

THE SITUATION

The labor market is a constant topic among politicians. Even in the midst of historically low unemployment rates, politicians debate the reasons why many blue collar jobs have disappeared. Majority of these reasons can be summarized to one simple answer: cheaper substitutes. One such substitute is automation. With every passing year, automation technology improves and becomes cheaper. As economists, we know events, such as these, affect the immediate market as well as related markets. All the while, these markets naturally pursue equilibrium.

You are an economic adviser to a political candidate running for the US Senate in 2020. Having never taken an economics course, the candidate needs your help in understanding the basics of how a market, like the labor market, works and how it responds to changes in other markets. Your task is to write a brief memorandum to prepare your candidate for future questions on this subject.

THE PROMPT

Draft a memorandum to your candidate on the subject of the labor market and its relationship to automation. Your memo should:

- Discuss the principles that contribute to market equilibrium;
- Identify which factors and variables lead to changes in the market;
- Explain, in the context of these principles, how an improvement in automation technology affects the labor market;
- Explain, how the improvement in automation technology, and its subsequent effect on the labor market, ultimately impact the markets for the goods and services which are produced using labor and automation. (You may treat the markets for the goods and services produced by labor and automation as one market for simplicity.)

Items to keep in mind:

- When we read your report, we will assume the perspective of the candidate, who does not have an economics background.
- Please assume there are no government interventions, like minimum wage in these markets.
- External sources are **not required** but also should be cited, if used. APA format or MLA format are acceptable.
- Since you are writing to help your candidate, please carefully proofread and edit your memo.
- This should be a memo of 250-300 words. Please include a word count at the end of your assignment.
- For ease of grading, please make sure your paper is in Times New Roman, 12pt font, and double spaced.

GRADING:

- For Writing Assignment 1, you are asked to submit a First Draft, review your peers (Peer Review), and submit a reflection on how your peer review experience would inform future revision (Peer Reflection).
- The First Draft is worth 2 points. Submitting a completed assignment is necessary to earn these points.
- The Peer Review is assessed on the Peer Review Rubric.

Commented [A1]: MEANING MAKING ACTIVITY

The prompt asks students to assume the role of “an economic advisor to a political candidate running for the US Senate.” The Senator has a layperson’s knowledge of economics, and so, as an advisor, the writer needs to communicate to a non-specialist audience.

Commented [A2]: CLEAR EXPECTATIONS

Explicit instructions about what to include in the memorandum to the candidate.

Commented [A3]: CLEAR EXPECTATIONS

Explicit instructions about what kind of information to include, working assumptions, when to provide citations and how, length, and formatting.

Commented [A4]: CLEAR EXPECTATIONS

Explicit instructions about how students will be evaluated.

- Majority of your assignment grade (18 out of 30 points) depends on the Peer Review.
 - Therefore, failure to complete this Peer Review will result in a loss of these 18 points.
 - Participation in the Peer Review depends on successfully submitting the First Draft on time. Therefore, failure to submit a First Draft results in an automatic loss of these 18 points for a lack of Peer Reviews, in addition to the 2 point associated with submitting the First Draft. For your sake, please submit your First Draft on time!
- The Peer Reflection is worth 10 points. This document will be graded on your revision reflections coming out of your peer review experience.

FIRST DRAFT

Prepare your first draft of the report requested in the prompt.

Your first draft is due before 11:59pm on January 28th (THURSDAY). Note, Canvas will treat a submission at 11:59pm as late. **A student failing to submit the first draft will not be able to participate in the peer review process, both in having their paper reviewed (obviously) and in not being allowed to review other papers. This effectively limits your grade to 10 points out of 30 possible points for Writing Assignment 1 Core Theory.**

Please be aware of the following:

- The file format must be in Microsoft Word format. DO NOT upload a Google Doc, as this is a common source of corrupted files.
- Please DO NOT put your name in the document that you upload. The peer review process should be anonymous, and we cannot remove your name from the documents once submitted.
- There is no need to add a comment to your submission with your name. Canvas will link your submission to your student record since you had to log in to view this page.

Please download your paper and open the document after uploading it, to ensure your paper properly uploaded.

[Click here to submit your First Draft.](#)

PEER REVIEW

In providing feedback, your task is to help your peers identify areas that need the most attention. You will be given a series of prompts to guide you through the process of effectively providing feedback.

Peer Review Guidelines

- Print and read over your peer's report to quickly get an overview of the piece.
- Read the report more slowly keeping the essay assignment in mind.
- Highlight the pieces of texts that let you directly address the feedback prompts in your online responses.
- In your online responses, focus on larger issues (higher order concerns) of content and argument rather than lower order concerns like grammar and spelling.
- Be very specific in your responses, referring to your peer's actual language, mentioning terms and concepts that are either present or missing, and following the directions in the

Commented [A5]: INTERACTIVE WRITING PROCESS
Writers will engage in a process of peer review.

CLEAR EXPECTATIONS
Students are given guidelines for how to engage in the process of peer review.

feedback prompts.

- Use respectful language whether you are suggesting improvements to or praising your peer.

Feedback Prompts

Understanding	Based on your class discussion and course readings, identify any important concepts that are missing. Identify any unnecessary concepts in use.
	Based on your class discussion and course readings, how could the student improve their explanation of the factors that influence market efficiency?
	How can the author connect concepts in a more useful manner? For example, how could the author improve their explanation of factors and variables leading to changes in the market?
Critical Thinking	Comment on the ways the author might better explain the connections between the assigned markets (automation, labor, and the goods and services produced by labor and automation).
	Does the author use any outside sources? If so, are all sources properly cited?
Response Alignment with Audience	The memo is for a candidate who has no prior economic knowledge. In this context, is the report aligned with the target audience? Which parts were difficult to understand? Which parts were easy to understand?

Commented [A6]: OPPORTUNITIES FOR METACOGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT
 Student writers are asked to think through how their peers responded to the prompt. These prompts are designed to refine their own thinking on course concepts and reduces misconceptions

Peer Review Grading Criteria

Your peer feedback will be graded on two primary criteria: Is it relevant, and is it specific. You will receive points according to the Peer Review Rubric:

Your Peer Review is due before 11:59pm on February 2nd (TUESDAY).

[Click here to complete your Peer Reviews.](#)

Peer Review Rubric for all Peer Reviews:

18 Points Possible	Missing Elements (2 or 4 points)	Meets Expectations (6 points)
Review of Essay 1	Follows the question prompts, focusing on ways to improve the weakest element of the paper, but lacks specific examples of elements for improvement	Follows the question prompts, focusing on ways to improve the weakest element of the paper by using specific examples of elements for improvement
Review of Essay 2	Follows the question prompts, focusing on ways to improve the weakest element of the paper, but lacks specific examples of elements for improvement	Follows the question prompts, focusing on ways to improve the weakest element of the paper by using specific examples of elements for improvement
Review of Essay 3	Follows the question prompts, focusing on ways to improve the weakest element of the paper, but lacks specific examples of elements for improvement	Follows the question prompts, focusing on ways to improve the weakest element of the paper by using specific examples of elements for improvement

Commented [A7]: CLEAR EXPECTATIONS
Students know how they will be evaluated

PEER REFLECTION

The process of reading and commenting on the writing of others as well as receiving feedback from your peers gives you a way of seeing your own writing differently. This is the first step in revising your own work: seeing your work differently. In this Peer Reflection assignment, you are asked to summarize your reflections and potential revision, using the insights you gained from reading the work of your peers, as well as the feedback you received from your peers. Focus on how this experience motivates potential changes in your own work. Consider this assignment to be an intermediary step between peer review and a true revision.

Reflection Guidelines:

- Re-read the situation and prompt
- Review the essays for which you provided peer feedback in the peer review process, making a list of effective content *you noticed in the writing of your peers*
- Read and summarize the feedback you received from your peers
- With these things in mind, re-read your draft.
- In a single document, propose the improvements you would make, pointing out where the peer review experience influenced these decisions.

Submit this reflection

Your submission will be graded on the degree to which you used your peer review experience in generating proposed points of improvement. You will receive points according to the Peer Reflection Rubric.

Your Peer Reflection is due before 11:59 p.m. on February 5th (FRIDAY).

Please download your paper and open the document after uploading it, to ensure your paper properly uploaded.

Click here to submit your Peer Reflection.

Commented [A8]: INTERACTIVE WRITING PROCESS
After engaging in Peer Review, students will reflect and revise their work

CLEAR EXPECTATIONS
Students are offered clear instructions and guidelines for this step of the writing process

OPPORTUNITIES FOR METACOGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT
Reviewing feedback from their peers offers students the ability to refine their thinking and clarify misconceptions in their own understandings of course concepts

Core Theory Peer Reflection Rubric:

Commented [A9]: CLEAR EXPECTATIONS
Students are given a rubric for their revisions

10 Points Possible	Missing Elements	Meets Expectations	Exceed Expectations
Peer Essays Read	<i>(1, 2, or 3 points)</i> Revision ideas reference one unique example from peer essays or only generally discuss peer essays read, and does not reflect on how this motivates further refinement in the work.	<i>(5 points)</i> Revision ideas reference two unique examples from peer essays and include at least one specific or two general ideas for revision.	<i>(6 points)</i> Revision ideas reference two peer essays, reflecting on how this motivates refinements in the writer's own work by including two specific or one general and one specific idea for revision
Peer Feedback Received	<i>(1 or 2 points)</i> Revision ideas reference one unique example from peer feedback or only generally discuss peer feedback, and does not reflect on how this motivates further refinement in the work.	<i>(3 points)</i> Revision ideas reference two unique examples from peer feedback. Citing at least one specific or two general ideas for revision.	<i>(4 points)</i> Revision ideas reference two unique examples from peer feedback, reflecting on how this motivates refinements in the writer's own work. Citing at least two specific or one general and one specific idea for revision.