

Baylor University
Spring 2012

Economics 3355: Economics of Poverty and Discrimination

Section 2, M/W 2:30-3:45 pm, School of Social Work (Rm. 115)

Professor: Dr. Linda Carter

E-mail: Linda_K_Carter@Baylor.edu

Phone: (254)710-1391

Office Hours: M/W 11:45-12:20 pm and 1:35-2:30 pm (Rm. 115 in the School of Social Work)

Office Hours: F 8:30-11:30 am or by appointment (335 Hankamer School of Business)

Course Description:

Why is it that some individuals are left behind as an economy grows? Why, in the richest economy the world has ever known, do we see destitution that seems intractable? Why is poverty concentrated among certain groups characterized by race and gender and what role does discrimination play in this outcome? How are issues associated with family structure linked to poverty? How might poverty be reduced? Have anti-poverty programs eroded incentives to work and save? Why – despite substantial increases in poverty relief expenditures over time – has the incidence of poverty remained higher than we would have hoped? We would like to be able to answer these and related questions.

This course will introduce the tools of economic analysis and develop an understanding of what economics can bring to the conversation about the issues of poverty and discrimination. The goal is to increase skill in evaluating arguments made by public officials, commentators, news items, and other forms of public discussion. The basic tools of supply and demand, especially as they are applied to the operation of the labor market, will provide the core concepts as we try to increase our understanding of the nature, causes, and consequences of poverty and discrimination, and the public policy responses to them.

Required Textbooks: Students should have access to the following textbooks:

The Economics of Poverty and Discrimination by Bradley R. Schiller (7th edition or newer)
Economics of Social Issues by Sharp, Register, and Grimes (18th edition or newer)

Several articles will also be posted on Blackboard. Students are expected to read the assigned chapters/articles ahead of time and be prepared to discuss them during class time.

Blackboard: An additional resource available to students is the class Blackboard site, which can be accessed through the World Wide Web at <http://my.baylor.edu>. Through this site students have 24-hour access to a great deal of information on the class. Items available through the site include but are not limited to the course outline, syllabus, and additional readings. Also, through e-mail you have greater access to the instructor. I usually respond to e-mailed questions within 24 hours as I frequently check my e-mail. Technology is a wonderful thing – make use of this resource!

Attendance: Students are expected to attend *all* scheduled lectures. Students are expected to be on time for class, stay for the entire period, and be intellectually fully engaged in the activities of the class. Since late work will not be accepted in this class (and make-up examinations will not be given), please refer to the relevant sections below to determine how missed work is to be handled.

Grading Policy: The course grade will be based on homework assignments, a policy-related position paper, participation in a classroom debate, article annotations, and three exams, where the components are weighted as follows:

Homework assignments	60 points	(11%)
Policy Position Paper	50 points	(9%)
Group Project: Debate	50 points	(9%)
Annotations	60 points	(11%)
Exams	330 points	(60%)

	550 points	(100%)

Your final score in the class is calculated as the percentage of the total possible points that you earn (e.g. if you earn 440 points out of the 550 possible, you have earned an 80%). I reserve the right to add a few points to your total score to recognize improvement, class participation, and consistent attendance. In general, final letter grades are assigned following a standard grading scale (e.g. 90-100 A, 86-89 B+, 80-85 B, etc.).

Homework: Each homework assignment is worth 15 points. Late homework assignments will not be accepted for any reason. If you anticipate missing, you may turn in your homework early or arrange to send it to class with another student. Because schedule conflicts and unforeseen circumstances may arise, however, only the best 4 of 6 homework assignments will count toward your homework grade.

Policy Position Paper and Classroom Debate: Students will be assigned (based as much as possible on student input/preferences) one of the eight policy debate topics and an affirmative or negative position with respect to the specific policy question. Each student is responsible for researching his or her assigned position and **independently** writing a short paper in support of that position. Students will then be paired with a partner who has been assigned the opposite position for that policy question. These **teams** will synthesize both team members' independent research in preparation for a classroom debate. The side (affirmative or negative position) that each team will argue will be determined by a coin toss just prior to the debate. All team members' policy position papers will be due in class at the time of the debate. Additional details regarding my expectations for the paper and the debate, as well as a list of references that will prove helpful in your preparation, will be available on Blackboard.

Critical Annotations: Students will also complete annotations for articles related to (four of) the other policy debate questions. Each of these annotations must include a summary and a critical analysis of the article's content. These must be typed, should be 1-2 pages in length, and will be due in class at the time of the related policy debate. No late papers will be accepted, so consider both your interest in the topic and the due date (listed on the syllabus) when choosing the four policy questions. Additional details regarding my expectations for the annotations, as well as the list of articles that may be chosen, will be available on Blackboard. Note: Students may complete up to five annotations, but only the best four will count towards their grade...Please do not turn in more than five annotations, however.

Exams: Each of the two midterms (100 points possible on each exam) and the cumulative final exam (130 points possible) will consist of a mixture of questions: identification questions (perhaps); true, false, and uncertain (and explain) questions; problems; and essays. Exams will be held on the following dates and there will be no makeup examinations given in this course. If you miss one of the midterm examinations you must fully document the reason for the absence and this should be done before the examination, if possible. Absences will not be excused except for the most serious, unavoidable reasons (and excuses must be supported by acceptable documentation). Acceptable reasons include official university business, serious illness or injury, death of a member of your immediate family, or other circumstances that I in my sole discretion deem appropriate. An unexcused absence from an examination will result in a grade of zero for that examination. An excused absence permits you to substitute the average of your other midterm examination score and your score on the final examination for that of the missed examination. Attendance at the final examination is mandatory (i.e., you may not substitute the average of the two midterms for the final exam).

Midterm Exam 1: 3/7/12
Midterm Exam 2: 4/11/12
Final Exam: 5/2/12

Students and Academic Integrity: Baylor University policies require that students, staff, and faculty act in academic matters with utmost honesty and integrity. *It is the responsibility of each student to be familiar with the Honor Code and other university policies and procedures affecting academic integrity.* The Honor Code may be found at the following web address: <http://www.baylor.edu/honorcode/index.php?id=44060> and students are also encouraged to consider these suggestions:

- Review each class syllabus for expectations your professor may have regarding course work and class attendance that go beyond those stated in university policies and guidelines and the Honor Code.
- Be familiar with the importance of academic integrity in class. Understand how citations show respect for other scholars.
- Talk with your professor if you are confused about citation practices or other research standards.
- Make sure you understand not only what counts as plagiarism and cheating, but also how to avoid engaging in these practices. Manage your time, take notes correctly, and use the internet appropriately.
- Make sure you understand your professor's guidelines about working with other students on assignments, receiving assistance from other students on assignments, citing sources, using notes or exams from previous or other classes, and accessing information during an examination. If in doubt – ASK YOUR PROFESSOR!
- Understand that penalties can result from dishonest conduct, ranging from failure of the assignment to immediate expulsion from the university.

***Tentative Schedule of Topics and Assignments**

Date	Topic	Due
Week 1		
1/9	Introduction to ECO 3355	
1/11	Poverty & Inequality	
Week 2		
1/16	Martin Luther King Jr., Day (No class)	
1/18	Poverty & Inequality (cont'd.)	
Week 3		
1/23	Counting the Poor	
1/25	Alleviating Human Misery: The Role of Economic Reasoning	
Week 4		
1/30	Alleviating Human Misery: The Role of Economic Reasoning (cont'd.)	Due: Annotation #1
Debate: Economic Growth and Living Standards		
2/1	Economic Systems, Resource Allocation, Market Forces, and Social Well-Being	Due: Homework 1
Week 5		
2/6	Economic Systems, Resource Allocation, Market Forces, and Social Well-Being (cont'd.)	Due: Annotation #2
Debate: Sin Taxes		
2/8	Labor Force Participation & Unemployment	Due: Homework 2
Week 6		
2/13	Labor Force Participation & Unemployment (cont'd.)	
2/15	The Working Poor	Due: Annotation #3
Debate: Minimum Wage		
Week 7		
2/20	The Working Poor (cont'd.)	
2/22	Education and Ability	Due: Homework 3
Week 8		
2/27	Aging and Health	
2/29	Aging and Health (cont'd)	Due: Annotation #4
Debate: Health Care Reform		

Week 9		
3/5	Family Size and Structure Debate: Marriage Subsidy	Due: Annotation #5
3/7	Exam 1	
	Spring Break! (No classes 3/10-3/18)	
Week 10		
3/19	Discrimination (Overview) and Discrimination in Education	
3/21	Discrimination in the Labor Market	Due: Homework 4
Week 11		
3/26	(No class)	
3/28	Discrimination in the Consumer Market & Judicial System Debate: Affirmative Action in Employment	Due: Annotation #6
Week 12		
4/2	Policy: Welfare Reform Debate: Negative Income Tax	Due: Annotation #7
4/4	Policy: Social Insurance	Due: Homework 5
Week 13		
4/9	Easter Holiday (No class)	
4/11	Exam 2	
Week 14		
4/16	Policy: Employment Policies	
4/18	Policy: Education Reform Debate: School Vouchers	Due: Annotation #8
Week 15		
4/23	Market Based Alternatives and Poverty Alleviation	Due: Homework 6
4/25	Wrap-Up	
	Study Day (No class on Monday 4/30)	
	Final Exam: Wednesday, May 2, 9am (in our regular classroom)	

*Please note that this is a tentative schedule and changes may be made if the progress of the class warrants such changes. Any changes to this schedule will be announced in class and via e-mail.

ECO 3355: Guidelines for Policy Papers/Debates/Annotations

Policy Position Paper: Students will be assigned one of eight policy-related topics and either the affirmative or negative position with respect to the topic. **Students will INDEPENDENTLY research their assigned position and prepare a short paper summarizing the arguments supporting only that position on the policy question at hand (to be turned in on the day of the debate).** The paper must be typed, should be 4-5 pages in length (double-spaced, no more than 1-inch margins, Times New Roman, 11pt. font). You may choose the style (i.e., APA, MLA, Chicago/Turabian) that you are most comfortable with...just be sure to properly reference any source that you consult while preparing the paper. A list of references that will prove helpful getting started on this assignment is provided below. The paper will be assessed as follows:

	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Poor	Unacceptable
Inclusion of key arguments supporting the position	The paper includes all of the key arguments discussed in the related literature.	The paper includes most of the key arguments.	The paper includes some of the key arguments.	The paper includes only a few of the key arguments.	The paper includes none of the key arguments discussed in the related literature.
Strength of Arguments	All key arguments are supported with empirical evidence, theoretical justification, etc. rather than just assertions, opinions, and feelings; Avoids biased, emotion-laden language.	Most key arguments are supported with empirical evidence, theoretical justification, etc. rather than just assertions, opinions, and feelings; Avoids biased, emotion-laden language.	Some of the key arguments are supported with empirical evidence, theoretical justification, etc.; Avoids biased, emotion-laden language.	Only a few of the key arguments are supported with empirical evidence, theoretical justification, etc.; Avoids biased, emotion-laden language.	Includes a substantial amount of student's opinions, feelings, or positions; few of the arguments are supported with evidence; or paper is written with biased/emotion-laden language
Clear, accurate description of the arguments	Each point is clearly and accurately described (with sufficient explanation, detail, supporting examples, etc.).	Each point is clearly and accurately described (but perhaps with insufficient explanation, detail, supporting examples, etc.).	A few of the points are described inaccurately (but the extent of explanation, detail, supporting examples, etc. is sufficient).	A few of the points are described inaccurately and the extent of explanation, detail, supporting examples, etc. is insufficient.	Many of the points are described inaccurately.
Connection to relevant economic concepts/terminology	The paper correctly explains the points of the arguments using the language/ concepts of economics wherever possible.	The paper explains the points using the language/ concepts of economics wherever possible, but some of the explanations/terms are incorrect.	The paper explains some of the points using the language/concepts of economics, but several of the explanations are incorrect.	The paper incorporates a few economic concepts/ terms, but discusses many points w/o reference to the relevant economic concepts/ terms or many of the explanations are incorrect.	The paper fails to use the language/concepts of economics to explain the relevant issues.
Sources: variety and credibility of sources; accurate summary of the sources	Includes at least 6 peer-reviewed journal articles or books (not just blogs, websites, etc.) and sources are accurately summarized	Includes at least 4 peer-reviewed journal articles or books in addition to other sources and sources are accurately summarized	Includes at least 3 peer-reviewed journal articles or books in addition to other sources and sources are accurately summarized	Includes at least 3 peer-reviewed journal articles or books in addition to other sources, but some sources are not accurately summarized	Sources include mostly websites, blogs, videos, etc. (i.e., less than 3 peer-reviewed journal articles); or sources are carelessly summarized

(cont'd.)	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Poor	Unacceptable
Writing: clarity, organization, style, grammar, & punctuation	The paper is well-organized, clearly and concisely written; few (if any) grammar/punctuation mistakes.	The paper is well-organized and clearly and concisely written; fair amount of grammar/punctuation mistakes.	The organization of the paper is acceptable; the writing is clear/concise enough to be acceptable, although it could be improved; few grammar/punctuation mistakes.	The paper is poorly-organized; the writing is somewhat clear; fair amount of grammar/punctuation mistakes.	The paper is poorly-organized, the writing is somewhat rambling or unclear, and/or it has numerous grammar/punctuation mistakes.

Debate: After preparing (a good outline and/or rough draft of) their position papers, students will meet with the other member(s) of their debate team, who were assigned to research and prepare a position paper supporting the **opposite** position. The team members will share/discuss their findings with each other, in order to ensure all team members understand the affirmative AND negative arguments for the policy question, and – together as a team – they will evaluate the strength of various arguments/evidence and work out a strategy in preparation for the debate. The teams should make arrangements to meet with me for a few minutes before/after class (or at another time that’s mutually agreeable) at least two days prior to the debate to discuss the arguments, team preparation, etc... **Since a coin toss (right before the debate) will determine which team argues each position, both teams should come to class prepared to debate EITHER position. All team members are expected to contribute (roughly) equally to the preparation in advance of the debate and participation during the debate. Team members will be evaluated independently, in terms of preparation, diction, eye contact, ability to knowledgably discuss both sides of the issue, overall effectiveness, and contribution to the success of the team. Teams will also be evaluated jointly in terms of preparation, organization, use of supporting evidence and use of rebuttal.** The structure of the debate is as follows:

Affirmative Construction – 8 minutes

Negative Construction – 8 minutes

Rebuttal: Interactive – 15 minutes (affirmative begins, then the teams take turns, being sure to avoid filibustering or cutting anyone off)

Class Interaction: 15 minutes of questions and comments

Critical Annotations: Students are also expected to complete annotations for articles related to four of the other policy-related topics (i.e., students may not receive credit for annotations written on the same topic as their policy position paper/debate). **The article that should be used for each topic chosen is listed below (in bold font).** These annotations must be typed and will be due in class at the time of the related policy debate as noted on the syllabus. No late assignments will be accepted, so consider both your interest in the topic and the due date (listed on the syllabus) when choosing the four policy topics. Each of these annotations must include a summary and a critical analysis of the article's content. Specifically, the annotation should address the following points:

- 1) Title, author, and date of the editorial, article, or essay.
- 2) What is the main purpose or key question of this editorial, article, or essay?
- 3) How does the author accomplish this purpose or answer the key question (e.g., summarizing existing research from a certain field/time period, collecting/analyzing certain data, overview of the data analysis approach, etc.)?
- 4) What seems to be the most important information in this editorial, article, or essay?
- 5) The main conclusion(s) in this editorial, article, or essay is (are) _____. The main assumption(s) underlying the author's thinking is (are)_____.
- 6) The main implication(s) of this line of reasoning is (are) _____.
- 7) The main idea(s) we need to understand in order to understand this editorial, article, or essay is (are) _____.

Some unfamiliar economics-related terms that I came across in the article include the following:

_____ Here is a (very) short explanation of what the author means by these concept(s):

- 8) Why would you recommend this editorial, article, or essay to a friend interested in the topic (or – if you didn't like the reading very much – why would you *not* recommend it)?

Resources for Annotations/Policy Papers/Debates

For each of the topics, **the article that must be used for annotations is listed in bold** (sometimes there are two articles to choose from). Other useful resources for the policy position papers/debates are listed below the annotation article(s). These resources (and the citations listed therein) should prove helpful in getting you started, but please realize that it will be necessary to utilize other sources as you prepare the paper/debate.

1. Trickle Down Effect of Economic Growth: Should the U.S. focus on economic growth (instead of focusing primarily on education, welfare, health care reform, etc.) in order to improve living standards among the poor? In other words, does economic growth translate into improved living standards among the poor? **(Due 1/30/12)**
 - **Article for Annotation #1: Greenwood, Daphne T. and Richard P. F. Holt. 2010. "Growth Inequality and Negative Trickle Down." *Journal of Economic Issues* 44(2): 403-410.**
 - Friedman, Benjamin. 2005. *The Moral Consequences of Economic Growth*. New York: Knopf.
 - <http://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/focus/pdfs/foc251a.pdf>
 - Philippe Aghion, Eve Caroli, and Cecilia García-Peñalosa. 1999. "Inequality and Economic Growth: The Perspective of the New Growth Theories," *Journal of Economic Literature* 37(4): 1615-1660.
 - Datt, Gaurav and Martin Ravallion. 2002. "Is India's Economic Growth Leaving the Poor Behind?" *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 16(3): 89-108.
 - Landefeld, J. Steven, Eugene P. Seskin, and Barbara M. Fraumeni. 2008. "Taking the Pulse of the Economy: Measuring GDP." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 22(2): 193-216.
 - <http://www.becker-posner-blog.com/2005/03/economic-and-political-freedom-does-one-lead-to-the-other-becker.html>
 - <http://www.becker-posner-blog.com/2004/12/disease-population-and-economic-progress.html>
 - <http://www.economist.com/debate/overview/171>

2. Sin Taxes: Given extremely high rates of obesity, diabetes, and cancer among poor individuals, should the U.S. implement (or increase previously established) sin taxes on soda, junk food, cigarettes, alcohol, etc.? **(Due 2/6/12)**
 - **Article for Annotation #2 (Please choose 1 of the 2 following articles in bold):**
 - **Grossman, Michael, Jody L. Sindelar, John Mullahy, Richard Anderson. 1993. "Policy Watch: Alcohol and Cigarette Taxes." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 7(4): 211-222.**
 - **Remler, Dahlia K. 2004. "Poor Smokers, Poor Quitters, and Cigarette Tax Regressivity." *American Journal of Public Health* 94(2): 225-229.**
 - O'Donoghue, Ted and Matthew Rabin. 2006. "Optimal Sin Taxes." *Journal of Public Economics* 90 (10-11): 1825-1849.

- Rampell, Catherine. 2010. "For Cash-Strapped States, Sin is Sure Lucrative." NY Times article available online: <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/18/weekinreview/18rampell.html>
- Trinko, Katrina. 2010. "Political cowards love the sin tax." USA Today article available online: http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/2010-09-21-column21_ST_N.htm
- Whaley, Sean. 2011. "Sin Tax Debate Focuses on Public Health Benefits, Revenues, Effects on Business." Nevada News article available online at: <http://www.nevadanewsbulletin.com/2011/04/05/sin-tax-debate-focuses-on-public-health-benefits-revenues-effects-on-business/>

3. Minimum Wage Increases/Living Wages: Should state minimum wages be increased substantially (as proposed by advocates of living wage campaigns)? (Due 2/15/12)

- **Article for Annotation #3: Freeman, Richard B. 1996. "The Minimum Wage as a Redistributive Tool." *The Economic Journal* 106(436): 639-649.**
- Katz, Lawrence F. and Alan B. Krueger. 1992. "The Effect of the Minimum Wage on the Fast Food Industry." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 46: 6-21.
- Neumark, David, and William Wascher. 2002. "Do minimum wages fight poverty?" *Economic Inquiry* 40(3): 315-333.
- Neumark, David, and William Wascher, 2000. "Minimum Wages and Employment: A Case Study of the Fast-Food Industry in New Jersey and Pennsylvania: Comment." *American Economic Review* 90(5): 1362-96.
- Krueger, Alan B. and David Card. 1995. *Myth and Measurement: The New Economics of the Minimum Wage*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Other useful resources:
 - http://www.policyalmanac.org/economic/minimum_wage.shtml (quick overview of topic and link to further resources)
 - <http://www.chicagodsa.org/livingwage.pdf>
 - <http://www.epi.org/> (pro-living wage)
 - http://epionline.org/index_mw.cfm (anti-living wage)
 - <http://prospect.org/article/cooked-order> (pro)
 - <http://www.cato.org/> (search minimum wage- against)

4. Nationalized System of Health Care: Should the government adopt a nationalized system of health care? **(Due 2/29/12)**

- **Article for Annotation #4: Champlin, Dell P. and Janet T. Knoedler. “Universal Health Care and the Economics of Responsibility” *Journal of Economic Issues*, 42(4): 913-38, December 2008.**
- Gruber, Jonathan. “The Impacts of the Affordable Care Act: How Reasonable Are the Projections?” *National Tax Journal*, 64(3): 893-908, 2011.
- http://www.swcollege.com/bef/econ_debate.html (click on “income distribution and poverty” then “is there a need for health-care reform?” for an overview of relevant issues and additional, albeit somewhat dated, links)
- http://hsmr.ac.kr/docu/2_1/William_P.pdf
- http://www.businessweek.com/debateroom/archives/2007/06/universal_health.html (pro and con opinions)
- <http://www.pnhp.org/> (Physicians for a National Health Program has a link “click here to learn more about single-payer national health insurance” listing many useful resources)
- <http://thingsconsidered.hubpages.com/hub/Arguments-Against-Universal-Healthcare-in-America>
- <http://laborcenter.berkeley.edu/healthpolicy/#reform>
- Orszag, Peter R. 2011. “How Health Care Can Save or Sink America.” *Foreign Affairs* 90(4).
- <http://www.becker-posner-blog.com/2009/06/the-administrations-health-care-plan--posner.html>

5. Marriage Subsidies (note: a marriage “subsidy” is the opposite of a “marriage tax” or “marriage penalty”): Should the U.S. subsidize marriage? **(Due 3/5/12)**

- **Article for Annotation #5 (Please choose 1 of the following 2 articles in bold):**
 - **Alm, James, Stacy Dickert-Conlin, and Leslie A. Whittington. 1999. “Policy Watch: The Marriage Penalty.” *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 13(3): 193-204.**
 - **Lichter, Daniel T., Deborah Roempke Graefe, and J. Brian Brown. 2003. “Is Marriage a Panacea? Union Formation among Economically Disadvantaged Unwed Mothers,” *Social Problems*, 50(1): 60-86.**
- Edin, Kathryn. 2000. “What do Low-Income Single Mothers Say about Marriage?” *Social Problems*, 38(4): 112-133.
- Whittington, Leslie A. Marriage Penalty, Urban Institute Press, <http://www.urban.org/books/TTP/whittington.cfm> (has further references)
- Gardiner, et. al, 2002. “State Policies to Promote Marriage: Final Report.” Available online: <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/marriage02f/> (overview of U.S. Policy)

- Brotherson, Sean E. and William C. Duncan. 2004. “Rebinding the Ties That Bind: Government Efforts to Preserve and Promote Marriage.” *Family Relations* 53(5): 459–468. (overview of U.S. Policy)
- Carasso, Adam and C. Eugene Steoerle. 2005. “The Hefty Penalty on Marriage Facing Many Households with Children.” available online: <http://futureofchildren.org/publications/journals/article/index.xml?journalid=37&articleid=111§ionid=718&submit>
- <http://www.becker-posner-blog.com/2007/03/should-marriage-be-subsidized-becker.html>
- Frimmel, Halla, and Winter-Ebmer. 2011. “Marriage Subsidies and Divorce: An Analysis of Marginal Marriages.” conference draft available online: http://www.iza.org/conference_files/SUMS2011/frimmel_w5631.pdf

6. Affirmative Action: Should affirmative action requirements (as they relate to employment) be maintained and/or strengthened? (**Due 3/26/12**)

- **Article for Annotation #6 (Please choose 1 of the following 2 articles in bold):**
 - **Bertrand, Marianne and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2004. “Are Emily and Greg More Employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination.” *American Economic Review* 94: 991-1013.**
 - **Arrow, Kenneth J. 1998. “What has Economics to Say about Racial Discrimination?” *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 12(2): 91-100.**
- Holzer, Harry and David Neumark. 2000. “Assessing Affirmative Action.” *Journal of Economic Literature* 38(3): 483-568.
- Fryer, Roland G. Jr. and Glenn C. Loury. 2005. “Affirmative Action and Its Mythology.” *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 19: 147-162.
- Norton, Michael I. and Samuel R. Sommers. 2011. “Whites See Racism as a Zero-Sum Game That They Are Now Losing.” *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 6: 215-218.
- <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/special/affirm/affirm.htm>
- <http://www.becker-posner-blog.com/2005/08/on-affirmative-action-becker.html> (see also comment from Posner and subsequent response from Becker)

7. Negative Income Tax: Should the U.S. establish a negative income tax (to replace the current welfare system and EITC)? (Due 4/2/12)

- **Article for Annotation #6: Moffitt, Robert A. 2003. "The Negative Income Tax and the Evolution of U.S. Welfare Policy." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 17(3): 119-140.**
- Steuerle, C. Eugene. 1990. "Policy Watch: Tax Credits for Low-Income Workers with Children." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 4(3): 201-212.
- Bacache-Beauvallet, Maya and Etienne Lehmann. 2005. "Minimum Wage or Negative Income Tax: Why Skilled Workers May Favor Wage Rigidities." *IZA Discussion Papers* No. 1570 available online: <http://ftp.iza.org/dp1570.pdf>
- Moffitt, Robert A. 2004. "The Negative Income Tax." *Focus* (University of Wisconsin–Madison Institute for Research on Poverty) Available online: <http://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/focus/pdfs/foc232a.pdf>
- Jodie T. Allen. 2002. "Negative Income Tax." in *The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics*, ed. David R. Henderson (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, Inc.) available online at: <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc1/NegativeIncomeTax.html>

8. Voucher System with K-12 Education: Should the U.S. implement a voucher system in order to improve K-12 education? (Due 4/18/12)

- **Article for Annotation #8 (Please choose 1 of the following 2 articles in bold):**
 - **Rouse, Cecilia Elena. 1998. "Private School Vouchers and Student Achievement: An Evaluation of the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 113(2): 553-602.**
 - **Ladd, Helen F. 2002. "School Vouchers: A Critical View." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 16(4):3-24.**
- *The Economics of School Choice*. 2003. Edited by Caroline M. Hoxby. Chicago and London: University of Chicago.
- Neal, Derek. 2002. "How Vouchers Could Change the Market for Education." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 16(4): 25-44.
- Other resources:
 - <http://www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=185&type=educator> (overview of topic, pros and cons, links to further resources)
 - <http://www.ecs.org/html/issue.asp?issueID=149> (overview of topic, pros and cons, links to further resources)
 - <http://www.ncspe.org/> (provides links to further articles about vouchers)
 - http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=2595

Date	Topic	Schiller 7 th Ed.	Schiller 8 th Ed.	Schiller 9 th Ed.	Schiller 10 th Ed.		Sharp 18 th Ed.	Sharp 19 th Ed.
1/9	Intro. to ECO 3355	---	---	---	---		---	---
1/11	Poverty; Inequality	Ch. 1 (1-9a)	Ch. 1 (1-10)	Ch. 1	Ch. 1		---	---
1/16	Martin Luther King Jr., Day (No class)							
1/18	(cont'd)	Ch. 1 (9b-19)	Ch. 1 (11-21)	Ch. 2	Ch. 2		---	---
1/23	Counting the Poor	Ch. 2	Ch. 2	Ch. 3	Ch. 3		---	---
1/25	Alleviating Human Misery: The Role of Economic Reasoning	---	---	---	---		Ch. 1; Ch. 11 (324-329a)	Ch. 1; Ch. 11 (324b-329a)
1/30	(cont'd.)	---	---	---	---		---	---
2/1	Econ Systems, Resource Allocation, Mkt Forces, & Social Well-Being	---	---	---	---		Ch. 2 (33b-48a)	Ch. 2 (31b-46a)
2/6	(cont'd.)	---	---	---	---		---	---
2/8	Labor Force Participation; Unemployment	Ch. 3	Ch. 3	Ch. 4	Ch. 5		---	---
2/13	(cont'd.)	---	---	---	---		Ch. 12; Ch. 13 (374b-379)	Ch. 13
2/15	The Working Poor	Ch. 4	Ch. 4	Ch. 5	Ch. 6		---	---
2/20	(cont'd.)	---	---	---	---		Ch. 3	Ch. 3
2/22	Education & Ability	Ch. 8	Ch. 8	Ch. 9	Ch. 10		---	---
2/27	Aging & Health	Ch. 5	Ch. 5	Ch. 6	Ch. 7		---	---
2/29	(cont'd)	---	---	---	---		Ch. 15 (445c-455)	Ch. 15 (445c-455)
3/5	Family Size & Structure	Ch. 6	Ch. 6	Ch. 7	Ch. 8		---	---
3/7	Exam 1							
	Spring Break! (No classes 3/10-3/18)							
3/19	Discrimination (Overview)	Blackboard	Blackboard	Blackboard	Blackboard		Blackboard	Blackboard
3/21	Discrimination in Education	Ch. 9	Ch. 9	Ch. 10	Ch. 11		---	---
3/26	Discrimination in the Labor Market	Ch. 10	Ch. 10	Ch. 11	Ch. 12		Ch. 7 (193c-198a)	Ch7 (191b-195a)
3/28	Discrimination in the Consumer Mkt & Judicial System	---	---	---	---		Ch. 7 (208b-212)	Ch7 (205b-208)
4/2	Policy: Welfare Reform	Ch. 11	Ch. 11	Ch. 12	Ch. 13		Ch7 (198b-208a)	Ch7 (195b-205a)
4/4	Policy: Social Ins.	Ch. 12	Ch. 12	Ch. 13	Ch. 14		Ch. 15 (428-445b)	Ch. 15 (429-445b)
4/9	Easter Holiday (No class)							
4/11	Exam 2							
4/16	Policy: Employment Policies	Ch. 13	Ch. 13	Ch. 14	Ch. 15		---	---
4/18	Policy: Education Reform	Ch. 14	Ch. 14	Ch. 15	Ch. 16		Ch. 6	Ch. 6
4/23	Mkt Based Alternatives & Poverty Alleviation	Blackboard	Blackboard	Blackboard	Blackboard		Blackboard	Blackboard
4/25	Wrap-Up							