Macroeconomics ECO 110/1, AAU Lecture 3



### NATIONAL INCOME

Eva Hromádková, 22.2 2010

## **Overview of Lecture 3**

National Income: macro measures and micro foundations

- GDP:
  - definition
  - computation methods
- Consumption:
  - John Maynard Keynes: consumption and current income
  - Irving Fisher: intertemporal choice
  - Milton Friedman: permanent income hypothesis
  - Robert Hall: random-walk hypothesis
  - David Laibson: pull of instant gratification

## Gross Domestic Product - GDP

- GDP = total market value of all final goods and services within nation's borders in given time period
- G National P = output produced by nationally-owned factors of production
  - ex.: Japanese-owned car production in Kolin
- GDP per capita = GDP/ total population
  - Allows for international comparison
  - Approximation of difference in living standards

### **Gross Domestic Product**

**Global overview** 



Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:GDP\_PPP\_Per\_Capita\_IMF\_2008.png

### GDP

Rules for computation – production method

- 5
- Valued at market prices how much people are willing to pay for good / service
- Resale of used goods not included
  - Transfer of ownership, not new product
- Increase in inventory = increase in GDP; sale out of inventory
  = no change in GDP
- Value of intermediate goods + value added at each stage of production = value of final goods
- Imputed values for G & S not sold in the market place
  - People living in own homes; gvt services
- □ Left out: home production, underground economy

- Nominal GDP:  $GDP_{2009} = \sum_{i}^{N} P_{i,2009} * Q_{i,2009}$ 
  - change in GDP can be due to change in quantity or change in price
- $\Box \text{ Real GDP:} \qquad GDP_{2009} = \sum_{i}^{N} P_{i, BASE} * Q_{i, 2009}$ 
  - Choose the base year and use its prices
  - Allows comparison of econ. activity across years
  - Problem: fixing the relative prices (ex. computers)
    - Updating base year + recalculating
    - Chain-weighted measures

### **GDP** Expenditure method

- Idea: all output of economy must be claimed / bought by someone GDP = C + I + G + NX
- C consumption
- I investment
- G gvt. expenditure
- NX net export



### Consumption (C) – output bought by households

- Nondurable goods immediate consumption
- Durable goods e.g.TV, car
- Services

Investment (I) – goods bought for future use; condition

- = new capital is created (e.g. not purchase of stocks)
  - Business fixed: new plants + new equipment

Residential investment: new housing

Inventory investment: increase in inventories of goods

Government purchases (G)

Net Exports (NX) – exports - imports



## Idea: one person's expenditure must equal another person's income



### Measures of income

From national to personal income

- Net domestic product (NDP) = GDP depreciation (F)
  - Depreciation = wearing out of capital; needs to be reinvested in order to keep the production possibilities
- National income (NI) = NDP + net foreign income
- Personal income = NI indirect business taxes (G) corporate taxes (G) – retained earnings (F) – Social Security taxes (G) + transfer payments (H) + net interest (H)
- Personal disposable income (H) = personal income personal taxes (G)
  - All disposable income is either consumed or saved

Note: (F), (G), (H) – to whom is income distributed

### GDP

Imprecise measure of quality of life

### Limitations:

- Black market, barter, volunteer production, home production – all not included
- Bubbles in prices housing, oil
- In some cases, increase in GDP may cause decrease in well-being of society
  - **Ex.** polluting production, military spending, child work
- Easterlin Paradox: happiness data are typically stationary over time despite considerable increases in income
  - Happiness of women actually goes down

### Quality of life

Alternative measures

- 12
- Human development index (HDI):
  - Includes life expectancy, literacy, education, and standards of living (GDP); since 1990 used by UN
  - Top 3: Norway, Australia, Iceland
  - Selected: ČR 36, USA 13, Austria 14, Russia 71, China - 92
- Happy Planet Index (HPI):
  - Composite index with 3 dimensions: life expectancy, life satisfaction, ecologic footprint
  - Cons.: no political freedom or human rights included
  - Selected: ČR 92, USA 114, Austria 57, Russia 108, China - 20

### Human development index (HDI) – 2009



Source: <u>http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:UN\_Human\_Development\_Report\_2009.PNG</u> - Highest ranked countries are dark green, lowest are dark red

### Happy Planet index (HPI) – 2006



Source: <a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Happy\_Planet\_Index">http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Happy\_Planet\_Index</a>

14

- Highest-ranked countries are green, the lowest are brown

### 15 Consumption Microfoundations

From Keynes to behavioral theories

## Consumption – micro-foundations

Motivation

- MICRO question: How do households decide how much of income they consume now and how much will they save for future
- MACRO relevance:
  - Long-run: effect on economic growth: savings = source of capital = key determinant of growth
  - Short-run: consumption = 50% of CR GDP, thus fluctuations will affect booms and recessions

Chronological approach: How did understanding of determinants of demand for consumption evolved over the history of modern economic thinking

Basic assumptions

- 3 conjectures about consumption function
- based on casual observation, no economic data was available + no computers to analyze them
- 1. Marginal propensity to consume is between 0 and 1
  - MPC = amount consumed out of 1 additional unit of income
  - Explanation = precaution
- 2. Average propensity to consume falls as income rises
  - APC = C / Y ratio of consumption to total income
  - Explanation = savings are luxury good
- 3. Key determinant of consumption is income, interest rate does not play important role

Formally:  $C = \overline{C} + cY$ 



**Empirical verification** 

#### **Positive evidence**

Individual HHs data (cross section)

HHs with higher income

- consumed more => MPC>0
- saved more => MPC<1</p>
- saved larger fraction of income => falling APC
- Aggregate data on consumption and income (time series)
  - Years of low income = years of low C and S => 0<MPC<1</p>
  - Years of low income = years with high C/Y ratio => falling APC

#### **Negative evidence**

### All concerning falling APC

 Secular stagnation: prediction about long depression after WWII – not confirmed by actual development

#### Kuznets dataset –

aggregate data on income and consumption since 1869

 APC remarkably stable despite large fluctuations in income

**Empirical verification - Summary** 

Keynes's conjectures hold well in cross section studies of HH's data and in short time-series, but fail when long time-series are concerned

- MPC between 0 and 1
- APC constant with income

# 2. Theory of intertemporal choice (Irving Fisher)

- Forward looking consumer chooses consumption for present and future to maximize lifetime happiness
- □ 2 period model:
  - T=1: person is young => earns income Y<sub>1</sub> (given) and consumes C<sub>1</sub> (choice)
  - T=2: person is old => earns income Y<sub>2</sub> (given) and consumes C<sub>2</sub> (choice)
  - Opportunity to borrow/save S at int. rate s

# 2. Theory of intertemporal choice (Irving Fisher)

22

### Period 1 budget constraint:

 $C_1 + S = Y_1$  $\Box \text{ Period 2 budget constraint:} C_2 = Y_2 + (1+r)S$ 

Intertemporal budget constraint:

$$\boldsymbol{C}_{1} + \frac{\boldsymbol{C}_{2}}{1+\boldsymbol{r}} = \boldsymbol{Y}_{1} + \frac{\boldsymbol{Y}_{2}}{1+\boldsymbol{r}}$$

present value of lifetime consumption

present value of lifetime income

Intertemporal budget constraint



Consumer preferences



Consumer preferences



The optimal ( $C_1$ , $C_2$ ) is where the budget line just touches the highest indifference curve.



 $C_{2}$ 

**Results**: Provided they are both normal goods,  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  both increase, ...regardless of whether the income increase occurs in period 1 or period 2.

27

An increase in  $Y_1$  or  $Y_2$ shifts the budget line outward.

 $C_1$ 

Increase in r – case of net saver

As depicted here,  $C_1$  falls and  $C_2$  rises. However, it could turn out differently...



Increase in r – case of net saver

- income effect: If consumer is a saver, the rise in *r* makes him better off, which tends to increase consumption in both periods.
- **substitution effect**: The rise in r increases the opportunity cost of current consumption, which tends to reduce  $C_1$  and increase  $C_2$ .

□ Both effects 
$$\Rightarrow$$
  $\uparrow$   $C_2$ .

Whether  $C_1$  rises or falls depends on the relative size of the income & substitution effects

Determinants of consumption

- Current consumption depends only on current income.
- Interest rate matters only in theory

#### Fisher:

- Current consumption depends only on the present value of lifetime income. The timing of income is irrelevant because the consumer can borrow or lend between periods.
- Interest rate affects current consumption
- Problem: borrowing constraints

## 3. Life-cycle hypothesis

Hypothesis

31

(Franco Modigliani)

- Income varies systematically over people's lives
- Savings allow people to move income from high-income period to low-income period (productive age -> retirement)

#### Example:

- Person with current wealth W expect to live T more years: R working and earning Y, T-R years in retirement with no earnings
- Goal = smooth consumption over life time

$$C = \frac{W + R * Y}{T} = \frac{1}{T}W + \frac{R}{T}Y$$

□ T=50, R=30 => C = 0.02\*W + 0.6\*Y

### 3. Life-cycle hypothesis

Implications

(Franco Modigliani)

Formally:  $C = \alpha W + \beta Y$ 

where  $\alpha$ - MPC out of wealth,  $\beta$  – MPC out of income

- Explanation of APC paradox: APC = C/Y =  $\alpha^*W/Y + \beta$ 
  - Short-run: W does not vary with Y falling APC
  - Long run: W and Y grow at the same rate constant W/Y as well as APC
- Testable prediction: young people who are working save while old who are retired dissave
  - In data, elderly do not dissave as much as model predicts
  - Possible explanations:
    - Insurance: live longer than expected, possibility of illness
    - Altruism: bequests to their children

## 4. Permanent income hypothesis

Hypothesis

(Milton Friedman)

People experience random and temporary changes in income Savings are then derived from their expected income:

- $Y = Y^{P} + Y^{T}$   $Y^{P}$  permanent income: part of Y a person expects to persist
  - e.g. return to one's education
- $Y^T$  transitory income: part of Y a person does not expect to persist in future
  - e.g. good weather => big harvest => high income
- Consumption depends primarily on permanent income
- Savings / borrowing are used to smooth consumption in response to transitory changes

## 4. Permanent income hypothesis

Implications

(Milton Friedman)

Formally:  $C = \alpha Y^{P}$ 

Explanation of APC paradox:

- □ HHs survey:
  - If variation (income) in income is based on permanent income => HHs add proportionally to their consumption => constant APC
  - If variation (income) in income is based on temporary income => HHs do not change their consumption => decreasing APC
- Time series
  - Short-term: fluctuations determined by temporary income => falling APC
  - Long-term: fluctuations determined by permanent income => const APC

### 5. Random walk hypothesis

Hypothesis

(Robert Hall)

- based on Fisher's model & PIH, forward-looking consumers base consumption on expected future income
- Hall adds the assumption of rational expectations: people use all available information to forecast future variables like income.
- If assumptions are satisfied, then consumption should follow a **random walk**: changes in consumption should be unpredictable.
  - A change in income or wealth that was anticipated has already been factored into expected permanent income, so it will not change consumption.
  - Only unanticipated changes in income or wealth that alter expected permanent income will change consumption.

### 5. Random walk hypothesis

Implications

(Robert Hall)

36

If consumers behave according to permanent income hypothesis and have rational expectations then policy changes will affect consumption only if they are unanticipated!

 Changed expectations will have immediate effect on consumption (e.g. student)

PROBLEM: not supported by data:

Predictable changes in income => predictable changes in consumption

### 6. Instant gratification

#### (David Laibson)

What is people are not rational optimizers?

- 1. Would you prefer (A) a candy today, or (B) two candies tomorrow?
- 2. Would you prefer (A) a candy in 100 days, or (B) two candies in 101 days?

Time inconsistency: Q1 – answer A, Q2 – answer B

- people generally prefer smaller, sooner payoffs to larger but later payoffs, when the smaller payoffs would be imminent instant gratification (Q1)
- when the same payoffs are distant in time, people tend to prefer the larger outcome, even though the time lag from the smaller to the larger would be the same as before(Q2)
- => People save less than they rationally know they should

## Summary

Keynes: consumption depends primarily on current income

Recent work: consumption also depends on

- Expected future income
- Wealth
- Interest rates
- Borrowing constraints
- Psychological factors