requested for emergency or medical reasons must be approved through academic advising.

Late assignments will only be accepted without penalty if a prior agreement with me has been made, or if academic advising has provided academic accommodation. Students who submit assignments late without making a prior agreement with me, or without academic accommodation will be *penalized 2% for every 24-hour period* past the assignment deadline.

Please note that I adhere to a “24/7 rule” for reviewing graded course work. This means that you must wait 24 hours after an assignment is returned before approaching me about your grade, and you must make an appointment to speak with me about said grade no longer than 7 days after an assignment is returned in class.

SCHEDULE OF CLASSES

Week 1 (September 11) – Course Intro

Smith, Noah. 2015. “Most of What You Learned in Econ101 Is Wrong”. Bloomberg, 24 November. <https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2015-11-24/most-of-what-you-learned-in-econ-101-is-wrong>

De Janvry, Alain and Elisabeth Sadoulet. 2014. “Sixty Years of Development Economics: What Have we Learned for Economic Development?” *Revue d'économie du développement* 28, 9-19. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-d-economie-du-developpement-2014-HS01-page-9.htm>

Week 2 (September 18) – Development Economics or Economic Development?

Taylor and Lybbert. *Essentials of Development Economics*. Chapter 1

Sen, Amartya. (1988). “The Concept of Development.” Chapter 1 in *Handbook of Development Economics*, Vol. I, edited by Chenery, H. & Srinivasan, T. N.

Week 3 (September 25) – Critiques of the Dominant Paradigms of Development Economics

Akbulut, Bengi, Adaman, Fikret and Madra, Yahya M. 2015. “The Decimation and Displacement of Development Economics.” *Development and Change* 46(4), 733-761.

Stiglitz, Joseph E. 2011. “Rethinking Development Economics.” *The World Bank Research Observer*, 26(2), 230-236

Fine, Ben. 2002. “Economics Imperialism and the New Development Economics as Kuhnian Paradigm Shift?” *World Development*, 30(12), 2057-2070.

Collier, Paul. 2015. "Development Economics in Retrospect and Prospect." *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 31(2), 242-25.

Max-Neef, Manfred. 1982. *From the Outside Looking In: Experiences in "Barefoot Economics"*. Sweden: Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation. Prelude pp 15-22.

Week 4 (October 2) – Economic Growth: The Neoclassical and Endogenous Paradigm

Taylor and Lybbert *Essentials of Development Economics* Chapter 3 and 7

Solow, Robert M., "A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, LXX (1956), 65-94.

Dollar, D. and Kraay, W. 2001. Growth is Good for the Poor, *Journal of Economic Growth*. 7(3), 195-225.

Week 5 (October 16) - Presentations

Week 6 (October 23) - Poverty and Inequality

Taylor and Lybbert. *Essentials of Development Economics*. Chapter 4

Deaton, Angus. 2005. "Measuring Poverty in a Growing World (or Measuring Growth in a Poor World)" *Review of Economics and Statistics*. 87(1): 1-19.

Ferreira, F. and Ravallion, M. 2008. "Global Poverty and Inequality: A Review of Evidence". *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, No:4623.

Rahnema, Majid. 1992. "Poverty" in *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*. ed. Wolfgang Sachs. Zed Books: London.

Week 7 (October 30) – Poverty Alleviation

Taylor and Lybbert. *Essentials of Development Economics*. Chapter 5

Besley, Timothy and Burgess, Robin. 2003. Halving Global Poverty. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 17(3):3–22.

Besley, Timothy and Coate S. 1992. "Workfare versus Welfare: Incentive Arguments for Work Requirements in Poverty-Alleviation Programs". *American Economic Review*, 82(1): 249-261.

Krishna, A., (2007). "For Reducing Poverty Faster: Target Reasons Before People". *World Development*, 35(11), 1947-1960.

Banerjee, A.V. and Duflo, E. 2007. "The Economic Lives of the Poor." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 21(1):141–167

Week 8 (November 6) - Foreign Aid and International Organizations – Part 1

Taylor and Lybbert *Essentials of Development Economics* Chapter 9 - Institutions

Nancy Chau, Hideaki Goto and Ravi Kanbur. 2009. "Middlemen, Non-Profits and Poverty", <http://www.kanbur.aem.cornell.edu/papers/ChauGotoKanburMddlemen9.2.09.pdf>

Week 9 (November 13) - Foreign Aid and International Organizations – Part 2

Riddell, Roger C. 2007. *Does Foreign Aid Really Work?* Oxford: Oxford University Press. Chapter 15 and 20.

Walsh, Susan. 2010. "A Trojan Horse of a Word? 'Development' in Bolivia's Southern Highlands: Monocropping People, Plants and Knowledge". *Anthropologica*, Vol.52(2), pp.241-257

The following news articles will be discussed in class:

http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2017/01/13/canada-foreign-aid_n_14150162.html

<http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/canadian-international-aid-drops-trudeau-1.4066640>

<http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/04/24/u-s-agency-for-international-development-foreign-aid-state-department-trump-slash-foreign-funding/>

Week 10 (November 20) –Sustainability and the Use of Natural Resources

Kates, Robert, Thomas Parris, and Anthony Leiserowitz. 2005. "What is Sustainable Development? Goals, Indicators, Values, and Practice." *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development* 47(3), 8-21.

Van der Ploeg, Frederick. 2011. "Natural Resources: Curse or Blessing?" *Journal of Economic Literature* 49(2), 366-420.

Galeano, Eduardo. 1997. *The Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent*. New York: Monthly Review Press. Chapter 5.

Ziai, Aram. 2016. "The Post-2015 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals: The Persistence of the Development Discourse." *Development Discourse and Global History: From Colonialism to the Sustainable Development Goals*. New York: Routledge, 194-207.

Week 11 (November 27) – Human Development and Well-being

Taylor and Lybbert. *Essentials of Development Economics*. Chapter 6.

Dasgupta, Partha and Weale, Martin. 1992. "On Measuring the Quality of Life." *World Development*, 20(1):119–131.

McGillivray, Mark. 1991. "The Human Development Index: Yet Another Redundant Composite Development Indicator?" *World Development* 19(10), 1461-1468.

Chowdhur, Omar Haider. 1991. "Human Development Index: A Critique" *The Bangladesh Development Studies* 19(3), 125-127

Gudynas, Eduardo. 2011. "Buen Vivir: Today's Tomorrow" *Development* 54(4), 441-447.

Waldmuller, Johannes. *Buen Vivir, Sumak Kawsay, 'Good Living': An Introduction and Overview*. <http://www.alternautas.net/blog/2014/5/14/buen-vivir-sumak-kawsay-good-living-an-introduction-and-overview>

Week 12 (December 4) – MDG Presentations



Appendix to Course Outlines is posted on the OWL course site.