

Seminar: Economics of Human Capital and Organization

First Semester, 2015

Instructor: Katsuya Takii, email: takii@osipp.osaka-u.ac.jp.

Time and Location: Monday 4 Preiod.

Office Hours: Make an appointment by e-mail.

Requirement: Decision Theory, Modern Microeconomics I and II, Modern Macroeconomics I and II, Applied Econometrics I (Equivalent other courses are acceptable.)

Purpose: This seminar is designed for the second year students or Ph.D. students who are interested in writing papers in this field. There are three purposes. It aims at improving three different ability: (1) the ability to find their own research topics in this field, (2) the ability to improve the ability to organize their thought and (3) the ability to deliver their idea to other people.

Plan: In this year it is planned to study the literature related to Signaling, Reputation and Career Concern. I will provide a list of suggested papers. Students are asked to present the papers in the list or the paper that is related to the subject. We will finish studying the subjects by June. After that, students are also asked to present their own research paper. Students can present either in English or in Japanese. Students are asked to hand in a term paper or a research proposal at the end of this seminar. Your report must include

1. The purpose of your research
2. Your method
3. What your results are
4. Explanation for the significance of your result
5. The validity and possibility of your method for your research purpose.

Grading Policy:

<i>Item</i>	<i>points</i>	<i>times</i>	<i>Total sum</i>
<i>Attendance</i>	1	15	15
<i>Presentation</i>	?	?	[25, 55]
<i>Report</i>	[10, 30]	1	[10, 30]

The presentation and report are evaluated by 6 ranks: A^+ , A , B , C , D and E . When one of the presenter receive A , I will distribute 1 point for all audience. When one of presenters receive A^+ , I distribute 2 for all audience. I hope that these points encourage team works for their presentation. The following is the standard of evaluation.

• Presentation

1. E ...Almost no preparations.
2. D ...Incomplete and the lack of comprehensiveness.
3. C . The presenter might understand the contents, but audiences do not understand it at all.
4. BThe audience can understand what the presenter tries to say. However, the significance and logic of the paper is not clear. (If the presenter thinks that the method is not proper, his/her view must be clear.)
5. A ...The audience can perfectly understand the significance and logic of the paper.
6. A^+ . Beyond the comprehensiveness of presentation, the presenter can entertain the audience.

• Reports

1. E ...Incomplete report.

2. *D*...The lack of comprehensiveness.
3. *C*. The report is consistently written.
4. *B*. The paper is consistent, but it is not clearly written.
5. *A*. The report is well-organized so we can easily understand the significance of topics and the validity of the method.
6. *A*⁺...Beyond the comprehensiveness of the paper, either the topics or the method is very creative or/and the report is well-organized so it can attract readers of the field.