

IZA DP No. 41

## **Anatomy of Policy Complementarities**

J. Michael Orszag  
Dennis J. Snower

May 1999

# Anatomy of Policy Complementarities

**J. Michael Orszag  
Dennis J. Snower**

Discussion Paper No. 41  
May 1999

IZA

P.O. Box 7240  
D-53072 Bonn  
Germany

Tel.: +49-228-3894-0  
Fax: +49-228-3894-210  
Email: [iza@iza.org](mailto:iza@iza.org)

This Discussion Paper is issued within the framework of IZA's research areas *The Welfare State and Labor Markets* and *General Labor Economics*. Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of the institute. Research disseminated by IZA may include views on policy, but the institute itself takes no institutional policy positions.

The Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) in Bonn is a local and virtual international research center and a place of communication between science, politics and business. IZA is an independent, nonprofit limited liability company (Gesellschaft mit beschränkter Haftung) supported by the Deutsche Post AG. The center is associated with the University of Bonn and offers a stimulating research environment through its research networks, research support, and visitors and doctoral programs. IZA engages in (i) original and internationally competitive research in all fields of labor economics, (ii) development of policy concepts, and (iii) dissemination of research results and concepts to the interested public. The current research program deals with (1) mobility and flexibility of labor markets, (2) internationalization of labor markets and European integration, (3) the welfare state and labor markets, (4) labor markets in transition, (5) the future of work, and (6) general labor economics.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character.

## ABSTRACT

### Anatomy of Policy Complementarities<sup>\*</sup>

The analysis provides a new explanation for two widespread problems concerning European unemployment policy: the disappointingly small effect of many past reform measures on unemployment, and the political difficulties in implementing more extensive reform programs. We argue that the heart of these problems may be the failure of many European governments to implement broad-based reform strategies. Our analysis suggests that major unemployment policies are characterised by economic complementarities (in the sense that the effectiveness of one policy depends on the implementation of other policies) and political complementarities (in that the ability to gain political consent for one policy depends on the acceptance of other policies). Under these circumstances, incremental, small-scale adjustments of existing policy packages are doomed to failure. Our analysis suggests instead that the European unemployment problem should be tackled through "broad" reforms that exploit the salient economic and political complementarities among individual policy measures.

JEL Classification: E61, E62, H21, H23, H53, H55, H61, I30, J64, J68.

Keywords: Labor market policy, economic complementarities, political economy, unemployment, unemployment benefits, taxation, inequality.

Dennis J. Snower  
Department of Economics  
Birkbeck College  
University of London  
7-15 Gresse Street  
London W1P 1PA  
England  
Tel.: +44-171-631-6408  
Fax: +44-171-631-6416  
email: dsnowe@econ.bbk.ac.uk

---

<sup>\*</sup> We are deeply indebted to Lars Calmfors, Bertil Holmlund, and Assar Lindbeck for profound and insightful comments.

## Introduction

Over the past 25 years, employment policy in many European countries has by and large failed to address the unemployment problem in an adequate way. Policy makers differ on why this has been so. Some contend that the problem is due to policy ineffectiveness, viz., it is alleged that the available policy instruments have little influence on unemployment. Others believe that unemployment policies are pointless, since they merely replace the unemployment problem by an inequality problem. And yet others believe that the underlying problem is one of policy inactivity, viz., the policy initiatives have been too few and too timid.

All these influential theses, we claim, are myths. We will argue, instead, that European unemployment policies have frequently been unsuccessful because governments have generally failed to exploit economic and political complementarities among policy measures. *Economic complementarities* exist when the effectiveness of one policy depends on the implementation of other policies, and *political complementarities* arise when the ability to gain political consent for one policy depends on the implementation of other policies.

This paper examines the causes and consequences of these complementarities, investigates the interplay among them, and analyses how unemployment policies are to be formulated in this context.

Various contributions in the economic literature are relevant to these concerns. Coe and Snower (1997) identify various sources of economic complementarities.<sup>1</sup> Some empirical evidence of economic complementarities has emerged in a number of recent studies.<sup>2</sup> There are some articles on why a particular political process may yield labour-market policies associated with excessive unemployment (e.g., Saint-Paul, 1993). Thus far, however, no attention has been given to how political policy complementarities arise alongside the economic ones, and what this network of complementarities implies for policy making. These important gaps are the subject of this paper.

The paper is organised as follows. Section 1 discusses the three myths about unemployment policy making and how our analysis of complementarities debunks them. Section 2 constructs a simple framework for thinking about economic and political complementarities. Section 3 examines how to make policy decisions in the presence of these complementarities. And finally, Section 4 examines how political constraints on policy change can be overcome through broad-based reform packages that take advantage of the existing economic and political complementarities among the individual policy measures.

<sup>1</sup> Coe and Snower (1997) examine economic complementarities in a static context. However, the dynamic aspect of the reforms turns out to be particularly significant for, as implied by the underlying model in Appendix B, the appropriate policy strategy can depend heavily on such dynamic factors as people's rate of time discount and their degree of risk aversion (or, equivalently in our model, the elasticity of intertemporal substitution) regarding their consumption and work through time. Moreover, due to the existence of labour-turnover costs (such as costs of hiring, training, and firing), employed people generally have far greater chances of keeping their jobs than unemployed people have of acquiring them. Consequently, a policy that helps move people from unemployment into employment during one time period will influence the unemployment rate in subsequent time periods. This means that the long-term effects of complementary policies may be substantially larger than their impact effects. This paper attempts to quantify these long-term effects for plausible economic parameters.

<sup>2</sup> See Buti et al. (1998), Daveri and Tabellini (1997), and Elmeskov et al. (1998).

## 1. The three myths

Over the past two decades European unemployment policy has been conducted in the shadow of three powerful – although partially contradictory – myths.

### 1.1. The policy ineffectiveness myth

The policy ineffectiveness myth – that the available policy instruments are ineffective with respect to unemployment – is an insidious one, since it diverts policy makers from focusing on measures to create employment and implies that their main objective should be to spread the burden of unemployment more equally across the working-age population, primarily through working time reductions and early retirement schemes. The dangers of this policy approach are well known.<sup>3</sup> But beyond that, our analysis suggests that – despite the continued high levels of European unemployment in the face of numerous attempts at policy reform – the available unemployment policies may well *not* be inherently ineffective. The reason is that past reforms have often failed to exploit economic complementarities.

It is easy to see how such complementarities may arise. For example, since it is impossible for people to find more work when firms do not provide new jobs, and since it is impossible for firms to fill their vacancies when there is no one looking for them, supply-side labour market policies (e.g., job search-promoting measures such as job counselling) are complementary with demand-side policies (e.g., measures to stimulate investment demand). Furthermore, tax breaks for hiring the long-term unemployed (such as those in France or Germany) may be ineffective in the presence of generous unemployment benefits, since the benefits will discourage the unemployed from taking advantage of the tax breaks. Giving employers greater latitude in negotiating fixed-term contracts (as in Spain) may do little to stimulate employment unless the job security provisions associated with the incumbent employees are relaxed (Bentolila and Dolado, 1994). Reducing the magnitude and duration of unemployment benefits may have only a limited effect on the employment rate in the presence of large incapacity benefits (as in the Netherlands) or high minimum wages (as in France).

In the presence of economic complementarities, individual unemployment policy measures might look ineffective – but only when the overall package of policies is insufficiently “broad,” i.e. when the package covers an insufficiently wide range of policies within a set of economically complementary ones.

### 1.2. The unemployment-inequality myth

According to the unemployment-inequality myth, governments must choose between two disagreeable options: a “flexible” labour market bedevilled by wide income disparities and an “inflexible” labour market crippled by unemployment. The “flexible” market, where people’s wages reflect their productivities, is allegedly achieved by reducing job security, restricting unemployment benefits and welfare entitlements, eliminating minimum wages, and bashing the unions. The “inflexible” market, where people’s earnings reflect politicians’ judgements about fairness and social cohesion, is supposedly achieved by the opposite policies. The ultimate choice, then, is between unemployment and inequality.

We argue that the unemployment-inequality trade-off should not be regarded as an exogenous constraint on policy making. On the contrary, it is commonly the *outcome* of unenlightened policies. The system of unemployment benefits financed through general taxes is a good example. When unemployed people find jobs, their unemployment benefits are withdrawn and taxes are

<sup>3</sup> It has proved very difficult to implement worksharing and early retirement without raising non-wage labour costs (particularly costs of hiring and training) and thereby discouraging firms from creating more jobs. Furthermore, by diminishing the number of people competing for jobs, early retirement may put upward pressure on wages and thereby on prices. Monetary and fiscal authorities may then feel called upon to dampen inflation through contractionary policies, thus generating further unemployment.

imposed on both them and their employers. Consequently, this policy discourages the unemployed from seeking work and employers from providing it. Within this system, reducing unemployment benefits would reduce unemployment, but only by making the unemployed worse off relative to the employed. What usually gets overlooked is that this unemployment-inequality trade-off is the *outcome* of the policy under consideration, which makes it impossible to compensate the unemployed for a decline in benefits. As shown below, a “broader” set of complementary policies would permit such compensation.

Our analysis suggests that by distributing the incentives to work more equally across the working population, it may be possible to reduce *both* unemployment *and* inequality. Economically complementary policies have an important role to play in shifting the unemployment-inequality trade-off. “Narrow” packages of reforms – defined as packages that do not exploit the existing economic complementarities – are generally associated with unnecessarily unfavourable trade-offs between unemployment and inequality. In contrast, “broader” packages could relax these disagreeable trade-offs.

### 1.3. The inactivity myth

Finally, the *inactivity myth* – that European governments have not done anything to reduce unemployment – is false, since most European countries have been far from inactive on unemployment policy over the 1980s and 1990s. The problem is that the employment policy strategies have not, on the whole, focused on exploiting policy complementarities. But examples of policy activity abound.

France, whose unemployment continues to hover around 12 percent, has implemented various of measures to promote employment and stimulate job search, including reductions in employers’ social security contributions, subsidies for young workers and the long-term unemployed, training programs and more flexible working-time arrangements. In addition, the French unemployment benefit system has been reformed to reduce the duration of unemployment benefits and to permit the size of the benefits to fall with their duration.

Spain, with an unemployment rate that remains stubbornly above 20 percent, has undertaken an impressive variety of initiatives over the past one and a half decades. In 1984 it introduced fixed-term contracts with low statutory severance pay. In the early 1990s, the Spanish government reduced the magnitude and duration of unemployment benefits and raised the minimum employment period that creates entitlement to benefits. Since then regulations limiting labour mobility have been dismantled, the monopoly of the state employment agency has been ended, and firms have been given opportunities to opt out of some aspects of sectoral wage agreements. In addition, the government has introduced apprenticeship wage contracts associated with remuneration below the minimum wage and low non-wage labour costs.

Italy, whose unemployment is still stuck at around 12 percent, has also conducted a long list of supply-side reforms over the 1990s. Wage indexation (the *scala mobile*) has been abolished, making wages more flexible in response to labour market pressures. Hiring regulations have been liberalised and job search programs have been instituted.

Belgium, with an unemployment rate of 12.5 percent, has tightened unemployment insurance eligibility requirements for the long-term unemployed, as well as for temporary and part-time workers. Wage indexation has been watered down; tax exemptions have been granted for the hiring of young workers; and training programs for the long-term unemployed have been introduced.

Despite this record, the inactivity myth is not entirely off the mark. Although most European countries have witnessed many reforms, these reforms have often been implemented in a partial, piecemeal, and timid fashion. Furthermore, European countries that have implemented labour market reforms (such as those discussed above) have often retained labour market measures that have tended to undercut these reforms. For instance, the French reforms above have probably been undercut by the maintenance of restrictive minimum wage legislation, and the effectiveness

of the Spanish reforms have probably been reduced through the maintenance of stringent job security legislation for incumbent employees in the primary sector of the economy (see, for example, Bentolila and Dolado (1994)). With two notable exceptions – the Netherlands and the UK – policy changes have typically been introduced one at a time, each rationalised on a stand-alone basis rather than as part of a self-reinforcing package of complementary policies.

If many existing labour market measures are economically undesirable – that is, if they are both inefficient and inequitable – why was not more comprehensive reform undertaken? This question is a political, rather than an economic one. What is it about the democratic political process that has kept many European governments from implementing bolder, more enlightened reforms?

To shed light on this important issue, we argue that unemployment policies are characterised by *political complementarities*. For example, as our analysis indicates, the political feasibility of unemployment benefit reform (such as reducing the magnitude and duration of unemployment benefits) depends on tax reform (such as reducing payroll and income taxes) and employment promotion policies (such as hiring subsidies). The reason, we will argue, is that “single-handed reforms” (e.g., reducing unemployment benefits without changing any other policy instrument) – even though they may improve economic efficiency – often pit the interests of the employed against those of the unemployed, creating political deadlock. “Broad (many-handed) reforms,” by contrast, enable the government to use the efficiency gains from one reform to compensate the losers from another reform, and vice versa, thereby breaking the political deadlock.

In the presence of political complementarities, it is not surprising that if policy makers consider a narrow portfolio of reforms, then governments will find it politically impossible to implement bolder policy reforms.

#### 1.4. Debunking the myths

In sum, the upshot of our analysis is that Europe’s cardinal policy mistake has been to focus on an excessively narrow set of policies, and implement these policies sequentially rather than in conjunction with one another. Labour market reforms have generally not been formulated jointly to exploit a network of self-reinforcing economic and political complementarities.

Economic complementarities reinforce the political ones, and vice versa. In particular, the greater are the economic complementarities, the greater is the payoff from broad reforms, and the greater is the government’s latitude to break political deadlock through such reforms. Conversely, the easier it is to break political deadlock through broad reforms, the more latitude the government has to exploit economic complementarities among the individual reform measures.

The combination of economic and political complementarities makes a strong case for broad-based reform. In the presence of such complementarities, policy makers do not have a choice between “broad” reform (using many policy instruments in conjunction with one another) and “deep” reform (using an individual policy instrument intensively). The reason is that deep reform is generally associated with unfavourable unemployment-inequality trade-offs, so that less unemployment can be achieved only by making some people significantly better off at the expense of making others significantly worse off. Such a course often is politically unacceptable. Thus, when there are significant policy complementarities, deficient breadth of reform may rule out sufficient depth.<sup>4</sup>

We argue that the deficient “breadth” of much European labour market reform over the past two decades has made it politically infeasible to do more than small, incremental, piecemeal adjustments of prevailing policy packages. In this way, the deficient “breadth” of reform packages has been responsible for their deficient “depth,” as evidenced by the small changes in replace-

<sup>4</sup> But it is, of course, also true that when there is sufficient breadth, any increase in breadth often implies that is less need for each component of a labour-market policy package to be implemented as deeply as would otherwise have been necessary.

ment ratios, duration of unemployment benefits, or severance pay requirements in many European countries.


For labour market reform to become politically feasible, the unpleasant unemployment-inequality trade-offs need to be relaxed, and that becomes achievable through “broad” reform. “Broad” reform strategies are not just more effective on account of economic complementarities, but may also permit the implementation of “deep” reforms through the exploitation of political complementarities.

## 2. A simple framework for thinking about policy complementarities

In order to formulate strategies for broad-based policy reform, we need a framework for thinking about policy complementarities. To keep the framework simple and transparent, we strip labour market activity down to bare essentials.

Consider a labour market in which workers are either employed or unemployed. Each employee has a chance  $f$  of becoming fired (and joining the unemployment pool), and each unemployed person has a chance  $b$  of being hired (and joining the ranks of the employees). Moreover, the employed and unemployed workers retire at rate  $d$ , and new workers enter the labour force at the same overall rate, so that the aggregate labour supply remains constant through time. These transitions between employment and unemployment, and into and out of the labour force, may be illustrated as follows:

**Figure 1. Labour market flows**



Each employed worker receives an income that consists of the wage ( $w$ ), paid by his employer, minus a tax on wage income, falling on the worker. Let  $t$  be the tax rate, so that the employee’s wage income is  $w(1 - t)$ . Moreover, each unemployed worker receives an unemployment benefit ( $b$ ).

**Table 1. Incomes**

Employed worker	Unemployed worker
Wage income: $w(1-t)$	Unemployment benefit: $b$




To fix ideas, our analysis of economic and political complementarities will focus on the interrelations between the influences of two specific policies on unemployment: unemployment benefit reform (viz. reducing  $b$ ) and tax reform (viz. reducing  $t$ ). To begin with, let us examine how these policies affect the incentives of the employed and unemployed workers.

### 2.1. Incentives to work and seek work

Since economic complementarities among policy measures arise when these measures have complementary effects on people's incentives, let us focus on employees' incentives to work and unemployed people's incentives to seek work. An *employee's work effort* may be portrayed in terms of how he divides his time between work and leisure while on the job. In each period, the employee decides to spend an amount of time,  $l_e$ , on leisure (where the subscript  $e$  stands for "employee") and the remainder on work.

Moreover, the less effort the employee devotes to his job (i.e. the more leisure  $l_e$  that the employee takes on the job), the greater are his chances of getting fired.<sup>5</sup> So the employee faces an intertemporal trade-off. He enjoys leisure, but taking this leisure now raises his chances of losing his job in the future, thereby experiencing a drop in income. The greater the differential between the employee's income and the unemployment benefit, the greater the cost of losing a job, and consequently the harder the employee will work (i.e., the less leisure he will take).

**Figure 2. Influencing work effort**




*Notes:* The greater is wage income ( $w(1 - t)$ ) relative to the unemployment benefit ( $b$ ), the less leisure the employee takes on the job (and thus greater is the employee's work effort).

Along similar lines, an **unemployed person's effort in seeking work** may be depicted in terms of how much time he spends looking for a job. In each period, the unemployed person spends a fraction of time,  $l_u$ , on leisure (where the subscript  $u$  stands for "unemployed") and the remainder on job search.

The less effort the unemployed person devotes to job search (i.e., the more leisure  $l_u$  the unemployed person consumes), the lower are his chances of finding a job and thus the lower his chances of getting hired. This person also faces an intertemporal trade-off. The more leisure he takes, the better off he is now, but the worse off he will be in the future, for the smaller will be his chances of experiencing a rise in income. The greater the differential between the wage income and the unemployment benefit, the greater the benefit of finding a job, and consequently the harder the unemployed worker will search.

<sup>5</sup> There are many possible reasons for this phenomenon. For example, the employer may find it worthwhile to promote work incentives by undertaking to fire an employee if his productivity falls beneath a specified minimum level. The employee's productivity, furthermore, may depend on the amount of time he devotes to work, as well as on some random factors (accidents, diseases). Consequently, the more leisure the employee takes on the job, the lower his chance of exceeding the minimum acceptable productivity level and thus the greater his chances of being fired.

**Figure 3. Influencing search effort**



*Note:* The greater is wage income ( $w(1 - t)$ ) relative to the unemployment benefit ( $b$ ), the less leisure the unemployed worker takes (and thus greater is the unemployed person's search effort).

Thus unemployment benefit reform (reducing  $b$ ) and tax reform (reducing  $t$ ) stimulate the incentives to work and seek work, since they both widen the differential between the incomes received by employed and unemployed people.

### 2.2. Incentives to hire and fire

The firms make the employment decisions, viz. they determine the hiring rate (the chances that an unemployed worker is given a job) for any given level of search effort ( $l_u$ ) by the unemployed. The firms also determine how the firing rate (the chances than an employed person loses a job) responds to work effort ( $l_e$ ). These decisions are made so as to maximise profits.

Like the workers, the firms also face trade-offs. The greater the hiring rate, the greater are the firm's hiring costs and, on the other hand, the greater is its revenue (from the output produced by the newly hired employees). With regard to firing, firms face explicit firing costs as well as effort-related costs: the greater is the firing rate, the smaller is the gain from work effort (since the job is likely to be terminated sooner), and thus the smaller will be employees' work effort. The firm also has benefits from firing: the more responsive is the firing rate to work effort, the greater will be the work incentive.

The firms seek to achieve the hire and fire rates that maximise their profits, subject to the trade-offs above.


### 2.3. Sources of economic complementarities

In this context, it is easy to see how economic complementarities can arise. The following are two major sources.

*First*, the most basic complementarity between unemployment benefits and taxes arises because *the firms' search for workers reinforces the workers' search for jobs, and vice versa*. It is no use to give the unemployed incentives to seek jobs (say, by reducing their unemployment benefits) if firms lack the incentives to hire them (say, because wages, after tax, are too high). Conversely, it is no use to give the firms incentives to create new jobs if workers lack the incentives to seek them. In this way, unemployment benefit reform (promoting search for jobs) is complementary to tax reform (promoting search for employees).

The economic linkages responsible for this complementarity are pictured in Figure 4.

**Figure 4. Economic complementarities operating through the interaction between the search for jobs and the search for workers**




Here the economic complementarities may be identified through the following causal relations:

- Unemployment benefit reform (a fall in  $b$ ) raises the workers' reward to job search, which stimulates the amount of search the workers do. This, in turn, increases the reward from hiring, for the harder the workers search for jobs, the cheaper it is for employers to hire them. Thereby unemployment benefit reform gives more leverage to the influence of tax reform (a fall in  $t$ ) on the reward to hiring (viz, tax reform stimulates hiring).
- Furthermore, tax reform raises the reward to hiring, which stimulates the employers' search for workers. This, in turn, raises the reward to job search, for the harder employers search for workers, the more likely will workers' search be successful. Thereby tax reform increases the effectiveness with which unemployment benefit reform stimulates the reward from job search.

*Second*, a complementarity between unemployment benefit reform and tax reform arises because *employees' work effort reinforces employers' retention decisions, and vice versa*. There is little point to give employees incentives to work hard (say, by reducing unemployment benefits) if firms have no intention of retaining them; and on the other side, there is little point to give firms incentives to retain their employees if these employees lack the incentives to work.

The relevant causal relations are illustrated in the following figure:

**Figure 5. Economic complementarities operating through the interaction between work effort and the employee retention**



Now the economic complementarities work themselves out through the following channels:

- Unemployment benefit reform raises the workers’ reward to work effort, which stimulates the employees’ work effort. This, in turn, raises the firms’ reward from retention, for the harder the employees work, the more worthwhile it is for the firms to retain these employees. Thereby unemployment benefit reform increases the effectiveness of tax reform in stimulating the firms’ reward from retention.
- Moreover, tax reform increases the reward to employee retention, and thereby raises the length of employees’ job tenure. This, in turn, stimulates the reward to working, for the longer employees can expect to remain employed, the larger is their reward for their work effort. In this way tax reform increases the leverage of unemployment benefit reform in stimulating the reward for work effort.

These are particularly significant, but by no means the only, complementarities operative in our model. Further examples of complementarities are given in Appendix A.<sup>6</sup>

#### 2.4. Assessing economic complementarities

The total degree of the economic complementarities between unemployment benefit reform and tax reform may be measured by a statistic called the “cross elasticity of unemployment with respect to unemployment benefits and taxes”. This measure indicates how much the responsiveness of unemployment to the unemployment benefit is influenced by the tax (or equivalently, by

<sup>6</sup> It is worth noting that, although unemployment benefits are not taxed in our model, the complementarities described here occur regardless of whether such taxes are levied.

how much the responsiveness of unemployment to the tax is influenced by the unemployment benefit.)<sup>7</sup>

The following table provides computations of these cross elasticities for various levels of unemployment benefits and tax rates. These computations are based on plausible parameter values for our model, built on the analytical framework described above (and specified in Appendix B).

**Table 2. The effects of alternative tax-benefit policy combinations**

[Insert Table 2 here]

The first row of the table describes the baseline position of our model economy. The welfare effects of alternative tax-benefit policy combinations are evaluated relative to this baseline. In the first column,  $b$  is given in terms of the replacement ratio (the ratio of unemployment benefits to the wage). The second column gives the tax rate  $t$ . The fourth and fifth columns specify the elasticity of unemployment with respect to the replacement ratio ( $\eta_b$ ) and the elasticity of unemployment with respect to the tax rate ( $\eta_t$ ). The cross-elasticities are given in the third column.

These economic complementarities are brought into sharp relief in Figure 6, which plots the cross-elasticities corresponding to a wide range of tax and benefit values.

**Figure 6. Economic complementarities**

[Insert figure on “Economic Complementarities” here]

The previous table and figure convey a strong message. First, all the cross elasticities are positive, which means that the unemployment reducing effect of benefit reform (a fall in  $b$ ) is always augmented through tax reform (a fall in  $t$ ). Second, the cross elasticities rise as the unemployment benefit and the tax rate rise. This means that the higher the unemployment benefit and the tax rate, the more benefit reform and tax reform reinforce one another with respect to unemployment. In short, the gains from exploiting the economic complementarities are greatest when taxes and transfers are highest.

Intuitively, when unemployment benefits and taxes are high, the resulting deficient reward to job search reinforces the resulting deficient reward to hiring. Since the deficiencies are large, the reinforcement effects are large as well. Under these circumstances, the economic complementarity from reducing unemployment benefits and taxes are particularly significant.

Another reason why the cross elasticities are high when unemployment benefits and taxes are high is that high benefits and taxes give rise to deficient rewards to working and deficient rewards to employee retention. Once again, these deficiencies reinforce one another, and thus the economic complementarity from unemployment benefit and tax reductions are large when benefits and taxes are high initially.

The upshot of these economic complementarities is illustrated in the following figure, which shows how the unemployment rate depends on the unemployment benefit and the tax.

<sup>7</sup> Specifically, the responsiveness of unemployment to the unemployment benefit is computed as the percentage change in the unemployment rate resulting from a percentage change in the unemployment benefit. Then the cross elasticity is the percentage change in the above responsiveness resulting from a percentage change in the tax.

### Figure 7. Unemployment, taxes, and transfers

[Insert figure on “Unemployment, Taxes, and Transfers” here]

Observe that the unemployment rate not only rises with the benefit and the tax; it rises particularly fast when the benefit and the tax are increased together.

### 3. Policy decision making in the presence of complementarities

The existence of economic complementarities indicates that there may be a payoff to setting different policy instruments conjointly, but it offers little guidance on how to do so. The reason is that we have said nothing so far about whether the government is able to finance the complementary policies above (for instance, not all the policies in Table 1 leave the government’s budget in balance). Furthermore, we have not considered whether the policies are politically feasible. (For example, only one of the policies in Table 1 make both the employed and unemployed people better off, and thus political consensus in favour of the other policies may be difficult to achieve). In order to understand how different policy measures can be used in conjunction with one another to achieve a socially desirable unemployment rate, it is necessary to take account of the budgetary and political constraints that governments face. This section provides a simple framework of thought for these issues.

We do so in a sequence of steps. *First*, we examine the government budget constraint, which describes what combinations of benefits and taxes the government can afford. *Second*, we describe the status quo of the labour market, i.e. the initial position that the government seeks to improve. *Third*, we specify the aim of government policy, i.e., its objective in terms of unemployment and inequality. And *fourth*, we show why this aim may be impossible to achieve on account of political constraints. In Section 4 we then examine how political deadlock can be overcome by broadening the portfolio of policy measures.


The scenario<sup>8</sup> we examine in this section may be termed the “Franco-German nightmare” (where France and Germany are perhaps the most prominent, but by no means the only, European countries to have exhibited these economic symptoms): unemployment is undesirably high, as are unemployment benefits and taxes, but the government finds it politically infeasible to do anything about this problem.

<sup>8</sup> This scenario is generated by the plausible parameter estimates described in Appendix B. Of course, different estimates are able to generate different scenarios (as defined by the relative shapes and positions of the government budget constraint and the indifference curves of the employed and unemployed people, described below). We have decided to concentrate on the scenario above since it appears to typify an important problem of policy decision making in Europe.

### 3.1. The government budget constraint

To capture the government’s budgetary restrictions in a transparent way, let us suppose that the money spent on unemployment benefits must be raised through taxes. The following figure depicts the government budget constraint (GBC) in the context of the labour market described above.

**Figure 8. The government budget constraint**



Clearly, when the government makes no transfers, it needs to raise no taxes: so when the unemployment benefit  $b = 0$ , then the tax rate  $t = 0$  as well. Thus the government budget constraint goes through the origin of the figure.


If the ratio of unemployed people to employed people were constant, a rise in the unemployment benefit would need to be financed by a proportionate rise in the tax rate. But as the unemployment benefit rises, the number of unemployed people rises relative to the number of employed ones. Consequently, equal incremental increases in the unemployment benefit  $b$  require larger and larger incremental increases in the tax rate  $t$ . This phenomenon is amplified by the fact that the increases in the unemployment benefit and tax rate also raise unemployment and reduce employment (by reducing the reward to work), further raising transfer payment and further eroding the tax base.<sup>9</sup> Consequently, the government budget constraint in the figure becomes progressively flatter as the unemployment benefit  $b$  rises.

Eventually, the unemployment benefit reaches a maximum,  $b^{max}$  in the figure. Beyond that, further increases in the tax rate ( $t$ ) reduce the tax base ( $N$ ) by so much that tax revenues ( $tN$ ) can no longer fund transfers at the rate of  $b^{max}$  per head. Thus, the unemployment benefit declines. This is the well-known “Laffer effect,” pictured by the downward-sloping portion of the government budget constraint in the figure.

Another useful way of viewing the government budget constraint is in terms of its implications for unemployment benefit reform and tax reform. Along the upward-sloping portion of the government budget constraint, unemployment benefit reform reinforces tax reform and vice versa: a drop in unemployment benefits permits the government to finance a drop in taxes, and vice versa. As result, unemployment falls, which enables the government to drop unemployment benefits and taxes even more; and so on. These successive declines in unemployment benefits and taxes may be called the “government budget multiplier.”

<sup>9</sup> Naturally, an increase in the unemployment benefit  $b$  may also lead to an increase in the wage  $w$ . This effect *increases* the tax base, enabling the government to keep the tax rate lower than it would otherwise have been. In our parameterization of the model in Appendix B, this effect is dominated by the influences outlined in the text above.

**Figure 9. The government budget multiplier**




The larger are the economic complementarities between the two policies, the more will a given reduction in unemployment benefits and taxes reduce unemployment, and consequently the larger will the government budget multiplier be.

### 3.2. The status quo of the labour market

The status quo position of the labour market may be represented by a point on the government budget constraint, such as point *I* in the following figure (where *I* stands for “initial” position).

**Figure 10. The status quo position**



The welfare of the unemployed people at the status quo point may be illustrated by the indifference curve  $IC_u$ , going through point *I*. This indifference curve is the set of points along which the unemployed people are equally well off.<sup>10</sup> Observe that this indifference curve is upward-sloping: An increase in the unemployment benefit  $b$  makes the unemployed people better off and an increase in the tax rate  $t$  makes them worse off (since it reduces their income once they become employed). Thus a rise in the unemployment benefit must be offset by a rise in  $t$  so that the unemployed remain equally well off along the indifference curve.

The welfare of the employed people at point *I* may be illustrated by the indifference curve  $IC_e$ , going through point *I*. This indifference curve, which is the set of points along which the em-

<sup>10</sup> For visual ease, this indifference curve (as well as the one for employed people) is drawn as a straight line, although it is not entirely straight in the numerical model of Appendix B.



employed people are equally well off, is also upward sloping. A rise in the tax rate  $t$  makes the employed people worse off (since it reduces their income), while a rise in the unemployment benefit  $b$  makes them better off (since it increases their purchasing power when they become unemployed). Thus a rise in the benefit must be counteracted by a rise in the tax in order for the employed people to remain equally well off along the indifference curve.

The indifference curve of the employed people is steeper than that of the unemployed. The reason is that the well-being of the unemployed is more sensitive to unemployment benefits (which they receive now) than to taxes (which they would have to pay only once they find jobs in the future). By the same token, the well-being of the employed is more sensitive to taxes (which they pay now) than to unemployment benefits (which they would receive only if they become unemployed in the future).

The level of unemployment at point I is depicted by the iso-unemployment curve  $U_I$ , describing the set of points along which unemployment is the same as at point I.<sup>11</sup> Observe that since a rise in the unemployment benefit  $b$  raises unemployment, a fall in the tax rate  $t$  is required to keep unemployment constant. Thus the iso-unemployment curve is downward sloping. The closer an iso-unemployment curve lies to the origin (where  $b = t = 0$ ), the lower the level of unemployment (for the lower is the unemployment benefit and tax rate).

We now ask whether, starting from the status quo point  $I$ , the government can improve people's welfare through unemployment benefit and tax reform.


### 3.3. Policy decisions and the political process

Given that the wage, work effort, and job search are outside the government's direct control, what position could the labour market achieve if the political process worked perfectly, that is, if the political process would permit the government to set its policy instruments so as to maximise the sum of everyone's welfare? We call the resulting labour market position the "Benthamite" position, since it is the political equivalent of Bentham's goal to achieve "the greatest happiness of the greatest number."

In our analysis, Benthamite social welfare is a weighted average of the welfare of the employed and unemployed people. Thus the Benthamite indifference curve,  $IC_B$ , is a weighted average of the employed and unemployed people's indifference curves. It is upward sloping, since its slope lies between that of the employment and unemployed people's indifference curves. The Benthamite position is pictured by point B in the following figure:

<sup>11</sup> For visual ease, the iso-unemployment curve as well as the indifference curves are depicted as straight lines in the figure, although they are actually curved in the model underlying the exercise.


**Figure 11. The best politically achievable position**



Let us now shift our attention from the best politically achievable position to what may be politically feasible within the democratic political process. An influential model of this process is the *median voter theory*, which indicates that if political decisions are taken by majority rule, the outcome will be in accord with the preferences of the median voter. Since employed people virtually always outnumber unemployed people by a large margin, the median voter is generally employed. Consequently, in the context of our labour market model, the median voter theory asserts that the voting process will yield a set of policies that make the employed people as well off as possible.

The figure below shows that the highest indifference curve of the employed people is the one that just touches the government budget constraint, so that point *M* is the outcome of the majority voting process.

**Figure 12. The median voter outcome**



Observe that point *M* lies beneath point *B* (the Benthamite position) along the government budget constraint. After all, point *M* reflects just the employed people's preferences, whereas point *B* reflects a weighted average of the employed and unemployed people's preferences; and the employed people are more in favour of tax reductions and less in favour of unemployment

benefit increases than the unemployed. Thus the democratic process (via the median voter) leads to lower unemployment benefits and taxes than the outcome from a perfectly functioning political process (the Benthamite position).<sup>12</sup> Usually one would expect employees to prefer less labour market reform than the unemployed, but in the case of unemployment benefits, the opposite is the case, since a drop in unemployment benefits would permit the employed people to enjoy tax cuts.<sup>13</sup>

In practice, however, it is highly unlikely that governments of the advanced, democratic market economies would ride roughshod over the interests of a significant minority of the voting constituency, such as the unemployed. Such behaviour would offend against a principle of liberal democracy, namely that the majority is allowed to have its way only if it does not involve sacrificing a significant minority. This principle is not only enshrined in a multitude of political institutions; it also appears to be commonly supported by a majority of voters in these countries. The implication, in practical terms, is that sizeable minorities, such as the unemployed, may in effect be viewed as blocking coalitions with regard to policies that hurt them.

Accordingly, in the context of our model, it is reasonable to examine a political process in which only those policies are feasible that improve the welfare of *both* the employed *and* the unemployed. As the following figure indicates, the set of policies favoured by the employed people are those in the shaded area above their indifference curve  $IC_e$  and under the government budget constraint, while the set of policies favoured by the unemployed people are those in the shaded area above their indifference curve  $IC_u$  and under the government budget constraint.


The problem is that, for the scenario depicted by the “Anglo-German nightmare,” these two shaded areas do not overlap.<sup>14</sup> So there is *no set of policies* that can be passed by the political process. Consequently the labour market is stuck at wherever it happens to be initially. This phenomenon may be called “political hysteresis;” it helps explain policy paralysis even in the face of high unemployment.

<sup>12</sup> In terms of the geometry of the figure above, observe that since the Benthamite indifference curve is a weighted average of the indifference curves of the employed and unemployed people, and since the employed people have the steeper indifference curve, the employed people’s indifference curve must be steeper than the Benthamite indifference curve. Consequently point  $M$  must lie beneath point  $B$  along the government budget constraint.

<sup>13</sup> This does not mean, however, that the democratically determined unemployment benefits and taxes also turn out to be below their socially optimal levels. Quite on the contrary, the socially optimum point may be expected to lie closer to the origin along the budget constraint than both the Benthamite point and the median voter point. After all, the unemployed want more than the socially desirable level of unemployment benefits, since they do not take full account of how these benefits - and the associated taxes - reduce the unemployed people’s chances of retaining their jobs. Furthermore, the employed may receive excessive wages in the status quo position of the labour market (since employers use wages to stimulate job search and work effort and since the employed have market power) and these people do not take full account of how these wages discourage employment and thereby reduce the unemployed people’s chances of finding work. Consequently, both the employed and unemployed may have an incentive to vote for higher unemployment benefits and higher taxes than is democratically achievable or even socially desirable.

<sup>14</sup> In this scenario, as shown in the figure, the indifference of the employed people ( $IC_e$ ) is steeper than the budget constraint at the status quo point  $I$ , whereas the indifference curve of the unemployed people ( $IC_u$ ) is flatter.


**Figure 13. Political hysteresis**



It is easy to see that *all* points on the government budget constraint from 0 to point *T* could represent initial positions characterised by political hysteresis.<sup>15</sup> However if the economy's initial position lies to the right of point *T*, this deadlock may be overcome. Such a situation might arise in the presence of a severe recession, when both the employed and the unemployed may want lower unemployment benefits and lower taxes in order to generate more jobs. At point *I'* in the Laffer portion of the government budget constraint in Figure 14, for instance, the set of policies favoured by the employed and unemployed people are those lying above their respective indifference curves ( $IC_e$  and  $IC_u$ , respectively) and under the government budget constraint. Observe that now there is some overlap between these two areas. Specifically, the unemployed people's area lies completely within the employed people's area, so that the policies on which both groups could agree now lie in the shaded area, called the "Pareto possibility set" in the figure.

<sup>15</sup> Point *T* is the point of tangency between the unemployed workers' indifference curve and the government budget constraint.

**Figure 14. Policy making under Laffer conditions**



Under these circumstances, the Benthamite policy, at point  $S$ , may now lie in the Pareto possibility set, as illustrated in the figure. Thus it is now politically feasible for the government to move from point  $P$  to the Benthamite point, thereby reducing the unemployment rate from  $U_T$  to  $U_S$ . In order to do so, however, it needs to implement unemployment benefit reform and tax reform *in conjunction with one another* with the express purpose of exploiting the existing political and economic complementarities. Both policy instruments need to be changed *simultaneously* to move towards the social optimum. Piecemeal, uncoordinated reform – in which one policy reform is undertaken at a time – may run the risk of failure, because after the first policy instrument has been adjusted, the economy may arrive at a position of political hysteresis, preventing the second policy instrument from being adjusted as well.<sup>16</sup> These considerations set the stage for an analysis of how political constraints on economic policy may be overcome.

#### **4. Overcoming political constraints through broad-based reform**

Thus far, the upshot of our analysis has been bleak: Even if the status quo of the labour market is inefficient (due to high unemployment) and inequitable (in terms of the welfare of employed versus unemployed people), it may nevertheless be impossible for the government to implement the appropriate policies on account of political constraints. Once political hysteresis sets in, the economy may be condemned to perpetuate policies that are not in the interests of society.

Is there any other way out of this box? Our analysis points to a promising answer: broad-based reform. This strategy involves abandoning the traditional approach to unemployment policy making, which involves determining the policy instruments on the basis of *political* criteria and then setting the magnitudes of these instruments in accordance with specific *economic* goals. This dichotomy between political and economic decisions has inadvertently been supported through the mainstream economic methodology that takes the set of policy instruments as exogenously given and then optimises a policy objective function with respect to these instruments. Our analysis suggests that this approach should be replaced by a new strategy: first to identify the group of policy instruments whose unemployment effect is characterised by significant economic

<sup>16</sup> Such a policy could involve a (suboptimal) horizontal shift from the Laffer portion to the upward-sloping portion of the government budget constraint, or it might involve temporarily running a budget surplus.

and political complementarities, and then to set these policy instruments conjointly so as to exploit these complementarities.

In short, unemployment policy decisions – concerning both the nature of the policy instruments and the degree to which these instruments are changed – are not to be made in isolation from one another. They must be made together, and it is clear why the existence of economic and political complementarities calls for such an approach. In the presence of economic complementarities, individual policy initiatives may be ineffective on their own; their true potential cannot be assessed unless we explore how their influence can be reinforced through other policy initiatives. If the policy measures are implemented in isolation, there is no assurance that such reinforcement will be forthcoming.

Furthermore, isolated policy initiatives are often a recipe for political failure, since each of them on their own has a tendency to create winners and losers. If the losers are sufficiently numerous and powerful, they will be able to block these initiatives, even if the winners stand to gain a lot more than the losers stand to lose. But if politically complementary policies are formulated conjointly, then the losers from one policy can possibly be compensated by becoming the winners of another policy.<sup>17</sup>

To see how this works, let us examine how the problem of political hysteresis in the analysis above could be resolved by broadening the set of policy instruments so as to exploit further economic and political complementarities. Recall that the political hysteresis problem, as depicted in Figure 13, involves a simple conflict of interest: The government is unable to achieve the socially desirable position by means of tax and benefit reform, since a reduction of unemployment benefits and taxes would hurt the unemployed, whereas a rise in benefits and taxes would hurt the employed. Now, however, consider including another instrument in the policy package, namely, employment vouchers (or tax breaks) for firms that hire currently unemployed people.

Since such hiring vouchers improve the welfare of the unemployed, they could compensate the unemployed for a reduction in unemployment benefits. On the other hand, the vouchers may hurt the employees, since firms would gain an incentive to replace some of their employees with subsidised new recruits. But in this case the employees could be compensated for this loss by a reduction in taxes, made possible through a reduction in unemployment benefits.

The political possibilities for policy reform that emerge with the expansion of the policy package can be illustrated clearly in terms of Pareto possibility sets. Recall that for the baseline model above – in which only unemployment benefit and tax policies are used, as specified in Appendix B.4 and illustrated in Figure 13 – the Pareto possibility set is empty, so that no policy change is politically feasible. In the baseline model,<sup>18</sup> the replacement ratio (the ratio of unemployment benefits to the wage) is 0.345 the tax rate is 0.1, and the corresponding hire rate is 0.232. Now consider what happens to the Pareto possibility set when a hiring voucher (financed through reductions in unemployment benefits and taxes) augments the tax and benefit policies. Specifically, let the voucher be 0.2, so that the voucher is 17.3% of the wage. This broadening of the policy portfolio creates a range of tax-benefit policies that improves the welfare of *both* the employed *and* unemployed people and consequently is politically feasible. The feasible range of policies is pictured by the Pareto possibility set in Figure 15.

### Figure 15. The Pareto possibility set created by a hiring voucher

[Insert figure here]

It is important to emphasise that the political gains from *broad* reform can be reaped only if the reform are undertaken *simultaneously and in conjunction with one another*. Suppose that, on the contrary, a government introduces a hiring voucher without at the same time implementing un-

<sup>17</sup> Blinder (1987, p. 209ff) provides useful examples of this strategy in the formulation of U.S. tax policy.

<sup>18</sup> The other parameters are specified in Appendix B.

employment benefit reform and tax reform. Then the hiring vouchers may reduce unemployment. But once this policy has been implemented, the political deadlock about any further unemployment benefit reform and tax reform may remain. Only through a *simultaneous* implementation of hiring vouchers, unemployment benefit reduction, and tax reductions can political hysteresis be overcome and sizeable expansions of the Pareto possibility set be fully realised.

## 5. Concluding thoughts

In sum, our analysis provides a possible explanation for two widespread policy problems in Europe: the disappointingly small unemployment effect of many past reform measures to stimulate job creation and job search, and the political difficulties in implementing more extensive reform programs. We argue that these problems arise neither because the considered reform measures are inherently ineffective, nor because of the danger that these measures will necessarily replace European-style unemployment by American-style inequality. Rather, what may lie at the heart of the difficulty is the failure of many European governments to consider the implementation of broad-based reform strategies that exploit policy complementarities.

Complementary policies call for a distinctive approach to policy making. When only a small number of unemployment policies – from a broader group of complementary policies – is under consideration, it may be politically impossible to implement them and, even if they were implemented, their influence on unemployment would be small. It is only when a broad set of policies is all implemented in conjunction with one another that they become politically feasible and economically effective.

If our analysis captures something significant, then the timid approach to policy making may simply not be an option. Incremental, small-scale adjustments of existing policy packages may be doomed to failure. Perhaps the only way to tackle the European unemployment problem is to have the courage to think big and broad.


## Appendix A: Other Sources of Complementarities

The article has dealt with two prominent economic complementarities, concerning the interaction between the workers' search for jobs and the employers' search for workers and between employees' work effort and employers' retention decisions. In this appendix we consider to further complementarities, operating intertemporally.

There is an intertemporal complementarity operating through search effort. In the current time period, unemployment benefit reform stimulates the reward to job search and thereby raises current search effort. The increase in current search effort, in turn, raises the chances of finding a job in the future and thereby stimulates future search effort. By how much future search effort will be stimulated depends on the tax burden. In this way, unemployment benefit gives more leverage to the influence of tax reform on search effort.

This intertemporal complementarity also works the other way round: Tax reform stimulates search effort, which increases the chances of finding a job in the future, and the resulting stimulus to future search effort depends on the level of unemployment benefits. So tax reform also gives more leverage to unemployment benefit reform.

**Figure A1. Intertemporal Complementarities Operating through Search Effort**




Besides, there is an intertemporal complementarity operating through work effort. In the current time period, tax reform stimulates the reward to working and thereby raises current work effort. The increase in current work effort, in turn, raises the employees' chances of keeping their jobs in future and thereby stimulates future work effort. By how much future work effort will be stimulated depends on the level of unemployment benefits (which is the alternative to wage income). In this way, tax reform augments the influence of unemployment benefit reform on work effort.

Conversely, a drop in unemployment benefits stimulates work effort, which increases the employees' chances of keeping their jobs in the future, and the resulting stimulus to future work effort depends on the tax burden. So unemployment benefit reform also augments the unemployment effects of tax reform.

**Figure A2. Intertemporal Complementarities Operating through Work Effort**





Although there are further sources of complementarities in our model, the ones above, together with those in the text, are sufficient to illustrate some salient channels whereby unemployment benefit reform and tax reform have complementary effects on unemployment.

## Appendix B. The Underlying Model

Our model is a dynamic efficiency-wage model with labour turnover in the spirit of (Phelps 1994, Ch. 15), incorporating worker search and optimising decisions of firms. In this model, unemployed workers receive unemployment benefits and divide their time between leisure and job search, whereas employed workers divide their time between on-the-job leisure (shirking) and work. The hiring rates depend on job search intensity (and thus are negatively related to the leisure of the unemployed workers) and separation rates depend on the effort decisions of the employed workers (and thus are positively related to the leisure of the employed workers). Workers make their search-leisure and work-leisure choices so as to maximise their discounted lifetime utilities, taking into account the effects of these choices on hiring and firing probabilities.

Firms know how the employees adjust their effort in response to higher wages and choose the wage to maximise profits. The firm pays the same wage to all workers but, in setting the wage, it supposes that its choice of wage does not influence the search effort of unemployed workers. The underlying assumption is that although the unemployed workers know the equilibrium wage offered by all firms, they have no information about any individual wage offer that may deviate from this equilibrium wage offer. The firm also chooses the hire rate optimally.

Our exposition of the underlying model is organised as follows. Section B.1 derives the workers' incentives to search and work. Section B.2 covers the worker's decisions. Section B.3 deals with the firm's decisions. Finally, Section B.4 reviews the particular parameterisation used to generate the plots and tables in the paper.

### B.1. Incentives to search and work

We assume that all workers retire with probability  $d$  each period. A worker who is unemployed is hired with probability  $b$ ; otherwise, the worker will either retire or be unemployed next period.<sup>19</sup> A current employee faces a probability  $f$  of becoming unemployed, a probability  $d$  of leaving the labour force permanently and a probability  $1 - f - d$  of retaining a job.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>19</sup> For expositional simplicity, we omit the time subscripts from all endogenous variables. Thus, for example, the time-varying variable  $f_t$  is expressed as  $f$ . The exogenous variables of our model (the retirement rate  $d$ , the unemployment benefit  $b$ , the discount factor  $\beta$ , the productivity per worker  $\Lambda$ , and the coefficients  $a$ ,  $\phi$ ,  $\alpha$ , and  $\gamma$ ) are constants.

<sup>20</sup> One alternative convention for probabilities would be to define them conditional on being alive so that for instance the probability a worker who has been employed stays employed is  $(1 - f)(1 - d)$  instead of  $1 - f - d$  as in our case.

Let  $l_u$  be the leisure of a worker who is unemployed and  $b = b(l_u)$  be that worker's hiring probability, where  $h'(l_u) < 0$  because greater leisure when unemployed implies less search for jobs. Furthermore, let  $u(b, l_u)$  be the worker's current utility and  $b$  his unemployment benefit. Finally, let  $V(u)$  be the present value associated with being unemployed, and  $V(e)$  be the value of being employed. Then the worker's problem is to make his leisure decision so as to maximise his present value of utility:

$$V(u) = \max_{l_u} \left[ u(b, l_u) + \beta \left[ b(l_u)V(e) + (1 - b(l_u) - d)V(u) \right] \right], \quad (\text{B1})$$

where  $\beta$  is the discount factor.

The resulting first-order condition is:

$$u_{l_u} = -\beta b'(l_u) [V(e) - V(u)]. \quad (\text{B2})$$

In other words, the marginal utility of leisure must be set equal to the discounted marginal hiring propensity ( $-\beta b'$ ) times the penalty for not finding a job ( $V(e) - V(u)$ ). Since there is diminishing marginal utility of leisure, the optimal level of leisure depends inversely on the penalty for job loss.

The decision-making problem of an employed worker may be expressed along analogous lines. Let  $l_e$  be the leisure of an employed worker and  $f = f(l_e)$  be that worker's separation probability, where  $f'(l_e) > 0$  since more leisure when employed implies less effort on the job and consequently a greater firing probability. Let  $w$  be the wage and  $t$  be the tax rate on wage income. Then the employed worker's current utility is  $u(w(1-t), l_e)$  and his decision making problem is to solve:

$$V(e) = \max_{l_e} \left[ u(w(1-t), l_e) + \beta \left[ f(l_e)V(u) + (1 - f(l_e) - d)V(e) \right] \right]. \quad (\text{B3})$$

The associated first-order condition is:

$$u_{l_e} = \beta f'(l_e) [V(e) - V(u)]. \quad (\text{B4})$$

Here, the marginal utility of leisure must be set equal to the discounted marginal firing propensity ( $\beta f'$ ) times the penalty for job loss ( $V(e) - V(u)$ ). Once again, diminishing marginal utility of leisure implies that the optimal level of leisure depends inversely on the penalty for job loss.

## B.2. The workers' decisions

To implement the model, we consider a specific functional form for the workers' utility, hire, and fire functions. We then examine their leisure decisions when unemployed ( $l_u$ ) and employed ( $l_e$ ). Each worker faces the following hire and fire functions:

$$b(l_u) = \theta(1 - al_u). \quad (\text{B5})$$

$$f(l_e) = \phi l_e. \quad (\text{B6})$$

where the parameters of the hire and fire functions are either chosen by the firm (as described below) or determined by technological relations.

Equation (B5) relates the leisure of the unemployed worker to his employment probability; where the parameter  $a$  is exogenously given and the scalar  $\theta$  is determined by the firm (as discussed below). Both  $a$  and  $\theta$  capture how responsive employment probabilities are to decreased leisure (increased search). Equation (B6) relates the leisure of the employed to their separation probabilities: the parameter  $\phi$  captures the effect of increased leisure (decreased effort) on fire rates.

For these hiring and firing functions, let us derive the worker's leisure decision when unemployed ( $l_u$ ) and employed ( $l_e$ ). Suppose that the unemployed and employed workers have the same instantaneous utility function,

$$u(c, l) = \frac{(c^\alpha l^{1-\alpha})^\gamma}{\gamma}, \quad (\text{B7})$$

where  $c$  is consumption and  $l$  is leisure. The worker is assumed to consume all his current income, so that  $c = b$  for an unemployed worker (where  $b$  is the unemployment benefit) and  $c = w(1-t)$  for an employed worker (where  $w(1-t)$  is the take-home pay). We believe this assumption to be a reasonable first approximation for low-wage workers with welfare state benefits who have negligible saving and do not have access to capital markets.

Given the utility function (A7), the hire function (A5), and the fire function (A7), the optimality condition (A2) implies that the optimum interior choice of leisure when unemployed is:<sup>21</sup>

$$l_u = \left[ \frac{\beta a \theta}{1-\alpha} (V(e) - V(u)) \right]^{\frac{1}{(1-\alpha)\gamma-1}} b^{-\frac{\alpha\gamma}{(1-\alpha)\gamma-1}}. \quad (\text{B8})$$

Similarly, the optimality condition (A4) implies that optimum interior choice of leisure when employed is:<sup>22</sup>

$$l_e = \left[ \frac{\beta \phi}{1-\alpha} (V(e) - V(u)) \right]^{\frac{1}{(1-\alpha)\gamma-1}} w(1-t)^{-\frac{\alpha\gamma}{(1-\alpha)\gamma-1}}. \quad (\text{B9})$$

These first-order conditions are then substituted back into the optimal value equations and a solution for the value function is then derived. This optimal value function is substituted into equations (B8) and (B9) to yield the optimal leisure decisions  $l_u$  and  $l_e$ . Finally, these optimal leisure decisions are substituted into equations (B5) and (B6) to determine the equilibrium (optimised) hire and fire rates.

### B.3. The firms' decisions

The firm maximises profits given by the discrete time Hamiltonian:<sup>23</sup>

<sup>21</sup> The hire rate in Eq. (B5) must lie between 0 and  $1-d$ . This implies that:  $\frac{1}{a} \left[ 1 - \frac{1-d}{\theta} \right] \leq l_u \leq \frac{1}{a}$ .

<sup>22</sup> The hire rate in Eq. (B9) must lie between 0 and  $1-d$  so that  $0 \leq l_e \leq (1-d)/\phi$ .

<sup>23</sup> Recall that, for expositional purposes, we have suppressed the time subscripts from the endogenous variables of our model. Thus we express a variable one period in the future by subscript "+1." Thus employment at time  $t$  as  $E_t$ , and employment at time  $t+1$  as  $E_{t+1}$ .

$$H = \beta^t [\Lambda(1-l_e) - w + h_F v - T(\theta, h_F)] E + \lambda_{+1} E_{+1} \quad (\text{B10})$$

where  $E$  is employment,  $\Lambda$  is the productivity of a worker,  $\lambda$  is the shadow value of an extra employee,  $\beta$  is the firm's discount factor<sup>24</sup>,  $T(\theta, h_F)$  are worker acquisition costs,<sup>25</sup>  $v$  is the hiring voucher (a fixed subsidy per person hired), and  $h_F$  is the firm's hire rate, which is the number of workers the firm hires divided by its workforce. Thus  $h_F = h \cdot (U / N)$ , where  $U$  is aggregate unemployment and  $N$  is aggregate employment. The Hamiltonian (B10) is maximised with respect to  $\theta$  and  $w$ , subject to the equation of motion:

$$E_{+1} = (1 + h_F - f - d)E, \quad (\text{B11})$$

We define:  $\mu_{+1} = \lambda_{+1} \beta^{-t}$  and obtain the first-order conditions with respect to  $w$ ,  $\theta$  and  $\mu_t$ :

$$-\left(1 + \Lambda \frac{\partial l_e}{\partial w}\right) = \mu_{+1} \frac{df}{dw} \quad (\text{wage equation}) \quad (\text{B12})$$

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial \theta} = (\mu_{+1} + v) \frac{dh_F}{d\theta} \quad (\text{hiring equation}) \quad (\text{B13})$$

$$\beta^{-1} \mu = [\Lambda(1-l_e) - w + h_F v - T(\theta, h_F)] + (1 + h_F - f - d) \mu_{+1} \quad (\text{value equation}) \quad (\text{B14})$$

The term of  $df/dw$  takes into account the effect of changes in the wage on employed workers' leisure. However, as noted, the firm's wage decision is assumed not to affect the leisure decision of the job applicants.

Finally, the stationary state of our labour market system (B11)-(B14) was found numerically.

#### B.4. Parameterisation of model

We let the period of analysis be one quarter. The parameters we have used are:  $\gamma = 0.75$ ,  $\beta = 0.98$ ,  $\alpha = 0.94$ ,  $a = 1.0$ ,  $d = 0$ ,  $\phi = 0.5$ ,  $\Lambda = 1.3$ ,  $t = 0.1$ , and  $b = 0.4$ . We have parameterised worker acquisition costs as  $T = \theta^2 / 2$ .

We used the NAG routine E04UCF to calculate the numerical solution to our model, given the parameters above.

The parameters above yield a reasonable approximation of labour market flows in Britain during the early 1990s. For instance, let us define the long-term unemployed to be those unemployed for at least a year (4 periods). If the transition rate out of unemployment is a constant  $b$ , then the steady state proportion of people who are unemployed for at least  $x$  periods is  $(1 - b)^x$ . Thus, the fraction of the unemployed who are long-term unemployed is  $(1 - b)^4$ . During the early 1990s in Britain, roughly 36% of the unemployed have been jobless for over a year:  $(1 - b)^4 = 0.36$ . This suggests that, under our Markov assumptions, the baseline hire rate should be 0.2254 which is reasonably close to our computed equilibrium hire rate of 0.232.

<sup>24</sup> For simplicity, we assume that workers and firms have the same discount factor.

<sup>25</sup> The worker acquisition costs depend on both  $\theta$  and  $b$  to capture the separate effects of training workers hired at rate  $b$  and the interview costs associated with a given choice of  $\theta$ .

The wage in our model is 1.16, which implies a replacement ratio of 0.345, which is close to that in the UK. Our separation rate is 0.026, which corresponds to an average job tenure of roughly ten years.

## References


- Bentolila, S. and J. J. Dolado (1994), Labour Flexibility and Wages: Lessons from Spain, *Economic Policy*, 18, April, 53-99.
- Blinder, Alan S. (1987), *Hard Head, Soft Hearts*, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Burgess, S. and H. Rees (1994), Lifetime Tenure and Transient Jobs: Job Tenure in Britain 1975-1991, CEPR Discussion Paper No. 1098, CEPR, London.
- Buti, M., L.R. Pench and P. Sestito (1998), European Unemployment: Contending Theories and Institutional Complexities, European Commission, mimeo.
- Coe, D. and D. J. Snower (1997), Policy Complementarities: The Case for Fundamental Labour Market Reform, International Monetary Fund Staff Papers, 44, 1-35.
- Daveri, F. and G. Tabellini (1997), Unemployment, Growth and Taxation in Industrial Countries, Brescia University, Discussion Paper No. 9706, Brescia University.
- Elmeskov, J., J. P. Martin and S. Scarpetta (1998), Key Lessons for Labour Market Reforms: Evidence from OECD Countries' Experiences, Swedish Economic Policy Review 5.
- Lindbeck, A. and D. J. Snower (1989), *The Insider-Outsider Theory of Employment and Unemployment* (Cambridge, MIT Press).
- Phelps, E. S. (1994), *Structural Slumps* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press).
- Saint-Paul, G. (1993), On the Political Economy of Labor Market Flexibility, in J. Olivier, (ed.), *NBER Macroeconomics Annual 1993* (Cambridge, MIT Press), 151-87.
- Shapiro, C. and J. E. Stiglitz (1984), Unemployment as a Worker Discipline Device, *American Economic Review*. 74, 433-444.

b	$\tau$	cross-elasticity	$\eta_b$	$\eta_\tau$	Government Budget	Welfare of employed	Welfare of unemployed	Unemployed unemployed
0.40	0.10	0.134	1.56	0.17	Balanced	57.28	55.13	0.099
0.35	0.09	0.086	1.27	0.12	Surplus	↑	↓	0.090
0.36	0.093	0.095	1.33	0.14	Surplus	↑	↓	0.091
0.362	0.092	0.095	1.34	0.13	Balanced	↑	↓	0.092
0.38	0.092	0.106	1.43	0.14	Deficit	↑	↑	0.092
0.41	0.102	0.147	1.64	0.18	Deficit	↓	↑	0.101
0.45	0.111	0.212	1.94	0.238	Deficit	↓	↑	0.111

*Note:*


Baseline parameter values are reviewed in the Appendix.

Table 1: The Effects of Alternative Tax-Benefit Policy Combinations.



**FIGURE 8:** Economic Complementarities





**FIGURE 9:** Unemployment, Taxes and Transfers

