

Määttänen, Niku; Poutvaara, Panu

**Working Paper**

## Should old-age benefits be earnings-tested?

IZA Discussion Papers, No. 2616

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

*Suggested Citation:* Määttänen, Niku; Poutvaara, Panu (2007) : Should old-age benefits be earnings-tested?, IZA Discussion Papers, No. 2616, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Bonn, <https://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:101:1-2008042257>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/33805>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

IZA DP No. 2616

## Should Old-Age Benefits Be Earnings-Tested?

Niku Määttänen  
Panu Poutvaara

February 2007

# Should Old-Age Benefits Be Earnings-Tested?

**Niku Määttänen**

*ETLA, Helsinki*

**Panu Poutvaara**

*University of Helsinki  
and IZA*

Discussion Paper No. 2616  
February 2007

IZA

P.O. Box 7240  
53072 Bonn  
Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0

Fax: +49-228-3894-180

E-mail: [iza@iza.org](mailto:iza@iza.org)

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 company supported by Deutsche Post World Net. 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.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

## ABSTRACT

### Should Old-Age Benefits Be Earnings-Tested?\*

We study the welfare effects of earnings testing flat-rate old-age benefits in a quantitative overlapping generations model with idiosyncratic labor income risk. In our model economy, even a moderate earnings testing reduces individuals' expected lifetime utility, whenever other taxes are taken into account. Moreover, it also lowers the realized lifetime utilities of those at the bottom of the lifetime utility distribution.

JEL Classification: H55, J26, C68

Keywords: social security, retirement, means-testing

Corresponding author:

Panu Poutvaara  
Department of Economics  
University of Helsinki  
P.O. Box 17 (Arkadiankatu 7)  
FIN-00014 Helsinki  
Finland  
E-mail: [panu.poutvaara@helsinki.fi](mailto:panu.poutvaara@helsinki.fi)

---

\* We thank Essi Eerola and the participants at the Annual Meeting of Finnish Economists in Helsinki in February 2006 for helpful comments. We gratefully acknowledge financial support from the Yrjö Jahansson Foundation.

# 1 Introduction

Private insurance agencies usually cannot cover for risks whose realization is revealed before children become adults. For example, there is no insurance market for innate talent, social status of one's parents, or the quality of education and peer groups one enters. This renders a significant part of lifetime income risks uninsurable from the perspective of a hypothetical citizen behind a veil of ignorance. Furthermore, private information implies in many cases that an insurance provider would suffer from adverse selection problems even when covering for risks realized during working life. In particular, it is difficult for individuals to insure themselves against labor income uncertainty. A government, however, can substitute for the missing private insurance markets by mandatory social insurance (see Friedman 1953, Harsanyi 1953, Rawls 1971). This provides an efficiency rationale for redistributive social insurance, a central part of which is in most countries provided through old-age benefits.

Even if there is a consensus to organize a redistributive social security, important decisions remain. One of the most important ones is whether benefits should be paid to everyone above a certain age or only to those with no or low wage income, i.e. whether benefits should be earnings-tested or not.<sup>1</sup> Earnings testing old-age benefits imposes an implicit tax on continued work after entitlement age. Such implicit tax comes on top of wage taxes. Gruber and Wise (1999) provide thorough empirical evidence suggesting that such taxes are common in OECD countries and that the implicit tax burden plays an important role in retirement decisions.

The stated aim of earnings testing is to target benefits to the poor. When benefits are earnings-tested, those with little wage income after the entitlement age receive higher benefits

---

<sup>1</sup>In the United States, for example, there is an age-dependent earnings test. The age at which one can receive unreduced benefits is 65 years and two months. For beneficiaries below that age, the annual social security benefit is reduced by one dollar for every two dollars earned, above the exemption of USD 11,520. For beneficiaries aged 65 to 69, the annual benefit is reduced by one dollar for every three dollars earned, above the exemption of USD 30,720. (Social Security Administration, 2005.)

than others. Earnings testing may improve the risk sharing properties of social security if earnings-tested benefits also imply more redistribution from individuals with high lifetime earnings to those with low lifetime labor income than uniform benefits. This is à priori unclear, however. For instance, it may be that it is mainly the relatively wealthy individuals who benefit from earnings testing because they can afford to retire early.

In this paper, we analyze the welfare effects of earnings testing old-age benefits within a calibrated, general equilibrium overlapping generations model with endogenous labor supply and retirement behavior. We take into account both innate labor productivity differences and transitory labor productivity shocks, calibrating the productivity process to the US data. Permanent productivity differences may be thought of as differences in innate ability. They capture the stylized fact that people enter the labor market with different skills, receiving different hourly wages. Transitory shocks, on the other hand, are modelled as a random walk that affects the development of earnings opportunities, in addition to underlying innate productivity and a common life cycle wage profile. Financial markets are incomplete in that individuals cannot insure themselves against the labor income risk and cannot borrow against future labor income.

We take as our starting point a pay-as-you-go (PAYG) social security system with flat-rate benefits and without earnings-testing. We then analyze what would be the effect of introducing an earnings test. We study both an earnings test in which all earned income reduces benefits proportionally and an earnings test in which sufficiently low earnings do not reduce benefits. Throughout the analysis, we keep the size of the PAYG social security system constant by fixing the contribution rate. This is needed to separate intragenerational redistribution, which would be the purpose of an earnings test, from intergenerational redistribution that any PAYG social security system implements whenever the interest rate does not equal the growth rate of the economy.

We consider both the expected lifetime utility of individuals with different innate abilities and the distribution of realized lifetime utilities. These two approaches provide complemen-

tary criteria for ethical evaluation and political decision-making. Considering the expected lifetime utilities would be highlighted from a utilitarian perspective. Comparing ex post outcomes may be more relevant if the social security system is designed to reduce welfare inequality. Clearly, a given social security system may increase the lot of the most unlucky individuals even if it reduces individuals' expected lifetime utility at birth.

Our results suggest that earnings testing flat-rate benefits is unlikely to work as it is intended. In our model economy, even a moderate earnings test not just reduces individuals' expected lifetime utility but also the realized lifetime utility of almost all individuals, including those at the very bottom of the realized lifetime utility distribution. The reason is twofold: First, earnings testing benefits does not redistribute in a very systematic way from individuals with high lifetime income to those with low lifetime income. Second, the aggregate labor supply elasticity of individuals who are old enough to receive old age benefits is very high. As a result, even a moderate increase in the effective taxation of labor at older ages results in a relatively large decrease in aggregate labor supply.

Previous analyses of the optimality of earnings testing of social security have mainly focused on disability risks. In pioneering contributions, Diamond and Mirrlees (1978, 1986) conclude that optimal benefits are structured so that the healthy are indifferent as to whether to mimic the disabled or continue working. More recently, Golosov and Tsyvinski (2004) suggest using asset testing to deter falsely claimed disability benefits. Cremer et al. (2004) conclude that if high-productivity individuals also have lower utility cost of working, then earnings-testing can be used to deter high-productivity types from pooling with low-productivity types. Two main features separate our paper from this strand of literature. First, in these papers, disability (or higher cost of working) is always modelled as a permanent state. In contrast, we ask whether old-age benefits should be earnings-tested in the presence of income shocks that are not permanent. Second, we use a more detailed model with the aim of providing a quantitatively credible assessment of the trade-offs involved.

There are many papers analyzing the risk sharing aspects of a social security system using

similar overlapping generations models with idiosyncratic uncertainty. Examples include İmrohoroğlu et al. (1995), Conesa and Krueger (1999), and Gomes and Michaelides (2003). However, in most of this literature, the focus is on a PAYG social security system versus a fully funded system. Perhaps the most similar exercise to ours has been conducted by Fehr and Habermann (2005). They consider the optimal relation between benefits and lifetime earnings within a PAYG social security system of a fixed size and find that because of risk sharing, the link between benefits and earnings should be relatively progressive. Apart from the different policy question, one important difference between our set-up and theirs is that agents in their model are forced to retire at a fixed retirement age. Given the policy experiments considered in our paper, modelling the retirement decision is a crucial part of our analysis.<sup>2</sup>

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we present our model economy. In the third section, we explain the calibration. Results are presented in section 4. Section 5 presents sensitivity analysis, and section 6 concludes.

## 2 Model

The analysis is based on a discrete time overlapping generations model where individuals decide upon consumption, savings, and labor supply. All individuals live from age 1 until age  $J$ . We use  $j$  to denote individual's age. Individuals face uncertainty about their future wage levels. Financial markets are incomplete in the sense that individuals cannot privately insure themselves against labor income uncertainty. Hence, a social security system, or some other

---

<sup>2</sup>There is an important and related strand of literature that analyzes how social security systems influence individuals' retirement decisions using similar models of labor supply. Earlier examples of this literature include Gustman and Steinmeier (1986), Rust and Phelan (1997), and Stock and Wise (1990) and a recent example is French (2005). These analyses model existing social security systems in great detail and also estimate many of the model parameters using micro data. However, they follow a partial equilibrium approach. Therefore, they do not account for the welfare effects of alternative social security systems.

redistribution scheme, may improve welfare by providing a partial substitute for the missing private insurance market. The interest rate and the wage rate are determined competitively. The parameters of the social security system are chosen so that the budget of the system is always balanced.

We consider only steady states where all prices, tax and transfer parameters, the demographic structure, and the distribution of individuals over their states are constant over time. This restriction helps us in focusing on the possible trade-off between providing insurance against individual uncertainty in the labor market and minimizing the distortionary effects that the social security system has on labor supply.

## 2.1 Firms

A representative firm employs business capital,  $K$ , and efficient labor,  $L$ , to produce output goods,  $Y$ . The output good may be costlessly converted into consumption goods or capital. The production function is

$$Y = AK^\alpha L^{1-\alpha}. \quad (1)$$

The firm's first-order conditions for profit maximization imply that the interest rate,  $r$ , and the wage rate per unit of effective labor,  $w$ , are given, respectively, by the marginal productivities of business capital and effective labor. That is,

$$r = \alpha AK^{\alpha-1} L^{1-\alpha} - \delta \quad (2)$$

and

$$w = (1 - \alpha)AK^\alpha L^{-\alpha}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\delta$  is the depreciation rate of business capital and  $A$  is total factor productivity.

## 2.2 Labor productivity

Individuals have different labor productivities. The labor productivity of an individual of age  $j$  is

$$w_j = wh_j e^{v+z_j}, \quad (4)$$

where  $h_j$  denotes the average, age-specific labor productivity component of individuals of age  $j$ ,  $v$  denotes individual's permanent productivity shock, and  $z_j$  a temporary shock.<sup>3</sup> The temporary shock follows an AR(1) process:

$$z_j = \eta z_{j-1} + \varepsilon, \quad (5)$$

where  $\eta$  determines the degree of persistence and  $\varepsilon$  is independently, identically and normally distributed with mean zero and variance  $\sigma_\varepsilon^2$ .

## 2.3 The social security system

There is a government that collects taxes in order to pay for government expenditures,  $G$ , and to run a PAYG social security system. Government expenditures are financed by a proportional tax on labor and capital income,  $\tau$ , and the social security system by a proportional tax,  $\theta$ , on labor income alone.

old-age benefits depend on individual's current labor income and age and we denote them by  $B(w_j l_j, j)$ . We assume the following benefit rule.

$$B(w_j l_j, j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j < j_r \\ \max[s - \lambda(1 - \tau - \theta) \max[w_j l_j - f, 0], 0] & \text{if } j \geq j_r \end{cases}. \quad (6)$$

Individuals are entitled to benefits from age  $j_r$  onwards. The parameter  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$  determines the implicit tax rate of the earnings test and the parameter  $f \geq 0$  denotes an exemption (free income that may be earned without effects on social security benefits). After-tax labor income below the exemption does not reduce benefits. When  $\lambda = 0$ , there is no

---

<sup>3</sup>This specification for the labor productivity follows Floden and Lindé (2001).

earnings test and all individuals above the retirement age receive the same full benefit,  $s$ . When  $\lambda = 1$ , benefits are fully earnings-tested for earnings above the exemption level. In that case, if there is no exemption, an individual with a net income higher than  $s$  receives no benefits. This means that the social security system implies a 100% effective marginal tax rate on labor whenever net labor income is less than  $s$  and earnings are above the exemption level.

A higher  $\lambda$  should decrease average labor supply among the elderly. On the other hand, by reducing the benefits of individuals with high labor income, a higher  $\lambda$  may also imply a higher full benefit,  $s$ , via the social security budget constraint. As discussed in the introduction, this may help to target larger benefits to individuals who would otherwise have very low consumption possibilities. For a given  $\lambda > 0$ , a higher exemption,  $f$ , in turn should imply a lower full benefit. However, an exemption may also help to target benefits for low income individuals, because a larger part of their income is not taken into account when earnings testing the benefit. Clearly, if  $\lambda = 0$ , the exemption does not matter and as the exemption becomes increasingly large, earnings testing is effectively eliminated no matter what is  $\lambda$ .

In our analysis, we keep the contribution rate,  $\theta$ , fixed and vary the parameters in the benefit rule. Given the contribution rate, the implicit tax rate, and the exemption, the full benefit,  $s$ , is then determined so that the budget of the social security system (defined below) is balanced.

## 2.4 Individual's problem

Each period, individuals have a time endowment of one. Their decision variables are consumption,  $c$ , labor supply,  $l$ , and savings,  $k$ . Periodic utility is given by  $u(c, l)$ . The individual discount factor between periods is  $\beta$ . The individual state variables are current savings,  $k$ , the temporary productivity shock,  $z$ , the permanent productivity shock,  $v$ , and age,  $j$ . In its

recursive form, the problem of an individual of age  $j$  reads as:

$$V_j(k_j, z_j, v) = \max_{k_{j+1}, l_j} \{u(c_j, l_j) + E_{z_{j+1}|z_j} \beta V_{j+1}(k_{j+1}, z_{j+1}, v)\} \quad (7)$$

subject to

$$0 \leq l_j \leq 1 \quad (8)$$

$$c_j + k_{j+1} = [1 + (1 - \tau)r]k_j + (1 - \theta - \tau)w_j l_j + B(w_j l_j, j) \quad (9)$$

$$w_j = wh_j e^{v+z_j} \quad (10)$$

$$z_{j+1} = \eta z_j + \varepsilon \quad (11)$$

$$k_{j+1} \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

The first constraint is the time constraint. The second one is the flow budget constraint: consumption and tomorrow's savings equal the sum of current savings, net interest income, net labor income, and old-age benefits. The third equation defines the wage rate per units of time spent working. The fourth equation describes the evolution of labor productivity and the fifth equation states the borrowing constraint.

We assume that individuals are born without initial assets. That is,  $k_1 = 0$ .

## 2.5 Competitive equilibrium

Let  $\Phi$  denote a joint measure over individual states. Given the contribution rate,  $\theta$ , parameters  $\lambda$  and  $f$  of the benefit rule, and government expenditures,  $G$ , the steady state competitive equilibrium consists of individual decision rules  $c_j(k, z, v)$ ,  $k_j(k, z, v)$ ,  $l_j(k, z, v)$ , a value function  $V_j(k, z, v)$ , aggregate quantities  $K$  and  $L$ , prices  $r$  and  $w$ , tax rate,  $\tau$ , and a measure  $\Phi$  describing the distribution of individuals such that:

- 1) Individual policies and the value function solve the individual's problem.

2) Capital stock and the aggregate efficient labor are given by:

$$K = \int k_j(k, z, v)\Phi(dk \times dz \times dv \times dj), \quad (13)$$

$$L = \int h_j e^{v+zj} l_j(k, z, v)\Phi(dk \times dz \times dv \times dj). \quad (14)$$

3) Prices are determined by (2) and (3).

4) The budget of the social security system is balanced:

$$\int \theta w_j l_j(k, z, v)\Phi(dk \times dz \times dv \times dj) = \int B(w_j l_j(k, z, v), j)\Phi(dk \times dz \times dv \times dj). \quad (15)$$

5) Government tax revenue equals government expenditures:

$$\int \tau[w_j l_j(k, z, v) + r k_j(k, z, v)]\Phi(dk \times dz \times dv \times dj) = G. \quad (16)$$

6) The sum of individual consumption, investments and public consumption equals total production:

$$\int c_j(k, z, v)\Phi(dk \times dz \times dv \times dj) + \delta K + G = Y. \quad (17)$$

7) The distribution,  $\Phi$ , follows from individual decision rules and the labor productivity process.

### 3 Calibration

A model period corresponds to one year. We assume that individuals enter the model economy at real age 20 and live 66 periods, the last period corresponding to real age 85. The aggregate mass of all individuals is normalized to one.

We assume that intratemporal preferences over consumption and leisure are defined by a constant elasticity of substitution function and that the agents have a constant relative

risk aversion. We also assume that there are fixed costs of work to take into account the time required for commuting and other work-related routines. This allows us to replicate the empirical fact that individuals typically spend a substantial fraction of their annual time endowment at work or do not work at all. This corresponds to the pattern emphasized by French (2005): annual hours worked are clustered around zero hours and 2000 hours. The intuition is that the fixed cost of working generates reservation wages below which individuals do not participate in the labor market. Just above a reservation wage, individuals may spend a substantial fraction of their time endowment at work.

The periodic utility function is

$$u(c, l) = \begin{cases} \frac{[(\mu c^\rho + (1-\mu)(1-l-\phi I(l))^\rho)^{\frac{1}{\rho}}]^{1-\sigma}}{1-\sigma}, & \text{for } \rho \neq 0, \rho < 1 \\ \frac{[c^\mu (1-l-\phi I(l))^{1-\mu}]^{1-\sigma}}{1-\sigma}, & \text{for } \rho = 0 \end{cases}. \quad (18)$$

Here  $\mu > 0$  determines the weight of consumption relative to leisure,  $\sigma \geq 0$  the risk aversion, and  $\phi \geq 0$  the fixed cost of work measured in time. The parameter  $\rho < 1$  determines the elasticity of substitution between consumption and leisure,  $\frac{1}{1-\rho}$ . The indicator function  $I(l)$  takes the value of zero for  $l = 0$  and one for  $l > 0$ .

In the benchmark case, the risk aversion parameter is set at  $\sigma = 2$ , a relatively conventional value. The macroeconomic literature tends to use a Cobb-Douglas specification which corresponds to  $\rho = 0$ . We take this to be our benchmark. We set the fixed cost parameter, somewhat arbitrarily, at  $\phi = 0.10$ . Of course, the aggregate labor supply elasticity depends on the (endogenous) distribution of reservation wages. We vary both the elasticity parameter,  $\rho$ , and the fixed cost of work parameter in our sensitivity analysis.

We take the calibration of the wage process from Floden and Lindé (2001). They estimate an AR(1) process for the relative wage level both for the US and for Sweden. We use their estimates for the US which are based on data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics. The process for the temporary shock is fully characterized by the persistence parameter  $\rho$  and the variance  $\sigma_\varepsilon^2$ . The values are  $\rho = 0.9136$  and  $\sigma_\varepsilon^2 = 0.0426$ . Assuming that the permanent shock follows a normal distribution with mean zero, they estimate its variance to be  $\sigma_v^2 = 0.1175$ .

When solving and simulating the model, we treat the temporary productivity shock,  $z$ , as a continuous variable, but approximate the normal distribution of  $\varepsilon$  with a discrete process that can take 5 values. Similarly, we consider just two levels for the permanent shock,  $v$ . Individuals with a high permanent shock, which we will refer to as ‘high ability types’, are on average about twice as productive as individuals with a low permanent shock or ‘low ability types’. We assume that for all individuals  $z_1 = 0$ . This means that the labor productivity distribution gets more and more dispersed among older individuals.

The age-profile of labor productivity,  $\{h_j\}_{j=1}^J$ , is taken from table 2 in Floden and Lindé (2001). Their estimates are as follows

$$\log(\text{wage}) = -3.330 + 0.076\text{age} - 0.00077\text{age}^2, \quad (19)$$

where ‘age’ denotes real age. This gives a usual hump-shaped pattern for average labor productivity. We further normalize the profile so that the average labor productivity is equal to one.

We set the technology parameters at  $\delta = 0.06$  and  $\alpha = 0.333$ , which are both relatively standard values.

We calibrate the social security system so that the size of the system is comparable to the US social security system. In particular, we set the entitlement age,  $j_r$ , so that it corresponds to real age 62, which is the entitlement age in the US, and the contribution rate at  $\theta = 0.153$ , which is the actual contribution rate.<sup>4</sup> The contribution rate pins down the full benefit,  $s$ , via the social security budget constraint (15). For the benchmark calibration, we set  $\lambda = 0$  so that there is no earnings testing.

We are left with the following parameters:  $\{\beta, \mu, G, \tau\}$ . We choose them so as to match the following targets: 1) capital-to-output ratio  $K/(AK^\alpha L^{1-\alpha}) = 3.0$ , 2) government expenditures-to-output ratio  $G/(AK^\alpha L^{1-\alpha}) = 0.20$ , 3) a participation rate at the age of 62 equal to 0.70. The first two targets are relatively standard and are based on national income and product

---

<sup>4</sup><http://www.ssa.gov/OACT/ProgData/taxRates.html>.

accounts. The second target pins down both public expenditures and the income tax rate via the government budget constraint. The third target pins down the consumption share parameter. A participation rate of 0.70 corresponds roughly to the participation rate of healthy individuals of age 62 in the PSID data as reported in French (2005). The reason we match a certain participation rate at the retirement age is that, for our experiments to make sense, it is crucial that we obtain reasonable aggregate labor supply behavior at ages at which individuals are entitled to old-age benefits. The income tax rate,  $\tau$ , is determined from (16). Table 1 collects the benchmark parameter values.

$\beta$	$\sigma$	$\rho$	$\phi$	$\mu$	$\tau$	$\theta$	$\lambda$	$f$	$s$
0.981	2	0	0.1	0.576	0.244	0.153	0	0	0.081

Table 1: Parameter values

## 4 Results

### 4.1 Labor supply behavior

We first illustrate the labor supply behavior in the model. In figure 1, we display the participation rate (i.e. the fraction of individuals supplying a strictly positive amount of labor) for individuals of different age. In figure 2, we display average labor supply of those who participate in the labor market (i.e., provide a strictly positive amount of labor). We show results with and without an earnings test. The case with an earnings test corresponds to  $\lambda = 0.2$  and  $f = 0$ . Our results are based on simulations of 1000 individuals with randomly determined labor productivity paths. We used the same set of labor productivity paths in all the experiments.




Figure 1. Participation rate profiles.




Figure 2. Hours worked profiles.

These profiles are similar to those observed in the real data (as displayed, for instance, in

French, 2005): as in the data, the participation rate remains very high until age 50 or so and average hours worked among workers (those who supply a strictly positive amount of labor) fall much more slowly than the participation rate.<sup>5</sup>

The earnings test has a large effect on labor supply at the retirement age and afterwards: the participation rate falls dramatically at the entitlement age. Hence, many of those who work little in the absence of earnings testing, decide not to work at all when benefits are earnings tested. Note also that even without earnings testing, the participation rate falls somewhat disruptively at the retirement age. This is because some households are borrowing constrained just before the retirement age.

The effects of the earnings test in our model are similar to the results in French (2005) who considered the effects of abolishing earnings testing in the US social security system. Somewhat relatedly, Börsch-Supan (2000) estimates that retirement before the age of 60 could be reduced by more than a third if the social security system were made actuarially fair.<sup>6</sup> While German system that Börsch-Supan analyzes imposes an implicit tax on continued activity in the form of less than actuarial adjustment when retirement is postponed, in our analysis the implicit tax arises from explicit earnings-testing after the entitlement age.

A key issue here is how changes in the effective tax rate on labor income affect labor supply. The elasticity of labor supply with respect to changes in the net wage rate depends on the distribution of individuals over their savings and labor productivity. Therefore, it is different at different ages. We compute the elasticity of labor supply by experimenting with an anticipated wage increase of 10% for one year at certain ages and comparing average hours worked (across all individuals of a certain age) with and without the wage increase.<sup>7</sup> Table

---

<sup>5</sup>The small bump around age 30 in the hours worked profile appears to be due to changes in the fraction of individuals who are borrowing constrained.

<sup>6</sup>With actuarial adjustment, the net present value of lifetime social security benefits does not depend on retirement behavior. Thus, we define actuarial fairness to be fairness at the margin.

<sup>7</sup>In contrast to our other experiments, this is a partial equilibrium experiment. I.e., prices, taxes and transfers are kept constant. Note that the computed elasticities include a (small) wealth effect.

2 displays the results. The elasticity of labor supply is very high at older ages. Intuitively, at older ages, many individuals are close to being indifferent between participating in the labor market or retiring. Even a small change in the economic incentives may change their participation decision.

Age			
30	50	60	65
0.29	0.49	0.96	2.4

Table 2: Labor supply elasticities

## 4.2 Policy analysis

We analyze the effects of earnings testing by comparing the benchmark economy, which features no earnings testing of old-age benefits, to economies where social security is earnings-tested. In these experiments, we take into account all the general equilibrium effects. Reducing earnings testing affects the interest rate,  $r$ , the wage rate,  $w$ , the full benefit,  $s$ , and the income tax rate,  $\tau$ , through changes in labor supply and aggregate savings.

Table 3 displays the main aggregate effects, namely the percentage changes in the contribution rate, labor supply, capital stock, interest rate, and the wage rate following the introduction of an earnings test. The results in the table refer to percentage changes compared to the benchmark case. We first set the implicit tax rate,  $\lambda$ , at 0.1, 0.2, and 0.3 without introducing an exemption. We then set  $\lambda$  at 0.2 and introduce an exemption equal to 0.3, 0.2, and 0.1. As shown in table 1, the full benefit is about 0.08.

Setting  $\lambda = 0.1$ , for instance, allows to increase the full benefit by 3.32%. At the same time, it decreases aggregate effective labor supply by 1.78% and aggregate savings by 1.56%. These changes induce small changes in the interest and wage rates. Setting  $\lambda$  at 0.2 further

increases the full benefit, little less than 5% compared to the benchmark case with no earnings test. However, increasing the implicit tax rate further at 0.3 lowers the full benefit compared to the case where the implicit tax rate is set at 0.2. Increasing the implicit tax rate decreases labor supply thereby reducing social security contributions. Reduced earnings at older ages also mean that some individuals may collect higher rather than lower benefits even though the earnings test is made more severe. In short, there is a Laffer curve here: The full benefit can be increased by introducing a moderate earnings test but at some point further increasing the severity of the earnings test lowers the full benefit. The peak of this Laffer curve is between  $\lambda = 0.2$  and  $\lambda = 0.3$ , when there is no exemption.<sup>8</sup>

A social security system with  $\lambda = 0.2$  and  $f = 0.3$  implies only a slightly higher full benefit than in the benchmark case with no earnings test at all. Keeping the implicit tax rate fixed at 0.2, the earnings test can be made more severe by lowering the exemption. This leads again to an increase in the full benefit and a decrease in labor supply.

$\lambda$	$f$	$\Delta s$	$\Delta L$	$\Delta K$	$\Delta r$	$\Delta w$
0.1	0.0	3.32	-1.78	-1.56	-0.32	0.07
0.2	0.0	4.78	-3.51	-2.85	-1.00	0.23
0.3	0.0	4.39	-5.05	-3.68	-2.06	0.48
0.2	0.3	0.72	-0.68	-0.80	0.17	-0.04
0.2	0.2	1.40	-1.12	-1.29	0.17	-0.04
0.2	0.1	3.06	-2.02	-2.00	-0.03	0.01

Table 3: Aggregate effects of means testing (in percents)

Our main interest lies in the welfare effects. Our welfare measure is the consumption equivalent variation defined as the percentage increase in consumption in all periods and

<sup>8</sup>We checked this by verifying that increasing  $\lambda$  from 0.20 to 0.21 increases the full benefit.

after all possible labor productivity histories needed in the benchmark case to make the expected lifetime welfare as high as in a comparison case. We compute it separately for individuals with a low and a high permanent productivity shock. Let  $cev_l$  and  $cev_h$  denote, respectively, the consumption equivalent variations for new born individuals with a low and a high permanent shock. In addition, we use  $cev_u$ , where  $u$  stands for utilitarian, to denote the consumption equivalent variation for new born individuals before they know their permanent productivity shock.

In table 4, we display the percentage changes in the expected lifetime utility following from the introduction of an earnings test. Increasing the implicit tax rate to 0.1, decreases the expected lifetime utility of an individual with a low permanent productivity shock by 0.63% and that of an individual with the high permanent shock by 0.89%. The corresponding loss in the expected welfare before the permanent shock is revealed is 0.73%. The utilitarian welfare loss becomes as large as 2.23% if the implicit tax rate is set at  $\lambda = 0.3$ .

Decreasing the exemption, while keeping the implicit tax rate at  $\lambda = 0.2$ , has very similar welfare effects than just increasing the earnings test rate. Therefore, it seems that introducing an exemption does not substantially change the way that earnings testing redistributes life time income across individuals with different permanent income shocks or insures them against temporary shocks.

The results in table 4 show that even a small ( $\lambda = 0.1$ ) earnings test lowers individuals' expected lifetime utility. In other words, its possible risk sharing benefits are not sufficiently large to overcome the efficiency cost of increasingly high effective marginal tax rates on labor. We also searched for an optimal combination of the implicit tax rate and the exemption. We found that having no earnings testing at all maximizes the expected welfare of both the low and the high ability type.

Instead of *expected* lifetime utility, people may be more concerned about the distribution

$\lambda$	$f$	$cev_l$	$cev_h$	$cev_u$
0.1	0.0	-0.63	-0.89	-0.73
0.2	0.0	-1.33	-1.79	-1.52
0.3	0.0	-2.00	-2.58	-2.23
0.2	0.3	-0.25	-0.36	-0.30
0.2	0.2	-0.43	-0.63	-0.52
0.2	0.1	-0.73	-1.10	-0.88

Table 4: Welfare effects of introducing an earnings test

of realized or *ex-post* lifetime utilities. It is possible that even though earnings testing decreases expected life time utility, it nevertheless increases the welfare of those who experience the lowest lifetime utility because of adverse labor productivity shocks. Figure 3 shows how earnings testing shapes the distribution of realized lifetime utilities. The figure plots individuals' realized lifetime utilities in the benchmark case ( $x$ -axis) together with the percentage change in welfare that follows from the introduction of an earnings test with  $\lambda = 0.2$  and  $f = 0$ .<sup>9</sup> The individuals face the same labor productivity paths in the two cases.

Except for two or three individuals, all individuals would have been better-off, *ex-post*, without earnings testing. While introducing earnings testing appears to hurt, on average, individuals with relatively high lifetime utility more than those with low lifetime utility, many individuals with very low lifetime utilities are substantially worse off because of earnings testing. In other words, earnings testing appears to be detrimental also in a Rawlsian perspective.

---

<sup>9</sup>For computational ease, we compute here the change in utility, not the equivalent consumption compensation.




Figure 3. Realized lifetime utilities and earnings testing.

Why doesn't earnings testing benefits improve the insurance properties of social security? The answer must be related to the labor supply incentives at older ages. Individuals' labor supply decisions depend on their current labor productivity and savings, which in turn reflect their past labor productivities. The issue is whether the earnings test helps to target higher benefits to those with relatively low lifetime income. Figure 4 shows the relation between lifetime labor income and income at age 62, which is the age at which individuals start to receive old-age benefits, in the absence of earnings testing. While the correlation between lifetime labor income and income at age 62 is positive (because labor productivity shocks are highly persistent), the relation is not very systematic: many households with relatively low lifetime labor income have relatively high labor income at age 62 while many individuals with high lifetime earnings earn very little at age 62. Because of this, earnings testing is a relatively inefficient way of targeting higher benefits to those with the lowest lifetime earnings. As a result, it is also an inefficient way of providing insurance against labor income risk.




Figure 4. Lifetime earnings vs. earnings at age 62.

## 5 Sensitivity analysis

### 5.1 Alternative preference parameters in the utility function

In this section, we analyze the sensitivity of our welfare results with respect to changes in the preference parameters. We consider changes in the elasticity parameter,  $\rho$ , risk-aversion parameter,  $\sigma$ , and the fixed-cost of work,  $\phi$ . In the benchmark calibration we have  $\rho = 0$ ,  $\sigma = 2$ , and  $\phi = 0.1$ . We change one of these parameters at a time keeping other two parameters at their benchmark values. For each specification, we first recalibrate the model so as to match the same targets as in the benchmark case.<sup>10</sup> We then compute the change in expected lifetime utility that follows from introducing an earnings test with  $\lambda = 0.2$  and  $f = 0$ . In addition to the welfare effects, we report the change in the full benefit,  $s$ .

---

<sup>10</sup>Note that this means that the discount factor and the consumption share parameters are also different across these different calibrations.

Table 5 displays the results. For the elasticity parameter, we consider values of 0.5 and  $-1$ . The elasticity of substitution between consumption and leisure is given by  $\frac{1}{1-\rho}$ . Hence, these two values correspond to elasticities of 2 and 0.5, respectively. For the risk aversion parameter we consider values of 3 and 1. For the fixed cost of work, we consider values of 0 and 0.2.

The welfare results are similar across all these specifications and the benchmark case: introducing a moderate earnings test decreases expected lifetime utility substantially and the welfare loss is somewhat larger for individuals with a high permanent productivity shock than for those with a low permanent productivity shock. Note, however, that for  $\rho = 0.5$ , the welfare losses are substantially higher than in the benchmark case and for  $\rho = -1$  they are lower. Intuitively, as labor supply becomes increasingly elastic (i.e.  $\rho$  is high), earnings testing becomes increasingly expensive in efficiency terms. The fixed cost of work also matters in that the increase in the full benefit is very different with  $\phi = 0.2$  and  $\phi = 0$ . The welfare effects are very similar, however, with and without the fixed cost.

	$\Delta s$	$cev_l$	$cev_h$	$cev_u$
$\rho = 0.5$	5.98	-1.92	-2.82	-2.35
$\rho = -1$	5.33	-0.57	-0.78	-0.65
$\sigma = 3$	4.38	-1.31	-1.73	-1.45
$\sigma = 1$	5.15	-1.34	-1.84	-1.59
$\phi = 0.2$	4.98	-1.37	-1.84	-1.56
$\phi = 0.0$	2.47	-1.21	-1.52	-1.35

Table 5: Welfare effects of introducing an earnings test with different preference parameters.

## 5.2 The importance of income taxation

We now reconsider the welfare effect of earnings testing assuming that there is no public consumption, i.e.  $G = \tau = 0$ . This makes it more likely that earnings testing increases individuals' welfare because the marginal tax on labor is initially lower. Again, we recalibrate the model so as to match the other targets. The preference parameters  $\rho$ ,  $\sigma$ , and  $\phi$  are the same as in the benchmark calibration.

Table 6 displays the effects of the same earnings tests that were considered in the benchmark case. In contrast to our benchmark results, an earnings test may now increase expected welfare. One somewhat surprising feature of these results is that an increase in the implicit tax rate from 0.2 to 0.3 increases welfare even though it means a slightly lower full benefit. The explanation is related to the general equilibrium effects: Due to its effects on aggregate saving and labor supply, an increasingly high implicit tax rate leads to a higher wage rate, in the case where there is no exemption. This effect increases the steady state lifetime utility.

We also experimented with fixed prices. That is, we assumed that the interest rate and the wage rate remain fixed at their initial steady state levels even as we introduce an earnings test. In that case, all the earnings tests considered here decrease the expected welfare of those with a high permanent shock whereas moderate earnings tests increase the expected welfare of the low productivity type but always less than 0.05%. Hence, the welfare effects found here are almost entirely due to the general equilibrium effects. Of course, the same effect is present in the benchmark case as well. It is just that there the distortionary effect of a higher implicit tax rate dominates.

These results highlight the importance of taking other forms of taxation into account when analyzing the effects of social security. Neglecting other public expenditures not only changes the quantitative results, but may even reverse qualitative conclusions. When individuals decide on their labor supply, they take into account both wage taxes and social security contributions. Neglecting wage taxes results in a severe underestimation of the labor supply distortion that is convex in the overall tax rate.

$\lambda$	$f$	$\Delta s$	$\Delta L$	$\Delta w$	$cev_l$	$cev_h$	$cev_u$
0.1	0	5.97	-1.83	0.21	0.20	0.04	0.14
0.2	0	8.98	-3.46	0.53	0.41	0.13	0.29
0.3	0	8.94	-4.56	0.89	0.58	0.27	0.45
0.2	0.3	1.07	-0.63	-0.01	0.02	-0.04	-0.01
0.2	0.2	2.41	-1.07	0.00	0.06	-0.06	0.00
0.2	0.1	5.47	-1.91	0.08	0.15	-0.07	0.05

Table 6: Welfare effects of introducing an earnings test without income taxation.

## 6 Conclusions

We have analyzed the welfare effects of earnings testing flat-rate old-age benefits. We used a calibrated overlapping generations model with endogenous labor supply and retirement behavior. We took into account both innate ability differences and temporary shocks arriving during the working life. We found that given a realistic level of general income taxation, flat-rate benefits without earnings testing deliver a higher expected lifetime utility than flat-rate benefits with earnings-testing. Flat-rate benefits without earnings testing dominate also from a Rawlsian perspective.

When interpreting our results to real world policy debates, one must keep in mind at least two things. First, we have considered only labor income shocks and not, for instance, disability shocks. Clearly, earnings testing old-age benefits may help in targeting benefits to the disabled if these risks cannot be addressed directly with other insurance schemes. Second, social security systems can be divided into flat-rate, or ‘Beveridgean’, and earnings-related, or ‘Bismarckian’, systems.<sup>11</sup> Our model applies to Beveridgean systems, and a corresponding

<sup>11</sup>Beveridgean tradition is dominant in Anglo-Saxon countries, including the United States and the United

analysis would be needed to draw policy conclusions for Bismarckian systems.

## References

- [1] Börsch-Supan, Axel, 2000, Incentive Effects of Social Security on Labor Force Participation, *Journal of Public Economics* 78, 25-49.
- [2] Conesa, Juan C. and Dirk Krueger, 1999, Social Security Reform with Heterogenous Households, *Review of Economic Dynamics* 2, 757-795.
- [3] Cremer, Helmuth, Jean-Marie Lozachmeur, and Pierre Pestieau, 2004, Social Security, Retirement Age and Optimal Income Taxation, *Journal of Public Economics* 88, 2259-2281.
- [4] Diamond, Peter A., and James A. Mirrlees, 1978, A Model of Social Insurance with Variable Retirement, *Journal of Public Economics* 10 (3), 295-336.
- [5] Diamond, Peter A., and James A. Mirrlees, 1986, Payroll-Tax Financed Social Insurance with Variable Retirement, *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 88 (1), 25-50.
- [6] Disney, Richard, 2004, Are Contributions to Public Social Security Programmes a Tax on Employment, *Economic Policy* 39, 267-311.
- [7] Fehr, Hans and Christian Habermann, 2005, Risk Sharing and Efficiency Implications of Progressive Social Security Arrangements, CESifo Working Paper No. 1568.
- [8] Floden, Martin and Jesper Lindé, 2001, Idiosyncratic Risk in the United States and Sweden: Is There a Role for Government Insurance?, *Review of Economic Dynamics* 4, 406-437.

---

Kingdom, as well as in Denmark and the Netherlands. Most of Continental Europe follows a competing Bismarckian tradition in which benefits are more closely related to past earnings (Disney, 2004).

- [9] French, Eric, 2005, The Effects of Health, Wealth, and Wages on Labour Supply and Retirement Behaviour, *Review of Economic Studies* 72, 395-427.
- [10] Friedman, Milton, 1953, Choice, Chance and the Personal Distribution of Income, *Journal of Political Economy* 61, 277-290.
- [11] Golosov, Mikhail and Aleh Tsyvinski, 1994, Designing Optimal Disability Insurance: A Case for Asset Testing, NBER Working Paper 10792.
- [12] Gomes, Francisco and Alexander Michaelides, 2003, Aggregate Implications of Defined Benefit and Defined Contribution Systems, Working Paper, Center for Retirement Research at Boston College.
- [13] Gruber, Jonathan and David A. Wise, 1999, Social Security and Retirement around the World, University of Chicago Press, Chicago IL.
- [14] Gustman, Alan and Thomas Steinmeier, 1986, A Structural Retirement Model, *Econometrica* 54(3), 555-584.
- [15] Harsanyi, John C., 1953, Cardinal Utility in Welfare Economics and in the Theory of Risk-taking, *Journal of Political Economy* 61, 434—435.
- [16] İmrohoroğlu, Ayşe, Selahattin İmrohoroğlu, and Douglas H. Joines, 1995, A Life Cycle Analysis of Social Security, *Economic Theory* 6(1), 83-114.
- [17] Rawls, John, 1971, A Theory of Justice, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- [18] Rust, John and Christopher Phelan, 1997, How Social Security and Medicare Affect Retirement Behavior in a World of Incomplete Markets, *Econometrica* 65, 781-831.
- [19] Social Security Administration, 2005, [http://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/progdesc/ssptw/2002-2003/americas/united\\_states.html](http://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/progdesc/ssptw/2002-2003/americas/united_states.html)

- [20] Stock, James H., and David A. Wise, 1990, An Option Value Model of Retirement, *Econometrica* 58, 1151-1180.