

Claremont Graduate University
Transdisciplinary Studies Program
TNDY 405 Wealth, Poverty and Inequality
Fall 2014

Contact Information

Course Instructor: Melissa Rogers

Melissa Rogers is an Assistant Professor in Comparative Politics in the Department of Politics and Policy. Her specialties are the political economy of inequality, comparative political institutions, Latin American politics, and government finance.

Office: McManus 228

E-mail: Melissa.rogers@cgu.edu

In-person Office Hours: Wednesday 11am-12pm; Thursday 11am-12pm

Skype Hours by appointment

Teaching Assistant:

Dong-wook Lee, Politics and Policy

E-mail: dong-wook.lee@cgu.edu

Course Schedule

Semester start/end dates: September

Meeting day, time: Thursday 1-4pm

Course Location: Stauffer 106

Course Description

Income inequality is an important and complex issue that faces every society. The challenge of managing inequality from a policy perspective is not merely a political concern, but one that is fundamentally economic, psychological, sociological, historical, philosophical, and geographic in nature. In this proposed trans-disciplinary course, students will engage the diverse literature on income inequality to develop a nuanced understanding of the issue and, ultimately, develop a policy proposal to manage rising income inequality with a multifaceted approach.

Disciplinary Approaches

Political/Philosophical: The study of politics is the study of distribution. Income inequality is the philosophical and ideological basis for competition in democratic politics throughout the world. All democratic party-systems are, to varying extents, structured around class interests and, related to this, the role of government in influencing the distributive effects of economic markets. In the proposed class we will examine the distributive nature of political conflict around the world, with particular focus on the United States in comparative perspective, to understand what leads to greater or lesser income inequality. In these discussions, we will address how political institutions influence the salience of inequality and the tools used by governments to address distributive conflict.

Economic: Classic models of the effects of inequality on politics come from the field of economics. In early work using stark formalizations, increasing income inequality is shown to drive preferences for increased government spending and redistribution. We will look at these models and subsequent work that has questioned the validity of these theories. We will also learn how inequality is calculated using economic statistics, the variance in these measures, and their theoretical implications. Finally, we will analyze inequality as an independent variable that may influence other important economic outcomes, such as growth and development.

Psychological: Inequality is not a simple distributive concern, but one that is strongly influenced by psychology and culture. Inequality is known to have psychological effects on those who experience poverty or perceived economic or political injustice. Inequality also influences the psychology and sociology of those at the higher ends of the income spectrum, including shaping beliefs about the distribution of skills, merit, and effort in society. These psychological and cognitive effects are inseparable from political preferences on redistributive policy and the two will be examined in tandem.

Historical: The United States has low government redistribution and high income inequality in comparison with other industrialized countries. The reasons for this difference between the USA and other high-income countries cannot be simply explained by ideological exceptionalism amongst Americans. Rather, U.S. policy toward income inequality is a complex process that is not easily understandable without a view to historical economic and political development. Similarly, European approaches to inequality reflect historical development that has a path-dependent effect on current political debate.

Sociological/Geo-Spatial: Inequality is not only caused by economic or political forces, but is affected by choices made by individuals. A significant body of literature in sociology suggests that many individuals prefer to live and work in relatively homogenous groups, whether informed by political, racial, ethnic, or income differences. We will investigate these sociological and related psychological bases for “otherness.” These groupings inform citizen preferences on politics and, along with other socio-demographic factors, has resulted in a process of geographic self-sorting that influences political representation based on geographic representation, and has contributed to dramatic political polarization in the United States.

Background Preparations (Prerequisites)

None. Understanding of basic economic principles is helpful but not required.

Student Learning Outcomes:

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

1. Articulate the relevance of inequality to political, social, and economic systems.
2. Discuss the varied concepts and measurement of inequality.
3. Analyze the relationships between politics, economics, social structure, public policy, and inequality.
4. Evaluate theories of the political causes and outcomes of income inequality.
5. Use the tools of social science research to evaluate the prominent literature on the income inequality.

Texts and Journal References

Students are expected to check the ISBN or doi number for each reference to ensure the intended edition is studied.

Required: Stiglitz, Joseph. 2013. *The Price of Inequality: How Today's Divided Society Endangers Our Future*. W.W. Norton and Company.

Grusky, David and Sonya Szeleyni, editors. *The Inequality Reader: Contemporary and Foundational Readings in Race, Class, and Gender*. Westview Press.

Milanovic. Branco. 2012. *The Haves and Have Nots*. Basic Books.

All other readings are available on Sakai

Course Requirements & Assignments:

Short Papers: All students will write three 3-4 page discussion papers on the topic of the class that week. These papers should be an analytical discussion of how you would incorporate the concepts of that week to your field and how you might incorporate this research into your own research. Each week that a student writes a paper, he or she should bring 2 discussion questions to share with the class. Students will sign up in the first or second week of class.

Midterm: the midterm exam will cover the macro concepts addressed in the first half of the course, especially defining, measuring and studying inequality from different research perspectives. The structure will be 3 essay questions. Students will have three hours to complete the exam.

Course participation: Two students each week will bring in three substantive discussion questions for the week's readings. These students will present the questions after my introduction to the class. After reading the questions, students will break up into groups of two to discuss the questions and create additional questions to discuss throughout the class period. ALL students will be expected to participate in the creation and discussion of these questions. Student participation is 20% of the course grade—do not sit quietly!

Collaborative Project: The course is built around the premise that income inequality is an issue of relevance to all of the social sciences. Accordingly, students will form multi-disciplinary teams and develop policy proposals to address either 1) the origins of inequality; or 2) the effects of inequality on societal outcomes. Depending on the composition and interest of the teams, these policy proposals can target interventions to reduce inequality through political, economic, or sociological/psychological transformation, or more specific policies to address differential opportunity structures in specific policy areas such as education, employment, or health policy.

<i>Class Element</i>	<i>Points Allocated</i>	<i>Weight</i>
<i>Participation in class & outside</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>20%</i>
<i>Collaborative Project</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>25%</i>
<i>Midterm</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>25%</i>
<i>Papers</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>30%</i>

I will make every effort to return to you each assignment with feedback within 7 days.

Grading

Your grade will be calculated using the following scale. Grades with plus or minus designations are at the professor's discretion.

<i>Letter Grade</i>	<i>Grade Point</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Learning Outcome</i>
<i>A</i>	<i>4.0</i>	<i>Complete mastery of course material and additional insight beyond course material</i>	<i>Insightful</i>
<i>B</i>	<i>3.0</i>	<i>Complete mastery of course material</i>	<i>Proficient</i>
<i>C</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>Gaps in mastery of course material; not at level expected by the program</i>	<i>Developing</i>
<i>U</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<i>Ineffective</i>

Continual matriculation at CGU requires a minimum grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 in all coursework taken at CGU. Students may not have more than two incompletes. Details of the policy are found on the Student Services webpage (<http://www.cgu.edu/pages/5081.asp>).

Important Dates

Midterm: October 16th

Discussion Papers: Three 3-page discussion papers (sign up sheet distributed in first two weeks of class)

Collaborative Assignment: topic sign up sheet distributed in first two weeks of class; Policy proposal and Presentations due December 11th

T-course Evaluation Rubric

Transdisciplinary Studies Course Rubric

Course: _____ Student Name: _____ Date: _____

	1 Emerging	2 Developing	3 Proficient	4 Insightful
Able to present material clearly, cogently and concisely in class discussion, oral presentations and written work in ways that are accessible to students in other disciplines	Inappropriate to audience Not original Inaccurate Unclear Ineffective	Not entirely appropriate for audience Somewhat original Somewhat inaccurate Somewhat clear Somewhat effective	Appropriate for audience Original Accurate Clear Effective	Highly appropriate for audience Innovative Accurate and highly sophisticated Extremely effective
Able to demonstrate knowledge of scholarship in their field(s) (often called a "literature review") with emphasis on relevance to transdisciplinary concepts	Illogical Ineffective Inaccurately stated Poor management of project Poorly structured	Somewhat logical Somewhat effective Weakly stated Adequate management of project Reasonably structured	Logical Effective Accurately stated Good management of project Well structured	Very logical Extremely effective Clearly and precisely stated Highly sophisticated management of project Strongly structured
Able to address a problem in collaboration with classmates across the disciplines, producing results beyond what a single disciplinary approach would produce	Does not work well with others Poor integration of multiple disciplinary methods Lacking perspective	Works somewhat well with others Reasonable integration of multiple disciplinary methods Limited perspective	Works well with others Integrates multiple disciplinary methods Wide-reaching perspective	Works extremely well with others Excellent integration of multiple disciplinary methods Unique perspective
Able to identify and describe the synthesis of approaches from multiple disciplines as well as contributions to individual disciplines resulting from a transdisciplinary mode of inquiry	Unable to describe synthesis of approaches Unable to describe disciplinary contributions Unable to explain transdisciplinary approach	Somewhat able to describe synthesis of approaches Somewhat able to describe disciplinary contributions Somewhat able to explain transdisciplinary approach	Able to describe synthesis of approaches Able to describe disciplinary contributions Able to explain transdisciplinary approach	Describes synthesis of approaches in a sophisticated manner Describes and appreciates disciplinary contributions Integrates transdisciplinarity into personal research

Total Score: _____

Course Policies:

The CGU institutional policies apply to each course offered at CGU. A few are detailed in the space below. Students are encouraged to review the student handbook for the program as well as the policy documentation within the bulletin and on the Registrar's pages (<http://bulletin.cgu.edu/> <http://www.cgu.edu/pages/179.asp>).

Attendance

Students are expected to attend all classes. Students who are unable to attend class must seek permission for an excused absence from the course director or teaching assistant. Unapproved absences or late attendance for three or more classes may result in a lower grade or an "incomplete" for the course. If a student has to miss a class, he or she should arrange to get notes from a fellow student and is strongly encouraged to meet with the teaching assistant to obtain the missed material. Missed extra-credit quizzes and papers will not be available for re-taking.

Scientific and Professional Ethics

The work you do in this course must be your own. Feel free to build on, react to, criticize, and analyze the ideas of others but, when you do, make it known whose ideas you are working with. You must explicitly acknowledge when your work builds on someone else's ideas, including

ideas of classmates, professors, and authors you read. If you ever have questions about drawing the line between others' work and your own, ask the course professor who will give you guidance. Exams must be completed independently. Any collaboration on answers to exams, unless expressly permitted, may result in an automatic failing grade and possible expulsion from the Program. *Additional information on CGU academic honesty is available on the Student Services webpage (<http://www.cgu.edu/pages/1132.asp>).*

Instructor Feedback and Communication

The best way to get in touch with me is email. I will respond to email messages within two business days. If you have not received an email from me after two days, please contact me again.

Expectations and Logistics

Papers should be submitted via Sakai each assigned week prior to the start of class. Late papers will be deducted a letter grade for each day late and will not be accepted after the fourth day. If you have a good reason why you cannot turn in an assignment on time or complete an examination, please contact me at least one week in advance. We can arrange an alternative schedule.

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

CGU is committed to offering auxiliary aids and services to students with verifiable disabilities, in compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. To ensure that their individual needs are addressed, students with special needs are encouraged to contact the Dean of Students Office or the Office of Disability Services, as early as possible. Additional resources can be found on the linked page (<http://www.cgu.edu/pages/1154.asp>).

Mental Health Resources: Graduate school is a context where mental health struggles can be exacerbated. If you ever find yourself struggling, please do not hesitate to ask for help. If you wish to seek out campus resources, here is some basic information about Monsour (<http://www.cuc.claremont.edu/monsour/>):

“Monsour Counseling and Psychological Services (MCAPS) is committed to promoting psychological wellness for all students served by the Claremont University Consortium. Our well-trained team of psychologists, psychiatrists, and post-doctoral and intern therapists offer support for a range of psychological issues in a confidential and safe environment.”

Phone 909-621-8202

Fax 909-621-8482

After hours emergency 909-607-2000

Address

Tranquada Student Services Center, 1st floor
757 College Way
Claremont, CA 91711

Weekly Assignments

Week 1 (September 4th): Introduction to the Inequality

- Inequality Reader- Chs. 1-4

Week 2 (September 11th): Defining and Measuring Inequality

- Article on Measuring Inequality:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2652960/>
- Piketty, T., & Saez, E. (2003). Income inequality in the United States, 1913–1998. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(1), 1-41.
- Neckerman, Kathryn and Florencia Torche. (2007). Inequality: Causes and Consequences. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 33:335–57
- Stiglitz, p. 1-34
- Milanovic, p. 3-32

Week 3 (September 18th): Economics of Inequality I

- Sokoloff, K. L., & Engerman, S. L. (2000). History lessons: institutions, factor endowments, and paths of development in the new world. *Journal of Economic perspectives*, 14(3), 217-232.
- Alesina, A., & Rodrik, D. (1994). Distributive politics and economic growth. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109(2), 465-490.
- Kuznets, S. (1955). Economic growth and income inequality. *The American economic review*, 1-28.
- Benabou, R. (1996). Inequality and growth. In *NBER Macroeconomics Annual 1996, Volume 11* (pp. 11-92). MIT Press.
- Stiglitz- 35-103

Week 4 (September 25th): Economics of Inequality II

- Brune, N., & Garrett, G. (2005). The globalization Rorschach test: international economic integration, inequality, and the role of government. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8, 399-423.
- Rotemberg, Julio. (2014). Models of Caring, or Acting as if One Cared, About the Welfare of Others. *Annual Review of Economics* 6: 129-154
- Stiglitz p. 104-147; 298-364
- Milanovic, p. 95-109, p. 149-164, p. 193-202

Guest Speaker: Maya Federman, Economics, Pitzer College

Week 5 (October 2nd): Inequality and Social Capital

- Lin, N. (2000). Inequality in social capital. *Contemporary Sociology*, 785-795.
- Cattell, V. (2001). Poor people, poor places, and poor health: the mediating role of social networks and social capital. *Social science & medicine*, 52(10), 1501-1516.
- Benabou, R. (2000). Unequal societies: Income distribution and the social contract. *American Economic Review*, 96-129.
- DiMaggio and Garip. 2012. Network Effects and Social Inequality. *Annual Review of Sociology* 38:93–118
- Inequality Reader- 62, 63, 64

Week 6 (October 9th): Inequality and Human Capital

- Lucas, S. R. (2001). Effectively Maintained Inequality: Education Transitions, Track Mobility, and Social Background Effects. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106(6), 1642-1690.
- Kawachi, I., Kennedy, B. P., Lochner, K., & Prothrow-Stith, D. (1997). Social capital, income inequality, and mortality. *American journal of public health*, 87(9), 1491-1498.
- Benabou, R. (1996). Equity and efficiency in human capital investment: the local connection. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 63(2), 237-264.
- Inequality Reader- Chapters 51, 52

Guest Speaker: Lucrecia Santibañez, Department of Educational Studies

Week 7 (October 16th): Midterm

Week 8 (October 23rd): Sociology of Inequality

- Alesina, A., & Glaeser, E. L. (2004). Fighting poverty in the US and Europe: A world of difference.
- Fowler, J. H., & Kam, C. D. (2007). Beyond the self: Social identity, altruism, and political participation. *Journal of Politics*, 69(3), 813-827.
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual review of sociology*, 415-444.
- Andrews, Dan, and Andrew Leigh. 2009. "More Inequality, Less Social Mobility." *Applied Economics Letters* 16 (15): 1489– 92.
- Inequality Reader- Chapters 5,6,26, 33, 39, 68, 69

Week 9 (October 30th): Psychology of Inequality

- Cunha, F., & Heckman, J. J. (2009). The economics and psychology of inequality and human development. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 7(2-3), 320-364.
- <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2832600/>
- Wilkinson, Richard and Kate Pickett. (2009.) Income Inequality and Social Dysfunction. *Annual Review Sociology* 35:493–511
- Sara McLanahan and Christine Percheski. 2008. Family Structure and Reproduction of Inequality, *Annual Review of Sociology* 34:257–76
- Inequality Reader- 28, 31, 56-60
- Milanovic- p.120-129, p. 37-60

Guest Speaker: Azamat Junisbai, Sociology, Pitzer College

Week 10 (November 6th): Politics of Inequality I

- Milanovic, B., 2000. The median voter hypothesis, income inequality, and income redistribution: An empirical test with the required data. *European Journal of Political Economy* 16, 367–410.
- Korpi, W., & Palme, J. (1998). The paradox of redistribution and strategies of equality: Welfare state institutions, inequality, and poverty in the Western countries. *American sociological review*, 661-687.
- Persson, T., & Tabellini, G. (1991). *Is inequality harmful for growth? Theory and evidence* (No. w3599). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Stiglitz- p. 234-297

Week 11 (November 13th): Politics of Inequality II

- Hacker, J. S., & Pierson, P. (2010). Winner-take-all politics: Public policy, political organization, and the precipitous rise of top incomes in the United States. *Politics & Society*, 38(2), 152-204.
- Bartels, L. M. (2005). Homer gets a tax cut: Inequality and public policy in the American mind. *Perspectives on Politics*, 3(01), 15-31.
- Lupu, N., & Pontusson, J. (2011). The structure of inequality and the politics of redistribution. *American Political Science Review*, 105(02), 316-336.
- Stiglitz- Chs. 148-233

Week 12 (November 20th): Poverty

- Lynch, J. W., Kaplan, G. A., & Shema, S. J. (1997). Cumulative impact of sustained economic hardship on physical, cognitive, psychological, and social functioning. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 337(26), 1889-1895.
- Aber, Bennett, Conley, Lee. 1997. The Effects of Poverty on Child Health and Development. *Annu. Rev. Public Health*. 1997. 18:463–83
- Tickamyer and Duncan. (1990). Poverty and Opportunity Structure in Rural America. *Annual Review of Sociology* 16: 67-87
- Danziger, Sonya. (2010). The Decline of Cash Welfare and Implications for Social Policy and Poverty. *Annual Review of Sociology* 36:523–45
- Inequality Reader 15-22

Guest Speaker: Linda Perkins, Applied Womens Studies CGU

Week 13 (November 27th): Wealth

- Spilerman, Seymour. 2000. Wealth and Stratification Processes. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 497-524
- Bartels, L. M. (2006). Is the water rising? Reflections on inequality and American democracy. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 39(01), 39-42.
- De Nardi, M. (2004). Wealth inequality and intergenerational links. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 71(3), 743-768.
- Norton, M. I., & Ariely, D. (2011). Building a better America—One wealth quintile at a time. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(1), 9-12.
- Inequality Reader Ch 11-14; 65-67
- Milanovic- p. 33-60

Week 14 (December 4th): Geography of Inequality

- Beramendi, P. (2007). Inequality and the territorial fragmentation of solidarity. *International Organization*, 61(4), 783.
- Rodden, J. (2010). The geographic distribution of political preferences. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 13, 321-340.
- Morenoff, J. D., Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2001). Neighborhood inequality, collective efficacy, and the spatial dynamics of urban violence*. *Criminology*, 39(3), 517-558.
- Lee, DW and Rogers, M. (2014). “Comparing Inequalities.” Manuscript.
- Inequality Reader- Ch 71
- Milanovic- p. 61-67; 74-77; 149-164

Week 15 (December 11th): Policy Approaches to Reduce Inequality

- Inequality Reader- Chs. 73, 74, 75, 76, 78

Group Presentations