



# Compensating Wage Differentials

EC 350: Labor Economics

Kyle Raze

Spring 2021



## Discussion about the Seattle minimum wage study

**Q<sub>1</sub>:** What data did the authors bring to bear? How do these data differ from other studies?

**Q<sub>2</sub>:** How did the authors estimate the impact of Seattle's minimum wage increase?

**Q<sub>3</sub>:** What did the authors find?

**Q<sub>4</sub>:** How do the findings compare to other studies?

**Q<sub>5</sub>:** What are the weaknesses of the study? How might those weaknesses affect the results?

**Q<sub>6</sub>:** What are the policy implications of the study?

**Q<sub>7</sub>:** Did the study make you update your beliefs about the minimum wage? Why or why not?



# Compensating wage differentials

# Compensating wage differentials

**Q:** Why are some workers paid more than others?

- Differences in preferences?
- Differences in human capital?
- Discrimination?
- Differences in **working conditions?**

**Even within the same industry, some jobs are riskier than others!**



# Compensating wage differentials



**The idea?** Wages can compensate for non-monetary aspects of a job.

The whole of the advantages and disadvantages of different employment of labour and stock must, in the same neighbourhood, be either perfectly equal or continually tending to equality.

— Adam Smith

## Examples?

- Hazard pay for grocery store workers during the pandemic
- Wage premium for risky jobs (e.g., *Deadliest Catch*)
- Wage penalty for fun/fulfilling occupations (e.g., art, music, "lifestyle PhDs", etc.)

# Market for risky jobs



## Supply

Workers care about wages  $w$  and the risk of injury  $\rho$ :

$$U = f(w, \rho)$$

- Workers are risk averse.
  - Wages are a "good:"  $U$  increases with  $w$ .
  - Injury risk is a "bad:"  $U$  decreases with  $\rho$ .
- An employer would need to pay a **wage premium** to convince a worker to take a **riskier job**.

## Demand

Employers care about profit, which depends on compensation bundles of wages  $w$  and injury risk  $\rho$ .

- Both wages and safe working conditions are costly.
  - To **increase wages** and keep the same profit, an employer would need to **cut back on safety** initiatives.
  - To **reduce injury risk** and keep the same profit, an employer would need to **cut wages**.



An **indifference curve** shows all of the wage-risk bundles that yield the same utility.

1. **Upward sloping:** Additional risk requires additional pay to keep the same utility.
2. **Convex**
3. Wage-risk bundles on **higher indifference curves** yield **higher utility**.



**Different workers** can have **different risk preferences**.

- Some workers dislike injury risk more than others.
  - Workers with steeper indifference curves are more risk-averse.
  - Workers with flatter indifference curves are less risk-averse.





An **iso-profit curve** shows all of the wage-risk bundles that yield the same profit.

1. **Upward sloping:** Safety and wages are costly.
  - To keep the same profit, increasing one requires reducing the other.
2. **Concave:** Diminishing returns to safety lead to increasing marginal cost of risk abatement.
3. Wage-risk bundles on **higher iso-profit curves** yield **lower profit**.



In equilibrium, workers **match** with employers.

- Most risk-averse worker  $\longleftrightarrow$  safest employer
- Least risk-averse worker  $\longleftrightarrow$  riskiest employer

The **Hedonic wage function** describes the relationship between wages and job characteristics (e.g., injury risk).

- Upward sloping for "disamenities."
- Downward sloping for amenities (e.g., generosity of health insurance plan).

# Safety regulation



**Case 1:** Workers fully aware of workplace hazards.

# Safety regulation



**Case 2:** Workers misinformed about workplace hazards.

# Value of a statistical life



**Q:** How much money are workers willing to give up in exchange for a marginal reduction in fatality risk?

- **Q:** Or, how much money would workers willingly accept in exchange for a marginal increase in fatality risk?

Other things being equal, **riskier occupations tend to pay more** than safer occupations.

- **Example:** Employer Y has a riskier work environment than Employer X, but workers at Y willingly accept this added risk because they are paid a compensating differential of \$7,600 per year.

Employer	Probability of fatal injury	Annual wage earnings
X	$\rho_X$	$w_X$
Y	$\rho_X + 0.001$	$w_X + \$7,600$

# Value of a statistical life



The **value of a statistical life**<sup>†</sup> (VSL) describes the strength of the relationship between fatality risk and wages.

- The **hypothetical amount of money** a person would accept to increase their probability of death from 0 to 1.
- Despite its dismal name, VSL is estimated from observed **responses to small changes** in fatality risk.

**How is this useful?** Helps governments weigh the tradeoffs of safety regulations and environmental policies.

- Safety regulations can save lives (benefit) in exchange for reduced economic activity (cost).
- Easy to ignore benefits when they aren't directly comparable to the costs!

<sup>†</sup> A prime example of how *not* to brand a useful concept.

# Value of a statistical life



## Estimation

Using data on wages and fatality risk for different occupations, a researcher can estimate a **Hedonic regression**:

$$\text{Wage}_i = \alpha + \beta \text{Risk}_i + \text{other variables} + \varepsilon_i$$

- $\text{Wage}_i$  represents the annual wage for occupation  $i$ .
- $\text{Risk}_i$  represents the annual probability of death in occupation  $i$ .
- $\beta$  represents the value of a statistical life.<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup> Previously published VSL estimates range from 1 to 12 million dollars. The Environmental Protection Agency uses a VSL of \$10 million for cost-benefit analysis.



## Discussion

$$\text{Wage}_i = \alpha + \beta \text{Risk}_i + \text{other variables} + \varepsilon_i$$

**Q<sub>1</sub>:** Estimates of  $\beta$  are often *negative* when researchers fail to include "other variables." Why?

**Q<sub>2</sub>:** What "other variables" should a researcher include to isolate the causal effect of risk on wages?





**Assigned reading for Monday:** The effect of human capital on earnings: Evidence from a reform at Colombia's top university by Carolina Arteaga (2018).

- Reading Quiz 8 is due by **Monday, May 17th at 16:00**.
- The quiz instructions will include a reading guide.