

Discussion of
Allocation of Time and Consumption-Equivalent
Welfare: A Case of South Korea

Ki Young Park and Soohyon Kim

Jinill Kim
Korea University

April 27, 2017

Summary of the paper

- **excellent contribution in Welfare Economics**
 - ***“Beyond ICW”*; Both data work and theory**
- **17th KLIPS data**
 - **Cross sectional analysis (gender, income)**
 - **Time series analysis (2014 against 2004)**
- **Measuring consumption-equivalent welfare**
 - **To illustrate the factors in the measurement**
 - **“Misleading results if based on only income or C”**

My comments

- **Putting this paper into perspective**
- **Putting this conference into perspective: ‘well-being’**
 - **$U(C,L)$ in micro vs. output and unemployment in macro**
 - **Micro: Labor is bad, and leisure is good.**
 - **Macro: Unemployment is bad, and work is good.**
 - **‘job-filled non-recovery’_{now} vs. ‘jobless recovery’_{in 2000s}**

A few key quotes

- **“... high-income earners tend to enjoy less hours of leisure while they spend more money in leisure activities”**: quantity vs. quality a la Becker
- **“... a cross-sectional pattern that higher income is associated with lower level of leisure, while rising income induces more leisure over time”**: cross section vs. time series
- **“... child care as laborious work or leisure”**
 - labor vs. leisure (e.g. DMZ)
 - voluntary leisure or involuntary leisure: how to interpret time use data

Some additional comments

- **inequality of income/consumption vs. that of leisure**
 - **What do we (want to) measure, literally speaking?**
 - ***“Bringing Leisure Distribution in From the Cold”***
- **(philosophical) meaning of household: *voluntary* division of labor vs. *involuntary* gender inequality**
- **What do we mean by comparing well-being?**
 - **Cross section: across countries; across people**
 - **Across time (learning by doing or habit formation for leisure in a dynamic model, e.g. work on immigrant happiness)**