

**Economics, Emotions, and Ethics:
Creating Student Empathy for Developing Economies**

Pamela A. Zeiser
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science and Public Administration
University of North Florida
4567 St. Johns Bluff Road South
Jacksonville, FL 32224

Paper for Presentation at the 2007 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference
February 9-11, 2007
Charlotte, North Carolina

Working Draft – Please do not cite or quote without author’s permission.

“For as long as I can remember, I felt that it was the lack of effort on the parts of these developing countries that kept them in poverty.”

UNF Student, Spring 2005

It has been my experience that American students inherently understand the mainstream global economy – it is the system within which they grew up. Its priorities and the goals of international economic institutions are logical and familiar to them. The challenges and criticisms faced by the IMF and World Bank, and the difficulties faced by developing countries in working with these institutions, are harder to convey. Active learning techniques are especially effective in producing students with a broad-based knowledge about the advantages and disadvantages of the global economy and with the skills to think critically and communicate effectively. My use of a blind simulation entitled the Extra Credit Fund specifically helped students to understand the contrary views of the mainstream global economy and to empathize with the economic challenges faced by developing countries. Designed to simulate International Monetary Fund (IMF) practices, this active learning technique allowed students to see disadvantages that others perceive of the mainstream economic mindset that they live within every day – helping them to be more effective potential participants in global economic governance. But while the Extra Credit Fund blind simulation proved to be a highly effective teaching tool, its implementation is riddled with ethical questions . . . including the ultimate ethical question of whether the end – of getting students to experience our economy in a different way – justifies the means – a blind simulation affecting the emotions of students?

After an explanation of the goals and challenges it is intended to meet and the techniques I have previously tried, I will describe the implementation and students’ response to the Extra Credit Fund. Then, I will discuss the ethical questions raised by my own reflections, feedback from students, and feedback from other scholars – ethical questions I have yet to fully answer.

Goals and Challenges

While I appreciate and advocate learning for learning's sake, many of my students must be actively convinced that what goes on in the classroom will benefit them in the "real world" of future careers (or further study). I openly explain to students the knowledge I will offer and the skills they will practice in every course I teach. When teaching about international economic institutions, I focus on knowledge of the history, structure, operations, and perceived advantages/disadvantages of the institutions (collectively and individually). I primarily teach about these institutions during a course entitled Global Issues in Contemporary Politics, so I present knowledge about these organizations relative to their role in addressing such global issues as poverty, HIV/AIDS, environment, and so forth. Because many such global issues have a significant impact on developing countries, I emphasize that impact and the political attitudes of developing countries toward the international system in general and international institutions in particular. This, for obvious reasons, is where the perceived disadvantages of international economic institutions such as the IMF enter into the course.

The student profile for this course is diverse. They vary in age and experience. Numerous majors enroll in this course; while it is a course designed specifically for political science and international studies students, they are often outnumbered by students studying other social sciences, the humanities, business, and education. In my experience, the students in this course are predominantly conservative (politically and economically) with a firm belief in the correctness of the mainstream global economy. Most are focused on their immediate post-graduation careers, though over the years an increasing percentage of them have indicated interest in graduate studies.

Students should have arrived in this upper-division course with basic skills; those that I emphasize and demand students practice include: reading comprehension, critical thinking, analysis and application of concepts, argumentation, oral communication, thinking on their feet, and effective writing. Course activities, discussions, and assignments help students use and further develop these various skills.

When teaching about international economic institutions, in addition to the skills noted above, I seek to help students empathize with developing countries. Generally, my students readily understand the advantages of the global economy, but have a harder time with the disadvantages, particularly those perceived by developing countries. I believe those who intend careers in international institutions or other areas of development should understand the disadvantages (perceived or real) and their affect on international relations generally, the institutions themselves, and all countries. The disadvantages and criticisms do have an affect, or we would not have seen reforms such as increased IMF transparency and accountability. I do not mean to solely emphasize the negative aspects of international economic institutions and the global economy; however, that is what my students typically overlook and thus what the Extra Credit Fund simulation highlights. I do not seek to emphasize the perceptions of developing countries only for the sake of understanding these countries' situations, but also for exploring the true responsiveness and operations of international economic institutions and their public images. Students prepared to understand both the developed and developing countries' situations and perceptions are better prepared to respond to criticisms and adapt as employees of governments, organizations, and so forth.

Techniques

In preparing students for careers or graduate study, therefore, I set myself and my students the goals of mastering certain information and the developing certain skills.

The techniques I use for achieving these goals are based in active learning, which Bonwell and Eison (1991) define as “instructional activities involving students in doing things and thinking about what they are doing” (p. 2). Though there is little agreement on a common definition, Bonwell and Eison (1991) insist active learning focuses on engaging students in more than just passive listening: “They must read, write, discuss, or be engaged in solving problems. Most important, to be actively involved, students must engage in such higher-order thinking tasks as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation” (p. 2). Although an adjustment to such techniques is usually necessary, students tend to prefer active learning, gain as much knowledge from active techniques as from traditional lectures, and employ analytical and writing skills through active learning more so than with a lecture format. A variety of techniques and strategies fall within active learning: guided lectures, in-class writing, case study methods, discussion and debate, role playing, games, and simulations (Bonwell & Eison, 1991).

I utilize active learning techniques on a regular basis, but find them particularly useful in overcoming the challenge of I have been describing here. Specific active learning strategies I have used include case study, problem-based learning, and games and simulations. All of these strategies have their advantages and disadvantages.

Case studies are especially effective when they “raise a thought-provoking issue” and “promote empathy with the central characters” (Davis, 1993, p. 162). Utilizing real, conflicts addressed by international economic institutions (such as the WTO and the “banana wars” or a particular country’s assistance from the IMF) allows students to learn about these institutions,

see the real-world impact of their lessons, and utilize skills such as reading comprehension, critical thinking, argument, and decision making. These are the key advantages of the technique. For my purposes, the disadvantages include students' self-limitation when viewing the case study as "nothing more than an assignment" – and thus their refusal to become invested in the experience for anything beyond a grade. The technique is also time intensive for the instructor, especially given the difficulty in selecting cases that promote sensitivity or even empathy with developing countries, rather than the economic system with which students are already familiar.

Star Power¹ is one educational game that seeks to teach students about power, power disparities, and how both relate to wealth. In this game, participants trade poker chips to increase their wealth and "progress from one level of society to another." After preliminary trading, those with the most wealth decide the rules for further play. As "the power group generally makes rules which maintain or increase its power and which those being governed consider to be unfair," the other participants usually rebel. A variety of lessons are learned through the game, including that, "to change behavior, it may be necessary to change the system," differing perceptions of how fair society is between those in power and those not, and that "power is like fire, it can be used to help make the world a better place to live or it can be terribly destructive" (Shirts). The game has an added benefit of being an ice-breaker: played early in the school term, it gives students an opportunity to meet one another, which creates a more comfortable atmosphere for later activities and discussions. While a valuable learning tool, however, Star Power has its limitations for my purposes. It is, after all, a game – and students treat it as such. I find that college students who enter a classroom and see poker chips often switch into a "play" frame of mind that lessens the impact of the educational lesson and the

¹ StarPower was created by R. Garry Shirts and is copyrighted by Simulation Training Systems (see www.simulationtrainingsystems.com for information).

students' investment in that lesson. And, Star Power is meant to be played in about 2 hours – students who grasp the inequities of the game experience the elation of power or frustration of powerlessness for so brief a period of time that it also lessens the impact. Students certainly learn about power, wealth, and the abuse of both, but while using this game in courses I still felt frustrated trying to get students to think about and empathize with developing countries in such a way that they were transported outside the mainstream economic system which they have experienced all their lives.

Extra Credit Fund

All of the above active learning techniques are valuable teaching strategies. To overcome the particular challenges I face, however, these techniques have their limitations. As I continually strived to better achieve the goals I set out for this course, I created a blind simulation of the IMF and its operations disguised as an extra credit opportunity for students, which I call the Extra Credit Fund (ECF). Stephen Brookfield (1990) finds simulations effective because

students feel the heightened sensations associate with real-life dilemmas, decisions, and problems. Because these experiences parallel actual experience, they tend to be infused with a drama and passion that make them stand out in sharp emotional relief . . . Because this kind of learning involves the whole person – intellect, feeling, and bodily senses – it tends to be experienced more deeply and remembered longer. (p. 115)

Brookfield (1990) further argues that teachers should use simulations “if you want your students to gain a strong visceral connection to their learning, if you want them to regard their learning activities as having immediate relevance to their lives outside the classroom, and if you want this learning to be recalled long after it has happened” (p. 116).

The Extra Credit Fund simulation corrects several limitations of my previous efforts. First, students are almost always invested in their grades – and thus in opportunities for extra

credit. Second, it lasts several weeks, so student involvement –and thus long-term learning – is enhanced. Third, as a blind simulation, students would, in Bonwell and Eison’s (1991) terms be “doing” before “thinking about what they were doing.” Thus, they are not able to quickly dismiss the learning experience as a game or assignment, though of course the opportunity for thought and reflection occurs after the simulation is disclosed.

The main goal of this blind simulation is overcoming the challenge of helping students to understand the perceptions of developing countries and their criticisms of the IMF and other international economic institutions. A secondary goal was knowledge of IMF operations, procedures, and conditionality, although certainly the Extra Credit Fund could only be a much simplified version of IMF operations, not an exact replication.

A small group of students (5-6) served as my assistants and were aware of the true nature of the activity. As the pre-selected members of the Extra Credit Committee, these students agreed to maintain secrecy, considered the applications of all of other students, and then granted extra credit points and assigned conditions attached to those grants. A confidential “Rules for Granting Extra Credit” handout was given to each committee member; this specified committee meetings, guidelines for granting extra credit, and other instructions as well as goals of the activity (see attachments). Applicants were unaware of these guidelines, in an attempt to simulate the historical lack of transparency in IMF decision making.

Instead of serving on the Extra Credit Committee, one student assistant, known by many in the course to be a friend of a committee member, was a “planted” applicant who received 6 points – more than the total number of points available to others, with no conditions – as an example of corruption. It was the job of this student assistant to tell as many classmates as possible about her extraordinary grant and the reason for it.

The guidelines for the Extra Credit Committee were designed to break the class into three general categories: 1) preferred applicants (to represent developed countries), 2) mid-range applicants (developing countries), and 3) high-risk applicants (the poorest of developing countries). These three categories were based on students' declared major area of study: political science students were preferred applicants, other social science majors were mid-range applicants, and all others were high risk applicants. The applications for extra credit included each student's major (see attachments) and I established these guidelines knowing that there were fewer political science majors than other social science majors (international studies, history, sociology, etc.) and an even higher number of non-social science majors (business, economics, fine arts, music). There were a total of 5 extra credit points possible, based on the grading scale (See Table 1 for points and conditions by category). The guidelines also asked that a handful of students from the mid-range and high-risk categories be refused points entirely. The instructions made it clear to the student Extra Credit Committee that our goal was to create feelings of inequity and discontent among all but the preferred category.

Table 1
Extra Credit Fund: Guidelines for Granting Extra Credit

Academic Major	Extra Credit Fund Category	Confidential Guidelines
Political science majors only	Preferred	4-5 points 0-1 condition
Other social science majors: international studies, history, sociology, etc.	Mid-range	3-4 points 3-4 conditions
Any non-social science majors: business, fine arts/music, sciences, etc.	High-risk	1-2 points most or all conditions

Students granted extra credit points by the Committee were subject to conditions that were designed to parallel IMF conditionality under structural adjustment programs. These

conditions were purely academic in nature: turning in a summary of the week's readings, spending time in the library, creating or joining a study group, and meeting with the professor to discuss progress in the class.

The bulk of the students in the class were unaware of the nature of the exercise, and truly believed it to be an opportunity for extra credit. I explained the opportunity for extra credit and gave students the Application for Extra Credit Forms following the first exam. Students were to justify their request for extra credit and propose a plan for doing better on future exams. After submitting their applications, students receive an Extra Credit Grant form, which informs them of the points granted and the conditions to be met to receive the points. Students were given a chance to appeal to me the Extra Credit Committee's decision – with these appeals serving as an opportunity for students to voice their frustration and discontent *and* (unbeknownst to them) an opportunity for me to gain valuable student complaints to juxtapose with real criticisms of the IMF when disclosing the true nature of the activity.

The ECF simulation lasted for three weeks and only succeeded because students talk with one another – sharing the points granted and conditions received. In this way, they became aware of the inequities in points distribution, which led to the intended feelings of frustration and discontent. I, personally, turned away all verbal attempts to complain, referring students to the appeals process and refusing to question the actions of the committee. As the appeals and later feedback proved, students definitely felt the range of emotions I hoped would deliver the lesson and achieve the goals of the activity. Those in the preferred category quickly learned they had an advantage; while some felt sorry for their classmates, none attempted to question or alter the situation. Those in the mid-range or high-risk categories increasingly attempted to complain to me, questioned the committee, wanted class time to air their complaints, and experienced even

more feelings of powerlessness when all these avenues proved (intentionally) fruitless. The most common complaints were the students' lack of information about how the committee made its decisions and that "teacher's pets" got to make the decisions.

I disclosed the simulation immediately following the last of three lectures on international economic institutions, one which focused solely on the IMF. During this lecture, I used one-half of the chalkboard to create an outline that noted the operations, conditions, and criticisms of the IMF, saving the other half of the chalkboard for a similar outline of the Extra Credit Fund simulation. However, the students beat me to it. Just before I finished the lecture on the IMF, one student asked if there was a reason that the information about the IMF on the chalkboard resembled our extra credit activity. I was pleased at the immediate connection – believing it proved the simulation to be a success – and turned to discussing the simulation itself. While some students had begun to suspect I was "up to something," others were taken completely unaware. Intriguingly (and thankfully), those students who had been most frustrated are also those who responded most positively to "being tricked" and most heartily agree they learned a lesson about inequality in the global economy. I then informed all students that they could earn all five (supposed) extra credit points by writing a paper providing feedback on the simulation *and* provided them with a true opportunity for extra credit.

In both the short feedback papers (to which names were attached) and anonymous evaluation forms, students agreed that the simulation was a valuable learning experience and should be used again in future courses. Out of 39 students involved in the simulation during Spring 2005, not a single one checked "no" in answer to the anonymous evaluation form question "Should this simulation be implemented in future courses?" Students also provided

valuable suggestions for improving the simulation. Some student comments (from both non-anonymous and anonymous evaluations; egregious grammatical errors corrected):

- It provided an example of how lack of transparency is perceived as purposeful favoritism.
- The simulation was a good way for students like myself to learn how the IMF can be biased. However, by putting it into terms like extra credit points that students are familiar with and care about, it fully makes it relevant for us.
- The developing countries' very existences may well depend on the support given of the IMF. The students, while there are broad ends to the spectrum, generally will not place such import upon extra credit.
- For as long as I can remember, I felt that it was the lack of effort on the parts of these developing countries that kept them in poverty. It was not until I experienced the situation of having a "powerful" few decide what I should receive that I understood how frustrating it must be for such countries.
- It gives the students the chance to be put into these countries' shoes. . . . Any teaching tool that is different and can catch the attention of the student body is good.
- This exercise was at first very frustrating. After understanding the full motives behind it now it has actually been a valuable learning lesson. Before the lesson I did not understand the discrimination of developed countries to developing countries. But it did not really hit home until I found myself questioning why I was being discriminated against.
- The "extra credit" assignment (is the most valuable assignment). It should be the backbone of the course
- The learning impact really is much greater when students feel they themselves are being mistreated.
- And it must have hit everyone else in the class that all the grief they were going through because of the injustice in the results of their applications is just what it's like with the developing regions.
- I was happy to get points for nothing. I wasn't looking at anybody else and wondering why they got more or less. I guess I would fit right in as a developed country.
- I was quite upset when my extra credit grade of zero extra credit points was returned to me. . . . When you informed us that the extra credit opportunity was just an experiment for us to investigate our feelings about how the IMF and the World Bank operate, I looked back at my notes and formulated a much different opinion and understanding of the lecture.
- The biggest problem that I have with the simulation is that an extra credit assignment was turned into a paper that must be done.
- I received five points with no conditions. . . . Students gathered outside discussing how they got so many points with so many conditions. I was trying to make everything make sense to the other students by explaining it and justifying the system, because to me it was just and fair. . . . In my view, everything was being handed out properly and the system was fair, which is more like the view of the first world.
- The simulation exercise (is the most valuable assignment) because I have never been so involved before.

As I hope these comments illustrate, overall the student feedback demonstrates that the lessons I hoped would be learned, were learned. Students also provided many suggestions for better implementing the simulation. While all agreed that they learned from the experience, many were upset that the simulated five extra credit points became five grade-based points for

the paper. They did not seem to appreciate that they were also given a real extra credit opportunity (also 5 points), or to notice that there had been a five-point IMF paper listed on the syllabus from the start of the semester. For my own comfort and sanity, I will have to make that more clear in any future iterations of the Extra Credit Fund.

Other student suggestions included both easier and harsher conditions; letting the class elect the Extra Credit Committee; not informing the committee that it was a simulation, rather simply providing them with guidelines to follow; publicly announcing points awarded; requiring appeals to be lodged publicly, in front of the class; making extra credit mandatory for passing the class (to ensure students become involved in the simulation); and offering real money instead of extra credit points. I will give more consideration to some of these suggestions than others.

While I found the Extra Credit Fund blind simulation to be a successful teaching and learning experience, there continue to be areas for improvement and limitations. There are practical as well as ethical challenges to using it again in the future. Two practical limitations of the ECF remain difficult to address. First, students tend to take courses from the same professors more than once; it is the students who already knew me from past courses that suspected that “something was up.” They knew this activity did not fit with my usual behavior. Second, the blind simulation cannot work nor have the intended educational impact if students are expecting it to happen. The fact that students talk with one another is the key to success within the simulation, but also a serious limitation to using it again in the future. I fear I can only effectively use this simulation once every few years, as word about it quickly spread among students in the fields of study that normally enroll in the course – one student’s friend, enrolling in the course for the following term, stopped by my office to ask if I would be “tricking” his

group as well. Until this particular cohort and their friends graduate, students may know in advance about the simulation.

Ethical Questions and Challenges

Even more important than the practical considerations are the ethical ones. Let me note that while planning the Extra Credit Fund, I tried to be very aware of ethical questions related to the activity. Because my goal was to create frustration and perceptions of inequity, I knew that I would be causing my students stress. I worked very hard to protect them from unintended consequences. As noted above, the simulated extra credit points became five points earned by writing a short paper providing feedback on the activity, and a true opportunity for extra credit was later provided. Students were given an opportunity to vent their frustrations through the appeals process and, once the simulation was disclosed, through in-class discussions, the short paper mentioned above, and anonymous evaluation forms. I also informed colleagues, our office staff, and my department chair, so that complaints against the activity were understood – and so that complaining students were returned to me without the simulation being exposed. I was also very up-front with the volunteer student assistants, so they knew that their classmates might be unhappy with them for the duration of the simulation. (One potential student assistant declined to participate for this reason.)

While I did take ethical considerations into account prior to implementing the simulation, further reflection and discussion raised yet more ethical questions – which cause me to question whether I should continue to use the Extra Credit Fund. Is the end goal of teaching my students new perspectives on the global economy justified by a means that is ethically debatable?

In “Ethics and Education,” Brownhill and Jarvis (2002) summarize traditional themes of ethical education:

the relationship between teachers and students, the moral status of the students, the aims of education, the methods of teaching, and epistemological questions related to the distinction between education and indoctrination. The basic moral principle is concerned with the student-teacher relationship, and brings out the moral status of the student. (p. 31)

Aspects of the ECF impinge upon all of these themes. The aims of the simulation are ethical; the goal is, in fact, to avoid the pitfall of indoctrinating students into one (“our”) view of the global economy. The method is uncertain because of the “moral status of students” and the teacher-student relationship.

According to Brownhill and Jarvis (2002), the moral status of the student depends upon the Kantian view that “people should be treated as an end in themselves rather than as a means to an end. We should therefore take account of the interests of individuals and try to provide opportunities that are suitable for their needs.” By doing so, educators can help “produce autonomous individuals who have the ability to appraise differing concepts and situations and act independently” (p. 31). Although the moral status of the student was not an overt part of my thought process, that was one of my goals in creating the Extra Credit Fund. I perceived a need among my students – to be exposed to other views of the global economy, so that they could think independently and critically about it – and sought to fulfill it. Only afterwards, however, did I perceive how the simulation could affect other student “needs.”

First, while I sought to minimize unintended consequences, I did not fully appreciate how much stress the denial of extra credit could add to students’ lives – particularly those on the margins of passing in the first place. The students who were most upset at being denied extra credit points were, as noted above, most likely to find the learning experience valuable. (This is perhaps, in part, because they were most relieved to realize they still had a chance to improve their grade through real extra credit opportunities.) They were also the most enthusiastic about

continuing to use the simulation in future classes. Yet I remain uncomfortable with creating so much stress that students fear they will not graduate, and I seek ways to further limit unintended consequences.

Second, engaging students is a key goal of the activity, yet some who did not receive the extra credit points they applied for reacted with apathy. Many felt that the effort to meet the conditions was not worth the points they were granted and responded by doing nothing. That such apathy could carry over to the required coursework and affect their overall grade remains an important procedural question and ethical concern.

Third, some intended lessons were *over*-learned; in Brownhill and Jarvis' terms, I risk becoming an indoctrinator rather than an educator. Perceived bias and unfairness as disadvantages to the international economic system are important, but a handful of students seemed to take away *only* that lesson. I used the Extra Credit Fund to impress upon students the disadvantages of global economic governance – and I succeeded all too well with some students. Whereas previously many students only understood the advantages, the ECF perhaps overemphasizes the disadvantages to some students. There is a need for more balance.

Upon reflection, the ethical question I am most concerned with is the teacher-student relationship. Brownhill and Jarvis (2002) argue that “it is the way the world is looked at that is important not the actual content of what is taught” (p. 34). In simpler terms, it is not what we teach, but *how* we teach that matters, and in this instance I taught with deception.² I could, perhaps, argue that there is deception in politics and international relations, and thus how I taught the ECF is not a problem. I could argue that, but I don't want to; the existence of deception in international relations was not what I was trying to teach. Months after the Spring 2005 course

² I thank Dr. Buie Seawell (University of Denver) for pointing out what should have been an obvious ethical consideration – but was not – during discussions at the Oxford Round Table on Global Economic Governance, July 2005.

ended, I e-mailed all of my students to ask what they thought of me using the blind simulation to deceive them, in order to teach them alternative views and criticisms of the mainstream economy. Most of those who responded were unconcerned and had not stopped to think about the deception or trickery. Does that mean my action was ethically harmless, or that their views of ethical standards are low in the first place? Other students had reflected on my use of deception, but determined that it was unimportant compared to the lesson I was trying to teach. These students felt that the simulation occurred far enough into the semester that I had created an atmosphere of openness and intellectual honesty in the course and a sufficient bond with the students – and therefore how I taught was less important than what I taught. While I certainly wouldn't mind believing the latter group of students is correct, it does not necessarily answer the question: Did the end I deemed successful justify deceptive means?

Conclusion

In some ways, I remain satisfied with the Extra Credit Fund as an active learning technique that meets the goals I set for the Global Issues in Contemporary Politics course. The simulation did indeed meet the challenge of prompting my students to acknowledge the disadvantages of the mainstream global economy, particularly those perceived by the developing world. It offered the advantages of simulation, including presenting students with real-world dilemmas and decision making. It also reinforced other knowledge and skills goals: knowledge of the IMF, argumentation through applications and appeals, critical thinking and effective writing through the evaluations of the simulation, and oral communication through the in-class discussions of the simulation. Yet ethical concerns remain, and leave me indecisive about continuing the Extra Credit Fund.

References

- Bonwell, Charles and James A. Eison. (1991). *Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED340272).
- Brookfield, Stephen D. (1990). *The Skillful Teacher: On Technique, Trust, and Responsiveness in the Classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brownhill, Bob and Peter Jarvis. (2002). "Ethics and Education" in *The Theory and Practice of Teaching* ed. P. Jarvis, London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Shirts, R. Garry. (n.d.). *StarPower*. Retrieved June 19, 2005 from http://www.stsintl.com/schools-charities/star_power.html

Attachment 1

**INR 3016
Spring 2005
Extra Credit Opportunities**

To earn up to a maximum of 5 extra credit points:

1. Apply to a student committee, which will decide how many points and under what conditions a student will be granted extra credit.
 - Applications are due to Dr. Zeiser February 17 or February 22, 2005. Dr. Zeiser will give the applications to the student committee, which will meet twice to go over these applications. All applications will receive a response no later than February 24, 2005.
2. If you disagree with the committee's decision, you can appeal to me in a 1-2 page paper justifying your request for extra credit and discussing the committee's reasons for not approving that request. That appeal is due March 1, 2005.

Please note: The final distribution of extra credit points is at Dr. Zeiser's discretion. As this is the first time I have tried this, the entire extra credit offer can be restructured at my discretion.

Attachment 2

**INR 3016
Spring 2005
Application for Extra Credit**

Due no later than: February 22, 2005

Name: _____

Major: _____

Year: ___ Freshman ___ Sophomore ___ Junior ___ Senior

Extra Credit points requested (max 5): _____

Justification for request and plan for improvement:* _____

*Please note: You may use your test score as justification. However, if you choose to disclose your test grade as part of your justification, you have given up the right for confidentiality of that grade (and that grade only). The Extra Credit Committee may verify that grade with me.

Signature: _____

Attachment 3

**INR 3016
Spring 2005
Extra Credit Grant**

Name: _____

_____ The student Extra Credit Committee has decided against granting you extra credit. You receive **ZERO** extra credit points for the following reason:

_____ Application incomplete.

_____ Justification for request unclear/unacceptable.

_____ Justification for request does not include a plan to do better on the next test.

_____ The student Extra Credit Committee has decided to grant you a total of _____ extra credit points for the Spring 2005 semester. To receive these points, you must meet the following conditions:

_____ At the beginning of each week, deliver to Dr. Zeiser a summary of the assigned readings for the week. Please do so for the next _____ week(s).

_____ Spend one hour in the UNF library each week for the next _____ week(s), studying for this course.

_____ Create/join a study group for this course. Provide Dr. Zeiser with a list of members and meetings for the next _____ week(s).

_____ Meet at least once during office hours with Dr. Zeiser, to discuss your progress in this class and how you might do better.

_____ No conditions.

APPEALS

All appeals are to be submitted directly to Dr. Zeiser. The student committee will not discuss any changes to their decision. The 1-2 page appeal should explain your original justification for the extra credit request and the reasons you feel the committee's decision should be altered. Appeals are due no later than March 1, 2005, but will be accepted and decisions made/returned throughout the extra credit period.

Attachment 4

**INR 3016
Spring 2005
Rules for Granting Extra Credit
(Confidential – for committee only)**

Meetings: Assuming there are applications ready, please meet once prior to 2/22, so as to get a few “grants” out there and start people talking. The bulk of the applications can be dealt with during class on Feb. 24. I will NOT announce to the class until Tues. 2/22 that I will be gone and that the whole period will be for your review of applications. Students can wait through the period or show up a bit late to receive your rulings.

Guidelines for filling out the “Extra Credit Grant” form:

“Preferred” applicants: 5 or 4 points with NO or 1 condition(s)

Senior political science majors (5 and no or 1 conditions?)
Junior political science majors (4 and 1 condition?)
REGARDLESS OF GRADE, if provided

Mid-range applicants: 3 or 4 points with 2 or 3 conditions

Other social science majors (international studies, history, sociology, etc.)
If test grade provided (and NOT in “preferred” category), those with B or better

“High Risk” applicants: 1 or 2 points with most or ALL conditions

Any non-social science majors (business, fine arts/music, sciences, etc.)
If test grade provided (and NOT in “preferred” category), those with C or below.

Please refuse to grant any points/give a ZERO to at least 4 applications each from the mid-range and “high risk” categories. You can give zero points to more than 8 applicants. The reason you mark doesn’t really matter . . . in other words, it does not have to accurate/true (such as incomplete application).

**Mix it up a bit – be nice to some and not nice to other applicants OTHER THAN the preferred category. Always be nice to the preferred category (the developed countries!) but we want more UNHAPPY (developing countries!) than happy customers!

LeeAnn will not be a committee member, but a “planted” applicant. Because she is known to be a good friend of Alicia (who is on the committee), she will get 6 points with no conditions (CORRUPTION) and will spread the word to foment discontent! (Sorry, LeeAnn, you cannot keep the 6 points.) LeeAnn does not need to bother with an application; I’ll give her a “grant” form Tuesday and she can start showing it around on Thursday (2/17).

AT THE END:

I will hopefully receive enough frustrated appeals and we will hopefully have generated enough feelings of inequity to make it meaningful when I disclose the simulation on March 3.

The five extra credit points will become the 5 point paper on int’l economic institutions (per the syllabus). Students will write a 1-2 pg. paper on what they learned about international economic institutions from the exercise.

I will make a real offer of the usual 2 points of extra credit! With the extra credit questions on the exam, that will total 5 points for the term.

IN RETURN FOR YOUR HELP:

- All of you automatically get the two REAL extra credit points for the time and effort you will put into this.
- You will still have to write the 1-2 pg. paper on int’l economic institutions. Sorry, folks, but because it turns into a graded assignment, ethically, I cannot give anyone special treatment on it.