The objective of the papers to be written in this tutorial are to analyze the growth experience of each of the “development successes” that we will study. To guide your analysis, I have prepared a list of questions that you should consider in thinking and writing about the experience of each country. I do not expect you to give a detailed treatment of each of these questions in your papers, but the papers should at least provide evidence that you have thought about them, and you should be able to take a defensible stand on each of them in your tutorial presentation.

1. In what sense can your country be described as a growth success (evolution of income per capita relative to US, human development indicators, other quality of life indicators?).

2. Do you think your country’s growth performance was predictable? Specifically, consider the positive aspects of your country’s economic performance. To what extent was this performance facilitated by favorable initial conditions, or did the country have to overcome adverse initial conditions to achieve this positive performance? Consider in particular aspects of the country’s institutional environment (political structure, rule of law, corruption, or “deeper” determinants such as culture or religious background, legal tradition), geography (poverty traps such as ethnic fractionalization, access to the sea, prevalence of infectious diseases) and the international environment (prosperity of the international economy, functioning of international economic institutions, access to external markets, access to external finance).

3. Were the favorable aspects of your country’s growth performance the outcome of good fortune or good policies? If the latter, what were the key policy components of your country’s growth strategy? How was this strategy designed? Was it home-grown or imported? What role – if any -- did the international financial institutions (IFIs) play in implementing it? To what extent did your country learn from and emulate or not emulate previous growth successes?

4. Would you describe your country’s growth strategy as market-based or interventionist? Why?

5. The market-based policy prescriptions growing out of growth research have been described as “openness, sound money, and property rights.” To the extent that your country followed a market-based strategy:

   • What role did real (goods market) and financial openness play in the country’s growth strategy? Was the strategy oriented to producing for the international market? Did the country allow imports in freely? If not, why not? Was the capital account of the country’s balance of payment at least partially open? How much did the country rely on foreign funding?
• What role did macro stability play during your country’s growth acceleration? Would you describe the macro environment as generally stable or frequently unstable during this period?

• To what extent did your country follow or not follow the specific precepts of the Washington Consensus?

6. How do you know that your country’s growth performance was the result of the factors identified in (3)? Is there debate about this? If so, what are the arguments on both sides? Where do you come out in this debate, and why?

7. What lessons can countries that wish to become growth successes draw from the experience of your country? Are there aspects of your country’s experience that can be emulated elsewhere, or are they specific to your country?

In grading your papers, I will be looking for an economically-coherent interpretation of why these countries may have succeeded where so many others have failed. Your interpretation should be consistent with the data that have been made available to you, and you should demonstrate that consistency whenever possible. Remember that there is something to be explained in each of these experiences not just with respect to the role that policies may have played in producing a sustained acceleration of growth, but also with respect to the political-economic setting that induced such policies to be adopted.