

SOCI/ETHN 448/848: Family Diversity
Department of Sociology
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Spring 2018

Course Information

Instructor: Professor Williams
Room: Burnett Hall 120
Days/Times: T/R: 9:30 – 10:45 pm

Office: 715 Oldfather Hall
Office Hours: Tuesday & Thursday 2-3pm or by appointment
Email: dwilliams9@unl.edu
Twitter: @doc_thoughts

Sociology Office: 402.472.6164; **Credit:** 3; **Prerequisite:** 9 hours (Sociology/Social Science)

Course Description:

This seminar offers a bold and critical overview to the study of families in the U.S. The idea of “family” is often taken-for-granted in day-to-day interactions. This course is an attempt to “peek behind the veil” and expose the idea of “family” (particularly, marriage) as a state-sanctioned (and racialized and gendered) institution. To do this, the course will cover (1) family as an “historical” institution that has changed over time, (2) “diverse” theoretical approaches (such as race, gender, sexuality, and intersectionality) that challenges normative understandings of families, (3) trends in family formations (e.g., marriage, cohabitation, and singles), (4) family processes (e.g., relationship quality and health), and (5) family policy.

Required Text: (Books can be purchased at the University Bookstore.)

Cohen, P. N. (2015). *The family: Diversity, inequality, and social change*. New York: WW Norton.

See also Cohen’s blog: familyinequality.com

Lee, G. R. (2015). *The limits of marriage: Why getting everyone married won't solve all our problems*. Lexington Books.

Hunter, T. W. (2017). *Bound in Wedlock: Slave and Free Black Marriage in the Nineteenth Century*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. (Graduate Students Only)

Course Requirements:

This course is a discussion based seminar (with minimum lecture) and you are expected to actively participate in every class. In order to do this well, you must complete the assigned readings in advance and be ready to discuss. I will keep track of attendance and whether or not you contribute to class discussion, ask questions, and engage with your peers. Overall, the course

requirements are divided into three parts: **(1) Attendance/participation, (2) Midterm, and (3) Final.** Each part is detailed below.

(1) Attendance/Participation (25%)

For All Students

Students will be arranged in groups, and these groups will be maintained throughout the semester. The purpose of the groups is to ensure participation from all students. Each week two groups will lead discussion regarding the readings. Groups that are not leading discussion for that week will be responsible for providing 2-4 questions about the readings for further discussions. Questions from each group will be collected by the professor at the end of class on Thursdays. Questions should be based on critical reflection of the readings and can address any of the following: strengths/weaknesses of the reading; data or variables; research methods or analytical design; hypothesis testing; theoretical conceptualization; policy implications; or directions for future research.

Note: Groups are NOT required to meet outside of class (but feel free to do so if you like). To make sure that groups do meet, each group will be given 15 minutes at the beginning of class (on Tuesdays) to make sure everyone is on the same page with the readings and questions. I would also encourage each group to be strategic and creative with crating a “division of labor” among their members. For instance, some of the readings are lengthy, and thus distributing sections to different members may be wise. ☺ Also, given that there will be two groups a week, it is OK to divide the readings across groups to help maximize discussions.

You may miss two class periods without penalty, but your final grade will be reduced by 5% for each absence thereafter. For extenuating circumstances, you are expected to communicate with me as soon as possible.

(2) Midterm (35%)

For Undergraduate Students: Midterm Exam

A “take-home” essay exam will be given that covers lectures, weekly readings, and discussions up to the point of the exam. The essay exam will be 4-5 questions. Students will have a week to complete the exam. For an understanding of how to answer essay exams, see:

<https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/737/01/>

Make-up Exams:

Make-up exams are only allowed under **extreme circumstances, and at the instructor’s discretion.** Students must also provide documentation for medical emergencies. Make-up exams may be different from the original exam to minimize cheating.

For Graduate Students: Book Review

You will be expected to write a 5-7 page review for the book *Bound in Wedlock: Slave and Free Black Marriage in the Nineteenth Century*. For an understanding of how to write an adequate book review, see <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/704/1/>. For additional guidance,

see the academic journal “Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews.” Format: 12 point Times New Roman, one inch margins, double spaced, stapled, with page number printed on the bottom of each page.

(3) Final (40%)

For Undergraduate Students: Annotated Bibliography

You will be expected to first develop a research question and then assemble an annotated bibliography that directly addresses your research question. You must submit a brief proposal for approval (1/2 page) indicating your research question and two possible journal articles that you will use. Your proposal is due **February 2nd**. This brief proposal must be typed. Late proposals will result in a 10% drop each day it is late. Please be sure to hand them in on time. Your completed annotated bibliography is due **May 4th**.

For an understanding of how to write an annotated bibliography, see:

<https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/614/02/>

For Graduate Students: Final Paper

Students are required to write a research paper which they will present to the class at the end of the semester (during the last week). The written paper will be approximately 15-20 ([depending on selected paper option] double-spaced) pages, addressing a core research question (or set of questions) related to the sociological study of families (broadly defined). Depending on students’ stage in the graduate program, interests, and access to data, this paper may take one of the following forms: (1) empirical research paper or (2) non-empirical paper: literature review [MA students only] or research proposal.

Final Paper Presentation

In addition to the first task, leading class discussion, mentioned above, students are also required to prepare a presentation on their final paper during the last two weeks of class. This presentation should be similar to that of a professional conference presentation. Presentations will be done using Power Point (with or without handouts), providing visual aids when necessary. Presenters should be prepared for questions.

Option #1:

This paper should add to the field by testing untested hypotheses (or updating/improving previous hypothesis tests). The final paper should include an introduction which clearly state your research question/s, a review of relevant literature, discussion of data and methods used to test the hypotheses, data analysis section, and discussion and conclusion section which cohesively addresses the implications of the analysis and how it contributes to the existing literature. While this is not a statistics or methods course, the choice of data and analysis must be appropriate to the research question and contemporary methods. Quantitative and qualitative analyses are both acceptable. Take advantage of this as an option for getting started on your thesis or dissertation. This paper may overlap with research being done in another class, or as part of your thesis/dissertation with the permission of the professor. Format: 12 point Times New Roman, one inch margins, double spaced, stapled, with page number printed on the bottom of each page. Also, make sure that the literature review is divided up into thematic sections.

Option #2:

Students may write a non-empirical paper. This paper would be an in-depth paper on a key theoretical perspective in the area of families (broadly defined) that may (or may not) be fully addressed in the class. Because this is a non-empirical paper, you are required to amalgamate key research in the field regarding your topic of interest. Moreover, you would summarize the major findings of existing research testing the competing perspectives around this topic. Paper topics can also build on areas discussed in the course specifically. Final papers should be 15 to 20 pages of text (not including references, tables, or figures; no cover pages please). Format: 12 point Times New Roman, one inch margins, double spaced, stapled, with page number printed on the bottom of each page. Make sure that the literature review is divided up into thematic sections.

Over the course of the semester I will require a (1) one page introduction (2-4 paragraphs) of your final paper as a short proposal. This is due in week 4 (February 2 @ 5pm) and week 12 (March 30th @ 5 pm). This will require you to begin thinking about your paper topic early. You will turn in a revised version of this introduction/proposal in week 12. In week 12 you will (2) also turn in a detailed outline of your entire paper. This includes a skeletal outline of the introduction, literature review, data and methods, etc.

Late Assignments:

All assignments are submitted electronically and therefore have day and time stamps. Be sure to submit assignments on time for credit. Late assignments will be docked 10 percentage points.

Students who have conflict due to representing the university (e.g., Band, Athletics, Theatre):

If you will have university related class conflicts, you need to submit official written documentation from the organization leader (e.g. director, coach) (highlighting your schedule) during the first two weeks of class. If your schedule conflicts with an assignment due date or an exam window, you must inform the Instructor via email about this conflict at least 2 weeks in advance, in order for a new assignment or exam date to be scheduled. Please note that make-up assignments or exams may vary from those originally given.

Assessments:

	Percent of Grade
Attendance & Participation	25%
Midterm	35%
Final	40%
Total	100%

A+ 97-100	B+ 87-89	C+ 77-79	D+ 67-69	F <=59%
A 93-96	B 83-86	<u>C 73-76</u>	D 63-66	
A- 90-92	B- 80-82	C- 70-72	D- 60-62	

Course Conduct:

I place a high value on respectful conduct in the classroom, representing diversity and acknowledging different opinions and experiences. As a student, classroom conduct respectful to both the instructor and your classmates covers range of areas that most of you are familiar with. Here are some examples of expectations to support the best learning environment for everyone:

- ✓ Arrive in class on-time - late arrivals make it hard to hear the instructor
- ✓ Use electronic devices for class tasks only
- ✓ Stay until the end of class time
- ✓ Wait until the instructor is finished to pack up possessions.
- ✓ Only students who have a medical necessity and who are registered with the Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) office can do any recording of the class
- ✓ Direct attention to the lesson and participate in all classroom activities
- ✓ Conversations should only occur when the instructor asks the class to have a discussion.
- ✓ Contribute to class by raising your hand and being called on. Students will be acknowledged and asked to speak in turn.
- ✓ Minimize distractions to classmates (e.g. keep eating during lecture at a minimum).
- ✓ Engage in productive dialogue, even on controversial issues; for example focus on ideas, theories, and evidence using respectful language about people we disagree with.

Grade Check Request:

Grade checks/reports for student athletes, scholarships, Greek society membership, etc. are handled in person by appointment.

Requisition for Re-evaluation of Assignments & Exams:

If a student believes an error was made in the assignment of their grade on a particular assignment they may address the situation in a type-written memo. For assignments and examinations, if a student believes there was more than one correct answer for a question or points were deducted in error they may submit, **via email**, a report detailing the error within 48 hours of assignment or exam date. For a request to be considered the student must provide relevant evidence from the assigned readings and/or lecture notes in support of the claim. Please note that re-grading means that the grade on the assignment or examination may increase, not change at all, or decrease. The score on the re-graded assignment or examination will then be considered the student's final score. Requests for re-evaluation of re-graded assignment or examination will not be accepted.

If a student is not satisfied with the response to a request for re-evaluation of an assignment or examination grade, the student may contact the chair of the Undergraduate Program in Sociology, in writing, to detail the complaint. Please note, however, that the chair of the

Undergraduate Program should be contacted only after a student has submitted a request for re-evaluation, as explained in the above paragraph, and only in the case that the student is unsatisfied with the Instructor's response to the initial request.

Students with Disabilities:

In accordance with the University policy, if a student has a documented disability and requires accommodations to obtain equal access in this course, he/she should contact the Instructor via email as soon as possible and make this need known. It is the policy of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to provide flexible and individualized accommodation to students with documented disabilities that may affect their ability to fully participate in course activities or to meet course requirements. To receive accommodation services, you must be registered with the Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) office, 132 Canfield Administration, 472-3787 voice or TTY. Please contact the Service for Students with Disabilities (SSD) office as soon as possible to have them advance the paperwork to the instructor in a timely manner.

Email Etiquette:

Electronic communication with your professors, instructors, recitation instructors and other UNL personnel constitute formal, rather than conversational, correspondence – similar to business-style email correspondence. As such, your email should be structured professionally beginning with the appropriate salutation (e.g., Good Morning/Day/Afternoon Professor, Dr., Director, Dean, Provost, Chancellor, Mr., Ms., and Mrs. _____ (Last Name). Unless otherwise instructed, UNL personnel should not be addressed as Hey/Hi/Hello/Yo/what's up _____ (First Name).

Likewise, if you prefer to be addressed by a different name other than what is listed on the official class roster, please inform me and your Recitation Instructor as soon as possible, so that I may address you appropriately.

When emailing please identify the course name (i.e. SOCI/ETHN 448/848) and end the correspondence by signing your name. I generally respond to emails between 9:00 am-5:00 pm, Monday-Friday. However, if you have not received a response within 24 business hours, please send a follow-up email.

Academic Integrity:

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln has set education objectives that aim to maintain academic integrity. Violations of academic integrity include, but are not limited to, *plagiarism, cheating, submitting unoriginal work in whole or part, fabrication or falsification, abuse of academic materials, complicity in academic dishonesty, and falsifying grade reports*. At minimum, any student found guilty of committing an act of academic dishonesty will receive a failing grade on the assignment, will be reported to the Chair of the Department of Sociology and the University Judicial Officer. Further academic and disciplinary sanctions may also be applied, however, including dismissal from the university. **Students have been dismissed from the University for Violations of academic integrity.** We therefore strongly urge you to maintain academic integrity. If you are unaware of what constitutes academic dishonesty, please see an academic advisor, talk to your professor/instructor, and become familiar with the University's Academic Integrity Policy (See <http://stuafs.unl.edu/ja/code/three.shtml>).

Personal Identities:

The university Canvas system allows students to change personal information although the system resets every night. Not all students go by their legal name or find that the set information in Canvas does not accurately portray who they are. Please send an email and let me know what your preferred name and pronouns are.

For example, I prefer to be called Professor Williams or Dr. Williams and my preferred pronouns are him & he.

Gender is central to the lives of many students and sex specific bathrooms are ubiquitous on campus. Gender neutral bathrooms can be harder to find; here is a link to their locations:

<http://involved.unl.edu/unl-gender-neutral-bathrooms>

The university was not originally designed for parents or new mothers. There are lactation spaces and refrigerators around campus to support lactating mothers (e.g. in the Sociology Department on the 7th floor of Oldfather Hall). If student parents encounter other barriers to success in class, please communicate with the class professor to find a way to overcome the barriers.

Preliminary Course Calendar

Week 1 (1/9 – 1/11): The History & Legality of Families

Readings: Groups 1 & 2

Cohen, pages 2-9; Chapter 2

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1996). On the family as a realized category. *Theory, culture & society*, 13(3), 19-26.

Coontz, Stephanie. (2000). Historical perspectives on family studies. *Journal of marriage and family*, 62(2), 283-297.

Gough, K. (1971). The origin of the family. *Journal of Marriage and family*, 33(4), 760-771.

Week 2 (1/16 – 1/18): Race/Ethnicity & Families –Part 1

Readings: Groups 3 & 4

Cohen, Chapter 3 (pages 72-104)

Franke, K. M. (1999). Becoming a citizen: Reconstruction era regulation of African American marriages. *Yale JL & Human.*, 11, 251.

Lenhardt, Robin. A. (2014). Marriage as Black Citizenship. *Hastings LJ*, 66, 1317.

Patterson, R. J. (2017). Marriage panacea: Black music re (imagines) sociological explanations of black inequality. *Journal of Popular Music Studies*, 29(4).

Bryant, C. M., Wickrama, K. A. S., Bolland, J., Bryant, B. M., Cutrona, C. E., & Stanik, C. E. (2010). Race matters, even in marriage: Identifying factors linked to marital outcomes for African Americans. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 2(3), 157-174.

Week 3 (1/23 – 1/25): Race/Ethnicity & Families –Part 2

Readings: 5 & 6

Burton, L. M., Bonilla-Silva, E., Ray, V., Buckelew, R., & Hordge Freeman, E. (2010). Critical race theories, colorism, and the decade's research on families of color. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 440-459.

Evans-Campbell, T. (2008). Historical trauma in American Indian/Native Alaska communities: A multilevel framework for exploring impacts on individuals, families, and communities. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 23(3), 316-338.

Orengo-Aguayo, R. E. (2015). Mexican American and other Hispanic couples' relationship dynamics: A review to inform interventions aimed at promoting healthy relationships. *Marriage & Family Review*, 51(7), 633-667.

Geronimus, A. T. (2003). Damned if you do: Culture, identity, privilege, and teenage childbearing in the United States. *Social science & medicine*, 57(5), 881-893.

Week 4 (1/30 – 2/1): Gender & Families

Annotated Bibliography Proposals (Undergrads)/Paper Proposals Introductions (Grads) **due: 2/2 @ 5pm**

Readings: Groups 1 & 2

Cohen, Chapter 5

Cott, N. F. (1998). Marriage and Women's Citizenship in the United States, 1830-1934. *The American Historical Review*, 103(5), 1440-1474.

Loscocco, K., & Walzer, S. (2013). Gender and the culture of heterosexual marriage in the United States. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 5(1), 1-14.

Hill, S. A. (2006). Marriage among African American women: A gender perspective. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 421-440.

Risman, B. J. (2004). Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism. *Gender & society*, 18(4), 429-450.

Craig, L. (2006). Does father care mean fathers share? A comparison of how mothers and fathers in intact families spend time with children. *Gender & society*, 20(2), 259-281.

Week 5 (2/6 – 2/8): Social Class & Families

Readings: Groups 3 & 4

Cohen, Chapter 4

Baker, R. S. (2015). The changing association among marriage, work, and child poverty in the United States, 1974–2010. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 77(5), 1166-1178.

Thiede, B. C., Kim, H., & Slack, T. (2017). Marriage, Work, and Racial Inequalities in Poverty: Evidence From the United States. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 79(5), 1241-1257.

McLanahan, S., & Percheski, C. (2008). Family structure and the reproduction of inequalities. *Annu. Rev. Sociol*, 34, 257-276.

Gibson-Davis, C. M., Edin, K., & McLanahan, S. (2005). High hopes but even higher expectations: The retreat from marriage among low-income couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(5), 1301-1312.

Benton, R. A., & Keister, L. A. (2017). The lasting effect of intergenerational wealth transfers: Human capital, family formation, and wealth. *Social science research*, 68, 1-14.

(*be familiar with this report*) Traub, A., Sullivan, L., Meschede, T., & Shapiro, T. (2017). The asset value of whiteness: understanding the racial wealth gap. *Demos (February 6, 2017)*

<http://www.demos.org/publication/asset-value-whiteness-understanding-racial-wealth-gap>

Week 6 (2/13 – 2/15): Sexuality & Families

Readings: Groups 5 & 6

Cohen, Chapter 6

Brumbaugh, S. M., Sanchez, L. A., Nock, S. L., & Wright, J. D. (2008). Attitudes toward gay marriage in states undergoing marriage law transformation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(2), 345-359.

Biblarz, T. J., & Savci, E. (2010). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 480-497.

Moore, M. R., & Stambolis-Ruhstorfer, M. (2013). LGBT sexuality and families at the start of the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 39, 491-507.

Rosenfeld, M. J., & Kim, B. S. (2005). The independence of young adults and the rise of interracial and same-sex unions. *American Sociological Review*, 70(4), 541-562.

Week 7 (2/20 – 2/22): Intersectionality & Families

Readings: Groups 1 & 2

Choo, H. Y., & Ferree, M. M. (2010). Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: A critical analysis of inclusions, interactions, and institutions in the study of inequalities. *Sociological theory*, 28(2), 129-149.

Collins, P. H. (1998). It's all in the family: Intersections of gender, race, and nation. *Hypatia*, 13(3), 62-82.

Few-Demo, A. L., Lloyd, S. A., & Allen, K. R. (2014). It's all about power: Integrating feminist family studies and family communication. *Journal of Family Communication*, 14(2), 85-94.

Few-Demo, A. L. (2014). Intersectionality as the “new” critical approach in feminist family studies: Evolving racial/ethnic feminisms and critical race theories. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 6(2), 169-183.

(No need for review: added in case someone is interested) Collins, P. H. (2015). Intersectionality's definitional dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41, 1-20.

Week 8 (2/27 – 3/1): Theories of Marriage Decline

Readings: Groups 3 & 4

Cohen, Chapter 8 (pages 260-274)

Lee, Chapters 7, 8, 9

Raley, R. K., & Sweeney, M. M. (2009). Explaining race and ethnic variation in marriage: Directions for future research. *Race and Social Problems*, 1(3), 132-142.

Week 9 (3/6 – 3/8): The Rise in Non-Marital Cohabitation

Readings: Groups 5 & 6

Cohen, Chapter 8 (pages 282-286)

Bumpass, L., & Lu, H. H. (2000). Trends in cohabitation and implications for children's family contexts in the United States. *Population studies*, 54(1), 29-41.

Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (2005). Measuring and modeling cohabitation: New perspectives from qualitative data. *Journal of marriage and family*, 67(4), 989-1002.

Guzzo, K. B., & Hayford, S. R. (2014). Fertility and the stability of cohabiting unions: Variation by intendedness. *Journal of family issues*, 35(4), 547-576.

Raley, R. K. (1996). A shortage of marriageable men? A note on the role of cohabitation in black-white differences in marriage rates. *American Sociological Review*, 973-983.

Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (1995). Why marry? Race and the transition to marriage among cohabiters. *Demography*, 32(4), 509-520.

Manning, W. D. (2015). Cohabitation and child wellbeing. *The Future of children/Center for the Future of Children, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation*, 25(2), 51.

Week 10 (3/13 – 3/15): Assortative Mating & Interracial Relationships

3/12 Distribute midterm exam for undergrads

Midterm & Grad students' book review due Friday, 3/16 by 5pm.

Readings: Groups 1 & 2

Cohen, Chapter 8 (pages 275-281)

Schwartz, C. R. (2013). Trends and variation in assortative mating: Causes and consequences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 39, 451-470.

Qian, Z., & Lichter, D. T. (2011). Changing patterns of interracial marriage in a multiracial society. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73(5), 1065-1084.

Feliciano, C., Robnett, B., & Komaie, G. (2009). Gendered racial exclusion among white internet daters. *Social Science Research*, 38(1), 39-54.

Choi, K. H., & Tienda, M. (2017). Marriage-Market Constraints and Mate-Selection Behavior: Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Differences in Intermarriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 79(2), 301-317.

Wu, Z., Schimmele, C. M., & Hou, F. (2015). Group differences in intermarriage with Whites between Asians, Blacks, and Hispanics: The effects of assimilation and structural constraints. *Journal of Social Issues, 71*(4), 733-754.

Schueths, A. M. (2015). Barriers to interracial marriage? Examining policy issues concerning US citizens married to undocumented Latino/a immigrants. *Journal of Social Issues, 71*(4), 804-820.

Week 11: Spring Break

3/20 – 3/22

Week 12 (3/27 – 3/29): Children's & Parents' Well-Being

Readings: Groups 3 & 4

Lee, Chapters 3, 4, 5, 6

Week 13 (4/3 – 4/5): Single & Living Alone; In-Laws; Divorce

Readings: Groups 5 & 6

Professor will show short video on African American women: Single & Living Alone

Marsh, K., Darity Jr, W. A., Cohen, P. N., Casper, L. M., & Salters, D. (2007). The emerging Black middle class: Single and living alone. *Social Forces, 86*(2), 735-762.

Hays, J. C., & George, L. K. (2002). The life-course trajectory toward living alone: Racial differences. *Research on Aging, 24*(3), 283-307.

Bryant, C. M., Conger, R. D., & Meehan, J. M. (2001). The influence of in-laws on change in marital success. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*(3), 614-626.

Amato, P. R. (2010). Research on divorce: Continuing trends and new developments. *Journal of marriage and family, 72*(3), 650-666.

Week 14 (4/10 – 4/12): Family/Dyadic Processes: Health & Families

Readings: Groups 1 & 2

Robles, T. F., Slatcher, R. B., Trombello, J. M., & McGinn, M. M. (2014). Marital quality and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological bulletin, 140*(1), 140.

Repetti, R. L., Robles, T. F., & Reynolds, B. (2011). Allostatic processes in the family. *Development and psychopathology, 23*(3), 921-938.

Robles, T. F., Reynolds, B. M., Repetti, R. L., & Chung, P. J. (2013). Using daily diaries to study family settings, emotions, and health in everyday life. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 30*(2), 179-188.

Week 15 (4/17 – 4/19): Family Policies / Paper Presentations (Grad Students)

*Readings: Groups 3 & 4

Policy Debate – Round 1

Johnson, M. D. (2012). Healthy marriage initiatives: on the need for empiricism in policy implementation. *American Psychologist*, 67(4), 296.

Critique:

Hawkins, A. J., Stanley, S. M., Cowan, P. A., Fincham, F. D., Beach, S. R., Cowan, C. P., ... & Daire, A. P. (2013). A more optimistic perspective on government-supported marriage and relationship education programs for lower income couples. *The American psychologist*, 68(2), 110.

Rejoinder:

Johnson, M. D. (2013). Optimistic or Quixotic? More Data on Marriage and Relationship Education Programs for Lower Income Couples. *American Psychologist*, 68(2), 111-112.

*Readings: Groups 5 & 6

Policy Debate: Round 2

Hawkins, A. J., Amato, P. R., & Kinghorn, A. (2013). Are government-supported Healthy Marriage Initiatives affecting family demographics? A state-level analysis. *Family Relations*, 62(3), 501-513.

Critique:

Johnson, M. D. (2014). Government-supported healthy marriage initiatives are not associated with changes in family demographics: A comment on Hawkins, Amato, and Kinghorn (2013). *Family Relations*, 63(2), 300-304.

Week 16: Paper Presentations (Grad Students)

Annotated Bibliography (for Undergraduate Students) and Final Papers (for Graduate Students) due May 4th @ 5pm.