



NYU

**ROBERT F. WAGNER GRADUATE
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE**

PADM-GP 2445

Poverty, Inequality and Policy

Spring 2022

Instructor Information

- **Instructor:** Dr. Anne Marie E. Brady
- **Email:** amb228@nyu.edu
- **Office Hours:** Anytime before or after class and by appointment over zoom or by phone

Course Information

- **Class Meeting Times:** Monday 4:55-6:35pm **Class Location:**

Course Description

This course examines the nature and extent of poverty and economic inequality primarily in the U.S. but with a comparative perspective (high income countries in Europe). To start, this course will examine on how poverty and inequality are defined and measured. It will proceed to explore how conceptions of poverty are socially constructed and historically bounded; examine what the causes and consequences of poverty are and discuss how these are complex and interwoven. This course will then explore how people can experience poverty at different points in the life course—and why some groups experience poverty more so than others. This course will discuss the role of labor markets, family structure and social organization in shaping poverty. And finally, it will explore how social policies seek to ameliorate poverty and other forms of social disadvantage throughout the life course. But when thinking about how ‘successful’ social policies are at alleviating poverty, this course will demonstrate that ‘success’ is influenced by the conceptions of poverty adopted by policymakers in the first place.

Course and Learning Objectives

The goal of this course is to provide students with:

1. An understanding of the broad area of poverty focusing on poverty as a concept and how this informs how poverty is defined and thus measured.
2. An understanding of the major contemporary theories about the underlying mechanisms that may contribute to poverty; understand the state of the evidence on theories, conjectured consequences and selected policy interventions.

- An opportunity to develop critical analytical skills (e.g., reading thoughtfully – assessing the arguments and evidence provided by authors; thinking carefully about one’s own beliefs in relation to the extant evidence on a given topic; and communicating wellarticulated arguments grounded in academic arguments and evidence).

Learning Assessment Table

Graded Assignment	Course Objective Covered
Class Participation	All
Paper I	All
Paper II	All
Class Presentation	All

Refer to the [URPL-GP 1603 Urban Planning and Practice Methods](#) course syllabus for format example.

Suggested Books

- Hills, J. (2015) *Good Times, Bad Times: The Welfare Myth of Them and Us*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Dean, H. and Platt, L. (Eds) *Social Advantage and Disadvantage*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dean, H. *Short Introductions: Social Policy*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2019
- Beland, D., Howard, C. and Morgan, K. (2014). *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. Social Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Assessment Assignments and Evaluation

Paper I and Paper II (30% respectively): For each paper, the student will select one question from the ‘class discussion questions’ itemized at the end of each week on this syllabus. The question must be answered. In doing so, it is essential for the student to ground their argument in the academic literature and research in order for the student to demonstrate their understanding of the various arguments/debates/concepts/evidence used by academics on any given topic. **Papers must be 8-10 pages in length, excluding cover page and bibliography.**

Oral Presentation (25%): Each class will start with an oral presentation by a student (or two students). The presentation should be 10 to 15 minutes in length and the student(s) can use whatever format they feel most comfortable using. The presentation will provide an insightful perspective on the topic for the week, drawing on the required *and* additional readings. The student(s) should not report on the class discussion question(s). Rather, the student(s) should draw from the additional readings and present on a perspective that is not immediately raised in the required reading. In short, use the time to present something new and different.

Class Participation (15%): Class participation includes active participation in class plus participating in written forum discussions. Active participation in class and via the forum means

demonstrating that you have read the required material through your reflections in class and your posts on the forum and your ability to engage thoughtfully in debate with your fellow students.

Overview of the Semester

- Week 1
 - Date: January 24
 - Topic: Introduction
- Week 2
 - Date: January 31 ○ Defining Poverty
- Week 3
 - Date: February 7
 - Measuring Poverty
- ☐ Week 4
 - Date: February 14
 - Topic: Inequality and Redistribution
- ☐ Week
 - Date: February 21 ○
NO CLASS
- ☐ Week 5
 - Date: February 28
 - Topic: The Underclass Debate
- Week 6
 - Date: March 7 ○ Topic: The Revised Culture of Poverty Thesis: Agency Versus Structure ○ **Deliverable: Paper I Due**
- Week
 - Date: March 14
 - Mid-Term Break, NO CLASS
- Week 7
 - Date: March 21
 - Topic: Short-Term Poverty Dynamics
- Week 8
 - Date: March 28
 - Topic: Lifecycle and Intergenerational Poverty Dynamics
- Week 9
 - Date: April 4
 - Topic: Race, Ethnicity and Poverty and Social Disadvantage
- Week 10
 - Date: April 11
 - Topic: Gender and Poverty and Social Disadvantage

- Week 11
 - Date: April 18
 - Topic: Causes and Consequences of Poverty and Social Disadvantage in Childhood. Policy Response: Early Intervention
- Week 12
 - Date: April 25
 - Topic: Causes and Consequences of Poverty and Social Disadvantage in Childhood. Policy Response: Education
- Week 13
 - Date: May 2
 - Topic: Causes and Consequences of Poverty and Social Disadvantage in Adulthood with a focus on employment. Policy Response: Work Activation
- Week 14
 - Date: May 9
 - Topic: Universal Basic Income: The Future of Social Protection? ○ **Deliverable: Paper II Due**

Letter Grades

Letter grades for the entire course will be assigned as follows:

Letter Grade	Points
A (94-100)	4.0 points
A- (90-93)	3.7 points
B+ (87-89)	3.3 points
B (84-86)	3.0 points
B- (80-83)	2.7 points
C+ (77-79)	2.3 points
C (74-76)	2.0 points
Letter Grade	Points

C- (70-73)	1.7 points
F (69 and below)	0.0 points

Student grades will be assigned according to the following criteria:

- (A) Excellent: Exceptional work for a graduate student. Work at this level is unusually thorough, well-reasoned, creative, methodologically sophisticated, and well written. Work is of exceptional, professional quality.
- (A-) Very good: Very strong work for a graduate student. Work at this level shows signs of creativity, is thorough and well-reasoned, indicates strong understanding of appropriate methodological or analytical approaches, and meets professional standards.
- (B+) Good: Sound work for a graduate student; well-reasoned and thorough, methodologically sound. This is the graduate student grade that indicates the student has fully accomplished the basic objectives of the course.
- (B) Adequate: Competent work for a graduate student even though some weaknesses are evident. Demonstrates competency in the key course objectives but shows some indication that understanding of some important issues is less than complete. Methodological or analytical approaches used are adequate but student has not been thorough or has shown other weaknesses or limitations.
- (B-) Borderline: Weak work for a graduate student; meets the minimal expectations for a graduate student in the course. Understanding of salient issues is somewhat incomplete. Methodological or analytical work performed in the course is minimally adequate. Overall performance, if consistent in graduate courses, would not suffice to sustain graduate status in “good standing.”
- (C/-/+) Deficient: Inadequate work for a graduate student; does not meet the minimal expectations for a graduate student in the course. Work is inadequately developed or flawed by numerous errors and misunderstanding of important issues. Methodological or analytical work performed is weak and fails to demonstrate knowledge or technical competence expected of graduate students.
- (F) Fail: Work fails to meet even minimal expectations for course credit for a graduate student. Performance has been consistently weak in methodology and understanding, with serious limits in many areas. Weaknesses or limits are pervasive.

Detailed Course Overview

WEEK 1, DATE: January 24

Introduction

WEEK 2, DATE: January 31

Defining Poverty

Readings Due (found on NYU Classes)

1. Lister, R. (2004). *Poverty*, Cambridge: Polity. (Introduction and Chapter 1: Defining Poverty)
2. Sen, A. (1983). Poor, relatively speaking. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 35(2): 163-169.
3. Townsend, P. (1985). A sociological approach to the measurement of poverty: A rejoinder to Professor Amartya Sen. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 37(4): 659-668.

Discussion Questions

1. Are absolute or relative definitions of poverty more useful in helping to understand 'who is poor'? What type of definition of poverty do you think the US should use?
2. Why do we seem continually to be rediscovering who is poor?

Additional Readings

1. Dean, H. (2016). *Poverty and Social Exclusion* (ch.1) in Dean, H. and Platt, L. (Eds) *Social Advantage and Disadvantage* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Brady, D. and Destro, L (2014). "Poverty" in Daniel Béland, Kimberly J. Morgan, and Christopher Howard (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of U.S. Social Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Sen, A. (1985). A sociological approach to the measurement of poverty: A reply to Professor Peter Townsend. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 37(4): 669-676.
4. Cancian, M., & Danziger, S.H. (Eds.) (2009). *Changing poverty, changing policies*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 35-62. (Chapter 2: Poverty Levels and Trends in Comparative Perspective).
5. Iceland, J. (2012). *Poverty in America: A Handbook*, 3rd Edition, Berkeley: University of California Press. (Chapters 1 and 3: Chapter 2 optional; provides interesting historical context).
6. Deeming, C. (2017). Defining minimum income (and living) standards in Europe: Methodological issues and policy debates. *Social Policy and Society*. 16 (1): 33–48.

WEEK 3, DATE: February 7

Measuring Poverty

Readings Due (found on NYU Classes)

1. Lister, R. (2004). *Poverty*, Cambridge: Polity. (Chapter 2: Measuring Poverty)
2. Pimpare, S. (2009). The failures of American poverty measures. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 36(1): 103-122.
3. Meyer, B. and Sullivan, J. (2012). Identifying the Disadvantaged: Official Poverty, Consumption Poverty, and the New Supplemental Poverty Measure, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 26 (3): 111-136.

Discussion Questions

1. To what extent is it possible objectively to quantify poverty and which kind of measurement is most useful?

2. What are the strengths and weakness of the current US poverty measure? What concept is it attempting to capture? Is the new supplemental measurement an improvement?

Additional Readings

1. Fisher, G. (2009). Remembering Mollie Orshansky—The developer of the poverty thresholds. *Social Security Bulletin*, 68(3), 1-4.
2. Short, K. (2011). [The Research Supplemental Poverty Measure, Current Population Reports](#).
3. J. Iceland and Bauman, K. (2004). [Income Poverty and Material Hardship: How strong is the association? National Center for Poverty working paper](#).

WEEK 4, DATE: February 14

Inequality and Redistribution

Readings Due (found on NYU Classes)

1. Atkinson, A.B (2015). *Inequality: What Can be Done?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Chapter 1 and 2 for sure, 3 if you have the time)
2. Hills, J. (2015) *Good Times, Bad Times: The Welfare Myth of Them and Us*, Bristol: Policy Press. (Chapters 2 and 8)

Class Discussion Questions:

1. What do we know about the underlying mechanisms of inequality? What does this suggest for policies to address inequality?
2. How is inequality assessed? What are the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches?
3. Why is it important to consider wealth along with income when seeking to understand disadvantage?
4. Hills and Cunliffe (reading #7 below) assert that wealth “represents the solidification of economic advantage across the lifecycle.” Please explain/discuss.

Additional Readings:

1. Piketty, T. (2020). *Capital and Ideology*. Harvard: Harvard University Press. (Introduction)
2. Pickett, K and Wilkinson, R. (2010). *The Spirit Level*. London: Penguin.
3. Karagiannaki, E. (2017). “The empirical relationship between income poverty and income inequality in rich and middle-income countries,” CASEpaper 206 /LIPpaper 3. London: CASE.
4. Moller, S. and Misra, J. (2014). “Inequality” in Daniel Béland, Kimberly J.Morgan, and Christopher Howard (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of U.S. Social Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

5. Bucelli, I. (2017). "Inequality, poverty and the grounds of our normative concerns," CASEpaper 204/LIPpaper. London: CASE.
6. Yang, L. and Vizard, P. (2017). "Multidimensional poverty and income inequality in the EU," CASEpaper211/LIPpaper5. London: CASE.
7. Hills, J. and Cunliffe, J. (2016). Chapter 8: Accumulated advantage and disadvantage: the role of wealth, in H. Dean and L. Platt (eds) Social Advantage and Disadvantage. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Piketty, T. (2014) Capital in the Twenty-First Century. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. See Chapter 3: The metamorphoses of capital (pp. 113-139).
9. Yang, L. (2018). "The relationship between poverty and inequality: Resource constraint mechanisms," CASEpaper211/LIPpaper5. London: CASE.
10. Neckerman, K. and F. Torche (2007). "Inequality: Causes and Consequences", Annual Review of Sociology, 33: 335-357.
11. OECD (2015) [In It Together: Why Less Inequality Benefits All](#).
12. Jenkins, S. (2015). [The Income Distribution in the UK: A Picture of Advantage and Disadvantage](#), No. 2015-01, Essex: Institute for Social & Economic Research.

WEEK 5, DATE: February 28

The Underclass Debate

Readings Due (found on NYU Classes)

1. Lister, R. (1996). "Introduction: In search of the 'underclass'". In Charles Murray and the Underclass: The Developing Debate (pp. 1-18), London: IEA Health and Welfare Unit
2. Murray, C. (1996). "[The emerging British underclass](#)". In Charles Murray and the Underclass: The Developing Debate (pp. 23-53), London: IEA Health and Welfare Unit. Retrieved
3. Macnicol, J. (1987). "In pursuit of the underclass", Journal of Social Policy, 16(3), 293-318.

Class discussion questions

1. Will we always have an 'underclass'? If so, how should we define it? If not, why does this concept survive or recur?
2. What are the key similarities and differences between people considered 'poor' and members of the 'underclass'?

Additional readings

1. Read any of the rebuttals to Murray in [Charles Murray and the Underclass: The Developing Debate](#). London: IEA Health and Welfare Unit.
2. Macnicol, J. (1999). From 'problem family' to 'underclass' in R. Lowe and H. Fawcett (eds) Welfare Policy in Britain: The road from 1945. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
3. Dixon, J., Carrier, K. and Dogan, R. (2005). On investigating the underclass: Contending philosophical perspectives. Social Policy and Society, 4(1), 21-30.

WEEK 6, DATE: March 7

The Revised Culture of Poverty Thesis: Agency Versus Structure

Readings Due (found on NYU Classes)

1. Small, M., Harding, D., & Lamont, M. (2010). "Introduction: Reconsidering culture and Poverty", *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 629(1), 6-27.
2. Wilson, W.J. (2010) "Why both social structure and culture matter in a holistic analysis of inner-city poverty", *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 629(1), 200-219.

Class discussion questions

1. Should researchers incorporate both individual- and structural-based explanations of poverty and social disadvantage into their work? And if so, how can they do this without "victim blaming?"
2. Why is there a renewed interest in the role of culture as a cause of poverty?

Additional readings

1. Edit, K and Reed, J. (2005). Why don't they just get married? Barriers to marriage among the disadvantaged. *Future of Children*, 15(2): 117-137.
2. Hamilton, K. (2012). "Low-income families and coping through brands: Inclusion or stigma?", *Sociology*, 46(1), 74-90.
3. Lareau, A. (2015). "Cultural knowledge and social inequality", *American Sociological Review*, 80(1), 1-27.
4. McKenzie, L. (2013). "Narratives from a Nottingham council estate: A story of white working-class mothers with mixed-race children", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(8), 1342-1358.
5. Murry, C. (1984) *Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950-1980*. New York: Basic Books.
6. Curchin, K. (2016). From the moral limits of markets to the moral limits of welfare. *Journal of Social Policy*, 45(1): 101-118.
7. Tirado, L. (22 November 2013). "[This is why poor people's bad decisions make perfect sense](#)", Huffington Post.

WEEK 7, DATE: March 21

Short-Term Poverty Dynamics

Readings Due (found on NYU Classes)

1. Hills, J. (2015) *Good Times, Bad Times: The Welfare Myth of Them and Us*, Bristol: Policy Press. (Chapters 4 and 5)

2. Hannagan, A., & Morduch, J. (2015). [Income Gains and Month-to-Month Income Volatility: Household Evidence from the US Financial Diaries](#), Washington, DC: US Financial Diaries.
3. Cancian, M. and Danziger, S. (2009). Changing Poverty, Changing Policies. New York: Russel Sage Foundation. (Chapter 7: "Mobility in the United States a Comparative Perspective" by Marcus Jantii. P. 180 – 201)

Class Discussion Questions:

1. What is income mobility and how is it assessed?
2. Why is it important to examine short-term income mobility as well as current income when seeking to understand social disadvantage?

Additional Readings:

1. Jenkins, S. P. (2011) Changing Fortunes: Income Mobility and Poverty Dynamics in Britain, Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Read Chapter 5: Income mobility and how it has changed over time).
2. Hills, J., Smithies, R. and McKnight, A. (2006). "Tracking Income: How Working Families' Incomes vary through the Year," CASEreport 32. London: CASE.
3. Department for Work and Pensions (2013). [Low-Income Dynamics: 1991-2008 \(Great Britain\)](#) , London: [Department for Work and Pensions](#) . (Focus on Sections 2 and 3)

WEEK 8, DATE: March 28

Lifecycle and Intergenerational Poverty Dynamics

Readings Due (found on NYU Classes)

1. Chetty, R., Hendren, N., Jones, R., Porter, S. (2018) Race and Economic Opportunity in the United States: An Intergenerational Perspective.
2. Hills, J. (2015) Good Times, Bad Times: The Welfare Myth of Them and Us, Bristol: Policy Press. (Chapters 3 and 7)
3. Corak, M. (2013) "Income inequality, equality of opportunity and intergenerational mobility", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27(3), 79-102.

Class Discussion Questions:

1. How does looking at lifecycle and intergenerational poverty dynamics change our understanding of those in poverty, compared to looking at people at one point in time?
2. Do the data on lifecycle and intergenerational poverty dynamics support the ideas presented by Murray and others when discussing the underclass?

Additional Readings:

1. Gottschalk, P. (1997). "Inequality, Income Growth and Mobility: The Basic Facts." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 11(2): 21-40.
2. Levell, P. Roantree, B. and Shaw, J. (2015) Redistribution from a Life Cycle Perspective, IFS Working Paper 15/27, London: Institute for Fiscal Studies.

3. Beller, E. and Hout, H. (2006). "Intergenerational Social Mobility: the US in a comparative Perspective" *The Future of Children* 16:19-36.
4. Corak, M., Curtis, L. and Phipps, S. (2010). [Economic mobility, family background, and the wellbeing of children in the United States and Canada](#). IZA Working Paper.
5. Roemer, J. (2004) "Equal Opportunity and Intergenerational Mobility: Going Beyond Intergenerational Transition Matrices", In *Generational Income Mobility in North America and Europe*. M. Corak Eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K. (2009) *The Spirit Level: Why Equality is Better for Everybody*, London, UK: Penguin Books. (Chapter 12: Social mobility: Unequal opportunities)
7. Hills, J. et al. (2015) [New Research on Social Mobility and Educational Attainment: Summary, London: Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion](#)

WEEK 9, DATE: April 4

Race, Ethnicity and Poverty and Social Disadvantage

Readings Due (found on NYU Classes)

1. Massey, D. (2007) *Categorically Unequal: The American Stratification System*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation. (Chapter 1 "How Stratification Works")
2. Phillips, C. and Platt, L. (2016) 'Race' and Ethnicity' in H. Dean and L. Platt (eds) *Social Advantage and Disadvantage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Flynn, A., Holmberg, S., Warren, D., and Wong, F. (2016). *Rewrite the Racial Rules. Building an Inclusive American Economy*. Roosevelt Institute.

Class Discussion Questions:

1. What is the impact of 'race' (or 'race' and 'gender') on social disadvantage?
2. What are some of the explanations for the different levels of poverty and social disadvantage among different ethnic and racial groups?

Additional Readings:

1. Lieberman, Robert (2014). "Race and Ethnicity in U.S. Social Policy" in Daniel Béland, Kimberly J. Morgan, and Christopher Howard (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of U.S. Social Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Rothstein, R. (2017). *The Color of Law*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
3. Gilens, M. (1996). "Race and poverty in America: Public misperceptions and the American news media," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 60(4), 513-535.
4. Lin, A.C. and Harris, D.R. (2008). *The Colors of Poverty: Why Racial and Ethnic Disparities Persist*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
5. Nandi, A. and Platt, L. (2010) [Ethnic Minority Women's Poverty and Economic WellBeing. London: Government Equalities Office](#).
6. Ihlanfeldt, K. and Scafidi, B (2002). "Neighborhood contact hypothesis: New Evidence from the Multi City Study of Urban Inequality". *Urban Studies* 39(4).

WEEK 10, DATE: April 11

Gender and Poverty and Social Disadvantage

Readings Due (found on NYU Classes)

1. León, M. (2016) "Chapter 11: Gender and (dis)advantage", in Dean, H. and Platt, L. (eds) *Social Advantage and Disadvantage*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Lewis, Jane (2006) Employment and care: the policy problem, gender equality and the issue of choice. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 8 (2). pp. 103-114.
3. Kleven, H., Landais, C., Steinhauer, A., and Zweimueller, J. (2020). Do Family Policies Reduce Gender Inequality? Evidence from 60 Years of Policy Experimentation. Working Paper 28082. Washington, DC: National Bureau of Economic Research.
4. Mason, N. (2020). Building(ing) the future. Bold Policies for a Gender-Equitable Recovery. Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Class Discussion Questions:

1. Do women experience poverty differently than men? If so, how?
2. How does using 'gender' change the way that poverty and social disadvantage are defined?

Additional Readings:

1. Rossin-Slater, M., Ruhm, C., and Waldfogel, J. (2013). The Effects of California's Paid Family Leave Program on Mothers' Leave-Taking and Subsequent Labor Market Outcomes. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. 32(2): 224–245.
2. Chant, S. (2008). "The 'feminisation of poverty' and the 'feminisation' of anti-poverty programmes: Room for revision?", *Journal of Development Studies*, 44(2), 165-197.
3. Abramovitz, Mimi (2000). The Gendered Welfare State. Ch. 3 in *Under Attack, Fighting Back: Women and Welfare in the United States*. Monthly Review Press, pp. 86-112.
4. Reese, E., D'Auria, S. and Loughrin, S. (2014). "Gender" in Daniel Béland, Kimberly J. Morgan, and Christopher Howard (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of U.S. Social Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. Lewis, J (2001). 'Is marriage the answer to the problems of family change?' *Political Quarterly*, 72(4): 437-445.
6. Lewis, J. (2001). 'The decline of the male breadwinner model: implications for work and care,' *Social Politics*, 8(2): 152-169.
7. Abbott, P. (2013). "Chapter 3: Gender", In Payne, G. (eds) *Social Divisions* (pp. 68-105), Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan,
8. Brah, A. & Pheonix, A. (2004). "Ain't I a woman: Revisiting intersectionality", *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 5(3), 75-86.
9. Millar, J. (2003). 'Gender, poverty and social exclusion', *Social Policy & Society*, 2(3), 181-188.
10. World Economic Forum. (2013). [The Global Gender Gap Report 2013](#). Geneva, Switzerland: World Economic Forum.

WEEK 11, DATE: April 18

Causes and Consequences of Poverty and Social Disadvantage in Childhood and Policy Response: Early Intervention

Readings Due (found on NYU Classes)

1. Stewart, K. (2016). 'The family and disadvantage' in Dean, H. and Platt, L. (eds) *Understanding Social Advantage and Disadvantage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Gambaro, L., Stewart, K., & Waldfogel, J. (2015). *An Equal Start? Providing Quality Early Education and Care to Disadvantaged Children*. Bristol: The Policy Press. (Read the Introduction, Chapter 9 and Conclusion)

Class Discussion Questions

1. What is the best way to understand social disadvantage among children?
2. Can early intervention programs improve outcomes among children? If so, which outcomes? How?

Additional readings:

1. McLanahan, S. & Percheski, C. (2008). 'Family structure and the reproduction of inequalities.' *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34: 257-276.
2. Baker, M (2011). "Innis Lecture: Universal early childhood interventions: What is the evidence base? *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 44 (4), pp. 1069-15.
3. Cooper, K. & Stewart, K. (2013). *Does Money Affect Children's Outcomes? A Systematic Review*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
4. Duncan, G. (2012). "Give us this day our daily breadth," *Child Development*, 83 (1): 615.
5. Heckman, J (2013) *Giving Kids a Fair Chance (A Strategy That Works)*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
6. Garces, E., Thomas, D. and Currie, J. (2000) *Long Term Effects of Head Start*. NBER working paper 8045.
7. Corak, M. (2013). 'Income Inequality, Equality of Opportunity and Intergenerational Mobility,' *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27(3): 79-102.
8. Dearden, L., Sibieta, L. & Sylva, K. (2011). *The Socio-Economic Gradient in Early Child Outcomes: Evidence from the Millennium Cohort Study*, London: Institute for Fiscal Studies.
9. D'Addio, A. (2007). *Intergenerational Transmission of Disadvantage: Mobility or Immobility across Generations? A Review of the Evidence for OECD Countries*. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.
10. Gibbons, S., Silva, O. & Weinhardt, F. (2014). 'Everybody needs good neighbours?' *CenterPiece Magazine*, Winter 2013/14: 22-25.
11. Axford, N. et al (2014). *The Best Start at Home: What Works to Improve the Quality of Parent-Child Interactions from Conception to Age 5 years?* London: Early Intervention Foundation. (Read: Introduction and Conclusion)

WEEK 12, DATE: April 25

Causes and Consequences of Poverty and Social Disadvantage in Childhood and Policy Response: Education

Readings Due (found on NYU Classes)

1. Exley, S. (2016). 'Education and learning' in Dean, H. and Platt, L. (eds) *Understanding Social Advantage and Disadvantage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Ladd, H. (2012). "Presidential Address: Education and Poverty: Confronting the Evidence." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 31(2): 203–227.
3. Ball, S.J. (2010) 'New class inequalities in education: Why education policy may be looking in the wrong place', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 30(4): 155-166.

Class Discussion Questions

1. To what extent can K-12 education systems exacerbate, rather than ameliorate social inequalities, and why?
2. Is it possible for the K-12 educational system to provide equality of opportunity? If so, how?

Additional readings:

1. Nasim, B. (2010). *The Interdependence and Determinants of Childhood Outcomes: The Relevance for Policy*. Report to the Department of Children Schools and Families, London: Centre for the Economics of Education.
2. Curto, V., Fryer, R. and Howard, M. (2010) [It May Not Take a Village: Increasing Achievement among the Poor](#)
3. Jacob, B. and Ludwig, P (2009) "[Improving Educational Outcomes for Poor Children](#)." CLOSUP Working Paper Series Number 13
4. St. Clair, R. Kintrea, K. & Houston, M. (2013) 'Silver bullet or red herring? New evidence on the place of aspirations in education', *Oxford Review of Education*, 39(6): 719-738.
5. Siraj-Blatchford, I. (2010) 'Learning in the home and at school: how working-class children succeed against the odds', *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(3): 463-482.
6. Bourdieu, P. (1986). 'The forms of capital' reprinted in H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough, A.H. Halsey (eds) *Education, Globalization and Social Change* (2006) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

WEEK 13, DATE: May 4

Causes and Consequences of Poverty and Social Disadvantage in Adulthood with a focus on employment and Policy Response: Work Activation

Readings Due (found on NYU Classes)

1. Dean, H. (2016). 'Divisions of Labour and Work' in H. Dean and L. Platt (eds) *Social Advantage and Disadvantage*, Oxford: Oxford University

2. Mead, L. (1989) "The Logic of Workfare: The Underclass and Work Policy", *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*.
3. Mead, L. (2007) "Toward a mandatory work policy for men", *Future Child*,17(2):43-72.

Class Discussion Questions

1. Is participation in the labor market the best way to avoid poverty and the best guarantee of social inclusion? If not, what not?
2. Is unemployment a cause or consequence of social disadvantage?
3. What assumptions do work activation policies make about the reasons that people are unemployed?
4. Evaluate the potential effectiveness of sanctions on reducing worklessness. What does the evidence suggest?
5. Must the poor, as Larry Meade (1989) argues, become workers before they can stake larger claims to equality?

Additional Readings:

1. McKnight, A. (2002). "Low-paid Work: Drip feeding the poor," in *Understanding Social Exclusion*, J. Hills, J. Le Grand and D. Piachaud (Eds), Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2.
- Atkinson, A. (2015). *Inequality: What Can Be Done?* Harvard: Harvard University Press. (Read Chapter 5: Employment and pay in the future pp. 133-154).
3. Fletcher, D. (2014). "Workfare – a blast from the past? Contemporary work conditionality for the unemployed in historical perspective", *Social Policy & Society*, 14(3), pp. 329-339.
4. Dean, H. (2007). "The ethics of welfare-to-work", *Policy and Politics*, 35(4), 573-589.
5. Cancian, M., & Danziger, S.H. (Eds.) (2009). *Changing poverty, changing policies*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 35-62. (Chapter 3: Economic Change and the Structure of Opportunity for Less Skilled Workers, pp. 63 -80).
6. Holzer, Harry (2000). "[Mismatch in the Low-Wage Labor Market: Job Hiring Perspective](#)" in *The low Wage Labor Market*,(Eds.) K. Kaye and D. Nightingale, Washington, DC: Dept. of Health and Human Services.
7. Hoynes, H. Miller, D. and J. Schaller (2012). "Who Suffers During Recessions? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 26(3): 27-48.
8. Barrett, R. (2010) "Disadvantaged groups in the labour market", *Economic & Labour Market Review*, 4(6), 18-24.
9. Casey, T. & Maldonado, L. (2012). [Worst Off – Single-Parent Families in the United States: A Cross-National Comparison of Single Parenthood in the U.S. and Sixteen Other High-Income Countries](#). New York, NY: Legal Momentum.
10. Standing, G. (2013). ['Defining the precariat: A class in the making'](#), Eurozone.
11. Wilson, W. J. (1996). *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York, New York: Alfred A. Knopf. (Read Chapter 2, "Societal Changes and Vulnerable Neighborhoods": pp. 25-50)
12. Blank, R (2002) "Evaluating Welfare Reform in the U.S.," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 40(4): 1105-1145 (rest optional).

13. Dean, H. (2012). "The ethical deficit of the United Kingdom's proposed Universal Credit: Pimping the precariat?" *Political Quarterly*, 83(2), 353-359.
14. Dunn, A. (2013). "Activation workers' perceptions of their long-term unemployed clients' attitudes towards employment", *Journal of Social Policy*, 42(4): 799-817.
15. Wright, S. (2013). "On 'Activation workers' perceptions: A reply to Dunn", *Journal of Social Policy*, 42(4): 829-837.
16. Edin, K. & Lein, L. (1997). "Work, welfare, and single mothers' economic survival strategies", *American Sociological Review*, 62(2): 253-266.
17. Hills, J. (2015). *Good Times, Bad Times: The Welfare Myth of Them and Us*, Bristol: Policy Press. (Chapter 4: It's complicated)
18. Ratcliffe, P & Newman, I (Eds) (2011) *Promoting Social Cohesion: Implications for Policy and Evaluation*, Bristol: Policy Press. (Read Chapter 10: Addressing worklessness post the financial crisis)
19. Smeeding, T. and Waldfogel, J. (2010) "Fighting Poverty: Attentive Policy Can Make a Huge Difference" *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 29(2): 401-407.

WEEK 14, DATE: May 9

Universal Basic Income: The Future of Social Protection?

Readings Due (found on NYU Classes)

1. What happens if the robots take the jobs? The impact of emerging technologies on employment and public policy. Center for Technology Innovation at Brookings. October 2015. <http://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/robotwork.pdf>
2. Piachaud, D. (2016) *Citizen's Income: Rights and Wrongs*, CASEpaper 200, London School of Economics.
3. Van Parijs, P. (1991). *Why Surfers Should Be Fed: The Liberal Case for an Unconditional Basic Income*. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 20(2): pp. 101-131.
4. Reed, H. and S. Lansley (2016). *Universal Basic Income: An idea whose time has come?* Compass Publications. <http://www.compassonline.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/UniversalBasicIncomeByCompass-Spreads.pdf>

Class Discussion Questions

1. Would a basic income solve many of the problems inherent in the labor market today or is it an unrealistic goal and a distraction from the real challenges in the labor market?

Additional Readings:

1. Martinelli, L. (2018). *Making it simple: Universal Basic Income* in Millar and Sainsbury (eds) *Understanding Social Security*.
2. Torry, M. (2013). *Money for Everyone: Why we need a citizen's income*. Bristol: Policy Press.
3. Torry, M. (2015). *101 Reasons for a Citizen's Income: Arguments for Giving Everyone Some Money*. Policy Press.
4. Atkinson, A. (2015). *Inequality: What Can Be Done?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

5. Kangas, O., Simanainen, M. and Honkanen, P. (2017). Basic Income in the Finnish Context. Leibniz Information Centre for Economics.
<http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs10272-017-0652-0.pdf>.
6. Khosla, S. (2018). India's Universal Basic Income: Bedevilled by the Details. Carnegie Foundation for International Peace.
https://carnegieendowment.org/files/EIP_Khosla_Report_FNL_w_covers.pdf
7. Salehi-Isfahani, D. and Mostafavi-Dehzoeei, M. (2011). Cash transfers and labor supply: Evidence from a large-scale program in Iran. Journal of Development Economics. Available online.

Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is a vital component of Wagner and NYU. All students enrolled in this class are required to read and abide by [Wagner's Academic Code](#). All Wagner students have already read and signed the [Wagner Academic Oath](#). Plagiarism of any form will not be tolerated and students in this class are expected to report violations to me. If any student in this class is unsure about what is expected of you and how to abide by the academic code, you should consult with me.

Henry and Lucy Moses Center for Students with Disabilities at NYU

Academic accommodations are available for students with disabilities. Please visit the [Moses Center for Students with Disabilities \(CSD\) website](#) and click on the Reasonable Accommodations and How to Register tab or call or email CSD at (212-998-4980 or mosescsd@nyu.edu) for information. Students who are requesting academic accommodations are strongly advised to reach out to the Moses Center as early as possible in the semester for assistance.

NYU's Calendar Policy on Religious Holidays

[NYU's Calendar Policy on Religious Holidays](#) states that members of any religious group may, without penalty, absent themselves from classes when required in compliance with their religious obligations. Please notify me in advance of religious holidays that might coincide with exams to schedule mutually acceptable alternatives.