GRADING GUIDE – HUMAN GEOGRAPHY (bachelor SGO and master HGO)

Course code and semester-year: HGO4601 autumn 2023
Type of examination: *[underline the option that applies]*
Written school exam / <u>take-home exam</u> / term paper given topic / term paper self-chosen topic

---

About exams at SGO/HGO: A good examination paper contains solid knowledge, logical and coherent reasoning and a systematic structure. The answer to a discussion question/task must examine, analyze, and connect different parts of the curriculum.

1. The answer responds to the question/task given in a precise and exhaustive way.
2. The answer demonstrates knowledge.
3. The answer must be well-written: coherent and using good academic language.
4. Key concepts – those at the core of the answer – must be defined.
5. The answer demonstrates analytical capacity and reflection.

Om eksamen ved SGO/HGO: En god besvarelse inneholder solid kunnskap, logisk argumentasjon og ryddig disposisjon. Besvarelsen av en drøftingsoppgave skal være diskuterende, analytisk og koble ulike deler av pensum.

1. Besvarelsen svarer på oppgaveteksten på en presis og utfyllende måte.
2. Besvarelsen viser kunnskap.
3. Besvarelsen skal være velskrevet: sammenhengende med godt akademisk språk.
4. Viktige begreper - de som er i kjernen av besvarelsen – skal defineres.
5. Besvarelsen skal vise analytiske evne og refleksjon.

About this course:
The course introduces students to evolutionary thinking in economic geography, and addresses institutions, agency, and the dynamics between the local and global with particular attention to questions related to sustainability transitions and the 'greening' of industries. Students should be able to discuss central concepts such as evolution and institutions as used in economic geography and have basic knowledge of how work in the discipline deal with sustainability challenges and transitions. Given the complexity and inter-relatedness of sub-topics covered, the examination questions are formulated to allow critical thinking and reflection. This should be acknowledged in the evaluation.

About specific questions/tasks:
Three-day home exam. The students are to answer <u>two</u> out of three questions. The two answers are to be weighted equally. There is no maximum length for individual answers but of the two combined should not exceed 3000 words excluding front page and reference lists.

Question 1
In this course, three theoretical frameworks for analyses of socio-technical change have been presented: 1) techno-economic paradigms, 2) the multilevel perspective and 3) technological innovation systems. Present each of the different frameworks with particular attention to how lock-in and lock-out mechanisms are conceptualised in TIS and MLP. Proceed to discuss complementarities between TIS and MLP with respect to our understanding of sociotechnical transitions.

The student is expected only to give a brief account of techno-economic paradigms, and how they can be thought of as 'meta-regimes' in the terminology of EEG (the idea that TEP constitute or rather structure (parts of) the landscape level has also been discussed in the course). The question then asks for more elaborate discussions of MLP that define and reflect on the relationship of (fragile) niches with regimes characterised by a high degree of structuration between elements: Lock-in as 'regular change' along sociotechnical trajectories. Lock-in and lock-out is an essential aspect of the 'functional dynamics' of TIS that should be elaborated on for a high grade to be awarded. Lock-and lock-out is also discussed elaborately at a general level by Klitkou et al (2015). In the literature, the idea that (emerging) TIS dynamics concerns the interface of niches with regimes from the perspective of the niche has been discussed, and how this emphasis on the internal dynamics of TIS is complementary to the emphasis of MLP on change through destabilisation of the regime itself from internal constraints/contradictions and/or landscape pressures.

Question 2

Evolutionary economic geography (EEG) is concerned with industrial continuity and change at the territorial (regional, national) level. In recent years, this approach has been criticised for over-emphasis on structural factors internal to territorial economies (i.e. current industrial and institutional conditions) with limited attention to the role of 'agency' broadly defined. Discuss the relevance of this critique for our understanding of territorial (regional, national) industrial change. Feel free to use examples from the curriculum.

Guidelines

As point of departure for this, the candidate needs to describe the essence of EEG with particular attention to 'structural' dynamics and factors (i.e. the tendency towards 'related diversification'/regional branching and how resources that are created as externalities of current industrial configurations tend to channel development in certain directions at the expense of others). Against this background, discussions about firm-level and system-level agency (Hassink et al, 2019), change versus reproductive agency (Fløysand et al, 2022; Asheim & Grillitsch, 2022) and 'the trinity of change agency' (Grillitsch & Sotarauta, 2020)) including literature on institutional entrepreneurship and institutional work more generally (Fløysand et al, 2022) all draw in the direction of a high marking.

Question 3

Building on evolutionary economic geography (EEG) and the technological innovation systems (TIS) approach, Njøs et al (2020) have developed a framework for analysing interactions between territorial dynamics and technological characteristics in the emergence and growth of new industrial activities in regions (new path creation). Briefly lay out and explain the framework using also supplementary readings on new path creation from the curriculum (e.g. Hassink et al, 2019). Proceed to use the framework as basis for a comparative analysis of new path creation in Danish and Norwegian wind power industries. Discuss implications of the analysis for 'transformative innovation policies' as presented e.g. by Weber & Rohracher (2012) and Lundvall (2022).

Guidelines

A good grade demands that the theoretical framework is clearly explained. Use of supplementary literature on EEG, TIS and new path creations to substantiate/extend the framework is required for a high marking. The first challenge is then to re-interpret the Danish and Norwegian wind power cases (represented on the reading list by Karnøe & Garud (2012), Steen & Hansen (2018)) and Mäkitie (2022) using the extended EEG-TIS framework, meaning that ability to do so draw in the direction of a high marking. The second challenge is to connect the results to more general discussions about 'transformative innovation policies' and thus in particular debates about demand articulation and directionality including visions of the future. Institutional work and agency debates are relevant to include, as is Lundvall's (2022) emphasis on the

interplay between scientific research ('breakthrough') and broad-based 'learning-by-doing' and using' ('bricolage') however, this would be quite sophisticated and beyond what is expected for a high marking.