
The case for pluralism: what French undergraduate economics teaching is all about and how it can be improved

The Members of the PEPS-Economie Students' Association

PEPS-Economie,
C/O Arthur Jatteau, 15 rue René Boulanger, 75010 Paris, France
Email: pepseconomie@gmail.com

Abstract: This two-pronged paper offers an evidence-based assessment of the worrying lack of pluralism in French undergraduate economics curricula, and subsequently suggests some solutions. Focusing on the titles of the economic courses given in all French universities, and taking a straightforward and tractable empirical approach, we first show that French undergraduate curricula do little to develop a critical understanding of both real world economic phenomena and economics as a (fallible) scientific discipline. We then suggest an alternative curriculum designed to satisfy the demanding three-fold conception of pluralism that we advocate (i.e., interdisciplinary, methodological and theoretical pluralism). This alternative curriculum is not so much based around techniques (as most curricula are today) as topics, questions and problems. Theories and tools are thus presented only inasmuch as they contribute to our understanding of such issues.

Keywords: economics education; economic theory; economics methodology; interdisciplinarity; pluralism.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: The Members of the PEPS-Economie Students' Association (2014) 'The case for pluralism: what French undergraduate economics teaching is all about and how it can be improved', *Int. J. Pluralism and Economics Education*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp.385–400.

Biographical notes: Since 2010, the PEPS-Économie student initiative (Pour un Enseignement Pluraliste dans le Supérieur en Économie) has championed a pluralist teaching of economics. PEPS-Économie has now become a major stakeholder in the field of economics higher education. Often quoted in the media as well as by renowned economists, our actions contributed to put economics teaching on the agenda of the Higher Education and Research Ministry. At the local and national levels, PEPS-Économie is working with students' unions and organisations in order to change the national competency framework for the Bachelor's degree in Economics. At the international level, PEPS-Économie is a founding member of ISIPE (International Student Initiative for Pluralism in Economics).

This paper is a revised and expanded version of a paper entitled 'L'enseignement de l'économie dans le supérieur: Bilan critique et perspectives' presented at the General Assembly of the French Economics Teaching in Higher Education, École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris, France, 6 April 2013.

1 Introduction

Among the areas left largely unscathed by the 2008 financial crisis and subsequent never-ending recession, the teaching of economics ranks high. In spite of recurrent criticisms and concerns (ten years after the birth of the Post-autistic movement!), undergraduate curricula is still largely dominated by strictly technical approaches, with little effort to make contemporary economic issues accessible to economics students. Surprisingly, the crisis has not caused any changes to the teaching of economics, even though it called into question some of the core results of the dominant approach.

In order to substantiate this claim, the members of the PEPS-Economie students' association took a close look at all the courses¹ offered by the French undergraduate economics curricula (54 universities in total²). By focusing on the course titles, we offer a picture of the training received by the typical French economics undergraduate. Of course, taking such titles at face value is questionable, since the content of two classes titled identically can significantly vary due to the teacher's specific interest, student competency, etc. Specifically, a microeconomics class taught by heterodox economist Bernard Guerrien (University Paris 1 – Sorbonne) might not have a lot in common with a microeconomics class given by Jean Tirole at the Toulouse School of Economics.

Nevertheless, we believe these course titles indicate the major trends shaping contemporary economics pedagogy. They are, in fact, a good indicator of the state of the power struggle between the different economics approaches. Also, we are aware that our study is not exhaustive, for it only focuses on universities and consequently does not take into account economics classes offered in other higher education institutions (*classes préparatoires*, engineering schools, business schools, etc.). But given how central universities shape the discipline of economics, our results will be informative.

So what does the typical French economics student learn during the course of his/her first three post-secondary years of study?

2 No time to reflect

Let us start by a highly significant example, that of epistemology (defined as the study of what grounds the scientificity of scientific claims). That it should be taught in every single undergraduate programme seems obvious: understanding in what respect one's discipline is scientific and how it came to be recognised as a science seems primordial. But surprisingly the share of epistemology is low as 0.006%! Of course, some professors might address some epistemological issues in their classroom. Still, the least we can say is that epistemology is far from being fashionable: only one university out of 50 offers such a course. Worse, incoming masters' students will specialise, and be less likely exposed to epistemology. In short, epistemological issues are virtually never addressed in current economics curricula.

Along the same lines, the history of economic thought (HET) only counts for 1.7% of all the classes taught; 15 universities do not even offer a single HET course. This is extremely worrying: how are economics students supposed to understand the historical development of economic concepts and theories? How are they supposed to put in perspective recent breakthroughs in economic theory and to take full stock of how such breakthroughs are crucial in making possible a better understanding of our economies?

Note that our assessment need not be qualified if we take into consideration ‘economic theory’ classes. Indeed, they only count for 0.5% of all classes offered in undergraduate programmes.

Given this low level of HET and economic theories courses (2.2% of economics classes), it is obvious that economics students are not encouraged to reflect upon their own discipline and to respond critically to the theories and the methods taught. Nor are they encouraged to put economic phenomena into historical perspective: the share of the economic history classes is as low as 1.6%, even if economists such as Paul Krugman and Joseph Stiglitz repeatedly stress its importance. Indeed, a clear understanding of recent economic events (such as the 2008 financial crisis) seems to be only accessible to the economist who is more than acquainted with the history of economic recessions.

3 Techniques for the sake of techniques

So far, we have seen what the average economics programme is not. Now, to what are economics students mainly exposed? In brief: quantitative approaches. Mathematics, statistics, econometrics and data analysis count for 20% of the economics classes, and their aggregate share is never lower than 6.7% (whereas that of HET is never higher than 5%). Put differently, one class out of five is based around the acquisition of quantitative methods while only one out of 50 is aimed at engaging critically with the discipline of economics.

Let us be clear: We do not argue that mathematics or statistics should be removed from economics curricula; generally speaking, quantitative methods are essential to economics and prove useful on many occasions, especially when economists engage in complex reasoning. What we bemoan is rather the excessive formalism of economics training and the correlated implicit dogma of an alleged superiority of quantitative methods over qualitative approaches. Instead, we believe that quantitative and qualitative methods should go hand-in-hand and that economics belongs to the domain of social sciences, two claims that the professors who designed undergraduate programmes seem to have unjustifiably rejected.

Microeconomics in the broad sense (which includes industrial organisation as well as game theory) counts for 10.7% of all undergraduate courses. That these courses can be rightfully considered closely related to neoclassical theory is beyond doubt. So their important share in economics curricula betrays the preferential treatment given to such a theory: it is the only one to which entire classes are dedicated. This is rather surprising given that neoclassical economics has never been proved superior to alternative approaches. Let us recall that neoclassical economists generally believe that markets are self-regulated and that economic agents are rational, two debatable assumptions causing them to predict that financial bubbles are impossible and that economic crises cannot last long!

Now, economic curricula should encourage students to use tools and methods (no matter how complex the techniques) as well as economic theories (no matter how partial their teaching) in order to elucidate what takes place in the real world. But surprisingly only 1.7% of all undergraduate classes are devoted to contemporary economic issues; 14 universities do not even offer such training. Again, some professors may address such issues in their classes; but course titles give a good idea of the philosophy prevailing in

economic pedagogy; and according to this philosophy, enabling students to gain a critical understanding of today's economic and social issues is not a top priority.

Finally, do existing economic curricula leave room for sociology and political science classes, which are arguably complementary to economics ones? The answer is no: only 1.8% of classes focus on social sciences other than economics; 18 universities do not even offer such classes). So how are economics students supposed to become educated if they are not exposed to alternative methodologies and important findings from other social sciences? We strongly oppose this academic jingoism and argue that economics curricula should be more comprehensive and offer at least a minimal training in sociology and political sciences.

Table 1 Inadequate curriculum for economics education: average weight given to each subject taught in French undergraduate Economics programmes, as measured in the number of ECTS credits granted*

<i>Type of course</i>	<i>Average weight</i>
Technical approaches [1]	43.0%
Working methodologies [2]	13.9%
Management	13.7%
Thematic approaches [3]	12.1%
Reflexive approaches [4]	5.5%
Others	4.7%
Interdisciplinarity	4.1%
Professionalisation [5]	3.0%

Notes: [1] Mathematics, statistics, microeconomics, macroeconomics

[2] Speaking and writing skills

[3] Labour economics, money and banking, international economics etc.

[4] Epistemology, economic history etc.

[5] Internships in the private or the public sector.

*The 'European Credit Transfer System' (ECTS) was established in the early 2000s to allow for greater comparability in higher education programmes at both national and European levels. An undergraduate diploma requires a minimum of 180 ECTS credits. The number of credits granted to a course more or less reflects its relative importance in the whole economics curriculum in terms of the amount of dedicated teaching hours and its grading weight.

For the sake of completeness, we supplement our descriptive statistics with a principal components analysis (PCA). Our results indicate that most bachelors in economics are rather homogenous and do not differ from one another.³ Most universities are indeed located in the shapeless middle of the graph; thus the increasing standardisation of economics curricula is no mere conjecture.

Our results also indicate a divide between programmes focused on management studies and programmes more inclined towards economics courses emphasising the micro-macro-maths trio: for instance, the first axis (horizontal) opposes the Bachelor of Economics at Mulhouse (38% of Management Studies and only a few Economics courses) to the Bachelor of Economics at Tours (27% of technical courses, 18% of microeconomics, 21% of macroeconomics, 2% of management).

Another divide, although less extreme, occurs between programmes emphasising general education courses and programmes more focused on methodological courses: the second axis (vertical) opposes Paris 7 University which emphasises object-oriented courses (14%) and general education, in particular introduction to other social sciences (9%), to the quantitative orientation of the Bachelor of Economics at Lille 3 which emphasises methods courses such as computer science (14%) and English (10%).

In light of such findings which strongly support our critique of the teaching of economics in higher education, we have designed an alternative curriculum that would respond to our four main claims.

First, we argue that each theory in economics should be given equal treatment. As previously seen, this is far from true, since the orthodox approach is largely favoured, especially through the many microeconomics courses. Each school of thought is grounded in its own epistemology, own postulates and models, and the ‘representative student’ should be exposed to each in a balanced way by the end of his/her studies. We do not dismiss the neo-classical school (in a broad sense) as such; we merely want to put neo-classical economics in its proper place – that is within a broader body of knowledge in economics, and taught in the same manner as any other school of thought. Experience shows that the majority of economics students is not familiar with alternative approaches to economics, or worse, has never heard of them: economics and neoclassical economics are the same. Since ‘reflexive courses’ are largely omitted from the French economics curricula, it is impossible to put theories in perspective: the characteristics of the economy at their inception, the ideological and epistemological commitments and the limits which they face when explaining the real world.

Moreover, another issue highlighted by our predecessors of the Post-autistic movement in the early 2000s – and which contributes to the growing disinterest in Economics in post-secondary education, is **the gap between the teaching of economics with “what is going on in the world around us”**. In fact, a majority of economics students have little knowledge about the subprime crisis, the consequences of global warming or tax reforms. Interestingly enough, a high-school French student is better equipped to understand the economic and social world than a student about to complete his/her Bachelor of Economics. Hence, we advocate economics courses in which references to the real world – as they cease to be exceptions or to be reduced to the level of anecdotes – become the focal point of teaching.

Last but not least, in order to shed light on real-world processes, we argue that economics cannot stand by itself without the support of other disciplines.

4 A proposal for an alternative economics curriculum

In order to go beyond mere criticism, we designed a curriculum for a Bachelor of economics. Freeing ourselves – for the time being – from institutional and administrative constraints, we allowed ourselves to dream of an economics curriculum which would truly satisfy our expectations and thus make amends for the palpable lack of pluralism that we strongly condemn in the existing curricula. This curriculum constitutes a ‘pluralist economics’ bachelor’s degree insofar as it responds to our demands for a three-fold pluralism: theoretical, conceptual, and disciplinary.

Moreover, the question of meaning is at the core of this curriculum: not only must each course be meaningful as a single unit, but the whole curriculum must be articulated as a coherent set of courses. This is a necessary condition for any solid intellectual training. Economics courses cannot continue to consist as a mere pile of teaching units – as they are nowadays in the great majority of French universities. In order to answer to such specifications (pluralist teaching and meaningful training) an approach by objects is (the) most effective. Instead of consisting of a set of often poorly articulated subjects (microeconomics, macroeconomics, econometrics, etc.), we argue that an economics curricula should primarily focus on contemporary economic issues, and that tools and theories should be taught in a way that contributes to our understanding of such issues. Put differently, questions and problems come first, theories and tools follow.

Let us illustrate this point with the example of unemployment. Whenever one addresses this issue, an endless stream of questions comes to mind: why is there unemployment? Has unemployment always existed? What is it like to be unemployed? How to reverse the trend? Is it even a desirable goal? Etc. One can easily grasp that in order to deal with such questions, a teacher cannot legitimately be content with the perspective of a single conceptual approach inspired by only one sub-discipline. The debate regarding the causes and solutions for unemployment remains one of the most controversial in economics, and therefore a wide range of perspectives should be offered. The question of the origins of unemployment itself pertains to economic history. Any thought on its definition calls for sociological and philosophical questioning. Therefore, in order to reply to any questions related to unemployment, and more generally to address any kind of economic issues, we argue that embracing a pluralist view must be a central requirement. When using the term ‘pluralist’, we refer to a demanding three-fold definition of pluralism:

- 1 *Interdisciplinary-methodological pluralism*: In addition to economics, we can also learn from sociology, philosophy, political science, geography, history, psychology, etc... Moreover, the methods of these social sciences should be incorporated into the economist’s set of tools alongside quantitative methods.
- 2 *Reflexive pluralism*: A substantial space should be given to courses allowing a reflection on economics and its methods and assumptions themselves, such as history of economic thought and epistemology of economics.
- 3 *Theoretical pluralism*: Theories such as the Neoclassical Synthesis, New Keynesian Economics, Post-Keynesian Economics, Institutional Economics, Marxian Economics, Feminist economics, etc., should be taught.

Admittedly, an object-oriented approach raises the question of the range and selection of such objects.⁴ There is no doubt that objects which are listed in our curriculum will give rise to discussion, especially because this list is by no means comprehensive. The important point is that an approach starting with the construction of a problem ought to constitute the backbone of undergraduate teaching. Starting with an object and the questions it calls for, ‘object-oriented courses’ would appeal to the whole range of available knowledge on an issue – the criteria to select a knowledge being its relevancy to address the problem. Therefore such courses would attenuate theoretical, conceptual and disciplinary monopolies.

We have also added to the curriculum a course exclusively devoted to contemporary economic and social issues, which takes up a heavy workload. As students, too many of

us have found ourselves unable in ordinary conversations to answer questions about youth unemployment, the financial crisis, etc., asked by those who expected that we would have a take on such issues, as surprising as this may appear. Contemporary economic and social issues are omitted from the economics curricula to the extreme point that some of us have not even heard of the current recession in our classes! Room for discussion of contemporary economic and social issues, to be grounded in theories, tools and economic thinking should thus be given.

In support of courses rooted in real-world economic issues, some others should be devoted to the toolkit that economics students should master. Thus we should include some courses explicitly devoted to methods – both quantitative and or qualitative. Indeed, it seems primordial not to grant exclusive privilege to one or the other approach, as it is nearly always the case in economics curricula, characterised by the ubiquity of quantitative teachings. If it goes without saying that employing mathematical and statistical tools whenever appropriate to aid the analysis is important, such tools could and ought to be complemented by qualitative methods such as interviews and archives work.

Such approaches are far from common among the majority of economists, let alone the vast majority of teachers and their students. However, when one sticks to the question of meaning, qualitative methods appears to be unavoidable. Knowing the figures of unemployment is essential, but carrying out an observation *in situ* within an employment agency; conducting an interview with a jobless person or a counselor; consulting the archives of a newspaper mentioning for the first time the rise of unemployment; enrich student understanding. While one can certainly question whether such approaches belong to the discipline of economics, this is not how to conceptualise the problem: what matters is not the discipline within which one is working, but rather the resources that can be used in order to address a given problem. If sociologists make interesting claims based on interviewing techniques and ethnographic observations, ignoring their insight is a mistake. In many cases – not to say all cases – mixed methods research is necessary. If the call for such an approach represents nothing new, its implementation within an undergraduate economics curriculum would be a true innovation.

Let us stress that quantitative and qualitative methods should not be taught for their own sake. Instead, instructors should demonstrate how such methods contribute to our understanding of the issues and problems addressed in the ‘object-oriented courses’.

A complementary course should be exclusively dedicated to the history of economic and social thought and to the history of economic and social facts. In this substantive class (in terms of content, credits and time commitment) attended by first and second year students, instructors will pursue three goals. First, they will teach theories, their core assumptions, and emphasise their coherence (or lack thereof). As opposed to the object-oriented class which shows how different theories give alternative answers to the same socioeconomic problems, this class will give an exhaustive and comprehensive account of each theory by stressing their internal structure. Second, instructors will show how such theories emerged at a given time in order to address socioeconomic phenomena that could not be explained with existing theories. This is why the history of socioeconomic thought and the history of socioeconomic facts must go hand-in-hand. Most history of economic thought classes go through a chronologically ordered list of theories and often give the impression that such theories first appeared out of the blue and subsequently fell out of favour for mysterious reasons. Our approach will avoid this shortcoming since it

emphasises the importance of the historical context in the emergence of new theories, and their evolution. Finally, instructors must illuminate debates between advocates of alternative theories. By doing so, they will demonstrate that economics is far from being a monolithic entity devoid of debate and ideological views, and will help develop students' critical skills.

For the above reasons, there may be some overlap between this class and the 'object-oriented course' but we argue that this is good: while the latter will be oriented towards the concrete application of theories to the socioeconomic realities, the former is theory based. Second, the learning process is made easier when the same material is studied several times with different perspectives.

Our curriculum also includes 'miscellaneous' courses such as foreign languages, computer science and an elective. Computer science courses will help students put into practice what they learned during their quantitative and qualitative methods classes; and perhaps even more importantly, students will learn to appreciate the relevance but also general weaknesses and limitations of the econometric approach.

5 Toward an alternative pedagogy

Rethinking economics education and the curriculum requires to take teaching issues seriously.

5.1 Knowledge transmission and learning

Such a curriculum will require a strong commitment from students and a renewal of teaching practices from teachers. The number of students is a crucial factor to be taken into account but chalk and talk has to be attenuated in order to increase critical thinking. Although a course on the history of economic thought can continue with the lecture format, object-oriented and methods courses call for interactive/participatory-style teaching approaches. Without going into further details, it should be mentioned that resorting to peer-assessment and regular student presentation and discussions are examples of teaching practices that would contribute to make the most of our ideal curriculum.

5.2 Teaching skills and abilities

As things stand, a high-school teacher in Economic and Social Sciences⁵ displays a more attuned profile to teach our ideal curriculum than the average university lecturer. Therefore, a high level of coordination among instructors is required if one wants to warrant the overarching logic of the curriculum within or between courses.

Strong analytical skills – including an acute view of global contemporary issues and the capacity to navigate within a wide range of theoretical frameworks – severely lacking among recent economics graduates – and fundamental technical skills provided by the PEPS-curriculum will enhance students' employability as well as academic opportunities at the doctorate level. Moreover, the PEPS-curriculum was designed to meet the French national competency standards for Economics graduates.

Pertaining to technical and applied skills, PEPS-curriculum graduate will be able to conduct a survey, collect data, conduct archival research, and perform statistical data

analysis. Moreover, an Introduction to Law and a preparation to civil service examination will be offered. Our pluralistic economics curriculum will keep all options open for students.

To conclude, let us say that our approach provides an informed critique of contemporary economics education and reclaiming our own education. Let us also recall that Peps-Economie stands for “For a Pluralistic Teaching of Economics in Higher Education” and that our ideal curriculum has been designed to concretely articulate our commitment to a strong conception of pluralism, regardless of the official name such a bachelor’s degree would take.

Based on our own experience as students, and then supported by our survey, we argue that our economics education does not train economists to understand global contemporary issues, nor does it contribute to the acquisition of basic skills and knowledge needed to inform citizens. The near absence of reflexive approaches, the quasi-domination of quantitative methods and standard microeconomics and macroeconomics combined with the lack of theoretical, methodological and disciplinary pluralism has made us intellectually frustrated and professionally helpless.


Such concerns are far from being purely French. As a matter of fact, even before the release of the Global Open Letter in May 2015 by the International Student Initiative for Pluralism in Economics (ISIPE)⁶, between March and December 2013, we were already connecting with similar groups in the USA, Canada, Chile, Uruguay, Germany, Israel, UK, Denmark and many other countries. As students and soon-to-be citizens, we claim the right to demand that economics and economic issues be taught from a plurality of perspectives. To do so, we need more than ever at the core of curricula, the three forms of pluralism – theoretical, methodological, and disciplinary – to become the standard in economics curricula.

Notes

- 1 We relied on the list of bachelors of economics given by the website of ‘Les Journées de l’Economie’ [online] <http://www.touteconomie.org/index.php?arc=c1>.
- 2 Some information was not available for four universities in early 2013, therefore our survey investigates 50 universities.
- 3 For detailed statistical results, please see Appendix 1.
- 4 See examples in Appendix 2.
- 5 French pupils choose one of three general baccalaureate streams: economics and social sciences (ES), literature (L) and sciences (S). For an analysis of the teaching of Economics and Social Sciences in French High Schools, see: Elisabeth, C. (2010) ‘Economics as a social science in French lycées: a programme shaped by the evolution of a school discipline’, *Journal of Social Sciences Education*, May [online] <http://www.jsse.org/index.php/jsse/>.
- 6 <http://www.isipe.net/open-letter/>.

Appendix 1

Results from statistical analysis (see online version for colours)



Appendix 2

Proposed curriculum

YEAR 1 SEMESTER 1

22 h/week

<i>Objects</i>	<i>Toolkit</i>	<i>Theories in perspective</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>
Contemporary economic and social issues	4h <i>Quantitative methods</i> Reminder (12th grade maths taught in the economics and social sciences stream)	2h30 <i>History of socioeconomic thought and facts</i> (till the end of the 19th century)	4h English 1h30
<i>Object 1: Production and consumption</i> Who produces? For which purposes? How to produce? How do organisations work? Who consumes? Why? Is it sustainable?	3h <i>Qualitative methods</i> Archives (historical perspective on an economic issue)	1h30	Second foreign language 1h30
<i>Object 2: The state and institutions</i> What is the state? Why the state? What is the role of the state in the economy?	3h		Information technology and office systems (c2i) 1h

Proposed curriculum (continued)

YEAR 1 SEMESTER 2

22h/week

<i>Objects</i>	<i>Toolkit</i>	<i>Theories in perspective</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>
Contemporary economic and social issues	4h <i>Quantitative methods</i> Reminder (12th grade maths taught in the economics and social sciences stream) Statistical survey on growth or unemployment.	2h30 <i>History of socioeconomic though facts</i> (till the end of the 19th century)	4h English 1h30
<i>Object 3: Growth and development</i> What is growth/wealth/development? What are the indicators?	3h <i>Qualitative methods</i> Interviews in workplaces	1h30	Second foreign language 1h30
<i>Object 4: Work and employment</i> Work, employment, unemployment: definitions. Is unemployment a recent phenomenon? How to fix it? What are the social consequences of unemployment?	3h		Information technology and office systems (c2i) 1h

Proposed curriculum (continued)

YEAR 2 SEMESTER 3

22h/week

<i>Objects</i>	<i>Toolkit</i>	<i>Theories in perspective</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>
Contemporary economic and social issues	4h <i>Quantitative methods</i>	2h30 <i>History of socioeconomic thought and facts (20th century)</i>	4h English 1h30
<i>Object 5: Globalisation</i> When did globalisation start? What is the driver of contemporary process of globalisation? What are the consequences?	<i>Qualitative methods</i> Fieldwork (monograph of an organisation)	1h30	Second foreign language 1h30
<i>Object 6: Inequalities and redistribution</i> How to measure inequalities? Where do they come from? Shall we fight inequalities and how?	3h		Computer (introduction to statistical softwares) 1h

Proposed curriculum (continued)

YEAR 2 SEMESTER 4

22h/week

<i>Objects</i>		<i>Toolkit</i>		<i>Theories in perspective</i>		<i>Miscellaneous</i>
Contemporary economic and social issues	4h	<i>Quantitative methods</i>	2h30	<i>History of socioeconomic thought and facts (20th century)</i>	4h	English 1h30
<i>Object 7: Money, banking finance</i> Where does money come from? What is the role of money? Do we need finance?	3h	<i>Qualitative methods</i> Group work on a freely chosen economic issue	1h30			Second foreign language 1h30
<i>Object 8: Europe</i> What is the economic role of the UE/European Central Bank?	3h					Computer (introduction to statistical software) 1h

Proposed curriculum (continued)

YEAR 3 SEMESTER 5

22h/week

<i>Objects</i>		<i>Toolkit</i>		<i>Theories in perspective</i>		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	
Contemporary economic and social issues	4h	Two courses to chose from	(4h)	Two courses to chose from <i>electives</i>	(4h)	English	1h30
		• Fieldwork	2h	• Philosophy of economics	2h		
		• Community service	2h	• Economic theories	2h		
		• Modelling	2h	• Sociological theories	2h		
		• Math, statistics, econometrics	2h	• Introduction to law	2h		
				• Special course on civil service competitive exams	2h		
<i>In-depth study of two objects among those previously studied during the first two years</i>	(6h)					Second foreign language	1h30
• Production/consumption	3h					Computer (statistical software)	1h
• State and institutions	3h						
• Growth and development	3h						
• Work and employment	3h						
• Globalisation	3h						
• Inequalities and redistribution	3h						
• Money, banking, finance	3h						
• Europe	3h						

Proposed curriculum (continued)

YEAR 3 SEMESTER 6

22h/week

<i>Objects</i>		<i>Toolkit</i>		<i>Theories in perspective</i>		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	
Contemporary economic and social issues	4h	Two electives	(4h)	Two electives	(4h)	English	1h30
		• Fieldwork	2h	• Philosophy of economics	2h		
		• Community service	2h	• Economic theories	2h		
		• Modelling	2h	• Sociological theories	2h		
		• Maths, statistics, econometrics	2h	• Introduction to law	2h		
				• Special course on civil service competitive exams	2h		
<i>In-depth study of two elective objects among those previously studied in 1st and 2nd year</i>	(6h)					Second foreign language	1h30
						Computer (statistical software)	1h
• Production/consumption	3h						
• State and institutions	3h						
• Growth and development	3h						
• Work and employment	3h						
• Globalisation	3h						
• Inequalities and redistribution	3h						
• Money, banking, finance	3h						
• Europe	3h						