### Rural Labour Markets

Fall 2010

# Example: Labour Markets in the ICRISAT Villages

- Mahbubnagar and Akola in Maharastra
- $\,\hookrightarrow\,$  hired labour constitutes 60–80% of total
  - Casual labour:
- $\hookrightarrow$  hired on a day–to–day basis
- $\hookrightarrow$  high turnover rates
- $\hookrightarrow$  high rates of unemployment (esp. off season)
- $\hookrightarrow$  some paid on a piece rate basis (harvesting)
- $\hookrightarrow$  others with daily wages

- Permanent Labour: "regular farm servant"
- $\hookrightarrow$  contractual period: 3 to 12 months (often renewed)
- $\hookrightarrow$  verbal contracts
- $\,\hookrightarrow\,$  hired by wealthier landed households
- $\hookrightarrow\,$  earn higher wages than casual labourers
- $\hookrightarrow$  increasing contract violation since 1980s

# The Neoclassical Labour Market



- No distinction between casual and long-term labour
- No distinction between numbers of workers and labour power (nutrition)
- Assumes away problems of asymmetric information
- No involuntary unemployment
- Ignores uncertainty

()

# Poverty, Nutrition and Labour Markets

### **Energy Use**

- Resting Metabolism
- $\hookrightarrow$  body temperature, heart, respiratory action
- $\hookrightarrow$  minimum energy for resting tissues and cell membranes
- $\hookrightarrow$  FAO estimate: 65 kg male requires 1700 kcal per day for this
  - Energy required for work
- $\,\hookrightarrow\,$  depends on type and intensity of work

### **Energy Balance**

- Energy Input
- $\hookrightarrow$  determined by food which is in turn determined by labour supply and non–labour income (e.g. land)
  - Storage and Borrowing
- $\hookrightarrow$  in short run:

```
energy deficit = energy use - energy input
```

- Met by running down stores in human body
- $\hookrightarrow$  sustained deficit leads to undernutrition, illness and, ultimately, death

# The Nutritional Efficiency–Wage Model

### • The capacity curve

- $\,\hookrightarrow\,$  at low incomes most nutrition used to maintaining resting metabolism
- $\Rightarrow$  little extra energy left over for work
- $\hookrightarrow$  once critical nutrition level achieved, work capacity increases rapidly
- $\hookrightarrow$  eventually diminishing returns to nutrition due to natural limits



Figure: Work Capacity Curve

### Piece Rates

 $\hookrightarrow$  assume income received on the basis of tasks completed:



#### Figure: Piece Rate

### • Labour Supply

- $\hookrightarrow$  how does capacity supplied vary with income ?
- $\hookrightarrow$  assume worker maximizes her income



Figure: Determination of Labour Supply



### Figure: Labour Supply Curve



### Implications

#### Involuntry unemployment

 $\hookrightarrow$  employers will not reduce piece rate below  $v^*$  despite unemployment, because this will reduce work capacity

#### Viscious cycle

- $\hookrightarrow$  lack of job opportunities
- $\hookrightarrow$  low income
- $\hookrightarrow$  low nutrition
- $\hookrightarrow$  low capacity to work
- $\hookrightarrow$  less access to labour markets

# Dynamics of Nutritional Status

- low wages paid today
- $\Rightarrow$  low nutritional status in the future
- $\Rightarrow$  reduced productivity
  - if probability of hiring same worker again is low
- $\Rightarrow$  employers do not take full account of impact of wage on nutritional status

### Example

- Worker's "reservation" wage = \$5
- Minimum wage to maintain nutritional status = \$7
- Current value of work effort = \$10
- If w < \$7 nutritional status deteriorates  $\Rightarrow$  productivity falls to \$7
- Two employers: E1 and E2
- Random matching of workers with employers
- $\Rightarrow$  probability or re-hiring a worker = 1/2

# Should each employer pay \$5 or \$7 ?

• Payoffs to E1 :

Wage	Profit Today	Profit Tomorrow		Total
w = 7	10 – 7	∫ 10−5	if E2 pays \$7	8
		$1 \frac{10}{2} + \frac{7}{2} - 5$	if E2 pays \$5	6.5
w = 5	10 – 5	$\int \frac{10}{2} + \frac{7}{2} - 5$	if E2 pays \$7	8.5
		1 = 7 - 5	if E2 pays \$5	7

• Payoff matrix:

E2  

$$w = 7$$
  $w = 5$   
E1  $w = 7$   $8, 8$   $6.5, 8.5$   
 $w = 5$   $8.5, 6.5$   $7, 7$ 

- Nash equilibrium: both employers pay \$5
- Superior outcome (both for wages and profits) is to pay \$7
- $\,\hookrightarrow\,$  BUT each employer will deviate if he thinks the other is paying \$7
- → "Prisoner's dilemma"
  - if situation is repeated over time
- $\hookrightarrow$  continuous degradation of nutritional status

- Also referred to as "tied" or "attached" labour
- Two main theories of why permanent labour markets arise:
- (1) to provide incentives for workers performing specialized tasks that are difficult to monitor
- (2) as a substitute for casual labour markets where there is risk and imperfect credit markets

# To Induce Effort on Non–Contractible Tasks

• Employer induces effort by paying a high wage and threatening to end contract if the worker "shirks"

### • Example:

- $\hookrightarrow w_c =$  wage in casual labour market
- $\hookrightarrow w_p =$  permanent wage
- $\hookrightarrow L_c =$ casual labour force
- $\hookrightarrow L_p =$  permanent labour force
- $\hookrightarrow$  *e* = work effort required of permanent labour
- $\hookrightarrow$  N = mental planning horizon

• Payoff to not shirking:

$$w_p - e + N(w_p - e)$$

Payoff to shirking:

$$w_p + Nw_c$$

To induce effort employer must set the permanent wage so that

$$(N+1)(w_p - e) \ge w_p + Nw_c$$

 $\hookrightarrow$  which implies

$$w_p = w_c + \left(rac{N+1}{N}
ight) e.$$

 $\hookrightarrow$  last term is a "bribe" not to shirk

Relative wage

$$rac{w_p}{w_c} = 1 + \left(rac{N+1}{N}
ight) rac{e}{w_c}.$$

# Implications of Growth

- Demands for both types of worker rise, pushing up  $w_p$  and  $w_c$ .
- $\hookrightarrow \ \frac{w_p}{w_c} \ \text{falls} \\ \hookrightarrow \ \frac{L_p}{L_c} \ \text{increases}$ 
  - Consistent with some empirical studies on agricultural booms
  - But inconsistent with long term trend

# Tied Labour and Seasonal Fluctuations

- If workers are more risk-averse than employers, they may accept a lower average wage in return for transferring the income fluctuations to the employer
- Why do permanent labour contracts become less prominent as economy develops:
- $\hookrightarrow$  decline in seasonality
- $\hookrightarrow$  greater access to credit
- $\hookrightarrow$  greater opportunities (e.g. manfacturing) may reduce enforceability



### Intermediate Societies

- General problem of "unbalanced" economic development:
- $\hookrightarrow$  increased mobility, wealth and change in some sectors
- $\hookrightarrow$  once economy is sufficiently wealthy, can be replaced with formal contracts supported by more advanced information and legal systems
  - BUT there may be a phase in which it becomes an intermediate society
- $\,\hookrightarrow\,$  growth in advanced sectors undermines traditional institutions