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### Intro and Discussion:
The main schools of economic thought that have emerged in the past few centuries include Classical, Neo-Classicals, New Classics, Keynesians, Neo-Keynesians, and New Keynesians, which can be classified under the broad categories of Classical versus Keynesian thought. The figure placed at the center of this poster exhibits the evolution process of the two major schools of economic thought as well as that of the new neo-classical synthesis, and summarizes a sequence of momentous events occurred over the course of the formation of these schools of economic thought. The essential distinctions among the Classical and Keynesian schools of economic thought are discussed in greater detail in the tables. In particular, the first column (entitled “Aspect”) introduces the point of comparison, the second column (entitled Classical) briefly explains the way Classical schools of economic thought address the specified aspect. The last column provides additional information and extra elaboration on related matters, if needed.

### Abstract:
Macroeconomics essentially discusses macroeconomic phenomena from the perspectives of various schools of economic thought, each of which takes different views on how macroeconomic agents make decisions and how the corresponding markets operate. Therefore, developing a clear, comprehensive understanding of how and in what ways these schools of economic thought differ is a key and a prerequisite for economics students to prosper academically and professionally in the discipline. This becomes even more crucial as economics students pursue their studies toward higher levels of education and graduate school, during which students are expected to attain higher levels of Bloom's taxonomy, including analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and creation. Teaching the distinctions and similarities of these two schools of thought has never been an easy task to undertake in the classroom. Although the reason for such a handicap can be multi-fold, one reason has undoubtedly been students' lack of a holistic view on how the two mainstream economic schools of thought differ. There is strong evidence that students make smoother transition to higher levels of education after building up such groundwork, on which they can build farther later on (e.g. Dilda and Haskel, 1998, Marcal and Roberts, 2001, Islam, et al., 2008, Green, et al., 2009, White, 2016). The paper starts with a visual spectrum of various schools of economic thought, and then narrows down the scope to the Classical and Keynesian schools, i.e. the backbone of modern macroeconomics. Afterwards, a holistic table contrasts the two schools in terms of over 50 aspects. Not only does this table help economics students enhance their comprehension, retention, and critical-thinking capability, it also helps macroeconomic instructors to gain a holistic view and deliver such a view more easily in their classrooms. The pedagogical aspects of this approach are discussed throughout the paper with reference to the economics education literature.

### Conclusion:
Economics is a discipline that involves a wide variety of schools of thought, each of which can differ from the others in terms of numerous aspects. This variety and numerosity can be a source of confusion for many economics students. This paper proposes a holistic contrast table that can serve as a complementary tool to eliminate this potential reason for concern in the teaching of macroeconomics. It is shown that this important task can be undertaken through structuring an organized contrast table, which clearly explains all the existing distinctions, helping students clear up the fuzziness and confusions about the existing distinctions. In particular, the primary aim of this paper is to facilitate the teaching and learning of the two major schools of economic thought, i.e. Classical and Keynesians, aiming at helping students to get the big picture of the distinctions at once in a single table. Embedded throughout the paper are suggestions and handy tips for how instructors should design and apply such a tool in their teaching.
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### Table 1: Aspect of the Classical vs. Keynesian Schools of Thought

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Keynesian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealth Accumulation and Saving</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Keynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Policy</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Keynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Policy</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Keynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Formation</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Keynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Market Operations</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Keynesian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Neoclassical School vs. New Keynesian School of Thought

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Neoclassical</th>
<th>New Keynesian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealth Accumulation and Saving</td>
<td>Neoclassical</td>
<td>New Keynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Policy</td>
<td>Neoclassical</td>
<td>New Keynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Policy</td>
<td>Neoclassical</td>
<td>New Keynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Formation</td>
<td>Neoclassical</td>
<td>New Keynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Market Operations</td>
<td>Neoclassical</td>
<td>New Keynesian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Diagram:

- **Graph A**: Traditional versus Classical
- **Graph B**: Classical versus Keynesian
- **Graph C**: Neo-Classicals versus New Keynesians
- **Graph D**: Classical versus Neo-Classicals
- **Graph E**: Keynesian versus New Keynesians
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### Notes:
- **Market Thought**: Demand and supply determine the price level, not government intervention.
- **Keynesian Thought**: Demand is not sufficient to generate full employment, and government intervention is necessary to stabilize the economy.
- **Classical Approach**: Markets are always in equilibrium, and government intervention is not necessary.
- **Keynesian Approach**: Markets do not always clear, and government intervention is necessary to stabilize the economy.
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