- We saw several ways in which product safety may be dealt with
- Markets will do some of the work for us: people will pay for safety, they won't pay for excessive safety
- When will markets fail us?
 - Incomplete information on part of consumer
 - Misperception of risk by consumer
 - Externalities

Solutions to these market failures:

- Inform consumers (product labels, ad campaigns, etc.)
- Use the courts (making companies liable for unsafe products)
- Direct regulation of safety (mandatory safety features, chemical bans, etc.)

Recapping Product Safety Regulation

- All of these approaches have their downsides
- Customers may not use the information you give them properly
- Courts can be costly, it can be hard to determine who is liable, excessive awards may lead to excessive caution (or lack of economic activity)
- Direct regulation can have unexpected behavioral effects and doesn't accommodate heterogeneous preferences
- Lots of uncertainty about costs and benefits of safety measures



Workplace Safety



- Many of the issues with product safety extend to workplace safety
- There are safety risks and reducing those risks involves a certain cost
- At issue is how to eliminate any units of risk for which the benefits of reduction exceed the costs
- There are some differences:
 - Different types of risks
 - Different market mechanisms: wages and option to quit rather than simply prices
 - More opportunities for learning
 - Different legal framework

- The most direct way that markets price risk in the workplace is through wages
- Wages don't just price characteristics of workers, they also price characteristics of the job
- In general, you get paid more if you are willing to do a less desireable job (bad hours, unsafe conditions, etc.)
- This is the theory of compensating differentials

Selected compensating differentials for job and worker characteristics, log hourly wage as dependent variable

Variable	Females	Males
Years of education	0.0686	0.0594
	(0.0022)	(0.0025)
Healthcare support	0.0133	-0.2289
	(0.0341)	(0.0441)
Sexual harassment rate	0.0018	0.0186
	(0.0009)	(0.0070)

From Joni Hersch, "Compensating differentials for sexual harassment" (2011)







- We do observe industries with higher accident rates having higher wages (controlling for other job and worker characteristics)
- The question is whether this gets us to the efficient level of workplace safety
 - Do workers know risks?
 - Safety versus health risks
 - How does bargaining power influence things?



Figure 6.1 Chemical labels for the job risk study. Top: CARB

Regulation of Markets, Spring 2017

eti Oraning Du Kross Sodie Ha 995phr + Dor Twejs dirthing scrittiner, Flugh anting dispose.	Dutt Harm Io nel amoko ku wan ng effent da not wa ath area ath area	OBM - C
ertifOraning Da Know Sodie Ha getgeles + Don Tempe distring sentainer, Fluch anting dispose.	Duct Hann In not emoke is wer ng offen: da not we wh area wh area	ORM - C
eegelin + Dor hange dathing container. Fluth anting disposel.	lo noi emoko in war ng offen: da nor wa ath area ath area	OBM - C
t MANUFA	ah area M. spill	OBM - C
		01111-0
		ASBESTOS
ALC: 4 1	ACTURING (JSE ONLY
45.4 Kg	kg.	
		LOI
COMP	PANY	•
		•



J. Parman (College of William & Mary)

Regulation of Markets, Spring 2017

SODIUM BICARBONATE. SPILL: Sweep-up, place in an appropriate chemical waste container...

CHLOROACETOPHENONE. WARNING! LACHRYMATOR— VAPOR AND DUST EXTREMELY IRRITATING. Do not breathe dust or vapor. Wear a self-contained breathing apparatus...

ASBESTOS. DANGER! CANCER HAZARD. Use with a NIOSH-Mesa approved respirator. Use with approved goggles...

TNT—(blend of dry Trinitrotoluene). DANGER! HIGH EXPLO-SIVES. MUST BE STORED IN ACCORDANCE WITH FEDERAL REGULATIONS. KEEP IN COOL, DRY, WELL VENTILATED, LOCK-UP AREA...

- Results from the Viscusi and O'Conner study
- Workers were shown the chemical labels, told they would be working with them
- Viscusi and O'Conner estimated how much workers demanded in a salary increase:
 - Sodium bicarbonate: \$0
 - Lachrymator: \$1,919
 - Asbestos: \$2,996
 - Trinitrotoluene: \$5,158

Empirical estimates of risk prem	niums as a percentage of total earnings
Risk premiums of 3% to 5%	Petroleum refining
	Tobacco manufacturers
	Transportation equipment
Risk premiums of 6% to 9%	Textiles
	Rubber and plastics
	Leather and leather products
Risk premiums of 12%-15%	Food products
	Furniture and fixtures
	Lumber and wood products

- There are two other big ways that workplace safety is regulated
- First is direct regulation of workplace conditions by OSHA
- The other major mechanism is workers' compensation
- These two approaches work in two very different ways and have very different benefits and drawbacks

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 was passed with the intention:

...to assure so far as possible every working man and woman in the Nation safe and healthful working conditions and to preserve our human resources.

Note that this is a bit different than what we've been talking about with compensating differentials.

- OSHA requires certain safety standards and monitors for compliance
- Criticisms are that OSHA's regulations are inefficient and focused on things that are easily accomplished through compensating differentials
- Other criticisms are that OSHA has the wrong objective function
- Consider the language describing the employer duties mandated by the act

Each employer shall furnish to each of his employees employment and a place of employment which are free from recognized hazards that are causing or are likely to cause death or serious physical harm to his employees...29 U.S.C. 654, 5(a)

OSHA and the Direct Regulation of Safety



	0.0			
		Cost per		
		Cost per life	normalized life	Cost per year
		saved (millions	saved (millions	of life saved
		of 1995	of 1995	(millions of
Regulation	Year	dollars)	dollars)	1995 dollars)
Seat belt/air bag	1984	0.1	0.1	0.0
Underground construction standards	1989	0.1	0.1	0.0
Aircraft floor emergency lighting	1984	0.7	0.9	0.0
Children's sleepwear flammability ban	1973	1.0	1.2	0.1
Rear lap/shoulder belts for autos	1989	3.8	3.8	0.2
Asbestos occupational exposure limit	1972	9.9	24.7	1.2
Asbestos occupational exposure limit	1986	88.1	220.1	10.6
Hazardous waste land disposal ban	1988	4,988.7	12,462.7	597.4
Atrazine/alachlor in drinking water	1991	109,608.5	273,824.4	13,126.8

Costs of risk-reducing regulations per expected life saved

Workers' Compensation

- Other major mechanism is workers' compensation
- Workers' compensation is essentially a program requiring firms to insure against worker accidents
- Different states have different types of programs but every state has some form of workers' comp
- The key idea is that firm's premiums are tied to the number of worker accidents
- Firms in dangerous industries will pay higher premiums, firms with worse conditions within an industry will pay higher premiums
- The hope is that linking firm's premiums to the number of worker accidents will incentivize firms to improve safety standards
- Let's see what actually happens

Elasticities of injuries and deaths with respect to workers' compensation benefits					
	Nonlost-workday	Restricted workday injury	Annual days away from work	Annual fatality	
Establishment size	injury cases	cases	injury cases	cases	
1-99 workers	0.21	0.17	0.62	-1.26	
100-249 workers	0.35	0.07	0.55	-1.3	
250-499 workers	0.29	-0.1	0.53	-0.69	
500+ workers	0.09	0.48	0.31	-1.33	

Elasticities of injuries and deaths with respect to workers' compensation benefits

From Table 10 in Workers' Compensation and the Distribution of Occupational Injuries, Ruser, Journal of Human Resources, 28 (3), 1993

- Empirically, there is a negative correlation between workers' comp and fatalities
- However, researchers find a positive correlation between workers' comp and nonfatal accidents
- What's going on? Maybe reporting, maybe moral hazard
- If it's moral hazard, that generates some new efficiency issues

- This notion of moral hazard leading to inefficiency gives us a chance to think about financial regulation
- One of the main issues people have worried about recently is the possibility of financial institutions taking excessive risk
- Consider the concerns over the notion of 'too big to fail'











- So if a firm thinks it will be deemed too big to fail, it will take on inefficiently risky assets
- This is a standard moral hazard problem that arises when agents are insulated from risk
- It's not the only efficiency issue with too big to fail
- First, there are social benefits from financial sector stability (think of our externality discussions)
- Also there may be economies of scale (think of our natural monopoly discussions)
- But there are also other social costs (more highly correlated risk in the system)