

**Question:**

Consider an individual with a utility function for consumption and leisure that is described as:

$$U = C \cdot l$$

where  $C$  is consumption and  $l$  is leisure. Assume that the individual has \$25,000 in non-labor income and receives a wage rate of \$50 per hour. Let the total time available to this person be 4992 hours per year to allocate between work and leisure. (4992 is 16 hours per day, 6 days per week, 52 weeks per year.) However, the individual is not perfectly free to choose a work schedule. The individual must work a minimum of 2250 hours per year to keep the job which pays \$50.

- How much does the person work and consume now? Is the constraint binding?
- How much would the person work and consume at a wage of \$100?
- Calculate how much, if anything, this person would pay (on an annual basis) to be promoted to a job that pays \$100 per hour.

**Answer:**

- a) Set the problem up as normal utility maximization:

$$\max_{\{C,l\}} U = C \cdot l + \lambda(C - E - w[T - l]) .$$

The FOC are the budget constraint and  $C = wl$ . Substitute for  $C$  in the budget constraint and solve for  $l^*$ . Then solve for  $C^*$ .

Unrestricted the person would consume 2746 hours of leisure at \$50 wage. The constraint is binding because at 2250 hours of work, there are only 2742 hours for leisure. Constrained consumption is \$137,500.

- b) Same set up with the same FOC. Solve the same way. At \$100 wage, the person demands 2621 hours of leisure. The constraint is not binding.
- c) The problem of how much the individual will pay for the higher wage is solved by minimizing non-labor income at the utility level given in part (a).

$$\min_{\{C,l\}} E = C - w(T - l) + \phi(\bar{U} - C \cdot l)$$

Note that this is the constrained consumption level  $C^*$  given by 2250 times \$50 plus \$25,000, and the constrained leisure level,  $l^*$ , of 2742. That is,

$$\bar{U} = C^* \cdot l^* = \$137,500 \cdot 2742$$

In this problem,  $C^* = \$194$  and  $200$ ;  $l^* = 1942$ . From these we can calculate  $E^*$ , which is negative \$110,857. Labor income is \$305,000.

This  $E^*$  is the non-labor income that will keep the individual on the utility indifference curve identified in part (a). Because the individual receives \$25,000 of non-labor income each

period, the person would be willing to pay this \$25,000 plus  $E^*$  of \$110,857 for a total of \$135,857 each period for the wage of \$100. A payment of a smaller amount will allow the individual to enjoy more utility than was found in part (a).

This is shown in the figure below. Point  $a$  represents the behavior found in part (a) above. Point  $b$  represents the choices in part (c). The distance  $xz$  is \$25,000, the non-labor income received by the individual. The distance  $zy$  is the non-labor income that will keep the individual on the same indifference curve. Hence, the individual would be willing to pay up to the amount depicted by the distance  $xy$  for the higher wage.

