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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)