

How I Work and Other Random Points

Chad Jones Stanford GSB

NBER Innovation Bootcamp, July 2022

As for myself, I only like basic problems and could characterize my own research by telling you that when I settled in Woods Hole and took up fishing, I always used an enormous hook. I was convinced that I would catch nothing anyway, and I thought it much more exciting not to catch a big fish than not to catch a small one.

— Albert Szent-Gyorgi, 1893-1986

Nobel Prize, 1937 (discovered Vitamin C)

How I Work

- Find a question that excites you (and others)
- Document the basic facts
- Build a model to try to generate those facts (Lucas, Feynman)
- See what else pops out

If we understand the process of economic growth — or of anything else — we ought to be capable of demonstrating this knowledge by creating it in these pen and paper (and computer-equipped) laboratories of ours. If we know what an economic miracle is, we ought to be able to make one.

— Robert E. Lucas, Jr.

What I cannot create, I do not understand.

— Richard P. Feynman

- PPF for economics (macro vs. micro)
- Motivate research by simple, indisputable facts. (cf estimation)
- Build models to explain the facts.
- Keep a "notebook"
- On reading papers
- Try to have research be the thing you think about when sleeping/bathing/etc.

On Writing Papers with Models

- Start as simple as possible (or at least get there eventually!)
- Show entire economic environment (preferences + technology) in one slide and in Table 1 of paper
- Allocating resources: always count equations and unknowns
 - Rule of thumb easiest (Solow)
 - Optimal allocation / social planner: pretty easy and where we'd like to begin
 - Equilibrium: most complicated, and details matter (is there an NSF?). Define it fully and carefully.

Research Questions

- How do we understand economic growth?
- Why is health spending / GDP rising everywhere?
- A Schumpeterian Model of Top Income Inequality
- The Allocation of Talent and U.S. Economic Growth
- Artificial Intelligence and Economic Growth
- Taxing Top Incomes in a World of Ideas



Other Specific Points

Shanghai 1987



Shanghai 2013



Growth Theory

• Conclusion of any growth theory:

$$\frac{\dot{y_t}}{y_t} = g$$
 and a story about g

• Key to this result is (essentially) a linear differential equation somewhere in the model:

$$\dot{X}_t = _ X_t$$

• Growth models differ according to what they call the *X_t* variable and how they fill in the blank.

Catalog of Growth Models: What is X_t?

Solow	$\dot{k}_t = sk_t^{lpha}$
Solow	$\dot{A}_t = \bar{g}A_t$
AK model	$\dot{K}_t = sAK_t$
Lucas	$\dot{h}_t = uh_t$
Romer/AH	$\dot{A}_t = RA_t$
Semi-endogenous growth	$\dot{L}_t = nL_t$

Why did I write "Are Ideas Getting Harder to Find?" (BJVW 2020 AER)

- In response to the "scale effects" critique:
 - Howitt (1999), Peretto (1998), Young (1998) and others
 - Composition bias: perhaps research productivity within every quality ladder is constant, e.g. if number of products N_t grows at the right rate:

$$\frac{\dot{A}_{it}}{A_{it}} = \alpha \, S_{it} \tag{*}$$

- $\Rightarrow S_{it} = \frac{S_t}{N_t}$ invariant to scale, but responds to subsidies
 - Aggregate evidence would then be misleading
 - Permanent subsidies would still have growth effects.
- Key to addressing this concern:

Study (*) directly \Rightarrow research productivity within a variety!

Alternative Futures?



The shape of the idea production function, f(A)

The stock of ideas, A

Taxing Top Incomes in a World of Ideas (JPE forthcoming)

- Large literature but interaction with ideas underappreciated.
- Consider raising the top marginal income tax rate from 50% to 75%
 - $\circ~\approx 10\%$ of GDP faces the top rate, so mechanically +2.5% GDP in revenue
 - $\circ~$ Halving the "keep rate" from 50% to 25% \Rightarrow entrepreneurs may create fewer ideas
 - $\circ\,$ Akcigit et al (2022 QJE) suggest a behavioral elasticity η of ideas wrt $1- au\geq 0.2$
 - $\,\circ\,$ Suppose degree of IRS is $\gamma=1/2$
 - $\circ~$ Then lower effort reduces GDP by a factor of $2^{\gamma\eta}=2^{0.5\times0.2}=2^{0.1}\approx1.07$
- Everyone's income falls by 7%, while tax raises 2.5% of GDP in revenue. Not worth it!
- Question: Is the 7% number large or small?

What is graphed here?

INDEX (1.0 IN INITIAL YEAR) 45 r YEAR

Population and Per Capita GDP: the Very Long Run



Growth over the Very Long Run

- Malthus: $c = y = AL^{\alpha}$, $\alpha < 1$
 - Fixed supply of land: $\uparrow L \Rightarrow \downarrow c$ holding A fixed
- Story:
 - $\circ~$ 100,000 BC: small population \Rightarrow ideas come very slowly
 - \circ New ideas \Rightarrow temporary blip in consumption, but permanently higher population
 - This means ideas come more frequently
 - Eventually, ideas arrive faster than Malthus can reduce consumption!
- People produce ideas and Ideas produce people
 - $\,\circ\,$ If nonrivarly > Malthus, this leads to the hockey stick

What is this?



North versus South Korea: Institutions Matter!



Misallocation and TFP: A Simple Example

Production: $X_{steel} = L_{steel}, \quad X_{latte} = L_{latte}$

Resource constraint:
$$L_{steel} + L_{latte} = \bar{L}$$

GDP (aggregation): $Y = X_{steel}^{1/2} X_{latte}^{1/2}$

 $x \equiv L_{steel}/\bar{L}$ denotes the allocation (markets, distortions, central planner, etc).

Then GDP and TFP are

 $Y = A(x)\overline{L}$

 $A(x) = \sqrt{x \left(1 - x\right)}$

Misallocation Reduces TFP



Total factor productivity, A(x)

- Sandra Day O'Connor, Supreme Court Justice (1981–2006)
 - Graduated 3rd in her class at Stanford Law School, 1952
 - Only job offer in the private sector: legal secretary

- Sandra Day O'Connor, Supreme Court Justice (1981–2006)
 - Graduated 3rd in her class at Stanford Law School, 1952
 - Only job offer in the private sector: legal secretary
- Consider white men in U.S. business:

1960: 94% of doctors, lawyers, and managers2010: 60% of doctors, lawyers, and managers

- Sandra Day O'Connor, Supreme Court Justice (1981–2006)
 - Graduated 3rd in her class at Stanford Law School, 1952
 - Only job offer in the private sector: legal secretary
- Consider white men in U.S. business:

1960: **94%** of doctors, lawyers, and managers 2010: **60%** of doctors, lawyers, and managers

- Over the past 50 years, the U.S. allocation of talent has improved! Accounts for
 - 40% of growth in GDP per person, and
 - 20% of growth in GDP per worker