4 Market Failure

FOCUS QUESTIONS

1 What are the principal reasons why markets fail to produce efficient outcomes?
2 What role does government play in making it possible for markets to work at all?
3 Why might the government intervene in the market's allocation of resources, even when it is Pareto efficient? What are merit goods? What is government's role in redistribution?
4 What is the "market failures" approach to the role of government? What are alternative perspectives in thinking about the role of government?

The last chapter explained why markets play such a central role in our economy: under ideal conditions, they ensure that the economy is Pareto efficient. But there is often dissatisfaction with markets. Some of the dissatisfaction is of the "grass is always greener on the other side" variety: people like to think that an alternative way of organizing the economy might make them better off. But some of the dissatisfaction is real: markets often seem to produce too much of some things, like air and water pollution, and too little of others, such as support for the arts or research into the nature of matter or the causes of cancer. And markets can lead to situations where
some people have too little income to live on. Over the past fifty years, economists have devoted enormous efforts to understanding the circumstances under which markets yield efficient outcomes, and the circumstances in which they fail to do so.

This chapter will look both at these market failures and at the reasons why governments intervene in markets even when they are efficient.

**PROPERTY RIGHTS AND CONTRACT ENFORCEMENT**

Chapter 8 explained why markets result in Pareto efficient outcomes. But even for markets to work, there needs to be a government to define property rights and enforce contracts. In some societies, land is held in common; anyone can graze their cattle and sheep on it. Since no one has the property right to the land, no one has an incentive to ensure that there is not overgrazing. In the former communist countries, property rights were not well defined, so people had insufficient incentive to maintain or improve their apartments. In market economies, the benefits of such improvements are reflected in the market price of the property.

Similarly, if individuals are to engage in transactions with each other, the contracts they sign must be enforced. Consider a typical loan, where one person borrows money from another, and signs a contract to repay it. Unless such contracts are enforced, no one would be willing to make a loan.

At an even more primitive level, unless there is protection of private property, people will have insufficient incentive to save and invest, since their savings might be taken away.

Government activities aimed at protecting citizens and property, enforcing contracts, and defining property rights can be thought of as providing the foundations on which all market economies rest.

**MARKET FAILURES AND THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT**

The first fundamental theorem of welfare economics asserts that the economy is Pareto efficient only under certain circumstances or conditions. There are six important conditions under which markets are not Pareto efficient. These are referred to as market failures, and they provide a rationale for government activity.

For markets to result in Pareto efficiency, there must be perfect competition—that is, there must be a sufficiently large number of firms that each believes it has no effect on prices. But in some industries—supercomputers, aluminum, cigarettes, greeting cards—there are relatively few firms, or one or two firms have a large share of the market. When a single firm supplies the market, economists refer to it as a monopoly; when a few firms supply the market, economists refer to them as an oligopoly. And even when there are many firms, each may produce a slightly different good and may thus
Economists refer to such situations as monopolistic competition. In all of these situations, competition deviates from the ideal of perfect competition, where each firm is so small that it believes there is nothing it can do to affect prices.

It is important to recognize that under these circumstances, firms may still seem to be competing actively against each other, and that the market economy may seem to “work” in the sense that goods are being produced which consumers seem to like. The first fundamental theorem of welfare economics—the result that market economies are Pareto efficient—requires more than just that there be some competition. As we saw in the last chapter, Pareto efficiency entails stringent conditions, like exchange, production, and product mix efficiency, and these conditions typically are satisfied only if each firm and household believes that it has no effect on prices.

There are a variety of reasons why competition may be limited. When average costs of production decline as a firm produces more, a larger firm will have a competitive advantage over a smaller firm. There may even be a natural monopoly, a situation where it is cheaper for a single firm to produce the entire output than for each of several firms to produce part of it. Even when there is not a natural monopoly, it may be efficient for there to be only a few firms operating. High transportation costs mean that goods sold by a firm at one location are not perfect substitutes for goods sold at another location. Imperfect information may also mean that if a firm raises its price it will not lose all of its customers; it only faces a downward-sloping demand curve.

Firms may also engage in strategic behavior to discourage competition. They may threaten to cut prices if potential rivals enter, and such threats may both be credible and serve to discourage entry.

Finally, some imperfections of competition arise out of government actions. Governments grant patents—exclusive rights to an invention—to innovators. While patents are important in providing incentives to innovate, they make competition in the product market less than perfect. The market dominance of such firms as Xerox, Alcoa, Polaroid, and Kodak was based on patents. Of course, even without patents, the fact that an innovator has some information (knowledge) that is not freely available to others may enable it to establish a dominant market position.

It is easy to see why imperfect competition leads to economic inefficiency. We saw earlier that under competition, firms set output at the Pareto efficient level. They set price equal to the marginal cost of production. Price can be thought of as measuring the marginal benefit of consuming an extra unit of the good. Thus, with competition, marginal benefits equal marginal costs. Under imperfect competition, firms set the extra revenue they obtain from selling one unit more—the marginal revenue—equal to the marginal cost. With a downward-sloping demand curve, the marginal revenue has two components. When a firm sells an extra unit, it receives the

---

1 Declining average costs correspond to increasing returns: doubling inputs more than doubles output.
Monopoly Pricing

Monopoly output is lower than competitive output, or the output at which profits are zero. There is a resulting welfare loss. Figure 4.1 shows the demand curve facing a firm and the marginal revenue, which lies below the demand curve. Competitive equilibrium occurs at $Q^*$, while the imperfect competition equilibrium occurs at $Q'$, a much lower level of output. This reduction in output is the inefficiency associated with imperfect competition.

Of course, if there is a natural monopoly, with declining average costs, and with marginal costs below average costs, competition is not viable; if a firm charged price equal to marginal cost (as would be the case under competition), it would operate at a loss, since the marginal cost is lower than the average costs. Even then, however, a private monopoly would typically charge more than a government-run monopoly; the private monopoly would seek to maximize profits, while the government-run monopoly which did not receive any subsidy would only seek to break even.

PUBLIC GOODS

There are some goods that either will not be supplied by the market or, if supplied, will be supplied in insufficient quantity. An example on a large scale is national defense; on a small scale, navigational aids (such as a buoy).

2 When average costs are declining, marginal costs always lie below average costs; it is the low value of the marginal cost—the cost of producing the last unit—which brings down the average costs.
These are called pure public goods. They have two critical properties. First, it costs nothing for an additional individual to enjoy their benefits: formally, there is zero marginal cost for the additional individual enjoying the good. It costs no more to defend a country of one million and one individuals than to defend a country of one million. The costs of a lighthouse do not depend at all on the number of ships that sail past it. Secondly, it is in general difficult or impossible to exclude individuals from the enjoyment of a pure public good. If I put a lighthouse in a rocky channel to enable my ships to navigate safely, it is difficult or impossible for me to exclude other ships entering the channel from its navigational benefits. If our national defense policy is successful in diverting an attack from abroad, everyone benefits; there is no way to exclude any single individual from these benefits.

The market either will not supply, or will not supply enough of, a pure public good. Consider the case of the lighthouse. A large shipowner with many ships might decide that the benefits he himself receives from a lighthouse exceed the costs; but in calculating how many lighthouses to put in place, he will look only at the benefits he receives, not at the benefits received by others. Thus there will be some lighthouses for which the total benefits (taking into account all of the ships that make use of the lighthouse) exceed the costs but for which the benefits of any single shipowner are less than the costs. Such lighthouses will not be put into place, and that is inefficient. The fact that private markets will not supply, or will supply too little of, public goods provides a rationale for many government activities. Public goods are discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

There are many cases where the actions of one individual or one firm affect other individuals or firms; where one firm imposes a cost on other firms but does not compensate them, or alternatively, where one firm confers a benefit on other firms but does not reap a reward for providing it. Air and water pollution are examples. When I drive a car that is not equipped with a pollution control device, I lower the quality of the air, and thus impose a cost on others. Similarly, a chemical plant that discharges its chemicals into a nearby stream imposes costs on downstream users of the water, who may have to spend a considerable amount of money to clean up the water to make it usable.

Instances where one individual’s actions impose a cost on others are referred to as negative externalities. But not all externalities are negative. There are some important instances of positive externalities, where one individual’s actions confer a benefit upon others. If I plant a beautiful flower garden in front of my house, my neighbors may benefit from being able to look at it. An apple orchard may confer a positive externality on a neighboring beekeeper. An individual who rehabilitates his house in a neighborhood that is in decline may confer a positive externality on his neighbors.

There are a large number of other examples of externalities. An additional car on a crowded highway will add to road congestion, both reducing the speed at which other drivers can travel safely and increasing the probability of an accident. An additional fisherman fishing in a given pond may reduce the amount of fish that others will be able to catch. If there are sev-
eral oil wells drilled in the same oil pool, taking more oil from one of the wells may reduce the amount of oil extracted by the other wells.

Whenever there are such externalities, the resource allocation provided by the market will not be efficient. Since individuals do not bear the full cost of the negative externalities they generate, they will engage in an excessive amount of such activities; conversely, since individuals do not enjoy the full benefits of activities generating positive externalities, they will engage in too little of these. Thus, for example, without government intervention of some kind, the level of pollution would be too high.

Externalities and environmental policy are discussed in detail in Chapter 9.

4 IMCOMPLETE MARKETS

Pure public goods and services are not the only goods and services that private markets fail to provide adequately. Whenever private markets fail to provide a good or service even though the cost of providing it is less than what individuals are willing to pay, there is a market failure that we refer to as incomplete markets (because a complete market would provide all goods and services for which the cost of provision is less than what individuals are willing to pay). Some economists believe that private markets have done a particularly poor job of providing insurance and loans, and that this provides a rationale for government activities in these areas.

INSURANCE AND CAPITAL MARKETS The private market does not provide insurance for many important risks that individuals face, though insurance markets are much better today than they were seventy-five years ago. The government has undertaken a number of insurance programs, motivated at least in part by this market failure. In 1933, following the bank failures of the Great Depression, the government set up the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Banks pay the corporation annual premiums, which provide insurance for depositors against a loss of savings arising from the insolvency of banks. The government has also been active in providing flood insurance. Following urban riots in the summer of 1967, most private insurance companies refused to write fire insurance in certain inner-city areas, and again the government stepped in.

Similarly, government has provided farmers with crop insurance, partly because of the failure of markets to do so; it provides unemployment insurance; and until Medicare, the government health insurance program for the aged, was introduced in the 1960s, many of the elderly found it difficult to procure health insurance in the market. Most recently, beginning in January 1997, the government began offering inflation-protected bonds—bonds on which the returns are guaranteed against the effects of inflation.

In recent decades, the government has taken an active role not only in remediating deficiencies in risk markets but in ameliorating the effects of imperfect capital markets. In 1965 the government passed legislation providing for government guarantees on student loans, making it less difficult for individuals to obtain loans to finance their college education. But this is only one of several government loan programs. The government, through
the Federal National Mortgage Association (referred to as Fanny Mae), provides funds for home mortgages; it provides loans to businesses engaged in international trade through the Export-Import Bank; it provides loans for small business through the Small Business Administration; and so forth. In each of these credit markets, there were allegations that access to credit was restricted prior to the introduction of the government program.

The question of why capital and insurance markets are imperfect has been the subject of extensive research during the past two decades. At least three different answers have been put forward; each may have some validity. One focuses on innovation: we are used to new products, such as VCRs and laser discs, constantly coming onto the market; but there are also innovations in how the economy functions—innovations in creating new markets, including inventing new securities and new insurance policies. Indeed, those working in the insurance and securities industries refer to these advances as new products.

The introduction of many of these new products is related to the second explanation: transactions costs. It is costly to run markets, to enforce contracts, and to introduce new insurance policies. An insurance firm may be reluctant to go to the trouble of designing a new insurance policy if it is unsure whether anyone will buy the policy. There is no effective “patent protection,” and as a result, there will be underinvestment in innovation.

The third set of explanations centers around asymmetries of information and enforcement costs. The insurance company is often less informed about the nature of some risks than the person purchasing insurance. When the two parties to a transaction have different information of this kind, we say that there is an information asymmetry. Thus, a firm might well wish to buy insurance against the risk that the demand for its product will decline. But the insurance firm may well reason: I want to estimate the risk, and charge a premium based on that estimate. But if I overestimate the risk, the premium will be too high, and the firm will refuse to buy my policy; while if I underestimate the risk, the premium will be too low; the firm will buy my policy, but on average, I will lose money. I am in a heads-you-win, tails-I-lose situation. When information asymmetries like this are large, markets will not exist.

Similarly, in capital markets, lenders worry about getting repaid. They may not be able to tell which borrowers are likely to repay. This is particularly a problem with loans, such as student loans, where there is no collateral. (In the case of a loan on a house, if the borrower defaults, at least the lender can sell the house and recoup most or all of what it has put out.) The bank finds itself in a dilemma: If it increases the interest rate to reflect the fact that many loans are not repaid, it may find that the default rate actually increases; those who know that they are going to repay refuse to borrow, while those who are not planning to repay care very little about the amount the lender is nominally charging, since in all likelihood they will not pay that amount anyway. The phenomenon is called adverse selection; as we shall see in Chapter 12, it plays an important role in health insurance markets. It may turn out that there is no interest rate which the bank can charge for, say, student loans (without a government subsidy) at which it can reap an expected return commensurate with what it can obtain on other investments.
This basic principle—that when there are asymmetries of information and enforcement problems markets may not exist—has been shown to provide part of the explanation of many missing markets. We shall examine these problems in greater depth in the context of health insurance, in Chapter 12.

The reasons why markets do not exist may have implications for how governments might go about remediying the market failure. Government too faces transactions costs, enforcement problems, and asymmetries of information, though in many instances they are different from those faced by the private sector. Thus, in designing loan programs or interventions in capital markets, governments need to bear in mind that they too are often less informed than the borrower.

**COMPLEMENTARY MARKETS** Finally, we turn to the problems associated with the absence of certain complementary markets. Suppose that all individuals only enjoy coffee with sugar. Assume, moreover, that without coffee there is no market for sugar. Given that sugar was not produced, an entrepreneur considering whether to produce coffee would not do so, because he would realize that he would have no sales. Likewise, given that coffee was not produced, an entrepreneur considering whether to produce sugar also would not do so, since he too would realize that he would have no sales. If, however, the two entrepreneurs could get together, there would be a good market for coffee and sugar. Each acting alone would not be able to pursue the public interest, but acting together they could.

This particular example is deliberately quite simple, and in this case coordination (between the potential sugar producer and the potential coffee producer) might easily be provided by the individuals themselves without government intervention. But there are many cases where large-scale coordination is required, particularly in less developed countries, and this may require government planning. Similar arguments have been put forward as justification for public urban renewal programs. To redevelop a large section of a city requires extensive coordination among factories, retailers, landlords, and other businesses. One of the objectives of government development agencies is to provide that coordination (if markets were complete, the prices provided by the market would perform this "coordination" function).

A number of government activities are motivated by imperfect information on the part of consumers, and by the belief that the market, by itself, will supply too little information. For instance, the Truth-in-Lending bill requires lenders to inform borrowers of the true rate of interest on their loans. The Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration have both adopted a number of regulations concerning labeling, dis-
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closure of contents, etc. At one time, the Federal Trade Commission proposed that used-car dealers be required to disclose whether they had tested various parts of the car, and if so, what the outcome of the test was. These regulations generated a considerable amount of controversy, and under pressure from Congress, the FTC was forced to back down.

Opponents of regulations on information disclosure contend that they are unnecessary (the competitive market provides incentives for firms to disclose relevant information), irrelevant (consumers pay little attention to the information the law requires firms to disclose), and costly, both to government, which must administer them, and to the firms which must comply with the regulations. Proponents of these regulations claim that, though difficult to administer effectively, they are still critical to the affected markets.

The government's role in remedying information failures goes beyond these simple consumer and investor protections, however. Information is, in many respects, a public good. Giving information to one more individual does not reduce the amount others have. Efficiency requires that information be freely disseminated or, more accurately, that the only charge be for the actual cost of transmitting the information. The private market will often provide an inadequate supply of information, just as it supplies an inadequate amount of other public goods. The most notable example of government activity in this area is the U.S. Weather Bureau. Another example is the information provided to ships by the U.S. Coast Guard.

There are various other market failures associated with imperfect information. One of the assumptions that went into the proof of the fundamental theorems of welfare economics was that there was perfect information, or more precisely, that nothing firms or households did had any effect on beliefs or information. In fact, much economic activity is directed at obtaining information—from employers trying to find out who are good employees, to lenders trying to find out who are good borrowers, investors trying to find out what are good investments, and insurers trying to find out who are good risks. Later, we shall see that information problems lie behind several government programs. For instance, many of the problems in the health sector in general and health insurance markets in particular can be traced to problems of information.

Resources devoted to producing new knowledge—research and development (R&D) expenditures—can be thought of as a particularly important category of expenditures on information. Again, the fundamental theorems of welfare economics, which form the basis of our belief in the efficiency of market economies, simply assume that there is a given state of information about technology, begging the question of how the economy allocates resources to research and development. Chapter 13 will explain why the market, on its own, may engage in an insufficient amount of at least certain types of R&D.4

Perhaps the most widely recognized symptoms of market failure are the periodic episodes of high unemployment, both of workers and machines, that have plagued capitalist economies during the past two centuries. Though these recessions and depressions have been greatly moderated in the period since World War II, perhaps partly because of government policies, the unemployment rate still climbed over 10 percent in 1982; that is low, however, compared to the Great Depression, when unemployment reached 24 percent in the United States. While by these standards the recession of 1991-1992, in which the country's average unemployment rate peaked at over 7 percent, was relatively mild, in some states, such as California, more than one out of ten workers was out of work. And unemployment rates in Europe have remained persistently high—in some cases in excess of 15 percent or even 20 percent—for the past two decades.

Most economists take the high levels of unemployment as prima facie evidence that something is not working well in the market. To some economists, high unemployment is the most dramatic and most convincing evidence of market failure.

The issues raised by unemployment and inflation are sufficiently important, and sufficiently complicated, that they warrant a separate course in macroeconomics. But some aspects of these issues are touched on in Chapter 28, which is concerned with the consequences of government deficits and attempts to survey some of the important ways that these macroeconomic considerations affect the design of tax policy.

The market failures we have discussed are not mutually exclusive. Information problems often provide part of the explanation of missing markets. In turn, externalities are often thought to arise from missing markets: if fishermen could be charged for using fishing grounds—if there were a market for fishing rights—there would not be overfishing. Public goods are sometimes viewed as an extreme case of externalities, where others benefit from my production of the good as much as I do. Much of the recent research on unemployment has attempted to relate it to one of the other market failures.

**SIX BASIC MARKET FAILURES**

1. Imperfect competition
2. Public goods
3. Externalities
4. Incomplete markets
5. Imperfect information
6. Unemployment and other macroeconomic disturbances
MARKET FAILURES: EXPLANATIONS OR EXCUSES?

The agricultural price support program provides an illustration of an instance where the appeal to market failures is more of an excuse for a program than a rationale. There are important market failures in agriculture. Prices and output are highly variable. Farmers typically cannot buy insurance to protect them against either price or output fluctuations. Though they could reduce their exposure to price risk somewhat by trading in futures and forward markets, these markets are highly speculative, and farmers worry that they are at a marked disadvantage in trading in them. For example, there are five very large traders in wheat who have access to more information; as a result farmers view trading on futures markets with these informed traders as playing on an unlevel playing field.

What farmers really care about, of course, is not price variability, but income variability. Programs to stabilize prices do not fully stabilize income, since income depends both on the price received and the quantity produced. Indeed, in some cases, stabilizing prices may actually increase the variability of income. Normally, prices rise when, on average, quantities fall. If prices rise proportionately, then income may vary very little, with price increases just offsetting quantity.

REDISTRIBUTION AND MERIT GOODS

The sources of market failure discussed thus far result in economic inefficiency in the absence of government intervention. But even if the economy were Pareto efficient, there are two further arguments for government intervention. The first is income distribution. The fact that the economy is Pareto efficient says nothing about the distribution of income; competitive markets may give rise to a very unequal distribution, which may leave some individuals with insufficient resources on which to live. One of the most important activities of the government is to redistribute income. This is the express purpose of welfare activities, such as food stamps and Medicaid. How we think systematically about issues of distribution is the subject of the next chapter.

The second argument for government intervention in a Pareto efficient economy arises from concern that individuals may not act in their own best interests. It is often argued that an individual's perception of his own welfare may be an unreliable criterion for making welfare judgments. Even fully informed consumers may make "bad" decisions. Individuals continue to smoke even though it is bad for them, and even though they know it is bad for them. Individuals fail to wear seat belts, even though wearing seat belts increases the chances of survival from an accident, and even though individuals know the benefits of seat belts. There are those who believe that...
decreases. In such a situation, stabilizing prices will increase income variability.

Price support programs are also justified as helping poor farmers—reflecting the failure of markets to provide an appropriate distribution of income. But, critics ask, why are poor farmers particularly deserving of aid, rather than poor people in general? Moreover, the price support programs give aid on the basis of how much a farmer produces. Thus, large farmers gain far more than small farmers.

If the objective of the farm programs were to address these market failures, then the farm program would be designed in a markedly different manner. In fact, a major objective of the farm program is to transfer resources—to subsidize farmers (and not just poor farmers)—not to correct a market failure. The program is designed to keep a large part of its cost hidden: only a part of the cost is reflected in the federal budget; the rest is paid for by consumers in the form of higher prices. The market failure approach has provided some of the rhetoric for the program, but not the rationale. For that, we have to look into politics and the role of special interest groups.

the government should intervene in such cases, where individuals seemingly do not do what is in their own best interest; the kind of intervention that is required must be stronger than simply providing information. Goods that the government compels individuals to consume, like seat belts and elementary education, are called merit goods.

The view that the government should intervene because it knows what is in the best interest of individuals better than they do themselves is referred to as paternalism. The paternalistic argument for government activities is quite distinct from the externalities argument discussed above. One might argue that smoking causes cancer, and that since individuals who get cancer may be treated in public hospitals or financed by public funds, smokers impose a cost on nonsmokers. This, however, can be dealt with by making smokers pay their full costs—for instance, by imposing a tax on cigarettes. Alternatively, smoking in a crowded room does indeed impose a cost on nonsmokers in that room. But this, too, can be dealt with directly. Those who take a paternalistic view might argue that individuals should not be allowed to smoke, even in the privacy of their own homes, and even if a tax which makes the smokers take account of the external costs imposed on others is levied. Though few have taken such an extreme paternalistic position with respect to smoking, this paternalistic role undoubtedly has been important in a number of areas, such as government policies toward drugs (illegalization of marijuana) and liquor (prohibition in the 1930s).
In contrast to the paternalistic view, many economists and social philosophers believe that the government should respect consumers' preferences. Though there may occasionally be cases that merit a paternalistic role for the government, these economists argue that it is virtually impossible to distinguish such cases from those that do not. And they worry that once the government assumes a paternalistic role, special interest groups will attempt to use government to further their own views about how individuals should act or what they should consume. The view that government should not interfere with the choices of individuals is sometimes referred to as libertarianism.

There are two important caveats to economists' general presumption against government paternalism. The first concerns children. Someone must make paternalistic decisions on behalf of children, either the parents or the state, and there is an ongoing debate concerning the proper division of responsibility between the two. Some treat children as if they were the property of their parents, arguing that parents alone should have responsibility for taking care of their children. But most argue that the state has certain basic responsibilities, such as, for instance, ensuring that every child gets an education and that parents do not deprive their children of needed medical care or endanger them physically or emotionally.

The second caveat concerns situations where the government cannot, at least without difficulty, commit itself to refrain from helping individuals who make poor decisions. For instance, individuals who do not save for their retirement become a burden on the government, and this provides part of the rationale for social security. There are other instances in which individuals who fail to take appropriate precautions become a burden to society—and a sense of compassion makes it difficult in the face of a crisis to simply say, "you should have taken appropriate precautions." Government accordingly responds by forcing or at least encouraging precautionary behavior. Individuals who neither buy earthquake insurance nor build homes that can withstand the effects of an earthquake become a burden on the government when an earthquake strikes. The government finds itself compelled to act compassionately, even if the victims' dire situation is partly of their own making. Recognizing this, the government may compel individuals to take adequate precautions against the event of an earthquake by, for instance, enforcing high standards for earthquake-resistant construction and making mandatory the purchase of earthquake insurance.

**TWO PERSPECTIVES ON THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT**

We saw in Chapter 1 that there are two aspects of the analysis of public sector activities: the normative approach, which focuses on what the government should do, and the positive approach, which focuses on describing