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## Aggregate Labor Supply

- In the aggregate, labor supply supply curve embodies both intensive and extensive margins, and is is upward sloping.
- Intensive margin: for those already working, increase in wage has income and substitution effects.
- Extensive margin: increases in wages may induce some who were not in labor force to enter and supply labor. Always increasing in $w$.
- Aggregate labor supply curve also smooths out kinks in individual supply, for example due to fixed costs of work.


## Figure 4.10 Effect of an Increase in Dividend Income or a Decrease in Taxes



## Application: Decline in Employment of Young Men

- In recent paper Aguiar, Bils, Charles, and Hurst (2018) document decline in employment and hours worked of young men (21-30) who did not attend college.
- Also document increased leisure time of this same group, and increase in computer and videogame use.
- Argue that improvements in leisure activities (productivity of videogames, taste for leisure) have made non-participation and less work more prevalent.
- Other factors as well: changing job prospects, living with parents

Figure 3: Annual Hours Index for Less Educated Young Men and All Prime Age Men, March CPS


Notes: Figure shows annual hours index for lower educated young men (squares) and all prime age men (triangles). Annual hours are calculated by multiplying self-reported weeks worked last year by self-reported usual hours worked per week last year. We convert the series to an index by setting year 2000 values to 0 . All other years are $\log$ deviations from year 2000 values. Data from the March supplement of the Current Population Survey.

Table 3: Leisure Activities for Men 21-30 (Hours per Week): By Employment Status

| Activity | Employed |  |  | Non-Employed |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2004- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2012- \\ 2015 \end{gathered}$ | Change | $\begin{aligned} & 2004- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2012 \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ | Change |
| Total Leisure | 57.6 | 59.6 | 2.0 | 87.0 | 82.1 | -4.9 |
| Recreational Computer | 3.0 | 4.3 | 1.3 | 5.4 | 9.6 | 4.2 |
| Video Game | 1.8 | 2.9 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 5.9 | 2.4 |
| ESP | 23.6 | 23.9 | 0.3 | 30.2 | 29.9 | -0.2 |
| TV/Movies/Netflix | 15.9 | 15.5 | -0.4 | 27.8 | 25.0 | -2.8 |
| Socializing | 7.4 | 7.8 | 0.3 | 10.6 | 8.9 | -1.7 |
| Other Leisure | 7.7 | 8.1 | 0.5 | 13.0 | 8.6 | -4.4 |
| Job Search and Education | 2.0 | 1.9 | -0.1 | 9.2 | 14.1 | 4.9 |

Note: Components sum to total leisure time. Video gaming is a subcomponent of total computer time. ESP refers to eating, sleeping and personal care net of 49 hours per week.

## Improvements in Leisure Activities

- Model as an increase in leisure productivity $\theta$ :

$$
\begin{gathered}
\max _{c, l} u(c, \theta l) \\
\text { s.t. } c=(h-l) w+\pi
\end{gathered}
$$

- Optimality condition:

$$
\theta \frac{u_{l}}{u_{c}}=w
$$

- Increase in productivity equivalent to increase in preference for leisure $\Rightarrow$ decrease in labor supply.
- A firm uses capital $K$ and labor $N$ to produce output $Y$ via a production function $F$ :

$$
Y=z F(K, N)
$$

$z$ is the level of technology or total factor productivity (TFP).

- The main example we'll use is Cobb-Douglas production function, with $\alpha \in(0,1)$ :

$$
Y=z K^{\alpha} N^{1-\alpha}
$$

- We will start with a static model: $K$ (supply) is constant.


## Properties of the Technology

We'll make several assumptions on the technology $F$, all of which are satisfied by Cobb-Douglas.

1. Inputs are essential.

$$
F(0, N)=F(K, 0)=0
$$

2. Constant returns to scale:

$$
F(\lambda K, \lambda N)=\lambda F(K, N)
$$

Doubling inputs doubles output. Compared to decreasing (increasing) returns to scale where doubling inputs leads to less (more) than double output.

$$
\begin{aligned}
F(K, N) & =K^{\alpha} N^{1-\alpha} \\
F(\lambda K, \lambda N) & =(\lambda K)^{\alpha}(\lambda N)^{1-\alpha} \\
& =\lambda K^{\alpha} N^{1-\alpha}
\end{aligned}
$$

3. Marginal productivities of capital and labor are positive and decreasing.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& M P K=F_{K}>0, F_{K K}<0 \\
& M P N=F_{N}>0, F_{N N}<0
\end{aligned}
$$

Increasing each factor gives more output, but at a decreasing rate.

$$
\begin{aligned}
F(K, N) & =K^{\alpha} N^{1-\alpha} \\
F_{K} & =\alpha K^{\alpha-1} N^{1-\alpha}>0 \\
F_{K K} & =\alpha(\alpha-1) K^{\alpha-2} N^{1-\alpha}<0 \\
F_{N} & =(1-\alpha) K^{\alpha} N^{-\alpha}>0 \\
F_{N N} & =-\alpha(1-\alpha) K^{\alpha} N^{-\alpha-1}<0
\end{aligned}
$$

Figure 4.13 Production Function, Fixing the Quantity of Labor and Varying the Quantity of Capital
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4. Marginal productivity of each factor increases in the other.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial M P K}{\partial N} & =\frac{\partial}{\partial N} F_{K}=F_{K N}>0 \\
\frac{\partial M P N}{\partial K} & =\frac{\partial}{\partial K} F_{N}=F_{K N}>0
\end{aligned}
$$

Note one implies other since $F_{K N}=F_{N K}$. Additional capital makes workers more productive: spread workers among more machines (and vice versa).

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{K} & =\alpha K^{\alpha-1} N^{1-\alpha} \\
F_{K N} & =\alpha(1-\alpha) K^{\alpha-1} N^{-\alpha}>0 \\
F_{N} & =(1-\alpha) K^{\alpha} N^{-\alpha} \\
F_{N K} & =\alpha(1-\alpha) K^{\alpha-1} N^{-\alpha}>0
\end{aligned}
$$

## Figure 4.16 Total Factor Productivity Increases
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- Competitive firm rents capital at rate $r$, hires labor at wage $w$.
- Profits: output minus costs

$$
\pi=z F(K, N)-r K-w N
$$

- Note everything in real terms - same as setting price of output to 1.
- Firm maximizes profits by hiring labor and capital. We take first order conditions for choice of $K$ and $N$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& z F_{K}(K, N)=r \\
& z F_{N}(K, N)=w \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

- Factors are paid their marginal products.
- (1) can be solved to give the labor demand: $N^{d}(w)$


## Figure 4.20 The Marginal Product of Labor Curve Is the Labor Demand Curve of the Profit-Maximizing Firm



## Problem of the Firm I: Special Case

- With Cobb-Douglas production, we have:

$$
\pi=z K^{\alpha} N^{1-\alpha}-r K-w N
$$

- We take first order conditions for $K$ and $N$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& z F_{K}=z \alpha K^{\alpha-1} N^{1-\alpha}=r  \tag{2}\\
& z F_{N}=z(1-\alpha) K^{\alpha} N^{-\alpha}=w \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

- (3) can be solved to give the labor demand:

$$
\begin{aligned}
N^{d}(w ; K) & =M P N^{-1}(w ; K) \\
& =K\left(\frac{z(1-\alpha)}{w}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}
\end{aligned}
$$

- $N^{d}$ decreasing in $w$. Increases in $z, K$ shift labor demand.


## Problem of the Firm II

- To fully solve the example, we want to solve for $K$ and $N$.
- We begin dividing (2) by (3):

$$
\frac{\alpha z K^{\alpha-1} N^{1-\alpha}}{(1-\alpha) z K^{\alpha} N^{-\alpha}}=\frac{r}{w}
$$

Or

$$
\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \frac{N}{K}=\frac{r}{w}
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
K=\frac{w}{r} \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} N \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

This gives us the optimal capital/labor ratio of the firm.
Depends on relative prices $w / r$, relative productivities $\alpha, 1-\alpha$.

- But if we substitute (4) in (1), trying to solve for $N$, we get:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(1-\alpha) z K^{\alpha} N^{-\alpha} & =w \\
(1-\alpha) z\left(\frac{w}{r} \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} N\right)^{\alpha} N^{-\alpha} & =w \\
(1-\alpha) z\left(\frac{w}{r} \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\right)^{\alpha} & =w
\end{aligned}
$$

$N$ disappears!

- You can check that the same happens with $K$ if we substitute (4) in (2).
- What is wrong?
- We have constant returns to scale.
- The size of the firm is indeterminate: we can have just one!
- Can show constant returns equivalent to

$$
F(K, N)=F_{K} K+F_{N} N
$$

- This implies profits are always zero if firm maximizes, since $r=M P K, w=M P N$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\pi & =z K^{\alpha} N^{1-\alpha}-r K-w N \\
& =z K^{\alpha} N^{1-\alpha}-M P K \cdot K-M P N \cdot N \\
& =z K^{\alpha} N^{1-\alpha}-\alpha z K^{\alpha-1} N^{1-\alpha} K-(1-\alpha) z K^{\alpha} N^{-\alpha} N=0
\end{aligned}
$$

- Example of Euler's theorem for homegeneous functions
- So the firms really only pick the labor-capital ratio given relative prices:

$$
\frac{N}{K}=\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} \frac{r}{w}
$$

## General Equilibrium

- In equilibrium, markets clear so:

$$
\begin{aligned}
N^{d}(w, K) & =N^{s}(w) \\
K^{d}(r, N) & =\bar{K} \text { i.e., fixed } \\
r & =\alpha z K^{\alpha-1} N^{1-\alpha} \\
w & =(1-\alpha) z K^{\alpha} N^{-\alpha}
\end{aligned}
$$

- We have a system of four equations in four unknowns ( $K, N, r, w)$.
- In other words, firms choose $K / N$ ratio, but by assumption $K$ is fixed at $\bar{K}$ in short run, which gives labor demand $N^{d}$.
- We will return to discussing general equilibrium shortly.


## A Simple Example

A representative worker has preferences:

$$
u(C, l)=2 \sqrt{C}-a \frac{(1-l)^{1.5}}{1.5}
$$

The budget constraint is:

$$
C=w(1-l)
$$

where 1 is the hours in the day, so $1-l$ is labor supply. Capital is fixed at 1 , and the representative firm technology is:

$$
Y=z N^{0.5}
$$

(1) Find the household labor supply function.
(2) Find expressions for the equilibrium values of the labor input and the wage.
(3) Suppose that $a$ increases but $z$ is unchanged. What is the effect of this change on labor and the wage?

## What are we missing?

- Wages are often different from marginal productivity. Labor market not completely a spot market.
- Some reasons:
(1) Long term contracting. Sticky wages: Keynes (1936), Taylor (1980).
(2) Search frictions in finding a job. Wages determined by bargaining: Nash (1950), McCall (1970), Mortensen-Pissarides (1994).
(3) Workers may exert effort which influences output, difficult to observe. Efficiency wages: Shapiro-Stiglitz (1984), moral hazard Holmstrom (1979).

We will return to some of these frictions later in the class. For now continue with competitive, spot labor market.

## Adding a Government

- Operational definition: takes in taxes $T$ and spends $G$.
- We'll assume a balanced budget. No debt in this static model.
- Also assume household does not value government spending. Not crucial here.
- We'll also assume proportional labor income taxes on households. Later will consider lump sum taxes.

$$
\begin{aligned}
G & =T \\
T & =\tau w N
\end{aligned}
$$

## New Problem of the Household

- Set unearned income equal to capital income $r K$. Incorporate labor income taxes.
- Problem for household is now:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\max _{c, N} u(c, l) \\
\text { s.t. } c=(1-\tau) w N+r K
\end{gathered}
$$

- First order conditions:

$$
\frac{u_{l}}{u_{c}}=(1-\tau) w
$$

- Household now equates $M R S$ to after-tax wage.
- Taxes affect labor supply!


## Labor Supply Effects in an Example

- Reconsider the log example from earlier:

$$
u(c, l)=\log c+\gamma \log l
$$

- Then we get:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\gamma \frac{c^{*}}{h-N^{*}}=(1-\tau) w \\
c^{*}=(1-\tau) w N^{*}+r K
\end{gathered}
$$

- Therefore we see that taxes affect labor supply:

$$
N^{*}=\frac{(1-\tau) w h-\gamma r K}{(1+\gamma)(1-\tau) w}
$$

## Laffer Curve

Tax revenue has a Laffer curve:

$$
T=\tau w N=w \tau \frac{(1-\tau) w h-r K}{(1+\gamma)(1-\tau) w}
$$




A Famous Cocktail Napkin


## Laffer Curve

- There were arguments in 1981 and 2001 that US economy was on the bad side of the Laffer curve, and revenue could increase with tax cuts.
- Although these tax cuts may have increased economic growth, there is no evidence that revenue increased.
- Estimates of peak tax revenue in US are at $60 \%$ or greater federal income tax rate
- A 2010 ECB study found Sweden was on the bad side, with a top labor income tax of $57 \%$ and a payroll tax of $31 \%$. Historically it had been even higher, up to $90 \%$.
- Laffer curve arguments are more likely apply to narrower categories of goods which have higher elasticities of substitution, like luxury goods or possibly capital gains.
- We have assumed a constant tax on labor income. In the US, the tax system is progressive: higher marginal tax rates apply to higher incomes.
- Over time the top marginal tax rates have fallen. There are current debates about whether the top tax rate should increase.
- In addition to the labor supply effects, or more broadly, the impact of taxes on taxable income, taxes affect other margins:
- Form of income (tax shelters, incorporation)
- Investment in physical and human capital
- Location of people and businesses
- Business formation and expansion decisions
- Income distribution and political concerns


## Progressive Tax Schedule

Chart 1
Income Tax Rates for Joint Filers in 1958 and in 2009 (brackets in 2009\$)


## Historical Top and Bottom Marginal Tax Rates

Historical Mariginal Tax Rate for Highest and Lowest Income Earners


## Average Tax Rates by Income Group

Figure 2.

## Average Federal Tax Rates, by Before-Tax Income Group, 1979 to 2013



Source: Congressional Budget Office.
Average federal tax rates are calculated by dividing federal taxes by before-tax income.

