Intergenerational disagreements in labor supply and optimal bequest taxation

Hakki Yazici[*]

Sabanci University, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This paper studies optimal taxation of bequests in a model where altruistic parents and their offspring disagree on the offspring's labor supply decision. I show that whenever offspring is too lazy from the parent's perspective and there are income effects on labor supply, optimal policy involves a subsidy on bequests.

© 2017 Central Bank of The Republic of Turkey. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

1. Introduction

The most widely analyzed model of bequest taxation is the altruistic model, where the motive for bequests comes from the assumption that parents care about their children's welfare. A standard assumption in the altruistic model is that different generations agree about economic trade-offs. The implication of the standard altruistic model for bequests is simple. The altruistic parent knows that the offspring will behave according what is optimal from the parent's point of view. As a result, parents do not have any paternalistic concerns regarding the economic behavior of the offspring and the whole dynasty acts as if it is a single individual (e.g., Bernheim (1989)). In such a setting, unless society puts a direct social welfare weight on the welfare of the offspring, it is optimal not to bequeathing decision.

However, disagreements are common to many parent-offspring relationships. In a survey study that investigates a wide range of disagreement patterns between older parents and adult children,

Clarke et al. (1999) consider a random sample of 496 parents (average age 62) and 641 children (average age 39) and ask about possible sources of disagreement.[1] More than 70% of the respondents report disagreements (about the same percentage among children and parents). The largest category of responses about conflict (38% among parents and 30% among children) is labeled as "Habits and Lifestyle Choices," and it includes sexual activity/orientation, living arrangements, quality of life, and allocation of resources and/or education.

In this paper, I analyze optimal taxation of bequests in an environment in which parents and offspring disagree on a specific economic behavior, that is the labor supply choice of the offspring. I show that, under the assumption that as a society we agree with the parent regarding the offspring's labor supply decision and there are income effects on labor supply, there is a reason for government intervention in the market in the presence of intergenerational disagreement. In particular, I find that, whenever offspring is too lazy from his parent's perspective, optimal intervention involves a

* Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Office 2093, Orhanli, Tuzla, 34956 Istanbul, Turkey.

E-mail address: hakkiyazici@sabanciuniv.edu.

Peer review under responsibility of the Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey.

[1] The exact question they ask is: *"No matter how well two people get along, there are times they disagree or get annoyed about something. In the last few years, what are some things on which you have differed, disagreed, or been disappointed about (even if not openly discussed) with your child (or parent)?"*

subsidy on bequests.

The key principle behind the optimality of bequest subsidies can be fully grasped in a simple model where the economy lasts for two periods. In the first period, a parent is alive and makes consumption-bequest decision. In the second period, the parent is replaced with an offspring who chooses how much to work and consume. I model disagreement in a way that minimally departs from the standard intergenerational model: a parent and an offspring agree on everything except for how hard the offspring should work.

Using this simple environment, I show that, if children prefer to work less than what their parents would like them to, then it is optimal for the government to correct parents' bequest decisions through a subsidy. The intuition for this result is as follows. Because of disagreement, the offspring supplies less labor than what their parents prefer. In particular, the parental welfare goes up if the parent can make the offspring work more, which is possible by decreasing bequests as long as the offspring's optimal labor supply choice is decreasing in the amount of bequests received. As a result, bequeathing has an additional marginal cost for the parents relative to the social planner. This is why it is optimal to distort parent's bequest decision.

The efficient allocation in this economy can be implemented as follows. In order to make children work the amount dictated by the efficient allocation, the government uses labor income subsidies on the offspring and uses lump-sum taxes to finance these subsidies. However, from the perspective of the parents, who take the labor income subsidy as given, their offspring are still working too little under the new - subsidized - wage rate. In other words, since parents take the lump-sum tax as given, they do not internalize the fact that the subsidy is there to discipline the labor supply behavior of the offspring and does not actually change the gross return to their offsprings' labor supply. As a result, parents bequeath too little to their offspring, and hence, bequests should be subsidized. Even though I find the case in which are too lazy from their parents' perspective more natural, I also analyze the case in which they are too diligent and find that bequests should be taxed in that case.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses related literature. Section 3 introduces the baseline model. Section 4 characterizes the laissez-faire equilibrium bequest behavior of parents and establishes the main bequest subsidy result. Section 5 concludes.

2. Related literature

The paper that is closest to my paper is Pavoni and Yazici (2017). To my knowledge, that is the first paper to analyze the implications of intergenerational disagreements for parental transfer taxation. The authors focus on intergeneration disagreements regarding intertemporal decisions and find that, when children are too impatient from their parents' perspective, it is optimal to tax bequests. The main distinction of the current paper is that I focus on disagreements regarding intratemporal (labor supply) decisions.

This paper is also related to the literature on optimal taxation of bequests and inter vivos transfers. Cremer and Pestieau (2011), Kaplow (2001), and Kopczuk (2009) provide excellent surveys of the literature on optimal transfer taxation. The most widely analyzed model of bequest taxation is the altruistic model with the assumption that different generations agree about economic trade-offs. Using this model, Kaplow (1995) and Farhi and Werning (2010) show that, if the society cares only about the parent's welfare directly, this would imply that parental transfers are socially optimal and should remain undistorted, given that there are no other reasons for taxation such as redistribution or financing

government expenditures. Following the same arguments, whenever society attaches direct welfare weight to future generations, parental transfers should actually be subsidized according to the altruistic model with intergenerational agreement. In addition to the altruistic model that is already discussed, a widely used model of bequests is the warm-glow (or "joy of giving") model. In this model too, the optimal bequest tax is zero or negative (i.e., a subsidy), depending on whether society cares about the offspring directly (e.g., Kopczuk (2009)). Piketty and Saez (2013) show that it is possible to justify taxation of parental transfers based on equality grounds when other instruments of horizontal redistribution are limited. My contribution to this literature is to provide a novel argument for subsidizing parental transfers.

3. Model

The model economy lasts for two periods. There is a parent and a child in the model. The parent is alive in the first period, and in the second period he is replaced by the offspring. The parent is altruistic toward his offspring and leaves bequests. The parent and the offspring disagree on how much the offspring should work. I model this disagreement in preferences as follows:

The offspring's preferences for consumption and labor are given by:

$$\max_{c,y} u(c) - v(y/w), \tag{1}$$

where c and y denote offspring's consumption and income, respectively. w denotes the wage rate that the offspring faces in the labor market. The functions $u(\cdot)$ and $v(\cdot)$ represent utility from consuming c units and disutility from working y/w hours, respectively. I assume $u', -u'' > 0$ and $v', v'' > 0$.

The parent's preference regarding the child's consumption and labor allocations on the other hand is given by the following:

$$\max_{c,y} u(c) - \eta v(y/w). \tag{2}$$

A comparison of (1) with (2) reveals that the only difference between the two preferences is the term η. The term η refers to the disagreement between the child and the parent regarding the child's work behavior. When $\eta < 1$, this means that the parent cares less about disutility of work relative to the child. The parent would like the child to work more than the child would like to. In other words, the child is lazy from the parent's perspective. On the other hand, when $\eta > 1$, the parent would like the child to work less than the child would on his own: the child is too diligent. When $\eta = 1$, there are no disagreements regarding the work behavior of the child and we are back at the standard intergenerational model.

3.1. Problem of the offspring

The offspring chooses consumption and labor allocations taking the level of bequest as given, i.e., the offspring solves:

$$\max_{c,y} u(c) - v(y/w) \tag{3}$$

such that

$$c \le y + b,$$

where b denotes the amount of bequests received by the offspring. For simplicity, the interest rate on the bequests is set to 1. All the results go through if instead the bequests earn a positive net return as well.