Version of 7/19/2006

HLE-511/Sociology 296a: Fall 2006
Proseminar on Inequality and Social Policy

Wednesdays, 2:10 to 4 PM,
Room 160 of 124 Mt Auburn St (1st floor)

Primary Instructor: Christopher Jencks
Office: Taubman 414
Phone: 617-495-0546
e-mail: jencks@wjh.harvard.edu
Office hours: Tues. 1:30-3:30 or by appointment

Assistant: Paul Yoon
Office: Taubman 473
Phone: 617-495-3919
e-mail: paul_yoon@harvard.edu

All students interested in taking this course should attend the introductory meeting on Wednesday, September 13 from 2 to 4 PM in Room 160 of 124 Mt. Auburn Street (first floor). Although FAS classes do not officially begin until the following week, holding our first meeting on September 13 will allow us to skip the class scheduled for 2-4 PM on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

Prerequisites and requirements: The proseminar is a three-semester course designed primarily for doctoral students in Government and Social Policy, Sociology and Social Policy, and the NSF Multidisciplinary Program on Inequality and Social Policy. Space permitting, other students may take the proseminar if they have completed both a year of doctoral work and two semesters of statistics. Auditors may also take the proseminar if they have met these prerequisites and agree to do the reading, attend regularly, and complete the weekly written assignments. Auditors are not expected to write a research paper. **Both auditors and regular students need the permission of the instructor. See me before 5 PM on Thursday, September 21.**

The second semester of the proseminar will also meet on Wednesdays from 2:10 to 4 PM. The third semester will meet on Mondays from 2 to 4 PM next fall. These times have been negotiated to minimize conflict with other departments' requirements and they cannot be changed. Enrollment in the second and third semesters of the proseminar is limited to students who have taken the previous semester(s).

The Kennedy School designates the three semesters of the proseminar as HLE-511, HLE-512, and HLE-513. The first semester is also cross-listed as Sociology 296a. The second semester is cross-listed as Government 2340.

Instructors for the 2006-07 cycle:

Fall 2006: Christopher Jencks (with Jeffrey Liebman, Kennedy School).

Spring 2007: First half: Jencks (with Kathryn Edin, Visiting Professor from Penn).
Second half: Torben Iversen (Government).

Fall 2007: William Julius Wilson (Kennedy School and Sociology).

Academic objectives: The proseminar has three main academic objectives:

1. Helping students develop a more interdisciplinary view of the world.
2. Familiarizing students with some of the key policy choices that affect economic inequality in rich democracies.
3. Examining what we know and what we can learn about the causes and consequences of these policies.

Professional objectives: Students taking the proseminar for credit will be expected to do an original research paper. Those who take the third semester of the proseminar will present their paper to their classmates, Professor Wilson, and an outside commentator and will then revise it for submission to a scholarly journal.

Overview of the three semesters:

Fall 2006. After a brief overview, the fall semester will focus on the causes of labor market inequality and the effects of policies that seek to reduce such inequality. These policies include market regulation and coordination, unionization, wage subsidies, education, and immigration. We will read and discuss roughly five research papers each week. In most weeks you will also write a memo of 500 words or less about the readings or help lead the discussion of the readings. You should also plan on spending a significant amount of time this fall choose a topic for your research paper, reviewing the relevant literature, and identifying the evidence you plan to use, and getting permission to use or collect it.

Spring 2007. The first half of the spring semester, led by Kathryn Edin and Jencks, will focus on policies related to equal opportunity. Specifically, we will consider policies aimed at reducing the effects of race, parental SES, family structure, neighborhoods, and genes on children's economic prospects.

The second half of the spring semester, led by Torben Iversen, will examine the politics of redistribution in rich democracies from a comparative perspective.

Summer 2007. Those who want to get a June degree must submit their research paper by May 17 to be sure of getting a grade in time to graduate. Most students who plan to take the third semester of the proseminar spend a substantial part of the summer working on their paper. Your advisor can extend the May 17 deadline as late as July 15. Your advisor will try to set a due date that allows him to return your paper by August 15.

Students taking the third semester of the proseminar must distribute their paper at least two weeks before their presentation date. **Revised papers may therefore be due as early as September 1.** Those with early presentation dates should plan on making final revisions between August 15 and September 1. Your presentation date coincides with the date on which your commentator is scheduled to speak in the Monday seminar, so it cannot be changed.

Fall 2007. The third semester of the proseminar focuses on preparing your paper for submission to a scholarly journal. You will all be paired with a speaker from the Monday seminar, who will read and comment on your paper. Each presentation will begin with a 20 minutes presentation of your findings, followed by up to 20 minutes of comments from the outside speaker and 20 minutes of open discussion. You are also be expected to attend your classmates' presentations and provide written comments on their papers prior to their presentations.

The second hour of each seminar will focus on the outside speaker's paper. You will be expected to comment on an outside speaker's paper at some point during the fall.

Organization of this fall's seminar:

In addition to our first meeting, we have twelve regular classes. Each of you will help lead two classes and will write eight short memos about the week's readings.

Memos are due on the Monday before class. All memos should be e-mailed to the entire class. Since the main purpose of the memos is to improve the quality of class discussion, late memos will not count.

Since some people cannot get attachments at home, **please do not distribute your memo as an attachment. Instead, copy and paste what you have written into an e-mail message.**

Subject line: Many people, including me, use their e-mail filter to keep track of class memos. To make this possible, everyone must use the same "Subject" line. This line should read, "511 Memo for [insert the date of the class -- *not* the date on which you are writing]. If you use some other subject line, my filter will not identify your memo as class-related, and you may not get credit for having written it. So please be compulsive.

Class discussion: Classes will start promptly at 2:10. We will devote the first 60 minutes to the assigned readings. I will usually designate two students to start each week's discussion. Discussion leaders should meet to plan this part of the class. You should prepare a one page outline identifying the issues you think the class should discuss and bring copies for everyone to class. I may add to your list. You should keep your initial comments to 5 minutes.

Both memos and class discussion of the readings should cover at least two issues:

1. Are there any important methodological questions about the validity of the empirical claims made in the assigned papers? If so, which ones are most important?

2. Do the assigned papers have any important policy implications, either explicit or implicit. Under what conditions, if any, are these implications valid?

In addition to organizing the discussion of methods and policy, discussion leaders should consider whether the memos suggest important disciplinary differences in working assumptions about the world that would repay discussion. Finally, d**iscussion leaders are also responsible for bringing cookies.** If you keep your receipt, Pam Metz will reimburse you.

During the second half of each class I will typically spend about 25 minutes on research and policy issues that fall under the topic for the week but are not covered in the readings or were not fully discussed in the first hour. I will spend the last 25 minutes of each class providing background on the readings for the next class. We will break promptly at 4PM so that interested students can attend the Labor seminar in the Economics Department.

Copies of readings: Most of the readings are available on a CD in the Kennedy School library. **You can make one (1) copy of this CD for your own use. Alternatively, you can copy its contents directly onto your laptop if you have one. Reproducing the CD for any other purpose is illegal.**

The CD contains both the required and recommended readings. You should read all the required papers. **You should also read at least the abstract of each recommended paper and take it into account in your memo if it seems relevant.**

The following books are ***not*** on the CD and should be bought from Amazon:

George Borjas, *Heaven's Door,* Princeton 1999.

Elliot Liebow, *Tally's Corner,* Little Brown, 1967.

You may also want to buy:

John Kingdon, *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies* (**Second edition**, 1996).

Grades: Half your fall grade will be based on your weekly memos. The other half will be based on your research proposal and you literature review.

Research paper

The research paper must throw new light on some policy question. It can use either quantitative or qualitative data. The proposal should be explicit about what policy question you hope your work will help answer.

You can also submit this paper in another class, but you must tell me and the other instructor that you are doing this. You can also write your paper jointly with another student in this class, but ***not*** with another student in another class.

Topic selection is the most challenging part of paper-writing. You should start thinking about possible topics today. Identify several policy-relevant questions that you think could hold your attention for two years. Then identify the empirical claims made in the debates surrounding these questions:

– What empirical assumption lead people to think that this a problem that policy should address and could ameliorate?

-- What effects would proposed solutions be likely to have?

-- What are the political obstacles to adopting and implementing these solutions?

Then do some more reading on each possible topic to see what has already been done, what questions have been answered convincingly, what questions have been addressed but not answered to your satisfaction, and what questions have not been studied at all. As you read, try to identify researchable questions in each area.

Discuss these questions with relevant faculty members and graduate students at Harvard and elsewhere. If you need suggestions about people to see, send me an e-mail. Do not limit yourself to people in your department. Make an appointment to see me as well.

Rank the research questions you have identified using several criteria:

1. How interesting would this be to learn about?
2. How much would answering this question contribute to making the world a better place?
3. How likely is it that you could do something over the next two years that would help answer this question?

Important topics are often neglected because no one can figure out how to investigate them fruitfully. If that turns out to be true of your first topic, turn to the next one on your list. You should not settle on a topic until you have done some reading, have a question that you think research can help answer, and have some idea what evidence you can gather to answer it. *Avoiding premature closure will save you a lot of grief later.*

I will schedule several meetings to discuss the papers in more detail. Based on past experience, the time is likely to be Monday from 2 to 3.

Paper advisors: Once you have selected a topic, Professors Iversen, Liebman, and I will divide them up so that you have a single advisor throughout the year. If you have preferences, let me know. (Professor Wilson will be away this spring, so he will not be advising papers this year, but you should feel free to consult him before he leaves.)

Paper deadlines:

Tuesday, Oct 17: Send me a brief description of **two or more** possible topics and make an appointment to discuss them with me.

Friday, Nov 17: Send me your tentative paper topic. Include a paragraph about previous work on the question, a paragraph about what you think you can add to current knowledge about the question, and a description of the evidence you plan to use. If you plan to analyze existing data, you should have figured out whether you can get access to it, whether it really contains the information you need, and whether it includes enough cases with the right characteristics to answer the question that interests you.

Tuesday, Dec 5: Send everyone in the seminar a sentence describing your paper topic.

Wednesday, Dec 20: Submit Parts 1 and 2 of your paper. Part 1 should be a short introduction (under 1000 words) that describes the question you propose to answer, explains why it is relevant to public policy, and describes the evidence you will use to investigate it. Part 2 should be a literature review of no more than 3000 words. The goal of the literature review is not to show that you have read everything that is relevant to your topic but to describe what we know *about the specific empirical question* you will try to answer. If your literature review turns up contradictory results, you should suggest explanations for the differences rather than just reporting their existence.

Before you start to write, read Jane Mansbridge, "A Few Simple Rules of Style for Graduate Students," which is on the course CD.

Jan 17, 2007: Submit a preliminary description of your data. For quantitative papers this means a description of the sample and variables plus descriptive statistics. For qualitative papers it means having done a few interviews and describing what you learned.

May 17, 2007: First draft due. This draft should explain why your empirical question is important for public policy. The literature review should by now be shorter. If you write more than ten pages before getting to your methods and data, go back and compress.

All papers should be submitted electronically. If your advisor also wants a paper copy, submit one of those as well.

Form and style for papers:

All papers should be submitted electronically. If your advisor also wants a paper copy, you should provide it as well.

Length: Papers should not exceed 15,000 words, excluding appendices.

Format. Double space and use 1.25 inch margins, so that readers have plenty of room to scribble comments on their paper copy. **Don't forget to paginate paper so that your reader's comments can refer to a specific page.**

Abstract. Your paper should have an abstract that says what its main point is. Remember that potential readers are just like you: they do not have time to read most of what comes their way, even if it is on a topic that interests them. They need to know whether your paper promises to tell them something they ***really*** want to know about. If you can't convince them of that in your abstract, you paper will go in the recycle bin.

File names. Whenever you send someone an electronic file, remember that once your file is on their computer, its file name needs to tell them what it contains. Every year I get at least half a dozen files called "paper" or "seminar paper." Almost every year I delete at least one of these files, thinking it is a duplicate. **File names should start with your last name, include a short title, and the submission date** ("Wolfers divorce 9-9-99").

Charts and tables. Excel charts and tables should be pasted into your manuscript, *not* sent as separate Excel files. Pasting charts and tables is more trouble for you but less trouble for everyone else. The best way to paste Excel tables and charts is usually to copy them in Excel, go to your Word document, and use "Edit," "Paste Special," and "Picture." You should print a clean copy of your paper and look it over before submitting it, to be sure that this process has worked.

You can also simplify subsequent revisions of your paper by *not* including the number of each table or figure in the Excel picture that you paste into your Word file. Instead, type the heading that gives the current number of the table or chart directly into the Word document and then paste the picture immediately below this heading. Then when you have to renumber charts and tables you will not have to go back to the Excel file.

Spell checker and table checking. If you want other people to read your paper carefully, you have to convey the impression that you have read it carefully yourself. Handing in a paper that you have not bothered to spell checked creates the opposite impression. If your reader knows that you don't care, why should he or she care either?

You should also check charts and tables to be sure that your numbers look reasonable. Including numbers that cannot possibly be correct – means and standard deviations that defy common sense, for example -- leaves the reader thinking that you either don't know or don't care whether your empirical work is correct. That is the road to a job selling aluminum siding. The word "sloppy" in a letter of recommendation, even when preceded by a word like "clever," is the kiss of death.

Fall 2006 Reading List

SEPT 13: Organizational meeting

Everyone should read:

1. Richard Freeman, *When Earnings Diverge: Causes, Consequences, and Cures for the New Inequality in the U.S.* National Policy Association, 1997, pp1-66.
2. François Bourguignon and Christian Morrison, "Inequality among World Citizens," *American Economic Review* (Sept 2002) 92:727-44.

If you have not had a course in labor economics, you should also read:

3. Ronald Ehrenberg and Robert Smith, *Modern Labor Economics*, Chs. 2, 3, and 11.

Class discussion: Facts in search of explanations

"Unease about Economic Inequality," *The Public Perspective* (April/May 1999) p11.

Robert Blendon, "The 60s and the 90s," *Brookings Review* (Spring 1999) 17(2):14-17.

Everett Ladd and Carlyn Bowman, *Attitudes Towards Economic Inequality* (American Enterprise Institute 1998), selected tables.

SEPT 20: How Much Does Social Science Affect Public Policy?

1. John Kingdon, *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies* (Little, Brown, **Second edition**, 1996), pp1-89 and 165-95.
2. Martin Feldstein, "How the CEA Advises Presidents" *Challenge* (Nov/Dec 1989) pp51-55.
3. Kent Weaver, *Ending Welfare as We Know It* (Brookings, 2000) pp135-68, 413-21.
4. *The Economist*, "The Avuncular State" April 8, 2006, pp67-69.
5. Christopher Jencks, *Rethinking Social Policy* (Harper Collins, 1992) pp1-23.
6. Peter Rossi, "The Iron Law of Evaluation and Other Metallic Rules" in Joann Miller and Michael Lewis (eds.), *Research in Social Problems and Public Policy* (1987) 4:3-20.
7. Mark Lipsey and David Wilson, "The Efficacy of Psychological, Educational, and Behavioral Treatment: Confirmation from Meta-Analysis," *American Psychologist* (Dec. 1993) 48:1181-1209.

Also recommended:

J. Anthony Lukas, "Harvard's Kennedy School: Is Competence Enough?" New York *Times* Magazine, March 12, 1989.

Martin Rein and Christopher Winship, "Policy Entrepreneurs and the Academic Establishment: Truth and Values in Social Controversies," in Elliot White (ed.), *Intelligence, Political Inequality, and Public Policy* (Praeger, 1997) pp17-49.

SEPT 27: Disciplinary Assumptions about Homo Sapiens

1. Gary Becker, "The Economic Way of Looking at Life." Nobel Lecture, Dec 9, 1992, 20 pages.
2. Joseph Henrich et al. "In Search of *Homo Economicus*: Behavioral Experiments in 15 Small-Scale Societies," *American Economic Review* (May 2001) 91:73-78.
3. Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, "Is Equality Passé? Homo Reciprocans and the Future of Egalitarian Politics," *Boston Review* (Jan 1999) 23(6).
4. Michèle Lamont, *The Dignity of Working Men* (Harvard, 2000) pp1-54 (notes on 269-93).
5. Robert Dahl, *Who Governs?* (Yale, 1961) pp 223-28.
6. Theda Skocpol, *The Missing Middle* (Norton, 2000) pp22-58 (notes on pp175-81).
7. Daniel Gilbert, *Stumbling on Happiness* (Knopf, 2006), pp3-25, 75-108, 169-70, 189-92 and 223-33 (notes on pp239-43, 246-50, 259, 262, and 266-67).

Also recommended:

Robert Kurzban and Daniel Houser, "Experiments Investigating Cooperative Types in Humans: A Complement to Evolutionary Theory and Simulations." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* (Feb 1, 2005) 102:1803–07.

You need not read recommended papers in full but you should read the abstracts. These papers are all on the course CD.

OCT 4: Is Economic Inequality Unjust?

1. Robert Nozick, *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (Basic Books, 1971) pp 149-64.
2. John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Harvard, 1971) pp 3-17 and marked passages on pp42-43, 60-62, 65, 72-75, 78, 120, 126-27, 136-37, 142-43, 150-53, 178-79, 201-08, 244 and 302-03.
3. Jane Mansbridge, "Notes on Rawls."
4. Norman Frohlich, Joe Oppenheimer, and Cheryl Eavey, "Laboratory Results on Rawls's Distributive Justice," *British Journal of Political Science* (Jan 1987) 17:1-21.
5. Peter Singer, "The Singer Solution to World Poverty," NY *Times* Magazine (Sept 9, 1999) pp60-63.

Also recommended:

David Miller, "Distributive Justice: What the People Think," *Ethics* (April 1992) 102:555-93.

OCT 11: Assessing the Costs and Benefits of Economic Inequality

1. Martin Feldstein, "Income Inequality and Poverty" (NBER, 1998, w6670).
2. Branko Milanovic, "Why We Do All Care about Inequality (But Are Loath to Admit It)." (World Bank, Oct. 8, 2003) 9 pages.
3. Gary Burtless and Christopher Jencks, "American Inequality and Its Consequences," in Henry Aaron et al. (eds.), *Agenda for the Nation* (Brookings 2003) pp 61-108.
4. Michael Hout, "Money and Morale: What Growing Inequality is Doing to Americans' Views of Themselves and Others." (Berkeley: Survey Research Center 2003) 55 pages.
5. Larry Bartels et al. "Inequality and American Governance," in Lawrence Jacobs and Theda Skocpol (eds.) *Inequality and American Democracy: What We Know and What We Need to Learn* (Russell Sage, 2005) pp88-155.

Also recommended:

Kristen Forbes, "A Reassessment of the Relationship Between Inequality and Growth" *American Economic Review* (Sept 2000) 90:869-87.

Tuesday, Oct 17: Send me a brief description of **two or more** possible topics and make an appointment to discuss them with me.

OCT 18: Poverty and Culture: What Causes What?

1. Elliot Liebow, *Tally's Corner* (Little Brown, 1967).
2. Lee Rainwater, "Class, Culture, Poverty, and Welfare" (1989) pp9-27.
3. Ann Swidler, "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies" *American Sociological Review* (April 1986) 51:273-86.
4. Michèle Lamont and Mario Luis Small, "How Culture Matters for Poverty: Thickening Our Understanding" (April 2006) 30 pages. University of Michigan, National Poverty Center, http://www.npc.umich.edu/publications/working_papers/

Also recommended:

Oscar Lewis, "The Culture of Poverty" in Daniel Patrick Moynihan (ed) *On Understanding Poverty* (Basic Books, 1968) pp187-200.

Lawrence Mead, *The New Politics of Poverty* (Harper Collins, 1992) p133-184.

Katherine Newman, *No Shame in My Game* (Knopf, 1999) pp23-36, 86-121, and 189-229.

OCT 25: Earnings Inequality: What Do Employers Value?

1. Mitchell Duneier, "Andrea's Dream," *Chicago Tribune*, Dec 1994, pp1-36, plus attached legal memo with Andrea's corrections.
2. "Making the Cut," "AFQT sample questions," "Varieties of Mental Tests."
3. William Johnson and Derek Neal, "Basic Skills and the Black-White Earnings Gap," in Jencks and Meredith Phillips, eds. *The Black-White Test Score Gap*, Brookings (1998), pp480-97.
4. Samuel Bowles, Herbert Gintis, and Melissa Osborne. "The Determinants of Earnings: Skills, Preferences, and Schooling." *Journal of Economic Literature* (Dec 2001) 39:1137-76.
5. James Heckman, "Policies that Foster Human Capital." *Research in Economics* (2000) pp3-56.
6. David Autor, Lawrence Katz, and Melissa Kearney, "The Polarization of the US Labor Market," *American Economic Review* (May 2006) 96:189-94. For a more detailed analysis see NBER w11627.

Also recommended:

David Autor, Frank Levy, and Richard Murnane, "The Skill Content of Recent Technological Change," *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* (Nov 2003) 118: 1279-1334.

NOV 1: The Core Economic Model (Jeff Liebman)

1. Richard Freeman and Lawrence Katz, "Rising Wage Inequality: The United States vs. Other Advanced Countries," in Richard Freeman, ed. *Working Under Different Rules* (Russell Sage, 1994) pp29-62.
2. David Card and John E. DiNardo, "Skill Biased Technological Change and Rising Wage Inequality: Some Problems and Puzzles." *Journal of Labor Economics* (Oct 2002) 20:733-83.
3. Douglas Hibbs and Hakan Locking, "Wage Dispersion and Productive Efficiency: Evidence for Sweden," *Journal of Labor Economics* (2000) 18(4): 755-82.
4. David Card and Richard Freeman (eds.) *Small Differences That Matter: Labor Markets and Income Maintenance in Canada and the U.S.* (University of Chicago, 1993) pp1-19.

Also recommended:

Claudia Goldin and Robert Margo, "The Great Compression: The Wage Structure in the United States at Mid-Century," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* (Feb 1992) 107:1-34.

Michael Handel, "Skills Mismatch in the Labor Market?" *Annual Review of Sociology* (2003) 29:135-65.

NOV 8: The minimum wage, wage subsidies, traditional cash & in-kind transfers, and wealth transfers (Jeff Liebman)

1. David Lee, "Wage Inequality in the United States during the 1980s: Rising Dispersion or Falling Minimum Wage?" *Quarterly Journal of Economics* (Aug. 1999) 114:977-1023.
2. David Neumark, "Raising Incomes by Mandating Higher Wages." *NBER Reporter* (Fall 2002), pp 5-9.
3. John Kennan, "The Elusive Effects of the Minimum Wage," *Journal of Economic Literature* (Dec. 1995) 33:1949-65.
4. Jeffrey Liebman, "The Impact of the Earned Income Tax Credit on Incentives and Income Distribution" in James Poterba (ed.) *Tax Policy and the Economy* (MIT Press, 1998) 12:83-119.
5. David Card and Dean R. Hyslop, "Estimating the Effects of a Time-Limited Earnings Subsidy for Welfare Leavers (NBER 2004, w10647).
6. Robert Moffitt, "Economic Effects of Means-Tested Transfers in the U.S." (NBER, 2002, w8730).
7. Browne, Robert, "The Economic Case for Reparations to Black America," *American Economic Review* (May 1972) 62:39-46.
8. Bruce Ackerman and Anne Alstott, *The Stakeholder Society* (Yale, 1999) pp1-17.

Also recommended

Christopher Howard, *The Hidden Welfare State: Tax Expenditures and Social Policy,* (Princeton, 1997) pp64-74 and 139-60 (on the politics of the EITC).

John Myles and Paul Pierson, "Friedman's Revenge: The Reform of 'Liberal Welfare States in Canada and the United States," *Politics and Society* (Dec 1997) 25:443-72.

NOV 15: Regulating the Labor Market (Jencks)

The politics of regulation

1. Gösta Esping-Andersen, *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* (Princeton, 1990) pp141-90.
2. Torben Iversen and David Soskice, "Distribution and Redistribution: The Shadow of the 19th Century" (Harvard Inequality Seminar, March 6, 2006).

Economic effects of coordination and regulation

3. David Card, Thomas Lemieux, and Craig Riddell, "Unionization and Wage Inequality: A Comparative Study of the US, the UK, and Canada" (NBER 2003 w9473).
4. Michael Wallerstein, "Wage-Setting Institutions and Pay: Inequality in Advanced Industrial Societies," *American Journal of Political Science* (July 1999) 43:649-80.
5. Torben Iversen and Anne Wren, "Equality, Employment, and Budgetary Restraint: The Trilemma of the Service Economy," *World Politics* (July 1998) 50:507-46.
6. Olivier Blanchard and Justin Wolfers, "The Role of Shocks and Institutions in the Rise of European Unemployment: The Aggregate Evidence." *Economic Journal* (March 2000) 110 (462): C1-C33.
7. "Union Scale for Motor-Truck Drivers, Boston, July 1, 1953."

Also recommended:

Peter Swenson, "Bringing Capital Back In, or Social Democracy Reconsidered: Employer Power, Cross-Class Alliances, and Centralization of Industrial Relations in Denmark and Sweden." *World Politics* (July 1991) 43:513-45.

Anders Björklund and Richard Freeman, "Generating Equality and Eliminating Poverty, The Swedish Way," in Richard Freeman et al. (eds.) *The Welfare State in Transition: Reforming the Swedish Model* (University of Chicago, 1997) pp33-78.

Olivier Blanchard, "European Unemployment: The Evolution of Facts and Ideas" (NBER, 2005, w11750).

FRIDAY, Nov 17: SEND ME YOUR PAPER TOPIC. See page 6 of the syllabus for details on what you should include.

NOV 22: Could redistributing school resources equalize outcomes?

School expenditures

1. Thomas Downes and David Figlio, “Economic Inequality and the Provision of Schooling,” *FRBNY Economic Policy Review* (Sept 1999) pp 99-110.
2. Eric Hanushek, “The Failure of Input-Based Schooling Policies,” *Economic Journal* (Feb 2003) 113:F64-F98. Also available as NBER wp9040.
3. Ludger Wöessman, “Schooling resources, educational institutions and student performance: the international evidence,” *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* (2003) 65(2):117-70.

Class size

4. Alan Krueger, “Experimental Estimates of Education Production Functions,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* (May 1999) 114:497-532.
5. Caroline Hoxby, “Effects of Class Size on Student Achievement: New Evidence from Population Variation,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* (Nov 2000) 115:1239-85.
6. Hanushek, Eric. “Some findings from an independent investigation of the Tennessee STAR experiment and from other investigations of class size effects.” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* (Summer 1999) 21:143-63.

Also recommended:

Caroline Hoxby, “All school finance equalizations are not created equal,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* (2001) 116:1189-1231.

Barbara Nye, Larry Hedges, and Spyros. Konstantopoulos, “The long-term effects of small classes: A five-year follow-up of the Tennessee class size experiment,” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* (Summer 1999) 21:127-42.

Alan Krueger, “Economic Considerations and Class Size,” *Economic Journal* (Feb 2003) 113:34-63.

Comments on these readings are due as usual on Monday, Nov. 20, but there will be no class on Nov 22.

Comments on the readings for Nov 29 are due as usual on Monday, Nov 27.

We will discuss the readings for both Nov 22 and Nov 29 on the 29th.

NOV 29: Could equalizing school quality make test scores more equal?

The search for more effective teachers

1. Jonah E. Rockoff, “The Impact of Individual Teachers on Student Achievement: Evidence from Panel Data,” *American Economic Review* (May 2004) 94:247-253.
2. Eric A. Hanushek et al., “The Market for Teacher Quality” (NBER, 2005, w11154).
3. Brian Jacob and Lars Lefgren. “Principals as Agents: Subjective Performance Measurement in Education.” (NBER, 2005, 11463).

Also recommended:

Sean Corcoran, William Evans, and Robert Schwab, “Changing Labor-Market Opportunities for Women and the Quality of Teachers, 1957-2000,” *American Economic Review* (May 2004) 94:230-235.

Competition and accountability

4. John Chubb and Terry Moe, *Politics, Markets, and America’s Schools* (Brookings, 1990) pp1-25 and 215-229 (notes on pp 278-83 and 308-10)**.**
5. Eric Hanushek and Margaret Raymond. “Does School Accountability Lead to Improved Student Performance?” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* (Spring 2005) 24:297-327
6. David Figlio and Cecilia Rouse, “Do Accountability and Voucher Threats Improve Low-Performing Schools?” (NBER, 2005, w11597).

Also recommended:

Eric Hanushek, John Kain, Steven Rivkin, and Gregory Branch, “Charter School Quality and Parental Decision Making With School Choice” (NBER, 2005, w11252).

DEC 5 (Tuesday): Send everyone in the seminar a one sentence description of your paper.

DEC 6: Would equalizing time spent in school make earnings more equal?

Those who have not taken any labor economics should read:

Ronald Ehrenberg and Robert Smith. *Modern Labor Economics*, Chapter 9, (Investments in Human Capital).

Is the correlation of schooling with earnings causal?

1. Card & Krueger, Figure 5-2 (on "sheepskin effects")
2. Philip Oreopoulos, "Do Dropouts Drop Out Too Soon? International Evidence From Changes in School-Leaving Laws" (NBER, 2003, w10115), *AER* (forthcoming).
3. Orley Ashenfelter and Cecilia Rouse, "Schooling, Intelligence and Income in America," in Kenneth Arrow et al. (eds.) *Meritocracy in America* (Princeton, 2000) pp89-117.

Who would gain most from universal free early childhood education?

4. Ann Witte and Marisol Trowbridge, "The Structure of Early Care and Education in the United States: Historical Evolution and International Comparisons," (NBER, 2004, w10931).
5. Eliana Garces, Duncan Thomas, and Janet Currie, "Longer-Term Effects of Headstart," *American Economic Review* (Sept 2000) 92:999-1012.
6. Michael Baker, Jonathan Gruber, and Kevin Milligan, "Universal Childcare, Maternal Labor Supply, and Family Well-Being" (NBER, 2005, w11832).

How much can we increase college enrollment among the disadvantaged?

7. Thomas Kane, *The Price of Admission*, Brookings (Brookings, 1999) pp88-127.
8. Susan Dynarski, "Building the Stock of College Educated Labor" (NBER, 2005, w11604).
9. Pell Application Form.

Also recommended:

Jens Ludwig and Douglas Miller, "Does Head Start Improve Children's Life Chances? Evidence from a Regression Discontinuity Design" (NBER, 2005, w11702)..

James Heckman and Paul LaFontaine, "Bias Corrected Estimates of GED Returns" (NBER, 2006, w12018).

David Card, "The Causal Effect of Education on Earnings" in Orley Ashenfelter and Card, eds. *Handbook of Labor Economics* (Elsevier, 1999), Vol 3A, pp1801-63.

DEC 13: Immigration and Inequality

1. David Card. "The Impact of the Mariel Boatlift on the Miami Labor Market," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* (Jan 1990) 43:245-57.
2. George Borjas, *Heaven's Door: Immigration Policy and the American Economy* (Princeton, 1999) pp3-86, 127-46, 189-212**.**
3. Robert Lerman, "US Wage-Inequality Trends and Recent Immigration," *American Economic Review* (May 1999) 89:23-28.
4. Christopher Jencks. "Who Should Get In?" *New York Review of Books* (Nov 29 and Dec. 20, 2001).
5. James P. Smith, "Assimilation Across the Latino Generations," *American Economic Review* (May 2003) 93:315-19.
6. Victor Davis Hanson, "The Universe of the Illegal Alien" (Washington: Center for Immigration Studies Backgrounder, June 2003) pp1-7.
7. Roger Lowenstein, "The Immigration Equation," The New York *Times* Magazine (July 9, 2006) pp36-43 and 69-71.

Also recommended:

George Borjas: "The Labor Demand Curve *Is* Downward Sloping: Reexamining the Impact of Immigration on the Labor Market" *Quarterly Journal of Economics* (Nov 2003) 118:1335-74.

DEC 20: Submit Parts 1 and 2 of your paper. See page 6 of the syllabus for what this should include.

Before you start to write, read Jane Mansbridge, "A Few Simple Rules of Style for Graduate Students," which is on the course CD.

JAN 17: Submit Part 3 of your paper, which should provide descriptive information about your data.